THE BIBLICAL ROLE OF THE EVANGELIST

by

William W. Combs

ew would question the prominent role played by “evangelists” in the history of fundamentalism—men like Bob Jones, Sr., for example. Jones was apparently fond of saying: “It takes evangelisticunction to make orthodoxy function.” Likewise, it would be difficult to write one page in the history of new evangelicalism without bringing up the name of Billy Graham. The “office” of evangelist is commonly accepted in fundamental and evangelical circles as a legitimate calling based on the teaching of Scripture. John R. Rice reminds us: “The calling of an evangelist is a holy calling, and it is a sin against God to talk against evangelists....” Rice adds that, in fact, evangelists are more important to the work of God than pastors and teachers. But can Rice’s viewpoint actually be sustained from God’s Word?

When one turns to the pages of Scripture, it turns out that the amount of material dealing with the evangelist is rather sparse. The word evangelist, the Greek εὐαγγελιστής, is used only three times in the NT:

On the next day we left and came to Caesarea, and entering the house of Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven, we stayed with him (Acts 21:8).

And He gave some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers (Eph 4:11).
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But you, be sober in all things, endure hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry (2 Tim 4:5).

So, we are told that Philip was an evangelist, evangelists have been given to the church, and Timothy was to do the work of an evangelist. But nowhere do we find a clear description of the evangelist’s proper ministry or the qualifications for this “office,” as we do with the office of pastor-elder-overseer.

This essay will attempt to grapple with the limited scriptural data in order to define, with as much precision as possible, the biblical role of the evangelist.

**DEFINITION OF ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΤΗΣ**

The latest edition of Bauer’s lexicon gives the meaning of εὐαγγελιστής as “proclaimer of the gospel, evangelist.” 6 The only non-Christian usage of the word is a poorly preserved inscription from Rhodes, where it apparently means “proclaimer of oracular messages.” 7 However, this is disputed by Spicq, who argues that there are so many questions about the inscription that “nothing certain can be drawn from it.” 8 Marshall doubts the inscription predates Christian usage. 9 In any case, it is hardly likely that this distant inscription would have had any influence on the early Christian use of the term. More than likely, εὐαγγελιστής was coined from the cognate verb εὐαγγελίζω (or εὐαγγελίζομαι). 10 The coining of εὐαγγελιστής is a perfectly

---


natural development. The της ending was commonly used to form nouns expressing the agent who performs the action denoted by the cognate verb.\textsuperscript{11}

Returning to the two definitions for \textit{eυαγγελιστής} given by BDAG, “proclaimer of the gospel” and “evangelist,” we can see that the definition “evangelist” is not really a definition at all, only a transliteration of the Greek term. The first definition, “proclaimer of the gospel,” is probably derived as much from the meaning of the cognate verb as the three NT uses of \textit{eυαγγελιστής}, which, as we have seen, do not provide a great deal of information about the ministry of the evangelist. For the cognate verb \textit{eυαγγελισμενος}, BDAG gives two definitions. First, it has a more general meaning of “bring good news, announce good news.”\textsuperscript{12} The “good news” in this first definition has nothing to do with the good news about Christ. This general meaning is only used a few times in the NT. For example, in 1 Thessalonians 3:6 Paul informs the church: “But now that Timothy has come to us from you, and has brought us good news of your faith and love,…” This usage is not relevant to our investigation, so we may turn to the second, more specific use of \textit{eυαγγελισμενος}, to “proclaim the divine message of salvation, proclaim the gospel.”\textsuperscript{13} It is this idea of the verb that is brought over to the noun. Thus, “\textit{eυαγγελιστής} could be viewed as simply a term for one who proclaims the \textit{eυαγγέλιον},”\textsuperscript{14} the good news about Jesus Christ.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12]p. 402.
\item[13]Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
It may come as a surprise, but there is actually some debate about what exactly is included in the content of the “gospel” proclaimed by the evangelist. Ordinarily, “preaching the gospel” is understood to mean the proclamation of the good news of salvation in Christ in order to bring about the conversion of unbelievers. That this is the overwhelming usage of εὐαγγελίζω is easily confirmed by a simple concordance search. For example, all fifteen examples of the verb in Acts refer to initial proclamation of the good news to unbelievers. However, some hold that the scriptural idea of preaching the gospel “covers a range of activities from primary evangelism and planting of churches to the ongoing building of Christians and the establishment of settled congregations.”\textsuperscript{15} Probably the main reason for supposing that εὐαγγελίζω denotes more than the initial presentation of the message of Christ is Paul’s use of the verb in Romans 1:15: “So, for my part, I am eager to preach the gospel to you also who are in Rome.” The idea that εὐαγγελίζω primarily involves the initial conversion of the unsaved would not seem to fit Paul’s anticipated ministry in an already established church.

One possible way around the problem is to take the “you” (“you…who are in Rome”) in a wider sense to include Romans generally (unbelievers), not just the church.\textsuperscript{16} Thus Paul is interested in coming to Rome and winning more converts. But this solution might seem to violate the preaching policy the apostle sets forth later in Romans 15:20–21: “And thus I aspired to preach the gospel, not where Christ was already named, so that I would not build on another man’s foundation; but as it is written, “THEY WHO HAD NO NEWS OF HIM SHALL SEE, AND THEY WHO HAVE NOT HEARD SHALL UNDERSTAND.” In other words, if Paul is saying in 1:15 that he wishes to come to Rome to evangelize new converts, that would seem to conflict with his policy of confining his preaching and church planting to virgin territory. But this apparent conflict might be answered by the


verses that follow (15:22–24): “For this reason I have often been prevented from coming to you; but now, with no further place for me in these regions, and since I have had for many years a longing to come to you whenever I go to Spain—for I hope to see you in passing, and to be helped on my way there by you, when I have first enjoyed your company for a while.” If “for this reason” (ὅτι) in verse 22 looks back to verses 20–21, then Paul could be saying that his normal policy of preaching in virgin territory had prevented him from coming to Rome earlier, but now that he had fully evangelized the eastern empire (“but now, with no further place for me in these regions”), that policy no longer constrained him.17 However, many commentators do not connect the “for this reason” of verse 22 with verses 20–21 specifically, but with verses 17–19 (especially 19b)—the idea being that Paul had been hindered in coming to Rome because he “was concentrating on ‘fulfilling the gospel from Jerusalem to Illyricum.’ ” It was the needs of ministry in these regions that ‘hindered’ Paul ‘many times’ from coming to Rome,”18 not his policy of only preaching in virgin territory. But these reasons should probably not be separated. As Stott explains: “On the one hand, because he was concentrating on pioneer evangelism elsewhere, he was not free to come to them. On the other hand, because the Roman church had not been founded by him, he did not feel at liberty to come and stay. Soon, however, as he is about to explain, he will visit them, since he will only be ‘passing through’ (24) on his way to the unevangelized field of Spain.”19

Therefore, Paul’s stated policy of pioneer evangelism in virgin territories should not be used to rule out the possibility that Paul’s primary reference in Romans 1:15 is to initial evangelization of the unsaved. That policy may have not been an absolute rule anyway. Since Paul wants to use Rome as a base for his operations in the western part of the empire, where he will be preaching in virgin territory, he must now come to Rome and secure the church’s support for his new missionary endeavors. While he is there, it is not unreasonable
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that in the largest city of the empire he may do some evangelization of the unsaved and thus "obtain some fruit among" the Romans "even as among the rest of the Gentiles" (1:13). So, while the case for restricting \( \textit{e\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'z\-\'w} \) in 1:15 to the initial conversion of unbelievers is not proven, even Moo—who does not lean toward such a restriction—admits, Paul’s normal use of the verb \( \textit{is} \) restricted to initial evangelistic preaching.\(^{20}\)

If we thus conclude that \( \textit{e\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'s\-\'t\-\'h\-\'s} \) is derived from \( \textit{e\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'z\-\'w} \), which seems most likely, then the chief ministry of the NT evangelist involved the evangelization of unbelievers. Though this emphasis was primary, no doubt the message of the evangelist would have included some teaching and discipleship of new believers to form them into a functioning NT church, if, as I will argue, the NT evangelist was primarily a church planter. Besides, any ministry of itinerant evangelism that does not lead to new converts being formed into local churches is foreign to the NT. Thus, the evangelist would probably not have had his primary ministry in previously established churches. That ministry, as we will see, was primarily left to other gifted men—pastors, and teachers.

The discussion of the role of the evangelist thus far has been built on the derivation of \( \textit{e\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'s\-\'t\-\'h\-\'s} \) from \( \textit{e\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'z\-\'w} \). This is not invalid since, as we have previously stated, nouns ending in \( \textit{th\-h\-s} \) are basically the agents of the action denoted by their cognate verbs. Still, since the meaning of a word is ultimately determined by its usage, we must now turn to the three NT examples of the noun \( \textit{e\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'s\-\'t\-\'h\-\'s} \) itself to more fully determine the role of the evangelist.

NEW TESTAMENT USES OF ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΤΗΣ

Acts 21:8

On the next day we left and came to Caesarea, and entering the house of Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven, we stayed with him.

The first occurrence of \( \textit{e\-\'\-\'a\-\'\-\'g\-\'e\-\'\-\'l\-\'i\-\'\-\'s\-\'t\-\'h\-\'s} \) in the NT is found in Acts 21:8. Paul and his companions stopped at the house of Philip in Caesarea on the final leg of his third missionary journey. Philip is the only individual in the NT who is clearly identified as an evangelist. But why does Luke designate Philip as “the evangelist”? Some commentators suggest that the designation is used mainly to differentiate him from Philip the apostle.\(^{21}\) But if that were its only purpose, the additional

\(^{20}\text{Romans, p. 63, n. 62.}\)

phrase “one of the seven” would seem to be redundant. More likely, the article “the” (tou) is anaphoric (previous reference). Thus it seems obvious that “the evangelist” is intended to remind us of Philip’s earlier ministry in Acts 8, which is described three times by the use of εὐαγγελισμός (vv. 12, 35, 40). For Luke, the title “evangelist” admirably describes the ministry of Philip in Acts 8. There his ministry was one of initial evangelization of unbelievers in Samaria, the Ethiopian eunuch, and those who lived in the maritime plain of Palestine, ending up in Caesarea. It was in Caesarea that Paul visited him approximately twenty years later (Acts 21). Whether Philip stayed put in Caesarea all those years or engaged in other itinerant activity is unknown. More importantly, the description of Philip’s ministry in Acts 8 supports our previous suggestion that the main ministry of the εὐαγγελιστής is the initial evangelization of unbelievers.

Philip’s ministry as an evangelist raises some questions, however. Philip displayed the ability to perform miraculous signs, as did the apostles (8:6). Is this ability a normal aspect of the evangelist’s ministry? Edgar, who seeks to eliminate miraculous signs as a necessary part of the evangelist’s ministry, argues: “The Bible gives us only one example of an evangelist performing miracles, in contrast to numerous examples of apostles doing so.” But the data can easily be construed to reach the opposite conclusion. One could argue that the only clearly identified example of the ministry of an evangelist in the NT is one that is characterized by miracles. Still, Edgar is probably correct in his conclusion. Evangelists were not apostles (at least not all of them), whose authority was necessarily attested by miracles (2 Cor 12:12), so it is unlikely that miracles were a necessary feature of the evangelist’s gifting.

We know Philip baptized converts in Samaria as well as the
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Ethiopian eunuch. While the baptizing in Samaria led to the inauguration of a local church (cf. Acts 9:31), this is not easily asserted in the case of the eunuch, with whom Philip seems to have had minimal contact. What happened to the eunuch is unclear.\textsuperscript{26} The establishment of a church at Philip’s ultimate destination of Caesarea seems likely—there seems to have been one there when Paul visited. So from what we can discern about Philip’s ministry in Samaria and Caesarea, his evangelistic efforts led to the establishment of new churches.

**Ephesians 4:11**

> And He gave some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers,

The second occurrence of εὐαγγελιστὴς in the NT is found in Ephesians 4:11. There Paul begins the chapter with an exhortation to maintain the unity of the Spirit (vv. 1–3). The basis for this unity is then set forth in a sevenfold confession of the unifying realities of the faith: “one Lord, one faith, one baptism,...” (vv. 4–6).\textsuperscript{27} But Paul then reminds us, beginning in verse 7, that within this unity there is a note of necessary diversity that ultimately contributes to the proper functioning of the body: Christ has given grace to “each one of us” in the form of different spiritual gifts (v. 8). After a digression in verses 9–10 that vindicates Christ as the dispenser of gifts, Paul returns to the subject of gifts in v. 11, but he shifts from believers as the recipients of gifts to the nature of some of the gifts. More specifically, he lists five groups of gifted people “who are themselves gifts to the church,”\textsuperscript{28} one of which is “evangelists.”

We should begin by noting that Paul lists a total of five kinds of spiritually gifted people: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. A popular interpretation sees only four groups, with pastors and teachers being equated as one group or office—the pastor-teacher.\textsuperscript{29} The argument for equating the two is most often


\textsuperscript{27}O’Brien, Ephesians, p. 273.


syntactical—while “apostles” and “prophets” and “evangelists” are each modified by separate articles (τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς), “pastors” and “teachers” are joined in a grammatical unit with one article (τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους). Sometimes this is incorrectly identified as a Granville Sharp construction. But the Granville Sharp rule applies only to singular nouns, not plural ones, as in Ephesians 4:11. Wallace has now clearly demonstrated that the equating of “pastors and teachers” is an invalid conclusion that fails to understand the real significance of the syntactical structure. Actually, the grammar strongly suggests that in the case of “pastors and teachers,” the first group, pastors, is to be viewed as a subset of the second group, teachers. “Thus, Eph 4:11 seems to affirm that all pastors were to be teachers, though not all teachers were to be pastors.” We might, therefore, translate the last part of Ephesians 4:11, “some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and other teachers.” Pastors and teachers are separate groups though the grammar of Ephesians 4:11 is designed to denote that pastors are always gifted as teachers, though not vice versa. Of course, teachers are also clearly listed as a distinct group in 1 Corinthians 12:28, 29 and a distinguishable gift in Romans 12:7. Thus pastor-teacher is still an appropriate title for those in the group Paul calls pastors, but there still remains a fifth group who are strictly teachers.

These five categories are groups of gifted people, not spiritual gifts per se. But it is unclear if this is an important distinction. Schreiner,
for example, observes: “In 1 Corinthians 12 the text moves from the gift manifested (e.g., prophecy) to gifted person (prophets), suggesting that no dichotomy is envisioned between them.” Scripture itself speaks of prophets and prophecy (1 Cor 12:10), teachers and teaching (Rom 12:7); however, it does not single out a spiritual gift of pastor or evangelism.

Therefore, the question remains whether we should assume a corresponding generalized spiritual gift for every one of the five gifted persons in Ephesians 4:11 and what that might mean. In the past the gifts of pastor and evangelist were seen as restricted to selected individuals whose ministry was viewed more as an office—pastor was always connected to the office of elder-overseer (1 Tim 3:1–7; Titus 1:6–9). But in the latter part of the twentieth century there has come a greater emphasis on spiritual gifts to the whole body of Christ and thus their importance to the proper functioning of the church, so that pastoring and evangelism are sometimes now viewed as common gifts available to most believers.

For example, in the 1980s Dallas Seminary issued a report arguing that the gift of pastoring is a general gift available to all believers (including women) and is to be distinguished from the gift as it is exercised in the office of elder-pastor, which is restricted to men. Following this line, Ryrie says: “The gift is the ability and can be exercised whether one holds an office in a local church or not. In this regard much confusion exists over the gift of pastor. The gift is the ability to shepherd people. This can be done by the person who occupies what we call, in our modern ecclesiology, the office of the pastorate. Or it can be done, say, by a dean of men or a dean of women in a school. Or it can be done by the wife and mother in a home.” However, this is clearly a minority view; most all who write on the subject restrict the gift of pastor to the office of elder-overseer.


36 “Women in the Church: Biblical Data Report,” Ad hoc Faculty Committee on the Admission of Women to Dallas Theological Seminary, n.d., pp. 4–5.


38 Bruce, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians, p. 348; Lincoln, Ephesians, p. 251; O’Brien, Ephesians, p. 300; Best, Ephesians, p. 392; Markus Barth, Ephesians, 2 vols., Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 2:438; MacArthur, Ephesians, p. 143; Lloyd-Jones, Christian Unity, p. 193; Homer A. Kent, Jr., Ephesians, Everyman’s
The evidence for this comes primarily from the use of the cognate verb. The noun **pastor** (ποιμήν) occurs only once in the NT (Eph 4:11) in reference to a ministry in the church, but the cognate verb (ποιμάω) is clearly used of the ecclesiastical office. In Acts 20:28 Paul tells the Ephesian elders-overseers (Acts 20:17, 28) “to shepherd [ποιμάνει] the church of God.” And in 1 Peter 5:2, Peter urges the elders (1 Pet 5:1) in his audience to “shepherd [ποιμάνετε] the flock of God among you.” Also, BDAG defines the noun ποιμήν as “guardian or leader,” and the verb ποιμάω as someone who “watch[es] out for other people” in the sense of to “lead, guide, or rule.” These ideas of leadership correspond well with the role of the elder-overseer in passages such as 1 Timothy 3:1–7; 5:17; and Titus 1:6–9. Therefore, as most would argue, it seems best to restrict the gift of pastor to the office of elder-overseer. This would then parallel the first group in Ephesians 4:11, apostles. Hardly anyone would deny that this gift was restricted to a select group of individuals who held a particular office. Clearly, there was not a gift of apostleship available generally to believers.

In the case of the evangelist the situation is not as clear. In their treatments of spiritual gifts, Walvoord and Ryrie emphasize only the gift of evangelism in discussing Ephesians 4:11, not the evangelist. Therefore, the question remains whether it is proper to speak of gifted
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40p. 843.

41p. 842.

people like evangelists as well as a corresponding gift of evangelism. But, as we have noted, contrary to Walvoord and Ryrie, Paul speaks specifically only of individuals called “evangelists” in Ephesians 4:11, not a gift of evangelism. Schreiner reminds us: “The fact that Paul speaks of prophets, teachers, evangelists and pastor-teachers indicates that some gifts were a regular feature in the lives of some persons.” It may be that, like the gifts of apostleship and pastor, any so-called gift of evangelism is restricted to a more select group of individuals involved in a specialized ministry and should not be thought of as a more general gift in the body of Christ. Still, it is difficult to be dogmatic since one of the groups in Ephesians 4:11, prophets, is paralleled by a gift of prophecy that seems to have been more widely available, at least in the Corinthian church: “For you can all prophesy one by one, so that all may learn and all may be exhorted” (1 Cor 14:31). On the other hand, some individuals, like Agabus, seem to have been marked out particularly as prophets (Acts 11:28; 21:10), and Luke can speak of a particular order of “prophets and teachers” in the church at Antioch (Acts 13:1). So, while there may be a gift of evangelism not associated with a specialized ministry, this is far from certain, and Scripture itself speaks only of evangelists. Still, some would contend that “evangelist can refer to a person called to that distinct ministry, and also to a function that may be performed by others.” However, it appears more likely that in Ephesians 4:11 Paul has in mind individuals whose primary ministry can be designated and differentiated by the titles apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, and teacher.

Closely related to this question is the issue of office. Some speak of the evangelist as an office, but it appears they may be using the term office rather loosely in the sense of an order or group of individuals who can be specifically identified by a particular gift. On the other hand, Flanders and Van Gelderen strongly contend for the office of evangelist. Van Gelderen begins by pointing out that office is used a

---


number of times in the KJV. However, there is actually no Greek term in the NT corresponding to *office*. When Paul, for example, says, “For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office” (Rom 11:13, KJV), the Greek word is διακονία, meaning “ministry” (cf. NASB). To be fair, Van Gelderen admits this is the case. However, he believes that because two of the four groups of gifted individuals in Ephesians 4:11 are clearly offices in the church—apostles and pastor-teachers, then the other two, evangelists and prophets, which are listed between apostles and pastor-teachers, must be also. However, the fact that “teachers,” as we have demonstrated, is actually a separate group clearly weakens Van Gelderen’s argument. For his reasoning to hold, he would have to also make teachers an office in the church, something he would probably be reluctant to do. Amazingly, Van Gelderen then destroys the force of his entire argument by contending that the term *office* as it is applied to the evangelist means nothing more than “function.” He says: "If an office means more than the oversight concept of *episkope*, and emphasizes function, then prophets and evangelists may be legitimately labeled an 'office.'" For Van Gelderen, the apostle was both an office of declaration and oversight, while the evangelist (and prophet) is "primarily an office of declaration." So, while claiming that the evangelist is a legitimate office in the church (body of Christ), Van Gelderen has redefined the term *office* in the case of the evangelist to mean “function” and thus rendered moot the question which began his discussion: “Is it really scripturally correct to refer to the evangelist as an ‘office’?” No one would deny that the evangelist is an office in the church if *office* means nothing more than function.

Schreiner offers a helpful clarification at this point:

The English word *office* suggests an appointment to a certain position. It is doubtful, though, that such an idea is intended in Paul’s listing of these various gifted persons. When Paul describes someone as a prophet, he does not envision the appointment to a definite prophetic office. The person is called a prophet because he or she regularly functions as a prophet. Of course, a teacher or a prophet may still have an office in the church. Still, the terms *teacher* or *prophet* do not specifically designate an
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49 Ibid., p. 27.

50 Ibid.

office but a regular function. The issue becomes even more complicated in the case of “apostles.” It seems hard to deny that Paul viewed apostleship as an office, though some understand apostles in 1 Corinthians 12:28 to refer to apostles in local churches. Even if those who are called apostles inhabit an office, which is likely, Paul’s purpose in using the term is not to focus on office but function.52

The emphasis in Ephesians 4:11 is on gifted men who have a certain function, which, according to v. 12, is “for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ.” Fung elaborates: “The immediately following context places the emphasis on the idea of harmonious functioning among the members of Christ’s body, thus showing that the gifted men just enumerated (as themselves gifts of the ascended Lord to his Church) are viewed as exercising functions rather than holding offices.”53 Office, on the other hand, as Schreiner correctly points out, is something someone is appointed to, and, as Fee notes, “an office is a position that one is called to fill; thus it is external to the office holder.”54 An office is “a position of authority or trust.”55

Though it is not the emphasis of Ephesians 4:11, it is proper to speak of the office of apostle for a group of men named in the NT who were specifically chosen by Christ himself. And, if we are correct in identifying pastors with the office of elder-overseer, then they are a second group in Ephesians 4:11 that can be identified as an office since these were appointed by local churches and/or possibly apostles and their representatives in the early church (cf. Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5). But clearly there was no office of prophet or teacher in the early church, and the same can be said for the evangelist. Most scholarly discussions of the evangelist do not even consider the possibly that it is an office, and those who do almost universally reject the idea.56

52Paul, p. 356.
54Fee, God’s Empowering Presence, p. 773.
Another issue that deserves consideration is whether we are to discern anything about the role of the evangelist from the specific sequence in which the groups of gifted men are listed. Paul’s list in Ephesians 4:11 has taken over three categories from 1 Corinthians 12:28, “first apostles, second prophets, third teachers,” and added two, evangelists and pastors, that occur nowhere else in Pauline literature. As we noted earlier, Rice believes that evangelists are more important than pastors to the work of God, and he bases this contention on the sequence of the gifted men in Ephesians 4:11:

Second, let us notice that in the inspired Scripture, the evangelist is placed before pastors and teachers in importance. So apostles are first in importance as the men whom Christ has given to the church and to men. However, any Christian may have the gift of prophecy (1 Cor 14:31). Then come evangelists. And after evangelists come pastors and last of all, teachers. Or, as some men believe, the pastors and teachers are the same men with the double gift. At any rate, the pastors and teachers are lesser in importance, lesser in the value of their gifts and their place in the work of Christ, than the evangelist.57

Flanders agrees: “In the New Testament, the evangelist had some prominence above local pastors. This is why he is listed in Ephesians 4 before the ‘pastors and teachers’ (verse 11). He certainly exercised a measure of freedom in his ministry from the control and direction of local pastors.”58 He goes on to add: “Every pastor and every church should be evangelistic, but special leadership in this all-important matter of spreading the Gospel should be given to the evangelist.”59 These statements would seem to suggest that the leadership of the local church should in some sense defer to the evangelist, but how this would work is not explained.

However, to argue that Paul’s listing of gifted men in Ephesians 4:11 represents a clearly intended hierarchy of importance or authority probably infers too much from the apostle’s language. Paul’s listing in Ephesians 4:11 does not use the language of “first…second…third” found in 1 Corinthians 12:28, and even in this latter verse the significance of Paul’s terminology is hotly debated. As Thiselton points out, are we to understand that these terms in 1 Corinthians 12:28 “denote gradations of rank, importance, or indispensability, or simply ways of
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58 Ibid. Van Gelderen asserts that “the evangelist is a leadership gift” (Revival and Evangelism, p. 3).
checking off a long list?" Fee believes that Paul’s ranking of apostles, prophets, and teachers in 1 Corinthians 12:28 “is almost certainly related to his own conviction as to the role these three ministries play in the church. It is not so much that one is more important than the other, not that this is necessarily their order of authority, but that one has precedence over the other in the founding and building up of the local church.” In any case the interpretation of Rice and Flanders that Ephesians 4:11 gives evangelists a sort of third place of authority behind apostles and prophets cannot be harmonized with 1 Corinthians 12:28. For surely if the Ephesians passage is expressing a clear hierarchy of importance, then the “first…second…third” language of the Corinthians passage must certainly do so, and, of course, in the latter passage teachers, not evangelists, have the third position.

Most probably, the placing of evangelists in Ephesians 4:11 after apostles and prophets and before pastors and teachers is because of their function in the early church. As Fee says: “One has precedence over the other in the founding and building up of the local church.” Apostles and prophets appear first (and in 1 Corinthians 12:28) because of “their foundational role as the authoritative recipients and proclaimers of the mystery of Christ.” Earlier Paul told the Ephesians that the truth of the NT church “in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it has now been revealed to His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit” (3:5). Thus, the church can rightly be said to be “built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets” (2:20). Evangelists probably appear next after apostles and prophets because in the early church they carried on this foundational work by taking the gospel to new groups of people and “extended the work of the apostles.” Evangelists are then followed in the list by pastors and
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63O’Brien, Ephesians, p. 298. So also Bruce, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians, p. 346; Lincoln, Ephesians, p. 249.

teachers since the work of the evangelist would naturally precede and pave the way for the latter two groups, who would mainly be involved in discipleship and leadership of local congregations.65

Although Philip is the only person specifically named as an evangelist in the NT, there were obviously more.66 Possibly a number of the apostles were gifted as evangelists.67 Certainly this would seem to be true of Paul. As Keener observes: “One cannot read Acts 13–28 without recognizing that Paul is as much an itinerant evangelist as Philip had been in his earlier days.”68 Many would argue evangelists performed some similar functions as apostles except that they lacked apostolic authority.69 Both Paul and Philip shared the ministry of itinerant evangelism, forming their disciples into new local assemblies. Paul also had a number of associates who assisted him in spreading the gospel, men like Epaphras at Colosse, who may have been primarily gifted as evangelists.70 Some evangelists may have been somewhat more independent in their missionary travels, like perhaps Philip, while others were more clearly under the direction of one or other of the apostles, like perhaps Epaphras.71 But even Philip’s activities are depicted by Luke (Acts 8:14–17) as being dependent on the apostles.72 Thus, in the early church all evangelists were probably seen as being in some sense “in subordination to the apostles.”73
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68Keener, Gift and Giver, p. 127; So also ISBE, s.v. “Evangelist,” 2:204.
72Lincoln, Ephesians, p. 250.
In light of our discussion thus far, it should come as no surprise that most authorities agree with Barclay that evangelists were “the rank and file missionaries of the Church.” Their work is often described as being of an itinerant nature since they evangelized and founded churches in multiple locations. Others may have been more settled in one place, like Epaphras at Colosse, though he was probably responsible for founding other churches in the Lycus valley (e.g., Hierapolis and Laodicea). This understanding of the role of evangelists may explain their absence in the list of 1 Corinthians 12:28 (“first apostles, second prophets, third teachers”) since there would be no need of their particular ministry in an already established church like Corinth. Paul, of course, did return to churches he had previously established, but this was probably more in his role as an apostle, rather than an evangelist.

A final issue of interest is the relationship of Ephesians 4:11 to v. 12. There we are told that the gifted men of verse 11 were given by Christ “for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ.” Verse 12 consists of three...
prepositional phrases: “πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.” The KJV placed a comma between each one, suggesting that they are coordinate and thus describing three separate purposes for which the gifted men in verse 11 are given to the church (“For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ”). But it is widely understood today that the change of prepositions in the second and third phrases (among other reasons) indicates that the latter two phrases are dependent on the first. Thus the gifted individuals of verse 11 have been given for “the equipping of the saints” so that they, the saints, can do “the work of ministry,” which will ultimately result in “the building up of the body of Christ.”79 This is the idea reflected in both the NASB and the NIV (“to prepare God’s people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up”).

Verse 12 is strongly appealed to by Rice and others to argue that modern day evangelists have a primary role, not as church planters but as indispensable ministers to the local church “for the equipping of the saints for the work of service.”80 This equipping ministry from Ephesians 4:12 can be seen in Van Gelderen’s definition of an evangelist: “a God-called man with supernatural enablement to specifically focus on the ministry of the gospel through equipping the saints for gospel usefulness and through preaching the gospel to lost sinners.”81 With this description of the role of the evangelist, one wonders how his ministry is to be distinguished from the pastor, and Flanders and Van Gelderen admit their ministries do overlap.82 Apparently, though, we are to understand that the evangelist has special abilities, not possessed by the pastor, which make his ministry absolutely essential for the local church. Thus, as we have noted previously, Rice argues strongly that
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evangelists are more important to the work of God than pastors and teachers.\(^8\) Accordingly, Van Gelderen also feels justified in saying: “A church that will not use the evangelist is also not following God’s plan for the New Testament church.”\(^8\)

Van Gelderen distinguishes the primary work of the pastor from the evangelist in that the former is to “lead the sheep,” while the primary work of the latter is to “shear the sheep” or “go for the jugular,” as he calls it.\(^8\) In the same vein, Rice believes, in contrast to pastors, “evangelists have a special ministry to the church in preaching against sin.”\(^8\) Flanders attempts to differentiate the roles of pastor and evangelist with an analogy from politics:

Every political party or movement has “big voices” that articulate especially well the views of the movement, and also “local leaders” that organize and direct the work of the faithful in particular districts.... These [“big voices”] are persuasive, and are invited to address rallies around the country to motivate party-members and to win people over to the movement. The local leadership of political movements are state and county office-holders as well as party chairman and precinct captains. The party could not succeed without both the big voices and the local leaders. The Christian movement finds its big voices in the evangelist, and its local leaders in the pastors.\(^8\)

Thus it is natural that the “big voices” should be given the prominent role in evangelism. As Flanders argues: “Every pastor and every church should be evangelistic, but special leadership in this all-important matter of spreading the Gospel should be given to the evangelist.”\(^8\)

This overinflated view of the role of the evangelist, whose responsibility is primarily centered in existing local churches, seems to depend too heavily on the rather broadly framed purpose statement in Ephesians 4:12. Though the five categories of gifted individuals in Ephesians 4:11 do have as their primary function the general goal of “the equipping of the saints for the work of service,” the evangelist, as a missionary church planter, actually functions on the front end of that overall purpose by winning people and forming them into local churches. And, no doubt, this involves equipping these new converts

\(^8\) Revival and Evangelism, p. 9.
\(^8\) Ibid., p. 8.
\(^8\) The Evangelist, pp. 29–32.
\(^8\)“The Work of the Evangelist,” p. 16
\(^8\) Ibid.
for ministry. But once a church has been established and has the proper local leadership, the role of the evangelist would normally be ended.

2 Timothy 4:5

But you, be sober in all things, endure hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry.

The third occurrence of εὐαγγελιστὴς in the NT is found in 2 Timothy 4:5. Verse 5 is the last verse in a paragraph beginning in verse 1 that makes up Paul’s final charge to Timothy.89 This charge takes the form of a solemn appeal in verse 1, which is then followed by nine imperatives—five in verse 2 and four in verse 5.90 The eighth of these imperatives calls for Timothy to “do the work of an evangelist.”91 Flanders asserts: “Although there are other interpretations of this admonition, the most obvious meaning is that Timothy was an evangelist.”92 Timothy may indeed have been gifted as an evangelist, but this is not certain. He is described as one who “served with [Paul] in the furtherance of the gospel” (Phil 2:22) and as “our brother and God’s fellow worker in the gospel of Christ” (1 Thess 3:2). But probably not everyone who assisted Paul in his missionary endeavors was a gifted evangelist. Whatever the case with Timothy, it is commonly understood that he was in Ephesus functioning like a pastor93 or, more probably, Paul’s apostolic representative.94 Contrary to Flanders, the
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90Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 232.

91The aorist tense of the imperative “do” (ποιήσω) probably falls into what Wallace calls the constative category, which is used for general precepts (Grammar, pp. 720–21). Wallace does not comment specifically on the imperative ποιήσω, but he does place κηρύξαν from v. 2, one of the nine imperatives in the string of vv. 1–5, in the constative category.


94Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. xxxii; William D. Mounce, Pastoral Epistles,
clause “do the work of an evangelist” is not actually identifying Timothy as an evangelist. Instead, the language more probably suggests that Timothy should do the kind of work that is normally associated with an evangelist even though he is functioning in more of a pastoral role and may not have been particularly gifted as an evangelist himself.95 As Liefeld suggests; “Do the work of an evangelist…is a straightforward command, implying that Timothy might be so consumed with other needs and tasks that he is in danger of not pursuing the work he probably originally did with Paul on their travels together.”96 An evangelist was primarily an itinerant church planter, but Timothy is now temporarily stationed in Ephesus area, in somewhat of a supervisory role. Still, even in that work, he must not neglect the task of proclaiming the gospel of salvation to unbelievers and forming them into churches.97

ARE THERE EVANGELISTS IN THE CHURCH TODAY?

Although it might seem that this question would be obviously answered in the affirmative, there are those who relegate evangelists exclusively to the early church. This was the view of John Calvin, who said:

“Evangelists” I take to be those who, although lower in rank than apostles, were next to them in office and functioned in their place…. According to this interpretation (which seems to me to be in agreement with both the words and opinion of Paul), these three functions [apostle, prophet, evangelist] were not established in the church as permanent ones, but only for that time during which churches were to be erected where none existed before, or where they were to be carried over from Moses to Christ…. I call this office “extraordinary,” because in duly constituted churches it has no place.98

95Ryrie, Holy Spirit, p. 135.
96Liefeld, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, p. 288.
97MacArthur, 2 Timothy, p. 185.
Hodge notes that this view prevailed at the time of the Reformation. In the post-apostolic period of the early church, the evangelist was hardly mentioned. Sometimes the term was used of early Christian missionaries, as, for instance, by Eusebius. Eventually, the term lost its missionary sense of proclaimer of the gospel, came to be applied to a reader of the Gospels in churches, and finally, almost exclusively, was identified with the writers of the Gospels themselves. The research of Kimbrell and Harber concludes that the concept of the evangelist as a preacher of the gospel was rarely identified with any historical person from the fifth through the eighteenth century. Thus, it was common during the Reformation and the post-Reformation period to follow the opinion of Calvin and view the evangelist as an “extraordinary office” limited to the apostolic church. For example, a 1774 document from the Baptist Association in Charleston, South Carolina, says: “The ordinary officers of the church, and the only ones now existing, are ministers, and deacons, Phil. 1:1. In the first gospel churches there were other officers such as apostles, prophets, and evangelists, 1 Cor. 12:28, Eph. 4:11, who were endowed with extraordinary gifts, which were then necessary for the conformation of the gospel, but have since become extinct.” This viewpoint is still held by some today who sometimes at a later period raised up apostles, or at least evangelists in their place, as has happened in our own day. For there was need for such persons to lead the church back from the rebellion of Antichrist” (ibid.). According to the editors of the McNeill edition of the Institute, Calvin was chiefly referring to Luther, whom he praises and calls “a distinguished apostle of Christ” (ibid., n. 4).

99Ephesians, p. 224.
believe that the NT evangelist was inextricably tied to the office of the apostle, and so once they died out, the evangelists disappeared as well.105

The position that contends evangelists became extinct with the passing of the apostles is not without some merit. Since it is commonly held by cessationists that two of the categories of gifted individuals in Ephesians 4:11, apostles and prophets, are not present today, and if evangelists are closely connected to apostles, then it is not impossible that evangelists also became extinct with the apostles. But this view is not likely to be correct. While it is true there is compelling evidence for limiting apostles and prophets to the first century,106 other considerations suggest this is not true of evangelists. As we have noted, Ephesians 2:20 lists apostles and prophets as the two foundational gifts whose purpose was limited to the early decades of the church. Evangelists are not, of course, placed by Scripture in this strictly foundational role. While evangelists in the first century carried on the foundational work of the apostles by taking the gospel to new groups of people, they were not, by function, involved in providing the new revelation essential to the beginning of the church. If the main role of evangelists in the first century was as missionary church planters, as I have contended, then there would be no reason why their particular function would not be needed throughout the church age; in fact, one would think they would be essential.

MODERN DAY EVANGELISTS

The revival of the use of the term evangelist as applied to contemporary preachers of the gospel did not come about until the nineteenth century. The research of Kimbrell has shown that before then well-known figures who are today commonly identified as evangelists did not apply the term to themselves or to each other.107 Amazingly, John Wesley never actually used the term of himself or any of the Methodist preachers in his day, including George Whitfield.108 And the same was true of Whitfield, who apparently only used the term of the Gospel

108Ibid., pp. 87–90.
But in the nineteenth century, probably as a result of the Second Great Awakening and especially the ministry of Charles Finney, many itinerant preachers were identified as evangelists.

From the time of Finney “evangelists” have commonly been associated with revivalism, not their NT role of church planting. A true revival cannot, of course, be worked up, but is a “surprising work of God,” to use Jonathan Edwards’s words; they are confined to what Solomon Stoddard called “special seasons.” Murray clarifies:

What happens in revivals is not to be seen as something miraculously different from the regular experience of the church. The difference lies in degree, not in kind. In an ‘outpouring of the Spirit’ spiritual influence is more widespread, convictions are deeper, and feelings more intense, but all this is only a heightening of normal Christianity. True revivals are ‘extraordinary,’ yet what is experienced at such times is not different in essence from the spiritual experience that belongs to Christians at other times.

But after the time of Finney and the adoption of his “new measures,” “seasons of revival became ‘revival meetings.’ Instead of being ‘surprising’ they might now be announced in advance.” Evangelists were now seen as the professional ministers who could best promote revivals, those who had the special skills necessary to bring them about. Thus the evangelist was seen as indispensable to the work of the local church. Echoing that sentiment, Van Gelderen says: “An assembly that refuses to use the gift of the evangelist is incomplete in following Christ’s plan for the church. This is disobedience.” It is probably this view of the evangelist, a promoter of revivals, which is most common in fundamentalism and evangelicalism today. The evangelist is
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often looked upon as someone who is involved in mass evangelism.\textsuperscript{117}

However, as we have sought to demonstrate, these modern day “evangelists” do not seem to fit the pattern of what the NT means by evangelist, if we are right in seeing the term as more correctly applied to the missionary church planter. Perhaps we should follow the lead of Lloyd-Jones and McCune who believe that the modern “evangelist” would be better identified as an exhorter (Rom 12:8).\textsuperscript{118} As previously observed, Van Gelderen views his responsibility as an “evangelist” to be twofold: “equipping the saints for gospel usefulness” and “preaching the gospel to lost sinners.”\textsuperscript{119} The local church is certainly free, if it chooses, to bring in an “exhorter-evangelist” to aid it in carrying out the Great Commission since “equipping the saints for gospel usefulness” and “preaching the gospel to lost sinners” are worthy and necessary goals. As long as any such ministry is theologically sound and properly related to the local church, an “exhorter-evangelist” can have a legitimate ministry.

**CONCLUSION**

Although it is not possible to be overly dogmatic about the role of the NT evangelist in light of the limited biblical data, the evidence seems to strongly suggest that he functioned not as an itinerant revivalist preacher but as a missionary church planter. As such, these gifted men were, and still are, truly vital to the NT church. This work of evangelizing the lost and forming them into local NT churches deserves the prayers and support of all members of the body of Christ. May God in his grace give us more of these gifted men.


\textsuperscript{118}Christian Unity, p. 192; Rolland D. McCune, “Systematic Theology II (class notes, Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, June 2001), p. 203.

\textsuperscript{119}Revival and Evangelism, p. 16.