

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES, No. 10.—APRIL, 1874.

---

ART. I.—PRESBYTERIANISM AND THE PEOPLE.

By Prof. E. D. MORRIS, D.D., Lane Theological Seminary.

AMONG the productions which have secured to the name of Albert Barnes a permanent place in Presbyterian literature, prominence might well be given to his brief treatise on the *Affinities of Presbyterianism*. First delivered as an address before the Presbyterian Historical Society, then published by request in one of our denominational reviews, and afterward issued by the Publication Committee as a tract for the times, this admirable treatise has been read by hundreds of ministers and thoughtful laymen in different sections of the country, and has done much both to shape the popular conceptions of Presbyterianism, and to give tone and quality to our denominational life. With no trace of sectarian partisanship, and without excessive partiality for the type of polity and of doctrine which it commends, this tract defines most happily the marked relationship or affiliations between Presbyterianism on one side, and certain types of mind, certain forms of culture, certain stages and tendencies in society, on the other. Presbyterianism has rarely seen in such brief compass so exact, comprehensive, just, exquisite a portraiture of itself as it is, or so wise and inspiring a delineation of what it ought to be, as one of the main forms of Protestantism, and one of the foremost regenerative forms in modern life.

But while the existence of such special affinities is to be recognized, and while such specific incentive and stimulation are gratefully to be accepted, may it not be wise to inquire whether this view, when carried into practice, does not involve some seri-

has done in respect to Slavery, Temperance, and other great public questions? The influence of Journalism shows the vast power of modern public opinion, in directing the course of Governments. The recent discussion of the Virginius question by the religious press shows how powerful an influence the Church may exert in favor of national charity, forbearance and peace.

Christianity reaches every human interest. It embraces the relations of nations as well as of individuals. Christ must reign King of nations as he is of saints. He must judge among the nations. The Government shall be upon his shoulder, and of the increase of his Government and PEACE there shall be no end.

---

#### ART. VII.—THE OFFICE OF EVANGELIST.

By REV. SAMUEL H. KELLOGG, Missionary at Allahabad, India.

ECCLESIOLOGY has for centuries been a vexed subject. Advocates of widely differing politics have each imagined that they found their own peculiar system laid out with more or less distinctness in the Scriptures. From high prelatists down to Plymouth Brethren, all have found, or believed that they have found, arguments for their special polity, or no polity, in the Word of God. May not one reason of this great divergency lie in the fact that churches in Christian lands have come to be in circumstances so different from those under which the principles of church government were originally laid down, that the understanding of the scriptural instructions on the subject has become a matter of peculiar difficulty? In this respect, the foreign missionary occupies a vantage ground. Providentially he is placed, as the home pastor is not, in just the position of those early laborers for whose guidance the principles of Church polity were delivered by the apostles. To Timothy or Titus corresponds in the modern church, not any home pastor or diocesan bishop, but the missionary, and emphatically the foreign missionary. To understand the state of things in Ephesus or Crete, we must look, not to New York or Boston, or even the destitute regions of our western states, but to the churches in heathen lands, as India, China or Africa. And it is a remarkable and

significant fact, that foreign missionaries, educated though they have been in diverse polities, and connected ecclesiastically with different churches, when once placed in the position of those primitive laborers, find that without any previous concert or intuition they are actually, not only in mutual love and sympathy but in church government, drawing very much nearer one another than would have been thought possible at home. Thus in the General Missionary Conference at Allahabad, India, in Dec., Jan. 1872-3, the Rev. Mr. Barton, Madras Sec. of the Church Miss. Soc. (Episcopalian), expressed himself as follows: "We have all been getting away from our loneliness, and drawing nearer to each other. . . . As regards our practice, is it the fact that our native churches are all so exclusively Episcopal, or Presbyterian, or Congregational? Look, for example, at our Congregationalist missionary brethren in S. Travancore; I should like to know what they are if not bishops (Episcopi)? And what are our native church councils in Tinnevely, (Episcopal Miss.) but Presbyterians, in all but the name? Even our Congregationalist friends cannot get on without a union." Now if we seek for the harmonizing element, which lies on the foreign field, entered into these conflicting polities, we shall find it, as we believe, in the office of the evangelist, and the necessities of evangelistic work. The prominent position of the office and work of the evangelist, is the most conspicuous characteristic of the foreign mission work, as compared with ministerial work at home. At home, the chief figure in the church is the pastor. Even the bench of elders has in too many Presbyterian churches lost its proper place and dignity. In the fore-front of every church appears, not the elders, but the pastor. On the foreign field, as *e. g.* in India, the conspicuous figure is not the pastor, but the missionary or evangelist. The elders are found, at least in Presbyterian churches, but, as at home, too much we believe in the background. Even the diocesan bishop seems less prominent than the ubiquitous evangelist. Neither Episcopacy, nor Presbytery, nor Independency, as such, have any place for him, but none the less he goes about his work, outside of all recognized polities, yet working along with every polity; an officer whose place and consequence is tacitly recognized by all, but for whom church polities have left as little or less place than for an apostle. And so it is that a question of church

government is forced upon us here in India, as to which we turn in vain to our standards for enlightenment. Who is this evangelist? What are his special duties and prerogatives? wherein, though, like Peter, himself an elder, does he differ in office and function from the elders of the local churches? and what are or should be his relations to this local eldership? These are questions which, however little they may have excited thought at home, are every day pressing on us in India more and more urgently for solution; while every year by which an authoritative answer is delayed, increases the existing perplexity and confusion. But to these questions our Form of Government gives us clear and satisfactory answer. In Chap. iii. Sec. 2, "Of the Officers of the Church" we read: "The ordinary and perpetual officers of the church are Bishops or Pastors; the representatives of the people, usually styled Ruling Elders, and Deacons. Here the office of the evangelist is not even mentioned; and were this the only passage bearing on the subject, we might infer that those who prepared our standards had followed in this matter the original standards of the Westminster Assembly, as retained to-day by the churches of Scotland, which declare that the office of the evangelist, like that of the apostles, was extraordinary, and has ceased! But in Chap. xv., Sec. 15, of our Form of Government, the continued existence of the evangelistic office is informally admitted, and the duties of the evangelist, in part, at least, incidentally indicated. Thus we read here: "It is sometimes desirable that a candidate who has not received a call to be the pastor of a particular congregation should, nevertheless, be ordained to the work of the gospel ministry *as an evangelist*, to preach the gospel, sealing ordinances, and organize churches in frontier or destitute settlements." Still this declaration, although containing a recognition of the office, barely touches the questions we have raised. But if church standards fail us, the Scriptures happily are not silent.

From them we learn, first of all, that the office of the evangelist was, in the original constitution of the church, a distinct and separate office. In Eph. iv. 11. we read: "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." From this connection we may justly infer that as the prophets were quite distinct from the apostles; and the pastors and teachers equally distinct from either apos-

tles or prophets; so also the office of evangelist is as distinct from each of the other three. Wherein the distinction lies, will, we hope, be made abundantly clear in the sequel, when we come to examine the duties assigned to the evangelist. But even the order of the text cited gives a limit or two which may aid us to form a general and preliminary conception of the office. Of the four offices there enumerated, the first two, viz., the apostolic and prophetic, agree in that both were strictly extraordinary, involving the direct inspiration of the Spirit of God, and could not therefore be bestowed on any one by any human instrumentality. On the other hand, the office of evangelist, and that of pastor and teacher, involved no such special inspiration, and was conferred mediately, through apostolic, evangelistic, or presbyterial ordination. We may trace a second analogy between the individuals of these groups, which will further aid us in forming a distinct conception of the office in question. The apostles and evangelists, the one inspired, the other uninspired, agree in this, that their ministry was general and not local; first to the world, and then to the church at large. The ministry of the New Testament "prophets," and that of the "pastors and teachers," on the other hand, appears to have been a ministry in and to local churches. The apostles were inspired evangelists, the prophets inspired teachers. In 1 Cor. xii. 28, a similar list is given, but of the offices as involving certain *charismata*. This list, beginning like that in Eph. iv. with apostles and prophets, passed thirdly to teachers, omitting any mention of the evangelist. This omission may, however, be easily explained; for both evangelists and pastors are teachers, these of the local church, those of the church and the world at large; and thus the same *charisma* of *didaskalia* was required for either office. In short, the specific is comprehended in the general term.

But the distinctive character of the evangelistic office will appear more clearly when we examine the special duties and prerogatives which are attached to it. As to what those special duties are, we are not left at all to surmise and inference. So far from this, the duties of the evangelist are indicated in the Scriptures with more distinctness and detail than those of any other office. Beside what we may gather from other books of the New Testament, three entire epistles, the two to Timothy and one to Titus, are devoted to this special subject. These

epistles are written expressly to instruct Timothy and Titus in the duties of an evangelist, and might well have been called the evangelistic epistles. Most commentators have strangely failed to note this special characteristic of these epistles, and have seen in Timothy and Titus either mere presbyters or diocesan bishops.

But that they were not mere presbyters is abundantly clear from the duties assigned them. They are repeatedly directed personally to exercise powers of discipline, ordination and deposition, which no church usage or ecclesiastical tradition has ever sanctioned in a mere individual presbyter; and for the exercise of which, any such presbyter would to-day, in any church, be justly held amenable to discipline. As little, also, can they be regarded as the prototypes of the modern diocesan bishop. At first sight, indeed, this view is much more plausible than the other, as the authority vested in them might naturally suggest this idea. But on a closer examination, the analogy fails in certain important particulars. There is an intimation, for example, that Timothy received a certain *charisma* "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," 1 Tim. iv. 14. If this, as many think, refer to ordination, it hints the exact reverse of the prelatical theory, according to which presbyters receive from bishops, but not bishops from presbyters. But it is in perfect accord with what we elsewhere read, Acts xiii. 1-3, of the ordination of the evangelists Barnabas and Saul, by the associated teachers of the church of Antioch. Although therefore we may freely concede that Timothy and Titus personally held the power of ordination, they did not hold it, like the modern Episcopal bishop, to the exclusion of presbytery. Nor is there any intimation that Timothy and Titus exercised or claimed any powers individually, which did not equally inhere in the presbytery collectively. In this respect, therefore, they were officers unlike the prelatical bishop. But they differed from the diocesan bishops of our day still further, in that they do not, in the New Testament, appear attached to any local diocese. There is nothing in the epistles in question which implies that Ephesus was the permanent abode of Timothy, or Crete, of Titus. On the contrary, the language used by Paul, 1 Tim. 1-3, "I besought thee still to abide at Ephesus, while I went into Macedonia," suggests a merely temporary arrangement. It reminds us at once

of the language used, 1 Thess. iii. 2, of the mission of Timothy to Thessalonica, which was unquestionably temporary. And to make the point still plainer, just as Timothy, having finished his work in Thessalonica, came again to Corinth, so we find the apostle directing him to come from Ephesus to Rome, 2 Tim. iv. 9, 13, 21. Unless indeed, as v. 13 may intimate, Timothy was at Troas when the second epistle was addressed to him; in which case the argument is even stronger, as Timothy's stay at Ephesus then would appear to be yet shorter than in the other case. Similarly, Titus is directed to remain in Crete only until Artemas or Tychichus should come, and then to go to Nicopolis, Tit. iii. 12. All this shows conclusively that the episcopal work of Timothy and Titus, of whatever sort it was, was not confined, as so many have affirmed, to any local diocese, as of Ephesus or Crete. Timothy could not have been in the modern sense of the word bishop of Ephesus, nor Titus of Crete. Indeed, so far as the New Testament is concerned, it would be as easy to prove that Timothy was bishop of Thessalonica, or Titus of Corinth; for they are said to have gone to those cities on much the same errand as afterwards kept the one for a season in Ephesus, the other in Crete. 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 18; viii. 6, 16, 17, etc. In this point again, therefore, the analogy with the modern episcopate fails. Timothy and Titus were no more diocesan bishops than they were mere presbyters. But, finally, the question is decisively settled by 2 Tim. iv. 5, where it is explicitly stated that the work given Timothy to do, and respecting which the apostle gives him so minute directions, was the work, not of a presbyter, nor yet of a bishop, but of an evangelist. All the many various charges of the two epistles are summed up in the words, "Do the work of an evangelist." And, inasmuch as the instructions given to Titus are identical with those given to Timothy, it logically follows that he held the same office, and was also an evangelist. —

Nor can we doubt that the office of evangelist is permanent in the church. There is qualification essential to the office which is not quite as possible now as in the apostolic age; nor is there in the whole New Testament any intimation that the office was any more temporary and extraordinary than that of the presbyter.

All the necessities which called for the work of the evange-

lists in the apostolic age, exist throughout the greater part of the world as much to-day as then. The world is still far enough from being converted to God; in the immense majority of cities and towns in heathen and Mohammedan countries, the foundations of the church are no more laid than they were in the days of the apostles. In brief, then, it seems most legitimate to infer that since there is in the New Testament no limitation of the evangelistic office to the apostolic age, and since the special work assigned to the evangelist is as urgent now as then; and since men are unquestionably found endowed by the Lord with every gift necessary for the office, therefore the office is perpetual in the church.\*

Since then, as above affirmed, the very object of the three so-called pastoral epistles was to instruct Timothy and Titus in the duties of an evangelist, it is evident that from these epistles, read in this light, we shall ascertain what those duties and prerogatives are, and so, it may be hoped, reach a clear and distinct conception of the evangelistic office. Taking, then, the epistles to Timothy and Titus as our special letters of instruction, we shall find that the duties therein and elsewhere assigned to the evangelist, may be classified under three different heads, viz.: 1. Proclamation of the gospel to the unbelieving world for the conversion of sinners; 2. Organization of those who believe into churches; 3. Supervision of these infant churches.

---

\* Prof. Bannerman in his work on "the Church of Christ," Vol. ii. Ch. ii. § ii. argues the temporary nature of the evangelistic office, as taught in the original Westminster Standards, from the personal relation of the evangelists to the apostles, as their vicars and delegates.

It may be freely admitted that the most at least of the New Testament evangelists did thus act as the representatives of the apostles, who delegated to them those special organizing and supervising powers with which they appear invested. But it certainly does not necessarily follow from this that the evangelistic office was merely temporary. For of all those apostolic powers which the apostles delegated to the early evangelists in order to the organization and establishment of churches, there are none which are not freely admitted to inhere as much in the presbytery as in any individual apostle. Now it is perfectly certain that a presbytery is as much at liberty to act by delegation as an apostle. Like any other ruling body, it may, when occasion may arise, delegate any or all of its own powers to any proper person or persons.

Thus it is plain that, although evangelists were delegates of the apostles, and received their special powers from them, it does not at all follow that they may not also be delegated by a presbytery; any more than, because the first presbyters received their powers from apostles or evangelists, it follows that presbytery cannot ordain presbyters.

First, then, the primary and fundamental work of the evangelist is the preaching of the gospel to the unbelieving world for the conversion of sinners. This, it need not be remarked, is the special characteristic indicated in the name "evangelist," which means "a proclaimer of good news,"—even the good news of the grace of God. Although, as will hereafter appear, he has other functions and duties; although, for example, powers of supervision or episcopacy are intrusted to him, yet is he not a bishop, parochial or diocesan. His episcopal powers are simply in order to the full accomplishment of his evangelistic mission. Having sown the seed, he must need water it; he must look after the young churches which may have sprung up, that they stand fast in the Lord; or, as Paul puts it, lest by any means the tempter tempt them, and so his labor be in vain. Although therefore he does episcopal work, he is not styled a bishop but an evangelist; because evangelizing is his great mission. The preaching of the word of the gospel to an ungodly world is his primary duty, as it is the indispensable previous condition of the formation of any church. It is only necessary, in confirmation of this, to refer to the narratives of such evangelistic work, continued in the acts of the apostles; and to remember how Paul charged Timothy with meekness to instruct those that opposed themselves; if God peradventure might give them repentance; to preach the word, being instant in season, and out of season. As the evangelist's work is the preaching of the gospel to the world in order to the salvation of men, and thus gathering the elect into the fold, it follows that, like the apostles, he must exercise, within a larger or smaller sphere, an itinerant ministry. Such in fact was the ministry of Barnabas, of Philip, of Timothy, of Titus, and of all the evangelists mentioned in the New Testament. Not one of all these seems to have become the bishop or pastor of any local church. They did not, any one of them, like too many modern missionaries, when they had organized a church, settle down and become the pastor of that church. On the contrary, having organized churches, they left and went elsewhere, only revisiting them from time to time, to insure their establishment in the faith, and the maintenance of proper discipline by the elders of the churches. But it is unnecessary to offer further proof of what probably no one will dispute. The first duty of the evangelist is to go about preaching the gospel for the salvation of sinners.

But though this general proclamation of the gospel is the first, it is not, as some have imagined, the only work of the evangelist. In this work, though it be indeed his preëminently, yet there is nothing distinctive; for it is undoubtedly the duty of every Christian man and woman to seek, through manifestation of the truth, to bring sinners to God. The second work of the evangelist is the work of *organization*. When, in any place, the Lord shall have owned his preaching to the conversion of sinners, he is not to leave them helpless and unorganized, to shift as best they may for themselves, or to arrange and organize themselves in whatsoever fashion they may choose. He is himself to organize them, not indeed according to any form he might deem expedient, but according to the commandment of the Lord, ordaining over them officers of two kinds, namely, elders, bishops or pastors, to guide and rule over them in spiritual things; and deacons and deaconesses, if need be, to attend to the temporal affairs of the church. From this law and this pattern, as delivered to the evangelists Titus and Timothy, he has no liberty whatever to depart. It is greatly to be regretted that this duty of the evangelist has not been more emphasized in modern missionary work. There can be no possible doubt that, unlike too many of their modern successors, the ancient evangelists, in every place where believers were gathered, straightway organized them after the manner described, into independent, self-governing churches. The anomalous state of things existing in many foreign mission fields, where churches are seen depending for years for the ministration of the word and sacraments on the missionary, has not a shadow of authority, and finds no parallel or precedent that we know of, either in Scripture or primitive church history. A complete organization was apparently at once given to every church, and the same organization of presbytery and diaconate to all. If we are afraid to trust our converts with such responsibilities, the first evangelists were not. When Barnabas and Saul went on their first missionary tour from Antioch, they on that very tour, "ordained them elders in every church" which they established, and then, commending them to the Lord, left them and went elsewhere, Acts. xiv. 23-24. So also Paul instructs Timothy to commit the things which he had heard to faithful men, who should be able to teach others also; 2 Tim. ii. 2; and more ex-

plicitly still, when obliged himself to hasten on from Crete, leaves Titus there, with directions to "set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city;" Tit. i. 5; giving these evangelists moreover careful directions as to the kind of men whom they should appoint as elders and deacons in the church. . . . And this their course, like all arrangements of Divine origin, is in fullest accord with the principles of practical wisdom. It may be and is often urged, in India, at least, that we do not ordinarily find men in these young churches competent to undertake their government. But in truth, this raises a most serious question. If indeed it be true that the little companies of believers scattered, *e. g.* through India or China, are in general so far inferior to those ancient churches planted by the apostles and first evangelists in Syria, Greece and Italy, that in the most of them no men can be found competent to bear the responsibilities of government—what is this but to say that the ascended Lord, so bountiful in his gifts to the early church, has grown chary of them in these latter days! that, in strange contrast with those days of old, he withholds from these young churches the gifts necessary to their organization in the way of his appointment! But surely we cannot mean to say this! surely, if we but prayerfully seek these ascension gifts for the young churches of our planting we shall not be disappointed. The truth is, we apprehend, in many mission fields too much relative stress has been laid upon the intellectual, as compared with the moral and spiritual qualifications for the ministry of the church. We have taken, not the New Testament eldership, but the American or European pastor as the model of what was required; and have forgotten that the highly educated pastor of the home church does not once appear in the primitive church, but is a later ecclesiastical development. Hence too many missionaries have looked more to Forms of Government with their catalogued conditions, than to the epistles of Timothy and Titus, for the qualifications needed in a bishop; and have forgotten that while divine principles and systems remain unchanged and unchangeable, the application of those principles may, nay must needs greatly vary in different ages and with different peoples. Now there is no doubt whatever that we should everywhere aim at the highest education for those who are to be pastors and teachers in the church; but if, forsaking apostolic

example, the evangelist refuse to commit young churches in heathen lands to the care of their presbyters, because they are not so highly educated as might be desired, and wait, not till the Lord shall furnish men endowed with the gifts required in the New Testament, but until these men shall also be able to pass certain rather high examinations, he is certainly not carrying out the instructions given to evangelists by the inspired apostle; and, as experience has shown, runs a grave risk of producing evils at least no less serious than those he would so prudently avoid. In short, then, according to the New Testament, it is the duty of the evangelist to organize his converts into churches, by ordaining at once over them presbyters and deacons, to whose care he should then immediately commit the church.

It will be observed that we have here come upon a second distinguishing characteristic of the evangelistic office. The evangelist has already been distinguished from the mere presbyter or pastor, in that he exercises a general and not a local ministry; a ministry primarily to the world and the church at large, as that of the elders is especially to the local churches. But he now appears as yet further distinguished from the local presbyters, in that he individually, without the necessary aid or conjunction of any other person, possesses a full Divine right and authority to admit or exclude from the fellowship of the church, and to ordain all necessary officers in any church to which he may be sent. The powers which exist in other presbyters only in their collective capacity, as session, presbytery, or synod, the evangelist comprehends in his individual capacity as evangelist. Had we no Scripture warrant more explicit than a general command to organize churches, we might yet from such a command justly infer these powers. For a charge given to any person implies his possession of all the powers requisite to the fulfilment of that charge. And how, indeed, in the first instance at least, could an evangelist, if he would organize a church, do otherwise than exercise all presbyterial powers of admission and ordination himself? For, in the case supposed, which is by no means merely hypothetical, there is no presbytery. If the evangelist do not ordain, there can be no ordination. In the very nature of the case, therefore, it is clear that the evangelist, in virtue of his office and mission, must needs be

invested with the powers in question; and it is therefore, we think, quite fair to argue that when our Form of Government in the place above cited, declares that a man may be ordained an evangelist . . . . "to organize churches in destitute regions," it does thereby *de facto* teach that the ordained evangelist, unlike other presbyters, who may only collectively organize churches, is personally invested with all organizing powers, and therefore with the presbyterial power of ordination. But we are not left to inference, as we have an explicit Scripture warrant. The organizing or ordaining power is in the New Testament expressly delegated to the evangelist. In Acts xiv. 23, *e. g.* we read that Barnabas and Saul ordained elders in every church. And this they did, not as apostles, but as evangelists, for Barnabas was not an apostle, and the apostle was only an evangelist supernaturally called and endowed. More plainly still, Titus, as above remarked, was directed to "ordain elders in every city." That he ordained the presbyters himself alone, is justly inferred from the tenor of the entire epistle which supposes him to be thus alone in Crete. By implication there were no presbyters in Crete who could have been associated with him, and if there had been, they could doubtless have ordained others without his assistance. To the same effect we may regard the charge to Timothy, 2 Tim. ii. 2, to commit the things he had heard to faithful men who should be able to teach others also. This last phrase reminds us of the qualification demanded for a bishop, 1 Tim. iii. 2, that he be "apt to teach;" and to the ordination of such bishops or elders, the apostle undoubtedly refers. It is a remarkable fact that there is not an instance in the New Testament of the ordination of presbyters by presbytery.\* This cannot indeed be taken as proof that the presbytery have no such right; for the evangelists Barnabas and Saul were ordained by the associated teachers, *i. e.* the presbytery of Antioch; and if the presbyters might ordain an evangelist, it follows, *a fortiori* that they might ordain a presbyter. But the

---

\* 1 Tim. iv. 14, is often cited as proving such a case. But it is not easy to prove that there is any reference here to ordination. It seems much more natural to understand it as the bestowment of some *charismà* or miraculous gift. Though bestowed *μετα* "with" the laying on the hands of the presbytery," in 2 Tim. i. 6, it is said to have been conferred *διὰ*, 'through' the laying on the hands of the apostles, as were the *charismata*, in other cases.

absence of any mention of presbyterial ordination, together with these express references to evangelistic ordination, shows that in the apostolic church, the idea of an individual officer clothed with the ordaining power was not regarded as at all inconsistent with that presbyterial polity which the New Testament undoubtedly sets forth. And, as a matter of fact, there are, in India at least, few missionaries of whatsoever name, who do not, when occasion demands, individually exercise all presbyterial functions, and justify themselves in so doing. What missionary, for example, holds it necessary to summon a session meeting, when in some out of the way village, a candidate presents himself for baptism? Yet this is not according to the letter of our book, and many perhaps thus act, with an inward self-apology, for what they deem their unpresbyterian ways. The truth is, the evident necessities of the case lead foreign missionaries of every name, when placed in the position of the ancient evangelists, into ways which approximate closely to the New Testament model. Would that we in India had yielded ourselves yet more fully to this Providential guidance! It were, for example, most wise, as it seems to the writer, and most in accordance with the Scripture, were we to confine the designation of pastors more closely to the evangelist; or, when presbytery exists, to the evangelist in conjunction with the presbytery. Churches gathered, as most are gathered in India and similar missionary fields, are certainly not competent to designate their own pastors. The authority of the eldership does not come from below, but from above; nor is it derived from the popular will, but from the great Chief Shepherd. And it were a most harmful thing for these young churches, should the idea so prevalent at home gain ground here, that the elder or pastor is the creature of the will of the people. But, it may be asked, is all this Presbyterianism? We reply, most assuredly; we believe it to be Presbyterianism; not, indeed, the exact form of the Presbyterianism of the Form of Government, which, let it never be forgotten, is the development of several hundred years, and shows us Presbyterianism in a strongly democratic country; but a form nearer than that to the Presbyterianism of the New Testament, whose details were filled out under circumstances much like those in which the foreign missionary finds himself to-day.

But a third function of the evangelist remains to be consid-

ered. That third function is supervision. Having preached the gospel to the salvation of men, and having organized churches with presbyters and deacons, it is the work of an evangelist, for some time at least, to supervise those infant churches. The evangelists Timothy and Titus are repeatedly charged, as will appear in the sequel, with the duty of supervision. They are not, indeed, to arrogate to themselves the functions and rights of the presbyters, but are to instruct and direct them in the exercise of their duties, and supplement, so far as may be necessary, their instructions to the people. In the epistles to Timothy and Titus more stress is laid on this than on any other duty. The churches of Ephesus and Crete were indeed organized on the full apostolic plan, with the bench of coördinate elders and deacons. These were doubtless good and worthy men, and, for the most part, according to their ability, fed and ruled their flocks. But they were, for all this, as yet inexperienced and imperfectly taught, and, as would appear from these epistles, scarcely able alone to grapple with the sins and rectify the errors which were ever appearing in their midst. They had much to learn, and doubtless, as proves the laxity of discipline in Corinth, made many a sad mistake. Such must needs always be the case where churches are organized in heathen and non-Christian lands. And to imagine that such should be left to blunder on as best they may, with no authoritative guidance and supervision, is alike contrary to common-sense and to the letter of Scripture. Such evangelistic supervision, so far from being subversive of Presbytery, is, under such circumstances, absolutely necessary to its establishment. Without it we may expect to see Presbytery speedily lapse into disorder, anarchy and ruin. Now, as to this matter of supervision, the duties of the evangelist are indicated in the aforesaid Epistles with abundant fullness and detail. According to these apostolic authorities, the evangelist is invested with authority over presbyters and people in the infant churches to which he may be sent.

He is to see to it, first of all, that the pastors teach pure doctrine. It was for this especially, because sound doctrine is the indispensable condition of right practice, that Paul says he besought Timothy to "abide still at Ephesus;" that he might "charge some that they teach no other doctrine," 1 Tim. i, 3. He was to "put the brethren in remembrance" of the solemn

warnings of the Spirit, touching the false teachers of the latter days," 1 Tim. iv. 5, charging them, "before the Lord," that they waste not their breath in vain logomachy, "strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers," 2 Tim. ii. 14. Nay, Titus was not only to charge, but to stop the mouths of certain who, for filthy lucre's sake, taught what they ought not, Tit. i. 11, "rebuking them sharply," that they might "be sound in the faith," v. 13; and that, "with all authority," allowing no man to despise him, ii. 15. If rebuke failed, the evangelist was authorized to go still further: he might "receive an accusation," even "against an elder," provided that two or three witnesses were present, 1 Tim. v. 19, and, after due admonition, reject a heretic, Tit. iii. 10. So, also, the evangelist is to supervise the order of worship and manner of life among the people. He is to direct the men to exercise themselves in every proper place in reverent public prayer, lifting up "holy hands without wrath and doubting," 1 Tim. ii. 8; to remember in such intercession all mankind, and especially "kings and all in authority," v. 1, 2. He is to charge the women against all display and ostentation in their dress, v. 9, 10; and forbid them to usurp any place of authority or to teach in the church, v. 11, 12. He is again to enjoin the men that they properly support their families, 1 Tim. v. 8; and honor those elders who toil in word and doctrine by a due support, v. 17, 18. But it is not necessary to adduce further proof under this head. It must be abundantly clear that this duty of supervision was laid upon the evangelists Timothy and Titus; and if, as our Form of Government correctly assumes, the office of evangelist is perpetual in the church, it follows at once, according to the Scripture, that the supervision of such infant churches is, under similar circumstances, the duty of every modern missionary or evangelist. And it may be further remarked in this matter, as on that of organization, that every missionary in a non-Christian land, be he a Congregationalist, Presbyterian or Episcopalian, although these duties are not explicitly assigned him in any Form of Government or Book of Discipline, yet, constrained by the evident necessities of the case, does exercise this power of supervision over the young churches and inexperienced presbyters in his district. Nor, we must again insist, is this derogatory to presbytery, but absolutely necessary in such heathen fields to its establishment and confirmation.

From the above considerations we have arrived at the following conception of the office of evangelist: The evangelist is a man ordained by presbytery, not to the pastorate of any local church, but for the propagation of the gospel and the establishment of churches in destitute or non-Christian lands. In order to meet the frequent necessities of such a field, presbyterial ordination confers on the evangelist, so long as he shall continue in this special ministry, all such powers of organization and supervision as otherwise and ordinarily inhere in presbytery. As being still a presbyter, though clothed with special delegated powers, he is yet subject to the government and amenable to the discipline of the presbytery, synod or assembly which sends him forth. Still, as an evangelist, he is a representative and delegate of that presbyterial body, and is therefore invested, within his sphere of labor, with all presbyterial powers and prerogatives.

In conclusion, we have only to urge the practical importance of the views herein advanced. The work of the evangelist has, within the present century, reassumed such importance that it has become of great consequence to have clear and well-defined views of the office. It is most important that every young man going forth as a foreign missionary should understand that he is not a mere presbyter, but an evangelist; and that the office of the evangelist is, in the respects above indicated, an office distinct and separate from the pastorate of any church. Great mischief has arisen, at least in India, from a failure on the part of most missionaries to distinctly apprehend the point in question. Confounding the offices of evangelist and pastor, too many of us have undertaken work which we never should have undertaken. Instead of delegating at once the work of the local churches to the presbyters we have ordained, we have too often appointed the elders, and then gone on ourselves, practically, to do their work and almost monopolize their functions. All this has been done, beyond a doubt, with the best intentions, but it has none the less proved a most serious and damaging error. The time of the missionary has thus, in very many cases, been largely taken up with labors not pertaining to his office, and thus the extensive propagation of the gospel greatly hindered; while, on the other hand, too often the native church has been kept in a state of helpless dependence on the missionary for the very

means of grace, such as may only be illustrated by the child whose nurse, through fear of his sometimes falling, should never trust him to walk alone. It may well be said to many of us, as Jethro said to Moses: "The thing thou doest is not good; thou wilt surely wear away both thou and the people that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee alone; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone." It is our firm conviction that had we generally begun our work with a clearer apprehension of the nature of the evangelistic office, as above set forth, we should not have had so much cause as now to mourn the slow growth of an independent, self-sustaining native church in India. Let it be, then, distinctly understood that when a presbytery ordains a man as a foreign missionary, he is thereby set apart to the work of an *evangelist*, and not of a pastor in any individual church; so that just so far as he takes the place of the pastor or elders in any such foreign church, just so far he forsakes the work to which he was ordained, and is in danger of long delaying, if not utterly defeating, the ultimate object of his mission.

Moreover, if, as the Scriptures teach, as we trust has been made clear, that the evangelist is invested with so high and peculiar powers beyond those of any local pastor, it should greatly exalt the office in the eyes of the church. We magnify our office; we claim that the Lord has committed to the evangelist powers he has entrusted to no other individual officer in the church. It is a very serious thing to be a pastor; it is a yet more serious thing to be an evangelist. On him alone is devolved the entire burden of presbyterial power. To organize churches of Christ, and supervise them during their tender years, is a labor and responsibility from which the most gifted might well shrink. And the church at home should clearly understand that for such labors and responsibilities, she should choose and send only the very choicest of her sons. Many a good man may be a blessing as a pastor at home, who is in no wise competent to the high and peculiar responsibilities of the evangelistic office. There can be no question that the students in our seminaries need special instruction on this matter, in order to a more intelligent decision as to their personal duty, than most are at present able to make. It is greatly to be hoped that in response to the desire which has found formal and official ex-

pression in two of our largest missions, the church may soon provide for the instruction of her sons in what has been happily termed "Evangelistic Theology." The questions raised and answered, with whatever success, in this paper, will perhaps show to our readers that the subject is not altogether barren. The Professor in such a department would, if we mistake not, soon find that he had something more on his hands than the discussion of effete mythologies and heathen philosophies, that principles and laws were to be fixed, which should touch for lasting good or evil the very foundations of the house of God in many a heathen land.

---

#### ART. VIII.—TAXATION OF CHURCHES, COLLEGES AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

By LYMAN H. ATWATER, LL.D., Princeton, New Jersey.

It has been the settled policy of the people of this country, on the one hand to avoid all union of church and state, in the sense of supporting any form of religion from the public treasury, or of giving special immunities or privileges to any religious denomination; and, on the other, to exempt from the burden of taxation the property of institutions founded, endowed and supported by private benevolence for the public good, which, so far from increasing, operate in various ways to lessen the taxation of other property. This includes churches, colleges, incorporated schools and academies, not of private ownership, also hospitals, reformatories and other charitable institutions originating in, and partly or wholly dependent on, private benevolence.

There is now, however, a strong movement to subject these institutions to the average taxation of other property. It reveals itself in our halls of legislation, and in the projects for new state constitutions. The State of Pennsylvania has adopted a new constitution by a large majority which subjects such property to taxation unless released by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature. It is, however, believed that the people of the State, are, by a large majority, opposed to this feature of their new constitution, which, nevertheless, they voted for, in order to secure the other safeguards incorporated in the instrument, against the corruptions of rings, legislatures, railroads, and other monopolies; and that they will avail themselves of the power to render it inoperative by a two-thirds vote. If we are not misinformed, some politicians in the