

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 4.

---

JANUARY, MDCCCLXII.

---

ARTICLE I.

## INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

*Fathers and Brethren of the Board of Directors  
of the Theological Seminary :*

On entering formally upon the discharge of the duties of the office into which I have just been inducted, I beg leave to express the deep feeling of responsibility which oppresses me, and of self-distrust, which would have prevented my listening to the call to it, had I believed that I was free to decide in accordance with my own opinion of my fitness. But without obtruding upon you an account of the many reasons which would have induced me to refuse it, clustering more or less closely around the one already presented, permit me to say that I did not dare to yield to them, because the Synod of Georgia, in appointing me to this office, did not act so hastily that I might have regarded their appointment as the result of accident. And hence, although I can not shake off the anxious fear that they have been mistaken in the estimate which led them to make the choice, I may not do otherwise than obey, and

VOL. XIV., NO. IV.—65

heel, what resource is there but to fill the weary hours with the unmeaning dance—and THIS IS SOCIETY! We do not speak here as churchmen, but as members of that great family, in which all are bound together; we utter a protest against abuses which destroy even the conception of society. To us, the term suggests a rational interchange of thought, “the feast of reason and the flow of soul;” and the prevailing frivolity of our social assemblies shuts out the communion of intellect—a confession by judgment of mental bankruptcy and poverty. But the evil can not be cured, until rational and pleasing conversation shall be the charm of every circle, and hence the responsibility resting upon us to lift the intellectual tone of society to the desired level.

---

ARTICLE IV.

TIMOTHY'S OFFICE.

There are few characters in the New Testament that dwell in the heart of the Church with a more affectionate interest than Timothy. His early piety, upon which the aged Apostle seemed to dwell with such deep delight in the last days of his life; his hereditary blessing, that descended in covenant transmission from his grand-mother, Lois, and his mother, Eunice; his filial relation to Paul, who can hardly speak of him without a gush of fatherly tenderness, and his own gentle and beautiful spirit, make him the Melancthon of apostolic men, and shrine him in the most loving remembrance of the whole Church. The very scantiness of the materials left to us about his personal history, combined with the occasional glimpses of it

given in connexion with that of the great Apostle, tends to deepen the charm with which he is invested, rather than to lessen it.

But our interest in him is not purely personal. A still deeper interest invests him in his ecclesiastical and official character. He and Titus are two of the most important links that bind the Apostolic with the post-Apostolic Church, and in their official position are involved some of the most important questions of Church polity. They mark the transition epoch of the New Testament Church, and belong to a condition of ecclesiastical affairs that was steadily assuming what was designed by the great Head of the Church to be her permanent form. If, then, we can obtain a clear conception of their official character, we shall have reached important conclusions in regard to the true form of the Church's polity, in the New Testament dispensation.

We propose, therefore, to take the case of Timothy, and inquire into the nature of the office which he held—an office which is commonly regarded as identical with that of Titus—and thus gather some light on the questions of Church government that are involved in this matter.

There are two passages of Paul's Epistles to Timothy that seem to refer to his office. The first is, 1 Tim. 4:14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;" the second is, 2 Tim. 1:6: "Wherefore, I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." Assuming, for the present, that these texts do describe the office of Timothy, we will examine some of the theories of that office that have found the most strenuous advocacy. Three of them are most prominent.

## I. THE APOSTOLIC THEORY.

It is contended by some that Timothy was an Apostle. Conceding, as they are compelled to do, that the New Testament Episcopos and Presbyter are only different names for the same office—or, at most, different and interchangeable offices of the same order—they find their warrant for a third and higher order of Ministers in the continuance of the apostolic office in the Church, and in an unbroken series of successors to the Apostles, of which Timothy was one of the first, if not the very first, ordained to this high function. It is plain that this question resolves itself into the inquiry, whether the apostolate was designed to be a permanent office in the Church, like the presbyterate, and the diaconate, or extraordinary and temporary, like the prophetic and priestly offices.

Let us grasp the precise question at issue. It is not, whether any one in the New Testament is ever called an Apostle, except the Twelve. The word, in its primary sense, means a messenger, or one sent, and is some times used in that sense. Such a primary sense have all the official terms of the New Testament, such as bishop (an overseer); pastor (a shepherd); prophet (an internuncius); angel (a messenger); elder (an old man); deacon (a servant), etc., etc. As the designation of any one by these terms, used in their primary sense, would not argue an official position, so the calling of any one an apostolos, or messenger, does not prove him to have been officially an Apostle. The question, further, is not, whether the Apostles have successors, in any sense, for they were preaching Presbyters, as well as Apostles. Paul, Peter, and John, thus designate themselves, and in this capacity they were to have successors to the end of the world, and do have them, in every regular preacher of the true Gospel. The question is, whether, as Apostles, as the supreme rulers of the Church, their office was permanent, and whether, in

this character, Timothy, or any other man, can be a legitimate successor of the Twelve? We take the negative of this question, for several reasons.

1. *The Qualifications of an Apostle.*

Dr. Barrow, one of the profoundest theologians that has ever been produced by the Church of England, specifies six qualifications of an Apostle :\*

a. An immediate call of God.—(Gal. 1 : 1.) Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by men, (*διὰ*, with the genitive, which is always *by means of*,) but by (*διὰ*) Jesus Christ, and God the Father.

b. To have seen Christ, after his resurrection, so as to be a witness of this fundamental fact. So Peter affirmed in the election of Matthias (Acts 1 : 21, 22): "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us, all the time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the resurrection;" so Ananias expressly declared to Paul (Acts 22 : 14, 15): "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldst know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of His mouth, for thou shalt be His witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard;" and so Paul affirms, himself, when, vindicating his official rank, he makes the two synonymous (1 Cor. 9 : 1): "Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Christ?"

c. Miraculous powers, called by Paul (2 Cor. 12 : 12) "the signs of an Apostle."

d. Power to confer the Holy Ghost, as was implied in the case of Peter and John.—(Acts 8 : 18.)

e. Infallibility and inspiration, so that they could say, "it seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us," and so that all apostolic teaching was authoritative and inspired.—(Matt. 28 : 19, 20.)

---

\* Treat. Pope's Suprem., Sup. 2, § 4.

f. The right to govern all Christian Churches in the world, without any limitation of parish or diocese, called by Paul (2 Cor. 10 : 8) "the authority which the Lord hath given us for edification;" "the care of all the Churches," (2 Cor. 11 : 28), and similar expressions.

These are unquestionably the scriptural qualifications of an Apostle; and as these were not, and could not be, permanent, the office to which they belonged could not be permanent.

2. *The absence of any intimation in the New Testament of the permanence of the apostolate.*

The twelve Apostles are always spoken of as a definite body of men, numbered after the twelve tribes of Israel, and just as incapable of increase as they were. Had other Apostles been added, the original number, twelve, would soon have disappeared, and been lost in the general body of Apostles, just as the original seven Deacons were at last lost in the general body of Deacons. But, instead of this, they are spoken of by Paul as the Twelve, when there were only eleven (1 Cor. 15 : 5); and by Jude (v. 17), and Peter (2 Pet. 3 : 2), in terms that imply a definite body of men, authoritative in their words, who were then nearly all gone. John, in the Apocalypse, speaks of them in the same way, and at a time when there ought to have been many Apostles, if the order was to be permanent, speaks of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.—(Rev. 21 : 14.) Nor is the case of Paul an exception to these views, for he speaks of himself as the least, *i. e.*, the last, of the Apostles. He could be least in no other sense than in the order of time, for in rank he was "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles." He tells us he was "as one born out of due time," *i. e.*, almost too late to be an Apostle, so that Christ had to appear to him miraculously, in order to give him the necessary qualifications; language utterly inexplicable if there was to be an order of Apostles in regular succession through all time.

In the absence, then, of all intimations that the office was to be permanent, we are warranted to infer that it was not designed to be permanent.

3. *The absence of all instruction as to the office, or its future occupants.*

Had it been designed that the apostolate should be permanent, instructions would, surely, have been left in regard to its duties and qualifications. How, otherwise, could the Church have known whom to select, or whether they discharged their duties. Ample instructions are given as to Presbyters and Deacons, the acknowledged permanent offices. Why not as to Apostles, if they, also, were to be permanent? If directions were needed as to the lowest offices, were they not much more needed as to the highest? If a class of men in our country were to claim that they were peers of the realm, would not this claim be destroyed by the absence of all reference to this order in our laws? If, then, the New Testament is equally silent about an apostolic order, its duties, rights, qualifications, or limitations, whilst it is not silent as to the other permanent officers of the Church, the inference is irresistible that such an order was not designed to be a permanent office in the Church.

4. *The disappearance of the very name with the death of the original twelve.*

Two of the primitive offices have been perpetuated under their divinely appointed names, and the primitive Presbyters, or Bishops, and Deacons, have been succeeded by other Presbyters, or Bishops, and other Deacons, down to the present day. If the original Apostles were to be succeeded by other Apostles, why did not the name succeed with them? If they ordained men to be Apostles, why did they not call them Apostles? When Bishops, in the second and third century, began to claim authority over Presbyters, why did they still call themselves Bishops, and never Apostles? And when Bishops now claim to be the only

legitimate successors of the Apostles, why do they never call themselves Apostles? If they have a right to the thing, have they not, also, a right to the name? If they dare to claim the one, why do they not dare to claim the other? Is not every other office perpetuated by its name? Could the office be transmitted, and the name dropped? Were the Apostles so negligent, or their successors so self-renouncing and unambitious, that the one failed to transmit the name, and the other to claim it?

If the apostolic order had been perpetuated, the number of Apostles would have increased with the increase of the Church, and we would have found a proportionate increase in the mention of the name. But the reverse of this is the fact. The name is often mentioned during the lives of the twelve and Paul, and ceases to be mentioned with their death, implying that the office, also, ceased with them.

That this disappearance of the name, Apostle, did not arise from any indisposition to claim it, is proved by a fact which comes out just before the death of the last Apostle. In writing to the Church of Ephesus (Rev. 2:2,) the Lord commends them in these words: "Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." This proves, (1,) that men claimed to be Apostles, and claimed the name, as well as the power; (2,) that there were certain acknowledged qualifications by which an Apostle could be known; and, (3,) that it was the duty of the Church to try all claimants by these marks. Couple these facts with the others, that, in spite of these claims, the very name of Apostle dropped out of the vocabulary of the Church, and, in spite of this duty, no rule was left on record by which the Church, in after ages, was to recognize the true Apostle, and we have reached almost a demonstration that the order of Apostles was not designed to be, and was not, in fact, a permanent order in the Christian Church.

### 5. *The Case of Timothy himself.*

It is conceded that, if there were any successors to the twelve Apostles, Timothy was one of them. It is equally clear that, if so, he was the peer of all the other Apostles, Paul not excepted. But it is just as clear that Paul never does treat him as an equal, or call him an Apostle. He is sent by Paul on various missions, and required to return and report to him, as the inferior reports to the superior officer; is instructed and directed in the two Epistles to him as a superior instructs an inferior; and, when named in connexion with Paul, the greatest care is apparently taken not to give him the name of Apostle; whilst Paul, as carefully, gives this name to himself. We never read of Timothy the Apostle, but "the work-fellow."—(Rom. 16: 21.) The phraseology is: "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, and Timothy, our brother," (2 Cor. 1: 1); "Timotheus our brother, and Minister of God, and fellow-laborer in the Gospel of Christ," (1 Thesa. 3: 2); "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ—unto Timothy, my own son in the faith," (1 Tim. 1: 1); "My dearly beloved son," (2 Tim. 1: 2); "Our brother Timothy," (Heb. 13: 23); and this carefully worded phraseology, withholding the title from Timothy, is used in the very Epistles in which are found the only pretended ground for asserting the apostleship of Timothy. This marked omission is a most decisive fact, for had Timothy been an Apostle, would not Paul have said so? Was Paul a man to withhold the title and authority of his peer in office, when he so carefully affirmed his own, and when that peer was his beloved Timothy? This careful omission, and these repeated indications of an official inferiority, show conclusively that Timothy was not an Apostle, and if he was not, the chain of succession is hopelessly broken at the very first link, and the apostolate proved to be a temporary office in the Church, and not a permanent order of the ministry.

6. *The testimony of facts.*

If the twelve Apostles were now on earth, with all their apostolic authority, it is plain that no Church could reject them without the deepest guilt. To reject them, by Christ's own warrant and words, would be to reject Christ, and to forfeit all right to that blessing which he has promised, to the end of the world. Now, if the apostolate be permanent, these modern Apostles have exactly the same authority with the ancient, and they do so claim, in point of fact, and to reject them, is to incur precisely this guilt. Then we have the marvellous fact, that nine-tenths of the Protestant world have been living for generations in this great sin, and yet, that God has been blessing them in it, pouring out His Spirit upon them, and granting them the proofs of His presence, just as if they were not guilty of any such contumacy.

Is this credible? Has God ever before so blessed sin? Do men gather grapes from thorns? Do the fruits of the Spirit grow schism and contumacy? Does not this, then, amount to almost the hand-writing of God in condemnation of this aspiring assumption of the high office bestowed alone on the Twelve, and that illustrious man who closed the college, as the great Apostle to the Gentiles?

Were a further argument needed, it would be found in the utter impossibility of substantiating the apostolic succession, if it was ever designed to transmit it. The theory demands an unbroken series of successors from the Apostles to the present day—a demand which can never be met—so the theory falls by its own weight, and the entire absence of facts to support it. Macaulay presents this difficulty with so much force that we quote a few sentences from his utter demolition of it in reviewing Gladstone's Church and State. He remarks, that the evidence for the fact of apostolical succession depends on the question whether, during fifteen or sixteen hundred years, the history of which is involved in utter darkness, “some thou-

sands of events took place, any one of which may, without any gross improbability, be supposed to have taken place—whether, under King Ethelwolf, a stupid priest might not, whilst baptizing several scores of Danish prisoners, who had just made their option between the font and the gallows, inadvertently omit to perform the rite on one of these graceless proselytes?—whether, in the seventh century, an impostor, who had never received consecration, might not have passed himself off as a bishop, on a rude tribe of Scots?—whether a lad of twelve did really, by a ceremony, huddled over when he was too drunk to know what he was about, convey the episcopal character to a lad of ten?—every such case makes a break in the apostolic succession.” The simple truth is, that it would be just as easy for the ambitious ruler of any petty German duchy to trace his pedigree by lineal descent to the twelve Cæsars, as for any clergyman to trace his episcopal pedigree in lineal succession from the twelve Apostles. The theory which demands this impossibility must, therefore, be rejected, by the stern necessity of facts, as untenable, and, therefore, untrue.

In view of such facts as these, the great mass of the Protestant world would have always rejected, and do now reject, this claim of apostolical succession. Down to the time of Laud, it was hardly heard of outside of Popery, and, in the earlier controversial works, is treated as a Romish tenet. Indeed, it is rejected by some of the most learned Romanists, such as the illustrious Belarmine, who restrict the succession to the Pope, and thus endeavour to establish his infallibility. This is the only consistent form in which it can be held, for an Apostle must be infallible in his official character and teachings.

Since the time of Laud, and down to the present hour, some of the most learned, pious and able men in the Church of England, have rejected it, as leading logically to Popery. Among these, are such great names as Arch-

bishops Whately and Potter, Bishops Pearson, Hoadly, Fell, and Davenant, besides Barrow, Whitley, Willet, Hooker, Chillingworth, Hinds, Lightfoot, Brett, Stillingfleet, Hammond, and others, whose names may be found in Dr. Smythe's learned and able lectures on apostolical succession, and works of a similar tenor. The *Christian Observer*, the organ of the Evangelical party in the Church of England, says of this doctrine of apostolical succession, that "it is a theory which is not only destitute of all scriptural basis, but it is in reality pregnant with consequences that fall nothing short of the worst abuses of Papal despotism." Testimonies just as decisive might be given, from such distinguished modern names in the English Church as Riddle, Stanley, Powell, Jowett, Litton, and others, who have carefully studied and written on this subject, and from whom nothing could have extorted a condemnation of this doctrine but its utter want of any foundation in Scripture, or right reason. We are, therefore, only standing with the greatest thinkers of the Church of England, when we reject this doctrine of the permanence of the apostolic office in the Church, and affirm that the Twelve had not, and were not designed to have, any successors in their apostolic character. This being true, it follows that neither Timothy, Titus, nor any other man, out of the number of the Twelve and Paul, were Apostles, and hence that, whatever Timothy's office might be, at least, it was not that of an Apostle.

## II. THE PRELATIC THEORY.

Some contend that Timothy was a Prelate, and Bishop of Ephesus.

This position is untenable, for some of the same reasons alleged against the first, arising from the general argument on the subject of parity in the ministry. All considerations tending to show that there were no Prelates, in the modern sense of the term, in the primitive Church, would

prove that Timothy was not a Prelate. It is useless, however, to give the argument so wide a range, as there are circumstances peculiar to the case of Timothy, which prove the position with sufficient clearness.

1. *He was ordained by a Presbytery.*

It is conceded that a lower office can not confer a higher, and hence a Presbytery can only ordain a Presbyter. If, then, Timothy was so ordained to the office which he held when the two Epistles bearing his name were written, he was a simple Presbyter, and not a Prelate, for the stream can not rise higher than its source.

The two passages already quoted as bearing on this point (1 Tim. 4 : 14, and 2 Tim. 1 : 6), seem to settle this matter beyond all doubt, for it is positively stated that the gift in question was bestowed by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, in the first ; and in the second, it is further explained that Paul was probably the presiding member of that Presbytery, as he speaks of the gift as conferred by the laying on of his hands. There is no discrepancy in these statements, if they refer to the same transaction, for it is just as true of each individual in an ordaining Presbytery, and especially of the presiding officer, that the gift is bestowed by the laying on of his hands, as it is true of the whole Presbytery, and such language is frequently used, without implying that the speaker alone performed the ordaining act.

The transaction referred to in 1 Tim. 4 : 14, was an ordination, for it was the bestowal of some official gift connected with the service of the Church, and not a mere private charism. This is evident from the immediate context, which refers to his official teaching, both before and after the verse (vs. 13-16), in such a way as to show that "the gift" was an official designation to this special work. If it was not an ordination, of course, the parallel passage (2 Tim. 1 : 6) does not refer to an ordination, and as Acts 13 : 1-3 was only a consecration to a particular service, we have no

instance of an ordination in the New Testament, and no scriptural warrant at all for doing it by laying on hands. This is a conclusion to which few will be willing to come.

It was, also, an ordination by a Presbytery. As this fact determines the official rank of Timothy, some efforts have been made to evade it, which deserve a passing notice.

It is said that the Presbytery may have been composed of Apostles alone. But the record does not say so; and, as Timothy was probably ordained in Asia Minor, at a distance from nearly all the Apostles, the supposition is unlikely. But, even if it were true, it would bear very strongly the other way, for it would show that they ordained, not as Apostles, but as Presbyters, which they were, by the statement of Peter and John (1 Pet. 5 : 1, and 2 John 1). But, by every analogy of language, a Presbytery must be a body of Presbyters, and nothing else, and if it confers an office, it must be the office of a Presbyter, and nothing higher.

Others say that the word Presbytery, means the office of Presbyter; but it never has that meaning, and would, moreover, involve a contradiction, for how could an office lay on hands?

Others say that the preposition, *μετα*, only expresses the concurrence of the Presbytery in the ordaining act, and not that it performed the act itself. But when was mere concurrence expressed by the laying on of hands? If the laying on of Paul's hands meant ordination, how could it mean less in the Presbytery? And why do we never afterwards hear of this concurrence, but always find the laying on of hands to mean ordination?

The preposition, *μετα*, may be taken either causally or connectively. If the first, it declares that the gift was bestowed by prophecy, through the instrumentality of the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. If the second, that it was bestowed by prophecy, together with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. As far as the point in question is concerned, it matters not which sense is taken,

for in both cases the Presbytery performed an essential and official part in the ordination. The second sense, however, is the true one.\* The plain meaning is, that Timothy was called to the ministry in two ways; first, by an extraordinary call, the prophecies that went before him, and, perhaps, a direct utterance of some prophetic person, endowed with this New Testament gift; and, secondly, by the ordinary call, expressed by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. There was, therefore, in his case, precisely the same elements that are found in the case of every other true Minister of Christ, a divine and a human call. In his case the divine call was by the Holy Spirit, speaking through prophetic men, in an extraordinary manner; in other cases, it is by the same Spirit, speaking in the written Word, and on the heart of the candidate, but in both, amounting to the very same thing, *i. e.*, the expression of God's will. In the human call, the agency is the same, the endorsement by the living Church of the validity of this divine call, by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Hence, we can in no way escape the conclusion that the office which Timothy held when this Epistle was written was bestowed on him, as to its human medium, by a Presbytery, and as a Presbytery could only ordain a Presbyter, Timothy was only a Presbyter, and not a Prelate.

2. *Facts are against this theory.*

It is said that he was Bishop of Ephesus, because Paul exhorted him to abide at Ephesus, for a special reason assigned. But, if so, why beseech him to abide at the place of his abode, and where it was his duty to abide? Does not this request of Paul prove the very reverse, and show that Ephesus was not his place of abode, and hence that he was not its Prelate?

But we have a fact that is decisive of this point. After the date of this Epistle, Paul met the Elders of Ephesus at

---

\* See Winer's Grammar, Part III., § 47, etc.

Miletum, and gave them his final charge. If Timothy was ever the Bishop of Ephesus, it was then; and we have a right to expect some allusion to it in Paul's charge to the Elders. Is there a shadow of allusion to any such thing? Why does he not refer to their Bishop, and urge them to obey him as their lawful Prelate? Was he a man to weaken the hands of legitimate authority, and that the authority of his beloved Timothy? Had this "beloved son" been their Bishop, would he not have commended him to them, and urged them to honor and submit to him? But what was his exhortation? "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers (bishops)," thus calling them Bishops of the Church, and giving no sort of allusion to Timothy, or any other prelati Bishop then existing, or likely thereafter to exist, in the Church of Ephesus. Does not this silence prove that there was no such officer there, and that, therefore, Timothy was not the Bishop of Ephesus? But if he was not then, he was not at all, for Paul died soon after this, as he intimated in his farewell address; and all the alleged evidence of the prelati character of Timothy is admitted to be of a date earlier than this interview.

If an attempt were made to fix a later date than this, it would be met by the uniform tradition of the Church, that John spent the last thirty years of his life in Ephesus, a fact which makes any prelati position of Timothy in Ephesus unnecessary, if not impossible; for either John was under the diocesan control of Timothy, which was incompatible with his apostolic character; or Timothy was under the apostolic control of John, which was incompatible with his prelati character. In any event, the inference is plain, that Timothy was not a Prelate, and that this was not the office to which he was ordained by the Presbytery; and we are forced to the conclusion, which Archdeacon Stanley has announced in his able *Sermons and Essays on the apostolic age*, (p. 78): "That we can not

anticipate half a century by calling Timotheus the Bishop of Ephesus, or by elevating that venerable name, as it occurs in the pages of the New Testament, to the single dignity which it has since acquired."

Some of these considerations are equally applicable to the case of Titus, in which there is the additional difficulty, that if he were the prelatial Bishop of the island of Crete, whilst Timothy would only have had the oversight of one city, Titus would have had that of nearly one hundred cities, making not only an inexplicable disproportion in their diocesan bounds, but a charge so extended as to make it almost impossible to perform its duties efficiently. We are, therefore, warranted in the inference, that in neither case was the office held by them that of a Prelate.

### III. THE TRUE THEORY.

The real work of Timothy is explained by Paul in 2 Tim. 4 : 5 : "Do the work of an Evangelist; make full proof of thy ministry." As to his ecclesiastical order, he was a Presbyter; as to his special work, he was an Evangelist.

That the Evangelist was one of the officers in the primitive Church, appears from Eph. 4 : 11 : "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers"; from the case of Philip, who is called "the Evangelist," (Acts 21 : 8), and from the case of Timothy, and, we may add, of Titus—for, although not called by the name, his work is clearly that of an Evangelist. To this class, also, belonged Silas, Luke, John, Mark, Epaphras, Epaphroditus, Tychichus, Trophimus, Demas, Apollos, and other co-laborers of Paul.

Calvin says (Inst. IV., ch. III., § 4): "By 'Evangelists,' I understand those who were inferior to the Apostles in dignity, but next to them in office, and who performed similar functions. Such were Luke, Timothy, Titus, and others of

that description, and, perhaps, also, the seventy Disciples, whom Christ ordained to occupy the second station of the Apostles." Stillingfleet says (*Irenicum*, chap. VI., § 19): "Evangelists were those who were sent some times into this country to put the churches in order there, some times into another, but wherever they were, they acted as Evangelists, and not as fixed officers. And such were Timothy and Titus, notwithstanding all the opposition made against it, as will appear to any one that will take an impartial survey of the arguments on both sides."

That these Evangelists were not confined to the apostolic age, as some allege, we learn from Eusebius, who, in writing about the second century,\* says that there were then many Evangelists, who performed this work "to those who had not yet heard the faith, whilst, with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the books of the Holy Gospels. After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and coöperation of God. The Holy Spirit, also, wrought many wonders as yet through them, so that as soon as the Gospel was heard, men voluntarily, in crowds, and eagerly, embraced the true faith." And, speaking afterwards of Pantænus, the philosopher, who flourished about A. D. 180, he says, that he went as a preacher to India, and that "there were even there yet many Evangelists of the Word, who were ardently striving to employ their inspired zeal after the apostolic example. Of these Pantænus is said to have been one." †

Such was the work to which Timothy was called, and in which we have reason to believe he spent his life. In the tenderness of his youth, he left his native home, among the

---

\* *Eccles. Hist.*, Lib. III., ch. 37.

† *Lib. V.*, chap. 10.

hills of Lycaonia, traversed with Paul much of Asia Minor, crossed into Europe, and travelled as far as Corinth. We then find him making long tours under the direction of Paul. Now, visiting Ephesus to organize the Church more fully, and rebuke errorists; now, sent to Macedonia on a special mission; now, accompanying Paul in his last visit to Jerusalem; now, sharing his confinement at Rome, or visiting the Churches to report on their condition; now, liberated from prison, and starting on a new tour; and, finally, commissioned at last by the aged Apostle to bring his cloak, to shield him from the chilly damp of a Roman prison, and give him a final look at his books and parchments. Such, then, was Timothy's work, partly an apostolic work, as far as itinerating to preach and establish discipline was concerned, without an apostolic rank and responsibility; and partly a work that was suggested and determined by the ever-varying circumstances of the Church. But it is plain that, as long as the Church had missionary work to do, either in occupying new fields, or maturing the culture of old ones, so long she needed the labours of Evangelists, and so long, we have reason to believe, she enjoyed them. The office of Timothy, then, was a most important one in the primitive Church, and one to which, as the testimony of Eusebius proves, she owed much of her great success.

A question of no small interest arises here, whether this office was intended to be permanent? Many distinguished theologians affirm that it was not, but, like that of Apostle and Prophet, was temporary, and no longer exists. It is true that, in the precise form in which it existed in the primitive Church, it does not any longer exist, for the same facts that created the necessity for the apostolic office, gave a peculiar and temporary form to that of Evangelist. But as to its essential functions, there is nothing in them to make it temporary, but rather the contrary.

There are two great functions of the Church, the progressive and conservative; by the one of which she extends her labors into new territories, by the other, cultivates the ground already occupied. The second is met by the pastoral office; the first can only be reached by that of the Evangelist. Hence, whenever the foreign missionary work has been undertaken, this office has been, of necessity, used, as the foreign Missionary is an Evangelist. Now, as this is a perpetual work of the Church, it would seem to follow that the office by which alone it can be performed, must be a perpetual office.

But in the home-work, particularly in a country situated like ours, there are facts that seem to demand the continuance of this office. There is a vast amount of work to be done in every denomination of the Christian Church, that can not be overtaken by the settled pastorate. The system of colportage is a confession of this need, and an effort to meet it, which can have only a limited success, as it is not the divinely appointed method of meeting it. Different branches of the Church have attempted to meet it in different ways. The Methodist Church has met it most fully, because its whole system is one of Evangelists, from the itinerant circuit-rider up to the itinerant Bishop, who is only a *Presbyter* in rank, though an Evangelist in function, with very extensive powers. The splendid success of this Church as an aggressive system shows the value of this arm of the service, and, had the founder of this system not overlooked the conservative work of the Church, which can only be performed by a settled pastorate, its success would have been proportionably greater. The Episcopal Church has met this necessity, in some of its aspects, by her order of Bishops, who are simply Evangelists, with the sole power of ordination, and large powers of government. Much of the success of this Church, so far as it is due to the activity of her Bishops, is owing to this evangelistic feature, that she selects her best men, and sends them forth clothed with

honor and power, to do the work of an Evangelist. Where no exclusive claims are arrogated for these modes of meeting this want, we have no controversy with those who prefer them, but wish them God speed in every sincere attempt to evangelize the world. But we believe that the scriptural mode of meeting it is equally efficacious, more simple, and less liable to abuses than any other, and that is by the primitive, and, as we believe, permanent office of an Evangelist.

There has been a prejudice felt in our own Church against this office, since the abuses of it during the great revival season of 1830, when Evangelists were guilty of great extravagances, unsettling pastors, dividing Churches, relying on mere human machinery for getting up excitements that scarred over many regions with scars of burning that still remain, and brought the very name of Evangelist into contempt. This prejudice has had much to do with its comparative disuse. We have committed the great error of undervaluing the office, and so degrading it in the estimate of the Church, that a man who was fit for no other place has generally been the one thought of for the work of an Evangelist. Men of superior talent and piety have been sought for, as occupants of important pastoral charges and professorships, whilst any one, it was thought, would do for an Evangelist. We have thus dishonored the office, and lowered it from its scriptural place, and suffered in consequence of this depreciation. It ought to have been an office to which the finest talents of the Church would have felt it an honor to be summoned, as much so as an election to the Episcopate in either of the Churches which have adopted that system. It ought to have an honor, perhaps, higher than the pastorate, for so it seems to have been placed by Christ, and to have been considered in the primitive Church. It is placed in rank only below Apostles and Prophets, and above pastors and teachers, in Eph. 4 : 11; and we have no doubt that its occupants, when they worthily

filled their office, were regarded with a reverence, corresponding to this divine order.

It is a well known fact that this feature was engrafted, in precisely this form, on the Church of Scotland, in the beginning of the Reformation, by the appointment of Superintendent. Scotland was divided into ten districts, to each of which it was designed to appoint a Superintendent, whose residence, duties and stipend, were all fixed by law. Three sections in the First Book of Discipline are devoted to these Superintendents, from which it is plain that their functions were precisely those of the New Testament Evangelist. In giving reasons for making this distinction between ministers, and appointing a larger stipend to the Superintendents, it is stated, "we have thought it a thing most expedient at this time that, from the whole number of godly and learned men, now presently in this realm, be selected ten or twelve, (for in so many provinces have we divided the whole), to whom charge and commandment should be given, to plant and erect kirks, to set, order, and appoint ministers, as the former order prescribes, to the countries that shall be appointed to their care, where none are now." It needs but a glance at the duties, limitations and qualifications of these Superintendents, to show that they differ most essentially from Anglican Bishops—(Calderwood makes out thirteen heads of difference)—and that they were simply Evangelists.

It was found difficult to obtain suitable men for these positions, and their places were supplied by visitors appointed by the General Assembly; and, as the Church became settled and supplied with qualified ministers, they were gradually disused, so that in the Second Book of Discipline, adopted eighteen years after the First, all allusion to them is omitted. They may have been thought to savor too much of prelacy, for the intense Presbyterianism of Scotland—but it is a matter for curious speculation—what

would have been the effect of perpetuating this feature in the Scottish Church.

Whatever may have been true of Scotland, with its limited territory, densely peopled, and fully supplied with ministerial labour, we can not but think that this system, or some thing like it, would have worked well in this country, with its boundless field, its sparse population, and its very limited supply of ministers. Suppose that each large Presbytery, or Synod, had enjoyed the labours of such an Evangelist during our past history, or even for twenty-five years, and the results must have been great. He need not have been a Whitfield, a Nettleton, a Baker, or a Guinness, in his qualifications; but to test the theory properly, he ought to have been one of the most efficient men in the body, who devoted himself to the work, not for a year or two, but for life. What, then, would have been his work? He would, of course, have visited those regions where the Gospel had never been preached, and, gathering the people into court-houses, school-houses, log cabins, or beneath the shade of forests, told them the story of the Cross. He would have discovered, in unexpected places, solitary individuals, or families of Christians, far removed from their churches, and pining under silent Sabbaths, who might have been induced to begin a Sunday-School, which would have been the nucleus of a church. He would have left here and there a book, tract, or newspaper, which would have brought some soul to Christ; and found young men of promise, and, perhaps, of piety, to whom a little aid might have opened the way to an education, and, perhaps, to the ministry, but who, wanting this, have never emerged from their obscurity. He would have gone from plantation to plantation, and enlisted the affections of both servants and masters, so as to be a blessing to both, as well as a common bond of sympathy in the temporal relations of life. He would have visited feeble churches, and preached to them, at regular intervals, until they were

stronger, and finally led them to obtaining a permanent Pastor. He would have visited the larger churches; and, as he told them of the scenes he had witnessed, the wants and desolations of the outlying regions, and the Macedonian cry that came up from them, his statements would have had a force that those of a special agent could not have had, from his impartial knowledge of the whole field. He would have kindled a fresh zeal in these churches. His visits would often have been the occasion for a glorious revival, and he would thus have been the living bond and vehicle of aid and sympathy between the remotest churches. And, as years rolled on, and his voice and form had become familiar over a large district of country, his influence would have grown apace; his experience extended to the minutest facts in the sphere of his labour; his counsels have been invaluable in every projected missionary movement, to a Presbytery or Synod, and his efficiency increased with every year of mature labor. And then, as gray hairs and advancing age began to narrow his circle of toil, how wide and deep would have been the reverence and love which must have clustered around his person—how full his rejoicing over the ever-coming sheaves of the seed he had sown as he went forth weeping, until his mantle would have been ready to descend upon some young Timothy or Titus, who could carry yet farther and wider the work he had begun! Who can measure the influence that such a man must have had, and the work that he must have done? Must he not have carried our outposts farther in ten years than they are now carried in twenty?

And yet, precisely such a class of labourers is included in our system, at least in its theory, if not its practice, and the work that they would do is not done by any systematic agency we are using. It is the great unused arm of our service. Had we Deacons busy in caring for the temporal aspects of the churches; Elders for their spiritual condi-

tion; Pastors feeding the flock diligently; Teachers, from the Sunday-School to the Theological Seminary; and then a corps of judicious, earnest, honored Evangelists, traversing the whole territory, and gathering up every interest not compassed by other agencies, and knitting the whole together by bonds of living sympathy, who can doubt that our march would have been much more rapid, and equally sure? In two years of such labour, Daniel Baker was the means, under God, of converting twenty-five hundred souls, and the success of Nettleton is well known to every intelligent member of our Church. Dr. A. Alexander, in an article published just before his death, mentions that the first two years of his ministry were spent in such labour, and states that, in reviewing the results of the system of evangelism inaugurated at that time by the Synod of Virginia, he saw the most beneficial and permanent results. Had such work as this been spread over many years, by many hands and hearts, who can doubt that results the most precious and enduring would have been reached?

We are glad to see, within a year or two past, an awakening of fresh interest in this work, and the experiment made by several of the Southern Synods, of a regular system of evangelism. As far as we are aware, the success of these movements has fully justified their adoption; and if, in any case, it has been otherwise, the cause will be found elsewhere than in the system itself. We only ask for it a fair trial. And to secure this, the office must be raised to its primitive dignity as soon as possible. The amplest salary must be attached to it, to cover every contingency, and to give it the consideration that will always be attached to a position that has an honorable support. The best men must be elected to it, as to a place of high public trust, and the Church must then patiently wait the result of their large and systematic labours.

There has never been a time, perhaps, when this movement could be more auspiciously made than the present,

when our Southern Church is opening a new chapter in her history, assuming a new form, and girding herself to do the great work to which her Head is calling her. That work, in our wide territory, our sparse population, our paucity of ministers, and, especially, our vast masses of colored people, so difficult to reach by our ordinary agencies, can in no way be so well done, we believe, as by resorting to an extensive use of the primitive, powerful and simple agency of the New Testament Evangelist.

---

ARTICLE V.

THE VICTORY OF MANASSAS PLAINS.

This glorious victory appears in its true light, when we consider the months that were occupied in marshalling, disciplining, and in every way preparing for this decisive battle, "the grand army" of the North, and the combined forces of the South. To this focus, all the energies, military genius, and unlimited resources of General Scott, converged. "Over one hundred thousand troops," according to their own estimates,\* were concentrated to meet, as they

---

\* We find the following in the *New York Times*, of the 18th July:

**THE ADVANCE OF THE ARMY.**—The utterance of a single word by Lieutenant-General Scott has sent through the American heart a sense of satisfaction that it has not experienced since the dark day of treason dawned. That word is the monosyllable, "March." As it was borne along the lines from Arlington to Alexandria, full fifty-five thousand men leaped to their feet with delight, and prepared for the long-sought encounter with the enemy. All regrets and repinings of the past were shaken off. The memory of toilsome work in ditches, of tedious hours in drill, of days of weary waiting in camp, vanished on the instant. The tents gave up their loiterers, and the hospitals gave up their sick; for the bugle note that sounded "forward," brought the warm blood coursing through their veins as of old, and nothing could restrain their resolution to go with their stouter comrades to the field.

VOL. XIV., NO. IV.—76