

When is an 'apostle'?

Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD

The beginning

The basic meaning of the term is 'sent one'; in John 13:16 it is used in that way. But within the incipient Christian Church it came to have a specialized meaning: an office or function characterized by special spiritual authority. It began with the twelve disciples who were personally chosen by Jesus; after His resurrection they received the designation, 'apostles' (but the Iscariot had lost his place, leaving eleven). With the exception of four verses (Luke 11:49, John 13:16, Acts 14:4 and 14) I would say that all the occurrences of the term in the four Gospels and Acts, about thirty-five, refer to that group, as do Galatians 1:17, 19; 2 Peter 3:2; Jude 17 and Revelation 21:14. The purpose of this note is to enquire whether the NT signals any further uses of the term.

Acts 1:13-26 records Peter's initiative to replace the Iscariot. The Text does not say that it was God's idea; and when they asked God to choose between the two candidates, they did not give Him the option of saying "neither". The Text affirms that Matthias was numbered with the Eleven apostles, but he receives no further mention.

Paul (erstwhile Saul of Tarsus) repeatedly refers to himself as an apostle: Romans 1:1, 11:13, 1 Corinthians 1:1, 9:1, 2, 15:9, 2 Corinthians 1:1, Galatians 1:1, Ephesians 1:1, Colossians 1:1, 1 Thessalonians 2:6, 1 Timothy 1:1, 2:7, 2 Timothy 1:1, 11 and Titus 1:1. Luke refers to Paul as an apostle in Acts 14:4 and 14. Jesus personally chose Paul, returning from Heaven to do so. Aside from the Eleven, Paul was the only one personally designated by Jesus.

Jesus Himself is called "the Apostle" of our confession in Hebrews 3:1. Peter calls himself an apostle in 1 Peter 1:1 and 2 Peter 1:1, but of course he is one of the Twelve. James, the half-brother of Jesus, became the 'big boss' in Jerusalem, and evidently was regarded as an apostle—1 Corinthians 15:7 and Galatians 1:19. Luke refers to Barnabas as an apostle: Acts 14:4 and 14. Paul seems to refer to Silvanus and Timothy as apostles: 1 Thessalonians 2:6. It is possible to interpret Romans 16:7 in the same way with reference to Andronicus and Junias. I believe those are the only ones who are actually named.

The discussion up to this point was necessary to provide the background for the questions that are the occasion for this study: did 'apostle' become an established office or function for the ongoing life of the Church, until the return of Christ, and if so, how is an apostle to be designated or recognized? It is my intention to analyze every verse where the term is used, and I will begin with those that may be purely historical, going on from those already dealt with.

In 2 Corinthians 11:5 and 12:11 Paul compares himself to 'the most eminent apostles', which must be limited to his contemporaries. 1 Corinthians 9:5 also must be limited to his contemporaries. 1 Corinthians 15:5 and 7 refer to physical appearances of the resurrected Jesus before His ascension (of necessity historical). 1 Corinthians 4:9 is a little different: "I think that God has displayed us, the apostles, last, as men condemned to death; for we have been made a spectacle to the world, both to angels and to men" (read also verses

10-13). In the context, Paul is complaining about the way he has been treated by some in Corinth, but in this verse he seems actually to be blaming God for the way he has been treated! I suppose that the use of the word 'last' would be a comparison with God's servants in prior ages. Paul is not talking about the future of the Church in this passage, and if we only had this text on the subject, we would have to conclude that to be an apostle was not a good thing.

And now we come to Luke 11:49-51, a most interesting text. "Therefore the wisdom of God also said, 'I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they will kill and persecute,' that the blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world may be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah who perished between the altar and the temple. Yes, I say to you, it shall be required of this generation." Jesus is speaking, deriding the lawyers. His citation of "the wisdom of God" appears to have no match in the OT, so what was His meaning? In 1 Corinthians 1:24 Paul refers to Christ as 'the wisdom of God'. In Matthew 23:34 Jesus said, "I send you prophets", so here Jesus may be referring to Himself as 'the wisdom of God'. However that may be, if the "required of this generation" was fulfilled in 70 AD, as I suppose, then the 'apostles' here are also historical.

I will now consider the other places where the phrase 'prophets and apostles' occurs, albeit with the terms in reverse order: Ephesians 2:20 and 3:5, and Revelation 18:20.

Ephesians 2:19-22—"So then, you are no longer strangers and aliens, but fellow citizens with the saints and members of God's household, 20 built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone; 21 in whom the whole building, being joined together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord; 22 in whom you also are being built together to become a habitation of God in spirit." The truth that Paul is expounding is that in Christ Gentiles join Jews as "fellow citizens" and "members of God's household", part of "the whole building". In what sense can that "building" be built upon "the foundation of the apostles and prophets"? Presumably "prophets" is short for the writings that make up the Old Testament Scriptures, or Canon. **The Faith is based on revealed Truth, not individual people.** Analogously, presumably "apostles" is short for the writings that make up the New Testament Scriptures, or Canon. Again, the Faith is based on revealed Truth, not individual people. Our "growing into a holy temple" (verse 21) depends upon the Holy Spirit and His Sword (not individuals whom God used). Note that Paul mentions the 'apostles' first. In any case, the 'apostles' here are historical.

Ephesians 3:1-7—"For this reason I, Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus on behalf of you Gentiles—2 surely you have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God that was given to me for you, 3 how that by revelation He made known to me the 'secret'¹ (as I have written briefly already, 4 with reference to which, when you read, you can understand my insight into Christ's secret), 5 which in different generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it has now been revealed by Spirit² to His holy apostles and prophets: 6 that the

¹ I consider that 'secret' is a better rendering than 'mystery'. The truth about the Church is not all that mysterious; it just had not been explained before.

² There being no article with 'spirit', it could be either 'by Spirit' (used as a proper name) or 'in spirit' (referring to the manner). Both are true and legitimate, but I have chosen the first option in the translation.

Gentiles are joint-heirs, of the same body, and fellow partakers of His promise in the Christ through the Gospel, 7 of which I became a servant according to the gift of God's grace, the gift given to me according to the outworking of His power." The use of "now" in verse 5 indicates that Paul is referring to the NT Canon. An apostle, upon receiving a revelation, would also function as a prophet, but people like Mark and Luke were prophets without being apostles. I take the 'apostles' here to be historical.

Revelation 18:20—"Rejoice over her, O heaven, yes you saints and apostles and prophets, because God has pronounced your judgment against her!"¹ Perhaps this verse should be connected to 18:6-7, above, and in that event, the judgment was pronounced in faith. But just who are these apostles? I take it that "saints and apostles and prophets" is in apposition to "heaven", and in that event, whoever they are, they are already in heaven. It follows that this text is irrelevant to the occasion for this study.

The hinge

As a hinge to link the past to the present, I will now consider the two texts that refer to 'false apostles'; they are 2 Corinthians 11:13 and Revelation 2:2.

2 Corinthians 11:12-15—"Further, I will keep on doing what I do in order to cut off the opportunity from those who desire an opportunity to be considered equal with us in the things of which they boast. 13 Such men are really false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into 'apostles' of Christ.² 14 And no wonder, because Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light. 15 So it is no great thing if his servants also masquerade as ministers of righteousness, whose end will be according to their works." It is well to remember that neither Satan nor his servants are in the habit of appearing with horns and tails. Just because someone 'looks good' does not mean that he is. We need spiritual discernment at all times. Note that Paul affirms that such people are Satan's servants, and they evidently declared themselves to be 'apostles'. In our day we have a veritable plague of self-proclaimed 'apostles' (that I call 'apustles'); now whom do you suppose they are serving?

Going back to the title of this study, when is an apostle? In Galatians 1:1 Paul affirms that his apostleship was "not from men nor through a man", but through both the Father and the Son. Paul's apostleship did not depend upon human ordination or recognition. So what about apostleship today? In Romans 1:1 Paul says he is a "called apostle". I take the point to be that true apostles are not ordained by man; they are designated by God, who has a specific reason for doing so. In the case of Paul, it was "to promote obedience of faith among all ethnic nations" (verse 5). Any genuine apostle will have a specific task to fulfil. Although God does not take back His gifts (Romans 11:29), a gift may be ignored (because the church's doctrine does not allow it), or neglected (1 Timothy 4:14), and hence aborted.

¹ Instead of "saints and apostles", a small minority of the Greek manuscripts has 'holy apostles', as in AV and NKJV.

² There have always been those who want to 'get on the band-wagon', to get a free ride; who traffic in spiritual things for personal, temporal advantage. Since such people only do damage, Paul's desire to expose them stems from his concern for the Corinthians' welfare.

Far worse, even an apostle that Jesus chose personally can be 'rejected' (1 Corinthians 9:27). If Paul recognized the possibility for himself, how about all the 'apostles' in our day?

In Revelation 2:2 the glorified Christ is writing to the church in Ephesus: "I know your works, yes the labor, and your endurance, and that you cannot stand those who are evil. And you have tested those who claim to be apostles and are not, and found them *to be* liars." The glorified Christ Himself declares that there are false apostles (and this at the close of the first century), and that the church in Ephesus knew how to test them. Unfortunately, at least from my point of view, we are not told how they did it, the criteria that they used. There is one text that speaks of the 'signs of an apostle', 2 Corinthians 12:12. "Truly the apostolic signs were produced among you with all perseverance, by signs and wonders and miracles."

Both Stephen and Phillip, 'mere' deacons, performed miracles, but evidently that did not transform them into apostles. And then there are the words of Sovereign Jesus Himself in John 14:12. "Most assuredly I say to you,¹ the one believing into me, he too will do the works that I do; in fact he will do greater works than these,² because I am going to my Father."

This is a tremendous statement, and not a little disconcerting. Notice that the Lord said, "will do"; not 'maybe', 'perhaps', 'if you feel like it'; and certainly not 'if the doctrine of your church permits it'! If you believe you **will do!** The verb 'believe' is in the present tense, 2nd person singular; if you (sg) are believing you will do; it follows that if you are not doing, it is because you are not believing. 2 + 2 = 4. Doing what? "The works that I do." Well, Jesus preached the Gospel, He taught, He cast out demons, He healed all sorts and sizes of sickness and disease, He raised an occasional dead person, and He performed a variety of miracles (water to wine, walk on water, stop a storm instantaneously, transport a boat several miles instantaneously, multiply food, shrivel a tree—and He implied that the disciples should have stopped the storm and multiplied the food, and He stated that they could shrivel a tree [Peter actually took a few steps on water]). So how about us? The preaching and teaching we can handle, but what about the rest? I once heard the president of a certain Christian college affirm that this verse obviously could not mean what it says because it isn't happening! Well, in his own experience, and in that of his associates (cessationists all), I guess it isn't. But many people today cast out demons and heal, and I personally know someone who has raised a dead person. Miracles are also happening. So

¹ "Most assuredly" is actually "amen, amen"—rendered "verily, verily" in the AV. Only John registers the word as repeated, in the other Gospels it is just "amen". In the contemporary literature we have no example of anyone else using the word in this way. It seems that Jesus coined His own use, and the point seems to be to call attention to an important pronouncement: "Stop and listen!" Often it precedes a formal statement of doctrine or policy, as here.

² Well now, if we cast out demons, heal and perform miracles, isn't that enough? Jesus wants more, He wants "greater things" than those just mentioned. Notice again that He said "will do", not maybe, perhaps, or if your church permits. But what could be 'greater' than miracles? This can't refer to modern technology because in that event such 'greater things' would not have been available to the believers during the first 1900 years. Note that the key is in the Lord's final statement (in verse 12), "because I am going to my Father". Only if He won could He return to the Father, so He is here declaring His victory before the fact. It is on the basis of that victory that the 'greater things' can be performed. Just what are those 'greater' things? For my answer, see my outline, "Biblical Spiritual Warfare", available from www.prunch.org.

how about me? And you? But to get back to the 'signs of an apostle', if all of us are supposed to be producing miracles, that does not make us all apostles, so there must be further criteria. (Please notice the 'further', I am not denying the 'signs'.)

I suggest that we must consider the matter of spiritual authority, and I begin with 2 Corinthians 10:8 and 13:10. 10:8 reads like this: "Now even if I boast a little to excess about our authority (which the Lord gave us for building up, not to tear you down), . . ." 13:10 reads like this: "This is why I write these things while absent, so that when present I may not have to deal harshly, according to the authority that the Lord gave me, for building up and not tearing down." In both verses Paul states that the authority is for building up, not tearing down, although his mention of harsh dealing indicates that such may be included in the process, as circumstance may require. (In fact, on at least two occasions, Paul actually turned someone over to Satan!—1 Corinthians 5:5 and 1 Timothy 1:20.)

Is this not what we are to understand from 1 Timothy 1:3? "You recall that I urged you to remain in Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, in order that you should command certain persons to stop teaching a different doctrine . . ." Now the church was well established in Ephesus, yet Timothy had authority to command; I suppose that Paul designated him as his deputy. And what about 1 Timothy 5:19-20? "Do not entertain an accusation against an elder except on the basis of two or three witnesses. 20 Those who are sinning rebuke publicly, so that the rest also may be in fear." Evidently Timothy had authority over the elders, being competent to rebuke them publicly.

Now consider Jeremiah 1:10—"See, I have this day set you over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant." Of course this was before the Church, but there is a principle here that remains valid. If you plan to build on a site that is covered with ruins and rubble, where must you start? You must remove the wreckage. If God sent you to the church in Laodicea (Revelation 3:14-19), to try to straighten it out, where would you have to start? You might have to depose the leaders, as well as denounce the error. Presumably, also, you would have to be able to establish your authority over them. In Timothy's case, Paul presumably took care of that.

Something similar happened with Titus; consider: "I left you in Crete for this reason, that you should set in order the things that were lacking and appoint elders in every town, as I directed you" (1:5). "Because there really are lots of rebels, loudmouths and deceivers, especially those of the circumcision group, who must be silenced" (1:10-11). "Speak these things, whether you exhort or reprove, with all authority" (2:15). If Titus was to appoint elders, he evidently had authority over them. And to silence 'rebels' evidently requires authority. Now then, does anyone imagine that such situations, requiring apostolic authority, ceased to exist in 100 AD? History records no lack of such situations, and far worse, down through the centuries and millennia. In our day the degree of perversity in the churches is such that I don't know how God can stand the stench! We desperately need people with apostolic authority who are prepared to function.

But to get back to the Text, consider Ephesians 4:11-13. "Yes, He Himself gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and

teachers,¹ 12 for the equipping of the saints into the work of the ministry, so as to build up the body of Christ, 13 until we all attain into the unity of the faith and of the real knowledge of the Son of God, into a complete man, into the resulting full stature of Christ.” If verses 12 and 13 are still being worked on, then the apostles, etc. are still necessary. Verse 13 emphasizes the truth in verse 12—every believer is supposed to grow into full stature. Just because we do not reach a goal does not invalidate that goal. I would say that one of the principal causes for the lamentable spiritual condition of most churches is the total lack of the apostolic function among us—itinerant, acting as God’s special emissary, an official intervener, for disciplinary and correctional purposes.

Now consider 1 Corinthians 12:27-31. “Now you are the body of Christ, and members individually. 28 And those whom God has appointed in the Church are: first apostles, second prophets, third teachers; after that miracles, then presents of healings, helps, administrations, kinds of languages. 29 All are not apostles, are they? All are not prophets, are they? All are not teachers, are they? All are not miracle workers, are they? 30 All do not

¹ One might imagine that this list follows the chronological sequence of the several ministries. An apostle introduces the Gospel into an area or context; a prophet gets the people’s attention and an evangelist urges them to believe; but once people are regenerated then pastors and teachers come to the fore—they are the ones who equip the saints. However, in practice, especially in a pioneer missionary situation, there are seldom that many people around. The missionary preaches the Gospel and it is up to him to teach the first converts; he is alone. A pioneer missionary, the first one to introduce the Gospel to an ethnic group or area, has an apostolic function (whether or not he himself is an apostle). But he must also function as an evangelist and as a teacher (whether or not he has those gifts).

However, most of us live and work where there are established, functioning congregations. So what would be the function of an apostle within an established, functioning congregation? If he lives and worships in that community, probably none at all, in that specific capacity—he might function as a teacher or a prophet. In a country, or area, where there is no more pioneer missionary work to be done, the exercise of the apostolic function would be itinerant, acting as God’s special emissary, an official intervener, for disciplinary and correctional purposes.

I will take up evangelist next; what would his function be within an established congregation? Well, can you evangelize someone who is already regenerated? Evidently the function of an evangelist is directed to unbelievers, who should not be members of the congregation (although some often are). Of course an evangelist might also function as a pastor or teacher. A truly gifted evangelist will function beyond the limits of a local congregation.

As for the prophetic function, I will address the question of supernatural revelation of information not available through existing channels. (1 Corinthians 14:3 speaks of ‘edification’, ‘exhortation’ and ‘comfort’ as coming from a prophet, but I will not take up such activity here.) We understand that the Canon of Scripture is closed; God is no longer giving written revelation that is of general or universal application. But that does not mean that God no longer speaks into specific situations. Divine guidance is a type of prophecy; He is giving information not otherwise available. I myself have been contemplated with a prophecy delivered by someone who had no idea who I was, and not in the context of a local congregation. The function of a true prophet cannot be limited to one congregation. Indeed, God may use a prophet at city, state or country level. Our world desperately needs prophetic voices.

A teacher will normally reside in a specific community, but his ministry may range beyond it. A pastor’s function is local, just as he is chosen and ordained locally. It is simply a fact of life that someone with a shepherd’s heart is not necessarily a good teacher, and an honest to goodness teacher often lacks a shepherd’s heart. The functions are supposed to be complementary, and the object is to get all true believers involved in the work of the ministry. Life in Christ is not a spectator sport!

have presents of healings, do they? All do not speak languages, do they? All do not interpret, do they?¹ 31 But earnestly desire the best gifts.”

It should be observed that the terminology here is clearly hierarchical: ‘1st, 2nd, 3rd, then, then, . . .’ (similar lists in other places lack this terminology) [the Kingdom of God is not a democracy]. Next, if God has appointed these functions, there must be a good reason for them, and to deliberately exclude any of them is to go against God. Here in Brazil, with a few exceptions, the churches have no place for a true teacher; they simply are not allowed. The consequences are not pretty.

Presumably even the most ardent ‘cessationist’ will grant that “teachers”, “helps” and “administrations” are still around. But this letter was written around 55 AD, well into the Church Age, therefore. Why would God “appoint in the Church” things that would be extinguished in a few decades. If miracles come “after” teachers, how can miracles be gone if teachers are still here? We have the command to “earnestly desire the best gifts”, so which ones are the best? Presumably those at the top of the hierarchical list. Why would God command us to earnestly desire a gift like apostleship, if He was going to extinguish it before the end of the first century? In such an event the command would be meaningless for the last 1900 years!

The present

Somewhere along the line, I heard this: ‘the status quo’ is Latin for ‘the mess we’re in’. Whether Latin or English, I imagine that most of us would agree that the world is in a bad way, and that is at least partly because the Church is in a bad way. By and large, ‘Christians’ have ceased to be salt and light in the surrounding culture (Matthew 5:13-16); they are part of the problem, rather than part of the solution. As I have already opined, the lamentable spiritual condition of most churches is a direct result of the total lack of the apostolic function among us. It would appear that that ‘lack’ began early on.

In the writings of the ‘church fathers’ that have come down to us, there appears to be no mention of ‘apostles’ after the first century. Already in the second century, the concept of a ‘bishop’ came into being, an elder having authority over other elders in a given area—so a ‘bishop’ could exercise the apostolic function within his area (but all too often the bishop became part of the problem, since bishops were not chosen by God). It did not take long before the ‘bishop of Rome’ started to claim authority over other ‘bishops’, and then there

¹ The Greek grammar of verses 29 and 30 is plain: no gift is given to everybody—not everyone is an apostle and not everyone speaks languages. Those churches that teach that speaking in tongues is the necessary sign of being ‘baptized in the Spirit’ (and until you are ‘baptized’ you are a 2nd class citizen, if a citizen at all), have done untold damage to their people. Since the Holy Spirit simply does not give ‘tongues’ to everybody, those who do not get it are out in the cold. But the social pressure is intolerable, so many end up faking it. Since many of the leaders are also faking it, the social problem is solved; the person is ‘in’. But since Satan is the source of all lies, someone who fakes it is living a lie and invites Satan into his life. I have been in many Pentecostal, neo-pentecostal, charismatic, whatever churches and have heard thousands of people ‘speaking in tongues’—a large majority were faking it, while a few were speaking a real language, but under demonic control. (I am a linguist, PhD, and can tell when I am listening to a real language, even though I don’t understand it, because real language has structure. To know whether or not a language is demonic requires spiritual discernment.) A church that teaches a lie invites Satan into the church, and he does not hesitate. Of course some had the genuine gift.

were archbishops, and so on. If I am correct in defining the apostolic function as someone ‘acting as God’s special emissary, an official intervener, for disciplinary and correctional purposes’, and if there has been a general lack of this function for 1900 years, then we should not be surprised at the ‘status quo’.

In our day we have denominations, defined by different doctrinal and procedural ‘packages’, and there is no end of splitting within such denominations. Here in Brazil we have at least five ‘Baptist’ denominations, four ‘Presbyterian’ ones, and no end of ‘Assemblies of God’, plus any number of ‘independent’ ones. We have literally thousands of self-proclaimed ‘apostles’; everywhere you turn there is an ‘apostolic ministry’. It is a generalized ego trip; no one wants to be left behind, or to appear inferior to his neighbor. They are building private empires, and fleecing the sheep in the process. I am not aware of any theological seminary in this country that teaches the students how to study the Bible, and much less how to expound it; expository preaching is almost nonexistent. In consequence, the variety of abject stupidities promulgated from the pulpits appears to be without end. I am not aware of any denomination here where the biblical Text has objective authority.

But it gets worse. We actually have self-proclaimed ‘apostles’ who pontificate like this: “I am an apostle on a level with Peter or Paul, so I can disagree with them; I can change what the Bible says.” And they do; they reject plain biblical teaching and impose their own ideas on their flocks. It should be evident to any true subject of Sovereign Jesus that all such ‘apostles’ are in the service of Satan. We have already noted Ephesians 2:20, God’s household is “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone.” 1 Corinthians 3:11 says that “no one can lay any foundation other than what is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” And Revelation 21:14 informs us that the foundations of the New Jerusalem are “the twelve apostles of the Lamb”. No pipsqueak ‘apostle’ of our day is competent to alter the Sacred Text—they obviously do not believe what the glorified Christ said in Revelation 22:18-19.

To someone who intends to be totally committed to Christ and His Kingdom, the following question is obvious and necessary: What can be done to remedy, to correct the calamitous reality I have described? We must cry out to God to raise up true apostles; but this raises another question: How is an apostle to be recognized, and how can he establish his authority so as to be able to bring about necessary changes in actual situations? I see only one way, the use of supernatural power; and that power must be used to clear out wreckage before it can be used to build. I see a difference between a prophet and an apostle in this connection: a prophet warns; an apostle inflicts. In Acts 5 Peter simply executed Ananias and Sapphira, without warning and without chance for repentance. In Acts 13 Paul inflicted blindness on the sorcerer Elymas, again without ado.

It should be obvious that anyone who starts functioning in this way will promptly be declared to be ‘public enemy number one’. Any and all leaders who are serving Satan will do all in their power to eliminate a true apostle, because of the threat to them personally and to the perverse structures they have created and maintained. It will be all out war. I am reminded of 1 Corinthians 4:11-13—“To this very hour we go hungry and thirsty; we are poorly dressed, brutally treated, and wander homeless; 12 yes, we labor, working with our

own hands. Upon being reviled, we bless; upon being persecuted, we endure it; 13 upon being slandered, we exhort. We have been made as the refuse of the world, the off-scouring of whatever, to this moment.” Well now, how many of the plague of self-styled ‘apostles’ in our day would maintain their pretensions if they had to experience the conditions described above? They would run and hide.

We need to understand what Paul is saying here. To be looked down on and criticized by believers among whom one has labored is one thing. Local people with personal ambition know how to do that. For God to make us “as the refuse of the world” is something very different. How should we understand this? If we insist on proclaiming a ‘gospel’ that the world considers to be stupid, abject foolishness, we will certainly be ridiculed. But if we insist on biblical values that the world has declared to be ‘hate crimes’, we will certainly be hated and persecuted, treated as refuse. The choice of Hebrews 13:13 is upon us: “So then, let us go out to Him, outside the camp, bearing His disgrace.” The above applies to any true subject of Sovereign Jesus, but any true apostle will be the target of the total fury of the religious leaders as well. In short, to be an apostle is not for the fainthearted.

And now please consider 2 Thessalonians 2:8-12, noting especially verses 10 and 11. “And then the lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord will consume with the breath of His mouth and abolish by the splendor of His coming; 9 that one’s coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, 10 and with all wicked deception among those who are wasting themselves, because they did not receive the love of the truth¹ so that they might be saved.² 11 Yes, because of this God will send them an active delusion so that they will believe the lie³ 12 and so that all may be condemned who have not believed the truth but have taken pleasure in wickedness.”⁴ Notice the sequence: first they reject the love of the truth; it is as a consequence of that choice that God sends the delusion. The implication is that there is a point of no return; God sends the delusion so that they may be condemned. The only intelligent choice is to embrace the truth!

Consider with me the consequences of the facts enunciated in verses 10-12 for a whole nation, like Brazil, where I now live. We have many thousands of local churches that call themselves Christian. But I know of almost none that could be characterized as ‘loving the truth’. No one wants a Bible with objective authority. Humanistic, relativistic, materialistic values have taken over the churches. Biblical values are no longer acceptable. In consequence, Satan has control of the government, of education, of health services, of commerce, of the entertainment industry, in short, of the whole culture. The churches that

¹ The use of the verb ‘receive’ clearly implies an act of volition on their part; that love was offered or made available to them but they did not want it; they wanted to be able to lie and to entertain lies told by others. But the consequences of such a choice are terrible; they turned their back on salvation.

² Since there are only two spiritual kingdoms in this world, that of Sovereign Jesus and that of Satan, “those who are wasting themselves”, in this text, are still in Satan’s kingdom and therefore wide open to his “wicked deception”. The Text states plainly that they are wasting themselves “because they did not receive the love of the truth so that they might be saved”. They are not saved.

³ Perhaps “the lie” is best illustrated in our day by the theory of evolution: ‘There is no Creator’—so there will not be any accounting; so you can do what you feel like. How terrible will be the awakening!

⁴ “Taking pleasure in wickedness” involves rejecting the Truth of a moral Creator who will demand an accounting, or even overt rebellion against that Creator (like Lucifer/Satan).

have rejected biblical values are part of the problem—since they have rejected “the love of the truth”, they have been taken over by “active delusion”.

Note that God Himself sends that delusion with the declared objective of condemning all those who believed the lie. If God Himself visits “active delusion” upon a whole country, what possible escape is there? The only possible ‘medicine’ is “the love of the truth”. Those of us who consider ourselves to be true subjects of Sovereign Jesus need to appeal to Him to show us how to promote the love of the truth to the churches and to the society at large. Here in Brazil it may be too late, but if God’s grace still offers us a window of opportunity, we must devote ourselves to promoting the love of the truth by all possible means. I imagine that the most effective means would be the exercise of the apostolic function, and that at more than one level. I am thinking of the following: local congregations, whole denominations, and the various levels of civil government. **Dear God, please send us apostles!**