


No. 303



**THE
APOSTOLIC
OFFICE**

PUBLISHED BY
HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE
LAMONI, IOWA
1908

www.LatterDayTruth.org

303 THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE

BY PAUL M. HANSON

ABOUT nineteen hundred years ago a child was born in Bethlehem of Judea who, when he grew older, claimed to be the Son of God. Jesus was the child. He was the Messiah long foretold in song and prophecy. He came doing the will of God—from heaven he came “sent of God.” The church he founded (for does not the New Testament give a history of his church?) was well organized, and the glorious gospel he preached strikes the human soul with the splendor of the noon-day sun.

We read of various officers in the church who composed Christ’s ministry, and prominent among them were men called apostles. The following lines are devoted especially to the apostles and the office in the church they occupied.

THE CALLING OF THE APOSTLES.

When it was day, he [Jesus] called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles; Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor—Luke 6: 13-16.

They were named “apostles” after being chosen. This society of twelve men was typified, indeed, in the Mosaic polity. The “seventy” Jesus sent forth were also prefigured in the Mosaic institution, as were the elders and deacons of Christ’s church. (Read Joshua 4: 4, 5; Numbers 11: 16, 17; Deuteronomy 32: 7; 2 Chronicles 35: 14, 15.)

In common usage the word “apostle” is sometimes applied to one sent forth to execute important business; so we hear of apostles of infidelity and of socialism. The “twelve” referred to, however, were named “apostles” and occupied, though in the church, a distinct office from others “sent” to do

work for the Lord. I wish, therefore, when using the term "apostle" to be understood as referring to a man holding the apostolic office—the same that the "twelve" held. Philip, a servant of the Lord, was not an apostle though he was "one sent." He was an "evangelist." (See Acts 21:8.) The "seventy" of Luke (see 10:1) were apostles in the sense of those "sent," but they did not possess the office and dignity of the "twelve" or Jesus would have appointed all "seventies" or all "apostles"—eighty-two seventies or eighty-two apostles; but he "chose twelve whom also he named apostles."

QUALIFICATIONS OF AN APOSTLE.

It has been thought that the twelve apostles were to be only "witnesses" to the resurrection of Christ and, therefore, seeing the Lord was an essential qualification to the apostleship, Paul says, "Am I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye my work in the Lord?"—1 Corinthians 9:1.

But one should not gather from it that Paul says, "Am I not an apostle because I have seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" Paul here asks four questions, one like unto another, and if he was an apostle because he had "seen Christ," he was an apostle because the Corinthians were his "work in the Lord"; and the conclusion is, if the Corinthians had not been his "work in the Lord," he would not have been an apostle. We can not admit such a conclusion. Paul did not base his apostleship on what his corporeal eye had seen, for he said, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."—1 Corinthians 12:3.

The apostles were executive officers as well as witnesses. The following is adduced as evidence:

And he [Christ] gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the

perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.—Ephesians 4: 11–14.

The apostles, together with the other officers, were given for the “perfecting of the saints”; for the “work of the ministry”; for the “edifying of the body of Christ”; “till we all come in the unity of the faith”; and that we “henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine.” In other words, to keep hell’s artillery and men’s false theology from battering or leading away the church of God from truth, which alone can save.

It was not absolutely necessary that one should see the marred body of Christ, after his resurrection, to entitle one to the apostleship. The view is here submitted for thoughtful reflection that Paul saw “Jesus Christ our Lord” in vision. Jesus, forty days after his passion, ascended “into heaven,” and Peter speaking of him says,

Whom the heaven must receive [hold] until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.—Acts 3: 21.

Since Paul did not see Christ until after his ascension “into heaven” and Christ was to be “received” or retained in heaven “until the restitution of all things” spoken of by the prophets, could Paul have seen Jesus personally, in the flesh?

But, if Christ did appear to Paul in his real resurrected state subsequently to the “forty days” after his passion, can not he appear to other men as well and thus qualify them for the high and holy calling of an apostle? Otherwise, we limit his power to whom “all power in heaven and in earth is given.”

To see Christ after his resurrection was not an indispensable qualification to the apostleship. The "twelve" men Jesus called to his ministry were "apostles" before Christ was resurrected and were "apostles" even before his death; for we read, "Now, the names of the twelve apostles are these."—Matthew 10:2. This fact, then, proves that men could be apostles without seeing Christ in his resurrected state. Was not Judas an apostle, and did he see Christ in his resurrected state?

The apostles, both before Christ's death and after his resurrection, held their offices by virtue of a call from God: "And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles."—Luke 6:13.

After his resurrection Jesus said to Paul:

I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee.—Acts 26:16.

Paul, in his epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and to Timothy, declared he was "called to be an apostle," "an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God," "an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God," and nowhere does he base his right to the apostleship on his having seen Christ after he rose from the dead. Since Jesus Christ is the "same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever" (Hebrews 13:8), can he not now "appear" unto men "for this purpose," to make of them ministers and witnesses of things which he shall reveal?

Must an apostle have seen Christ in order to be a "witness" that he lives? If so, every other officer in God's church should see Christ before they say he lives and is our redeemer. The "comforter, which is the Holy Ghost" was to be given by God to "guide into all truth." "No man can say that Jesus is the

Lord, but by the Holy Ghost," One can then know by the Holy Ghost that Jesus is the Lord. When one knows that Jesus is the Lord, whether apostle or elder, he is competent to be a witness, even a special witness, to that fact. Jesus said to his apostles:

But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.—Acts 1: 8.

When Paul explicated the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead (1 Corinthians 15) much of his exposition was based on what was revealed; not on knowledge acquired by the natural eye. Apostles could testify and bear witness of Christ without seeing him, the same as Paul could unfold the doctrine of the resurrection and testify of its truthfulness without seeing the dead come forth from their graves.

Paul says that Christ after his resurrection, was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.—1 Corinthians 15: 5-8.

Here Paul says Christ was seen by Cephas, the twelve, by "five hundred brethren at once," James, and himself. If from this we conclude that no one can be an apostle without seeing Christ because those apostles saw him we should conclude that there can be no brethren now without seeing the Lord because those "five hundred brethren" saw him.

The call of God together with the reception of the Holy Ghost qualified men for the apostleship. The apostles of old, both before Christ's death and after, were apostles because God set them in the church as apostles. Who will say that men shall not now be made apostles "by the will of God," or that a call of God together with the reception of the Holy Ghost is

not a safe rock upon which may be placed the feet of an apostle—whether in former or in latter days?

THE APOSTLES HELD AN OFFICE.

It seems well here to make clear the fact that the apostles held an office. Judas, the betrayer of Christ, held the apostleship, as is evident from his call by Christ and the following words:

And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen. That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place.—Acts 1: 24, 25.

Peter, in speaking of the transgression of Judas, says:

For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and, his bishopric [marginal rendering is "office"] let another take.—Acts 1: 20.

The quotation in Psalms referred to, reads, "Let his days be few; and let another take his office."—109: 8. Paul says in Romans 11: 13: "Inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office." Therefore, there was established, with the consent of the divine mind (which could not err) the office of an apostle in the church of which Christ was the head and Peter and Paul and others were members.

Judas held the apostleship, for he "fell" from it, and Paul magnified his "office." The oracles of God do, then, show that such an office existed in the church nineteen hundred years ago. In the precincts of Calvary is to be found the pattern for the church in all ages.

SHOULD WE HAVE APOSTLES NOW?

Why should we not have apostles now? There is nothing in the Bible to forbid the welcome thought;

they are needed. If an elder is now doing and can do the work once done by the apostles (part of which was preaching the gospel and baptizing, see Mark 16: 15, 16), why can not the elders do the works once done by the deacons and evangelists and the other officers? Why? "I speak as to wise men."

Man as a babe is like the babes of creation; he has two eyes, two feet, one head, etc. Now, if the first babe of creation had never been overtaken by death it would have two eyes, two feet, one head, etc.,—the exact counterpart of man to-day. Man is now as he was formed by God in the beginning. Unchangeability is marked on the works of God. Jesus said, "I will build my church."—Matthew 16: 18. We are informed how it was built and likened as then built (with apostles) to a human body. (See 1 Corinthians 12: 12-28.) If death or apostasy has not overtaken the church it is evident as light that it will not have changed in one point. If an apostasy has occurred, it is just as clear that the church should be patterned after the original one as that man is now made like as in the beginning. We do not read that scaffolding was made of the apostles and when the church was completed the apostles were torn away. We find recorded that God set them "in the church" (1 Corinthians 12: 28), not on the outside.

So long as apostolic duties have not ceased, just that long apostles are needed. That proposition is set down on a parallel with the following: So long as there are men to believe that long the gospel is needed. Deacons and elders are in the church now evidently because there are duties for them to perform. Are an elder's duties now different from the duties of the elders of the Bible? No. Should a deacon perform duties higher or of less consequence than his predecessors of Bible times? No. Then who are performing the apostolic duties, or are they neglected? If the elders and deacons of to-day can

do the works allotted to the apostles, perfect the saints, carry on the work of the ministry, edify the body of Christ, and keep the church from being blown to pieces by false doctrines, why could not the inspired elders and deacons of old do the same—why had the church apostles besides? Reader, ponder in your mind these stupendous questions.

One office in the church does not need perpetuating more than any other office, for they are all God-appointed, not humanly devised. If all the offices are not to be retained it would be more consistent with our understanding of order to have the lesser (not the greater) offices discarded first. We can better do away with certain municipal offices than with high federal offices. We disagree with the doing away of any office in the church of God. God would not squander his time and perplex his people by having an office in his church not to be filled. Since revelation certifies the apostolic office was set in the church, let revelation from God and that alone declare it has been abrogated.

Since God set in the church apostles, evangelists, teachers, deacons, etc., by what rule of interpretation is one or more offices to be blotted out and one or more retained? If apostolic duties exist now, apostles should execute them. If the office of an apostle was not to be perpetuated, the offices of evangelist and deacon were not to be continued; for it is just as clear that God set apostles as that he set the other offices in the church. The claim that the office of an apostle was not to be continued in the church is not true, for the principle couched in it, when logically reduced, strikes at every office in the church. We contend for the "faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

If the church we read of in the Bible had continued along the ages unchanged to our day, a history of the church now would be like the history of the

church then, for it would be the same church; and to be the same church it must not be lacking apostles any more than it must be lacking its doctrine of faith in God. If Christianity taught nineteen hundred years ago was not like what now professes to be Christianity, then what now professes to be Christianity is not Christianity. If the church had a perfect organization in Paul's day (and it surely had, for God meets in his plan of salvation every necessity and indulges in no work of supererogation), the church now should have a like organization, or it is not perfect in organization. There appears to be no room for doubting that a church like the church of the Bible in organization, faith, doctrine, and practice is, in fact, the church of Jesus Christ; for if it is like (exactly corresponding to) that church, it is the thing itself.

THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE WAS CONTINUED IN THE CHURCH.

As when a governor dies he does not take the governorship from the State, so when an apostle is removed from his office by death or transgression the office remains. This the record clearly shows. There was a succession of apostles. The apostles prayed to the Lord to make known who should take part of the "ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell," and they gave "forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." (Acts 1:26.) If the apostolic office was not to be perpetuated after the death of the twelve apostles, Judas should have had no successor. Here was the time for the "eleven apostles" to make known to all future generations whether the apostolic office should be continued in the church. How did they decide? They chose Matthias and he was numbered with them. One is chosen and again there are twelve apostles. Why

did Judas have a successor if there were to be no successors? Should a man who lost his office by transgression, betraying his blessed Lord, have a successor and his brethren who died (many of them by sanguinary means, but all, in the bosom of the true faith) have no successors? If so, one must sin to have an office in the church of God perpetuated.

No doubt the action of the eleven apostles in choosing Matthias was smiled upon by God; no doubt they acted with divine authority, for Jesus had appeared to them "after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." (Acts 1:3.) This rupture in the "twelve" (Judas' fall) was one of the "things pertaining to the kingdom of God" and David had said, "Let another take his office."

Though the apostles selected Matthias, who had "complicated with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them" (Acts 1:21), yet that fact does not prove one could not be an apostle without being with Christ from the beginning, for *Paul* was not with him all through his ministry "from the baptism of John to that day that he was taken up," and yet he was "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." (2 Corinthians 11:5.)

The kingdom of God, or church, had been set up prior to the choosing of Matthias (read Matthew 11:12; 18:17; 23:13; 12:28); therefore, the apostles showed by their action that they favored the continuance of the apostolic office in the church.

Is it safe to conclude that because we do not know who succeeded each of the other apostles, they had therefore no successors? If so, because we can not find who succeeded Philip the evangelist, or the elders of Ephesus, or the seven so-called deacons, we should conclude they had no successors. We defend the presence of evangelists, elders, and deacons in

the church now because we believe they were in the church founded by Christ. Why should we not defend apostles now when we find there were apostles in the church during all that period of time which the New Testament covers in its history of the church?

We read in Acts 13:1-3 of the call by the Holy Ghost of Barnabas and Saul and of their ordination. In the following chapter we read: "Which when the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard of, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people." Barnabas is here made equal to Paul in office. Now, neither Paul nor Barnabas was of the "twelve" Jesus called in the beginning of his ministry; so we have now to admit either that Paul and Barnabas were successors to two of the "twelve" or there were fourteen apostles at one time. Either admission will prove the perpetuity of the office and the continuance in the church of apostles.

Matthew 19:28 and Revelation 21:14 have been quoted by some writers as applying against all apostles not of the "twelve" Jesus called as recorded in Luke, chapter 6. If one wishes to have the first "twelve" sit on the "twelve thrones" (but Judas was one of the first "twelve") or inscribed on the "twelve foundations," very well; the others will remain apostles still. If those passages mean that there were no God-sent apostles after the first "twelve," Paul with all his claims to the apostleship must be denounced and Barnabas must be rejected. If there were to be only twelve apostles, why did the church recognize men as apostles who were not of the first "twelve"? Why did they recognize such men as Paul and Barnabas as apostles and fall upon Paul's neck with tears if he was making a false claim all the time?

THE APOSTLES WERE FALLIBLE.

Power was given to the apostles to heal the sick,

i. e., the Lord through them would restore the sick to health. But that power was given to the "seventy" (Luke 10:9); to Philip, not an apostle (Acts 8:13); and to the elders (James 5:14). Power was not committed to apostles nor to any of the other officers to heal whomsoever they desired. The apostles disclaimed such prerogative and attributed it to God. Peter said:

Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk. . . . His [Christ's] name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong.—Acts 3:12-16.

Had the power to heal been resident in the apostles, Paul no doubt would have healed Timothy; would not have left Trophimus at Miletum sick, and would have called upon some of his fellow apostles to remove the "thorn" in his own flesh.

The apostles did not claim infallibility for themselves. The Lord's work is perfect, and he is infallible. If the apostles were infallible Paul ought not to have said, "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."—Galatians 2:11.

APOSTLES WERE NOT THE "FOUNDATION" OF THE CHURCH.

An error has lodged in the minds of some believers in the Bible that the apostles were the foundation of the Christian church. This conclusion has been arrived at from reading, or rather from *glancing* at the words of Paul to the Ephesians, viz.:

Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.—Ephesians 2:19, 20.

Is it credible that Peter, who cursed and swore and denied the Lord, together with eleven other fallible

men, should be the foundation of God's church? Apostles were of the church and "in the church." The church (in which were apostles) was to rest on a "rock." (See Matthew 16:18.) The apostles were not the foundation, for "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Corinthians 3:11.) He is the "sure foundation." (Isaiah 28:16.) From the above it is clear that the "saints" were built upon Christ, for Paul, an apostle, says Christ is the foundation. The saints were built upon the same foundation as were the apostles and prophets and that foundation was Christ.

If apostles are the foundation of the church, all, or nearly all churches have no foundation, for they have no apostles; only the writings of a few. It is, then, an egregious error that the twelve apostles were the foundation of the church and that, therefore, no more apostles are needed. If, however, the apostles were the twelve pillars which supported the church, it is obvious that as one pillar was taken out another should take its place, or there would soon be no "pillars." Apostles must build upon the "sure foundation as well as other men, for Barnabas and Paul said, "We are also men of like passions with you."—Acts 14:15.

PETER WAS NOT THE "ROCK" UPON WHICH THE CHURCH WAS BUILT.

When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.—Matthew 16: 13-18.

In Luke 6: 47, 48 Jesus says:

Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like. He is like a man which built a house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock.

The Lord here speaks of a "house" a "foundation," and a "rock." Paul speaks of the "house of God, which is the church of the living God." (1 Timothy 3: 15.) Christ is the "sure foundation." (Isaiah 28: 16.) Peter was not the "rock" upon which the foundation of the church was to rest, for then Christ, the Lord of heaven and earth, would be resting on man. Christ built upon the "rock" of truth revealed by God to him. He "received a commandment, what he should say, and what he should speak" and from that "rock" he never removed his feet. Upon that "rock" (that which came from God) Christ declared he would build his church "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Christ is the "foundation" between the "rock" and the "church." Christ did not say, "Thou art Peter, and upon thee I will build my church." He did not say, "upon myself I will build my church." He said to Peter, "flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven," and "upon this rock" "I will build my church." Against a church so built the gates of hell can never, never prevail; the cry of "victory" will be heard at last, the kingdom will be delivered to the Father. Our earnest concern should be, Are we in that church?

**CHRIST'S CHURCH DID NOT COME DOWN THROUGH
THE AGES UNCHANGED.**

If the church established by Christ came through the ages, unchanged till now, the church now would have men acting in the apostolic office. The church of Rome claims an unbroken succession to the church established by Christ, but where are Rome's

apostles? We read of her archbishops, cardinals, monks and friars, but no apostles. The Romish church supplanted, not succeeded, the true church.

Isaiah 24:1-6; 60:2; Daniel 7:21-25; Amos 8:11, 12; Acts 20:28-31; 2 Thessalonians 2:3-7; Revelation 12:1-6; 13:5-8 portray an awful apostasy. God takes no part in iniquities, crimes, or abominations. Holiness, justice, and truth radiate from his throne for ever. When his church drifted from the "rock" (what he revealed) into apostasy, and practiced such enormities as the worship of images, infallibility of popes, indulgences, extermination of heretics, courts of inquisition, and changed the organization of the church, its doctrines and usages, the priesthood, i. e., the right to act for God, could not be retained, for it was given for the building up of the kingdom of God. The apostles received the priesthood personally from Christ and they ordained men to various offices in the church. Without the priesthood no man can officiate acceptably in an office of God's church. With the loss of the priesthood, therefore, the apostolic office must be vacant. How long must it be vacant? Until the priesthood is restored. When it is restored, how beautiful upon the mountains will be the feet of God's messengers—sent of God!

THE REFORMATION.

Did the famous reformers reinstate the apostolic office? No. They could not give what they did not have. If any of these reformers held authority, it was derived from the church they called "mother of harlots," "abomination of the earth," or from God by revelation or an angel. They made no claim to priesthood by virtue of revelation or angelic ministrations; therefore, if they possessed authority it was derived from the church they forsook. The church of Rome could revoke, if she chose, what

authority she conferred. But even if the reformers possessed all the authority the Romish church had conferred, would that authority be pure—can a corrupt stream send forth sweet water? If we say, no, then Luther, who was a monk of the Augustinian order, Calvin, an apostate from the mother church, Henry VIII, once “defender of the faith” (Roman Catholic), but latterly a dissenter, John Wesley, a member of the Church of England, which sprang from the Catholic Church, and other notable reformers had not the authority to confer the apostleship upon any one. Could they ordain men to any office in the church? Could they lawfully organize churches when the only authority they had (if they had any) came from Rome? Can a society formed without God’s command and direction be his church? If it be so formed, in what sense is Christ the builder of it?

The reformers denied revelation and did not pretend to angelic ministration. If men, whether elders, deacons, evangelists, or apostles, have the right to act for God now, they obtained such right through the agency of an angel, by revelation, or it came down from the apostles by a regular set of successors abstract from the Roman Catholic Church; but it is impossible to prove such a succession. It will not do for elders, teachers, and deacons, or other church dignitaries to appropriate to themselves the injunction: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark 16: 15), for that was given to the “eleven” apostles. If that commission authorizes anyone now to act in an office it authorizes them to act in the apostolic office, for it was given to apostles and to them only. It would seem more consistent for an apostle to arise now basing his authority on that commission than for an elder, a teacher, or a deacon to do so.

RESTORATION OF THE LORD'S WORK FORETOLD.

The priesthood was lost in the corruptions of the Middle Ages and until it is restored no man can act in the apostolic office or any other office of the church. The following references point to a restoration of the Lord's work in the last days: Revelation 12:6; 14:6, 7; Matthew 20:1-16; 24:14; Isaiah 11:10, 12; Malachi 3:1-6.

If the church set up by Christ was to be found within the confines of the church of Rome the reformers ought never to have left her. If it existed elsewhere their duty was to unite with it; but the church of God was not on earth. If it was, why did the reformers organize other churches? Oh, why?

Since the church was overtaken by apostasy and the gospel in its purity, unembellished by worldly pomp and ostentation, with all its gifts, powers, and blessings, with the priesthood, faded from human sight, it will require, as in the days of John the Baptist and of Christ, divine revelation, or angelic ministration, to reinstate the ancient order of things. Human wisdom alone can not restore the order of the primitive church. Christendom in her divided state testifies to this.

Revelation declares, "Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things."—Matthew 17:11. Is not the apostolic office—lost somewhere between Christ's time and now—one of the "things" which needs restoring? When Jesus spoke of "Elias," "then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist." (Verse 13.)

Listen to John the Revelator:

And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come.—Revelation 14:6, 7.

Such action on the part of an angel makes it certain that just prior to his advent God's church was not on earth, for the officers of God's church would not neglect the preaching of the gospel. If the gospel was on earth, why did the angel come "having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth"? There is but one gospel; men and angels must not preach any other. Therefore, the angel will bring the gospel preached nineteen hundred years ago by Christ and his apostles. No doubt with the restoration of the gospel there will come the restoration of the priesthood, i. e., the right to preach it.

What is lost that God confers only he can restore. God placed the apostolic office in the church and conferred the priesthood upon men; the priesthood was lost and, therefore, prevents the occupancy of the office until the priesthood is restored. Before the apostasy God called his ministry and they were ordained by some one who held authority (otherwise those who ordained were practitioners of an empty form); after the apostasy men should, in the same manner, enter the ministry of God. Where did those men get their authority who ordained others to the ministry before the apostasy? Where did those men get their authority who now ordain their fellow men to clerical offices? The former ones obtained their authority from Christ—he spoke to them, "ordained" them. (See Mark 3:14.) The latter received their authority from the Church of Rome, from an angelic being, by revelation, or else they have none. If one says, "Bro. Jones" ordained him, the next thing to do is to find out who ordained "Bro. Jones"; then trace the authority of his predecessors until the fountain of God is reached, or those claiming authority are "weighed in the balance and found wanting."

"By what authority doest thou these things?" is a

question that should be propounded not only to apostles, but also to elders, teachers, deacons, and evangelists.

PRIESTHOOD RESTORED.

The priesthood being lost, God must restore it. This he has done. Revelation foretold such an action; history now records it. On Tuesday, April 6, 1830, there was organized in Fayette, Seneca County, New York, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. The priesthood of the Church is based upon authority conferred upon men who had to do with its founding. Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery have left their record of the commitment of the priesthood to them, in the following words. The former says:

We still continued the work of translation, when in the ensuing month (May, eighteen hundred and twenty-nine) we on a certain day went into the woods to pray and inquire of the Lord respecting baptism for the remission of sins, as we found mentioned in the translation of the plates. While we were thus employed, praying, and calling upon the Lord, a messenger from heaven descended in a cloud of light, and having laid his hands upon us, he ordained us, saying unto us, "Upon you, my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah, I confer the priesthood of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion, for the remission of sins; and this shall never be taken again from the earth, until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness." He said this Aaronic priesthood had not the power of laying on of hands, for the gift of the Holy Ghost, but that this should be conferred on us hereafter; and he commanded us to go and be baptized, and gave us directions that I should baptize Oliver Cowdery, and afterwards that he should baptize me. . . .

The messenger who visited us on this occasion, and conferred this priesthood upon us, said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist, in the New Testament, and that he acted under the direction of Peter, James, and John, who held the keys of the priesthood of Melchisedec, which priesthood he said should in due time be conferred on us—and that I should be called the first elder, and he the second. It was on the fifteenth day of May, eighteen hundred and twenty-nine,

that we were baptized and ordained under the hand of the messenger.

Immediately upon our coming up out of the water, after we had been baptized, we experienced great and glorious blessings from our heavenly Father. No sooner had I baptized Oliver Cowdery than the Holy Ghost fell upon him and he stood up and prophesied many things which should shortly come to pass. And again, so soon as I had been baptized by him, I also had the spirit of prophecy, when, standing up, I prophesied concerning the rise of the Church, and many other things connected with the Church, and this generation of the children of men. We were filled with the Holy Ghost, and rejoiced in the God of our salvation.—Church History, L. D. S., vol. 1, pp. 34-36.

Oliver Cowdery says:

This was not long desired before it was realized. The Lord, who is rich in mercy, and ever willing to answer the consistent prayer of the humble, after we had called upon him in a fervent manner, aside from the abodes of men, condescended to manifest to us his will. On a sudden, as from the midst of eternity, the voice of the Redeemer spake peace to us, while the veil was parted and the angel of God came down clothed with glory, and delivered the anxiously looked for message, and the keys of the gospel of repentance! What joy! what wonder! what amazement! While the world was racked and distracted—while millions were groping as the blind for the wall, and while all men were resting upon uncertainty, as a general mass, our eyes beheld—our ears heard! As in the “blaze of day”; yes, more—above the glitter of the May sunbeam, which then shed its brilliancy over the face of nature! Then his voice, though mild, pierced to the center, and his words, “I am thy fellow servant,” dispelled every fear. We listened—we gazed—we admired! ’Twas the voice of the angel from glory—’twas a message from the Most High! and as we heard we rejoiced, while his love enkindled upon our souls, and we were rapt in the vision of the Almighty! Where was room for doubt? Nowhere! uncertainty had fled, doubt had sunk, no more to rise, while fiction and deception had fled for ever!

But, dear brother, think, further think for a moment, what joy filled our hearts and with what surprise we must have bowed, (for who would not have bowed the knee for such a blessing?) when we received under his hand the holy priesthood, as he said, “Upon you my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah, I confer this priesthood and this authority, which shall remain upon earth, that the sons of Levi may yet offer an offering unto the Lord in righteousness!”

I shall not attempt to paint to you the feelings of this heart, nor the majestic beauty and glory which surrounded us on that

occasion; but you will believe me when I say, that earth, nor men, with the eloquence of time, can not begin to clothe language in as interesting and sublime a manner as this holy personage. No; nor has this earth power to give the joy, to bestow the peace, or comprehend the wisdom which was contained in each sentence as they were delivered by the power of the Holy Spirit! Man may deceive his fellow man; deception may follow deception, and the children of the wicked one may have power to seduce the foolish and untaught, till naught but fiction feeds the many, and the fruit of falsehood carries in its current the giddy to the grave; but one touch with the finger of his love, yes, one ray of glory from the upper world, or one word from the mouth of the Savior, from the bosom of eternity, strikes it all into insignificance, and blots it for ever from the mind! The assurance that we were in the presence of an angel; the certainty that we heard the voice of Jesus, and the truth unsullied as it flowed from a pure personage, dictated by the will of God, is to me, past description, and I shall ever look upon this expression of the Savior's goodness with wonder and thanksgiving while I am permitted to tarry, and in those mansions where perfection dwells and sin never comes, I hope to adore in that day which shall never cease.—Church History, L. D. S., vol. 1, pp. 37-39.

Malachi says:

Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years. And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts. For I am the Lord, I change not.—3: 1-6.

Upon examination it will be found that this prophecy refers to the second coming of Christ, for Jesus did not, nineteen hundred years ago, "suddenly come to his temple." He came as a "babe" in

the "city of David"; nor can these quotations: "Who may abide the day of his coming?" "Who shall stand when he appeareth?" "Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord," and "I will come near to you to judgment," be applied to his first coming. Therefore, this "messenger" ("Elias," or restorer) was to make his appearance just prior to the Lord "coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

On pages 60 and 61 of the Church History, Joseph says:

We now became anxious to have that promise realized to us, which the angel that conferred upon us the Aaronic priesthood had given us; viz., that provided we continued faithful we should also have the Melchisedec priesthood, which holds the authority of the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. We had for some time made this matter a subject of humble prayer, and at length we got together in the chamber of Mr. Whitmer's house in order more particularly to seek of the Lord what we now so earnestly desired: and here to our unspeakable satisfaction did we realize the truth of the Savior's promise: "Ask, and you shall receive, seek, and you shall find, knock, and it shall be opened unto you"; for we had not long been engaged in solemn and fervent prayer when the word of the Lord came unto us in the chamber, commanding us that I should ordain Oliver Cowdery to be an elder in the Church of Jesus Christ, and that he also should ordain me to the same office, and then to ordain others as it should be made known unto us, from time to time: we were, however, commanded to defer this our ordination until such times as it should be practicable to have our brethren, who had been and who should be baptized, assembled together, when we must have their sanction to our thus proceeding to ordain each other, and have them decide by vote whether they were willing to accept us as spiritual teachers, or not, when also we were commanded to bless bread and break it with them, and to take wine, bless it, and drink it with them, afterward proceed to ordain each other according to commandment, then call out such men as the Spirit should dictate, and ordain them, and then attend to the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost upon all those whom we had previously baptized; doing all things in the name of the Lord.

It will be noted that Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery did not attempt to force themselves as

spiritual leaders upon the people. It was for the people to receive or reject these men. The same principle is found in the preaching of the gospel; it should not be forced upon but offered to the world.

Some may doubt the bestowment of the priesthood, by God, upon men in this our age; but, upon reflection, we are led to ask, who else could do it?

At this time (1829) was received a revelation providing for the choosing of twelve apostles. The names of the twelve chosen are:

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Lyman E. Johnson. | 7. William E. McLellin. |
| 2. Brigham Young. | 8. John F. Boynton. |
| 3. Heber C. Kimball. | 9. Orson Pratt. |
| 4. Orson Hyde. | 10. William Smith. |
| 5. David W. Patten. | 11. Thomas B. Marsh. |
| 6. Luke Johnson. | 12. Parley P. Pratt. |

They were ordained by those in possession of the priesthood recommitted to earth by an angel. All apostles in the Church since that time have held their office by virtue of a call from God and ordination by those holding the "keys of the kingdom."

Shall the Church be condemned because Brigham Young left his high and holy calling and went after "strange doctrine"? If so, the church of nineteen hundred years ago will suffer by Judas' low and heavy fall. The Church having its headquarters at Salt Lake City is not the Church founded by command of God in 1830. Brigham Young was an apostle in the early Church, and after Joseph Smith's death in 1844 he abandoned it and made himself president over the Church now in Utah and presided over it until his death.

The Church of which he was an apostle never taught the doctrines of polygamy, blood-atonement, Adam-god, and the many other unholy principles taught by him and his coadjutors. These doctrines were taught in later years by the institution over which he presided. Had Brigham Young named the

church he organized and presided over after himself, the distinction would have prevented many in the past, and many now, from believing he presided over the Church organized in 1830; but he gave it the same name as the early church; viz., the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and as a result the public is partly excusable for believing that the Church organized in 1830, named the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and the Church which was presided over by Brigham Young are one and the same church. They are not one and the same church. The Lord called Brigham Young to the apostleship of his church; not to the presidency of a church teaching doctrines obscene and unholy.

The true successor to the original church is known as the Reorganized (which term indicates that the Church fell into disorder by the latter-day apostasy and was restored to order) Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and is presided over by Joseph Smith, son of his martyred father. Its headquarters are at Lamoni, Iowa. It has ever extolled monogamy and denounced polygamy. It teaches doctrines, and doctrines only, that are harmonious with the teachings of the Church founded in 1830, or the church established by Christ and his apostles nineteen hundred years ago. It is the same church revived in these last days.

The Lord, therefore, has his apostles now and the Church and the world their services. Reader, let not fanaticism carry you beyond reasonable bounds, nor let prejudices keep you from examining fairly the momentous claims presented for your consideration. In asking the question, "Shall the apostolic office be now defended?" we are asking a question concerning an office in the church of God—surely we ought to know what to do with the things of God.

Cape Hawke, TUNCURRY, New South Wales.

HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE, LAMONI, IOWA.

