

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

BY JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, D.D., DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MADISON, N. J.

Perhaps the most characteristic feature of apostolic Christianity as compared with later times was the wide diffusion of spiritual gifts. The most striking of these was the gift of tongues. At the day of Pentecost, by a spiritual elevation of the more susceptible of the hearers, the latter thought they heard their own language—prophecy of the universal destination of the gospel. Whatever we may think of that one instance, the gift of tongues was a more or less rapt utterance of religious emotions, generally in speech unintelligible except to those spiritually initiated, and played no important part, as it is mentioned only three times, Acts 10:46; 19:6; 1 Cor. 12 and 14. Paul discouraged the exercise of this gift in Corinth, except in an orderly way and except as an expert was by to interpret. Similar phenomena have appeared in times of deep religious feeling from that day to this, and the Catholic Apostolic Church (Irvingites) deliberately revived it in 1835 as a regular (or irregular) part of worship, following actual bestowments of the gift in Edward Irving's Caledonian Chapel in London, 1831-32. The power to speak in foreign tongues except by laborious study and practice has never been an equipment of Christian workers, nor was it needed in apostolic times, when Greek was the key to all intelligent minds. But one may speak in an unknown tongue with such enthusiasm and spiritual scintillation that the hearers are deeply affected or even imagine they hear their mother tongue, as Bernard of Clairvaux in unknown Latin fired the Germans to the second crusade. The whole Pentecostal event was a miracle in the sense of something beyond the lower powers (even Rothe called it a "proper

miracle'¹), but neither that nor the gift of tongues in general was miraculous in the sense of being beyond the spiritual forces of the universe. These and other gifts are the higher naturalism of divinely endowed men.²

Perhaps the most conspicuous of these spiritual gifts was prophecy, a special afflatus of the Spirit on either men or women by which they gave communications from God either as to the future or general religious instruction, this instruction being different from that of the teachers in that it was directly from above. See Acts 11:27f; 21:10f; 13:1f; 21:9ff. The apostles did not necessarily have this gift, though it is likely that most of them were also prophets. Paul had messages from God in a dream or trance state, but these were never the subject of his public addresses or letters.³ What the prophets received they were to give forth in the congregation. Paul is reckoned among prophets and teachers in Acts 13:1, and he believed prophecy the highest gift (1 Cor. 14:1), especially because it combined two characteristics—it was rational, edifying and understandable (verse 3), and yet it was immediately from God and therefore had convincing and revealing effect on unbelievers (verses 24, 25). The prophets were not irresponsible, but were subject not to the society but to their brother prophets (v. 32). They must not speak at the same time, but in order (v. 29). Every congregation had its prophets, and they also went from place to place. They will appear later.

Gifts of healing and other similar powers were part of the machinery of Christian propaganda. In an age when wonders were the indispensable credentials of religion, the marvel is not that there were miracles but that

¹Vorlesungen über K. G. i. 33 (1875).

²On the gift of tongues the latest books are Mosiman, E., *Das Zungenreden geschicht. und psychol. untersucht* (Mohr), 1911 (see *Theol. Lit., Blatt*, 1911, 487-8), and Hayes, *The Gift of Tongues*, 1913 (admirable).

³Correct here von Orelli, in *Int. Stand. Bib. Enc.*, 2464.

they were so few, so beneficent, and so linked to spiritual ministries. Though they were historically necessary for the starting of Christianity, though Paul refers to them as the signs of an apostle which he possessed in full (2 Cor. 12:12), though the apostolic company were thoroughly equipped (Heb. 2:4), yet the chief dependence of the latter was preaching—they overcame by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony (Rev. 12:11). Even the “power of signs and wonders” to which Paul appealed was co-ordinate to that of “word and deed” and the “power of the Holy Spirit”, and all was for the one purpose—“I have fully preached the gospel of Christ” (see Rom. 15:18-20). The powers in apostolic times were like the raising of Dorcas (Acts 9:36ff) and Eutychus (20:9ff), the healing of the cripple of Jerusalem and the palsied of Lydda (3:1ff; 9:32ff). The gifts of healing were more ordinary, and were sometimes perhaps no more than natural endowments of strong-minded people of heroic faith who knew how to lay hold of the hidden forces of another’s personality and thus evoke remedial agents lying in the dim frontier of spirit and matter. The faith that removes mountains can sometimes heal the sick, and the man that can pour that faith into another may work a miracle on this clay. This is not to minify that miracle, for most of the horrible diseases of the East were not amenable to spiritual sleight-of-hand or the esoteric “mortal mind” philosophy of Christian Science. “It is worth remembering that with all his faith in the spiritual gift of healing and personal experience of its power, Paul chose Luke the physician as the companion of his later journeys; and worth noticing that Luke shared with the apostle the honors showered upon the missionaries by the people of Melita whom they had cured of their diseases (Acts 28:10). Upon the modern church there seems to lie the duty of reaffirming the reality and permanence of the primitive gift of healing, while relating it to the scientific practice of medicine

as another power ordained of God, and its natural ally in the task of diffusing the Christian gospel of health.”⁴

First among the workers should be mentioned the apostles, a name used of two different classes of missionaries. There were, first, those who had been chosen by Christ Himself to accompany Him, to hear His teachings and later to carry on His work, and Paul to whom Christ revealed Himself in vision and taught and personally commissioned. The apostles were not priests, had no priestly functions whatever, but were the advance agents of the gospel. As the founders of the Church, they were given special leading of the Spirit to lay down the ethical and religious principles on which sins were to be judged (“retaining and forgiving sin”, “binding and loosing”), and the right involved in their historical position of suggesting appointment of officers and of general leadership. But this included no prelatie power or official pre-eminence. They did not even decide the matter of the circumcision of the Gentiles themselves, but called a council of elders and brethren to consider it. Their authority was spiritual only. The most aggressive was Paul, who magnified his office, but his credentials in it were sufferings (2 Cor. 11:23-33), and he sought to gain influence not through any official authority but only by manifestation of the truth commending himself to every man’s conscience in the sight of God (4:2). He did not interfere with the ordinary administration of church affairs, and when he has to give advices or commands he does so on the ground of their reasonableness or conformity to Old Testament precepts, or some word of the Lord (1 Cor. 7:10), on his own judgment as informed by the Spirit (verse 40), or a transparent demand that even a heathen would recognize (1 Cor. 5:1), or on his relation as spiritual father (4:15f), etc. Nor is there any trace of the necessity of connection with the apostles as validating service, such as grew up later in the doctrine of

4J. C. Lambert in *Int. Stand. Bible Encyc.*, 1350 (1915).

so-called Apostolic Succession. Ordination as we understand it was unknown in apostolic times, and our conception of it is due in part to the numerous mistranslations of the ecclesiastically dominated Authorized Version. The nearest equivalent to it then was appointment or election, and the laying on of hands was simply a symbol of blessing. The crown of the apostolate was its missionary pioneering, and therefore James the Lord's brother, head (later called bishop) of the church in Jerusalem, is contrasted with "all the apostles" (1 Cor. 15:7; 9:5). The spiritual authority of the apostles could not in the nature of the case be transmitted.

There were, second, men besides the Twelve and Paul who were called apostles on account of their eminent services as heralds of the cross. These were not placed by the apostles in an inferior class, but held in full honor. Barnabas is side by side with Paul himself (1 Cor. 9:5, 6; Gal. 2:9), Andronicus and Junias are of note among the apostles (Rom. 16:7), and several whose names are not on earthly books are the apostles of the churches and the glory of Christ (2 Cor. 8:23; see also 1 Cor. 4:6, 9; Phil. 2:25). These men were entitled to whatever honor was due their work, and the Twelve never dreamed of limiting the apostleship to any closed number of men, even if Peter wanted some one elected to succeed Judas, except, of course, as the Twelve had a pre-eminence involved in their historical position as the personal pupils and missionaries of Jesus.

The evangelists were the proclaimers of the glad tidings or gospel, or a sort of sub-apostles, were itinerants, and their work was entirely missionary. Our evangelist or revivalist is his successor as to the substance of his message, but not as to his work. As far as he has any modern counterpart, it is the home and foreign missionary.

While the prophet gave forth instruction by special inspiration, the teacher did so by use of the ordinary

powers (Rom. 12:7; 1 Cor. 12:28). God was not the less the author of his truth (1 Cor. 12:8), but it did not come by revelation. Teaching was a most important function in apostolic times, not only by those addicted to it, but by apostles and others. See Acts 2:42; 5:42; 15:35; 17:1-3, 10-15, 16-17; 18:1-11; 19:8, 19; 28:23, 30-31. It was much more used then than today by the average pulpit, much to the loss of the permanent appeal and power of our preachers.

If the reader will compare Acts 20:17 with v. 28; Tit. 1:5 with v. 7; 1 Tim. 3:1 (cf. v. 8 for the only other officer in this list) with 4:14 and 5:1, he will see that elder or presbyter and bishop or overseer are one and the same person. Compare our use of the words minister, clergyman, pastor. Perhaps where Jewish customs predominated, or age was the first thought, the word elder was used, where Greek the word bishop. At first, the elder was only an administrative officer, like our steward or trustee, the Presbyterian elder, the Congregational deacon, but later he preached and taught (1 Tim. 3:2). The view of Hatch and Harnack that there was an initial distinction between elder and bishop, the former being administrative, the latter partly administrative but also preaching, is rather forced, the more natural view being that above, though in some places the development may have gone on that line. The elder or bishop (or any other) did not rule in the hierarchical sense (*ἀρχειν*), the word "rule" in our versions of Scripture in regard to church officers being always a mistranslation ("shepherding the Church of God [2 oldest MSS.] which he purchased", Acts 20:28; "be persuaded by those guiding" [or leading, or directing] you", Heb. 13:17; "he who is placed before [or presiding over, or a patron] with diligence", Rom. 12:8; "let the elders that preside beautifully be worthy of double honor, especially those that toil wearily in the word and in teaching", 1 Tim. 5:17). In fact, anything like ecclesiastical rule in the ordinary

sense was strictly forbidden by the Lord, who after speaking of rule says: Not so shall it be among you. But whosoever wills to become great among you shall be your servant, and whosoever wills to be first shall be your slave (Mt. 20:26).

The Church was a society of believers in Christ, called out from the world, saints, elect, very loosely organized at first, with no officials in the modern sense in the first epistles of Paul; by the time of the later epistles with distinct officers, but those officers never addressed but always the society or believers (except Phil. 1:1, where overseers, elders and deacons are brought in in a subordinate way), which is also the case when urgent duties of discipline, etc., are enforced (the officers or ministers not asked to attend to these, but the whole brotherhood). The ecclesiastical idea, as we know it, is quite embryonic in New Testament times.

Baptism was religiously of tremendous importance, but ecclesiastically of little, so little that Paul, on account of the factional disputes in Corinth, is glad he baptized only two or three, recognizing that the work to which Christ sent him was preaching and not baptizing (1 Cor. 1:14-17). Baptism was a dedication into Christ's death, a symbolic burial by which the old man disappeared and the new man arose, to represent the newness of life in Christ Jesus, founded on His death and resurrection (Rom. 6:3-5). In a missionary age it necessarily had a more vivid meaning than now, just as it has today in foreign mission lands. It meant an irrevocable cleft from the old life, the final challenge to the old gods, a new birth, a change so profound that with what preceded and followed it might be called a new creation and might sometimes be a new creation. Its psychological significance to the convert, therefore, was so profound, and its historical bearing so important, that it was at times accompanied with a special outpouring of the Spirit, a natural response to the quickened faith presupposed in

such a splendid leap from the old associations. It had in itself no regenerating influence nor in itself gave the Spirit, as Simon Magus found (Acts 8:13, 23), but symbolically and publicly it was the washing away of sin (2:38).

What we call the Lord's Supper was a brotherhood meal in memory of Christ. We are not sure whether it is mentioned in Acts, but probably the breaking of bread of 2:42 and 20:7 were Lord's Suppers, as it was impossible for disciples then to come together in a meal without remembering their Lord and feeding upon Him. It is only mentioned elsewhere in 1 Cor. 10 and 11, in the first passage to guard the Christians from taking part in the abominations of pagan feasts, by the argument that their cup of blessing was a communion (*κοινωνία*, not drinking nor partaking of) of the blood of Christ and the "bread which we break" was a communion with the body of Christ (the cup and bread set forth the fellowship which believers had with the blessings brought to them by the life and death of Christ), and in the second passage to save them from drunkenness and other horrible profanities by calling their attention to the religious meaning of their suppers as "proclaiming the Lord's death till He come". In those times, the supper was a social meal "celebrated by those in whose minds the earthly and the heavenly, the social and religious aspects of life were not yet divided asunder. We see the banquet spread in the late evening, after the sun had set behind the western ridge of the hills of Achaia; we see the many torches blazing as at Troas to light up the darkness of the upper room, where the Christian community assembled; we see the couches laid and the walls hung after the manner of the East; we see the sacred loaves each representing in its compact unity the harmony of the whole society; we hear the blessing or thanksgiving on the cup, responded to by the thunder of the joint Amen; we witness the complete realization of the apostle's words, suggested doubt-

less by the sight of the meal and sacrament blended together, "Whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God" (10:31). Perhaps the nearest likeness now existing to the union of social intercourse with religious worship is to be found in the services of the Coptic Church,⁵ or those of the Dunkards or other churches which have deliberately attempted to restore primitive Christianity, or in the love feast of the *Unitas Fratrum*.

The social aspect of apostolic Christianity was summed up in the word, Brotherhood in Christ. As to spiritual privileges, all were on an equality, and the poorest might be called to any office in the gift of the community. Wide measures of relief were inaugurated. The Christians were a solidarity something in the sense of a world-wide secret fraternity of modern times. But this does not mean that Christianity was a proletarian movement, or received its impulse from socialistic ideals. The first socialism in Jerusalem was a passing enthusiasm, founded on their new love and joy in Christ and suggested by the Jewish hospitality to strangers at the day of Pentecost, and was not imitated elsewhere. There was not the slightest effort made to obliterate classes, or to preach a universal democracy in a political or economic sense. Kings were to be honored (1 Pet. 2:17), every ordinance of man to be obeyed (v. 13), and the empire endorsed as a divine order (Rom. 13:1). The fact that Christianity accepted slavery as a matter of course, encouraged no effort at emancipation, even sent back a runaway slave to his master, shows the baselessness of the recent interpretation of our religion as at its beginnings a movement for the poor. Its driving impulse was religion, not economics. Therefore from the first it had all grades of wealth among its members, and never attempted social equalization. It is true that James sharply rebukes the rich selecting the chief seats in the Chris-

⁵A. P. Stanley, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 3 ed., 1865 (1 ed. '62), 206.

tian synagogue, and though he denounces their wealth as cankered because gained by fraud and oppression, he does not suggest that they should share equally their possessions with others (Jas. 5:1-6). The constant exhortations to benevolence and kindness to the poor presuppose the full rights of private property and free accumulation. Every Christian privilege and religious blessing belonged to the poor, toward whom the widest and deepest charity was preached, and all were taught that worldly blessings were infinitely below the spiritual in value; but the Church to which the wealthy sheik Abraham was the father of the faithful, and which sought and won adherents in the palaces of the Cæsars did not ban riches as in themselves sinful. Christianity was not a program—it was a life.

I think there is now no dispute among scholars that the Lord's Suppers were actual repasts in apostolic time, and for a considerable time after. Harnack's comment on ἐμπληροσθῆναι in *Did.* 10:1, states the fact: Therefore still a real meal (his ed., Leipz., 1884, p. 31). The distinction of all historians and commentators between love feasts and Lord's Suppers—one following the other—is no longer tenable—I mean as to this early time. Later the love feast succeeded to the meal feature of the Supper.

NOTE.

Apostles and Apostolate.—The first to give a careful and scientific treatment of apostles was Harnack in his *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel* (his famous edition of the *Didache or Teaching of the XII Apostles*), Leipz., 1884, pp. 93-119. A brief statement of his results might be welcome. The fundamental exhortation of this book (say A. D. 115-125) is 4:1: "My child, thou shalt remember night and day him that speaks to thee the word of God, and thou shalt honor him as the Lord, for where the Lordship is spoken of, there is the Lord." The whole book shows that there was only one class of men to be honored, viz., those who proclaimed the word of God, in their position as *ministri evangellii*. This corrects previous views. Who were these speakers? Not standing officers, not even officers elected by the Christian society, but especially free teachers who owed their calling to a divine man-

date and charisma, and wandered as preachers from society to society. There were three classes—apostles, prophets, and teachers—of which the first were the regular missionaries of the gospel. 1. They are not elected by the congregation but set in by the Spirit, a special divine commission, whereas deacons and bishops were elected (15:1). 2. The distinction, apostles, prophets and teachers, is an original one, going back to earliest times. The apostle needed a special call. By the time the Epistle to the Ephesians was written, evangelists and pastors were shoved in after the prophets (4:11), which means that the author used the expression apostles in a narrower sense of the Twelve and Paul, brought in evangelists alongside of them, dove-tailed pastors into the rank of preachers given to the whole church, understood teachers as distinct persons belonging to the local society. This was practically the same as the *Didache*, which places the pastors (bishops) of the local church by the side of the teachers, and to be honored with them (15:1, 2). In the *Shepherd of Hermas* (about 135), the author omits prophets in the lists, but this is simply on account of modesty, because he is himself a prophet, and he gives information on prophets in Mandate II. "The stones that are squared and white and fit together in their joints, these are the apostles [and prophets] and bishops and teachers and deacons, who walked after the holiness of God, and were overseeing and teaching and serving (lit, diakonizing) holly", etc. (Vis. 3:5). Why he puts the bishops before the teachers we do not know. We see then from Acts, Paul, Ep. to Eph., Hermas and *Didache* that in the oldest Christian societies "those who speak the word of God" took the highest place, that they consisted of apostles, prophets and teachers, and that they were not the officers of a local society but were honored as preachers set in by God and given to the whole church. All administrative and jurisdictional functions are entirely lacking to these three classes of workers.

Christendom had a unique band of union in apostles, prophets and teachers. Wandering from place to place, received in every church with the highest respect, they explain how it was that the ecclesiastical development could have gone on with the sameness that it did under conditions so different. In the face of adverse forces and storms between 64 and 150, we see how firmly the local society organized itself, and how all the societies united finally in a Catholic confederation—we must assign to the uniting influence of apostles, etc., one factor of this wonderful development. This is witnessed to also in the so-called Catholic Epistles. Like the apostles and prophets, these addressed themselves and belonged to the whole church, and were immediately received in honor, whether they had the name of an apostle attached to them or not. It was only when the bishop be-

came an officer of the whole Catholic Church that he became the successor of the apostles. The Catholic organization of the church as it fixed itself in the third century and placed at its head the confederation of bishops gave back again to Christendom in strict political and therefore in altogether changed form that which it had in the beginning, though not in a politically and legally fixed way, namely, universally acknowledged teachers. Between those epochs there was a brief time when the old apostles, prophets and teachers had vanished and the bishops were local, not general, church officers.

The apostles were to be without possessions and to be supported entirely by the society they served for the time. They could remain only two days, that is, in the time covered by the *Didache* (early 2nd century). They must be restless missionaries of the gospel. They could take with them however a day's ration of bread. The *Didache* knows no distinction in the rank of apostles, though in the inscription it speaks of the Twelve. That the Twelve were the highest officers in the church, that a hard line existed between them and other apostles is false. They had higher honor, but the others were fully apostles, and Paul was the founder of the idea that they had an extraordinary position. But the Twelve had a special position in apostolic and post-apostolic times, and the title apostle very early was limited to the Twelve and Paul (see references, note p. 118). This fact must kill and finally did kill the old formula—apostles, prophets, and teachers. The Old Testament prophets and the Twelve pressed back the apostles generally and the Christian prophets; that is, the need for an external authoritative witness of the gospel necessarily hemmed in the living creative power of the same. (Thus Harnack.)

In 1886, Weizsäcker in old Tübingen came out with an independent treatment of the apostles in his *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche*, Eng. tr. of 2 edition, 2 vols., 1894-95, 3rd ed.—unchanged—of German, 1901, a work of great interest and suggestiveness, though in places decidedly free and rationalistic. He says that the fact that people find episcopacy, presbyterianism and democracy in the apostolic church means that the sources leave a wide field for conjecture. The church did not come out of a single society, but the whole, the "Church of God", came first, and then the separate churches arose out of mission activities, and their government was due to the wants and ministries of this mission; that is, church government was based on apostolate. The apostolate was not set up in the church as a council of twelve, but was founded by Jesus, not as an office but as a preaching ministry. Their judging the twelve tribes (Mt. 19:28) was not official. They went up to Jerusalem with Jesus because they were called on behalf of Israel (that is, as missionaries), and it was because of this that they afterward reassembled in Jerusalem and originated the church. Their leadership was also their instruction

or preaching, which held the Christian community together. The Twelve do not come before as a corporation, but as individuals, and therefore stress is laid only on certain men. When Paul wanted to come to an understanding with Jerusalem, he sought out not the apostles but only Peter, James and John, and he calls them not apostles but pillars, those highly esteemed, thus emphasizing their personality, not their office. This is because their mission and work only were involved.

Contrary to what we might expect, the term widened rather than narrowed, and as applied to missionary assistants (1 Thess. 2:6; 1 Cor. 9:5, 6; 4:6, 9; Rom. 16:7), and this widening was due not to Paul's own use of the word to which he felt free on account of his independent call, but to an already existent use. For instance, James, the Lord's brother, is placed among the apostles (Gal. 1:19), and in 1 Cor. 15:5, 7, the twelve and the apostles are different terms or classes not necessarily mutually inclusive. As apostles, men were formally appointed in the apostolic church, and Weizsäcker thinks he can make out their qualifications. They must be Jew by birth (2 Cor. 11:22, comp. v. 13), must have seen Jesus (1 Cor. 9:1, comp., 2 Cor. 5:16), and be a promoter of His cause (2 Cor. 11:23), perhaps with courage (10:1ff) and eloquence (11:6), mighty or miraculous deeds (12:12), perhaps visions and revelations (12:1) and persecutions (11:23ff). All this made a definite number meaningless. This larger number is further shown by the false apostolic claimants (11:13), who on the strength of purporting to represent the original twelve were the "extra" or "pre-eminent apostles" (11:5; 12:11). But Paul gave the title unhesitatingly to his assistants in the mission, recognized Apollos on his own initiative, and in this he was justified as he was only following the practice of the Jewish Christians.

Paul placed the apostleship at the head of the ministries based on divine gifts (1 Cor. 12:28), and he clearly expressed a view prevalent in the whole church. Without apostles there was no church. This was based not on official relation, but on actual relation, viz., the church had from them received its faith, and continued to do so. They were the messengers, literally apostles, of God, because they brought the word of Jesus Himself. Reverence for them was of faith, because it was recognized they had the spirit. But the special forms of that reverence was due to personal and historical reasons—in the case of James because he was the representative of legalism and because he was brother to Jesus, of Paul because of his gospel and his mission or labors. But this conferred no supreme power and ecclesiastical office. The Acts represents the apostles advising the church. The gospel they laid down with authority and rules connected with it, but in a single case (and that a fearful one) Paul suggests to the church (1 Cor. 5), but does not decree in an official sense. When he had a

saying of the Lord Himself he gave a charge which he hoped they would consider as binding, but he distinguished between this and his own opinion (7:6, 10, 25, 40). The apostles had the Lord's word and His mission, they had the Spirit—that was the source of their authority in the primitive church. (Thus Weizäcker. It is a sober and well-grounded view. See English tr. ii.291-9.)

The first monograph on the apostles was the prize essay (octavo) of Pastor Wilhelm Seufert, *Der Ursprung und die Bedeutung des Apostelats in der Christlichen Kirche der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte*, Leiden (Holland), 1887, pp. viii, 162. Seufert was the pupil of the very "critical" theologians, Hausrath and H. J. Holtzmann, to whom he dedicates his book, which is an after-clap of the old Tübingen school and is certainly sufficiently free—I might say arbitrary—in his use of his sources. While he does not deny that Christ chose a select number of fishers of men to whom He gave instruction, he says that the "apostolate is an institution of the apostolic church, which was naturally formed out of the spirit of the risen Christ, and was referred back by the Christian writers to the living Jesus" (p. 162), which is true if we interpret the apostolate in the later Catholic way. "Paul not only by his personality but by vindication of his attacked apostles' honor became the proper founder of the reputation of the apostolate" (p. 158). [But Paul evidently would not have invented that reputation—you only have to read Galatians to know that—which was there already, though his writings may have enhanced it.] Seufert says that out of Jewish interest the evangelists make Jesus select twelve apostles, harking back to the twelve tribes of Israel; that is, the "origin of the apostolate is in narrow Jewish sentiment which arose at the cradle of the apostolate of the Twelve", and which brought the actual apostolate which later arose out of the missionary spirit of Christ under the influence of that Jewish Twelve—Apostolate (p. 154). Christ really did not choose twelve nor send them out in His lifetime, and the words in 1 Cor. 15:5, "then to the twelve", is a gloss. Even Harnack has to protest that "the Twelve is sufficiently made certain by the unanimity of the Synoptic Gospels, 1 Cor. 15:5, and the important passage, Acts 6:2 [he might have said Acts 1:13, 21-26, if he had not thought the first part of Acts less trustworthy], as a fact which reaches back into the life of Jesus" (*Theol. Lit.—Zeitung*, 1887, p. 471), though he claims they were disciples (*μαθηταί*) and not apostles, and that their destination or vocation is "that they might be with Him" (Mark 3:14)—this being the true foundation of their peculiar significance, which later was attributed to their being sent (*ἀποστέλλεσθαι, ἀπόστολος*). Against Seufert, Harnack also holds that they were in this sense apostles, that they were sent out by Jesus in His lifetime, which explains why the name apostle clung to them after His death, though they were not the only apostles nor the only

ones who had the mission. Later the Twelve came to be apostles **par excellence**, and they outshone not only the nameless apostles, but also Paul, because they had not only all he had, but in their discipleship of Jesus a plus of immeasurable significance. Thus it happened [in the second and third centuries] that the apostleship was derived from the discipleship, and all claims of others to the name and distinction of apostles was rejected. The Gnostic conflict necessitated proving that the church possessed a public apostolic tradition springing from Christ and directly handed down by these official representatives. Therefore the nameless apostles (those mentioned in *Didache* as well perhaps as men like Barnabas in New Testament) were robbed of their apostolic honor, and Paul would have met this fate if he had not left his epistles behind—"Paul the writer protected Paul the apostle" (Harnack, 472-3. See also the review of Bang in *Theol. Lit.—Blatt*, 1887, 348-50.) So far as the missionary work of the apostles was concerned, that was due, says Seufert, to their being seized by the spirit of Christ, but the apostolate became an office through the opposition between Paul and Jerusalem. That office became the guarantee, however, of true doctrine among the seething errors of later times, connecting the church with the apostolic witness and with Christ, and so on down to the present, and thus essentially contributing to the preservation of the spirit of Christ in humanity. And this, says Seufert (p. 161) is the historical justification of the Twelve—Apostolate.

A more sober and objective and equally scholarly discussion appeared ten years later by one of the New Testament professors at Halle, Erich Haupt, *Zum Verständnis des Apostolats im neuen Testament*, Halle, 1896, 8 vo., pp. iv, 154. Unlike Seufert, Haupt holds that Christ did select the Twelve, as the synoptics claim, but that He did not give them a task different from that of His other disciples. The missionary command is given to the apostles as representatives of the Christian society. It is the advance-program of Jesus. But from the gospels you cannot get the nature of the apostolate. Here Paul must come in. On the ground of the Christ-revelation before Damascus, the vital point of which was not what Christ revealed to him, but that Christ revealed Himself to him, Paul knew himself a called or qualified apostle. As such, he had his mission to Jews and Gentiles, and knew that he had. The essence of his gospel at the start (that is, as bound up with the Damascus experience) was not the death on the cross but the universality of salvation (Gal. 1:16; Col. 1:25ff; Eph. 3:7-10). His apostolate was not the taking over of an office. As the Twelve, he had the assurance that he was to work for the Kingdom of God, but the special task day by day became clear through personal leadings by the Spirit. There was no demarcation of his tasks, as of an office. "With Paul as with the Twelve, there was nothing com-

municated in his call as to the special content of his vocation. He knew himself called to the preaching of the gospel, but anything further came to him as to them from the shaping of historical relations, from the divine leading which revealed itself to him in those relations. Nor had he revelations concerning the rights bound up with his calling: he had the rights demanded by the object (or end) of his activity" (p. 105). In other words, Paul's apostolate was a divine call, a heavenly gift or charisma, not an office. As to the specific charisma, it was that of church-founding, dispensation of the word, the presupposition for all other gifts. "Whoever has an independent significance for the development of the church is an apostle." The apostles' task and achievement was the founding of the mission and the founding of the word, which last meant eventually the New Testament (pp. 139, 140). In the nature of the case, the apostle could have no successor. You cannot inherit special divine gifts (*Charismata lassen sich nicht vererben*, p. 142). (Thus Haupt: A noble work, with fine observations and able defence of positions attacked by the left, though himself an independent critic; a work well worthy of translation. He treats of many subjects only loosely connected with his subject and treats them admirably.)

The veteran New Testament scholar of Leipzig, George Heinrici, who died during the great war, thinks that while you cannot make the apostolate an office in the Catholic sense, and an apostle without charismata is only painted fire, the special nature of the apostolate is a commission and not a charism. It is a dispensation (*oikonomia*). "With the office of administrator of an office Paul is acquainted, yes, he knows himself bound to the duty thus laid upon him, as slave, servant, steward, a recognized servant and minister, "in holy service to the gospel of God" (1 Cor. 4:1f, 9, 15f; Rom. 15:16). With this obligation is the apostolic authority given to him, in virtue of which he is ready to lay down the proofs that Christ speaks in him (2 Cor. 13:3) and that his decisions came from God (1 Cor. 14:37). * * * The decisive point for the apostolate is this, that the apostle legitimates his authority and his independence of the authority of men by the proof that he is called by the living Christ for the proclamation of the gospel, and so is a classic witness." Luke 1:2 and Hebrews 2:3 show that the creation of the New Testament was not the specific work of the apostolate. See Heinrici in *Theol. Lit. Zeit.*, 1897, 129-133, esp. 132-3, and the valuable review of Nösgen in *Theol. Lit., Blatt*, 1897, 1-4. Since 1897 nothing of importance has been done in this field. The articles in the Bible dictionaries are meager (except D C G), and their writers seem unacquainted with this literature.

It will be noticed that there is not a scholar who has made special studies here who has found that the apostolate of the early time were prelates or rulers in the so-called Catholic sense, or that they transmitted what powers they had to successors.