

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY
AND
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 22.—APRIL, 1877.

Art. I. PROBLEMS FOR EDUCATED MINDS IN AMERICA
IN THE NEW CENTURY.

By CHARLES E. KNOX, D. D., Bloomfield, N. J.

CERTAINLY the college began the advance one hundred years ago. The six colleges which existed at that time exerted, no doubt, as strong an influence over the nation as our three hundred and thirty colleges now do. Around the sources of opinion the communities of liberty grew. The great questions which were then throbbing in the brain, were profound principles, which needed for their solution the very best order of mind. Neither rustics nor novices could have solved them. The leaders then were men of penetrating vision. They looked far into the century. Their power of analysis, their discrimination, their logical acumen, their resources in learning, their clearness of expression, their broad comprehension and wise adjustment of difficult and unlike subjects, were largely the result of superior education. From leaders who were accomplished students, bred either in the college or in the local culture which the college created, came those really sublime plans which now, after a hundred years, constitute *our* foundation for the future.

We now stand as they did, looking out upon a new century, with opening vistas which end we know not where. The young men who go out just now from our institutions, go out to problems perhaps even greater than those which invited the courage and the patriotism of our fathers. It is a new and a grand era of life into which they now step. Their standpoint is that of the college—the standpoint of the *educated mind*.

Art. V—EVANGELISTS AND LAY-EXHORTERS.*

By Rev. J. M. P. OTTS, D. D., Wilmington, Del.

PART FIRST—EVANGELISTS.

THERE is no reason to suppose that the four evangelists have given an exhaustive account of all that Jesus said and did in that last interview with his disciples on the Mount of Ascension. But, as some of them record facts omitted by others, we may safely infer that many things were said and done on that memorable occasion, not recorded by any one of them. They all have chronicled the great commission given by the Master to his church, as the enlarged charter for the new dispensation, in which it was then made the duty of the church to go into the world, to preach the gospel in every nation, and to teach every creature to observe and do all things whatsoever he had spoken unto them. But they are all silent as to what offices Christ instituted by which this great commission was to be carried into effect. It is, however, the economy of the Holy Scriptures, that one inspired penman should supply the omissions of others, where this is necessary to complete this revelation; and, as this is done incidentally, it furnishes a strong internal evidence of the truthfulness of the sacred records.

We have an instance of this in the case before us. The evangelists tell us that Christ, on the ascension-day, gave a new and enlarged commission to the church, and then the apostle Paul, in one of his epistles, incidentally supplies what seems to be lacking, by telling us that among his ascension gifts was the appointment of certain offices by which the gospel commission was to be put into execution. When he ascended on high he gave gifts unto men, and among these gifts were apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. Two of these, apostles and prophets, in the very nature of their offices, were intended to be temporary, and when they had served their specific purposes they ceased to exist, leaving evangelists, pastors, and teachers as the permanent officers, who are to go into all the world, to preach the gospel in every nation, and to teach every nation to know and do the will of

**Evangelists in the Church.* By Rev. P. C. Headly. Henry Hoyt, Boston.

Christ unto salvation. Collating Eph. iv. with Rom. xii. and 1 Cor. xii., we find that the permanent officers in the Christian dispensation are evangelists, pastors and teachers, ruling elders and deacons, by whose official labors, as supplemented by the prayers, exhortations, and services in various ways of the general brotherhood, the gospel is to be spread over the world, until the knowledge of Christ shall fill the whole earth as the waters do the great deep. But it is not our purpose in this essay to give a dissertation on ecclesiastical polity in general, but to select from among our Saviour's ascension gifts the office of the Evangelist, and inquire into its import and importance.

We begin by inquiring, what is the nature and import of the evangelistic office? This question can be best answered by a careful consideration of the public duties and labors of those who, in apostolic times, filled this office. It is, therefore, necessary for us to know, at the outset, who, of those mentioned in the New Testament, held this position. We may enumerate as evangelists, Luke, Mark, Titus, Timothy, Philip, Epaphras, Epaphroditus, Tychichus, Trophimus, Demas, Apollos, and, on Calvin's authority, "perhaps, also, the seventy disciples, whom Christ ordained to occupy the second station of the apostles."* From among these we will select Timothy, and prove that he was an evangelist; and then, from the official instructions imparted to him by the apostle Paul about his labors, and from his official acts, deduce the nature and functions of the office he filled.

Well, then, was Timothy an evangelist? He was a pastor, an apostle, a diocesan bishop, or an evangelist. It is quite evident that he was not a pastor, because he was all his ministerial life an itinerating preacher. He never had a settled flock over which he could have been the pastor. He could not have been an apostle, because he was destitute of the prime qualifications requisite to that office. He never saw the Lord Jesus Christ, either before his crucifixion or after his resurrection. The apostle was a witness on personal knowledge of the fact of the resurrection. In order to give this qualification for the apostolic office to Paul, Christ appeared unto him by miracle, as to one born out of due season.† There is no inti-

* *Vide Inst.*, book iv, chap. iii, sec. 4.

† Acts i: 21, 22; xxii: 14, 15; and 2 Cor. xii: 12.

mation to be found in Scripture that Timothy was an apostle. On the contrary, Paul, in writing to him, is careful to style himself an apostle, but equally careful not to give this appellation to Timothy. Paul always addressed Timothy as being inferior to himself in office. His style of address is inexplicable on the hypothesis that Timothy was an apostle. Hence, the argument is narrowed down to the alternative—Timothy was either a diocesan bishop or an evangelist. This brings us into the great battle-field between Prelacy and Presbytery. We might summarily dismiss this point by saying that we have already shown that Timothy was not, and could not have been, an apostle, because he never saw the risen Lord; and, inasmuch as it is claimed that diocesan bishops are successors to the apostles, therefore, he could not have been a bishop in the prelatiic sense of the term. This would be simply denying that there is, or can be, in the church any such office as that of diocesan bishops and successors to the apostles. This is what we believe to be the fact; but allowing as a conceit what we cannot concede as a fact, we hold that Timothy could not have been a diocesan bishop, for the following reasons:

1. He could not have been a diocesan bishop in the modern sense of the office, because he was ordained to his office “by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.” Of the particular session of the presbytery which ordained him, Paul was a member—very probably the moderator. In either case, he would have, conjointly with the other presbyters, imposed his hands on Timothy in the act of ordination.* Presbytery, according to the prelatiic theory, could not have ordained a diocesan bishop.

2. Timothy could not have been the bishop of Ephesus—of which he was bishop, if bishop at all—because he remained there only at the earnest entreaty of Paul, and that, too, for a specific reason assigned.† It would have been a very curious thing for Paul to have exhorted the bishop of Ephesus to remain at home and discharge his diocesan duties. If Timothy was the bishop of Ephesus, he must have been a very delinquent bishop, to have given occasion for such a charge. Such a bishop deserved to be ignored, as, indeed, Paul did subse-

* 1 Tim. iv: 14; and 2 Tim. i: 6.

† 1 Tim. i: 3.

quently, on two very important occasions, ignore the existence of any such office at Ephesus; first, when he met the presbytery of Ephesus, and delivered to it a solemn charge, without recognizing the bishopric of Timothy, or any body else; and secondly, when he wrote an epistle to the Ephesians, in which he gave a catalogue of the offices of the Christian church, without giving the slightest intimation of the existence of any such office as that of the diocesan bishop.* These are facts absolutely inexplicable on the hypothesis that Timothy, or any body else, was the prelatie bishop of Ephesus. Furthermore, if Timothy was the bishop of Ephesus in the episcopal sense of the word, he was put in ecclesiastical authority over the apostle John, for Polycrates, who lived in the second century, relates that John lived and died at Ephesus. Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, all testify to the same fact. In Fulgentius we read of "*Cathœdra Johannis Evangelistæ, Ephesi.*" Did John the evangelist have a parish under Timothy the bishop? Well, then, it was a cathedral church, and in that, perhaps, he found some comfort when Timothy was promoted over him. "The legend," says Dr. Killen, "that Timothy and Titus were the bishops, respectively, of Ephesus and Crete, appears to have been invented about the beginning of the fourth century, and at a time when the original constitution of the church had been completely, though silently, revolutionized."† It is, therefore, evident that Timothy was not a diocesan bishop, but an evangelist. So was Titus, as can be proved in the same line of argument. We conclude this part of our essay in the words of Bishop Stillingfleet, who, after a most careful examination of the whole subject, was constrained to admit, that "both Timothy and Titus were evangelists, notwithstanding all the opposition made against it, as will appear to any one that will take an impartial survey of the evidence on both sides."

As Timothy was ordained to his office by the presbytery, we are to infer that the evangelist was a presbyter, and nothing more. In the ecclesiastical courts he had equal authority with pastors, and no more. Hence, the evangelistic office is not incompatible with the purity of the ministry. In the

*Acts xx: 17-38; and Eph. iv: 11.

†*The Ancient Church*, sec. iii, chap. 2.

presbytery the evangelist is an equal among equals; but he goes out of presbytery into the sphere of his peculiar labors invested with somewhat superior, or rather, additional, powers to those of the pastor, because his duties require them. He is an itinerating preacher of the Word, invested with authority to preach the gospel, and to plant churches in the unevangelized parts of the earth. He goes forth as the pioneer of Christianity and the missionary of the church. Hence, he must be invested with authority to originate and organize new churches, and, to this end, to receive members into the communion, *in the first instance without the concurrence of a session*; and, thereupon, to ordain ruling elders, and thus constitute a session in and over the newly organized congregations; and even in foreign lands, where the concurrence of a presbytery is impossible, he may license and ordain ministers of the gospel, and of them originate and constitute a presbytery. But all this he is to do only by the authority and under the supervision of the presbytery or synod to which he belongs.* We are happy in having the authority of the immortal John Calvin to fall back upon in support of this view of the nature and dignity of the evangelistic office. "The evangelists," says he, "ranked as assistants next to the apostles. It is more likely that Timothy, whom Paul has associated with himself as his closest companion in all things, surpassed ordinary pastors in rank and dignity of office, than that he was only one of them."† And in another place he says, "The evangelists, in my judgment, were in the midst between apostles and doctors. For it was a function next to the apostles to preach the gospel in all places, and not to have any certain place of abode; only in degree of honor were they inferior to the apostles. For when Paul describeth the order of the church (Eph. iv: 11.), he doth so put them after the apostles, that he showeth that they have more room given them than the pastors, who were tied to certain places."‡ To this we add the opinion of Bishop Stillingfleet, which has the peculiar value of being the concession of a bishop of the Church of England. He says, in the same chapter of his *Irenicum*, which has been already quoted, "Evangelists were those who were sent sometimes into this country to put

*1 Tim. i: 3; iii: 1, 15; 2 Tim. ii: 2; Titus i: 5.

†*Vide Calvin's Com. on 2 Tim. iv; 5.* ‡*Com. on Acts xxi: 7.*

the churches in order here, and sometimes into another; but wherever they were, they acted as evangelists, and not as fixed officers."

The important question now arises, Is the evangelistic office permanent in the church? We answer in the affirmative, and think that the following facts and considerations will prove that it was designed to stand as a permanent office of the gospel ministry along side of the pastoral office, and as being of equal importance with it,

It continued to exist long after the apostolic age. Eusebius, who lived toward the close of the second century, informs us that there were many evangelists in his day, and describes their labors as follows: "After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and appointing others as the shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had recently been introduced, they went," says, he, "again to other regions and nations with the grace and coöperation of God."* And, again, speaking of Pantænus, the philosopher, who flourished about 180 A. D., he says that he went as an evangelist of the Word to India, and adds, that "there were there many evangelists of the Word who were ardently striving to spend their inspired zeal after the apostolic example."† Since the office did not cease with the days of inspiration, we conclude that Christ designed it to stand as one of the permanent offices in his church.

The evangelistic office is the aggressive arm of the church's power, and the settled pastorate is her conservative force; and while there are unevangelized regions, there will always exist the necessity for the work of evangelists. There will always exist the cause and the call for this office till all the world shall be gathered into settled pastorates and each congregation shall have its own regular pastor. This will never be the case till the millennial glory shall burst upon the face of the world. There have always been evangelists in the church under some name. Our domestic and foreign missionaries are scriptural evangelists. They are neither apostles, nor prophets, nor pastors; but evangelists.

* *Eusebius' Hist.*, Lib. iii: c. 37. † Lib. v, c. 10.

The importance of this office cannot be over-estimated. In point of usefulness it is in no degree inferior to the settled pastorate. These two offices stand on a parallel in authority and importance. The additional authority, of which we have spoken as belonging to the evangelists, is only accidental to the nature of his work. No church can attain unto the highest degree of prosperity which does not include both these offices in its polity and practice. As we have already said, one is the aggressive and the other the conservative arm of the church's power. If the church neglects to use her aggressive power, it will soon come to pass that she will have nothing left to conserve ; and if it only uses its aggressive arm, it will lose ground in old places about as fast as it gains in new ones. The true policy of the church is to neglect neither the one nor the other, and not to give undue preponderance to either over the other. The weakness of the Presbyterian Church, heretofore, has consisted in the neglect of the office and work of itinerating evangelists ; and the weakness of the Methodist Church has consisted in giving undue importance to this office to the neglect of the settled pastorate. The consequence is, the Methodists run fast, and the Presbyterians hold fast. The Methodists gather more and lose more than the Presbyterians. These two offices are to the church, what the two side-wheels are to the steamer : both must be kept in simultaneous motion in order to safe, certain, and secure progress. If one stops and the other moves, the church will only gyrate in a vicious circle. There will be motion without progress.

There are many in these modern days called evangelists, who are not evangelists in any scriptural or true sense of the word. They are merely peripatetic and irregular preachers, who oftentimes run before they are sent, and come before they are wanted. They have no constitutional place in the church. They are like wandering stars, with no certain orbits to move in, and, crossing frequently the lawful orbits of others, they come into collision with them. In such cases there is always a shock and a check to the real prosperity of pastoral work, and, not infrequently, a rupture between the pastor and the people of his charge. The sphere of the evangelist is as clearly defined as that of the pastor. He is appointed to labor in the destitute regions and for the unevangelized masses.

The evangelist is just as much an officer of the church as the pastor, and it is just as essential for him to labor under the supervision and control of the presbytery as it is for the pastor. Timothy and Titus and the primitive evangelists were men ordained of the church, as well as called of God to their office and work. The example—which has the force of a law to the church for all time to come, because it was divinely ordered—was set in the case of Paul and Barnabas.* They were inducted into the evangelistic office at the order of the Holy Ghost, by the solemn act of ordination by prayer and laying on of hands. Previous to this ordination to the evangelistic office and work, Paul had preached and served the church as an apostle for the space of ten or twelve years; but for the apostolic office there was not and could not be any ordination by the laying on of human hands. In the case of Matthias, who was chosen of the Lord to “take part in this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell,” there was no election by the congregation of the church, nor ordination by the school of the apostles. He was chosen by lot, and when the Lord had thus indicated his will, he was, without any human ceremony, “numbered with the eleven apostles.”† And afterward Paul was chosen and made “an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.”‡ In this office there can be no successors to the apostles, unless they should be chosen and appointed by miracle. Barnabas, also, for ten or twelve years previous to his ordination to the evangelistic office, had served the church in the extraordinary office of a prophet, for which there was no ordination, and in which there is no succession. For these extraordinary offices there was required a miraculous call and the investment by the Holy Ghost of miraculous powers and knowledge. With the cessation of miracles in the church, these extraordinary offices ceased to exist, because the miraculous qualifications requisite to them were withdrawn. By ordination, Paul and Barnabas were inducted into and invested with the ecclesiastical authority and powers of the ordinary and permanent office of evangelists, without being deprived of the miraculous investment of their extraordinary offices. Paul continued to be an apostle, and Barnabas a prophet, while

*Acts xiii: 2, 3.

†Acts i: 23-26.

‡Gal. i: 1; xi: 12.

they went forth everywhere invested, as evangelists, with the ordinary ecclesiastical authority and powers, still and permanently remaining in the church, to organize new congregations, and to ordain over them elders and deacons, and to set things in proper order in vacant churches.

From this view of the evangelistic office, which seems to us to be the scriptural and only true view of it, it follows that there can be no more room or authority in the church for lay-evangelists than for lay-pastors. Both are divinely appointed and permanent officers in the church, and ordination is required for the one just as much as for the other.

In the book mentioned at the head of this essay—"The Evangelists in the Church, from Philip of Samaria, A. D. 35, to Moody and Sankey of America, A. D. 1875," by Rev. P. C. Headly—there is a confusion of ecclesiastical ideas from beginning to end. The book is very interesting to read, because it is made up of personal biographies, which cannot fail to interest all classes of readers, especially those who read to be interested rather than instructed; but it is not a safe book to be put into the hands of young men as an authority on points of ecclesiastical law and order. It brings together all classes of independent, irregular, and peripatetic preachers and laborers, men and women, the ordained and the unordained, under the common name of evangelists. With Mr. Headly, any independent and itinerating preacher, no matter how irregular and disorderly his ministry may be, is an evangelist. No wonder that Mr. Headly, with this indefinite, undefined, and undefinable idea of the evangelistic office, could say, "we reverently affirm that Jesus, in his earthly ministry, occupied the place of the evangelist." And this because "he was not a pastor, nor, in the popular sense of the term, was he a missionary." Of course he was not; neither was the Lord and Master a prophet, nor an apostle, nor an evangelist, "not even in the popular sense of the term," for he was the true Messiah, the eternal Son of God; not merely a divinely inspired teacher, but the Divine Teacher, the Divine Head of the church, from whom all authority to preach and teach is derived, and in whom all offices, functions, powers, gifts, and authorities of the church reside, and from whom alone they can emanate.

PART SECOND—LAY-EXHORTERS.

The question here arises, does this view of the evangelistic office, demanding ordination for it as much as for the pastoral office, shut the mouths of all laymen? We think not. Of course it excludes all laymen from assuming the attitude and functions of the preacher, either as evangelists or pastors, and it puts the church in the alternative of either prohibiting all such preaching, or, by recognition, of investing it with the ecclesiastical authority of ordination. But all public addresses on the part of laymen in open assemblies cannot be held as preaching in the technical and ecclesiastical sense of the word; nor do such lay exercises invade the office and functions of the ordained ministry. Exhortation is one thing, and preaching, in the ecclesiastical sense of the term, is quite another thing. The ordained preacher, whether as evangelist or pastor, delivers his sermon under the endorsement, and by the authority, of the whole church that conferred upon him his ordination. He is the authorized mouth-piece of the whole church, and as the church is held responsible for what he says, so the church holds him responsible for all his authoritative utterances. It is on this principle alone that the right of trial for heresy is founded. The ordained preacher is the authorized and authoritative teacher and expounder of the doctrines of the church from which he received his ordination. Now the laymen, receiving the doctrines at the lips of the ordained ministry, may thereupon exhort, beseech, and encourage one another to the faithful discharge of the practical duties enjoined and implied in the doctrines thus received, and may also exhort and entreat sinners to the exercise of faith and repentance. Here is a wide and orderly field for the legitimate labors of laymen. By way of exhortation they may speak to one, two, a hundred, a thousand, or ten thousand at a time. Whether to many or few, in the private house or on the street, in the public hall or in the church, the principle is the same. If it is lawful for laymen to speak at all, there can be no "let or hindrance" in the place or number of hearers. Some would call this public exercise on the part of laymen "lay preaching," and we must admit that the word "preaching" has such a variable and india-rubber-like meaning in popular use, that it can be stretched

out over this exercise without any abuse of the term. But we prefer to call it lay exhortation, because that is the name given to it in Scripture, and because by holding to this name we can always keep clear and distinct the proper discrimination between the legitimate spheres and labors of laymen and of ordained ministers. When we hear so much talk about lay-preachers and lay-preaching, we are reminded of the riddle, which has come down to us from the ancients, to show us how nearly a thing may be what the name given to it indicates, and yet be wanting in the essential element to constitute it the very thing designated by the name. This is the riddle: "A man that was not a man, threw a stone that was not a stone, at a bird that was not a bird, that was perched and yet not perched, on a tree that was not a tree;" the meaning of which is: A eunuch threw a piece of pumice-stone at a bat, suspended by its claws from the top of a reed, that had grown to the dimensions of a tree. Now, when a lay-preacher preaches, we have a preacher that is not a preacher, preaching and yet not preaching, a sermon that is not a sermon. Is it not better, therefore, to say, he is an exhorter making an exhortation? Only pride and ambition can object to the use of these terms, and aspire to more high-sounding titles.

For lay exhortation, for the active and abounding services of laymen, there is the most abundant scriptural authority to be found in the precepts of the apostles, and in the common practice of the church in the apostolic days. St. John saith, "Let him that heareth say, come." Is not this not merely permissive authority, but an authoritative injunction, to every individual, who himself has heard the gospel, to invite and exhort all other sinners to come to Christ and be saved? St. Paul saith: "Let him that exhorteth wait on exhortation." He specifies the work of exhortation as distinct from that of preaching and teaching. In Heb. x: 25, he enjoins this duty upon the brethren: "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is, but *exhorting one another.*" This certainly was instruction given to laymen how they were to do when no minister was present to hold public assemblies for them. It is the generally received opinion that the infant congregations in the primitive times, before they received settled pastors, met together on the Lord's day to

read the Scriptures and exhort one another. On this point we have the testimony of the safe and conservative Dr. Killen, who, while holding that all the primitive elders were not preachers, says, "it was necessary that at least some of the session or eldership connected with each flock should be competent to conduct the congregational worship. As spiritual gifts were more abundant in the apostolic times than afterward, it is probable that at first several of the elders were found ready to take part in its celebration."* It appears that in the Church of Corinth several speakers were in the habit of addressing the same meeting, and it does not appear that all the speakers were necessarily elders, as Dr. Killen seems to hold; but as women, and only women, are forbidden to speak in the public meetings, it would seem to be implied that permission was given to all the male members of the congregation to speak the word of exhortation, if any one of them had a word to say unto edification.† It is too well known that lay-exhortation was a common practice in the synagogues, to leave any necessity for us to cite authorities to prove that fact. But as a recent and competent authority on this point, we quote the words of Dr. Farrar, who says; "As there were no ordained ministers to conduct the services of the synagogue, the lessons from the parashah and hophtarah, the law and the prophets might not only be read by any competent person who received permission from the rósh hak-keneséth, but he was even at liberty to add his own midrash, or comment."‡ It was in accordance with this custom that Paul and his company were called upon to speak the word of exhortation in the synagogue of Antioch-in Pisidia.§ It is generally agreed that the early Christian churches, in worship and government, were founded upon and fashioned after the model of the synagogues. Bishop Whatley says, "the primitive Christian churches were converted synagogues."

From all this it appears that there was in the church, in the apostolic days, the ministry of lay-exhortation. This ministry of lay-service without office has always existed in the church in some form, and has at all times been more or less clearly recognized as, at least, a permissible ministry. At certain periods, always in times of revival, it has been

* *Ancient Church*, sec. iii., ch. 2. † I Cor. xiv : 26, 31.

‡ *Life of Christ*, ch. xvi. § Acts xiii : 14, 15.

more active than under ordinary circumstances, and has come more clearly under ecclesiastical recognition. In the days of John Knox, and under his authority and approbation, there were appointed in the Church of Scotland lay-readers and lay-exhorters, who relieved ministers of a part of their public services, and who, when there were no ministers, read the Scriptures and delivered exhortations to assemblies of the people.* These lay-readers and exhorters filled very much the same place that our modern Bible-readers and so-called lay-evangelists fill, only—and this is a very important difference—they were appointed by the ministers, and labored under the supervision of responsible ecclesiastical authority. This same thing exists to-day in the Southern Presbyterian Church. The General Assembly of that church, in 1869, authorized its presbyteries to give “permission” to qualified laymen to exercise their gifts here and there, as the Lord may furnish opportunity. The Southern Church is filling up with these lay-exhorters, who labor under the authoritative permission of the presbytery. In this way, possibly, a solution to the perplexing problem of lay-preaching may be reached. These men do not abandon their secular pursuits, nor are they regarded as in ecclesiastical office. They are simply laymen. They are not self-called and self-appointed preachers. They do not call themselves lay-evangelists, nor do other people call them lay-preachers. They go under the name of lay-exhorters. If any choose to call their exhortations lay-preaching, then it is lay-preaching, kept within proper limitations and under proper authority.

Here the important question for the Presbyterians arises, Is the appointment of lay-exhorters by presbytery constitutional? The very most that can be said against it can only hold it to be extra-constitutional. It is not contra-constitutional, because it does not run contrary to any existing constitutional provision or prohibition. It only puts under rule and regulation what has always existed in some form in the church. There have always been lay-talkers, and there always will be, and ought to be; and because their legitimate sphere has not been clearly defined, and their labors brought under

* *McCries' Life of John Knox*, Period vii.

ecclesiastical recognition, they have sometimes transgressed all due limitations, and invaded the sacred functions of the ordained ministry, and thus given offence and made trouble. It may be said that the appointment of lay-exhorters has the effect of creating a sub-ministry in the church, the ministry of unordained men. Let it be so, then. It would be simply the ministry of lay-exhortation, for which there is the most abundant scriptural authority. It would not be creating a new ministry, but only giving ecclesiastical recognition to what is already in existence by divine appointment. Thus, that vast reserved power in all our churches, which has hitherto been largely running to waste for the want of having proper recognition and direction given to it—the labors of laymen—will be brought under control; and being thus regulated, it may be utilized to the best and very highest advantage. We have seen that the two divinely-appointed offices for preaching the gospel, in the churchly and official sense of preaching, are those of the evangelist and pastor, the one thing the aggressive and the other the conservative arm of churchly power; and that it is divinely ordered that those admitted into these offices should be inducted into them by ordination. By ordination we understand nothing more nor less than the investiture by the church of a man, who is supposed to be divinely called, with all needed ecclesiastical authority for the work of his office. It does not give the call to the holy office, nor does it confer any grace, or mental or spiritual qualifications for its work. It presupposes all this, and thereupon proceeds to invest the man with ecclesiastical authority to exercise the functions of the office to which he seems to have a divine call, and for the work of which he is supposed, on reasonable evidence given to the church, to be endowed with all needed natural and supernatural qualifications. The investiture of ordination in the Presbyterian Church is usually made by “the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,” for which form of ordination there is abundant scriptural authority. But the formal act of “the laying on of the hands” is not essential to the fact and validity of ordination itself. Ordinations may take place, and hold as valid, without the formality of laying on of hands. Neither John Calvin, nor John Knox, was ordained by the “laying on of hands.” Presbyterians

cannot afford to be over nice and particular on this point. In the case of Calvin, there was not even a prior papal ordination to fall back upon, to make up for any supposed deficiency in this presbyterial ordination. Paul Henry says: "No trace of his ordination can be found in the records of his life." * In the case of John Knox, there was no formality of laying on of hands, nor any other ceremony, save the solemn call of the congregation of the Castle of St. Andrews, delivered to Knox in a most solemn and impressive charge, by John Rough, at the conclusion of a sermon appropriate to the occasion. Knox did not set the least value upon his prior ordination by the popish bishop; for McCrie informs us, "In common with all the original reformers, he rejected the orders of episcopal ordination, as totally unauthorized by the laws of Christ; nor did he even regard the imposition of the hands of presbyters as a rite essential to the validity of orders." † If the formal act of laying on of hands is essential to the validity of ordination, then the two foremost and most honored men in the Presbyterian Church were never anything more than laymen.

We have brought out these facts in order to apply them to the case of Mr. Moody, and all others who stand in the attitude he occupies in the church. We believe that Mr. Moody, whether he recognizes the fact or not, is constructively ordained to the work of an evangelist by the general consent and approval of the ordained ministry of the holy Catholic Church. All necessary ecclesiastical endorsement and authority have been imparted to him in the hearty co-operation of ministers and people of all evangelical branches of Christ's church. In this way there is just as truly the authority of ordination in his ministry as ever there was in the ministry of John Calvin and John Knox. Without the laying on of the hands of bishop or presbytery, by the manifest call and approval of the divine Head of the church in heaven, and by the manifest call and approval of the people of the church on earth, he is constructively and most truly ordained to the work in which he is engaged. Not being formally ordained by any one

* *Henry's Life of Calvin.* Part i. ch. ii—"Calvin was never ordained priest, and did not enter the ecclesiastical state." Bayle. art. Calvin, Beza.

† *Life of Knox.* Period iii.

denomination, but constructively ordained in the united endorsement and approval of all, as shown in their hearty cooperation with him, he goes forth in his labors, not as the minister of this or that branch of the church, but as the undenominational, or rather, as the inter-denominational evangelist of pure Christianity to the great mass of non-church-goers, who fill up the wide and waste places intervening between the churches and their ordinary congregations. In this field, which is in the strictest sense an evangelistic field, he has the authority of ordination in his preaching just as thoroughly and truly as John Calvin and John Knox ever had the authority of ordination in their ministry in the fields to which the Lord called them, and in which the church has always recognized them as princes and leaders in the great work of reformation. With this kind of ordination for their work, Presbyterians ought to be very well satisfied with Messrs. Moody and Sankey. They are more than satisfied; they rejoice in their work, and thank and praise God for giving such workmen to the church and the world.

If Mr. Moody should be unwilling to recognize himself as placed in the way we have explained above, under constructive ordination by the universal acceptance and approval of all the denominations of evangelical Christianity, then, still, we would bid him God-speed in his labors as simply a layman; only, if he persists in holding himself as a layman, we cannot recognize in him competent ecclesiastical authority to administer the sacrament, to govern in the courts of the church, and to do such other things as can only be orderly done by the ordained ministers of the Word. But it does not require a formal and pronounced acceptance on the part of Mr. Moody, any more than a formal and ceremonial act of laying on of hands on the part of the church, to complete his ordination, and to establish its validity. It is only needed that he silently and unceremoniously adjust himself to the peculiar position in which he finds himself placed by the providence of God, and in which he is recognized as "the right man in the right place," by the universal consent and approbation of all evangelical denominations.

There is, as we think we have conclusively shown, a divinely appointed place in the church for the private and public labors

of laymen—a ministry without an office. A man may be a patriotic politician without holding or seeking a political office. In this way, in private and public, though unofficial labors, he may serve his party, or, what is far better, his whole country, to the great advantage of the highest interests of the nation. There is such a thing, in both state and church, as a ministry and service without office. When, therefore, such men as Messrs. Wanamaker and Stuart of Philadelphia, and Dodge and Cree of New York, and many others whom we might mention, engage in active and public efforts for Christ and humanity, without abandoning their secular employments, they are not to be looked upon as ecclesiastical outlaws, to be condemned and silenced, but they should be recognized by the church and her ministry, and encouraged in their labors, as doing an orderly work, for which there is divine authority. It is not their fault if the church fails to recognize and to bring under rule and regulation their lay ministry, and to utilize its results for its own highest interests. If they have imparted to them a divine message, and the gift of uttering it, then it is their privilege to speak in the way of lay-exhortation, and they dare not keep silent. But being unordained men, only laymen, they cannot assume to themselves the ecclesiastical authority and functions of the ordained ministry without a breach of constitutional order. Like these men, Mr. Moody at first began to labor for Christ and humanity as a layman ; but when he gave up all secular employment, and devoted himself exclusively and entirely to preaching and the work of evangelization, then he ceased to be a layman, and become, in the eyes and estimation of all the world, a preacher of the gospel ; and the church, by her recognition of him in this attitude, and by her endorsement, in thus receiving and co-operating with him in his labors, has, by common consent, invested him with all needed ecclesiastical authority for his ministry and work.

There are, we think, three classes of laborers in the vineyard of the Gospel-ministry. First and foremost, the regularly and formally ordained pastors and evangelists ; and then the unordained ministry of laymen who, without abandoning their secular employment, and without coming into ecclesiastical office, speak the word of exhortation from place to place and from time to time, as the Lord gives them ability and opportunity ;

and then, between the regular ministry of formally ordained clergymen, and the regular ministry of laymen, there comes in a third class of men, who, having begun their labors as laymen, have gradually grown into the ministry of the Word as their exclusive employment, and have thereupon abandoned all secular engagements, and consecrated themselves to the sacred avocation ; and being recognized in the holy office by the common consent and general approval of the churches, and their labors being endorsed by general co-operation with them, they are thus constructively ordained and invested with all needed ecclesiastical recognition and authority for their work.

We observe, in conclusion, that another class of so-called lay-preachers is coming forward, upon whom we cannot look but with disapprobation and alarm, because they neither recognize the church, nor desire to be recognized by it. They not only ignore all constitutional ecclesiastical authority, but go so far as to place themselves in an attitude of antagonism to the church and her ordained ministry. We have met, and have come into collision with such men, who claimed to be followers of Mr. Moody, but who, evidently, neither knew him nor were known of him. They are the counterfeit Moodyites ; the bare and base imitators of some of his external manners, without having entered, or being able to enter, into the inner spirit of the man and his work. They are like Mr. Moody only in the one point, that each one of them runs around with a Bagster Bible in hand. Money can buy the Bible at the book-store, but only the Holy Ghost can baptize a man into the spirit of the Bible, and endow him with the requisite gifts to do a real Bible-work for Christ and for souls. The Bible will do these men no harm, and there can be no possible objection to their having Bibles ; but the fear is, having Bibles in their hands, and setting themselves up as Bible-teachers, without having the spirit of the Bible in their hearts, they may do the cause and the true people of the Bible a very serious damage. These men, of whom we now speak, have not been baptized into the spirit of humility and modesty ; and, therefore, manifestly, they are neither called of God nor wanted of man. They have neither office nor gifts for unofficial work, and should, we think, be severely discountenanced. To all such let it be said, a Bagster Bible cannot make a Moody of any

man, though it may help a presumptuous man to ape a Heaven-sent evangelist. And where that evangelist himself has not been seen in his work, such crude and weak imitations may tend to bring him and his holy work into disrepute. Imitation is never genuine work; and when it is prompted by vanity and pride, it can only end in mischief and harm. We have known some of these peripatetic Bible-carriers, who go about calling themselves Bible-readers and lay-evangelists, to make themselves ridiculous in vain attempts to imitate the marvellous rapidity of utterance, the peculiar stammering and stutter, the angular and jerky gestures, and even the mispronunciations, of Mr. Moody. And when we have seen weaklings thus imitating the mere external habits, and even the defects and faults, in the manner of the good man's preaching, we have been reminded of the lines of Coleridge on imitation, especially the following words:

“On folly every fool his talent tries;
It asks some toil to imitate the wise;
Though few like Fox can speak—like Pitt can think—
Yet all like Fox can game—like Pitt can drink.”

Our best policy is to let these mere imitators alone—severely alone—and they will soon die out; for imitation is the mere shadow of a passing man, and can last but for a day. When God wants another Moody, he will call him into existence, and call him into his ministry, and then call upon and constrain his church and people to recognize him and to co-operate with him in his labors. But when God sends another man to stir up his spiritual Israel from Dan to Beersheba, and to move the world, most surely he will be like Mr. Moody in spirit, but most likely he will be unlike him in manners and means. The Haldanes—those genuine and godly laborers in Christ's vineyard in the first quarter of this century—were men of great wealth and high literary tastes and attainments, and were very different in modes of operation from Moody and Sankey of this last quarter, but were like them in spirit, zeal, self-sacrifice, and earnestness. All the God-appointed evangelists, from Philip to Moody, have always been alike in spirit, but generally very unlike in external habits and modes of work. God is fertile in resources, and seldom repeats himself.