

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 10. — OCTOBER, 1889.

I. THE NEGRO IN ECCLESIASTICAL RELATIONS.

THE negro question, as it is called, presents one of the most perplexing problems of our age. Every phase of it, social, political, and ecclesiastical, involves difficulties sufficient to tax the wisdom and philanthropy of the most enlightened. The difficulty is increased by the malign influence of sectionalism. Both sections of our common country essay the attempt, and each embarrasses the other. The North would speedily settle it were it not for the South; and the South would have settled it long ago but for the North. The conscientious convictions of each party stand in the way of the best intentions of the other, so that the well meant efforts of both fail, to the scandal of religion and the sorrow of philanthropy. Two opposing policies are presented by the two sections. This want of harmony was at first explained and excused by the heat of passion lingering like smoke around the recent battle fields, and there was confident prophecy of its speedy disappearance. The passions of war, however, have long since subsided, and the hostiles have "shaken hands across the bloody chasm," and the lines of opposition, like those of breastwork and battle-field, have been long ago obliterated, while this conflict still rages. These policies have confronted each other now for a quarter of a century, and they are as unreconciled if not as irreconcilable in 1889 as in 1865. There is something very significant in this.

Moreover, whatever suggestion is offered by either fails of influence on the other, each being discounted—the South by the North upon the allegation of prejudice, the North by the South upon that of ignorance.

hands is soluble in words (words which simply state what the whole body—preachers and elders—have done by their united vote), and therefore only ministers of the word, whom we call “teaching elders,” should perform it. Ordination is the act of a representative body of rulers, and one class of these rulers has nothing more to do with it than the other.

We had intended to say something, by way of refutation, of Dr. McGill's doctrine that baptized non-communicating members of the church should be subject to discipline, in the technical sense of the term. We desired also to discuss what he has to say about the “ministry of gifts, without ordination,” sent out by the Holy Spirit as a rebuke to the ordained ministry for neglect of the gift that should be in them. (See pp. 215–218.) But we cannot do so now. We will only add an expression of our gratification at his condemnation of the rotary eldership, adopted by the Northern Presbyterian Church. His vindication of the principle of permanency in the office leaves nothing to be desired. (See pp. 345–354.) The almost plaintive strain in which he expresses the hope that the genius of Presbyterianism (and in this connection our Southern Church is mentioned) will reassert itself and work out the cure has in it an element of pathos which touches us.

Many things upon which we have fallen, in the perusal of this volume, have impressed us with the fact that the author of it belongs, not to one section of the Presbyterian Church, but to the whole. Our Southern ministers and elders who may read it will feel that he speaks with no accent of the alien, but is, in spirit, one with us.

JAMES F. LATIMER.

Union Theological Seminary, Hampden-Sidney, Va.

GORE'S MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. *By Charles Gore, M. A., Principal of the Pusey House, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln.* Second Edition. 8vo., pp. xviii., 424. London: Rivingtons. 1888.

Not only the High Church party of the Church of England, but the Christian Church at large, is to be congratulated upon the learning and candor with which the latest champion of the High Church principle has performed his self-imposed task. No one can read Mr. Gore's delightful treatise without profiting by it. Least of all can sound Presbyterians read it without a pleasurable sense of being at one with him in much of the essentials of his position. That our Lord, in bringing redemption into the world, for example, founded also a visible church to be the pillar and ground of the truth, and in “founding a church founded also a ministry in the church,” we all most firmly believe. And if we may accept Mr. Gore's dictum, that “the whole doctrine of the apostolic succession” is summed up in the two principles—“the principle that the church is a differentiated body, in which different individuals exercise different and clearly defined functions, and the principle that power to exercise these functions, so far as they are ministerial, is derived by succession from the apostles” (p. 322)—we may fairly claim to be believers in the “apostolic succession” also, although we would rather say that ministerial power is derived by appointment of, rather than by succession from, the apostles, conceiving, as we do, of the apostles as Christ's representatives in founding the

church rather than as elements in the church as founded. Though we cannot agree with him that men become united to Christ only through the visible church, nevertheless we stand by Mr. Gore's side when he argues that the visible church is a divine institution and its ministry a divine appointment.

Nor do we fail to find within his treatise certain passages which seem to promise a more liberal (not to say Christian) attitude on the part of our prelatial brethren towards Presbyterian churches. Thus we are told that "in the light of apostolical succession," "there is no objection on the ground of principle" to the conclusion "that the churches in the West were governed simply by a council of presbyters, who had no superiors over them, and who therefore must be supposed to have handed down their own ministry." "These presbyter-bishops legitimately 'ordained' and fulfilled episcopal functions, because those functions belonged to the equal commission they had all received. Subsequently, at later ordinations, this full commission was confined to one of their number, and the rest received the reduced authority which belonged to the presbyterate of later church history. Such a process would not represent the elevation of any new dignity from below, but the limitation of an old dignity to one instead of its extension to many, and that in accordance with the precedent set by the apostle St. John. 'Monepiscopacy' takes the place of a diffused episcopacy," (p. 334) Again, "the principle of succession" would not be touched "if we were to accept Jerome's testimony, . . . to the effect that in the early church of Alexandria, on the vacancy of the see, one of the presbyters succeeded to the episcopate after mere election by his fellows. This would only mean that the Alexandrian presbyters were by the terms of their ordination bishops *in posse*, even though their exercise of episcopal powers without special election would have been irregular," (p. 339). Consequently he can say broadly: "No one, of whatever part of the church, can maintain that the existence of what may be called, for lack of a distinctive term, *monepiscopacy*, is essential to the continuity of the church. Such monepiscopacy may be the best mode of government; it may most aptly symbolize the divine monarchy; it may have all spiritual expediency and historical precedent on its side; nay, more, it may be of apostolic institution; but nobody could maintain that the continuity of the church would be broken if in any given diocese all the presbyters were consecrated to the episcopal office, and governed as an coördinate college of bishops without presbyters or presbyter-bishops. A state of things quite as abnormal as this existed for many centuries in the Celtic Church of Ireland. Something equivalent to this very arrangement has been commonly believed in the West to have existed in the early church" (p. 74).

After such statements as these, it appears utterly illogical to deny, as Mr. Gore does deny (p. 344), the validity of Presbyterian ordination. The ground on which the denial is based is that "it cannot be maintained that the acts of ordination by which presbyters of the sixteenth or subsequent centuries originated the ministries of some of these societies were covered by their commission or belonged to the office of presbyter which they had duly received." Thus Mr. Gore's whole case is made to hang on what Dr. McGill not unfitly calls "the mere ligature of succession," rather than on the succession itself; and in thus erecting the act and intention of ordination into the chief thing, he raises several very curious questions. How does he know, for example, that the Alexandrian presbyters were "by the terms of their ordination" made "bishops *in posse*?" and unless he knows this, must he not (on the supposition that Jerome's testimony is credible) unchurch the whole

Alexandrian succession? How does he know that the Western presbyters received a different ordination in earlier times from that given later? How does he know that they were justified in laying aside their episcopal rights in favor of one of their number? How does he know that these rights, once laid aside, could not legitimately be claimed back again? Above all, how can he teach that a right given by God can be irretrievably laid aside on human authority alone? In a word, how can he erect a human provision of order above a divine gift of function? The dispute really reduces to this so soon as we admit (as Mr. Gore cordially does) that in the New Testament presbyters and bishops are one order; and the prelatie position can be sustained only on the assumption that the post-apostolic development of the church is as authoritative as the apostolic prescription. Of course this is the very antipodes of Mr. Gore's primal principle that the ministry comes by devolution from above, not by evolution from below; but he is hopelessly driven to it; and we cannot be surprised to find him approvingly quoting this position from Mr. Stanton, on p. 343; or at an earlier point (p. 269) to observe the consciousness already pressing forward that only "the principle of a ministry with different grades of function and power is given us in the apostolic age," while for the prelatie position we are left only the recourse of "accepting in detail the mind of the church, as soon as it declares itself, as the mind of the Spirit." Hence he is led (p. 270) to distinguish between "the ministry of the future" and the New Testament ministry; and to reiterate that "all that the New Testament can be said to prove clearly is the principle that the church ministry is a thing received from above, with graduated functions in different offices, so that it follows as a matter of course that there would always be persons who had the power to minister and persons who had also the power to ordain other ministers." Here are the intrenchments of the Presbyterians; they refuse to be governed by the "future" mind of the church; they desire to stand firmly by the mind of the Lord, as expressed to us by the apostles. They remind Mr. Gore that he himself confesses that the driftage of time has introduced "immense changes," and advises the recovery of the "primitive standards, which ought never to have been abandoned" (p. 114); they invite him to listen with them to Cyprian's indication of "the short way for religious and simple minds to lay aside error, or to find and elicit truth;" "for if we go back to the head and origin of the divine tradition, human error ceases, the real nature of the heavenly mysteries is seen, and evolution, hid in darkness and under a cloud, is opened out into the light of truth."

When we go back thus with Mr. Gore to the "divine tradition" where "human error ceases," Presbyterians have no reason to quarrel with the evidence as he adduces it; for we find in these pages the sure evidence for all the distinctively Presbyterian positions. The original oneness of "presbyters" and "bishops" is recognized. That, even after the differentiation of presbyters and bishops, they together constituted one order, as over against deacons, is recognized; that one might pass from the presbyterate to the bishopric without reordination is admitted (p. 143, cf. 115, note); that early bishops were not diocesan, but pastoral, is recognized (pp. 104, 106, 112, 145, 329); that Christian ministers are not called "priests" for a century and a half is acknowledged; and much more of the same kind. We confine ourselves, however, for the present, to remarks on two points.

Mr. Gore insists that ordination was an apostolic function, and strives hard to render plausible his statement that there is no proof that it was ever performed by

presbyters. To do this, however, he has to explain away almost the whole body of very early evidence, including that of the New Testament itself, which never suggests that ordination is confined to apostles or the extraordinary ministry. (Cf. *Pres. Review*, October, 1887, p. 702.) It is only by confusing the communication of miraculous gifts of the Spirit by the laying on of the apostles' hands with ordination, that Mr. Gore can make out even a specious case. His theory of ordination is closely connected with his theory of the origin of the episcopate. His view is that the episcopate was not formed out of the presbyterate by development, but by the settling of "apostolic" men, *i. e.*, evangelists or prophets, over special churches; and thus that it was not a development out of the permanent local ministry, but a localization of the general ministry. This is an advance on the crude theory which makes Timothy and Titus the New Testament examples of "bishops;" but it is no more tenable. Let us observe how Mr. Gore deals with Timothy and Titus. After an admirable account of the presbyter-bishops of the Pastoral Epistles, he speaks of Timothy and Titus with great accuracy as "apostolic delegates," but (p. 24) proceeds to represent them as if not "bishops" (which he admits they are not called, but rather "evangelists;" an office he confesses not to be "local," p. 241), yet as "exercising what is essentially the later episcopal office." In order to make this plausible he is led to confound the permanence of Timothy's ministry with the permanence of his localization at Ephesus (p. 248), suggesting that Timothy was ordained at Ephesus, and that he was to continue his ministry after Paul's death, "presumably with the same church of Ephesus," and adding that we cannot "argue against his localization [at Ephesus] from the fact of St. Paul summoning him to Rome," or "from the fact of his having gone there." This, however, is not quite the point; the question is rather, do these facts raise a "presumption" in favor of his localization in Ephesus? And Mr. Gore has failed to mention that when Paul summoned Timothy from Ephesus he *supplied his place there*: "Tychicus, however, have I sent to Ephesus." (2 Tim. iv. 12). The fact is, Mr. Gore was on the right track when he designated Timothy and Titus "evangelists" (p. 249, note 1), and when he represented "evangelists" as one class of "the general or catholic ministry of the church" (p. 241).

And now we must go a step forward. Timothy's and Titus's title and authority, inherited in Paul the apostle,—they were not "apostles," but "apostolic delegates," (p. 246, adopting Winterstein's phrase,) and ranked in *office* with presbyters (cf. *Clem. Hom.* vii. 12, where Peter's travelling attendants are called presbyters), while exercising, as delegates of the apostle, his *authority*. There is no historical proof that any of these evangelists, attendants of the apostles, ever settled in local charges; and the wandering prophets of the *Didaché*, when so settled, passed over into bishops, as into another and separate office. The bishops, in a word, were plainly contemporaneously existing local officers—belonging to a single church, not exercising authority over many—among whom a "prophet" might come to take his place; but they were not dependent on this contingency for the recruiting of their ranks. If investigation has settled anything, it has determined the origin of this local (pastoral) episcopate out of the presbyterate by differentiation of function. All historical indications point that way, and the only question that remains is whether this differentiation took place with apostolic sanction, or only in the post-apostolic age. With Bishop Lightfoot, and the majority of competent and unprejudiced scholars, we believe that the evolution was apostolical—whence arises divine sanc-

tion for the pastoral office. But any effort to derive the office itself from another and "general" (rather than local) source is already obsolete; and is an unpleasant excrescence on Mr. Gore's generally sober and learned treatise. It is even dangerous to his central idea of the unbroken succession of episcopal ordination, as it suspends the whole western succession (when succession is so conceived) on the may-be of an hypothesis, unillustrated by a single historical example.

Princeton.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

DELITZSCH'S NEW COMMENTARY ON GENESIS.

A NEW COMMENTARY ON GENESIS. *By Franz Delitzsch, D. D., Leipzig. Translated by Sophia Taylor.* In Two Volumes. Scribner & Welford, 743 and 745 Broadway, New York. 1889.

For fifty years the name of Franz Delitzsch has been a familiar one to critical students of the Scriptures. Quite recently, however, he has been introduced to a much wider circle of readers in America through the series of twenty-four papers entitled "Suggestive Jottings," which appeared in the *Sunday-School Times*, in 1887. These articles afforded glimpses of the beauty of his spirit, the richness of his learning, and the vigor of his style, which only deepened the desire of the public to know more of this remarkable man and his work.

He was born at Leipzig in 1813. It is supposed by many that he was originally a Jew, but we are informed by one who has known him intimately for many years that this is not the case. The impression is doubtless due to the direction taken by both his literary and practical work. In the first place, his almost matchless Hebrew scholarship, covering as it does the Biblical, Talmudic and Rabbinic literature, and giving him a well-nigh vernacular mastery of the language, naturally suggested that he was himself a Hebrew. Professor Driver, of Oxford, a judge whose competence on this point no one will question, speaks of him as "amongst living Christian scholars perhaps the most profoundly read in post-biblical Jewish literature." We do not think the statement would be too strong even if "perhaps" and "post-biblical" were left out. One proof of his preëminence is the fact that he has written the most accurate and idiomatic Hebrew version of the New Testament, not even excepting that of the lamented Salkinson. This brings us to the second reason for the erroneous supposition that he is a Jew, viz., his life-long interest in Israel, and his indefatigable zeal for their conversion. Of his translation of the New Testament into Hebrew for circulation among Jews, eighty thousand copies have been distributed and a tenth edition is now in preparation. For a quarter of a century he has published a missionary quarterly called *Saat auf Hoffnung*, (Seed Sown in Hope), which has done more perhaps than any other single agency for the evangelization of the Jews. While a student in the gymnasium at Leipzig, he began to learn the Hebrew language, but was then indifferent not only to the spiritual welfare of Israel, but also to his own spiritual condition, and, on entering the university, he gave himself up, not to Hebrew and the Scriptures, but to philosophy and speculative questions of every kind. Through a combination of evangelical influences providentially brought to bear upon him while in the university, his personal attitude towards religion underwent a complete change; his interest in Israel was awakened, and his studies were directed into a