

The Canadian Evangelist.

"GO . . . SPEAK . . . TO THE PEOPLE ALL THE WORDS OF THIS LIFE."

Vol. VI., No 11.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 1st, 1891.

\$1 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

THE Canadian Evangelist

is devoted to the furtherance of the Gospel of Christ; and pleads for the union of all believers in the Lord Jesus in harmony with his own prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, and on the basis set forth by the Apostle Paul in the following terms: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."—Eph. iv. 1-6.

Were there twelve Apostles?

To the Editor of THE CANADIAN EVANGELIST:—
SIR,—We will put aside those passages where the term "Apostles" is used, perhaps in the sense of a delegate of a church as in 2 Cor. viii. 23, and Phil. ii. 25. In both these instances "Apostolos" has been translated "messenger."

But does not this free use of the term suggest that no such rigid and precise application as is sometimes supposed can be attached to the term? The Apostles were at first twelve in number, Judas being one. Was this limit strictly observed, St. Paul taking the place of Judas? So far is this theory carried by some that Schaff holds that the election of Matthias was a hasty and mistaken act, God afterwards substituting Paul in his place (see history of the Apostolic Church II., page 194). St. Luke's narrative bears not the faintest trace of such a reversal. St. Matthew uses the word once only and defines it "the twelve apostles" (x. 2). St. Mark uses it once with a special reference to the return of the "sent ones" (vi. 30). St. John uses the word once without any reference to the twelve (xiii. 16). St. Luke tells us our Lord gave this name to the twelve disciples, and he often calls them by this name, but that St. Luke does not mean to restrict this title to the twelve is clear because he elsewhere (Acts xiv. 14) extends it to others—not St. Paul only but to Barnabas also. St. Paul certainly seems to distinguish between "the twelve" and "all the apostles" (1 Cor. xv. 5-7).

As "Lightfoot" observes, our translation—a most extraordinary one—of Rom. xvi. 7, could only have been made to escape the difficulty involved in such an extension of the apostolate.

In this verse Andronicus and Junias are clearly called distinguished members of the apostolate; and so in the R. V. we have it:—"Salute Andronicus and Junias my kinsmen and my fellow prisoners, who are of note among the apostles who have also been in Christ before me" (Rom. xvi. 7, R. V.).

In 1 Thess. ii. 6, where he is speaking of the labors of himself and his colleague, Silvanus, he adds "though we might have been burdensome to you being Apostles of Christ."

Silvanus had labored with St. Paul at Thessalonica, and his name appears with St. Paul's in the superscription of the letter. St. Luke in his account of the missionary labors of Paul and Barnabas names them together as Apostles (see Acts xiv. 4-14). St. Paul's epistles clearly establish this unmistakable assertion of St. Luke in the Acts. In his Galatian letter Barnabas is associated with himself in the Apostleship of the Gentiles (ii. 9); in the first letter to the Corinthians he claims for his colleague all the privileges of an Apostle (ix. 5, 6). If St. Paul has held a larger place than Barnabas in the gratitude of the church, it is not due to superiority of rank or office, but to the ascendancy of his personal gifts, and a larger measure of the Spirit of Christ. Had the number of Apostles been definitely restricted, the claims of those interlopers, called false Apostles (see 2 Cor. xi. 13), would have been self-condemned.

Though it was necessary that an Apostle should have seen the risen Lord, and thus have been a witness of the resurrection, yet it does not follow that the actual call to the Apostolate should come from an outward personal communication with our Lord. With Matthias it was not so. He received his commission by the Spirit acting through the medium of the church. Even St. Paul seems to have been invested with his office in the same way. His conversion indeed in some sense may be said to have been his call to the Apostolate. But after his conversion, "without conferring with flesh and blood," he went into Arabia, and his investiture with office took place afterwards at Corinth (Acts xiii. 2). It was then at length that St. Paul, together with Barnabas, was set apart by the Spirit acting through the church as a medium for the work to which God had destined him. Up to this point in St. Luke's history, both (Paul and Barnabas) are alike called only "prophets"; from this point onwards they are called Apostles. The twelve were primarily the Apostles of the circumcision (Matthias taking the place of Judas); they were the representatives of the twelve tribes (Rev. xxi. 14). Matthew xix. 27, 28.

In the figurative language of the book of Revelation the typical number still remains. The extension of the church to the Gentiles was accompanied by an extension of the Apostolate. How far this extension was carried is a question, but, in the cases of Paul and Barnabas, the original number was broken in upon. The imagery of Revelation is Jewish. The church is now Jerusalem; the elect are sealed from the twelve tribes, twelve thousand from each. It would be as unreasonable to interpret the restriction literally in one case as in the other.

"The twelve Apostles of the Lamb" in the figurative language of St. John represent the Apostolate, perhaps the whole body of Christian Pastors, as the elect of the twelve tribes represent the elect of Christendom. Truly yours,
Mount Forest. Wm. BRYAN.

The soul is a soil which requires to be dug and stirred deeply, otherwise nothing will grow in it but weeds.

"Are all Apostles?"

Without direct mention of my brief answer to the query "Are there thirteen Apostles?" Mr. Bevan, in this issue of THE CANADIAN EVANGELIST, evidently aims at my remarks, although he seeks to refute the views of the celebrated theologian Schaff, which are, fortunately, in harmony with mine upon this subject. I say *fortunately*, for in Mr. B.'s last article on confirmation, he arrays Schaff's words on a "new and most important branch of theological science" that has sprung up against my quotations from some of the most eminent theologians that have ever written; and that to quote them against Mr. Bevan's modern theology, in which he finds the Episcopal order of confirmation in Heb. vi. 2, is "like attacking a modern ironclad with a bow and arrow." Now this modern theologian is in the same boat with his humble servant. These are his words: "The Apostles were at first twelve in number, Judas being one. Was this limit strictly observed, St. Paul taking the place of Judas? So far is this theory carried by some, that Schaff holds that the election of Matthias was a hasty and mistaken act, God afterwards substituting Paul in his place."

The question at issue is not of very much consequence, as it does not involve any sectarian doctrine, set aside any Christian ordinance, or give any pretext for priestcraft, unless by the words "Christian pastors" used in the latter part of his communication; Mr. Bevan means not only what he has asserted in previous articles that modern Episcopalian bishops have the same power as the Apostles had, but that they are apostles.

Now for a few arrows from the bow of obsolete exegeses.

First, from P. Schaff's translation of Lange: "The call of twelve Apostles, indicating a definite and fixed number, shows that in its ultimate idea the Apostolate was one, and that each individual called and sent by the Lord possessed the power and authority of the whole college of Apostles."—Matt. x. 1.

"The name *Apostle* was sometimes given to ministers of the word who were of an order inferior to the twelve, but who were sent forth on some particular service. In this sense Barnabas is called an Apostle. (Acts xiv. 14.) Andronicus and Junias may have been of note among the apostles of this inferior order. Or the meaning may be . . . that they were highly esteemed by the Apostles."—Macknight on Rom. xvi. 7.

"Who are of note among the Apostles." "It does not mean that they were Apostles, as has been sometimes supposed. For there is no account of their having been appointed as such. . . . All that the expression fairly implies is that they were known to the other Apostles; that they were regarded by them as worthy of their affection and confidence."—Barnes on Rom. xvi. 7.

"Why supersaturate the world with conjectures on matters which have no ground of evidence to stand upon? As whether Andronicus and Junia

were man and wife; whether Junia was not Julia, or if she was a woman at all; whether they were claimed by Paul as of kin to himself, because Israelites, or because of nearer affinity; whether they were of note among the Apostles because they were converted before Paul, they might have been of the seventy disciples."—Chalmers on Rom. xvi. 7.

I need not add anything in answer to this passage which is made so prominent in Mr. Bevan's theory, which would appear to be rather vulnerable though he is in the "ironclad" of modern criticism.

The only reason I have for this response to the paper before me is to show our readers the difference of opinion between some prominent critics and Mr. Bevan; that they may know that I am not alone in the views expressed in Critics Corner, though I had not, when I wrote, consulted one of them, not even our correspondent's modern theologian, Schaff.

All the professed proofs given of the sending out by Christ of more than twelve Apostles are susceptible of refutation, but we conclude by the following quotation from a safe writer:—

"The word *Apostle*, unless connected with some other word, as in the phrase messengers (*apostolos*) of the churches is very rarely applied in the New Testament to any other than the original messengers of Jesus Christ. The word has a fixed meaning from which we should not depart without special reason."

And Theophylact's claim for the definite twelve "*Kata ton arithmon ton dodeka phuton*," according to the number of the twelve tribes.

E. SHEPPARD.

Sham.

What is really sham? How shall we give a true definition to it? The learned give it "false pretence, counterfeit, deception." Of all the depravity in human nature, sham is the most baneful trait. It might be truly said that it is the germ from which all other evils spring. Though sham is so conspicuous in its nature, yet it turns and shifts every way if possible to keep itself out of sight. Its strength and success consist in its secrecy; nevertheless it is so strenuous in its efforts that no human being was ever altogether exempted from its snares.

It is a happy thought that there are many among the human family who have observed the vileness of sham, and are now fighting hard against any signs of its stratagems; and who do not in any shape give it quarters.

But there are many other human beings who make sham their chief stay and staff; who have made themselves so familiar with it that they don't see any other way to live but in its domain. The deluded captive of sham has a hard struggle, often, as he knows well himself, in the concealing of his deceptions; and fancying that no one observes, though all intelligent persons see, that the concealment is but a rank stop in his own degradation. The victim of sham is in a sense a despicable being, in making sham the semblance of his strength, and airing himself as

if he were some great one—oh! the deformity that sham creates. It deprives its victim of mental-soundness, of independency, of manliness and of all nobleness, and makes him altogether a slave under the control of imitation; yes, an imitator of some greatness—but worse than all is the influence produced on the rising generation. Children are great discerners; if any deception is indulged in by the parents, how quickly the children learn and practice the same. No wonder though this world is so full of deception, pretences and counterfeits.

O, ye who observe rectitude, keep your sword at all times ready and in good edge to despatch anything about you bearing any semblance to dissimulation or deception! B.

Sympathy.

How seldom do we stop in the rush and whirl of life to realize the full meaning of this word! We express our sympathy for our fellow-being by thought, word or action, and, in the expression of this sympathy, should not overlook any, whether child or adult, for all need it in some way. The world at large has fallen into the habit of seeing and considering matters from a dollar-and-cent standpoint.

Practice brotherly love with those that are easily offended. If you see a member at fault, go and speak kindly to him about it instead of tolling every other member of the fault.

The well-to-do needs sympathy as much as the needy, for each one has his duties, temptations, affections and trials, and we should feel for each other in twenty ways that have nothing to do with the workshop or pay-office.

Sympathy for each other is needed between the husband and wife, each entering into the joys or disappointments of the other. A lack of this will cause an estrangement that is apt to be life-long.

Children have their difficulties, and a smile or kind word will bring sunshine to their sky. In training children, have enough compassion to distinguish whether the child's action is done through ignorance or disobedience.

Remember the new family that has moved into your midst and make them feel at home among you.

The young man that lacks moral courage, the one that feels he must do as the Romans do when among the Romans, must be looked after and helped to do the right.

Let us cultivate more sympathy for our fellow-men and thus follow the steps of our blessed Teacher.—E. A. Knibb.

For every progress in strenuous work for God there must have been a slaying of the selfishness which urges us to work in our own strength and for our own sake.—F. D. Huntington.

Ho that is habituated to deceptions and artificialities in trifles, will try in vain to be true in matters of importance: for truth is a thing of habit, rather than of will. You cannot in any given case, by any sudden and single effort, will to be true, if the habit of your life has been insincere.—F. W. Robertson.