

THE CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XXVII.—MARCH, 1881.

STORIES FOR CHILDREN.

“COME then, and like story-tellers, let us be at leisure, and our story shall be the education of our heroes. . . . You know that we begin by telling children stories which, though not wholly destitute of truth, are in the main fictitious. . . . You know also that the beginning is the chiefest part of any work, especially in a young and tender thing ; for that is the time at which the character is formed, and most readily receives the desired impression. . . . And shall we just carelessly allow children to hear any casual tales which may be framed by casual persons, and to receive into their minds notions which are the very opposite of those which are to be held by them when they grow up ? We cannot allow that. Then the first thing will be to have a censorship of the writers of fiction, and let the censor receive any tale of fiction which is good, and reject the bad ; and we will desire mothers and nurses to tell their children the authorised ones only. Let them fashion the mind with these tales. . . . At the same time, most of those which are now in use will have to be discarded.—Of what tales are you speaking ? he said. Those, I said, which are told by Homer and Hesiod, and the rest of the poets, who have ever been the great story-tellers of mankind.—But which are the stories that you mean, he said ; and what fault do you find with them ?—A fault which is most serious, I said ; the fault of telling a lie, and a bad lie.—But where is this fault committed ?—Wherever an erroneous impression is made of the nature of God and heroes, like the drawing of a limner which has not the shadow of a likeness to the truth.”—*The Republic*. JOWETT.

THE centuries which have passed since these words were written have added little to the instructions under which stories to children should be told. If the names of the poets, and the phrase which expresses the pagan conception of God, could be exchanged for their modern equivalents, the counsel which Plato puts into the lips of Socrates would be good teaching for us still. There is frank recognition of the need of imaginative food for children. That is a great concession in one who means to end by excluding poets from his Republic. And there is put in the forefront of the instruction the really root-principle of justification for all imaginative teaching,—that the stories told should be, in some vital sense, true.

Starting from these positions, it is proposed to indicate, in a homely way, some quarters in which good stories and good matter for stories may be found ; and also some characteristics in the stories themselves,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, March, 1881.]

issue a series of popular biographies of the leading Reformers in various periods of the Church's history, to lie, if need be, side by side with those attractive portraiture of "great souls" within the Church of Rome, that have now become so fashionable. Let us know, by all means, all about Dominic and Bernard, Francis of Assisi, and Thomas à Kempis, Francis de Sales, and Bossuet, Besson, and Perreyre; but let us also have fresh monographs (and not less artistically framed) of Peter Waldo and Wicklif, Luther and Zwingle, Hamilton and Wishart, Rutherford and Farel, Calvin and Wesley—names that will bear perennial reproduction.

W. EDMUND CROTHERS.

THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY.

IN this evangelising age, the office of the Missionary begins to be recognised as of much more than ordinary importance. His work is by all thoughtful men felt to be of weightiest moment, as it is also of the highest responsibility, and often of the greatest difficulty. Others have merely to maintain posts in lands which, in a certain outward sense, have been already conquered: the missionary force must go abroad, advance upon the fortresses of organised heathenism, that they may deliver Satan's captives and form them into new bands for the service of Christ's kingdom. It needs no argument to show that, in proportion to the magnitude and the transcendent importance of the missionary's work, is it of consequence that the Church have right views of his office and its functions. This being granted, as it will be, the question at once presses upon us, how and where shall we find what we need to know regarding this subject? In particular, is there anything in the New Testament about the missionary, his office and his duties?

In answer to this question we remark, first, that it is by all means to be expected that the New Testament would have something to say upon this subject. We know that the Lord has in fact left us full and detailed instructions as to the officers of particular churches. We are told in the New Testament of bishops and deacons, and the qualifications and duties of each of these are fully and clearly set forth. This being so, it would be most unlikely that the Lord, while so careful to provide for the edification of the settled Church, should have made no special analogous provision for this other and prior work, on which the very existence of the Church in any land, in the first instance, must depend. It were the more unlikely, because the missionary work, as Christian people are beginning to see, is their work, to carry on which the Church of Christ exists on earth. That His servants shall go and teach all nations, and continue in this work until the Lord himself shall

come, was the Lord's last and most emphatic command. That the Lord should have put such emphasis upon this work, and appointed no order in the Church specially charged with its execution, were out of all analogy with the way in which He has confessedly done in other matters. It were most reasonable, therefore, that we should open the New Testament expecting to find in it something regarding the missionary and his work.

And we shall not be disappointed. For, when we go to the New Testament narrative, we find that, from the very earliest days in the history of the Church, there appear, not only apostles and prophets, and elders and deacons, concerning whose office and function there will be no dispute, but also other men who cannot be classed under either of these heads. We find a class of men as distinctly set apart to the work of the propagation of the Gospel and the establishment of new churches, as were the bishops for the instruction and rule of the local churches. Such for example, were Barnabas, of whose call and ordination to this specific work by the Presbyters of Antioch we have an account in Acts xiii. 2, 3; Silas, called and set apart by Paul in the exercise of his apostolic authority (Acts xv. 40, and xvi. 1-8); Mark (Acts xv. 37-39, and 2 Tim. iv. 2); Titus, as appears from the epistle to Titus and 2 Cor. vii. 23, and xii. 18; and Philip (Acts vii.). It is plain, from the whole history, that these men were not mere laymen; nor were they mere presbyters of individual churches, any more than they were apostles or prophets. The work which they were set apart to do was, as a simple matter of fact, precisely that which, in these days, the man we call a missionary is sent forth to accomplish. Their business was not to rule or teach in particular churches, but to propagate the Gospel where it was not known, and to establish new churches wherever men believed their message. In a word, in such as Timothy, Titus, Barnabas, and others like them, we cannot fail, one should say, to recognise the *missionaries* of the primitive Church.

The Lord did not then leave the Church without a body of men set apart for the special work of propagating the Gospel and organising new churches. It thus becomes, in the next place, a matter of special interest and importance to know what these officers were called, and what particular duties were laid upon them. If these men, no less than the local pastors, really held an official position in the Church, we can hardly doubt that the office must have had a name; and if so, then what was the name? It will not be difficult to find an answer to this question; for, in a letter of Paul's to one of these primitive missionaries, we find that he sums up all he had to say to him in these words,—“Do the work of an evangelist: make full proof of thy ministry” (2 Tim. iv. 5). This language teaches us explicitly that the specific designation of the ministry which Timothy had received was the term **EVANGELIST**. Evangelist, then, is the word by which the Holy Spirit has denoted the man whom, in modern times, we call a mission-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, March, 1881.]

ary. This is further plain from the fact that Philip also, who, some time after his first appointment as deacon, is found doing the same missionary work as Timothy (Acts viii.), is in Acts xxi. 8 called by this same name, evangelist. And finally, the same term, "evangelist," is used in Eph. iv. 2 expressly to denote one of the four ministries bestowed by the ascended Lord upon His Church. Like the terms "apostle," "prophet," "pastor," and "teacher," in the same enumeration, this term evangelist must be an official designation of the persons intended. And so we reach the conclusion that a special order of men was set apart in the primitive Church, charged with this special ministry of the Word to an unbelieving world,—the gathering and organising of new Churches, as contrasted with the pastoral ministry of the Word to Churches already established. And we have learned further, that the official title by which the Holy Spirit designated such men was the term "*evangelist*."

But here we are met by the assertion of many, that the office of the evangelist was extraordinary and temporary. This in particular is the teaching of the Form of Government as held by the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, wherein we are told, in the section on the Officers of the Church, that the "offices of apostle, prophet, and evangelist," "are extraordinary and have ceased." In this, however, the Form of Government, as adopted by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, differs from that which is in use in the Scotch Church. For, although in Ch. iii. of the Form of Government we read, "The ordinary and perpetual officers in the Church are bishops or pastors, . . . ruling elders, and deacons," and the evangelist is not here included; yet there is no express statement, as in the Scotch Form, that the office has ceased. And while this alone is not decisive, Ch. xv. 15 would seem to settle the question, and recognise the continuance of the evangelistic office in the following language:—

"It is sometimes desirable and important 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, administer sealing ordinances, and organise churches in frontier or destitute settlements."

Here, although the special and original reference is evidently to the work of missions at home, the evangelistic office, as distinguished from the pastoral, is clearly recognised as still existing, and its duties are briefly indicated. In full accordance, therefore, as we believe, with the implications of this language, we maintain that the office of the evangelist, as set before us in the Word of God, was intended, no less than the office of the pastor and teacher, to be perpetual in the Church until the Lord shall come. The following considerations seem to us to be conclusive to this effect:—

First, we find no intimation in the New Testament that the office was of a temporary sort. In this respect, there is a marked contrast

between this and the apostolic office. The temporary nature of the latter, as we all agree, was indicated in many ways. The number was Divinely fixed at twelve. The qualifications for the office were such as, in the nature of the case, could not be found later than the first century of the Church's history. As a matter of fact, the gifts which marked the office have not been perpetuated in any order of men in any Church. But we cannot find a single hint of this kind as regards the office of evangelist. On the contrary, we are at once struck with the fact that no less than three of the canonical epistles are entirely taken up with instructions to Timothy and Titus as to the duties of men who, like them, were called to the evangelistic office.* The fact seems to us to furnish, to say the least, a very strong presumption, that it was by no means the mind of the Spirit that the office of the evangelist should cease for ever within thirty or forty years after these epistles were written. Moreover, when we examine these instructions to the primitive evangelists, we find nothing demanded of the evangelist as such, either in the way of qualification or duty, which is less possible now than when the epistles were written. The work, too, which the evangelist was commanded to do, and for which he was set apart, still remains to be done; and its nature and exigencies, through a great part of the world, remain unchanged. The Gospel has not yet been preached to every creature. Beyond all question, an evangelistic work as much remains to be done as a pastoral work, and according to the distinct intimation of Matthew xxviii. 20, will continue to be needed till the Lord shall come. If the work remains, then it is most reasonable to infer that the order of ministry appointed for that work was also intended by the Lord to continue till His second coming. To assume the contrary is to assume that a work, in some respects the most momentous which the Lord has laid upon the Church, is left without the appointment of any order of men in the Church delegated to its execution. And finally, it is a simple matter of fact that the gifts for the evangelistic office are still continued in the Church. The need for the pastoral office exists, and the Lord bestows the pastoral gifts; the need for an evangelistic work continues, and the Lord as plainly still bestows the evangelistic gifts. So clear and undeniable is this, that in spite of the general confusion of mind on this subject, all denominations of Christians, whatever be their theories on the subject, do recognise the presence of the evangelistic gift, and the Divine call to this specific work,

* These epistles have indeed been commonly called the "pastoral" epistles, but they might also, and, as it seems to us, much more fitly, be called the "evangelistic" epistles. They contain, it is true, much instruction bearing on the duties of the pastoral office, but so do they also as to the office of the deacon, as well as many other matters pertaining to church order and discipline. All these varied instructions, however, are given under the form of directions to Timothy and Titus concerning their duties as evangelists. The directions have chiefly to do with the method and principles on which believers should be organised into churches, and the evangelistic supervision of such infant churches during the period of their comparative ignorance and weakness.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, March, 1881.]

in ordaining men to do the self-same work which Timothy and Titus were commanded to do in Paul's inspired epistles.

Him whom the New Testament calls "evangelist" we call "missionary," but the office and work are the same. To this it is sometimes objected that the evangelist of the apostolic Church was more than any modern missionary can be. He was, it is claimed, a man standing in a certain personal relation to an apostle, as his deputy or representative; so that, in the very nature of the case, the office must have come to an end with the death of the last of the apostles. In reply, we ask for the evidence that any such personal relation which Timothy, *e.g.*, may have sustained to Paul, was essential to his evangelistic office. Such evidence we have not been able to find. That Paul charged Timothy and Titus to do certain things in his absence, no more proves that the *evangelist* was essentially a deputy-apostle, than the fact that Paul charged the elders of the Church of Ephesus to do certain things when he should leave them, proves that *elders* were deputy-apostles. If it be replied that Paul delegated to Timothy and Titus certain apostolic powers of ordination, discipline, &c., which they could not have exercised as individuals, we answer that the fact that an apostle could delegate such powers to an individual for a certain work, does not prove that a presbytery could not give the same powers to the same official for the same purpose, but rather the reverse. The facts do not show that the evangelistic office depended upon apostolic delegation to the office, but the contrary. As for Philip, we have a more detailed account of his evangelistic work than that of almost any other of the evangelists, but there is not the slightest intimation that he ever acted as an apostolic deputy. And if Timothy seems to have been selected by Paul himself, in the first instance, to this work, yet it appears from 1 Tim. iv. 14, that the presbytery took part in his ordination; so that he may as well have received all the authority with which he was vested from the presbytery as from the apostle. Finally, as regards Barnabas, we are told that he was delegated by the presbyters of Antioch alone, without the presence or concurrence of any apostle. We feel forced, then, to conclude that the opinion that the office of the evangelist was merely occasional and temporary is without sufficient proof from Scripture; and as, beyond a doubt, the work which the first evangelists did is still to be done in the largest part of the world, while the gifts for the office are still conferred, we conclude that the office, like that of the pastor, was intended to be permanent in the Church throughout this dispensation, and is in fact before us in the person of the foreign missionary.

But among those who admit, in accord with the apparent meaning of the Standards of the American Presbyterian Church, that the missionary is to be identified with the evangelist of the New Testament age, there are some who affirm that there is no sufficient reason for distinguishing the evangelist as a separate officer from the minister of the local

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, March, 1881.]

church. To this we reply, in the first place, that in a Scriptural sense it is quite true that not only the evangelist, but every church officer is a "minister" and his office a "ministry." But it is the difference in the nature of the ministry that makes the difference in the office. If it is answered that it is meant that the evangelist, like the pastor, is simply a presbyter set apart to a certain work, with this again we fully agree, but maintain that it does not prove the offices identical. Peter, the apostle, tells us that he was a presbyter (1 Pet. v. 1), and so he was,—namely, a presbyter set apart to the special work of the apostolate. But does this prove that the apostolate is not an office quite distinct from the presbyterate? So neither does the admitted fact that the evangelist or missionary is a presbyter set apart to a specific work, prove that his office is therefore the same with that of the local elder or pastor. It is plain enough that different offices may have somewhat in common, and none the less be different offices. It is the specific *function* which constitutes the specific *office*.

That, despite all inconsistencies of practice, the function of the missionary or evangelist is practically distinct from that of the local pastor, must be plain enough to every one. They differ first of all in their specific object. The local pastor is set apart for the edification of the local church, to feed and rule them according to the Word of God. The evangelist or missionary, on the contrary, is set apart, not to minister to any local church, but, by preaching of the Gospel, to found and organise churches where there are none. The one office is essentially local, the other essentially itinerant. The gifts required are also essentially diverse. It is a matter of constant observation that a man may make a most excellent pastor, but not a very good missionary, and *vice versa*. How different the specific functions of the evangelist are from those of the pastor we shall see in the sequel. Not to go more into detail, then, we maintain that the modern missionary is to be identified with the evangelist of the apostolic Church; that the office was intended, like that of the local ministry, to continue in the Church; and that, as in the beginning, so now and always, the office is rightly to be distinguished from that of the pastor of the individual church.

We next have to inquire, what, if this be so, *are* the distinctive functions and duties of the missionary or evangelist? For this again we must go to the Word of God, and in the inspired instructions given to the evangelists, Timothy and Titus, we shall find our question fully answered. Those instructions warrant us in summing up the distinctive duties of the evangelist under three heads, namely, (1.) the *proclamation* of the *Gospel* to the *unbelieving world*; (2.) the *organisation* of those who believe into churches; (3.) the *supervision* of the churches thus organised until they shall be able to do without it.

First then, there is the *proclamation* of the Gospel to an unbelieving world for the salvation of men. This is plain from the very name of the office. The missionary is, in virtue of his very office, a proclaimer

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, March, 1881.]

of good news to lost men. It is plain also from the inspired narratives of the work of the first evangelists. Unlike many of their modern successors, they never became the pastors of any local church, but went continually from place to place, preaching the Word. And the same is no less clear from the apostolic injunctions to the first evangelists, that they "in meekness instruct those that oppose themselves," so "that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil who are led captive by him at his will,"—that, in brief, they "preach the Word, being instant in season, out of season."

But this proclamation of the Gospel, though primary and fundamental to the office, is not all. The second function of the evangelist, as such, is the *organisation* of churches. For when, in any place, men are converted through his preaching, he is not to settle down and become their pastor. That were, so far forth, to abdicate his office. He is to organise such companies of professed believers into churches, according to the Lord's appointment, placing over them elders and deacons, to whose care he is then in faith and prayer to commit the infant church. For this we have, first, the authority of the apostolic example. So always did the apostles; and so did the first evangelists instructed by them (Acts xiv. 23, 24). And we have also the express command of the apostle to the primitive evangelists. Paul charges Timothy that he commit the things which he had heard of him to "faithful men who should be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2); and similarly Titus that he "ordain elders in every city" in Crete. The objections which are made to our following the same course have been considered in a previous article,* and we need not here repeat. It is enough, for this occasion, to remark that immediate organisation of believers into churches is the inspired command to the evangelist. But it will be evident at once that this implies that the evangelist, as such, is invested with certain powers which do not inhere in the local pastor. This duty of organisation which is laid upon him implies that he has the right, in virtue of his office, to admit or exclude from sealing ordinances, and appoint officers in the churches which he forms, in the first instance without the necessary co-operation or conjunction of any other person. That such powers inhere in the nature of the evangelist is plain from the very nature of the work which he is sent to do. How can the concurrence of a session be required, *e.g.*, to admit an adult to baptism in a place where the evangelist himself is the only elder? How can presbyterial co-operation be required for ordination in a place where, as may often happen, the presbytery does not yet exist? Moreover, for this position we have the warrant of inspired example. So acted, as we have seen, the first evangelists; and the evangelist Titus is expressly commanded so to do in Crete, where it is plain there was as yet no other presbyter. Such in fact has been the practice of

* "Church Organisation in Foreign Missions." *The Catholic Presbyterian*, July, 1880. See pp. 51, 52.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, March, 1881.]

missionaries of all denominations. While Presbyterian missionaries have always recognised the powers of presbytery and session where such have existed, yet they have often found themselves compelled, by the very exigencies of their work, to perform functions which inhere in the pastor of no local church, baptising, and ordaining, themselves alone, in virtue of their office as evangelists. Nor is this doctrine of the powers of the evangelist inconsistent with the most rigid Presbyterianism. It is beyond question in the power of a presbytery, as of any organised body, to delegate any or all of its powers to any individual, for good and sufficient reason. That it must so delegate its powers to the individual evangelist is plain, to say the least, in every case where the man is sent into a new field to work.

The third and last function of the evangelist as such, is *supervision*. In this also, presbytery, in its ordination, has the power to delegate its functions, and must do so if it shall be possible in many cases for the evangelist to do his work. Having preached the Gospel, and organised into a congregation those who in any place believe, while he is to give over the churches from the first to the care of the elders, he is not by any means then to leave them to shift for themselves. To do this would in most cases be simply fatal. For some time, these infant churches will need the missionary's evangelistic watch and care. He is not, indeed, on any account, to usurp the functions of the local eldership, but he is to teach them how to perform these. Herein again we have apostolic example, for so did the apostles and first evangelists. We read that after a while they visited the churches they had founded to see how they were doing (Acts xv. 36). To the same effect we might cite a large part of the epistles to Timothy and Titus. In those inspired directions as to the duty of the evangelist, more emphasis is laid upon this duty of supervision than on any other. The evangelist Timothy was directed to see that the teachers in the churches taught sound doctrine (1 Tim. i. 3),—if need be, to rebuke and even silence those who teach what they ought not (Tit. i. 11 and iii. 10). Timothy was to supplement the teachings of the local pastors, at the best but imperfect at first,—in his visitations instructing and guiding all classes of people in the church as they required (1 Tim. ii. 8 and v. 8, &c., &c.). So far from such evangelistic supervision being subversive of the principles of Presbyterianism, it is in greater or less degree, in all heathen fields, necessary to its establishment. Whatever the theories of any may be, missionaries everywhere find themselves compelled for a season to exercise, more or less, this quasi-episcopal power.

We can only, in closing, indicate in a word the importance of this whole subject. If we are not greatly mistaken, many of the most serious abuses which have grown up in some mission-fields, may be traced to a confusion of the evangelistic with the pastoral office. The subject is broad and difficult, and it has been impossible, in the limits assigned to this paper, to do more than indicate an outline of the matter.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, March, 1881.]

The relations of the missionary evangelist to the Church which sends him, and to the churches he may found, as well as to other evangelists who may be labouring in the same field, demand a more thorough discussion than they have anywhere as yet received. They are questions of very great importance, and in many aspects at least, scarcely less difficult than important. It is to be hoped that, through the Presbyterian Alliance, they may soon receive the attention they demand and deserve.

S. H. KELLOGG.

DR. CANDLISH.

DR. CANDLISH was a man of whom Scotland as a whole has much reason to be proud. He filled an important place at an important period, and filled it well and nobly. Now that the air is tolerably clear of passion and prejudice, it would not be easy for even the most vigorous of his surviving opponents to point to any serious blot on a difficult public career, extending over forty years, or to bring up aught which renders his memory less worthy of respect. Nevertheless, of the leaders of the Disruption of the Church of Scotland in 1843, he was the one who was regarded in England with the minimum of liking and the maximum of distrust—as a wily Church tactician and restless ecclesiastical demagogue, rather than as a faithful standard-bearer in the host which fought and sacrificed for “the crown rights of the Redeemer.” And in Scotland, the strong and somewhat angular individuality of his character, the intellectual subtlety which partially veiled his real honesty, and the unflinching manner in which he pursued his ecclesiastical aims, divided his countrymen into camps of warm friends or bitter foes. But the generation which admired him without qualification, or hated him with a perfect hatred, has nearly passed away. The shibboleths of the old antagonisms are being forgotten. The Free Church of Scotland herself is a sober, middle-aged institution, subject to the difficulties and internal divisions from which no visible Church is long exempted; and therefore the character and career of the man who largely helped to make her what she is, can be discussed without bias or reserve.

It is not the purpose of this paper to give any record of the life of Dr. Candlish, or any general estimate of his character and work, but rather to indicate some of those elements of both which appear to a member of another communion to have given him that remarkable place in the history of Scotland which, in this day, is accorded to him by both friends and foes.*

* For the record of his life, and very copious extracts from his public speeches, the reader is referred to a volume just published—“Memorials of Robert S. Candlish, D.D.” By William Wilson, D.D. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black.