

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 28.—APRIL, 1894.

I. THE ATTRACTIONS OF POPERY.

DR. JOHN H. RICE, with the intuition of a great mind, warned Presbyterians against a renewed prevalence of popery in our Protestant land. This was when it was so insignificant among us as to be almost unnoticed. Many were surprised at his prophecy, and not a few mocked; but time has fulfilled it. Our leaders from 1830 to 1860 understood well the causes of this danger. They were diligent to inform and prepare the minds of their people against it. Hence General Assemblies and Synods appointed annual sermons upon popery, and our teachers did their best to arouse the minds of the people. Now, all this has mainly passed away, and we are relaxing our resistance against the dreaded foe just in proportion as he grows more formidable. It has become the fashion to condemn controversy and to affect the widest charity for this and all other foes of Christ and of souls. High Presbyterian authority even is quoted as saying, that henceforth our concern with Romanism should be chiefly irenic! The figures presented by the census of 1890 are construed in opposite ways. This gives the papists more than fourteen millions of adherents in the United States, where ninety years ago there were but a few thousands. Such Protestant journals as think it their interest to play sycophants to public opinion try to persuade us that these figures are very consoling; because, if Rome had kept all the natural increase of her immigrations the numbers would have been larger. But Rome points to them with insolent triumph as prognostics of an assured victory over Protestantism on this continent. Which will prove correct?

V. ORDINATION TO THE MINISTRY OF CHRIST.

“Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.”—1 TIM. iv. 14.

WHEN Paul, in his second missionary tour, came to Derbe and Lystra, he found a certain disciple named Timotheus, “the son of a certain woman which was a Jewess, and believed.” Timothy “was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him.” (Acts xvi. 1–3.) The great apostle left Timothy in charge of the church at Ephesus, while he himself went into Macedonia. Not long afterwards Paul wrote the two epistles, in order, to Timothy, who was young and inexperienced, and they have constituted an inspired manual of pastoral theology for the church of all subsequent ages.

The passage above quoted is the fullest and clearest record we have of the ordination of Timothy. It shows as a *fact* that he was ordained, or formally and authoritatively set apart unto the office of the ministry, and *the mode*, “by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.” Doubtless the writer intended to lay special emphasis on the first and hortatory clause of this text, “*Neglect not the gift*,” and all ministers should constantly remember this exhortation. But the special object I now have in view will require me to occupy the space allotted in considering what succeeds the exhortation. I wish to speak of *ordination to the ministry—its conditions precedent; its divine warrant; its signification; and its mode.*

It is well for our argument to begin with the inquiry, What is “the gift” which is not to be neglected? “There are diversities of gifts” bestowed by God, and mentioned in the Scriptures. These were sometimes extraordinary and miraculous, and, therefore, temporary—*e. g.*, speaking with tongues, casting out devils, and healing diseases, which are ordinarily styled “charisms.” But the Scriptures nowhere furnish evidence that these gifts were bestowed on Timothy; hence they are not included in the “gift”

which Timothy was charged not to neglect. There is no evidence in Scripture that Timothy received even an extraordinary measure or power of the Holy Ghost.

The term "gift" also denotes ordinary and permanent spiritual attainments and blessings by God. And this must be the meaning of the term in the text under consideration, for it is qualified by the succeeding terms of the text, viz., "by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." But these qualifying terms relate to ordinary and permanent means; consequently, we say that "the gift" belonged to the class of ordinary and permanent gifts bestowed by God upon proper ministers. Gifts of this class may and do differ in measure; and no doubt Timothy received and used large measures of them.

"The gift . . . by prophecy" (*δῶτα* with genitive); what is it? Evidently Timothy's intellectual and spiritual knowledge of revealed truth; the gift which came through means of prophecy. For the apostle testifies "that from a child (*βρεφῆος*, a babe, R. V.) thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." (2 Tim. iii. 15.) And "I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and in thy mother Eunice; and I am persuaded that in thee also. 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." (2 Tim. i. 5, 6.) Knowledge and faith are here clearly embraced in the gift. They obviously represent the graces received from God through the diligent, prolonged and docile study of God's word, and this under the guidance of approved teachers. These testimonials show that Timothy had a profound and extensive culture in the word of God. And this culture he had before the apostle laid hands on him. Putting these passages together we are obliged to say, that the culture preceded the ordination by presbytery, was recognized by the presbytery and by the Apostle Paul, and conditioned Timothy's ordination to the ministry. He was ordained because of his intellectual and spiritual knowledge of the word of God. This was *the condition precedent to his ordination.*

Hence we insist that it is proper to ordain only men who are found by correct tests to possess profound and extensive knowledge of God's word. Their knowledge must be both intellectual and experimental. They must be able to teach the truth both systematically and particularly. They must be able to teach not only special truths, but the just proportions of truth to truth. They must be able to divide to all "their portion in due season." They must be well equipped for spiritual warfare, both defensive and offensive. With the whole heart set on fire by the Spirit and love of God, they must believe the written word, both in the integrity of its system of doctrine, morality and practice, and in each of its more important articulate truths. For "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2. Tim. iii. 16, 17.) Men, then, should be well equipped when they enter upon the work of the ministry; nor are they afterwards to forget the loving apostle's charge to Timothy, the ordained minister, "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, and to doctrine." (1 Tim. iv. 13.)

"The gift . . . with ($\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ with the genitive) the laying on of the hands," etc. "The laying on of hands" here signifies ordination. "The gift" was received from God by means of the sanctified study of God's prophecy, but that gift was accompanied and signalized by "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Timothy's personal qualifications having been recognized by the presbytery, that body set him apart to the office of the ministry by the laying on of hands. There is no room for doubting that Timothy felt God's call to the ministry, or that, in the usual way, he applied to the proper body for authority to preach the gospel. On these two points, it is true, the Scriptures are silent; but their silence furnishes no ground for questioning the ordinary course of procedure. Certain it is "not a novice" was to be ordained; and another law said "lay hands suddenly on no man"; it is not likely, then, Timothy was ordained against his will or without feeling that he was called of God to preach. These truths being taken for granted, and the young man showing all the needed ele-

ments of a godly character and competent attainments, mental and spiritual, he received the laying on of hands as the formal act of induction into the ministry. This action of a duly authorized church court is required by the word of God, in all ordinary conditions, before a man is authorized to perform the functions of the ministry, such as ruling, or preaching the word. The warrant and the propriety of this requirement will appear to most men who are not imbued with a spirit of lawlessness and disorder.

Civil governments require officers to be qualified by oath, bond, or letters of commission. No function of office discharged by an "unqualified" person is ordinarily authoritative and valid. Here we have the general consent of society deliberately stamped upon the necessity for formal qualification for office or introduction into office. It is proper that the transference from private life to public office should be marked by some suitable public action.

There are some bodies of Christians who deny that ordination is required in order to the exercise of the functions of the ministry. The basis of their denial and the guide to their practice are found in such passages as "he that hath a dream, let him tell a dream." (Jer. xxiii. 28.) But the dreams of these dreamers are so numerous and so mystical that we shall not pause to expose the baseless fabric of their vision.

There is, however, an increasing number of persons in well-organized churches, and more worthy of our consideration, who advocate and encourage the habitual and public preaching of the word of God by persons who have not been ordained by any church court. The spirit of "lay evangelism" has of late years invaded some of the most orthodox and orderly churches. It has in not a few instances invaded the Southern Presbyterian Church. Self-constituted "lay evangelists," with measures of an exciting character, not always noisy and boisterous, attract large crowds, and often conduct meetings long protracted; and through their instrumentality many persons become professors of religion, some of whom join regularly-constituted churches. These "lay evangelists" claim to be called of God to "preach" the gospel, and their claim is sometimes fully admitted by Presby-

terians, and even by Presbyterian ministers, who claim that they are loyal to Presbyterian standards.

Now, in reply to these claims and concessions, let us inquire, What is the Presbyterian doctrine of vocation to the ministry? How is a man's call of the Spirit to be tested and proven? The answer is, "Ordinary vocation to office in the church is the calling of God by the Spirit, through the inward testimony of a good conscience, the manifest approbation of God's people, *and the concurring judgment of the lawful court of Christ's house according to his word.*" (Form of Government, Chap. VI., Sect. I., § 1.) "*Wherefore every* candidate for office is to be approved by the court by which he is to be ordained." (Form of Government, as above, Sect. III.)

We are here met by the declaration that these "lay evangelists" do not profess to be, or propose to become, ordained ministers; that "preaching of the word" in public is not a function peculiar to the ordained ministry, but is the right and duty of every Christian who has the gift of utterance; and that ordination would defeat their popularity and success. In reply to all this we submit the following considerations and facts:

If the ordained ministry has fallen under popular odium, it is not the result of ordination which God appointed, and which the New Testament ministry accepted when it did notoriously bring odium and persecution upon them. If odium attaches to ordination, it is one of the divinely-appointed "offences of the cross." And those who are called of God to "preach" are called of God, like Timothy, to bear its odium, and thus prove that they are "worthy of double honor." If this is not correct, then our Form of Government is wrong. Is it not, however, more probable that these "lay evangelists" who, though acquainted with human nature, are not conspicuous for their knowledge of the revealed order of Christ's church, are mistaken as to either their call to the work of the ministry, or its revealed and logical consequences, than that our Form of Government is mistaken as to these matters? If God requires those whom he calls to preach to be ordained, then those who claim the call of God to preach, and yet decline to receive ordination, are certainly contemning an ordinance of

God, and thus they invite discredit upon their claim to a divine call.

If it be true that the ordained ministry has fallen under popular odium, then the spirit of lay evangelism should come to the support of the ministry, and by its earnestness and aggressiveness extricate God's ordained ministry from this odium. But here the question may, with pertinency, be raised, is not this spirit out of sympathy with the Lord's ministry? And is it not often the very means of breeding discontentment in churches with the orderly and scriptural methods of good pastors, and intolerance of his "holding fast the form of sound words"? The natural tendency of the high pressure and novelty of methods used by these "lay evangelists" is to beget a love of excitement, and to teach people that they must have sensational preachers, or none. Moreover, the style of address and the partial character of the discourses of these "evangelists" people teach, demand superficial instruction instead of sound and systematic instruction in the doctrines of God's word. Thus they assist in emasculating Christians as to knowledge, morality, and the faith. The great apostle's lamentation over the Corinthian church, then, becomes pertinent: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even unto babes in Christ." (1 Cor. iii. 1.)

I affirm that there is no passage or fact revealed in the New Testament that clearly warrants the habitual and public preaching of the gospel to assembled audiences by unordained men. Several different Greek words are translated by the verb to preach (in some of its inflections), or by the noun preacher. These words are used, in round numbers, about one hundred and forty times. I have examined all these passages, and of this number there are only *two*, which, by any possibility, with the most liberal concession, as one may see, can furnish any shadow of pretext in support of such lay preaching as I am combating, and such as is often done in these days by persons designated as "lay evangelists," and who are sometimes encouraged and invited to "preach" by ministers of the Presbyterian Church. The cumulative testimony of all these passages is that public preaching is a function peculiar to the ordained ministry, or that "preaching" is predicated only of

ordained men. The two passages which I have conceded are the following, viz.: Acts xi. 20, 21, and Acts viii. 4.

Acts xi. 20-21: "And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake (*ελαλουν*) unto the Grecians, preaching (*ευαγγελιζομενοι*) the Lord Jesus Christ." Evidently "lay evangelism" can find no safe resting-place in this passage, for no man can prudently affirm or deny, on this statement alone, whether the men who spake to the Grecians, and preached the Lord, were ordained or not; nor can any one more safely affirm that their speaking and preaching was publicly done before an assembly, or privately in the way, or from house to house.

Acts viii. 4: "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching (*ευαγγελιζομενοι*) the word." This, we admit, is the strongest passage to be found in support of "lay evangelism"; but to a careful mind it is far from being conclusive. We admit that private Christians were scattered abroad, and were preaching the word. But from all the circumstances of the case, we sincerely doubt if their preaching was like that of the modern "lay evangelist," for they were scattered by persecution, which fact would render it in a high degree improbable that they would advertise, and further incite the persecutor's vengeance by holding large public meetings, and publicly preaching the word, for which thing's sake they were already persecuted. It is far more probable that they, with their ardent zeal, testified for Christ in private with many persons; or that they met, like the disciples in Jerusalem, in some "upper room" to pray, to exhort, and to teach, where they might safely work, and yet escape public observation. It must be admitted that this interpretation would signify an exceptional use of the word "preaching," but the exceptional facts stated seem to justify it. And if it be insisted that the "preaching" done by them was of a public and authoritative nature, it would show only that, under exceptional circumstances, such as persecution that scatters, are laymen justified in assuming the functions of public "preaching." We are in the presence of no such circumstances, and consequently not permitted to resort to this extraordinary license. Yet "lay evangel-

ists" are "scattered abroad," and "go everywhere," without persecution, and without the authority of God's word as interpreted in our Presbyterian standards! The fact is, the term "lay evangelist" is a misnomer and is unscriptural, for the only "evangelists" distinctly and clearly mentioned as such in the New Testament were ordained ministers. The term "evangelist" is used only three times in the New Testament: once of Philip, once of Timothy and once to designate officers given by Christ to the church—always, therefore, of ordained men. The term "preaching" in the above text must be used in a generic sense only. Preaching, in the specific sense of public and authoritative proclamation of God's word, is a peculiar function of the office of the ministry.

And now let us see whether ordination is not required for the office-work of the ministry.

Old Testament history shows, not, indeed, by uniform record, but by occasional records and examples, that men were ordinarily set apart by some formal act of their fellows to offices of all dignified grades. Aaron and his sons were formally anointed unto the priesthood. (Exod. xxix. 7; cf. Lev. viii. 1-13; x. 7; Heb. v. 1; viii. 3.) The Levites were set apart to their office by the water of purification. (Num. viii. 1-13.) Saul (1 Samuel x. 1), David (1 Samuel xvi. 13), and Solomon were formally inducted to kingship over united Israel. Jehu was likewise anointed to be king over divided Israel, and Hazael, over Syria (1 Kings xix. 15, 16); Elisha (1 Kings xix. 15, 16) and Jeremiah, to the prophetic office. Thus, *prophets, priests, and kings* were formally set apart.

New Testament history shows a similar custom. Our Lord "ordained (*εποιησεν*) twelve" to the work of apostleship, expressly including preaching (*κηρυσσεν*) among its functions. Afterwards he says, "I . . . ordained (*εθιξα*) you, that you should go," etc. (John xv. 16.) No *mode* is given in this passage, but the Greek words and the objects proposed indicate the probability of some more or less formal action or commission. When Judas had fallen, the apostles proposed that another man should be elected in his place, and "ordained" (*γενεσθαι*) "to be a witness with us of the

resurrection." (Acts i. 22.) When Barnabas and Paul were sent as foreign missionaries, God said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." (Acts xiii. 3. See also 1 Timothy ii. 7.)

Ruling elders were "ordained in every church" in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch in Pisidia, "with fasting and prayer." (Acts xiv. 23.)

Deacons were ordained in like manner. (Acts vi. 6.)

Titus was left by Paul in Crete in part to "ordain (*καταστήσει*) elders in every city." (Titus i. 5.)

We shall see that Timothy and Titus must have been ordained.

These records show that in the period and conditions of the planting and establishment of the Christian church, with all its necessities and emergencies, and they were great, persons were introduced into all grades of office by a formal act. Apostles, evangelists, pastors, ruling elders and deacons, *all* who were called to exercise the functions of office, were formally ordained thereunto. Verily, concerning them all may we say as the Spirit said of the priesthood, "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but such as are called of God, as was Aaron." (Heb. v. 4.) And the ordinary evidence of the Spirit's call is to be *judged by a church court* and *attested by the act of ordination*, which is the act of a human tribunal conferring upon the candidate the right and power to discharge the duties of that office in the visible church; and this gift is bestowed in recognition of the previous and richer "gift by prophecy."

What is the proper form of ordination? 1 Tim. iv. 14, teaches that Timothy was ordained by "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." From other passages relating to the ordination of apostles (Acts xiii. 3), ruling elders (Acts xiv. 23), and deacons (Acts vi. 6), we learn that fasting and prayer are proper accompaniments in the action. The laying on of hands was sometimes the means of communicating something from one person to another—*e. g.*, Acts viii. 17; ix. 17; xix. 6. Sometimes it was a symbolic act, as when the Jewish offerer and the priest laid hands upon the head of the animal-sacrifice; and in ordination it is sym-

bolic. The thing symbolized is, what has already been said, the giving of the right to office and the power for its exercise in the visible church. In token of this gift the members of presbytery say, "We give thee the right hand of fellowship to take part in this ministry with us."

An important question is, By whom shall hands be imposed, or who is to ordain?

In the passage we are considering the answer is plainly given, "*of the presbytery*" (του πρεσβυτεριου). We therefore construe the passage to teach that ordination is properly performed by the laying on of the hands of a *church court composed of a plurality of presbyters*. Prelatists, who advocate ordination by a bishop singly, deny our construction and the warrant for our custom.

In justification of their denial, and of their own custom, they say that "presbytery" here means "the presbyterate," and, therefore, that Timothy was ordained by the apostle Paul singly, representing "the presbyterate." In reply, I would say that there is no warrant to be derived from scriptural usage of this word (το πρεσβυτεριον) for their interpretation. It occurs three times in the New Testament—first, in Luke xxii. 66, where it is well translated, "the elders of the people" (Au. Ver.), or "the assembly of the elders" (Rev. Ver.). Next, in Acts xxii. 5, where both versions agree in rendering "the estate of the elders." The third place is the text, where both versions again agree in translating "presbytery," which means a court composed of a plurality of presbyters. Our translation and interpretation are confirmed by prelatistical commentators and authors of the Church of England, as follows: Scott, *Commentary, in loco*: "By the imposition of the hands of the elders as well as those of the apostle"; Burkitt, "The laying on of the hands of the presbytery"; Alford, "Presbytery" ("the body of the elders who belonged to the congregation in which he was ordained"); Young (*Concordance*), "An assembly of elders." Smith (*Bible Dictionary on Timothy*) does not speak particularly of his ordination, but says that after his conversion "his life and education must have been under the superintendence of the body of elders." Conybeare and Howson, "College of the elders." Hence we are satisfied with our translation, "the presbytery."

Again, prelatists point us to 2 Timothy i. 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." In the words of a distinguished witness of their own class, Dean Alford, we reply: "There is no real difference between this (*i. e.*, 1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6). There was a special reason then for putting Timothy in mind of the fact that the apostle's *own hands* were laid on him; but that fact does not exclude this of the presbytery, the body of the elders." If, however, the apostle alone laid hands on him that fact would exclude "the presbytery." But it is articulately declared that "the presbytery" laid hands on him. These passages are easily reconciled, if Paul was a member of "the presbytery" and joined in the ordination, which was no doubt the fact and explanation in this matter.

Once more we are told that Paul left Titus in Crete in part to "ordain elders in every city." (Titus i. 5.) The whole verse obviously shows that Paul had begun to organize the churches of that island, and then sent Titus to complete this work. But that Paul sent Titus to proceed in an orderly way admits of no question. "Order is heaven's first law," and in the absence of any direct and conclusive testimony, as to the mode of procedure, we cannot for a moment conceive or allow that an inspired apostle directed Titus to proceed to ordain elders in Crete in any way or on any conditions that would annul the order of ordination in Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Greece. We *know* that a plurality of presbyters ordained deacons in Jerusalem (Acts vi. 6); apostles at Antioch in Syria (Acts xiii. 1); elders in Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiv. 21-23); and Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14). We must, then, interpret the obscure by the plain. In all doubtful cases we must say that the mode and the courts of ordination were the same as in the well-ascertained cases. Hence we say that Titus was ordained just like Timothy; and that, in Crete, he proceeded to ordain elders in coöperation with other presbyters, in the same orderly way in which he and Timothy had been ordained.

And, now, from all that has been said, we conclude, that all persons who are called of God's Spirit to "preach the word" are

required of him to be ordained; that "preaching the word" is a function of the ministry; that the evidence of a call to the ministry and of "the gift by prophecy" is to be certified to the church, not only by the man's professions, but also "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery"; and that the proper tribunal for ordaining is a court of the Lord's church, composed of a plurality of presbyters. Ordination, then, is a sacred thing to be respected by all lovers of the Lord the head of the church, and they who condemn it condemn God's ordinance. And all who receive it should regard it as a high and honorable privilege; they should "not neglect the gift," but with ever-increasing watchfulness and zeal "stir up the gift" which they have received, unto the glory of the Redeemer.

A. C. HOPKINS.

Charlestown, W. Va.