

Gisbertus Voetius, *Politicae Ecclesiasticae* [Amsterdam, Joannes à Waesberge, 1663–1676], 3:337–338, 351–363.

337

Ministers are divided into ordinary and extraordinary. Both can be considered in a state of integrity or lapse.

In a state of integrity, if they are considered, the following questions might arise:

1. Was there any actual ministry?

338

2. If no lapse had intervened, would there have been a visible and instituted church, and indeed organically integrated; that is, would there have been any ministry in it?
3. Would that ministry have been ordinary, or extraordinary?
4. If ordinary, would it have been conferred upon someone perpetually, that is, would it never have been transferred to another unless that person ceased to exist on earth and was thus transferred and established in the state of complete beatitude?

To the first question: It could be questioned whether two people, Adam and Eve, united in an economic society, could properly be called a church, that is, a collection, multitude, spiritual society, that is, an external, visible, instituted, organically integrated church; of which he would be the minister and predecessor, and she the congregation. It is not inconsistent for the ministry to reside and be preserved in one singular person; but it seems no less contradictory to me that the people of God, a sacred flock, that is, a multitude, collection, plurality, could be preserved in one person, than for one singular bishop to be called a diocesan church (as Vult Viguerius in *Institutiones*), or one singular Pope, for example, the current Alexander VII, to be called the Catholic Church, as Bellarmine philosophizes. Although the potential power might be virtually applied, it is

certainly crude and gross to contradict many with one number, one singular, one individual. This is clear from the definition of one, which is indivisible in itself. Therefore, the safest course here is not to determine this question, either idle or curious.

To the second question: It is not inconsistent that such a thing could have been. It is almost determined in the same way about political order and magistracy.

To the third question: If it refers to an extraordinary calling made immediately by God and suggested to individual future ministers, I admit my learned ignorance of this; meanwhile, I do not deny that it could have happened this way. But if by extraordinary it refers to infallibility in the preaching of saving doctrine; certainly, I would not dare to deny this of anyone, especially one endowed with the image of God, that is, with perfect wisdom and justice. But then it would have been ordinary, no less than the image of God would have been ordinary in all and each individual at that time.

Ministers after the fall under the covenant of grace are either extraordinary or ordinary. They are either from the Old Testament or the old dispensation, or from the New Testament, or intermediate between the two. Extraordinary from the Old Testament are, 1. Patriarchs. 2. Prophets. 3. Prophetesses.

Concerning the Patriarchs of the Old Testament

Section 2: The word patriarch is ambiguous: it is attributed to certain ecclesiastical ministers under both the Old and New Testaments, and to some who are neither ordinary nor extraordinary ministers of either the Old or New Testament.

Chapter II: On Extraordinary Ministers under the New Testament: First, on the Apostles

An apostle is a minister of the New Testament endowed with infallibility in doctrine and various charisms, called immediately by Christ for the initial and universal planting, formation, and reformation of any churches.

Section 1:

In this description, the name of the described entity must first be explained. When considering this, we must examine:

1. The origin.
2. The synonymy.
3. The conjugation or manner.
4. The homonymy.
5. **Apostle** (ἀπόστολος) means one who is sent, a messenger, an ambassador, derived from ἀποστέλλω (I send). Thus, these chosen instruments for building the church of the New Testament are properly called apostles. Christ particularly chose them for this purpose, as seen in Acts 1:2, Luke 6:13, and John 6:70. He called them in Romans 1:2, sent them in John 20:21: "As the Father has sent me, I am sending you." Compare this with Matthew 28:19.

352

Section 11:

The synonyms for "apostle" in the Greek New Testament are:

1. ἀπεσταλμένος (sent), as in John 9:7, where the term Siloam, derived from the Syriac or Chaldaic word "chiloucho," is explained.
2. ἄγγελος (messenger), as in Mark 1:2, from the Hebrew מַלְאָךְ (malach), which is used to refer to ministers of the word in both the Old and New Testaments (Malachi 2:7; Revelation 2:1, 8, etc.).
3. πρέσβυς (ambassador), though this term does not appear in the New Testament as a noun, it does in the form πρεσβεία (embassy) in Luke 14:32 and 19:14, and πρεσβεύω (to act as an ambassador) in 2 Corinthians 5:20.

The Hebrew synonym is שְׁלִיחַ (shalouach) or שְׁלִיחָא (scheliach in Chaldaic form), meaning "sent," derived from the root שָׁלַח (shalach, to send). While this verbal noun does not occur in the Old Testament, it is used analogically by Talmudists and Rabbis. The same term is employed in Hebrew translations of the New Testament by Münster and Hutter.

In related languages:

- The Chaldaic, Samaritan, and Syriac dialects use שְׁלִיחָא (schelicha or schelicho).
- The Arabic term is رَسُول (rasoul) or with the definite article الرَّسُول (arrasoul), commonly used in Arabic translations of the New Testament. The same term is used in Persian.
- In Islam, Moses, Christ, and Muhammad are referred to as رَسُلُ اللَّهِ (rasoul Allah, "messengers of God"), with Muhammad specifically called الرَّسُولُ اللَّهِ (arrasoul Allah, "the Apostle of God").

Other Hebrew synonyms in the Old Testament are:

- לָחַ (lach), meaning "ambassador," in Proverbs 25:13, Isaiah 18:2, and 57:9, which is translated in Chaldaic and Syriac as שְׁגָרָא (ishgar).

Section III:

The derived terms are:

- Apostolatus (apostleship) in Romans 1:5.
- Apostolicus (apostolic) used by ecclesiastical writers, who also refer to apostolic tradition, the apostolic spirit, apostolic men, apostolic disciples, and apostolic churches. These churches were strictly called apostolic because they were directly planted by an apostle. Against heretics and schismatics, early Christians often appealed to these churches, which Tertullian referred to as the "matrices and originals of the faith" (De Praescriptione, chapter 21). Examples of such churches include those in Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, and Rome, described in chapters 5 and 6 of the same work. Additionally, Tertullian acknowledges other churches as apostolic due to their doctrinal kinship with the

aforementioned churches. This point is also discussed elsewhere (in *De Desperata Causa Papatus*) in opposition to the claims of the Roman Catholic Church.

353

Section IV:

The term "apostle" in the New Testament is applied to:

1. Our Savior Himself (Hebrews 3:1).
2. Evangelists who were sent either directly by an apostle or apostles, or by a church to other churches or individuals. For example, Epaphroditus is called the apostle of the Philippians (Philippians 2:25). Similarly, Silas and Judas, also known as Barsabbas, who were delegates of the synod to the churches in Syria (Acts 15:22, 27), could be considered apostles.
3. Ordinary ministers and even any faithful members sent by churches to handle certain matters (2 Corinthians 8:23).
4. The twelve disciples, later including Paul, who was in no way inferior to the others as he asserts against some detractors (1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Corinthians 11:5, 12:9, 11, 12). We learn that these were specifically called apostles by the Lord (Luke 6:13), and their role is distinguished from other sacred functions (1 Corinthians 12:28) as will be evident from their attributes.

In ecclesiastical writings, the term "apostle" is sometimes applied to the disciples and assistants of the apostles. For instance, Timothy is called an apostle in Photius's epitome of Philostorgius (Book 3, Chapter 2). Additionally, the title has been granted to others who lived in post-apostolic times and were notable for their gifts and contributions to the church, especially if they were the first to plant or restore a church in a certain area.

In later writings, the terms "apostle" and "apostolic" (as well as "pontiff") are frequently used to refer to bishops and patriarchs, and their attire is called "apostolic habit." Various ambassadors have also been called apostles. In the *Menologion* of the Greeks, Constantine the Great and Helena are referred to as saints and apostles. Numerous references from Latin writers could also be cited.

In secular writings, "apostles" refer to letters of dismissal sent from one judge to another if an appeal is made. If the appeal is rejected, they are called "apostoli refutatorii." If there is doubt, they are called "apostoli reverentiales." If the appeal is accepted, they are called "apostoli conventionales." Legal scholars, such as Alciatus in his work on the meaning of words (Book 4, page 246), discuss these terms.

The term also describes a type of vessel sent here and there, as mentioned by Alciatus from Demosthenes. In contemporary terms, these might be called "yachts" or "mail boats" in various languages. Suidas defines them as missions, gifts, or tributes. In Proclus's Chrestomathia, edited separately by Schott and included in Photius's Bibliotheca (Book 239), among the various types of songs are those performed when something was sent to someone. Harpocration, in his Lexicon on the Ten Orators, interprets from Demosthenes's "For Ctesiphon" that "apostles" refers to ships sent on missions and maritime expeditions.

354

Section IV:

Pollux in Onomastico Book 1, Chapter 9, Section 21, and elsewhere, mentions the term ἀπόστολος, which signifies "fleet" or "naval expedition." But leaving aside these secular uses, let's return to ecclesiastical matters, which concern us more closely. In the Liturgy of Chrysostom, included in the Greek Euchologion, page 68, the reading of the ἀπόστολος of the day is mentioned. This refers to the epistle read in the Greek liturgy, called ἀπόστολος because it is extracted from the writings or acts of the apostles. In the Western Church, this epistle, read by the subdeacon, is called the "lection" by Amalarius in De ecclesiasticis officiis, Book 2, Chapter 11. In the Greek Euchologion, page 904, readings from the apostle and gospel to be read throughout the year are called ἀποστολικός and εὐαγγέλιον. A temple dedicated to an apostle is also mentioned. In the Ethiopian Menologion, the apostle is called chawarja (derived from "to go," "to walk," "to proceed").

Section V:

Having discussed the terminology, let's now explain the description of the apostle through the following attributes, which presuppose the functions of the word and sacraments, or the ministry of the keys, which they shared with all other ministers (Matthew 16:19, Acts 6:4). However, these attributes were peculiar to them:

They were twelve in number, no more and no less, with Paul later added as a supernumerary. This is evidenced in Matthew 10:1, 2, 5; Mark 3:14 ("He appointed twelve, that they might be with him, and that he might send them out to preach"); Luke 6:13 ("He chose twelve of them, whom he also named apostles"); and John 6:70 ("Have I not chosen you, the twelve?"). When Judas Iscariot fell, Matthias was substituted in his place (Acts 1:26), restoring the number to twelve. This full number was significant in their defense of the remarkable work God performed through them (Acts 2) and as confessors (Acts 5:29, 40). Paul's inclusion is supported by Acts 9, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Corinthians 11:23, and Galatians 1:1, 12, 16.

Their names, partly given by their parents and partly by Christ, are listed in Matthew 10, Mark 3, Luke 6, and Acts 1: Simon Peter, Andrew, etc. We won't delve into the etymology and meaning of each name here. Notably, one was known by two names: Bartholomew (Matthew 10:3, Mark 3:18, Acts 1:13) who is called Nathanael in John 1:46-51 and John 21:2. Another had three names: Judas the brother of James (Luke 6:16, Acts 1:13), who is called Thaddaeus in Mark 3:18, and Lebbaeus in Matthew 10:3. There were also three pairs of cognominal names: two named Judas (Judas the brother of James and Judas Iscariot); two named James (James the son of Zebedee and James the son of Alphaeus); and two named Simon (Simon the Zealot and Simon son of Jonah, surnamed Peter by Christ in Mark 3:16 and John 21:16).

They were Israelites or Jews, as they were then called. Although many from other tribes had mixed with them (Acts 29:7, James 1:1), it is uncertain if all the apostles belonged to the tribe of Judah,.....

...and who were from other tribes, and from which tribe and family each of them came. Except that if any of Christ's relatives (who are called His brothers in Matthew 12:46) were among the apostles, their family and tribe could be questioned; and it is certain that Paul's tribe is known from Philippians 3:5.

IV. They were eyewitnesses and earwitnesses of Christ's life, teachings, and resurrection (Acts 1:3, 1 Corinthians 15:4, 9; 1 John 1:1-2) and were specifically chosen and appointed for this testimony (Acts 1:8), which they faithfully provided (Acts 8-33). For Paul's testimony of the extraordinary and immediate appearance and infallible revelation of Christ, see 1 Corinthians 15:8; Acts 9:3-8; 22:14-15, 17-18; and 1 Corinthians 9:1. Therefore, he was also an earwitness and eyewitness. Additionally, by Christ's revelation, he was certain of the things he preached, preaching infallibly, and he did not receive the apostolic office through any human mediation (Galatians 1:1, 12; 2:2, 6; 2 Corinthians 11:7).

V. They were chosen, called, sent, and made emissaries directly by Christ. See the texts cited earlier: Matthew 10, Mark 3, Luke 6, John 6, and after the resurrection, John 20:21, and at the very moment of the ascension into heaven, Matthew 28:19, Mark 16:15, and Acts 1:4, 9. Regarding Paul, see the passages previously cited.

VI. They were prepared for this office under Christ's direct discipline, having lived familiarly with Him for about three years. Hence, they were called His disciples, although others were also called by this name (as we gather from Luke 6:13 and 10:1, 17, where the seventy disciples are mentioned), and many others; but they were hidden, such as Joseph of Arimathea (John 19:38). And after the apostles had composed themselves to the mandate of Christ in Matthew 28:19 (HINTÚTUTE, etc.), all who were initiated into Christianity were called disciples (Acts 6:1-2; 9:26; 11:26). Although Matthias and Paul were not participants in the close companionship and familiar conversation with Christ, and consequently in the immediate instruction, vision, and hearing of Him, as the remaining eleven were, God supplied this through immediate revelation, so that they testified of Him no less than the others did, as we deduce about Matthias from Acts 2:14, 40, 42-43;

5:12, 32, 42; and about Paul from Acts 22:18 and 26:16, 22. Matthias could also have been among the seventy, having some closer familiarity with the Lord.

VII. They were men of God, sufficiently instructed in the Scriptures and the doctrine of salvation, and made infallible teachers on the day of Pentecost, according to the promise in John 16:13, with Acts 1:4, 8; 2:33. Paul testifies of this gift in himself in 1 Corinthians 7:4 and 1 Thessalonians 2:13; 4:8.

356

Galatians 1:12. See Tertullian's argument for the immunity of the apostles from error and for their infallibility in his book "De Praescriptione" chapters 21-30.

VIII. On the same day of Pentecost, they were endowed with all sorts of charismata, including the power and gift of confirming others in the charismata bestowed by God through the laying on of hands as an extraordinary seal or sacrament (Acts 8:14-18). Refer to the second part of the dissertation titled "De Charismatis."

IX. They were the first architects of the churches of the New Testament in Jerusalem, and from there throughout Judea, Samaria, and other nations and regions of the world, according to the mandate received from Christ (Matthew 28:19 with Acts 1:8). Paul specifically testifies about this in 1 Corinthians 3:6 and Romans 15:19-20.

X. They were universal ministers, and their ministry was universal both in terms of their actions and functions and in terms of locations and churches. Their acts included preaching, administering the sacraments, presiding over governance, ordaining and establishing ministers, both ordinary and extraordinary (i.e., evangelists), caring for the poor (Acts 6:2 with Galatians 2:10; 2 Corinthians 8), censuring and anathematizing heretics (1 Corinthians 5; 1 Timothy 1:20; 3 John 9-10), convening and celebrating synods (Acts 15), restoring and reforming collapsed churches, etc. Their ministry is also called universal with respect to locations, as they were not bound to one place or specific church like the other presbyters or bishops appointed to towns (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5; Acts 20:17;

Philippians 1:1). Evangelists were similarly bound to acts and functions, cities, districts, or regions as prescribed by the apostles, who utilized their assistance and labor.

XI. The apostolic ministry and office, including that of Paul as a supernumerary, was unique and solitary, without homogeneous predecessors, colleagues, or successors. Briefly, as the epithet in Hebrews 7:24 can be applied here, it was "untransferable."

From the attributes already listed, the excellence, dignity, and efficacy of this ministry follow, surpassing all ordinary and extraordinary ministries of both the New and Old Testaments. This is also indicated first (though not a sufficient argument in itself) in 1 Corinthians 12:28, "And God has appointed in the church first apostles," etc. Refer also to Ephesians 4:11 and Revelation 21:14, "And the new Jerusalem had twelve foundations, and on them were the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." The salvific doctrine or foundation of faith under the New Testament is named after the apostles, its most excellent and primary preachers: "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," etc. (Ephesians 2:20). Consequently, to this day, Christian doctrine, faith, and church are called Apostolic. The Roman Church, although unworthily, claims this title for itself.

357

Our doctrine, with all due respect, rightly claims the title of Apostolic. Tertullian in "De Praescriptione Adversus Haereticos" chapter 32, however, considers those in agreement with the Apostolic faith to be called Apostolic due to the kinship of doctrine. To this excellence, some refer to Matthew 19:28 ("You will sit on twelve thrones..."), meaning that through and according to the doctrine of the Apostles, Israel will be convicted and judged. Just as in Romans 2:16, God is said to judge people according to Paul's Gospel. And in John 5:45, Moses is said to accuse the Jews.

However, whether the judgment in Matthew 19 refers to judgment in this age or the final judgment of the last day is debated by interpreters. John Lightfoot in his "Hebrew Hours" on Matthew 19 believes that this should be understood as

doctrinal judgment in this world, particularly when Christ would enter into His gospel kingdom (referenced in Psalm 2:6, Matthew 28:18, John 5:37). After the four monarchies oppressing the world and the church with their tyranny would be destroyed, Christ's kingdom would rise, as foretold in Daniel 7:9-10. Judgment would be passed on the perfidious and rebellious Jewish people, as the Savior predicted extensively in Matthew 24, along with Romans 11:16, 1 Thessalonians 2:15-16, and Acts 13:46.

At the very least, it should be acknowledged that judgment in the scriptures does not always mean the final universal judgment but sometimes refers to a particular judgment in this age, whether doctrinal, real, or executory. For doctrinal, see John 5:45, "It is Moses who accuses you," and for real and executory, see Joel 3:12-13.

Reasons supporting this view are given there:

The description of the final judgment includes all people, both Gentiles and Jews, both good and bad, even those living on the last day, to be presented before the judge (Matthew 25:30-31, 2 Corinthians 5:10, 1 Thessalonians 4:16-17).

If this were understood as the personal judgment of the twelve Apostles, it would lead to the absurd conclusion that Judas the traitor would be one of them.

Therefore, it must necessarily be understood as the judgment and condemnation in this age, which will be according to and through the doctrine preached by the twelve Apostles.

Such questions are not insoluble. To the first, we respond: if Christ is to judge Gentiles and Jews, it is certainly not absurd to say that they will be judged by Christ and by the Apostles, who are from Israel. Just as it can truly be said of Christ and the Apostles that they will judge the Gentiles.

To the latter, we respond: It does not follow that Judas the traitor would be one of them. If he had not fallen from his apostleship, he would have been one of them, but someone else took his place when he fell, namely Matthias (Acts 1:20, 26).

Bernard in his sermon on St. Benedict, Thomas, Suarez, Platus, Jansen, Maldonatus, and with them A Lapide in Matthew 19 interpret the uncertain number of thrones as a certain number here, referring to monks who, because they have followed Christ by abandoning everything, will judge the 12 tribes, that is, all nations; for they are thought to have earned this honor. However, with this ridiculous comment dismissed, accepting either of the previous opinions, it is evident that some part of the apostolic ministry is involved. As for the effectiveness of this extraordinary ministry, it shines in the spread of the Gospel throughout the world, the conversion of the Gentiles, the conviction of adversaries, and the glorious victory through martyrdom (from which John alone is said to have been exempt). Concerning these, the Acts of the Apostles, Eusebius's ecclesiastical history, and we ourselves in the second part of the selected discussion on the Gentiles and the calling of the Gentiles. And even the example of Paul alone shows its effectiveness, who from Jerusalem to Illyricum, etc. (Romans 15:18-19).

11. The following absurdities result:

12. That the Roman bishops, in the strict sense of the word, have been wrongly called Apostles and apostolic men, and leaders of the apostolic see, and their office absolutely an Apostleship: and that the Pontiffs use this abusive term in Bellarmine's "De Pontifice" book 2, chapter 31 to prove the Pope's primacy.
13. Baronius wrongly called Clement VIII Peter to give authority to his apology and cause. Bellarmine in "De Pontifice" book 2, chapter 12 presents the fifth objection of the adversaries: "Whatever Peter said or wrote is an oracle of the Holy Spirit. But this does not apply to the Pope. Therefore, the Pope does not have all the prerogatives of Peter." To which he responds nothing other than: "Nor do we claim that." How these statements align with the canonistic and papal praises of the Pope, and how effectively they solve this objection, I leave to the judgment of any godly men.
14. Constantine and Helena are also called "equal to the apostles" too flatteringly in the Greek menology.

15.If Linus, or Cletus, or Clement succeeded Peter in Rome, who was the Vicar of Christ, the prince of the Apostles, and the ecclesiastical Monarch (see Baronius on the historical labyrinth regarding this in the year 69, section 18), it would follow that he or they were superior to the Apostles if any of them were still alive at the time; at least John, whom Baronius affirms lived beyond the years 96 and 97 according to ecclesiastical historians. Whether it is absurd to make Linus, Cletus, or Clement superior in rank and ministry to the Apostle John should be judged by comparing the described apostolic excellence with the qualities of Linus, Cletus, or Clement.

359

5. A Lapide wrongly calls Mary the teacher of the Apostles, to whom the Apostles would have turned, and who received the charisms of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost while sitting in the midst of the Apostles.
6. Sulpitius Severus in the life of Martin and Gabriel Biel wrongly makes Martin equal to the Apostles; indeed, he even makes him superior to the Apostles and to the angels themselves. Sulpitius Severus in the life of Martin and in his epistle considers Martin as comparable to the Apostles and prophets, being very similar to them in all respects. See what we noted in part 3 of the selected discussion on the patronages, etc., of saints, part 3, section 2, about this Martin.
7. Francis of Assisi is unfortunately exalted by Bartholomew of Pisa in his book on the conformity of saints above the Apostles, and even Christ Himself; the same is said by Bonaventure, Joachim of Fiore, and Bertinus, who refers to him as the angel mentioned in Revelation 7:2-3. See Peter of Valderama in the "Theater of Religions," vol. 2, sermon 2, on the patriarch St. Francis.
8. Hierarchical bishops are erroneously considered successors of the Apostolic choir, as if they succeeded the Apostles, and thus, according to divine right, are superior to the 70 disciples (as the tradition suggests) and successors of the Apostles. The Apostles had no successors in their apostolic office. This is discussed further in Book 4, in the controversy about the priesthood and

episcopacy. A Lapidé in Matthew 10 seems to indicate that this succession is to be understood only by analogy and accommodation.

This description of the apostolic ministry is not a matter of ecclesiastical politics but of sacred and ecclesiastical history. It would not be inappropriate to compare it with:

1. The ordinary ministers of the Old and New Testaments.
2. The prophets of the Old and New Testaments.
3. The Evangelists.
4. John the Baptist.

However, because it is easy for our studious readers to judge, based on descriptions of the apostles, prophets, evangelists, and John the Baptist, how they agree or differ, there is no need to linger longer on this.

We therefore present the following questions:

1. **Question:** Does the number twelve contain any mystical significance?
Response: No. Thomas in his commentary on Matthew 10, following Rabanus Maurus, philosophizes as follows: The number twelve, arising from three and four, signifies those who will preach the faith of the Holy Trinity through the four climates of the world. This number was also prefigured in the Old Testament in many ways: through the 12 sons of Jacob, the 12 princes of the sons of Israel, the 12 living springs in Helium, the 12 stones in Aaron's breastplate, the 12 loaves of the showbread, the 12 spies sent by Moses, the 12 stones from the Jordan, and the 12 oxen supporting the bronze sea. In the New Testament, it is seen in the 12 stars in the crown (Revelation 12:1), the 12 foundations of Jerusalem as seen by John, and the 12 gates.

360

A Lapidé in Genesis 29 says that the 12 patriarchs were figures of the 12 apostles, and that in Matthew 10, the reason for choosing exactly 12 apostles rather than more or fewer is so that they might correspond to the 12 patriarchs, etc. But what about the 13th apostle, Paul?

However, we consider inquiries into the mysteries of numbers and the explanations of all things instituted by God in worship and ordered in the Church, or all that is historically mentioned in the scriptures, to be mere curiosities, superstitions, or idle pursuits. Where God does not speak, we must remain silent. Compare to part 3 of the selected discussion on superstition.

II. Question: Was Peter according to the scriptures the Prince of the Apostles, and can he be called such?

Response: If "prince" denotes primacy, monarchy, supreme ecclesiastical power, and if it is fully and adequately resident in Peter alone, then no. However, if "prince" refers to the apostolic college; as Augustus wished to be called Prince of the Senate to avoid the odious name of king and monarch, then no. Finally, if it denotes the permanent president of that college, appointed by Christ, or chosen by the votes of the other apostles; such a thing cannot be conceded to the Pontiffs without scripture. We do not wish to imitate the excessive liberality and easiness of some ancient writers in this matter, nor be subject to the ambition of even the smallest Diotrephic spirits (whose fruitful growth has been evident in every age).

III. Question: Was Barnabas an apostle?

Response: No, because he is not one of the twelve whom Christ chose, as listed in Matthew 10. It is clear from Luke 6:13, which says He chose twelve, and from John 6:70, where Jesus says, "Did I not choose you twelve?" Matthias was chosen in place of Judas, who was elected with the eleven in Acts 1:26. Only Paul, who came later, is called an apostle, and he himself defends this rank against adversaries in Galatians 1:1; 1 Corinthians 9:1-2; and 2 Corinthians 11:5 and 12:11-12. Epiphanius in his "Panarion" (Book 1, Vol. 1, at the end) and Eusebius (Book 1, Ecclesiastical History, Chapter 12) say that Barnabas was one of the 70 disciples. How certain this is, I do not know. At least, I concede that he can be counted among the evangelists or helpers of the apostles.

IV. Question: Was Nathanael one of the twelve apostles, and is he the same as Bartholomew?

Response: Both Rupert of Deutz and Cornelius a Lapide affirm this in their concordances. But Baronius, in the year 31, Section 28, says that he does not agree

with them, considering them to be based on slight conjectures. I believe that with Maldonatus and Ribera, the very slight conjecture should be conceded to the negator.

361

The argument that Nathanael was a scholar of the Law, as Augustine claims in his 17th tractate on John, and that Christ did not call scholars of the Law to the apostolate but only fishermen, is questioned. They first think to find their support in John 1:46-47, where it is said, "Moses and the Prophets wrote about him," and argue that this implies Nathanael had knowledge of the Law and Prophets. However, the same would apply even more so to Philip, who cites Moses and the Prophets.

They argue that the conclusion is flawed: if Philip or Nathanael had any knowledge of the Law and Prophets, and derived from them the doctrine of salvation, then they would have been considered scholars of the Law by rank and calling. Why not apply the same reasoning to the Samaritan woman in John 4:25 or the crowd in John 12:24? Prophets were read in the synagogues before the people (not just before scholars) every Sabbath, as seen in Acts 13:27. It is no wonder if Philip and Nathanael acquired some knowledge from them. The reading of scriptures was not considered prohibited, as shown in John 5:39 and Acts 17:11. Examples such as Aquila, Priscilla, and Apollos in Acts 18 also show that it is not easily proven that they were not doctors and scholars of the Law by rank and calling.

The claim that all apostles were fishermen is dubious. For Matthew, at least, it is false. As for Matthias, the replacement for Judas Iscariot, it is unclear from where it would be proven. It is established from Acts 18:43 that Paul, the thirteenth or supernumerary apostle, was not a fisherman, though he may have been a scholar and studious of the Law, as evidenced by Acts 22:3-6. Bartholomew Gavantus, in a particular discussion found in Volume 2 of "The Treasury of Sacred Rites," addresses this but relies on dubious conjectures and unproven writings. We concede that this argument may still have some merit in favor of Nathanael being among the apostles.

Nathanael is mentioned in the initial calling of the apostles in John 1. It is generally accepted that the four, Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael, were called to the apostolate at that time, and no one denies this. Additionally, in John 21:2, Nathanael is numbered with some other disciples (that is, apostles) who were seen by Christ for the third time after the resurrection. The term "disciples" here, as elsewhere, refers not to just any disciples but specifically those who had been elevated to the rank of apostles. This can be inferred from John 21:1-2 and 14-18.

However, when apostles are listed and their names are mentioned (Matthew 10, Mark 3, Luke 6, Acts 1), the name Nathanael does not appear, but Bartholomew's does.

362

This indicates that Nathanael was a man with two names, or more precisely, that his name was Nathanael and his surname was Bartholomew, as Hutterus writes in his Hebrew translation. In the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, printed by Münster, it is written as Bartolmi. This surname is expressed in the Syro-Chaldaic or Aramaic dialect, which was common in Jerusalem and Judea at that time, as seen in surnames like Bartimeus, Bar Jonah, Barabbas, and Bar Jesus. The Syriac interpreter writes Bartoulmai. Münster notes in Matthew 10 that Thalmai (as it is written there) is the same as Ptolemy for the Egyptians and Greeks. He adds that it was not uncommon for Jews to adopt Greek and other foreign names, as shown by names like Philip, Nicanor, Prochorus, Stephen, and Alexander, which appear in the New Testament. Just as it is evident from the Old and New Testaments that some were known by double names (as in the case of some apostles in Matthew 10:3), it is sometimes clearer and more frequent for surnames to be used rather than first names, as seen with Bartimaeus in Mark 10:46 and Bar Jesus in Acts 13:6. Similarly, among Arabs, Averroes and Avicenna (as foreigners commonly write in that language) are Ibn-Rois and Ibn-Sina, meaning son of Rois and son of Sina, with the personal name preceding. Among Jews in Africa or Spain who spoke Arabic, names like Aben Ezra and Aben Tibhon are used.

Regardless of the reading and use of these names, it is crucial to determine whether Nathanael was called and chosen by Christ to the apostolate or whether he was the

same as Bartholomew, given that there were only twelve apostles, who are designated by twelve names in Matthew 10 and Luke 6, and eleven in Acts 1 after Judas's departure. According to Josephus in Book 20 of Antiquities, Chapter 10, and in Sub 19.1.3, the Hebrew name "Thalmi" is written as Tolmi by Greek interpreters and as Thoulmai by Syriac interpreters.

Cornelius a Lapide supports the opinion that Nathanael and Bartholomew are the same, and we accept this view as far more probable. Besides the reasons from John 1 and 21 mentioned above, Cornelius a Lapide also follows Abulensis, Rupert, and Janisenius in Matthew 10, suggesting the following reasons:

1. The Evangelist joins Bartholomew with Philip.
2. There is no record of Bartholomew's calling by Christ, unless it is that of Nathanael.
3. The Evangelists do not mention Nathanael in the list of apostles, and John 1 and 21 do not mention Bartholomew, as if these two were the same person.
4. Bartholomew does not appear to be a personal name but signifies "son of Tholmai"; thus, Nathanael is likely the personal name.
5. Christ says of Nathanael, "Behold, an Israelite indeed," and promises him visions of angels (John 1:47). Therefore, Christ seems to have chosen him as his intimate friend and apostle.

All these reasons are not implausible, and the two arguments from John 1 and 21 make the opinion that Nathanael and Bartholomew are the same more probable. The argument against this, based on Augustine, is entirely without merit.

363

Question V: What should be said about Martial of Limoges (as Gregory of Tours attests in Book 2 of his History, Chapter 28), who in his letter to the people of Bordeaux calls himself "servant of God" and "Apostle of Jesus Christ"?

Answer: Whether that letter is a pseudepigraphon and spurious should be examined in the censures of the Fathers by Coci and in Rivet's Critique, Book 1, Chapter 7. Regarding his deeds, Baronius (in his annals for the years 34, 14, 74) tends to focus not so much on ecclesiastical annals but on the history of the papal

ascent and primacy from any available sources and writings. If the accounts about him are true, he was a disciple of the Apostles and known as the Apostle of the Gauls: he preached the Gospel in certain parts of Gaul. Many others in subsequent centuries were also called apostles, but in a restricted sense, relating to a specific people where the Gospel was first preached or had been renewed.

There was some resemblance to the Apostles: their preaching was not confined to one church or one city. To be called an apostle absolutely, without any restriction, was neither customary nor safe. It is even less likely that they would have claimed the title "Apostle of Jesus Christ" in the subscription of their letters, as Martial did to the people of Bordeaux, and with the title "Servant of God, Apostle of Jesus Christ Martial Kepbas," as stated in his letter to the people of Toulouse.

From these and other sources, the reader should infer how ancient and apostolic such writings were, which were compiled in the libraries of the Fathers by the Pontiffs. It is surprising what the very learned Elmenhorstius saw in these letters, having worked so significantly with the patristic texts, that he published again in 1614 the two letters appended by Gennadius of Marseille. If someone wants to understand how ecclesiastical writers not only honored but also burdened themselves with titles in the declining age of the church and before the fifth century, they should consult Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Clermont, who flourished around the year 440. In Book 6 of his letters, he attributes apostolic functions and hunting to bishops (letters 4, 7, 12, and 7, letter 4). He greets bishops as Popes (Books 7, 8, 9) and frequently as high priests, supreme pontiffs, and Popes (Book 7, letter 6 and 8, letter 14). If such a pompous attitude was so openly evident in the temple of God at that time, what should be said about the subsequent centuries, from the fifth through the twelfth or even the thirteenth?