

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 3.

---

JULY, MDCCCLXXXIV.

---

ARTICLE, I.

EVOLUTION.<sup>1</sup>

*Gentlemen of the Alumni Association:*

At the same time that you honored me with an invitation to deliver an address before you on this occasion, the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary, in view of the fact that "Scepticism in the world is using alleged discoveries in science to impugn the word of God," requested me "to give fully my views, as taught in this institution, upon Evolution, as it respects the world, the lower animals, and man." Inasmuch as several members of the Board are also members of this Association, and both Board and Association feel the same interest in the Seminary, I have supposed that I could not select a subject more likely to meet with your approval than the one suggested to me by the Directors.

I am all the more inclined to make this choice, as it will afford me the opportunity of showing you that additional study has, in some respects, to a certain extent modified my views since I expressed them to many of you in the class-room.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Address was delivered May 7th, 1884, before the Alumni Association of the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., and is published in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW at its request, and also at the request of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary.

in his presence, in his fruition to all eternity! Oh, that God would shed forth upon us abundantly the spirit of this work! Then indeed would the set time to favor Zion have come, and the glory of the Lord be risen upon her! (Ps. ciii. 13-22; Isa. lx. 1-5.)

---

ARTICLE VII.

THE EVANGELIST IN FOREIGN FIELDS.<sup>1</sup>

The Committee appointed to prepare an answer to the overture touching the powers of the evangelist in foreign fields sent down by the Assembly of 1883, would present the following recommendation to the Presbytery of Lexington, based upon the following grounds:

The overture (see Minutes of Assembly, p. 60) is that—

Chapter IV., Section II., Paragraph 6, Book of Church Order, be so altered as that after the word "ordain," it shall read: "to all the offices required to make them complete; and also with a view to the extension of the Church, he has power in foreign fields to ordain other evangelists."

The Committee recommend that this overture be answered in the affirmative, with a restriction imposed by the addition of some expression limiting the power of the evangelist in the home field to the organisation of churches and the ordination and instalment of ruling elders and deacons, and recognising the just relation of the joint power of the Church to the work in the evangelistic field, both foreign and domestic.

The first principle which bears upon the subject is the well recognised principle of the parity of the ministry. The term "office" is frequently applied to designate both the evangelist and the pastor. Such an application is, however, loose and inaccurate: the office of both is nothing more nor less than the one equal office of the Christian ministry. In strict accuracy of speech, the term

---

<sup>1</sup> This Report is published in accordance with the request of the Presbytery of Lexington.

“office” is not properly applied at all in the designation of either evangelist or pastor. The term “evangelist,” like the term “pastor,” represents a relation and not an office; both describe a relation in which an office is exercised, but not the office itself. In the Presbyterian system, the office of the ministry is absolutely one and equal; but it is exercised in different relations, for the regulation of which the written Constitution of the Church provides, allotting certain duties which may and must be done in a certain relation by one minister which cannot be done by any other minister in a different relation, though their office be absolutely one and the same ministerial capacity. As examples of this arrangement, the pastor of a church is required ordinarily to moderate the Session; no other minister, though holding the same ministerial office, can assume the function unless specially invited to do so. The moderator of a Presbytery or a Synod has duties assigned him which no other member of the court can do. It is clear that the only modification of the co-equal powers of the one ministerial office recognised in our system is dependent upon the relation in which the office is exercised as regulated by the Constitution.

The term “evangelist,” like the term “pastor,” defines one of these relations determined by the Constitution, but not an office. The pastoral relation defines the use of the ministerial office under a fixed connexion with one or more settled churches. The term “evangelist” defines the use of the ministerial office under an unfixed relation to regions yet to be furnished with the gospel. Both of these relations are absolutely necessary to the work of the Church of God. The grand end of the organised Church is to propagate the gospel in order that men may be saved—to propagate it more and more deeply in the souls of the saints; to propagate it on a scale limited only by the conversion of the whole world, in all regions beyond its own pale. This one grand end involves as a matter of necessity the two great duties of maintaining all ground won and of perpetually winning new conquests. The maintenance of the ground already gained develops the necessity for a fixed employment of the ministerial office, and determines the relation of pastor. The perpetual obligation to extend

her conquests develops the necessity of a regular and sustained system of aggressive labor in fields unreached by the gospel, and develops the relation of evangelist. Both of these relations are indispensable to the work of the Church, and both are as permanent and obligatory in the policy of the Church as the work which has been given her to do.

The question raised by the overture concerns the power of the evangelist in foreign parts to ordain pastors in churches founded among the heathen and native evangelists to extend the work still farther beyond. The amendment proposed contains two distinct clauses: one empowering the evangelist, already authorised to organise churches and ordain elders and deacons, to complete the organisation, which can only be done by the ordination and installation of pastors; the other empowering him to ordain other evangelists. The question to be settled in the answer to the overture is whether there is any power in the evangelist to ordain ministers and determine the relations in which the office is to be exercised. This involves the investigation of the nature and origin, grounds and limits of the power.

It is admitted he has power to ordain ruling elders and deacons: this is fully recognised in the Book. The power to ordain to all offices is essentially the same. What, then, is the nature and origin of this power? Two theories, or perhaps more correctly three theories, exist on the subject. One makes the power inherent in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist developed by the exigencies of his work, or, as some prefer to express it, under the absolute necessities of the work. The second theory makes it in all cases the delegated joint power of Presbytery, and denies altogether the implied several power in the office of the ministry in any relation. The third theory, if distinct at all from the first, affirms the several power as co-existing with the joint power—ordinarily yielding precedence to it, yet available for use whenever really needed. It is conceived by some advocates of the several power that it emerges only under the pressure of an absolute necessity. Beyond all doubt the exigencies of the work both at home and abroad often make the power already recognised in the evangelist to ordain elders and deacons highly important,

in a certain high and material sense necessary to the work with which the evangelist is charged. But it is dangerous to the hope of establishing the several power to condition it on an absolute necessity. Such a necessity would undoubtedly develop the power. To deny this would affirm that the Church did not possess the power indispensable to do her work. This admission would be too absurd for a moment's credit. But in point of fact no such necessity exists, nor is it at all essential to assert it.

Joint power may always be made available in the field of the evangelist in two ways—generally by both, always by one. It may be made available under suitable constitutional arrangements, whenever two or more evangelists are in the same field. It may always be made available, even when there is but one evangelist in the field, by the delegation of the joint power of the Presbytery. This method is equally available when there are two or more evangelists in the field. The Constitution distinctly provides for the appointment of commissions for judicial and other business, and the power is articulately granted for commissions to ordain. If not, it would be easy to provide it, and constitute the evangelist a commission of Presbytery. In fact, this seems to be the view of some advocates of the overture, and indeed of the very parties who have offered the overture to the consideration of the Church. They say in so many words, after quoting the paragraph proposed to be amended: "It is the joint power of the Presbytery delegated to him." Joint power delegated to a single individual does not change its nature or cease to be joint power.

It is obvious that such a delegation of joint power is essentially different from a true several power inherent in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist; and only emerging under the exigencies of his work. The advocates of this several power in the ministerial office suppose it to be determined by the relation in which the office is exercised, and only determined in that relation by the real and commanding necessities of their work. The majority of the evangelists in Brazil who have proposed this overture giving power to the foreign evangelist to ordain, speaking by Mr. Boyle in his late pamphlet, construe this second method to be the one dictated in the existing provision of the Book touch-

ing the evangelist at home and abroad, even in the ordination of ruling elders and deacons. They construe the word "entrusted" as synonymous with "delegated," and consequently recognise the power in the evangelist as already defined in the Book, as a delegated joint power and not as a power inherent in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist. If this construction is correct, it would seem to be altogether superfluous in them to discuss the question of several power at all: joint power is available and actually provided for even in the case of elders and deacons. The power of the evangelist in all ordinations is joint power delegated by the Presbytery. Whether the evangelist is construed by this theory as generally endowed with this joint power by the mere force of his appointment as evangelist, or whether it is supposed he must apply for it in every case where there is call for the use of it, it is joint power delegated; and as this delegation is possible to any evangelist under any circumstances, with delay and injury to the work it may be, but still possible, it follows that the several power of the evangelist to ordain cannot be construed as developed under that form of necessity which may be properly demonstrated a necessity absolute. On this account some who are jealous of any discount of the fundamental principle of the Presbyterian system—government by joint power—are disposed to regard any ascription of a several power of ordination in the evangelist as not only superfluous, but as incapable of any recognition whatever. They regard the recognised power of the evangelist to ordain ruling elders and deacons at home and abroad as delegated joint power entrusted to the evangelist and as in no sense a several power of the ministerial office in the relation of evangelist, developed by any necessity in his work absolute or less imperative.

But the question cannot be settled in this peremptory fashion for weighty reasons. In the first place, a necessity less than absolute may develop the several power in question. An absolute necessity is one which exists where no other resource is available. Another form of necessity exists which springs from the want of proper availability in another resource existing, but not adjusted to the actual demands of a work at a given crisis. Yet another

form of necessity is created by the best interests of a work, and any organised association of men is defectively organised when their powers are so granted as not to permit the maintenance of the best interest of their work. That some necessity does exist for the use of the evangelist in the ordination of elders and deacons, is already recognised in the Book in the paragraph to be amended. Yet, as we have already seen, this necessity is not an absolute necessity, for joint power is available by delegation. It is clear, then, the necessity recognised by the Book is a necessity of the second or third form just defined, or of both combined. It is a necessity springing from the want of prompt availability in another resource existing or from the best interests of the work. The very purpose for which the evangelist is sent out is to found the Church. He must have power either in his office and relation, or as delegated to him, or his mission is an absurdity. If he cannot do it in the exercise of his office and relation, his office and relation would seem to be defective. If he must refer back in every case to the Presbytery to receive a delegation of power, inconvenience and injurious delay must always embarrass and frequently seriously interfere with his work. Every time he has to organise a church or ordain an elder or a deacon, he must from the foreign field send back thousands of miles and wait on the meeting of Presbytery, it may be for half a year before he can act. The Book has settled the point that even in the home field, where less violence of pressure is on the work, it is for the interest of the Church that the evangelist should be empowered to act. The necessity is not absolute in the absence of any other resource available, but a commanding necessity in the interests of the work, and in the more ready utility of another resource equally in reach. Denying the several power, the work must frequently be seriously embarrassed.

That a necessity less than absolute may develop the several power is evident also from the analogy of office in the civil sphere. So long as the colonel of a regiment commissioned by the civil government to command in action is able to be at his post, no subordinate officer has a right to assume his authority. But if he falls, the next in rank is required to take his place. If that

subordinate falls, the next in rank below assumes the command, and so *seriatim* down to the lowest office in the series. The necessity for this is real and commanding, and often indispensable to the public service. Yet it is not an absolute necessity; for the commander in chief may order another officer of rank similar to the rank of the fallen leader to take his place, thus superseding the assumption by the next in rank and the succession of the whole series. In like manner no absolute necessity in the absence of any other resource is needful to develop the several power of the evangelist: it may be developed by a form of necessity less imperative, though equally real and equally practical in the interests of the Church.

But does not the language of the Book preclude the conception of a several power developed by no matter what form of necessity by asserting the power to ordain elders and deacons to be delegated joint power? It is so supposed by the authors of the present overture; but it is by no means unquestionable. The language of the Book is, "and to him may be intrusted power to organise churches and ordain ruling elders and deacons therein." Our Book is new and the meaning of many of its terms has not yet been determined by the construction of the courts. To construe the word "entrust" as synonymous with "delegate," or as necessarily involving a delegation of power, is, to say the least of it, not immediately obvious. To "entrust" may refer to discretion in the use of power already existing as well as to delegation of power. It is possible to trust or not trust the discretion of an agent who may be recognised as having full power to do a thing. It is one thing to delegate power; it is another to trust discretion, and the latter expression recognises power as existing. If the word "entrust" refers to discretion, it seems to recognise a power in the evangelist independent of delegation. If the several power does exist, either by the necessities of the case or by the authority of scripture precedent as we hope to show, the language of the Book must refer to discretion in the agent. In all cases where joint power is delegated as it may be even though the several power is recognised as co-ordinate or co-existing with it—in such cases the "entrust" of the evangelist will imply both the delegation of power and the discretion to use it.



It is obvious, then, that the language of the Book is not necessarily to be construed as merely delegation of power, and consequently is not to be construed as definitely repudiating the several power. It may involve in certain cases a delegation of power; it may embrace the notion of a delegation of power in part, but only in part. It also involves the notion of discretion and with this carries the recognition of a power existing independent of special delegation. The language of the Book ought always to be construed in consistency with the precedents of Scripture, the necessities of the work of building up the kingdom, and the most efficient use of all the powers granted to the Church or implied in those grants. We conclude, then, from the nature of the work committed to the evangelist, that its necessities warrant the recognition of a power in the office of the ministry in the relation of evangelist to organise churches and ordain ruling elders and deacons therein.

But a still more effective argument may be drawn from the precedents of the Scriptures, which not only clearly vindicate the power of the evangelist to ordain to the office of the elder and the deacon, but to the office of the teaching elder which is sought to be recognised in the overture of the Assembly—precedents which not only vindicate the use of the power by the evangelist, but clearly define the nature of the power as several in the office, and not merely limited as a delegation of joint power. These precedents are presented in the cases of Timothy and Titus. It is universally admitted that these two apostolic men held the same office, and discharged it in the same relation, whatever this office and relation might be. Titus was left in Crete by Paul “to set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every church.” The character of these elders is defined, among other qualifications, by being “able by sound doctrine to exhort and convince gainsayers,” as teaching elders. Timothy is besought to abide at Ephesus and entreated “to lay hands suddenly on no man,” and to commit the things heard from Paul to faithful men “who shall be able to teach others also.” It is clear, then, that Timothy and Titus were empowered to ordain singly, not only elders who ruled well, but those who were to minister

in word and doctrine. Their ordination of deacons is also clear on the face of the record. What function did they exercise in these ordinations? Four theories in explanation are proposed. The first of these is the Episcopal or Prelatic theory, which makes Timothy the Bishop of Ephesus and Titus the Bishop of Crete, exercising the power of a modern diocesan in a regular diocesan relation. This view is advocated by vast numbers of Episcopal scholars and may be termed the standard view of the Episcopal Church. The second theory represents them as acting under an extraordinary commission to exercise the delegated power of the apostle under whose orders they acted. A third theory construes them as doing the work in their recognised functions as evangelists, construed as an extraordinary office. These last two views are advocated by numbers of writers, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Romanist, some preferring one, and some the other, but all agreed in repudiating the Episcopal theory and in construing the function exercised as extraordinary—as an extraordinary delegation of apostolic authority, or the legitimate use of an extraordinary office. This third theory is held by Willett and Stillingfleet, by the Jesuit Salmeron, and by other adherents of the Prelatic system.

This is the view taken by the celebrated Dr. John M. Mason in his controversy with Hobart. After consenting to the enumeration by his antagonist of the acts of Timothy and Titus at Ephesus and Crete, he says they “could do all these things without being diocesan bishops. An apostle could do them in virtue of his apostolic office; an evangelist as Timothy,<sup>1</sup> and consequently Titus, undoubtedly was, could do them in virtue of his office as an evangelist, and yet be very unlike a diocesan bishop.” He says again: “In ordaining presbyters he was doing the work of an evangelist.”<sup>2</sup> Again he says in a general conclusion of his argument touching the official character of Timothy and Titus: “What were they then? We answer, they were extraordinary officers known in the apostolic Church by the name of evangelists; and employed as travelling companions and assistants of the

<sup>1</sup> See 2 Tim. iv. 5, Dr. Mason's Works, Vol. 2, p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> Mason's Works, Vol. 2, p. 195, *Ibid* pp. 200, 201.

apostles in propagating the gospel. For this purpose their powers, like those of the apostles, were extraordinary; their office, too, was temporary, and therefore their superiority over presbyters is no precedent nor warrant for retaining such superiority in the permanent order of the Church." He then proceeds to cite the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius in support of his position. "And moreover very many of the disciples of that day travelled abroad and performed the work of evangelists, ardently ambitious of preaching Christ to those who were yet wholly unacquainted with the doctrine of faith, and to deliver to them the Scriptures of the divine Gospels. These having merely laid the foundations of the faith and ordained other pastors, committed to them the cultivation of the churches newly planted, while they themselves, supported by the grace and co-operation of God, proceeded to other countries and nations."<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that in the time of Paul, and afterwards of Eusebius, evangelists did singly ordain pastors, and in the case of the evangelists mentioned by Eusebius there is no pretence even of "delegated power." It will not be necessary to discuss at length the theory of the function of Timothy and Titus as exercising an extraordinary delegation of apostolic power. It is sufficient to observe that if it were delegated power, it was not delegated joint power; it was power inhering in a single supreme authority. It may be also remarked that nothing in the record carries this idea of delegation. The language of entreaty used to Timothy is positively inconsistent with the notion of delegation. The more positive form of command used to Titus—"as I had appointed thee"—is altogether as consistent with the recognition of the power in Titus as with a delegation to him. But the conclusive argument is found in the real nature of the evangelist function. If in reply to the theory of the evangelist as an extraordinary office, we can make it appear that the exercise of the function of evangelist is an ordinary and permanent function of church power, it would be superfluous to discuss it as an extraordinary delegation of the power of the apostleship. It would have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Mason's Works, Vol. 2, p. 201.

a superfluous delegation of power, if the power of Timothy and Titus as evangelists carries all the power which was needed.

The discussion of the point stated brings up the fourth theory already classified. This theory is that the function of the evangelist is not an extraordinary one, but a regular and permanent function in which it is necessary the Church should do its work in regions beyond its pale. That the work of the evangelist is not extraordinary, but a regular part of the Church's work, admits of no dispute. The relation is determined necessarily by the obligation of the Church to advance its conquests perpetually in the regions beyond its pale; this purpose cannot be executed without an organ to do it, and marks the office as regular and permanent. The regular and ordinary character of the evangelist is a recognised principle in the Presbyterian system and standards. Dr. Mason altogether mistakes its true nature when he pronounces it extraordinary. He seems to have felt it to be necessary so to define it, in order to avoid the concession to the Prelatic theory of the diocesan character of Timothy and Titus on the one hand, or on the other to sacrifice the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian system—the parity of the ministry and the government of the Church by joint powers. But neither of these alternatives was at all necessary. The diocesan theory of the official character of Timothy, and consequently of Titus, is set aside by the direct title of evangelist given to Timothy; by the migratory character of their work as close attendants on the apostles in their travels whereas the diocesan bishop is confined to a certain fixed district; by the special form of expression used by Paul in assigning them to the service to be rendered in Ephesus and Crete; and emphatically by the pointed ascription of the episcopal function to the presbyters of Ephesus by Paul himself when he met them at Miletus.

That no danger is involved to the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian system, the parity of the ministry and government by joint power, either or both, is evident under the following consideration. The several power stands based upon a clear scriptural precedent in Timothy and Titus. It is thus demonstrated to be entirely consistent with the principle of joint

power elsewhere established in the Scriptures and permanently co-existent with it. It consequently is entirely distinct from Prelatic power. The prejudice existing among us against the several power in ordination as essentially identical with Prelatic power is founded altogether in the mistake that the exercise of power by individual offices identifies the power and confounds the offices. But this is obviously a misapprehension. The power of a magistrate is different from the power of a sheriff, though each is exercised by a single person. The power of an absolute monarch is different from the power of a prime minister, though each acts singly in the discharge of his function. The power of one is the supreme power lodged in the crown by the law of the realm; the power of the other is the power granted under law to a specified office; and the circumstance that each power is singly exercised cannot possibly identify the power as the same. A colonel and a corporal can both control a thing falling within the authority of the subordinate; but although exercised about the same thing, and singly exercised, the power of the one officer cannot be confounded with the other. It is obvious that the mere circumstance of a single exercise of two kinds of power cannot confound the difference in the nature of the power. The power of a prelate is the power of a superior order with authority to appoint to all inferior offices. The power in the evangelist is a power common to one equal order, and claims no superiority in the exercise. It is the power of rule which inheres in an equal office, a power ordinarily to be exercised jointly, yet capable of single exercise in special conditions, according to the precedents of Timothy and Titus. If the power of a colonel and a corporal are competent to do the same thing in a certain class, although different, so the power of an evangelist and the power of a prelate may be competent to do the same thing, and yet be different. The one feature in common—single exercise—cannot possibly, logically, involve any identification of the power employed.

It is no offence to the parity of the ministry, for the office of the evangelist is the one office of the ministry, and the difference in its exercise is due only to the difference of relation and the conditions of the work. It is no offence to the principle of joint

power, because it only emerges in the absence or in the lack of a suitable availability of joint power, and as an alternative resource when the exigencies of the Master's service demand it. If Paul did not delegate his apostolic power to Timothy and Titus, and recognised in their function as evangelists the full competence to do the work in Ephesus and Crete, he nevertheless might have done so, his not doing so did not at all prejudice his power and right to do it. Both resources were available to him and he had choice of either. By a parity of reasoning it may be competent to a Presbytery to delegate its joint power; but if the power is also determined by the relation of the evangelist and certain conditions of his work, it is evident the Church is possessed of two resources, either of which may be employed according to the expediences of the case. Both of them ought to be recognised and regulated by regular constitutional enactments. Neither ought to be abandoned, and the Church ought to secure the use of either, as the best interests of the work may demand. The power of the evangelist ought to be recognised in due deference to the scripture precedent of Timothy and Titus, and on account of those practical exigencies which may emerge in the progress of the great work of founding the Church when the use of this power, if not absolutely necessary, may nevertheless be of eminent practical necessity. The joint power also exists, and as the grand permanent and universal principle of government in an established Church state, will and ought ordinarily to take precedence of the contingent and remote several power of the evangelist. But while arrangements ought to be made for the use of this joint power by delegation, settling its method and securing its precedence, it ought not to be so placed and construed as to extinguish the single power of the evangelist, as recognised in the precedents of Scripture, and sometimes signally vindicated in its superior practical usefulness. The power to create a commission for the employment of joint power is already clearly recognised in the law of the Church. The use of the other may be gained by this overture.

It is obvious, then, as a general conclusion, both from the practical necessities of the work of founding the Church and from the

precedents of the Scriptures, that the power of the evangelist "to organise churches and ordain elders and deacons therein" is capable of vindication as a several as well as a delegated joint power. If therefore the evangelist is competent in several power to organise a church in part, there would seem to be no good reason why he should not complete it. If competent to ordain ruling elders and deacons, which is ordinarily to be done by joint power, why not to ordain teaching elders? The precedent of Timothy and Titus is emphatically a precedent for the ordination of teaching elders and bishops by the evangelist. The success of the evangelist's work in the foreign field is mainly dependent upon the ordination of pastors in the churches organised by him. Without a teaching elder in the relation of pastor, the organisation is incomplete, and the deficiency is in the very office by which its main work is to be done. Without the power of the evangelist is equally extended to the ordination and installation of ministers as pastors as well as to the ordination of ruling elders and deacons, a church may be founded in a heathen land and remain incapable of discharging the main business of a church for want of an organ to do it much longer than would be at all consistent with its duty or its interests; or else must resort to the power of other churches laboring among the heathen, to complete its needful organisation. Surely neither of these results is to be contemplated as emerging in the regular course of our work as a Church without feeling an imperative call to prevent it. It would seem, then, that the first clause in the overture looking to the ordination of ministers as pastors is supported by the precedents of Scripture, and rests upon the same logical ground with the ordination of elders and deacons, only intensified in force, and consequently should be answered in the affirmative. Every reason which would justify the paragraph proposed to be amended as it now stands in the Book would justify the first clause in the amendment proposed by the overture.

If the power proposed to be recognised in the first clause is admitted, it will be comparatively easy to settle the legitimacy of the power proposed to be recognised in the second. This second clause provides for the power of the evangelist to ordain other

evangelists in the foreign field, with a view to the more rapid extension of the Church and the greater extension of his own usefulness. The first clause empowers him to ordain and instal ruling elders, deacons, and pastors in the foreign field; the second, to ordain other evangelists, all under the same proviso, the want of any properly available joint power and the necessities of the Master's work among the perishing multitudes. Now, if the evangelist is competent to ordain and instal a native pastor in a heathen land, assuredly the main difficulty in his ordination of native evangelists is swept away. He can ordain to the ministerial office and set it to work in a particular pastoral relation, why may he not ordain to the same office for employment in a different relation under the same general proviso which authorised the other? In the Presbyterian mind, fixed as it is in the conviction of joint power in ordination as in other functions of government, the main difficulty is to recognise the single power to ordain to the office; and the settlement of the relation in which the office is to be exercised is a purely subordinate question. If the one is allowed to the evangelist, it would seem to be superfluous to deny him the other. If he is not only allowed to ordain to the office, but to establish a pastoral relation in which it is to be exercised, it would appear to be an unnecessary nicety to refuse him the power to ordain to its exercise in a relation, to say the most of it, of no dignity superior to the relation of pastor. The second clause in the amendment is justified by the same reasons and to the same extent which justify the first.

It is clear from the relation between the regular joint power of the Church and the several power of the evangelist, the use of the former ought to be supreme and exclusive of the latter in all cases where the availability of the joint power is equal or superior to the availability of the several power, or in other words in all cases where there is no real and commanding necessity for the use of the inferior power. This principle will limit the power of the evangelist in the home field to the ordination of ruling elders and deacons, and prohibit his ordination of ministers, while it will admit of the ordination of all by the foreign evangelist. Ministers may be ordained in the home field at a dis-



tance from the churches of which they are to take charge, and be installed afterwards by a commission or a committee. It is therefore proper to require their ordination by joint power and prohibit it to the evangelist. Elders and deacons, on the contrary, are to be ordained and installed on the ground, and their ordination may be properly committed to the evangelist in frontier settlements and in the destitute parts of the Church at home. Both ministers and other officers in foreign fields are not easily accessible to the regular joint power of the Church, and their ordination may be properly committed to the evangelist employing either the single power of his office and relation or the delegated joint power of the Church. The difference in the practical necessities of each case will properly determine in all cases the power and procedure to be employed. Where two or more powers are granted to the Church, she may employ either. She can lawfully employ no power except what is granted by her Head; but she can use all granted by him as the policy of each case may determine.

To prevent any obscuration of the power of the domestic evangelist to ordain ruling elders and deacons which might be the result of adding the words of the overture as now arranged, and to prohibit his ordination of ministers which would be equally granted by the words as proposed to be inserted to the home as to the foreign evangelist, it would be advisable to make some change in the arrangement. Instead of blotting out the words "ruling elders and deacons therein" and inserting the addition proposed after the word "ordain," leave the words as they now stand, which will clearly define the power of the home evangelist, and insert after the word "therein" the words "and in foreign fields native ministers also, both as pastors and evangelists, when necessary." The clause would then read: "Ordain ruling elders and deacons therein, and in foreign fields native ministers also, both as pastors and evangelists, when necessary."

To these words the Committee recommend the addition of the following paragraph, in order to recognise and define the relation of the joint power of the Church to the evangelistic fields both domestic and foreign; they also recommend that the Assembly

be requested to have the necessary steps taken to have this addition appended to the amended form of the overture: "Provided that, in the ordination of native ministers as pastors and evangelists, no joint power is available in timely consistency with the best interests of the work; and where two or more evangelists are in the same field, no such ordination shall be accomplished unless by the recommendation of a majority of the evangelists in the field."

Respectfully submitted,

C. R. VAUGHAN,

J. T. L. PRESTON,

*Committee.*

---

We would add in the form of an appendix, because not strictly in a line with the object and argument of the report, the following views as suggestive to the reflection of the Church:

That the terms "pastor" and "evangelist" describe a relation and not an office, is clear, first, from the fact that in setting apart any ordained minister, either as pastor or evangelist, no ordination to office is employed; an office already granted is simply determined to a specified use. It results, secondly, from the recognised parity of the ministry; the office is absolutely one and equal. To construe the pastor as holding one office, the evangelist as holding another distinct and different, the teacher as holding a third variety of office, is inconsistent with the conception of one office of the ministry absolutely equal and the same. It results, thirdly, from the very nature of the case: both pastor and evangelist holding each the same office are, as matter of fact, set apart to the use of their office in different relations, and the reference of the titles obviously as different, is not to the office, which is the same in both, but to the relation in which alone any difference appears. The conception of pastor and evangelist as terms of relation and not of office is fully supported by the terminology of our system. To form a pastoral relation and to set apart to the work of an evangelist, are familiar in our usage. The bear-

ings of this distinction are important, as will appear in the immediate sequel.

But before proceeding to develop this, we will call attention to certain distinctions which bear strongly, not only on this question of the evangelist, but on the question of the eldership now exciting a renewed interest in the Church. The distinction of "order," "office," "rank," and "relative power," and the relation of "work" to all these have been so mixed up and confounded as to prevent all clear uses of discrimination and lead to erroneous conclusions in opposite directions as the necessary result. Some will suppose that the phrase we just used as familiar in our usage, "set apart to the work of an evangelist," concludes against our view of evangelist as descriptive of a relation and not an office. They construe office as determined by work actually done or to be done. Whoever does the work is construed as holding the office set apart to do that work. A single moment's steady consideration will show this to be one of those half truths which have the effect of a whole error in the discovery and settlement of permanent principles. The only possible way to reach satisfactory conclusions in matters of this description is not to attempt to settle them by mere consideration of abstract terms, but by taking concrete cases in actual life and then abstracting the terms from the concrete case. Now, it is perfectly true that office does bear relation to work; a military office stands related to military work, a financial office to financial work, a teaching office to the work of a teacher. But what relation does it bear? A colonel of a regiment is on leave of absence, his duties are discharged meanwhile by a subordinate; but the office of the colonel has not been vacated, nor has it been assumed by his subordinate though doing the work. A professor in a college is temporarily laid aside by sickness, his son takes his place and does the work; but the professorship is still held by the father. From these instances, what does office appear to be and what is its relation to work? Obviously it is not to hold an office merely to do the work. Office is the legal instrument with authority to do a work carrying with it obligation to do it, responsibility for doing it, and a right to the privileges and rewards attached to it by the

law which establishes the office. Neither capacity to do the work, nor opportunities to do it, nor the actual doing of it, places a man in office. A teller in a bank temporarily doing the work of a cashier disabled by sickness does not supersede him in office. Office, then, does bear a relation to work; but it is the peculiar relation of authority, obligation, responsibility, and privilege, and not merely the actual doing of the work. A man may do the work of an office and yet not be invested with it.

Yet further, if office is determined merely and altogether by the work to be done, so that he who does the work must be construed as holding the office, it will logically follow that any change in the work will result in a change of office, and a minister must be construed as holding a different office when he preaches in public and when he visits his people in private. It is intrinsically obvious that an appointment to do a particular work is not synonymous with an appointment to office. A minister sent to rectify the disorder in a particular church is not thereby ordained to a new office; he is only appointed to a special work for which the office he holds renders him competent. Yet further, the relation in which an office is discharged is determined often by the work to be done. Work has as much to do in determining the relation in which office is to be exercised as in determining the nature of office itself. The work of preaching the gospel in one settled church determines the pastoral relation; the work of preaching the gospel in regions beyond clearly determines, not a difference in the work to be done—preaching the gospel; not a difference in the office to be employed—the one office of the ministry; but a difference in the relation in which the work is to be done, and the office is to be exercised in doing it.

The bearings of this view of the term "evangelist," as descriptive of relation and not of office, are full of significance. In its strict construction it confines the use of the evangelist to the regions beyond the pale and boundary of the organised Church. At the same time it may be asserted with a pointed degree of truth that these two grand divisions of the work of the Church—maintaining the gospel in a settled church state and extending it in an unlocalised relation to the regions beyond, the one deter-

mining the pastoral and the other the evangelist relation—logically compels all use of the ministerial office outside of the pastoral relation to fall under the relation and denomination of evangelist. The logical division of use under two relations comprehensive of all the uses of the ministry seems to be complete. All these uses are either within a pastoral relation or without it. This completeness of the logical division of the relations of the ministry is also recommended by the practical advantages which would spring out of the recognition of two divisions of the relation of evangelist.

The necessities of the Church frequently determine uses of the ministry which are found difficult of definition and seem to defy reduction under any clear scriptural denomination. It would assuredly be an advantage if it were possible to place them all under one clear and positive scriptural relation and name. Such a recognition of the relation and name of evangelist would supersede the awkward and unscriptural designation of “stated supply,” as applied both to the regular supply of vacant churches, in which this use of the ministry is seriously objectionable as a general rule, and to the temporary supply of a vacancy, in which this use of the ministry is both proper and necessary. It would define the position of professors, teachers, editors, and executive officers under a scriptural term expressive of a lawful use of the ministerial functions in those methods of work—professors, editors, and teachers employing chiefly the teaching function of their office and executive officers employing chiefly the governing functions of the office, and both under the scriptural relation of evangelist.

It would also give a color of absolute propriety to a use of evangelist labor which is not conveyed by the strict interpretation of the relation of evangelist—the use of the evangelist as a mere co-worker with settled pastors and in organised churches. While it may be true that in the case of churches organised, and especially when falling to decay for want of stated preaching, a regular evangelist would be in the line of his duties as a teacher of the regions beyond, it is also true that it is felt by many to be a serious innovation on his recognised function when his work is to a great extent done in coöperation with pastors and in organised churches. Yet such work is often eminently proper and eminently

necessary and ought to be provided for in some recognised way and without subjecting the noble character of the regular evangelist to any discount or question in rendering such service. The labors of such a man as Nettleton or Stiles, devoting his life under wise and well-regulated rules to the aid of settled pastors, are of eminent value and ought to be recognised and provided for in the regular order of the Church. This class of workers, however, ought to be men of great wisdom as well as great piety and skill in preaching the gospel, and ought always to be designated by the Church itself to this branch of service. Otherwise they may do great and irreparable mischief, and can be held to no just responsibility. But no system of church administration ought to prohibit such labor, or the temporary supply of a vacant church, or the visitation of churches falling into decay; on the contrary, ought to provide for such uses of the ministry under a regular arrangement and designation of the service.

From these considerations there would seem to be a practical as well as a logical propriety in construing the relation of evangelist as falling into two distinct divisions—one under a broader and the other under a stricter construction. Coming under the broader significance, all ministerial labor outside of a pastoral relation would be brought under a scriptural relation and a scriptural name. Coming under the stricter construction, the term “evangelist” would positively and sharply define the relation, falling as a distinctly defined species under the genus evangelist, in which the strictly propagandist or aggressive function of the Church in the regions beyond its pale might be exercised. A discriminating term might be easily invented, to be employed with the common term “evangelist,” which would instantly mark the difference between those who were discharging their ordination vows in the miscellaneous but legitimate methods of work outside of the pastoral relation, and those who are strictly engaged in preaching the gospel beyond the ascertained pale and boundary of the organised Church. The term “general” and “particular,” “irregular” and “regular,” evangelist would instantly and clearly discriminate the two divisions of the relation of evangelist.