

Institute for Christian Studies
FACULTY BULLETIN

Number 7
November, 1986

Copyright 1986

by

The Institute for Christian Studies
1909 University Avenue
Austin, Texas 78705

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	4
OLD TESTAMENT MODELS OF LEADERSHIP	
Rick Marrs	5
AUTHORITY AND LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	
James W. Thompson	20
A HIERARCHY OR MERE FUNCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: IS THERE ANOTHER MODEL FOR THE MINISTRY?	
Allan J. McNicol	37
ETHOS AND AUTHORITY: THEN AND NOW	
Michael R. Weed	62
CONTRIBUTORS	78

Foreword

Essays in this Faculty Bulletin variously address issues associated with leadership and authority in the church. Rick Marrs provides suggestive insights for the contemporary church in his analysis of several types of leadership in Israel.

James Thompson and Allan McNicol separately address similar problems in examining leadership in the early church. Thompson finds in the early church a model of leadership which is neither autocratic nor democratic. McNicol focuses on the concept of ministry and applies his insights to the Restoration tradition.

The final essay argues that authority functions in and reflects an ethos. The contemporary church's difficulties with authority are in part due to a failure to understand this and in part due to the contemporary ethos.

Appreciation is due my colleagues for their cooperation in preparing these essays.

Michael R. Weed, editor

A HIERARCHY OR MERE FUNCTIONAL LEADERSHIP:
IS THERE ANOTHER MODEL FOR THE MINISTRY?

by Allan McNicol

It is a too frequent story. As I sit down to read the brotherhood newspaper my attention is drawn toward a veritable litany of reports which involve conflict with the ministry (elders, deacons and preachers) in the local churches. In one church a faction is suing the elders. The group alleges that the elders have abused their role as trustees and are not making a full disclosure of their stewardship of the monies in the church treasury. In other places a number of slander, libel, and invasion of privacy disputes involving disciplinary action by the ministry in local churches has spilled over into the courts. Clearly we in churches of Christ are a contentious people; and increasingly a litigious group as well. These developments seem to be a more frequent part of our scene every year. Why is there so much conflict in the church between the ministry and the rest of the membership?

Of course some of these developments have their origin in the political ethos of our liberal democratic society. Here the individual is fed the constant line that he has all sorts of constitutionally guaranteed rights and these are often under assault by the large institutions in our society; for institutions are always susceptible to abuses of power. Thus the continual suspicion that exists in our society toward corporations, the government, and other major entities is carried over into the church. “We need to watch out for that eldership!” It appears to be assumed that the business of the kingdom is pursued in a similar ethos and with the same ground rules as in any other major institution in our society. As such this seems to represent another example of what Michael Weed has called “the secularization of the church.”¹

Nevertheless our grief over this situation should not in any way be perceived as special pleading for poor administrative practices and raw abuses of power that, unfortunately, still occur in some congregations. In the early church the New Testament writers could credibly hold up the moral life of the leading members as far superior to anything that took place in the outside world (1 Pet. 4:3-4, 15; Acts 2:46-47). Even toward the outsiders Paul exhorts the Christians at Rome to be scrupulously honest and pay their taxes in order to cause no offense to the authorities (Rom. 13:1-7).

Thus there is no excuse for the leadership in churches if they handle the finances unprofessionally or do not conduct themselves with fairness and rectitude, seasoned with genuine care, in delicate matters of administration and discipline. When the believing community does not fulfill the promises evoked by its story it invites the condemnation of disgruntled members as well as outsiders.

Yet, even taking into full consideration the insidious influences that our political ethos infuses into the church, one wonders whether this accounts fully for the current problems which beset our ministry. Years ago, the English scholar T. W. Manson noted that real confusion exists over the understanding of ministry among churches which are organized totally along congregational lines.² For example, in such a church whom do we call ministers? Are minister just members who have lost their amateur status?³ If ministers are paid, are they employed to do what other members are too lazy or incompetent to do?⁴ Is there a place for an order or office of ministry in the church of Christ?⁵ Perhaps our present problems over church leadership occur because we are confused as to what we perceive ministry in the church to be, what is its theological rationale, and how we are to respond to it.

This essay intends to bring some clarification in this area. Our attempt will be to lay the groundwork for a doctrine of ministry that can gain acceptance

within the churches of Christ. Procedurally, as a way of orienting ourselves historically and theologically we will discuss two models for ministry that have emerged in historical Christendom: the hierarchical and the functional egalitarian model. After having shown the strengths and weaknesses of these models we will attempt to discuss the biblical teaching on ministry. We will conclude with a brief summary of the vision of ministry that we would commend to the churches. We trust that these reflections will be helpful; for it will enable us to get in clearer focus what we mean by the ministry of the church, what claim it has over us, and what our obligation is to it.

The Hierarchical Model of Ministry

Throughout the greater part of the history of Western Christianity, especially in Europe, the paradigm for the ministry of the church has been that of the hierarchical model. The ministry of the Roman Catholic Church is the example par excellence for this kind of structuring of the ministry of the church. We will now examine the Catholic view of ministry to assess the strengths and weaknesses of a hierarchical model for the ministry of the church.

One of the most recent authoritative documents on the Catholic view of ministry are those statements that have emerged from Vatican Council II.⁶ In the section on the church it is stated that the Lord, after having sent his apostles,

willed that the bishops be their successors and guide the church to the consummation of the world.⁷ In order that the true bishops be identified it is claimed that the episcopate was established by Peter, who was placed in authority over the twelve, and that it was confirmed by the Holy Spirit that Peter's primal authority be carried on by the Roman Pontiff and his infallible magisterium.⁸ Thus the church is structurally organized on the basis of its episcopate. Ministry only has legitimacy if it operates in direct connection with the episcopate.

This model of ministry is, of course, based on an historical anachronism: the primacy of the church at Rome founded on Peter. It has its origin in the development of the three-fold ministry (bishops, presbyters [priests], deacons) which perhaps first was advocated by Ignatius and then developed in the second-century church. By the end of the second century Irenaeus, the bishop of Lyons, had produced a list of bishops of the church at Rome which he traced back to Peter.⁹ This development further consolidated the belief that Peter was primum inter pares among the apostles. In later centuries the metaphor of Peter obtaining the keys of the kingdom (Matt. 16:19) became very significant. In the Middle Ages the perception was widespread that in an institutional setting, keys were the special prerogative of a steward or vicar who had sole use of them so that no one could open a door he had shut or close a door he had opened.¹⁰ Ultimately, when

the papacy became dominant, the pope on the basis of his claim that he was the successor of Peter, asserted that he had the right to bind or loose in matters of faith and practice in the church.

Under this model of ministry there is a clear division of the church into two groups: clergy and laity. The laity are dependent upon the clergy for their spiritual life and sustenance. For example, the sacraments (including baptism and the Lord's Supper) can only be administered under the direct Jurisdiction of the episcopate. Any other form of ministry is considered to be unapostolic and illegitimate.

Such a model for ministry is not without its advantages. First, since there is a clear distinction between the ministry and laity the ministry is clearly identifiable and visible in the community. Moreover, since it has functioned this way for many centuries it has created a number of deeply hallowed traditions. Protestants often dismiss traditions as stifling and permeated with superstition. But, as many modern secular Jews have discovered, contemporary American secular culture is spiritually bankrupt and one may find identity by returning to observance of various models of Torah observance available within their own tradition; so many Catholics look upon Bernard of Clairvaux, Francis of Assisi, or Mother Teresa as models to shape their own identity today.

Second, since the validity of ministry in the Catholic Church rests upon the transmission of authority from an episcopal body it is easy for that body to determine who should be clergy and under what conditions they should be called. This has the distinct advantage of assuring the world that the clergy must have finished a prescribed course of study in theology, have a reasonable understanding of the tradition, and can present it fairly, before they are ordained. This position is particularly striking when it is compared with the situation in many Free churches where the call to ministry has no theological pre-requisites and is often only subject to whatever political forces are operative in a given congregation. Thus the ministry in many Free churches is often less educated theologically than that in the Catholic episcopate.

Nevertheless despite the great impact of the hierarchical model of ministry in the history of Christianity, it appears deficient for both historical and theological reasons.

The idea that the church at Rome was founded by Peter, and that as steward of the keys of the kingdom he passed on the powers of binding and loosing to the universal church through the power of apostolic succession is an historical fiction. With reference to Peter's connection with Rome, there is no historical evidence to indicate he ever spent significant time there before the great fire of July 64 A.D.,

and his subsequent death shortly thereafter. There is evidence that the church at Rome was in existence in the early forties of the first century and that Paul's letter to the Romans (circa 58) presumes the existence of a considerable body of Jewish and gentile Christians active in the faith by that time.¹¹ Thus, it is impossible to claim, on historical grounds, that Peter was the founder of the church at Rome.

Moreover, evidence from the primary literary sources indicates that governance of the church at Rome (unlike some other major cities in the Empire) was exercised by a plurality of elders or bishops until well into the second century.¹² Therefore, the idea that Peter ordained one bishop to succeed him as the bishop of Rome is also impossible.

Furthermore, while it is true that the New Testament, including Matthew 16:16-18, indicates that Peter was a foundational pillar in the early church, the textual evidence points more to the fact that he was of foundational significance for the church at Jerusalem--not Rome!¹³

Nevertheless, although the hierarchical model of ministry operative in the Catholic Church is historically an anachronism it is often argued that theologically it is true. That is to say there is no doubt that ultimately the ministry of the church at Rome did become an episcopacy and so long as these material structures which emerged acted in a way congruent with the gospel this

development is theologically defensible; even though it may be vastly different from anything that we find in the New Testament!

Yet, given our long historical experience with the hierarchical ministry in European Christianity, the results attained do not make us feel sanguine. One does not necessarily need to raise the scandal of the Inquisition. What we have in mind is a more fundamental inner contradiction in the Catholic view of ministry. There seems to be a basic incompatibility between the proclamation of the gospel and the perception of ministry (as it developed in Western Christendom) as a status, or ordo, perceived to function as somewhat akin to the old Roman senatorial system.¹⁵ Instead of becoming a vehicle to preach the gospel, the Catholic Church became like any other monolithic institution. Certain permanent offices were available to be filled within the hierarchy. Each of these positions had a peculiar status of its own. Achieving status within the hierarchy became a major preoccupation. Such a perception of ministry constituted a fundamental distortion of the gospel; for to minister the gospel is to serve others.

At the heart of Jesus' announcement of the kingdom was a new definition of power. Unlike the highly structured society of the Roman Empire with its constant preoccupation with power and status, Jesus envisioned a new world that would be structured with different priorities. The greatest in the kingdom would

be the humble servant (Matt. 20:20-28; Lk. 21:24-27; Mk. 10:35-45). Children who daily trust and live without anxiety in absolute dependence upon their parents are held up as the models for life in the kingdom (Matt. 18:1-5/Lk. 9:46-48/Mk. 9:33-37; Mk. 10:13-16, 42). Jesus' followers constituted a new family who had only one father, the one in heaven (Matt. 23:9). In turn, they were not to be concerned with possessions or any other symbols of status (Matt. 23:8-12; Mk. 10:17-31).

This word of Jesus found its fulfillment in his congruent conduct in going obediently to the cross and constituted the paradigm for ministry in the early church. In 1 Peter 5:1-2 Peter himself, as a witness of the suffering of Christ, exhorts the leaders of the church to show the same attitude as Jesus toward their flocks (1 Peter 2:21-25; 3:17-18). As is well known, Paul sees his own life as an imitation of the commitment of Christ in going to the cross; and he frequently calls upon his followers to imitate this lifestyle (Phil. 2:1-11; Gal. 2:20; 1 Cor. 1:21-29; 2 Cor. 4:7-12; 1 Thess. 1:5-6).

Thus our analysis can only lead to a fundamental conclusion. The hierarchical model of church leadership, although hallowed and respected because of its long-standing use, is a fundamental contradiction of the gospel. Even though it has manifested itself historically, primarily in the "high churches"

of European Christianity it also may represent an attitude in any church when leadership is sought as a status in itself and domineers over others in the body. In no way can this model be commended to the church today as a theological discrimen which may fruitfully inform our view of ministry.

It is now time to give attention to a quite different model for ministry. This model is significant because it had a major impact on the churches of Christ--especially in recent years.

The Functional Egalitarian Model of Ministry

With the establishment of the first permanent English colony in the New World in 1607 a new era in the history of Western Christianity came into existence. As Sidney Mead points out, the transplanted European may have retained the family names and proclivities of his ancestors yet "all had been changed by the subtle magic of the new land."¹⁶ This change included the churches. There were no longer the traditional state churches of Europe which made claims to legitimacy, either through creedal confessions or territorial jurisdiction; neither were there traditional European sects.¹⁷ Rather the various ecclesiastical expressions of Christianity were free purposive voluntary associations engaged in the proclamation of the gospel--each according to its own understanding and ingenuity.¹⁸ This social climate unquestionably has affected

the structure of the ministry of religious groups in America--even those who continue to maintain connectional or hierarchical polities. Every religious group in America is dependent upon voluntary contributions for their existence. And since giving takes place at a local level a strong degree of control also is maintained there. Thus ministry in America tends to be influenced strongly by egalitarian forces in the wider society. Functional egalitarianism is the model of ministry that often arises in these churches. Here the agenda for a local church totally determines the structure of its ministry. Leadership is set up to fulfill the various perceived functional needs for ministry in the life of the congregation.

The move to a functional egalitarian form of ministry can certainly be seen in the history of those churches who are heirs of the nineteenth century Restoration movement. When Alexander Campbell came to America in 1809 he had already been well schooled in the model for ministry favored by Scottish Restorationists. This was a two-fold ministry: (1) a plurality of elders in a local congregation who exercised pastoral oversight over the members; (2) "mutual ministry" where the men of the congregation regularly took turns in exhorting the congregation.¹⁹ After Campbell came to America he seemed to favor a three-fold ministry: elders, evangelists (either local or peripatetic), and deacons. This seemed to him to come closer to the model of the New Testament church. It also

limited the number of men who regularly preached--something that Campbell was strongly in favor of.

However, in the strongly egalitarian environment of the American frontier and in the liberal twentieth-century era the idea of a strong eldership exercising oversight over a congregation in both doctrinal and spiritual matters has not sat well. Among the Disciples of Christ this is true to such an extent that a writer can say, "We have seen most of their congregations move from an organization supposedly based on a New Testament model to the position that local church order must be judged on its functional effectiveness."²⁰

The situation in many of the churches of Christ today is similar. The pastoral ministry once primarily exercised by the elders has been taken over by a number of functionaries who often represent a particular constituency in the church. These functionaries may be called minister of education, minister of youth, minister of pastoral care, etc. It is these functionaries who constitute the core of the ministry in many congregations. The local church may have elders in name but they do little more than set policy.

Such a functional model for ministry may be perceived as having several advantages. The first is pragmatic. It appeals to common sense to say that the ministry of the church ought to be structured in a simple and straightforward way

to carry out the mission of the congregation. Robert S. Paul tells the story of an American theologian who was giving a lecture on American Church History to European theological students.²¹ The theologian described some of the remarkable stories of evangelism which took place on the American frontier. He gave examples of the improvised ways in which the Lord's Supper was administered. But this was too much for an affronted Episcopalian who blurted out, "Do you mean to say that the service of Holy Communion was conducted by men who had not been properly ordained?"²² The American responded, "If some parts of America had waited for the Communion to be administered by an episcopal clergyman they would be waiting still."²³ At a fundamental level of getting the job done the functional egalitarian mode of ministry has a clear advantage over the hierarchical model.

Such a model of ministry often can involve a large number of believers in direct meaningful participation in the life of the church. Churches with this form of ministry often do more good works and generate more activity and enthusiasm for the Lord's work than those that are structured along hierarchical lines.

Finally, the functional egalitarian model of ministry, at least at a superficial level, would seem to derive some warrant for its use from the practices of the early church. For example, a similar way of structuring the ministry seems to be operative in the ordination of the seven Hellenists in the church at Jerusalem to

assist in the daily distribution of food (Acts 6:1-7). The practice of ordaining those who can best carry out the function of ministry seems to have some affinities with the biblical doctrine of the priesthood of all believers (1 Pet. 2:5, 9; Rev. 1:5, 6).

Yet there are several disadvantages to this model as well. Curiously enough in our modern society the abolition a distinction between “the clergy and the laity,” implicit in the functional egalitarian model of ministry, has a downside. This occurs in what we call the demystification of the ministry. In theological terms we may refer to this as a cheapening of both the call to ministry and its sense of worth. The minister does not wear clerical attire and lives his daily life in a way similar to the other members. He joins the same social clubs, his children go to the same schools, and he receives the same remuneration for his work as others in the congregation. In other words, the minister is hardly different in function from the school teacher, state employee, or the assistant manager at Safeway. Persons who hold these latter positions in our society seldom refer to their work as a calling. Neither, we would assert, are many who happen to serve in ministry today in the local church. In practice many people merely drift into ministry. They may just as well have ended up selling insurance or being the local mortician. Yet, by virtue of some peculiar set of circumstances they are the ones who speak the word of the Eternal One in the assemblies and are called to share the most intimate moments

of highest joy and deepest grief in the lives of the various families of the congregation. Surely, if we think about it, there is something special about the call to ministry. Surely we respect the elder or pulpit minister for something more than the fact that he marries, counsels, or buries us. But the functional egalitarian model for ministry has a difficult time teasing out just what that difference is.

And this is specifically a problem in another setting as well. In a functional model of ministry where is the final locus of authority in a church where the ministry is ultimately one-dimensional? Harry Truman used to speak of his office as president as the place where “the buck stops here!” In some of our local congregations who ultimately is in charge and how is authority dispensed in the congregation?

Ministry as Charisma

It is now time to attempt to determine as closely as possible the biblical teaching on ministry.

Within the history of the Restoration Movement considerable exegetical effort has been expended in order to find an underlying formal pattern for church organization and ministerial offices in the New Testament church and to implement this pattern in the church of our time. But such an attempt is doomed to repeated frustration and failure. Try as we can it is very difficult to see that the

churches of the New Testament period structured their ministry along the lines of conscious following of some revealed formal pattern of ministry. Thus the answer to the problem of what model of ministry we should implement is not to be seen in discovering and decoding for modern application a certain formal pattern for ministry supposedly found in the pages of the New Testament. What is demanded is that we look at the context in which ministry is discussed in the New Testament and determine what are the theological principles that inform the New Testament discussion. This procedure offers better prospects for understanding the New Testament teaching on ministry.

It can be shown that the New Testament view of history, as so much of its other doctrinal teaching, has its origin in implications drawn by early Christians in response to the death and resurrection of Christ. As a result of his absolute commitment in obedience to the heavenly Father in going to the cross, Jesus was vindicated and placed at God's right hand (Phil. 2:1-10; Acts 2:34-36; Rom. 1:3-4). As the one who became the heavenly king, the lesson was that Jesus' rule was not attained according to the earthly standards for kingship held by the Herodians or Caesars; but he elicited allegiance by the sheer power of the love and commitment of his wounded life given for others. Because of the offering of his life Jesus Christ was seen not only as the heavenly king but as the heavenly

high priest (Heb. 4:14; 5:6, 8-10; 8:1-6; 9:11). As a result of the once-and-for-all-offering of his life he offered, proleptically through that single act, the obedience of all those who afterwards would be united with him. (Heb. 10:10-14).²⁴ This image of Jesus as the eternal high priest is very important for understanding the New Testament view of ministry: for it is the presupposition for the important doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. Since Jesus is the High Priest the believer responds by offering himself in living a faithful holy life, and thus the individual offering of his life is taken up into the one perpetual offering made by the eternal high priest of the new covenant (Rom. 12:1; 2 Cor. 4:10; Col. 1:24-25).²⁵ Whether one perceives of the believing community as the body of Christ over which Christ the head rules (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18) or as the new priesthood who faithfully carry on the work of the obedient life of Christ, the community continues and there is a constant necessity for it to be exhorted, guided, and disciplined by those who live the most exemplary lives.

The writer who gives the most specifics about this leadership in the New Testament is Paul. Paul clearly sees the ministry of the church as an expression of the charismata of the spirit. It is the power emanating from God (viz. as in his raising Christ from the dead) now applying the rule of the exalted Lord in the community. As such, leadership is a direct result of the presence or rule of the

exalted Christ in the community of believers. Formally the appearance of leadership in the community is no different than the appearance of the phenomenon of speaking in tongues. Both are charismata of the Spirit. Just as it would be silly to speak about an “office” in the church for speaking in tongues so, for Paul there is no such thing as a distinctive ministerial group or office of ministry in the church apart from the charism of the Spirit which works in the body giving the gift of leadership.²⁶ Leadership and gift are intermingled. Ministry in the church is no more or less than the working of the charismata. Ministry is as much pneumatology as it is ecclesiology.²⁷

A good example of this thinking is found in Eph. 4:7-16. In 4:7-10 we are told that the exalted Lord has been given the right to give gifts as a result of his saving ministry on earth. Certain of the gifts were distributed to the body for the sake of teaching, edification, and maintaining order (4:11-12). As recipients of the gifts, the apostles, prophets and teachers, and shepherds are the ligaments or joints whom the Lord has provided to give nourishment to the body (4:19; Col. 2:19).

In the earlier Pauline writings a similar view of ministry is set forth. In 1 Cor. 12:7, 11 and Rom. 12:4-6, each believer is given a manifestation of the Spirit. Some have been given gifts of leadership. The persons who fulfill leadership roles in the church are diverse (1 Cor. 12: 28; Rom. 12:6-8). From the

beginning we hear of the proistamenoι (leaders) in the Pauline churches (1 Thess. 5:12, 14; Rom. 12:8). A similar designation for leaders (kubernēseis) is given in 1 Cor. 12:28. These ones seem to be the precursors for the bishops (Phil. 1:1). The term elder (drawn from post-exilic Judaism) only comes in the Pastoral letters of Paul and Acts. It seems to be the equivalent of bishops and overseers (Titus 1:5-7; Acts 20:17-28). But, even here, it would be a mistake to view this diversity of terminology as some major stage of development in the ministry of the early church from the dynamic charisma in the early Pauline churches to some self-perpetuating office in the Pastorals, Acts, and Johannine epistles.²⁸ As the church became established certain precedents for doing things clearly became established. But from beginning to end leadership in the New Testament finds its basis in the spiritual rule of Christ in the lives of his followers who excel in sharing common obligation to sustain the weak and who show the agape manifested by their Lord.²⁹ These are the true princes of the church.³⁰ As their Lord, they elicit the flock to follow them by the power of their surrendered lives. This is the model for ministry we would commend to the church today.

Conclusion

By the end of the New Testament period groups of Christians were meeting in the major cities throughout the eastern part of the Roman Empire to honor

Christ as Lord. Unlike the modern day churches of Christ in America who may have twenty congregations in a city, all with their own autonomous leadership, the Christians in a particular city would meet in a various number of places (usually homes) and the ministry would be thought of as constituting the total leadership among the brethren in the particular area.³¹ If C. K. Barrett is correct in his analysis of the ministry of the church at that time, leadership carried out three primary tasks: discipline, exposition of the word (preaching and teaching), and service.³² Of course, there is nothing sacrosanct about the actual material shape of the ministry of churches in the New Testament period vis-à-vis the way we structure it today. At that time there were disputes between leaders just as there are today. No structure can create perfection.

But what is different today is that the churches have largely lost the theological foundations for leadership which were known by the first-century church: the sense of the church as a community of priests offering itself in service to God guided by overseers who exemplify the best of the Story; or the community filled with the Spirit of the risen Lord. In this essay I have shown that when the church forgot these theological truths in its history one of two things happened. Either the ministry degenerated into a self-perpetuating hierarchy or there arose a functional egalitarian type of leadership. The former was too

dictatorial. The latter could not elicit the complete support of the total flock.

I would submit that this analysis aptly describes the current crisis of leadership in churches of Christ. Some churches emphasize the importance of the office of eldership. But without any sense that leadership is a charism it becomes an empty call to authoritarianism. Other churches have become so functionally egalitarian that they appear to be getting anyone, no matter how poorly qualified, to do the job. They have no definable ministry. In either case, such churches constitute the perfect breeding grounds for conflict.

T.W. Manson once described the ideal minister as one in whom the love of God is not only offered to the community but in whom it is also seen to be offered. In the divine scheme of things such men, and they alone, constitute the ministry of the church and truly, as the biblical writers say, “are worthy of double honor.”

Footnotes

- ¹ Michael R. Weed. "The Secularization of the Church: From Transcendence to Technique," Institute for Christian Studies Faculty Bulletin 6 (Fall, 1985) 69-85.
- ² T. W. Manson, Ministry and Christ's Priesthood: Christ's and Ours (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, n.d.) 41.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ De Ecclesia: Constitution of the Church: Vatican Council II. eds. C. Leetham and C. Clifford (Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1965), 35-48.
- ⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses 3.2.3. A good translation is found in The Early Christian Fathers, edited and translated by Henry Bettenson (London: Oxford University Press, 1956) 122-126.
- ¹⁰ J. Kunze, "Keys, Power of the," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge 6. ed., S. M. Jackson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959) 323-324.
- ¹¹ Raymond E. Brown and John P. Meier, Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity (New York: Paulist Press, 1983) 97-111.
- ¹² 1 Clement 42:4, 44:4-5, 54:2; and Didache 15, which many think came at the end of the first century; see Brown, Antioch and Rome, 167 for the second century evidence that Rome, always conservative, was very slow to change to the threefold ministry with a single bishop being the leader of the church in the city of Rome.

- 13 Ben F Meyer, The Early Christians: Their World Mission and Self Discovery GNS 16 (Wilmington, Delaware. Michael Glazier, 1986) 57-66 gives copious evidence that the Hebrew Christians, of whom Peter was the early leader, viewed themselves in their community at Jerusalem as the eschatological Zion in fulfillment of O.T. prophecy. With respect to the latter Rome could not qualify.
- 14 This seems to be the point of Reginald Fuller's review of C. K. Barrett's work on Ministry and the Sacraments, Religious Studies Review 12 (April, 1986) 163.
- 15 E. Schillebeeckx, Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ (New York: Crossroad, 1981) 31.
- 16 Sidney Mead, "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America (1607-1850)." The Ministry in Historical Perspectives, eds., H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956) 208.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Dwight E. Stevenson, "Concepts of the New Testament Church which Contribute to Disciple Thought about the Church," The Revival of the Churches III, ed. W. B. Blakemore (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1963), 28.
- 20 W. B. Blakemore, "The Christian's Task and the Church's Ministry," Revival of the Churches III, 173.
- 21 Robert S. Paul, Ministry (Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmans, 1965) 116.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 T. W. Manson, 61.

- ²⁵ Ibid., 64.
- ²⁶ Some think that they can determine such a ministerial office was in existence by the time of the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. 3:1; 4:14; Titus 2:2). We are not convinced. It is said that Timothy was the beneficiary of the gift of the ministry. This came through the congregation recognizing this gift or charism appointing him to ministry through a laying on of hands by the older men (presbuterious) and Paul (1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6). This process does not seem to be materially different than the earlier Pauline writings. Neither can 2 and 3 John provide that evidence as Abraham Malherbe, "The Inhospitability of Diotrophes," God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl, Jacob Jervell and Wayne E. Meeks eds., (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977) 222-232 points out.
- ²⁷ H. A. Lombard, "Charisma and Church Office," Neotestamentica 10 (1976) 47.
- ²⁸ C. K. Barrett, Church, Ministry, and Sacraments in the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) 83-87.
- ²⁹ Ibid., 39.
- ³⁰ Although the New Testament is not unduly concerned about the process of selection and appointment of these leaders (ordination), there are attempts to point out that the key criterion in the community in recognizing the charism of leadership is that the person manifest qualities shown in his life similar to that of the earthly Jesus. Paul will sometimes hold himself up as the appropriate model (1 Cor. 10:31-11:1; 2 Cor. 11:1-30).
- ³¹ Malherbe, 227.
- ³² Barrett, 42.
- ³³ Manson. 71.

CONTRIBUTORS

The contributors to this issue are all faculty members of Institute for Christian Studies.

Marrs, Rick R., B.A., M. Div., Abilene Christian University; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University. Old Testament.

McNicol, Allan, B.A., M.A., Abilene Christian University; B.D., Yale University; M.A., Ph.D., Vanderbilt University. New Testament. Intertestamental Literature.

Thompson, James W., B.A., M.A., Abilene Christian University; B.D., Union Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Vanderbilt University. New Testament, Hellenistic Literature.

Weed, Michael R., B.A., M.A., Abilene Christian University; B.D., Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Emory University. Ethics, Theology.