

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY 1849.

No. III.

ART. I.—*Annual Report of the Board of Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1849.*

As a fruit of the Spirit of Christ in the church, and of the motions of that Spirit towards its proper manifestation, the Annual Reports of our Board of Missions are signs of the times. These yearly statements of the aims and results of our activity in the natural and legitimate direction of true Christianity, indicate a method and a scale of operations, honorable to the zeal and wisdom of the Board and its agents, and gratifying to the church; and while these operations are far behind the ability of the church and perhaps behind our advancement in some other things, they come from the spirit of the gospel, and are destined, as the gospel prospers, to a vast enlargement. While the same is true of the other Boards of our church, we would here offer a few hints concerning the ground of our system of Domestic Missions, for the sake of the bearing of our remarks on the nature and extent of our work.

the medical attendants of the separate prisons in France, some of whom have feared the effects of the discipline upon the health of prisoners. All acknowledge that sickness is found less frequently, and of shorter duration. Epidemic disorders, and sickness occasioned by the change of the seasons, rarely penetrate the cells, whilst under the old system the inhabitants of the prison never escaped. They frequently see prisoners weak, emaciated, and languishing, gradually recover all the outward signs of good health. Thus several physicians formally declare that the cellular system ought to be accepted as a benefit on account of health,"—[M. Ardet, Honorary Inspector of the prisons of France, at the Frankfort Congress, 1846.—Cited by Field, vol. ii. p. 363.]

The only remaining testimony we shall cite is that of the Count Gasparin, equally eminent as a Christian and a Statesman. "Every Government," says he in his letter to Mr. Sumner, "which in the actual state of society, and of the progress of Social science, adopts any other than the separate system, will expose itself to the necessity of having before long to reconstruct its prisons."

ART. III.—*The Apostleship a Temporary Office.*

In a former number* an attempt was made to prove that the highest permanent office in the church is that of Presbyter, by showing that the primitive Presbyters exercised the highest ministerial functions. In opposition to this doctrine, some allege the superiority and perpetuity of the Apostolic office. If this office was superior to that of Presbyter, and if it was designed to be perpetual, it follows of course that no church authority can rightfully be exercised, except by those who have succeeded the Apostles in the powers which belonged to them as such, and as distinguished from the Elders of the Church. Let it be observed, however, that in order to justify this conclusion, two things must be made out. If the Apostles were not an order of church officers, distinct from and superior to the Presbyters or Elders,

* See p. 116 of this volume.

the strongest proof that the office was perpetual only proves that that of Elder was designed to be perpetual, which all admit. If, on the other hand, the Apostolic office was a temporary one, it matters not how far it may have been superior to that held by Presbyters, who still remain, in that case, the highest permanent office-bearers in the Christian Church. In order then to the decision of the controversy, two distinct questions are to be determined. 1. Were the Apostles superior to Presbyters? 2. Was their office, as distinct from that of Presbyter, designed to be perpetual? By some Presbyterian writers both these questions have been answered in the negative, while all Episcopalians, who assert the *jus divinum* of prelatical episcopacy, answer both affirmatively. In the remainder of the present argument the first point will be yielded to the adverse party; that is to say, it will be granted that the Apostles were church-officers superior to Presbyters or Elders. At the same time an attempt will be made to prove, exclusively from scripture, that the Apostolic office was a temporary one.

I. The first argument in favour of this proposition is that the continuance of the office is no where expressly stated.

To this it might be answered, that an office being once created, its continuance must be presumed, without an explicit declaration to the contrary.

The general principle is not denied; but in this case there are peculiar circumstances which afford strong ground for a contrary presumption.

1. The original Apostles are uniformly spoken of as constituting a distinct and well-defined body of men, not only in the gospel history, but in the latest books of the New Testament. "But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before by THE APOSTLES OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, how that they told you there should be mockers in the last time who should walk after their own ungodly lusts." (Jude, vi. 17, 18.) This mode of expression seems to intimate, that "the apostles" belonged to a preceding period, and that most of them were actually gone. Jude would hardly have expressed himself in this way, if the title had already been extended to a multitude of others. "Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy APOSTLES AND PROPHETS; for God hath avenged you on her." (Rev. xviii. 20.) Can there be any doubt that this apostrophe is ad-

dressed to the original Apostles? And would John have so described them if the name, in his day, had been rightfully assumed by many others, equal and equally "supreme" in power? That he was not familiar with any such extension of the name, may also be inferred from Rev. xxi. 14, where he speaks of "the twelve apostles."

It may be urged, however, that the case of Paul destroys the force of the presumption drawn from the mention of the Apostles as a limited number; for he was a thirteenth, and if one might be added, why not more?

This objection would be valid, but for one consideration, which converts the case of Paul into a strong corroboration of the doctrine against which it is alleged. That case is every where referred to and described as an anomalous exception. He speaks of himself as the least of the Apostles (1 Cor. xv. 9,) and not only as morally unworthy to be called one, but as almost too late to be an Apostle, as one born out of due time, (1 Cor. xv. 8,) while at the same time he asserts his equality with the rest as to official rank and power. Now if the Apostolic office was intended to be regularly continued, and if many others were to be brought into it, and invested with its "supreme powers," even during Paul's life-time, and by his agency, how was he like one born out of due time? Or how could he call himself the least of the Apostles? Can any degree of humility make it consistent with his truth and candour, to pronounce himself inferior, as an Apostle, to Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Silas, Junias, and Andronicus, who were all officially his equals on the supposition which we are opposing? Since then the case of Paul is represented by himself as an anomaly, it serves, as a sole exception, to confirm the general statement that the Apostles are referred to as a limited body, not to be increased. This is the first ground of presumption that the office of apostle, as distinguished from all others, was intended to be temporary.

2. A second is, that some of the apostolic powers are acknowledged by both parties in this controversy to have been temporary. The presumption, therefore, is, that all the rest were temporary likewise, except so far as the continuance of any can be clearly shown from scripture. Now it is not and cannot be denied, that some of them were thus continued, and

that for this very purpose the offices of Presbyter and Deacon now exist. But this very fact adds greatly to the strength of the presumption, that the apostolic office was a temporary one. For if the cessation of some apostolic powers makes it *a priori* probable that all the rest ceased likewise, how much more does the acknowledged transfer of some of the remaining powers to distinct church-officers, continued in existence for that very purpose, make it *a priori* probable, that all the apostolic powers, which did not thus cease, were thus transferred.

3. The power exercised by the Apostles was a general ambulatory power, not confined to particular districts. This was exactly suited to the incipient condition of the church, but could not supersede the necessity of permanent and local officers, after the planting of particular churches. Now the elders and deacons, of whom we read in the New Testament, are the elders and deacons of particular churches, after whose appointment the irregular supervision of the Apostles might be expected to cease, as being no longer needed. On the hypothesis, that the Apostles were commissioned merely to plant the church in various countries, and ordain permanent officers who should exercise such of the apostolical powers as were necessary for the continued existence of the church, while all the others ceased;—on this hypothesis the course of things could hardly have been different from that which is recorded. This then affords a third ground of presumption that the supposition is coincident with fact.

4. A fourth ground is, that the apostolic functions which all admit to have been subsequently exercised by Presbyters, are precisely those which, in their own nature, are the most important, viz. the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. However important the powers of ordination and discipline may be, they derive their importance from the others. The end of discipline is to preserve purity and exclude the unworthy from the peculiar privileges of the church. The end of ordination is to secure a valid administration of the word and sacraments. If the Head of the Church had left this ministration to any one who chose to perform it, without special ordination to an office, whatever inconveniences might have attended that arrangement, it could not have impaired the intrinsic value of the word and sacraments. But if, on the other hand, there were no word and sacraments, ordination

would be useless. And the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of government or discipline. These then (ordination and discipline) are subsidiary functions which derive their value from the relation they sustain to others. Now if the office of a Christian Presbyter had been invested with powers of a subordinate nature, i. e., such as derive their value from their being necessary to the exercise of others, it might have been alleged, with some degree of plausibility, that the Apostolic office was designed to be perpetual for the sake of those functions which were not bestowed on Presbyters, but which were essential to the being of the Church. But when we find that the lower office was invested with those powers which possess a necessary and intrinsic value, this, to say the least, adds strength to the presumption that the Apostolic office, which was thus succeeded by another order, in its most important functions, was intended to be temporary.

5. On the supposition, that some apostolic powers were neither shared by Presbyters nor discontinued, there is no means of determining what these reserved powers were. For if it be said that all which were not extended to Presbyters were thus reserved, this, in the first place, presupposes the decision of the question whether Presbyters ordained and governed; and, in the next place, supposing that they did not, the successors of the Apostles must, according to this rule, possess the power of working miracles, which certainly belonged to the original apostles. If it be said that this was a temporary gift of an extraordinary nature, then the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost was also temporary. But this our opponents are unwilling to admit. There is, in fact, no unity among Episcopalians, as to the precise powers which have been continued in their Bishops as successors of the Apostles. Some confine their claims to ordination. Some add discipline, as rightfully belonging only to the Bishop. Others add the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost. This last is inseparable from the gift of miracles. Whenever the effects of the gift of the Holy Ghost, conferred by the Apostles, are described, they are of a miraculous nature. The power of bestowing the more inward and spiritual influences of the Holy Ghost, is not only never claimed, but is expressly disclaimed. The Church of Rome is therefore more consistent than the advocates of High Church Episcopacy,

in claiming not only the power of conferring the Holy Ghost, but also its inseparable adjunct, that of working miracles. Our present design, however, is not to disprove the possession of this power, but to show the want of harmony among those who maintain that certain apostolic powers are continued in the church, by means of ministers distinct from and superior to Presbyters. And the design of showing this is to illustrate the impossibility of drawing any line between the powers which ceased or were transferred to Presbyters, and those which are alleged to have been continued in the apostolic office. And the use which we propose to make of this impossibility is simply to strengthen the presumption which has been already raised in favour of the doctrine that the Apostolic office, as distinct from that of Elder, and superior to it, was a temporary one.

The grounds of the presumption, then, are (1) that the twelve apostles are referred to in the New Testament, as a well-known body of men, limited in number, and not to be increased, except in the extraordinary case of Paul, which he himself describes as a remarkable exception—(2) that some of the powers exercised by the original apostles are no longer in existence—(3) that some which still exist are exercised by Presbyters, and were so exercised in apostolic times—(4) that those which are thus exercised by Presbyters are in themselves the most essential to the existence of the church—(5) that the office of Presbyter has been continued in the church for the very purpose of succeeding the apostles in these functions, and with a view to permanent action within fixed local bounds—(6) that the advocates for the perpetuity of the apostolic office are not agreed among themselves as to the powers which now belong to it, and that this want of agreement arises from the silence of scripture, and the impossibility of fixing any principle, by which a line may be drawn between the powers which are thus continued and those which have ceased or been transferred to Presbyters.

Waving the positive conclusions which might not unreasonably be deduced from these premises, we shall merely insist upon their furnishing a strong presumption, that the apostolic office was intended to be temporary, bearing the same relation to the permanent ministry that a constituent assembly or convention bears to the legislative body which succeeds it. We say there is

presumptive proof of this, so strong that it can only be counter-vailed by positive evidence from scripture. The facts, which have been stated as the grounds of this presumption, may be clearly proved from scripture. It is not too much to ask, then, that if another fact is to be added to the list, viz. that some of the apostolic powers were neither discontinued nor transferred to Presbyters and that for the exercise of these reserved powers the apostolic office was itself continued, some explicit declaration of the fact may be adduced to countervail the strong adverse presumption. And this brings us back to our first position, that **THE CONTINUANCE OF THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE, IN ADDITION TO THOSE WHICH RELIEVED IT OF ITS MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS, IS NOWHERE EXPLICITLY ASSERTED IN THE SCRIPTURES.** As the presumptions are so strong against the supposition of a permanent apostleship, the very silence of the scriptures might be urged as a decisive proof. It cannot be denied, however, that the force of this negative argument would be destroyed by proving that the scriptures *indirectly* recognize the Apostolic office as perpetual. This leads us to another view of the subject.

II. A second argument in favour of the proposition, that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, is that the name Apostle, in its strict and proper sense, is not applied, in the New Testament, to any persons who were not of the original thirteen.

The passages, in which such an application of the title is alleged, are the following. 1. "But the multitude of the city was divided and part held with the Jews, and part with **THE APOSTLES,**" [meaning Paul and Barnabas]—"which when **THE APOSTLES,** Barnabas and Paul, heard of, they rent their clothes," &c. (Acts xiv. 4, 14.)—2. "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among **THE APOSTLES,** who also were in Christ before me" (Rom. xvi. 7.)—3. "Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother and companion in labour and fellow-soldier, but your messenger (*ἀπόστολον*), and he that ministers to my wants." (Phil. ii. 25.)—4. "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers (*ἀπόστολοι*) of the churches, and the glory of Christ." (2 Cor. viii. 23.)—5. "Paul and Silvanus and

Timotheus unto the church of the Thessalonians" (1 Thess. i. 1,) compared with "Nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome AS THE APOSTLES of Christ," (1 Thess. ii. 6.)—From these texts it is inferred by some that Barnabus, Andronicus, Junias, Epaphroditus, Silas, Timothy, and certain brethren who accompanied Titus to Corinth, were Apostles, in the same sense in which Paul was an Apostle; and from this the obvious conclusion has been drawn, that the Apostolic office was intended to be permanent.

It might well be made a question whether the strong antecedent probability that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, could be wholly set aside by the application of the title in five places, however clear the application might be, and however obvious the sense in which the word was used. The advocates of this interpretation themselves protest against all objections to their system which are founded on the scriptural use of the word *Bishop*, which they own to be convertible with *Presbyter*. They have no right, therefore, to make that of the word *Apostle* the foundation of a perfectly exclusive system. If the *lawfulness* of a superior order were the point in question, incidental proofs of this kind ought to have due weight; but when attempts are made to prove, that the continuance of the Apostolic order, as distinct from that of Presbyters, is essential to the being of a church, and that in the face of such presumptions to the contrary as have been stated, a sober reasoner would have good cause to hesitate before receiving, as conclusive evidence, the application of the name in a few cases, even if the proposed interpretation of the passages referred to were undoubtedly correct.

But this is very far from being certain. Of the five texts cited, there are two, in which the very application of the title is at least very doubtful. 1. In the first epistle to the Thessalonians, the word ἀπόστολοι is not in juxtaposition or apparent connexion with the names of Timothy and Silas, but separated from them by fourteen intervening verses. It is not even alleged, that the joining of other names with Paul's, in the beginning of a letter, makes it necessary to refer the whole of its contents to all the persons thus included in title; because, after such a joint address, he often uses the first person singular. Nor is it, on the other hand, alleged, that the use of the plural *we* re-

quires such a reference; because that mode of speech is so habitual with Paul, that it may almost be regarded as one of his characteristic idioms; and, as if to guard against such a construction, he says, near the conclusion of this very passage, "Wherefore we would have come unto you, **EVEN I PAUL**, once and again." (1 Thess. ii. 18.) This explanation is, at least, sufficient to outweigh the argument derived from the plural form *ἀπόστολοι*, which is, no doubt, strictly, inapplicable to a single person, but not when preceded, as in this case, by a particle denoting resemblance or comparison. Though Paul could not call himself "the **APOSTLES** of Christ," he could assert his right to do a thing "**AS** the apostles of Christ." He could disclaim having sought glory of them or of others, when he might have been burdensome **AS** the apostles of Christ collectively had a right to be. This construction of the sentence is, to say the least, as natural as that which makes the plural form in chap. ii. 6, refer to Timothy and Silas, who are mentioned only in the title (i. 1,) and neither there nor elsewhere as apostles.

But even granting that this is a more probable explanation of the plural form, which is a mere gratuitous concession, it would not follow necessarily that Timothy and Titus were Apostles in the sense contended for; because another supposition is still open to us, namely, that *ἀπόστολοι* is here used in another sense. For which is it easier to believe, that Silas and Timothy were as much Apostles as Paul himself, but nowhere called so except here by implication and remote allusion—or that when he calls them by that title, he uses it in a wider sense, than when it is employed to designate our Lord's immediate followers? We are willing that this question should be answered without any reference to the reasons, hereafter to be stated, for believing that the word *apostle* is employed in a plurality of meanings. Even if there were no other reason for attaching to it a double sense, this case would be just as good a reason for supposing one, as it is for supposing Silas to have been an Apostle, in the absence of all proof from any other quarter. The one argument is this: Paul says, "we the apostles of Christ," and as Silas and Timothy are mentioned with him in the title of the epistle, they must be included; they were therefore Apostles, in the same sense in which Paul was one. The

other argument is this: The Apostles were a limited number, and Paul elsewhere speaks of his addition to it as an extraordinary thing; but Silas and Timothy, though often mentioned, are no where else called Apostles; therefore, when Paul so calls them, he uses the title in a wider sense. If these two arguments be only *equal* in conclusive force, they balance one another, and the passage cannot be employed as proof, that these two persons were "supreme Apostles." This is the case be it observed, on the supposition that the ἀπόστολοι in ch. ii. 6, refers to all the men named in ch. i. 1. But we have already seen that this reference is doubtful and that a different construction is, at least, as plausible. The adverse argument, then, rests on two assumptions; (1) that ἀπόστολοι in ch. ii. 6 refers to Timothy and Silas, as well as Paul; (2) that it must be taken in its strict and highest sense; whereas it is at least as probable that it does not refer to them, and that if it does it does not denote Apostles in the strict sense. To say the least, then, after every concession, this passage is too doubtful to be made the basis of an argument to prove, in opposition to such strong presumptions, that the office of Apostle was continued.

2. The other case, in which there is a doubt as to the application of the name APOSTLE, is Rom. xvi. 7. Here the phrase ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις may mean either *eminent apostles* or *highly esteemed among* (i. e. by) *the apostles*. Admitting, for the sake of argument that the former is the better construction, we are not shut up to the conclusion that Andronicus and Junias (or Junia, as Bishop Onderdonk writes it, even while claiming him or her as an apostle) were Apostles in the strict sense. We have just as much reason to believe, that they were Apostles in another sense. Even supposing, for the present, that no such sense of the term can be proved from usage, we have just as much reason to infer it from this passage, as to infer that these two persons were Apostles in the strict sense. For against this inference lies, first, the whole weight of the strong presumption that the apostolic office was a temporary one; and, secondly, the extreme improbability that two eminent apostles, in the strict sense of that title, would be thus named among a crowd of private Christians, and never heard of elsewhere. Is it easier to believe this than that the word apostle has a double meaning, even supposing this to be incapable of proof from any other

quarter? We are not now determining the true sense of the passage. We are only showing that a passage which admits, first of two grammatical constructions, and then (assuming that contended for by our opponents) of two interpretations, cannot be regarded as decisive of so difficult and grave a question as the one respecting the perpetual or temporary nature of the apostolic office.

In these two cases, it is doubtful to whom the name Apostle is applied; but in the other three there can be no such doubt. We admit that Barnabas, Epaphroditus, and the brethren who accompanied Titus, are expressly called ἀπόστολοι; and from this the inference is drawn by our opponents, that the Apostolic office, strictly so called, was conferred upon these persons, and that it consequently did not cease with the original incumbents. This inference involves the assumption that the term ἀπόστολος has always the same meaning, viz., that of Apostle in the strict sense, as denoting one of the original thirteen, or a person equal to them in official rank and power, as supreme ruler of the church under Christ himself. In order to estimate the probability of this assumption, it is necessary to refer to the analogy of other terms, used to denote office in the Christian church.

The other terms admitted, upon both sides, to be so employed are πρεσβύτερος, ἐπίσκοπος, διάκονος, ποιμήν, διδάσκαλος, προφήτης, ἄγγελος. Now let it be observed that, of these seven words, not one was invented for the purpose, or derived from the Hebrew. They are all pure Greek words, used by profane writers, and already familiar to the Jews who spoke that language, before they were appropriated to the use in question. From this state of the case it would be natural and reasonable a priori, to conclude that all the words would have, at least, a double sense, as used in the New Testament, viz. a wide or popular meaning, according to their etymology and previous usage, and a stricter technical meaning, as appropriated to the designation of ecclesiastical office. How far this natural presumption is confirmed by the actual usage of the New Testament, may be forcibly stated, as to some of these terms, in the words of a well known episcopal writer.

“Many words have both a loose and a specific meaning.

* Εὐαγγελιστής is omitted, because its precise meaning is a matter of dispute. As to the rest, there is a formal agreement.

The word 'angel' is often applied loosely, (Acts xii. 15. Rev. i. 20, ix. 14), but distinctively it means certain created spirits. The word 'God' is applied to angels, (Deut. x. 17. Ps. xcvii. 7, cxxxvi. 2), and idols, (Ex. xx. 3, xxiii. 24, &c.) and human personages or magistrates, (Exod. vii. 1, xxii. 28. Ps. lxxxiii. 1, 6, cxxxviii. 1. John x. 35); but distinctively it means the Supreme Being. The word 'deacon' means an ordinary servant, a servant of God in secular affairs, and any minister of Christ; but a Christian minister of the lower grade is its specific meaning. So with the word 'elder'; it is sometimes applied to the clergy of any grade or grades; but its appropriate application is to ministers of the second or middle order. The above remarks, it is hoped, will enable those who feel an interest in consulting scripture on the subject before us, to do so without any embarrassment from the apparent confusion of official names or titles." *Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined*, p. 14.

"We would also advert to the fact that, however distinct may have been the three above latin names for the three grades of sacerdotal office, those names of office were, in the Greek, and at an earlier period, applied but loosely. At least, they were so in the New Testament. Thus we read 'this ministry [*deaconship*] and *apostleship* (Acts i. 25)' for the office to which Matthias was admitted. 'I am the apostle of the gentiles, I magnify mine office [my *deaconship*], the ministry [*deaconship*] which I have received,' 'approving ourselves the ministers [*deacons*] of God,' (Rom. xi. 13; Acts xx. 342; Cor. vi. 4), are passages applied by St. Paul to himself. We also read, 'who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers, [*deacons*] by whom ye believed?' (1 Cor. iii. 5), and 'do the work of an *evangelist*, make full proof of thy ministry, [*deaconship*]'—thou shalt be a good minister [*deacon*] of Jesus Christ,' are admonitions addressed to Timothy, (2 Tim. iv. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 6.)" *ib.* p. 20. "It may not be improper to add some further illustrations of the uncertainty of official names. Thus we say the Jewish 'priesthood,' including in that term, with the priests, the superior order of high priests, and the inferior one of levites. Thus also we have the phrase 'ministry [literally *deaconship*] of reconciliation'; and the expressions, 'that the ministry [*deaconship*] be not blamed;' 'seeing we have this ministry, [*deacon-*

ship’, ‘putting me into the ministry, [*deaconship*],’ and more especially ‘apostles, prophets, evangelists, &c.,’ are all said to have been given for the work of the ministry, [*deaconship*], (2 Cor. v. 18, vi. 3, iv. 1.; 1 Tim. i. 12; Eph. iv. 11, 12,) in all which passages the word *deaconship*, *διακονία*, the appellation strictly of a sacred body of men, or of their office, includes, nay, signifies chiefly, those who were superior to deacons. The word ‘presbytery,’ therefore, being no more definite than ‘ministry’ or ‘deaconship,’ cannot explain itself in favour of our opponents.” *ib.* p. 21. “The mere expression *presbytery*, therefore, does not explain itself, and cannot of itself be adduced in favour of parity.” *ib.* p. 21.

We make these quotations from an argument against the doctrine which we are defending, not for the sake of the specific application which the author makes of an important principle, but for the sake of the principle itself, which is, that names of office “do not explain themselves,” and “cannot of themselves be adduced in favour” of either side of the question. An obvious deduction from this rule is that the mere use of the name “apostle” can prove nothing as to the precise rank of the men to whom it is applied, which can only be determined by a careful collation of the general usage with the context in any given case. Let us proceed to this comparison; but first let us consider the analogous usage of the other titles which have been enumerated, and which are employed to designate ecclesiastical office. In order to secure a satisfactory result, we shall survey them *seriatim*.

1. *Πρεσβύτερος* sometimes means *older*, as an adjective in the comparative degree, (Luke xv. 25; John viii. 9); sometimes an *old man* in the proper sense (1 Tim. v. 1, where it is put in opposition to *πρεσβύτερα*); sometimes an officer or magistrate under the Jewish commonwealth, (Matt. xxi. 23; Mark xv. 1; Luke vii. 3. Acts iv. 8, &c.); sometimes an officer of the Christian Church, (Acts xv. 2, xx. 17; 1 Tim. v. 19.; Tit. i. 5; Jas. v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 5.)

Ἐπίσκοπος (which only occurs five times in the New Testament) in one case is applied to the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head of the Church, or the spiritual guardian of the souls of all believers, (1 Peter ii. 25). Elsewhere it denotes the official

overseer of a particular church or congregation, (Acts xx. 28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7.)

3. Διάκονος sometimes means a menial servant, a domestic, (Matt. xx. 26, xxii. 13, xxiii. 11; John ii. 5, 9); sometimes a minister or agent either of good or evil, (Gal. ii. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 15); sometimes a secular representative of God, (Rom. xiii. 4); sometimes a minister of the old dispensation (Rom. xv. 8); sometimes a minister of the Christian Church generally, without regard to rank, (2 Cor. iii. 6, xi. 23; Eph. iii. 7, vi. 21; Col. i. 7, 23, 25, iv. 7; 1 Thes. iii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 6); sometimes a *deacon*, the lowest order of church-officers, (1 Tim. iii. 8, 12.)

4. Ποιμὴν sometimes means a literal shepherd, (Matt. xxv. 32. Luke ii. 8, 15, 18, 20); sometimes a spiritual pastor, both in reference to Christ himself, (Matt. xxvi. 31; John x. 2, 11, 12, 14, 16; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 25), and to his ministers, (Eph. iv. 11.)

5. Διδάσκαλος sometimes means a teacher generally, as opposed to a learner or disciple, (Matt. x. 25; Rom. ii. 20); sometimes a public teacher of religion, (Luke ii. 46; John iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; James iii. 1), especially the founder of a school or sect, (Matt. ix. 11, vii. 24; Luke xviii. 18); sometimes an official teacher in the Christian Church, (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11, iv. 3.)

6. Προφήτης once means a poet, regarded by the heathen as inspired, (Tit. i. 12.) Elsewhere it means, sometimes a prophet of the old dispensation, (Matt. i. 22, viii. 17, &c.), sometimes an inspired teacher in the Christian Church, (Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, xiv. 29, 32, 37; Eph. iv. 11.)

7. Ἄγγελος sometimes means a human messenger, (Luke ix. 52); sometimes a spirit, good (Matt. i. 20, &c.) or bad, (Matt., xxv. 41; 2 Cor. xii. 7); sometimes an ecclesiastical superior (Rev. i. 20, ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 5, 7, 14.)

Now if ἀπόστολος has one invariable meaning in the New Testament, it is contrary, not only to what might have been expected from the origin and previous usage of the term, but also to the analogy of the other terms used in the New Testament, to designate ecclesiastical office. The only probable supposition *a priori* is, that it would have the same variety of meaning as the rest. Now of the seven terms, which we have been considering, the three which occur most frequently in application

to ecclesiastical office, have a threefold usage perfectly distinguishable. They are all used in a popular sense, in a general religious sense, and in a specific ecclesiastical sense. Thus *πρεσβύτερος* is used, in a popular sense, to signify an old man; in a general religious sense, to signify a minister of any rank; and in a strict ecclesiastical sense to signify a Presbyter. The popular sense of *διάκονος* is a servant, its more restricted sense a minister, its most restricted sense a deacon. The widest sense of *διδάσκαλος* is a teacher of any kind; its more restricted sense a religious teacher; its most restricted sense, an authorized official teacher in the Christian Church. The three corresponding senses of the word *ἀπόστολος* would be (1) a messenger of any kind; (2) a religious messenger or missionary; (3) an Apostle, in the strict official sense before described. And this distinction, suggested by analogy, is verified by usage. The first of these senses occurs in John xiii. 16, "the servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent (*ἀπόστολος*) greater than he that sent him." Here *ἀπόστολος* stands in the same relation to the *sender*, as the *servant* to the *lord*. The second sense occurs in Rom. xi. 13, where *ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος* means not merely a Christian teacher of the highest rank, but one *sent out* as a missionary to the heathen. The same idea is still more clearly expressed in 1 Tim. ii. 7, where the collocation of the words connects *ἀπόστολος*, in a peculiar manner, with *κήρυξ* and *διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν*. The very same form of speech is repeated in 2 Tim. i. 11. In neither of these cases would the word *bishop*, in the modern sense, seem natural in such a position. If *ἀπόστολος* is here used in the technical sense, without any special reference to its etymology, why is it thus twice placed between the titles *preacher* and *teacher of the Gentiles*? We are of course, not endeavouring to show, that Paul was not an Apostle in the strict sense, but that the word is sometimes used with special reference to its etymology, and in its secondary sense of a religious messenger or missionary. The third or strict sense is the usual one, and need not be exemplified.

Let us now apply this usage of the term to the three cases which remain to be considered. 1. It appears from Phil. iv. 10—18, that the Philippian Christians had sent a present to Paul at Rome, by the hands of Epaphroditus. For this act of benevolence the apostle heartily commends and thanks them in

he passage just referred to. It is a certain fact, then, that Epaphroditus was a *messenger* from them to Paul, for the specific purpose of supplying his necessities. When, therefore, in a former part of the same letter, Epaphroditus is described in these terms, "Epaphroditus, my companion in labour and fellow soldier but your ἀπόστολος," which is more probable, that it means an Apostle in the strict sense, or a messenger? The solution of this question is made still more easy by the words which are added—"and he that ministered to my want"—which are clearly explanatory of τὸν ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν. This interpretation of ἀπόστολος not only deducts one from the alleged proofs of an addition to the number of apostles, but adds one to the proofs that ἀπόστολος is sometimes used in the sense of messenger.

2. It appears from 2 Cor. viii. 16, 17, that Titus, in compliance with Paul's request, and his own strong inclination, was about to visit Corinth, and that Paul sent with him "the brother whose praise was in the gospel throughout all the churches," and also another "brother, whom (says he) we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things, but now much more diligent upon the great confidence which I have in you." Of these two persons who accompanied Titus, one is expressly said to have been "chosen of the churches to travel with us [i. e. Paul], with this grace which is administered by us, to the glory of the same Lord and declaration of your ready mind." He was therefore a messenger of the churches, and both he and the other companion of Titus were messengers of Paul to the church at Corinth; and the other would even seem, from the last clause of v. 22, to have been a messenger from that church to Paul. These facts afford sufficient data for the decision of the question as to the sense of the word ἀπόστολοι in the following sentence. "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you; or our brethren be inquired of, they are the ἀπόστολοι of the churches, and the glory of Christ." (2 Cor. viii. 23.) Here are two cases, then, in which the word is applied to persons, who are not known to have been Bishops, but who are known to have been messengers, and are so described in the context. This prepares us for the only remaining case, that of Barnabas.

3. Acts xiv. 4, 14. In order to understand this case aright, it is necessary to bear in mind the nature of the work, in which

Paul and Barnabas were then engaged. This we shall state in the words of a favourite episcopal writer. "That this transaction at Antioch [Acts xiii. 1] related only to a special missionary 'work,' will be found sufficiently clear by those who will trace Paul and Barnabas through that work, from Acts xiii. 4 to xiv. 26; where its completion is recorded—and thence sailed to Antioch from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the *work*: which they fulfilled.' This 'work,' their missionary tour, being 'fulfilled,' all was fulfilled that had been required by the Holy Ghost, when he had them 'separated' or 'recommended to the grace of God' 'for the work to which he had called them.' This call, therefore, this separation, this 'work,' related only to a particular mission. And this laying on of hands was no ordination, but a lesser ceremony, which has no bearing on the controversy between parity and episcopacy."* "When the latter [i. e. Barnabas] had been made an Apostle, we know not; neither do we know when James the brother of the Lord, Sylvanus, &c., were admitted to that office."†

The case then stands thus: two men are called ἀπόστολοι, one of whom we know to have been an Apostle in the highest sense; but when the other "had been made an Apostle, we know not." From this application of the term our opponents infer that both were Apostles in the strict sense. To this we might reply that Barnabas is here called an Apostle in the strict sense, or rather included in the term ἀπόστολοι, for he is never so called separately, although often mentioned, and several times described, (Acts iv. 36; ix. 27; xi. 24; xiii. 1; xv. 35;) merely because he was Paul's colleague in this work, just as Silas is included in the description "Roman citizens," (Acts xvi. 37, 38,) for no reason that appears but this connexion with Paul, who is expressly and repeatedly declared to have been a Roman citizen, (Acts xxii. 25, 26, 27, 29; xxiii. 27.) Even granting, therefore, that ἀπόστολος is here used in its strict sense, it is by no means certain that it could have been applied, in that sense, to Barnabas alone; the rather as we have found no other case, in which it is so applied, either to him or any other person not of the original thirteen.

So too on the other hand, even admitting that he is individually styled an ἀπόστολος, it does not follow that he is so styled in the

* *Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined*, p. 17.

† *Ib.* p. 18.

strict sense of the term. The word, as we have seen, is used in three distinct senses—(1) a messenger of any kind—(2) a religious messenger or missionary—(3) an Apostle in the strict sense. The name is here applied to a man who is no where else called an apostle, or described as one, but who was, at the very time referred to, engaged with Paul in “a special missionary work,” a “missionary tour,” to which the Holy Ghost had called them; for “this call, this separation, this work, related only to a particular mission.” Under these circumstances, which is more probable, that ἀπόστολος, as thus used, means a *missionary*, or that it means a supreme ruler of the church, equal in rank to the original thirteen? If it means the latter, it is singular, to say the least, that Barnabas, who is so often mentioned and repeatedly described, is no where else called an Apostle, which, in the case supposed, was his grand distinction. But if, on the other hand, he is so called in the lower sense, it is easy to explain why he is no where else so called, viz. because his apostolic character was temporary. “This work, this missionary tour, being fulfilled, all was fulfilled that had been required by the Holy Ghost, when he had them separated or recommended to the grace of God, for the work to which he had called them. This call, this separation, this work, related only to a particular mission.” True, he afterwards went out upon a similar mission, but not, as it would seem, under church authority, nor is the narrative of that mission upon record. Paul, on the contrary, was still an Apostle, and is still so called, which makes it at least probable that he was an Apostle in a higher sense than Barnabas.

Still it may be argued that as both are called Apostles, and as Paul was certainly one in the highest sense, the inference is plain that Barnabas was also an Apostle in the highest sense. This would be valid reasoning if it were not equally certain that Paul was an Apostle in the lower sense too. One of the senses of the word applies to both; another applies certainly to one of them. Which is more reasonable, to infer that the latter applied also to the other, or to infer that the former is the sense here intended? In the one case, this solitary passage is adduced to prove what is no where else recorded, viz. that Barnabas was strictly an Apostle. In the other case, nothing is assumed or supposed to be here proved, but what is clearly

revealed elsewhere, viz. that both Barnabas and Paul were missionaries.

The argument admits of a familiar illustration. In the foreign missions of our own and other churches, the word "missionary" has a double sense; a strict one applicable only to ordained ministers or clergymen, and a wider one including lay-assistants. The first is considered the most proper and is certainly the most usual sense; but the other does undoubtedly occur, even in the official documents of missionary boards, especially when several or all of those engaged in the work are spoken of collectively. Let us suppose then that in a certain mission, two persons, A and B, have long been labouring, the first as a preacher, and the second as a lay-assistant; but that in some one report or journal, they are twice mentioned by the common name of *missionaries*, and it becomes a question with some readers of the document, whether B was not an ordained minister. On examining the series of reports and journals, it is found that B is no where else even called a missionary, and that in the case in question, no act is ascribed to him which necessarily implies that he is an ordained clergyman. From these premises two opposite inferences are drawn. The one is, that as A is certainly a clergyman and as both are called missionaries, B must be a clergyman also. The other is, that as B is no where else represented as a clergyman, and as both he and A are certainly missionaries in a wider sense, that is the sense in which the term is used. Without insisting on a choice between these opposite deductions, as entirely conclusive, we may ask what would be thought of an argument to prove a doubtful point, as to the organization of the mission, from the mere application of the term in such a case. But in the case of Barnabas there is this distinctive circumstance, that the antecedent probability is in favour of the supposition, that the apostolic office, in the strict sense, was confined to a certain number of persons, among whom Barnabas was not; and that this presumption can only be removed by positive proof that he was an Apostle.

The amount, then, of the argument from names is this, that of five cases, in which the name apostle is said to be applied to persons not of the original thirteen, there are two in which the application is itself disputed, and at least so far doubtful as to

render them unfit to be relied on as proofs; while in these cases, and in all the rest, the word either requires or admits another sense than that of an Apostle proper. These cases, therefore, make no change in the truth of the general proposition, that the extension of the Apostolic office to persons not of the original thirteen, is no where taught in scripture, either directly, by explicit assertion of the fact, or indirectly, by the application of the name Apostle, in its strict and highest sense.

III. A third argument in favour of the proposition, that the Apostolic office was a temporary one, is that the qualifications for the Apostleship, as a permanent office in the church, are no where stated. Even supposing that an explicit statement of the fact might easily have been omitted, which we do not grant, and that the absence of any unequivocal application of the name may be accounted for, which seems impossible, the question still arises, why are the qualifications of an "Apostle-bishop" not revealed? It is not enough to say, because Paul or Peter has not left epistles to those who were to consecrate Apostle-bishops. Granting the fact, why was not such a revelation made? Were the instructions to Timothy and Titus, as to "Presbyter-bishops," given without necessity? If not, why was not an occasion sought or made for giving the qualifications of Apostles? Because this office demands none in particular, or because it is less important than the others? It may be said, indeed, that we have no right to inquire why certain things have been revealed and others not. But this would be a mere evasion of the argument by the misapplication of an acknowledged principle. The question is not what should have been, but what has been revealed; and if both parties are agreed that certain offices are recognised in the New Testament, and the qualifications for those offices carefully detailed, and if one of the parties alleges that another office is there recognised, the other party has a right to ask how the omission of its qualifications is to be explained upon the opposite hypothesis. This would be the case, even if the disputed office were the lowest. If, for example, the qualifications of Deacons had no where been given, the evidence of such an office, as a permanent order in the church, would be much less conclusive than that of the Presbyterate, although Deacons are expressly mentioned, in connexion with the Presbyters or Bishops, in two of Paul's

epistles. How much inferior, then, is the evidence that Apostles were permanent officers of the church, when both these proofs are wanting. And how much weaker still when we consider the paramount importance attached to the apostolic office by the adverse party.

Even admitting, then, that no occasion does present itself in the New Testament, as it stands, for the detail of the qualifications of Apostles, that very circumstance increases, in a high degree, the improbability that such an office was intended to be permanently established. But this admission is gratuitous. By whom were subsequent apostles to be consecrated, if not by their predecessors in the office? If, then, Timothy and Titus were apostles, and addressed as such in Paul's epistles, why does he not instruct them in relation to the paramount importance of admitting only qualified men to that high station? Is it because the same qualifications which are required in presbyters are also required in apostles? Even if this were so, the great alleged superiority of the apostolic office would entitle it to the honour of a separate enactment, especially as presbyters and deacons are distinctly treated, though the qualifications for these two offices are almost identical. This difficulty is not merely theoretical but practical; for how are the qualifications of Apostle-bishops now to be determined? By what test shall they be judged? Those described in the first chapter of Acts are totally inapplicable to all modern cases. How then is it to be ascertained whether those admitted now to the alleged rank of Apostles, are as certainly possessed of the necessary qualifications as Presbyters and Deacons who are tried by the directions which Paul gave to Timothy and Titus? We do not maintain that this omission is itself sufficient to disprove the perpetuity of the Apostolic office, but merely that it renders it so far improbable as to require the most explicit proof to establish it.

But even this is not a full view of the subject of apostolical qualifications. It is not only true that no account is given of the qualifications of Apostle-bishops, as permanent officers in the church, after it had been planted by the original Apostles; but also that the qualifications which are given of an original Apostle, are of such a nature as to discountenance, in a high degree, the opinion that the office was intended to be perma-

ment. When the death of Judas made a vacancy in the apostolic body, the disciples proceeded to elect a successor, and Peter, in the name of the eleven, declared the qualifications which were requisite. These were (1) that the candidate should have been one of Christ's original followers; (2) that he should be a witness of the resurrection. (Acts i. 22.) The obvious *prima facie* inference from this is certainly that none could be apostles who were destitute of these qualifications. And this is very much confirmed by the case of Paul, who seems not to have known the Saviour personally, during his abode on the earth, but who, in vindicating his own claim to an equality of rank with the eleven, says expressly, "Have I not seen the Lord Jesus?"—thereby admitting that to have seen him was necessary to the apostolic character. This might be urged, with plausibility at least, as a direct proof that the apostolic office was a temporary one, because the number of those who had actually seen Christ after his resurrection, was limited and must soon be exhausted. All that we now allege, however, is, that the absence of express declarations, that the Apostolic office was continued in the church, is the more difficult to be explained on the opposite hypothesis, because when the qualifications of church officers are given, in two separate epistles, those of Apostles are not included; and because the only requisites prescribed in the election of a man to fill a vacancy in the original apostolic body, are precisely such as cannot be possessed by any men at present.

It may, however, be alleged, that, although the permanence of the apostolic office is not explicitly asserted; and although the qualifications of Apostle-bishops are not given; and although the name Apostle, in its highest sense, is not applied to any but the original thirteen; others are, nevertheless, spoken of as actually exercising apostolic powers; and that as it is the thing, and not the name, which is really in question, this is sufficient to establish the perpetuity of the Apostleship. Before proceeding to examine the grounds of this allegation, there are two preliminary observations to be made upon it.

1. The omission of the name Apostle is by no means an unimportant circumstance. The title was not so regarded in the original institution. It did not grow out of circumstances, nor was it, in any sense, the result of accident. It is not said, in an inciden-

tal way, that the twelve were called apostles, as it is said that the disciples were called Christians at Antioch; but we are told, that our Lord "called unto him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also HE NAMED APOSTLES." (Luke vi. 13.) The office and the name were conferred by the same authority. When the persons thus chosen are afterwards mentioned, it is commonly by the name which Christ bestowed at first, or by that of "the twelve," denoting their limited number. This is especially the case after our Lord's ascension, when there seems to be no case of the Apostles, in the strict sense, being called by any indefinite name. Now these two facts, viz. that the name was coeval with the office, and is recorded as a matter of some moment; and that the original Apostles are almost always, and after Christ's ascension always, called by it or some other title equally definite—render it *a priori* highly probable, that if the office was to be continued, the name would be continued with it; and that if continued in common parlance it would be applied in the New Testament; and that if applied at all, it would be applied with greater frequency than ever after the name had been extended to a multitude of persons. How is it that as the number of apostles increased, the mention of the name becomes less frequent, even when the organization of the church, and the qualifications of its officers, are the subject of discourse? These considerations will, perhaps, suffice to show, that the failure to establish the explicit application of the name Apostle to the alleged successors of the original thirteen, is by no means a matter of indifference, even if it can be shown that they possessed and exercised apostolic powers. Not that the actual possession and exercise of peculiar apostolic powers does not prove them to have been apostles, but that the omission of the title makes it harder to establish the fact of such possession and exercise, and entitles us to call for more explicit proof than would otherwise be necessary.

2. Before the exercise of apostolic powers by persons not of the original thirteen can be adduced in proof of the permanent continuance of the apostolic office, it must be determined what are apostolic powers. It cannot mean all the powers of the original apostles; for some of these are admitted, on both sides, to have ceased. It cannot mean any of these powers indefinitely; for some of them are admitted, on both sides, to be lawfully

exercised by presbyters; and this would prove that presbyters are the successors of the apostles in the highest of their powers which did not cease. If the possession of any apostolic powers is a proof of the succession, then the succession is in presbyters. If the possession of all the apostolic powers is necessary to establish a succession, then there is none at all. Either of these conclusions would be fatal to the adverse argument, which cannot have the slightest force, except on two conditions—(1) that the apostolic powers, shown to have been exercised by persons not of the original thirteen, be such as are not acknowledged to have ceased—(2) that they be such as were not exercised by Presbyters. For if they were powers possessed by Presbyters, their exercise proves nothing but the continuance of that office, which is not disputed; and if they were powers which have ceased, their exercise in apostolic times proves nothing as to the rights and powers of any office now existing in the church. With these preliminary observations, we here leave the subject, reserving to a future time the full exhibition of our fourth argument against the perpetuity of the Apostolic office, which is, that no peculiar apostolic powers are said in scripture to have been exercised by any person, who was not either an original apostle or a presbyter.

ART. III.—*Ignatius von Antiochien und seine Zeit. Sieben Send-schreiben an Dr. August Neander; von C. C. J. Bunsen. Hamburg. 1847.*

The personal history of Ignatius can be told in a few sentences; his writings, including all that bear his name, could be published in a single newspaper of ordinary size: while a full account of the controversies to which his writings have given rise would fill a considerable volume. According to a tradition intrinsically probable, and generally received, he was in his youth a scholar of the Apostles. He was settled in the pastoral charge of the church of Antioch, about A. D. 70; and remained in that important post, until his martyrdom A. D. 110–113. The emperor Trajan on his way to the east, stopped for some