

EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 8

Volume 8 • Number 1 • April 1984

Evangelical Review of Theology

*Articles and book reviews selected from publications
worldwide for an international readership,
interpreting the Christian faith for contemporary
living.*

GENERAL EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS



Published by
THE PATERNOSTER PRESS

5. Give examples of how God judges and purifies our culture. [Rom. 12:2](#); [1 Cor. 9:19–23](#); [James 1:16–17](#).
6. How can a simpler lifestyle contribute to a more responsible stewardship of God's creation? [Deut. 15:7–11](#); [Acts 4:32–37](#); [Phil. 2:1–4](#).

This material is freely reproducible if credit is given to Wheaton '83. Please send a copy of any materials you prepare in response to this study and reports to: 804 Deepali 92, Nehru Place, New Delhi-110 019 India. [p. 16](#)

Function or Office? A Survey of the New Testament Evidence

Ronald Y. K. Fung

Printed with permission

Through careful exegesis of the New Testament the author rejects the views of a succession of modern scholars on the relationship between Charisma and Church order and argues for the harmony of relationship between spiritual gifts, function and specialized office. He also answers the question as to whether or not all charismata can be subsumed under ecclesiastical office.

(Editor)

A succession of scholars have seen the relation between spiritual gifts and ecclesiastical office, charisma and church order, basically in terms of separation, tension, or even opposition.¹ We must ask on the basis of the New Testament evidence whether such a position can be maintained and, if not, What the true relation is between function and charisma on the one hand, and office and order on the other.² 'Office' is here thought of

¹ Thus Adolf Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, trans. James Moffatt (2 vols; London: William & Norgate, 1908), 1.334ff., who distinguished between the universal 'charismatic' ministry of apostles, prophets, and teachers and the local 'administrative' ministry of bishops and deacons; R. Sohm, who regarded the organized structure of the Church as involving 'a departure from the pristine purity of the spiritual fellowship of saints' (W. D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 202–203); Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes*, trans. W. J. Montague (London: SCM, 1964), 63–94, and J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM, 1975) 345–350; *idem*, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1977) 351–359, both of whom regard the rise of the institutional ministry as a symptom of 'early Catholicism' (*Frühkatholizismus*).

² In an earlier article, 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry? An Examination of an Alleged Antithesis', *EvQ* 52 (1980) 195–214, I have attempted a detailed critique of Käsemann's thesis, with particular reference to the Pauline corpus. I have avoided simply reproducing here what was said there, although some repetition will hopefully be excused as inevitable.

as a formally recognized position with appropriate duties, and ‘function’ as the discharge of a ministry without a formal position being involved.³ p. 17

I JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES⁴

It has been said in general that Jesus ‘made little contribution to the establishment of an orderly pattern of life and ministry’;⁵ certainly, he does not seem to have appointed any of his disciples to any permanent posts. Yet the very fact that he constituted twelve apostles ([Mark 3:14](#); [Luke 6:13](#))⁶ may indicate that even the early disciples of Jesus were not a mere haphazard band. T. W. Manson, describing the picture of the retinue of Jesus during his ministry as one of a series of concentric circles of people, has helpfully drawn attention to this evidence of ‘degrees of intimacy and of responsible sharing in the work of the Ministry’ even at this early stage.⁷ Nevertheless, it is clear that in the community of Jesus there is no distinction between priests and laity, nor is there any hierarchy among the disciples⁸—service being the sole principle of rule as well as the single criterion of greatness (e.g. [Mark 9:35](#)/[Luke 9:48](#); [Mark 10:43–44](#)/[Matt. 20:26–27](#)).

II THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH IN JERUSALEM

Leadership of the Jerusalem church was originally in the hands of the twelve apostles, who had been designated by Jesus as judges of ‘the twelve tribes of Israel’ in the new age ([Matt. 19:28](#); [Luke 22:30](#)). The place left vacant by the defection of Judas having been filled by Matthias ([Acts 1:15–26](#)), the twelve feature prominently in the early chapters of Acts both as witnesses to Jesus’ resurrection (e.g. [4:33](#); [5:30](#)) and as directors of the church’s affairs (e.g. [4:34–37](#); [5:2](#); [6:1–6](#); [9:27](#)) as well as supervisors of evangelistic work beyond its confines (e.g. [8:14](#)), with Peter assuming the leadership as *primus inter pares* P. 18 ([2:37](#); [5:3](#); [29](#); [8:14](#)).⁹ Paul’s statements in [Galatians 1:17](#), [19](#) are in accord with the picture of Acts and thus indirectly bears witness to its accuracy. At the time, however, of his second post-conversion visit to Jerusalem ([Gal. 2:1–10](#)), probably

³ Cf. the distinction between German *Amt* and *Dienst* as defined by Eduard Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*, trans. Frank Clarke (SBT 32; London: SCM, 1963), 8(= Preface).

⁴ Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 252, claims that Jesus ‘did not found any organizationally apprehensible and clearly defined communities’, and Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 106, has advocated the use of the word ‘movement’ instead of ‘community’ to describe the circles round Jesus. For a defense of ‘the community idea in the teaching of Jesus’ see Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1981) 706–710; cf. Davies, *Christian Origins* 206–207.

⁵ G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 695a.

⁶ The genuineness of this tradition is defended by Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*, trans. J. A. Baker (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), 14. On Luke’s unique Claim that Jesus himself used the name ‘apostles’ of the twelve, cf. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978) 238–239.

⁷ T. W. Manson, *The Church’s Ministry* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948) 47–48.

⁸ Schweizer, *Church Order* 31–32 (=21); Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 28–29.

⁹ The leadership of the twelve in the affairs of the Jerusalem church is doubted by scholars who do not take the historicity of Acts seriously: see, e.g., Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 14–15; Schweizer, *Church Order* 28 (=2i), 48–49 (=3n), 70 (= 5i); Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 107.

identical with the famine-relief visit of [Acts 11:30](#) (= [12:25](#)),¹⁰ James, the brother of the Lord (cf. [1 Cor. 15:7](#)), appears as the number one 'pillar' of the church ([Gal. 2:9](#)), the implied transfer of leadership from Peter to James being probably attributable to Peter's imprisonment under Herod Agrippa I and his subsequent engagement in missionary work outside Palestine ([Acts 12:1-17](#)). By the time of the Jerusalem conference James had emerged as the undisputed leader of the Jerusalem church ([Acts 15:13-21](#)), a position which he maintained up to the time of Paul's fateful visit to Jerusalem ([Acts 21:18](#)) and beyond. But in the case of neither James nor Peter before him is there any suggestion of his being the first 'bishop' of Jerusalem; nor did they or the other apostles find successors to follow in their steps.¹¹ Indeed, such an attempt was inherently impossible, for 'directly implicit in [the] once-for-all character of their function is the fact that the rank and authority of the apostolate are restricted to the first "apostolic" generation and can be neither continued or renewed once this has come to an end'.¹²

Closely associated with the apostles were the Christian elders who first appear in connection with the collection from Antioch ([Acts 11:30](#)), subsequently as a group alongside, and sharing in policymaking with, the apostles ([Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 22-23; 16:4](#)), and finally in close conjunction with James ([Acts 21:18](#)), who now appears as 'president, or *primus inter pares*, of the elders of the Jerusalem church'.¹³ The Christian elders probably arose by analogy with the elders (*zeqenîm*) of Judaism, and this suggests that the term is to be p. 19 regarded as an official title and not merely indicative of function.¹⁴ No indication is given as to the mode of their appointment (apostolic designation or popular choice?); they simply, so to speak, suddenly appear in [Acts 11:30](#).

The case is different with the seven appointed to assist the apostles by taking over the responsibility of the daily distribution to widows ([Acts 6:1-6](#)). While they appear in the present passage as almoners, they may have been regarded as leaders of the Hellenistic group within the church:¹⁵ subsequently Stephen is to play an important role as the first Christian apologist and martyr ([Acts 7](#)), while Philip is to be instrumental in carrying the gospel to Samaria ([8:4-13](#)) and to the Gentile eunuch of Ethiopia ([8:26-39](#)), finally settling down at Caesarea ([8:40; 21:8](#)). The number seven may rest on analogy with the Jewish synagogue;¹⁶ chosen by the members of the church, they were probably

¹⁰ I have offered a defence of this identification in 'The Epistle to the Galatians (10)', *The Harvester* 62/10 (October 1983); and, at greater length, in 'Excursus II: The Visit of [Galatians 2:1-10](#) and the Date of the Letter', 'The Relationship between Righteousness and Faith in the Thought of Paul' (University of Manchester dissertation, 1975; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, #80-28, 242), 1.575-604 (esp. 575-593). with corresponding notes in 2.580-596 (esp. 580-593).

¹¹ Cf. Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 19, 20 (contrast, however, 77). See also G. S. M. Walker/R. T. Beckwith, *IBD* 1.200a-b.

¹² Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 23.

¹³ F. F. Bruce, *New Testament History* (rev. ed.; London: Oliphants, 1971) 352.

¹⁴ Cf. Guthrie, *Theology* 740 n. 129; Fung, 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 198:199. By far the most Common view of their model is the synagogue of Judaism; so, besides those mentioned in Fung, *ibid.* 199 n. 11: Schweizer, *Church Order* 200 (= 24i); G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 517a; G. S. M. Walker, *IBD* 1.287c; R. A. Bodey, *ZPEB* 4.239b.; James Monroe Barnett, *The Diaconate: A Full and Equal Order* (New York: Seabury, 1981) 34.

¹⁵ F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 131.

¹⁶ Schweizer, *Church Order* 71 (= 5h); K. Hess, *NIDNTT* 3 (1978) 545. Bo Reicke, 'The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents', in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York: Harper, 1957), 143-156 (145), suggests that the apostles formed a 'college' and the seven

appointed to their task by the apostles (cf. v. [3b](#), ὁ υἱς καταστήδμεν)¹⁷ with laying on of hands and prayer—thus ‘instituted in their office by the highest authority in the Church’.¹⁸ There is a general consensus of opinion that the passage should not be taken as describing the origin of the diaconate;¹⁹ the appointment of the [p. 20](#) seven was rather a singular measure designed to meet a specific emergency.²⁰

Even so, it was a highly significant moment in the development of the ministry in the early church, for a number of reasons. (1) It is ‘a typical example of how the Church may be guided by the Holy Spirit in the formation of new institutions’, in this case ‘the creation of a new office with appropriate functions’ to which suitable persons were elected.²¹ (2) It was also significant ‘as the first example of that delegation of administrative and social responsibilities to those of appropriate character and gifts, which was to become typical of the Gentile churches, and the recognition of such duties as part of the ministry of Christ’.²² (3) What is most relevant for our immediate purposes, it illustrates the perfect manner in which charisma, office (order) and function (ministry) are interrelated: seven men of appropriate *gifts* (v. [3](#)) are appointed to their *office* (of almoner) (vv. [3b](#), [6](#)) for the *ministry* (v. [2](#), διακονεῖν) of serving tables. The priority, however, manifestly rests with the charismatic qualifications of the men and an abiding principle is thereby forcefully illustrated: ‘Since the apostolic Church required satisfactory evidence that a person was filled by the Holy Spirit before entrusting him with the most ordinary service ([6:3](#)), one may assume that candidates for official ministerial orders were chosen from among those persons in whom the Spirit’s gifts were most evident’.²³

Hellenists ‘themselves probably formed another college, in the fashion of the septemvirate of the Jewish synagogue’; similarly, Edward Schillebeeckx, *Ministry. A Case for Change*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1981), 144 n. 4.

¹⁷ On this see R. P. C. Hanson, *The Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 91–92; Everett F. Harrison, *Acts: The Expanding Church* (Chicago: Moody, 1975) 106–107; I. Howard Marshall, *Acts* (TNTC; Leicester: InterVarsity, 1980) 127.

¹⁸ E. Lohse, *TDNT* 9 (1974) 433. On the other hand Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* 181, thinks that their election ‘was a recognition of charismatic authority more than institution to an office’; cf. *idem*, *Unity and Diversity* 107. But ‘recognition’ and ‘institution’ are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

¹⁹ T. M. Lindsay, *ISBE* 3.2059a; H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 90; C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 3 (1978) 1067; P. H. Menoud, *IDB* 1.623; J. Stam, *ZPEB* 1.49a; A. F. Walls, *IBD* 1.371a; Leon Morris, *Ministers of God* (London: IVF 1964) 82–86; Hans Küng, *The Church*, trans. Ray Ockenden and Rosaleen Ockenden (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1967), 400–401; Leonhard Goppelt, *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, trans. Robert A. Guelich (Grand Rapids: Baker, n.d.), 188; Barnett, *The Diaconate* 30 (note the reference to the article by Andre Lemaire in n.28 on p.39). The opposite view is held by e.g. D. G. Stewart, *ZPEB* .618b.

²⁰ Schweizer, *Church Order* 74 (=5m); however, he arbitrarily considers the seven’s subordination to the apostles unhistorical (49–30; 70–71 =5i). Marshall, *Acts* 204, suggests that by the time of Paul’s famine-relief visit ([Acts 11:30](#)) the seven ‘had ... become known as “elders” by analogy with the name given to leaders in Jewish synagogues’; it seems preferable to say that ‘presumably their task was taken over by the elders ([11:30](#)) after the Hellenists were driven out in the coming persecution ([8:1](#))’ (Harrison, *Acts* 107).

²¹ Hans von Campenhausen, *Tradition and Life in the Church*, trans. A. V. Littledale (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 131.

²² A. F. Walls, *IBD* 1.371b.

²³ R. A. Bodey, *ZPEB* 4.237b. To what extent one may speak of ‘candidates for official ministerial orders’ in relation to the New Testament is, of course, part of the subject of our inquiry.

There were also prophets in the Jerusalem church, three being mentioned by name: Agabus ([Acts 11:28](#); [21:10](#)), Judas and Silas ([15:32](#)). They do not, however, appear to have played any part in the administration of the church. [p. 21](#)

III THE PAULINE COMMUNITIES

We know nothing about the church at Tarsus where Paul spent his ‘silent years’ (cf. [Acts 9:30](#); [11:25–26](#)). But in the Antioch church, he is mentioned as a teacher among a number of ‘prophets and teachers’;²⁴ other unspecified workers (teachers and preachers?) are mentioned in [Acts 15:35](#), so that clearly the leadership of the Antioch church was in the hands of prophets and teachers as a corporate body ([Acts 13:1–3](#)). This is sometimes taken as representative of the structure of the ministry in the churches of the Hellenistic mission, and providing at least a partial basis for rejecting the statement in [Acts 14:23](#) as historically inaccurate²⁵—the other factor adduced to justify that rejection being the complete absence of the term ‘elder’ in the undisputed letters of Paul.²⁶ It is quite unnecessary, however, thus to cast doubts on Luke’s narrative here, for the following reasons. (1) Given that Barnabas—who had invited Paul to be his fellow-worker in the church at Antioch and apparently remained Paul’s senior colleague during the initial stage of the missionary journey which they took together (note the order of their names in [Acts 11:30](#); [12:25](#); [13:1–2](#), [7](#))—came from Jerusalem, ‘there is every reason to suppose that he brought the presbyteral model from Jerusalem to Asia Minor’²⁷ and (one might add) to Syrian Antioch before that. (2) ‘It is in the highest degree likely, since this was the only method of organizing a community of which he had direct experience, that he would instinctively have established boards of elders wherever he founded a congregation, in Gentile just as much as in Jewish regions’.²⁸ (3) The fact that Paul does not mention elders (except in the Pastorals) need not imply conflict with Luke’s account, [p. 22](#) and the more general terms which Paul does use elsewhere ‘could well be intended to denote elders’.²⁹ (4) It is conceivable that the title ‘elder’ ‘caught on more rapidly where there was a predominantly Jewish element in the congregation, for it was reminiscent of the LXX’³⁰—as is apparently borne out by the fact that the title is used in connection with those churches which ‘started from an ex-Jewish

²⁴ Some take the expression as referring to one group: e.g. Schweizer, *Church Order* 183 (= 22c); Kevin Giles, ‘New Testament Patterns of Ministry’, *Interchange* 31 (1983) 43–60 (56 n. 49). However, the double use of $\tau\epsilon$ suggests that two classes of men are in view—three prophets and two teachers: so G. Friedrich, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 849 n. 426; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* 171–172.

²⁵ E.g. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 108; Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 70.

²⁶ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 355; *idem*, *Jesus and the Spirit* 182; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, trans. R. McL. Wilson *et al.* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 436; Schweizer, *Church Order* 71 (= 5i) n. 271; 216 (= 26e).

²⁷ Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 15.

²⁸ J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1972) 123. Cf. Guthrie, *Theology* 761 n. 196, citing in support William Neil, *Acts* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1973) 166.

Kelly (op. cit. 15) also rejects the view which takes Luke to be adapting his terminology to the current practice of his day—a view espoused e.g. by Hanson, *Acts* 152, and Marshall, *Acts* 241—for ‘brushing aside what looks like eye-witness testimony’ (the other reason he mentions does not apply to the two authors just named).

²⁹ Harrison, *Acts* 225. Cf. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 15.

³⁰ Kelly (as in n. 28 above).

nucleus' (Jerusalem, Lycaonia, Ephesus, Crete)³¹ but not in Philippi, where the Jewish synagogue presumably did not even exist and the church from the very start was entirely composed of Gentile elements ([Acts 16:13–15, 33](#)). It has been suggested that 'Luke mentions the appointment of elders or presbyters here as typical of Paul's method which he adopted wherever he founded a Christian community',³² and it is not unreasonable to assume that Paul pursued the same plan wherever necessary and possible.³³ Acceptance of the basic historicity of [Acts 14:23](#) is bound to have its influence on our interpretation of the evidence in the Pauline letters (taken below in their probable chronological sequence).

In [Galatians 6:6](#) ὁ κατηχῶν, specifically singled out as deserving of pay, most probably refers to a form of full-time or almost full-time ministry supported by the congregation.³⁴ A definite, specialized ministry is also suggested by τοὺς κοπιῶντας ... καὶ προϊσταμένους καὶ νοουθετοῦντας of [1 Thessalonians 5:12](#), to whom Paul asks the community to render respect 'on account of their work' (v. [13](#)).³⁵ In [p. 23](#) choosing this threefold designation Paul is obviously more concerned about the function than the office, but this in itself does not invalidate the conclusion that a recognized group of church leaders is in view here; with or without dependence on the statement in [Acts 14:23](#), some scholars have identified these leaders as probably 'elders',³⁶ although others have argued that they are not to be taken in any official sense at all.³⁷ Paul's exhortation in [1 Corinthians 16:15–16](#) suggests that while church workers are in view³⁸ they are not church officials, since they owed no appointment to apostle or church but were self-appointed (ἑταξαν ἑαυτοὺς)—although ultimately, of course, their

³¹ J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1969) 197. In this connection we may note the following passages in [13:43, 44–45](#) (Antioch); [14:1, 2](#) (Iconium); [16:1, 3](#) (Lystra); [19:10, 17](#) (Ephesus). No information is given about the formation of the Cretan church; but the fact that in the Pastorals it, like the church at Ephesus, appears threatened by 'a Gnosticising form of Jewish Christianity' (Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 12; cf. [Tit. 1:10, 14; 3:9](#)) may point to its having a strong Jewish element within its ranks.

³² C. S. C. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1971) 174.

³³ Cf. F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia* (London: Macmillan, 1908) 98 (cf. 66); A. M. Farrer, 'The Ministry in the New Testament', in *The Apostolic Ministry*, ed. K. E. Kirk (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946) 113–182 (144); E. J. Moeller, 'Concerning the Ministry of the Church', *CTM* 22 (1951) 385–416 (398).

³⁴ Cf., in addition to those mentioned in Fung, 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 197 n. 2: H. N. Ridderbos, *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia*, trans. Henry Zylstra (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 216–217; Davies, *Christian Origins* 244; E. Earle Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 10 with nn. 33, 34.

³⁵ This position is strongly maintained by Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* 7 with n. 24, 11–12. Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 8, cites this verse as 'historical evidence' for his view that when the first 'missionary apostles moved on, their functions of leadership and coordination' were 'taken over by obvious and spontaneous leaders in the various communities'.

³⁶ (With reference to [Acts 14:23](#)) Guthrie, *Theology* 761; A. L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (NCB; London: Nelson, 1969) 80; D. E. H. Whiteley, *Thessalonians* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969) 81; (without reference to [Acts 14:23](#)) James Denney, *The Expositor's Bible* 4.349b; William Neil, *The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1950) 122; I. Howard Marshall, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1983) 147.

³⁷ E.g. James Moffatt, *EGT* 4.41a; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* 286–287, 291 (where he goes so far as to say, 'the word "office" is best avoided completely in any description of the Pauline concept of ministry').

³⁸ Cf., Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* 7–8.

appointment was from God. The rest of the letter bears out the conclusion that there were no church officers in Corinth.³⁹ This, however, is probably an exception and should not be regarded as exemplifying a general pattern; as Leonhard Goppelt observes, 'I Corinthians in no way represents an authoritative ideal of the Pauline constitution, but corresponds to the strong pneumatic movement found during the initial period in Corinth and more generally to a transitory stage in the Pauline constitution'.⁴⁰

In *Romans* 16:1 the term *διάκονος*, used of Phoebe of the church at Cenchreae, is probably a designation of office,⁴¹ thus making p. 24 Phoebe a deacon (or some other sort of 'minister') of the church.⁴² Similarly, the *διακονία* which Archippus is to be solemnly charged to execute fully (*Colossians* 4:17) probably denotes some recognized, official ministry in the church at Colossae.⁴³ Epaphras (*Col. 1:7*; cf. 4:12), too, appears as an evangelist of the Lycus Valley,⁴⁴ and the emphasis of the passage appears to lie in the fact that Epaphras was Paul's authorized representative in Colossae and hence a

³⁹ A contrary opinion is expressed by Adolf Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1965) 396, who deduced the existence of deacons and bishops in Corinth (and Rome) from the fact that there was a deaconess in the church at Cenchreae.

⁴⁰ Goppelt, *Apostolic Times* 187. Similarly, F. F. Bruce, *Paul and His Converts* (London: Lutterworth/New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1962) 60; *idem*, *ZPEB* 1.971b; Guthrie, *Theology* 767. On the Corinthian situation cf. our previous discussions in 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 200–203; 'Spiritual Gifts or Organized Ministry? (1) The New Testament Evidence', *The Harvester* 60/4 (April 1981) 28–29.

⁴¹ To the authorities cited in Fung, 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 197 n. 4 the following may be added in support: Schweizer, *Church Order* 199 (=24g); Leon Morris, 'The Ministry of Women', in *Women and the Ministries of Christ*, ed. Roberta Hestenes and Lois Curley (Pasadena: Fuller Theological Seminary, 1979), 14–25 (15); G. G. Blum, 'The Office of Woman in the New Testament', in *Why Not? Priesthood and the Ministry of Women*, ed. Michael Bruce and G. E. Duffield, revised and augmented by R. T. Beckwith (Appleford, Abingdon: Marcham Manor, 1976), 63–77 (64–65); R. T. Beckwith, 'Recent New Testament Study', in *Why Not?* 148–152 (151—but cf. G. S. M. Walker/R. T. Beckwith, *IBD* 2.1007a). Opposed to this view are C. C. Ryrie, *The Role of Women in the Church* (Chicago: Moody, 1980) 88–89; George W. Knight, III, *The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977) 51; Robin Scroggs, 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman', *JAAR* 40 (1972) 283–303 (294 n. 34); P. Hünnermann, 'Conclusions Regarding the Female Diaconate', *TS* 36 (1975) 325–333 (325–326); Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* 288; J. Stam, *ZPEB* 1.49a; W. A. Heidel/G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 880a.

⁴² G. Stählin, *TDNT* 9 (1974) 464 n. 231, notes that the word *διακόνισσα* (deaconess) did not occur till well after New Testament times; C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 3 (1978) 1065, states: 'Paul's use of the masc. term *diakonos* not only suggests the existence of an order of women deacons but also that the women were included in the same order as male deacons'.

⁴³ Cf. H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 88; G. Delling, *TDNT* 4 (1967) 13; *idem*, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 297. While there is no way of ascertaining the exact nature of this ministry, Paul's personal encouragement to Archippus is most probably to be interpreted against the local situation at Colossae: the reference could then be to the assumption of pastoral responsibility formerly held by Epaphras (Everett F. Harrison, *Colossians: Christ All-Sufficient* [Chicago: Moody, 1971] 119–120; Ralph P. Martin, *Colossians and Philemon* [NCB, London: Oliphants, 1974] 139–140) or on relation to the house community of Philemon and Apphia (Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 10).

⁴⁴ F. F. Bruce, in *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians*, by E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 182; G. Friedrich, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 737.

preacher of the authentic gospel.⁴⁵ Thus both Archippus and Epaphras may be regarded as examples of a specialized ministry.⁴⁶

In *Ephesians*, Paul does not expressly mention any church officials; the charismata of [4:11](#) refer to functions and not offices.⁴⁷ This, [p. 25](#) however, again (as with [1 Thess. 5:12](#)) does not preclude the possibility that there were church officers in the communities being addressed;⁴⁸ that there were in fact elders in the Ephesian church is attested by [Acts 20:17, 28](#), where πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι appear as clearly synonymous. It is exaggerating the situation to regard this equation of terms as an anachronistic 'early Catholic tidying up of the initial rather diverse forms into the more uniform pattern of later decades (cf. 1 Clem. 42:4);⁴⁹ all it need imply is that there was in apostolic times a sufficient fluidity about titles of church officials for the identification of πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος (also in [Titus 1:5](#), 7) to be perfectly natural and not in the least anachronistic.⁵⁰ On this showing, different titles may have been assumed by the same church leaders: 'elder' conjuring up the notion of office or status, 'overseer/bishop' bringing to the fore the idea of function,⁵¹ as does also the implied title of ποιμένες ([Acts 20:28](#)), which links up significantly with the ποιμένες of [Ephesians 4:11](#). Of even greater significance is the fact that the appointment of these presbyter-bishops are directly attributed to the work of the Holy Spirit, which may mean, 'either that their possession of charismatic gifts marked them out for their ministry, or that they had been designated

⁴⁵ Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 22a, b, 23a; Donald Guthrie, *NBCR* 1142b. Both the sense of the verse and the weight of superior witnesses favour the view that in [Colossians 1:7b](#) ἡμῶν should be read for ὑμῶν (διάκονος): C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (CGTC; Cambridge: the University Press, 1968) 27 n. 1; Lohse, *Colossians* 23a; Martin, *Colossians and Philemon* 49; Harrison, *Colossians* 25; Bruce, *Colossians* 179 n. 7.

⁴⁶ Cf. our previous discussion in 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 197–198.

⁴⁷ Some think that the reference is to office-holders in the Church: e.g. Rudolf Schnackenburg, 'Christus, Geist und Gemeinde (Eph. 4:1–16)', in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament* (C. F. D. Moule FS), ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge: the University Press, 1973), 279–296 (292, 295). Others see a double reference—to offices as well as gifts: T. K. Abbott, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1968) 117; Markus Barth, *Ephesians* (AB, 2 vols; Garden City: Doubleday, 1974) 2.435. But the immediately following context places the emphasis on the idea of harmonious functioning among the members of Christ's body, thus showing that the gifted men just enumerated (as themselves gifts of the ascended Lord to his Church) are viewed as exercising functions rather than holding offices.

⁴⁸ Cf. Barth, *Ephesians* 2.436.

⁴⁹ Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 355–356.

⁵⁰ Cf. Hanson, *Acts* 204. The common supposition that the equation of presbyters and bishops in Acts and in the Pastorals represents the fusion of two different church orders (the Jerusalem church with its elders and the Pauline churches with bishops)—so Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 77–78; Schweizer, *Church Order* 199 (=24g); G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 666; Goppelt, *Apostolic Times* 189; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* 347—is challenged by Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 123–124, and by R. E. Brown, *Priest and Bishop: Biblical Reflections* (New York: Paulist, 1970) 65–69, as summarised in E. Margaret Howe, *Women and Church Leadership* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982) 74: 'both the offices of presbyter and bishop may have originated within the ranks of the Jewish Christians'; 'it is by chance that only the presbyters at Ephesus are referred to as bishops'; 'it is equally likely that the Jerusalem presbyters were so designated but that this escaped mention in Acts'.

⁵¹ G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980) 82. Differently, H. E. Dosker, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 516b: 'elder/presbyter' signifies age and place in the church; 'bishop' refers to office.

for it by the p. 26 testimony of prophets in the Ephesian congregation';⁵² although the latter interpretation could conceivably be supported by reference to the case of Timothy (1 Tim. 1:18; 4:14), yet the two cases are not identical, and in view of Paul's teaching on spiritual gifts in general and the particular correspondence between our passage and Ephesians 4:11 (where the subject is spiritual gifts), the former interpretation is surely to be preferred.⁵³ This again (as in the case of Acts 6:1–6) illustrates the perfect blending of charisma, office and function: the elders/presbyters (*office*) were endowed by the Holy Spirit with the appropriate *gifts* for the discharge of their work as overseers/bishops and pastors/shepherds (*function*); here again, the sovereignty of the Spirit—and hence the possession of charisma—takes priority of place.⁵⁴

It is generally agreed that the ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι of Philippians 1:1 designate the leaders of the Philippian church; but whether the terms denote functions only or offices also remains a matter of debate.⁵⁵ It is a noteworthy fact that 'in none of the other Pauline letters (apart from the Pastorals) do we find such special reference made to a definite body of people in the church exercising supervisory and administrative functions',⁵⁶ and considering the fact that Philipplans is probably the latest of Paul's 'prison epistles' and in the Pastorals the same categories of people appear as definite officers, we may conclude, with Campenhausen, that 'we are dealing p. 27 with established terms for offices, ... even though these are of a very general and neutral, and entirely non-sacral, origin and nature'.⁵⁷

⁵² G. W. H. Lampe, 'Grievous Wolves' (Acts 20:29), in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (as in n. 47 above), 253–268 (253).

⁵³ Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Tyndale, 1965) 380: 'The church recognized as overseers those whom the Holy Spirit had qualified for the work by bestowing the appropriate χάρισμα upon them'.

⁵⁴ Cf. C. K. Barrett, 'Conversion and conformity: the freedom of the spirit and the institutional church', in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (as in n. 47 above), 359–381 (381): 'Not only the synoptics but Acts also sees the development of the church as controlled from point to point by the gift and direction of the Spirit, who remains sovereign, appointing, for example, those who are to act as presbyter-bishops (Acts 20:28)'.

⁵⁵ E.g. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* 10 n. 32, considers the διάκονοι to be 'local ministers ... who served in an official, i.e. a recognized and designated capacity in the community'; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* 288–289 (cf. *idem*, *Unity and Diversity* 113), insists that the terms represent only 'charismatic ministries ... recognized by the church and not offices ...'; while J. Stam, *ZPEB* 1.49a, regards their use as 'quasiofficial'. Cf. Eduard Lohse, 'Die Gemeinde und ihre Ordnung bei den Synoptikern und bei Paulus', in *Jesus und Paulus* (W. G. Kümmel FS), ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 189–200 (192), who thinks that they probably had to do with financial management and eucharistic celebration of the community, but were not yet fixed offices set off from the community.

⁵⁶ F. F. Bruce, 'St. Paul in Macedonia: 3. The Philippian Correspondence', *BJRULM* 63 (1980–81) 260–284 (283).

⁵⁷ Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 68. Barrett (as in n. 54 above) says that 'to explain them [sc. the two words in question] in terms of the usage of half a century later is methodologically false'; but this criticism loses its force if the Pastorals are genuinely Pauline letters (if only written through an amanuensis). The position reflected in Barrett's comment illustrates the need for 'evaluation of the effects of theories of pseudonymity on the exegesis of a text' (Donald Guthrie, 'Questions of Introduction', in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, ed. I. Howard Marshall [Exeter: Paternoster, 1977], 105–116 [107]). Cf. our previous discussion in 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 198; to the references there cited (nn. 9, 10) may be added in support: F. W. Beare, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1973) 48–49; J. J. Müller, *The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 35 n. 8; J. H. Michael, *The Epistle of Paul to the*

In the *Pastoral Epistles* the local ministry shows a more advanced degree of organization than heretofore, with apostolic delegates exercising supreme authority and transmitting the authentic gospel, with bishop-presbyters engaged in preaching, pastoring, ruling and in their turn passing on the tradition, with deacons (both male and female) rendering service of a more practical and temporal sort, and with suitably qualified widows probably assisting the whole by providing ministries particularly adapted to the needs of women.⁵⁸ We have elsewhere examined—and rejected—Käsemann’s claim that the ministry as presented in the Pastorals represents the very antithesis of Paul’s outlook.⁵⁹ Here a few observations may be made by way of emphasis or supplementation.

(1) Timothy and Titus are apostolic delegates, not adumbrations or the first concrete examples of the monepiscopate in a line of ‘apostolic succession’:⁶⁰ Timothy’s ordination ‘does not yet bear the character of legal authorization’, since the initiative rests with the Spirit ([1 Tim. 1:18](#); [4:14](#)), his ministry is to be based on his exemplary life and conduct ([1 Tim. 4:12–16](#); cf. [Tit. 2:7](#)), the emphasis is on the succession of sound *doctrine* ([2 Tim. 2:2](#)), and there is no mention of ordination or laying on of hands in the case of the ‘faithful men’.⁶¹

(2) The priority of the Spirit cannot be over-emphasized: Spirit-inspired prophecy led to the choice and ordination of Timothy in the first place ([1 Tim. 1:18](#)); the Spirit imparted to him the charisma [p. 28](#) needed for his task ([1 Tim. 4:14](#); [2 Tim. 1:6](#)); the Spirit is the one who will enable him to keep the tradition of sound doctrine ([2 Tim. 1:14](#)), just as he is the giver of the charisma of teaching—the aptitude to teach (διδασκικόν)—which is required both of Timothy and of all other servants of the Lord ([2 Tim. 2:24](#)), not least, the presbyter-bishop of the local church ([1 Tim. 3:2](#); [Tit. 1:9](#)). All this ‘proves that the charisma is still taken seriously in the Pastoral Letters, and has not become simply an attenuated idea’ and that ‘the writer still knows ... that it is not the permission of an authority but the “event” of God’s Spirit, that qualifies a person to serve’.⁶² Thus for the third time (cf. [Acts 6:1–6](#); [20:17, 28](#)) we see clearly illustrated the interrelation between office (e.g. ἐπίσκοπή, [1 Tim. 3:1](#)),⁶³ gift (v. [2](#), διδασκικόν), and

Philippians (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1939) 6; Guthrie, *Theology* 761; R. A. Bodey, *ZPEB* 4.240a; Barnett, *The Diaconate* 31–33.

⁵⁸ For details cf. Fung, ‘Spiritual Gifts or Organized Ministry?’ (see n. 40 above), esp. 29, and, more fully, *idem*, ‘Ministry, Community, and Spiritual Gifts’ (ThM thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1971) 157–175.

⁵⁹ Fung, ‘Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?’ 206–209.

⁶⁰ Cf. G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 695b. Pace Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 352.

⁶¹ Schweizer, *Church Order* 83–85 (=6g).

⁶² Schweizer, *Church Order* 210 (=25e) (in the original statement, the subject of the verb ‘proves’ is ‘1 Tim. 1.18’; the phrase ‘at least in theory’ has been omitted in our quotation as being judged unnecessary); cf. *ibid.* 88 (=6k), where the significance of [1 Timothy 1:18](#) is again stressed. The author rightly points out (210) that the writer certainly does not think that God’s Spirit can be acquired only through the laying on of hands, which is not mentioned in connection with the appointment of presbyter-bishops.

⁶³ The word seems to be used here ‘to designate a defined office to which one could aspire’ (L. Coenen, *NIDNTT* [1975] 192); cf. H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 608. On the other hand, Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 72, thinks that since the word ‘does not necessarily refer to ecclesiastical office but can denote any kind of administration, this may possibly be a current proverb commending ambition for office in general’. In any case, the immediate mention of ἐπίσκοπον in verse 2 renders it likely that the office in view in verse 1 is that of the church official known as overseer/bishop.

function (v.1, ἔργον), with the Spirit taking priority of place in equipping an office-bearer with the appropriate charisma for his work.

(3) There is no doubt that the elders form a clearly defined group.⁶⁴ Valuable clues to their position in the church at Ephesus are provided by [1 Timothy 5:17](#), which shows that (i) their function is to exercise leadership (οἱ προεστῶτες) in the congregation;⁶⁵ (ii) a distinction is made between the body of elders who exercise this general leadership and the narrower group with more specific tasks, particular mention being made of those who labour in preaching and teaching;⁶⁶ p. 29 (iii) in the case of some at least of the narrower group of elders, the exercise of their functions is taking up much of their time and energies which might otherwise have been gainfully employed, since Paul enjoins that they are to be given double honorarium⁶⁷—a situation easily reminiscent of the apostle's teaching in [Galatians 6:6](#).

(4) As in [Acts 20:17, 28](#), the terms 'elder' and 'overseer' seem to be used interchangeably in [Titus 1:5, 7](#). In both its occurrences ([1 Tim. 3:2](#); [Tit. 1:7](#)), however, ἐπίσκοπος occurs in the singular with the arguicle prefixed. This is taken by Günther Bornkamm as one of two arguments against an equation of the titles—the other being 'the separate enumeration of qualifications': [Titus 1:5–6](#) referring to the qualifications for presbyters and [Titus 1:7–9](#), for the bishop.⁶⁸ But the singular is almost certainly to be taken as generic, like πρεσβυτέρω in [1 Timothy 5:1](#) and ἡ χήρα in [5:5](#),⁶⁹ as referring 'to the bishop as a type and not to the number of bishops in a given place';⁷⁰ as for the list of qualifications in [Titus 1:5–9](#), the conjunction γάρ at the beginning of verse [7](#) binds what follows closely with what precedes, so that only *one* list, not two, of qualifications is here

⁶⁴ Cf. Schweizer, *Church Order* 85 (=6h); G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 666; Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 122, where cogent reasons are given against understanding the πρεσβύτεροι as simply elderly men.

⁶⁵ 'That the rulers "who rule well" were to be differentiated from others who ruled less well ... is unlikely' (Schweizer, *Church Order* 86 [=6h] n. 333). On προῖστασθαι see B. Reicke, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 702 (=to lead, to care for); Ernest Best, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1977) 225 (=to protect, care for).

⁶⁶ For this understanding of the distinction implied in the verse, cf. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 124; G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 667. Schweizer, *Church Order* 86 (=6h) n. 333, concludes from this verse that the requirement that the bishop be an apt teacher ([1 Tim. 3:2](#); [Tit. 1:9](#)) 'will be an ideal demand that is not fulfilled in every case'; but it would be nearer the truth to say that while all elders should be 'apt to teach' some have teaching as their special gift (F. F. Bruce, *Answers to Questions* [Exeter: Paternoster, 1972] 117)—and possibly full-time occupation. Some have seen in the verse a distinction between 'ruling' and 'teaching' elders—e.g. Walter Lock, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1966) 62; L. Coenen, *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 199—but this view is opposed by J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963) 195 n. 3; R. A. Bodey, *ZPEB* 4.239b; D. G. Stewart, *ZPEB* 1.619a.

⁶⁷ The context ([1 Tim. 5:18](#)) 'lends unconditional support' to this interpretation of διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν (G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 [1968] 666–667), for 'if τιμῆς here is to be taken merely as 'honour', the Deut. quotation is singularly lacking in point' (A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* [London: SPCK, 1974] 165). Similarly: Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 113 n. 261; J. Schneider, *TDNT* 7 (1971) 176–177.

⁶⁸ Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 667. Cf. Goppelt, *Apostolic Times* 190.

⁶⁹ So Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 74 (cf. 13–14, 231–232); Martin Dibelius/Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, trans. Philip Buttolph and Adela Yarbro (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 56a with n. 41

⁷⁰ H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 617. Cf. Lohse, 'Die Gemeinde und ihre Ordnung' (see n. 55 above) 198.

given—namely, those for the presbyter-bishop.⁷¹ But if ‘elder’ and ‘bishop’ are interchangeable p. 30 terms,⁷² and there was clearly a plurality of elders, then even in the Pastorals there is no trace of the emergence of the monarchical episcopate, the origins of which belong to a later period of church history.⁷³

(5) It needs to be emphasized, finally, that the organization of the ministry in the Pastorals is not so advanced that they must be placed outside Paul’s lifetime;⁷⁴ it provides slender support for the view p. 31 which sees the rise of the institutional ministry in the Pastorals (and other New Testament literature) as a sign of ‘Early Catholicism’.⁷⁵

⁷¹ Schweizer, *Church Order* 85 (=6h), suggests that here ‘the writer inserted a traditional exhortation for a bishop’ (see also n. 322).

⁷² This view is widely held: e.g. Lightfoot, *Philippians* 95–99; Edwin Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1888) 39 with n. 31; J. A. Robinson, ‘The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Periods’, in *Essays on the early History of the Church and the Ministry*, ed. H. B. Swete (London: Macmillan, 1918) 57–92 (84); B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London: Macmillan, 1929) 77; Bruce, *Book of Acts* 415; G. B. Caird, *The Apostolic Age* (London: Duckworth, 1955) 151; John Knox, *The Early Church and the Coming Great Church* (New York: Abingdon, 1955) 120, 130; Morris, *Ministers of God* 72–74; Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 15, 146 n. 15; H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 615–616; L. Coenen, *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 191–192; C. Brown, *NIDNTT* 2 (1976) 563; D. G. Stewart, *ZPEB* 1.618b.

⁷³ Cf. L. Coenen, *NIDNTT* 1 (1975) 192; Ridderbos, *Paul* 457 n. 91. In support of a distinction, some have taken the appointment of elders in [Acts 14:23](#) and [Titus 1:5](#) to mean ‘to appoint to the episcopate’: thus M. R. Vincent, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1968) 49; L. M. A. Haughwout, ‘Steps in the Organization of the Early Church’, *ATR* 3 (1920) 31–50 (41–42). But the attempt must be judged far-fetched; to say the least, if this were the intended meaning the biblical authors could have easily made it unambiguously clear with an additional phrase—say, εἰς / πρὸς τὴν ἐπίσκοπὴν—or by supplying a second accusative (cf. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 122). Equally unacceptable is the ‘liturgical’ interpretation whereby the bishop is directly evolved from the ἀρχισυνάγωγος, whose function was almost entirely liturgical (so P. Hinchliff, ‘Origins of the Christian Ministry’, *CQR* 162 [1961] 415–423 [416–417]), so that while ‘all the bishops might be also accounted as elders, ... not all the elders were bishops, but only those who presided over the Eucharistic assemblies’ (M. H. Shepherd, Jr., *IDB* 2.74b); for the New Testament evidence regarding the function of bishops places scant emphasis on the liturgical aspect, if indeed this aspect comes into view at all (on the connection between ministry and eucharist see Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 30); and while προϊστάσθαι could include the idea of ‘presiding’, its primary meaning in the passages concerned can hardly be ‘presiding at the worship service/the eucharist’. More plausible are the views that the bishops were ‘executive officers ... chosen from the ranks’ of the presbyters (Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 232) and that the ἐπίσκοπος was ‘an elder who performed the special function of oversight’ (Guthrie, *Theology* 763), but even these do not completely tally with the fact that leadership and pastoral care are functions predicated both of the bishop (προϊστάμενον, προστῆναι, ἐπιμελήσεται, [1 Tim. 3:4–5](#)) and of the elder (προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, [1 Tim. 5:17](#); ποιμαίνειν, [Acts 20:28](#)). Thus, regarding the two terms as completely interchangeable in ‘a varying use of language’ (Ridderbos, *Paul* 457 n. 91) still seems the most satisfactory interpretation.

⁷⁴ Cf. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* 14–16 (esp. 15); and our previous discussion, ‘Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?’ 209. Guthrie, *Theology* 764, even says that ‘the ministry in the Pastorals is no more advanced than that in the Philippian church’.

⁷⁵ Cf. I. Howard Marshall, ‘“Early Catholicism” in the New Testament,’ in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 217–231 (esp. 227–228). Cf. also Leon Morris, ‘Luke and Early Catholicism’, *WJT* 35 (1973) 121–136, reprinted in *Studying the New Testament Today*, ed. John H. Skilton (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1976), 60–75 (esp. 67); Campenhausen, *Tradition and Life in the Church* (see n. 21 above) 126–127, where he speaks of the concept of ‘early catholicism’ as the product of ‘a certain unhistorical, highly suspicious, ultra Protestant Criticism’ (further, 134–135).

IV THE GENERAL EPISTLES

The teaching of *1 Peter* [4:10–11](#) shows very close affinities with the Pauline concept of charisma. The variegated grace of God manifests itself in the many different charismata of the community,⁷⁶ whose members have received each his own gift, and they are to employ their gifts in loving (cf. [v.8](#)) service to one another as good stewards of that same grace. Verse [11](#) cites two examples of specialized tasks, which may be taken as ‘a shortened summary’⁷⁷ dividing the exercise of charismata into ministry of word and ministry deed (cf. [Acts 6:2](#));⁷⁸ the word διακονεῖν here, as contrasted with λαλεῖν, would seem to be used in the narrower sense of service to the needy and suffering, in contradistinction to its use in verse [10](#), which is all-embracing.⁷⁹ The passage makes it abundantly clear that, as in Paul, the gift bestowed by God constitutes a call to ministry⁸⁰ (cf. [Rom. 12:6–8](#)), and that all ministry is grounded in, derived from, and supported by God’s power ([v.11b](#)).⁸¹ The fact that the verb λαλεῖν is used elsewhere with the connotation of teaching and preaching (e.g. [Acts 10:44](#); [Rom. 7:1](#); [2 Cor. 2:17](#); [4:13](#); [Phil. 1:14](#)) and the parallelism between εἰ τις λαλεῖ and εἰ τις διακονεῖ have led some interpreters to see in verse [11](#) a reference to church officials;⁸² if this is correct, we [P. 32](#) have here yet another (besides Acts and the Pastorals) illustration of the interweaving of gift, task and office.

In any event, an ordered ministry is clearly envisaged in [1 Peter 5:1–4](#), with a definite body of elders whose function is described in terms of ‘pastoral oversight’ (if ἐπισκοποῦντες in verse [2](#) is original) or ‘shepherding’ God’s flock committed to their charge ([v.2](#), ποιμάνετε τὸ ... ποίμνιον; cf. [Acts 20:28](#))⁸³ and who are warned against the possible abuse of authority (κατακυριεύοντες, [v.3](#)).⁸⁴ The prohibition against discharging their duties for the sake of shameful gain (αἰσχροκερδῶς, [v.2](#)) has been taken to suggest that the elders received stipends,⁸⁵ readily recalling [1 Timothy 5:17](#) (and [Galatians 6:6](#)); but probably it is to be explained as the temptation to turn their

⁷⁶ Cf. H. Seesemann, *TDNT* 6 (1966) 485, who notes that this is the only place in the New Testament where the word ποικίλος has theological importance.

⁷⁷ Schweizer, *Church Order* 111 (=9b) with n. 419. Cf. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 116.

⁷⁸ Cf. H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 86. On λόγια θεοῦ cf. G. Kittel, *TDNT* 4 (1967) 138–139.

⁷⁹ C. E. B. Cranfield, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; 2 vols; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975, 1979) 2.622 n. 3.

⁸⁰ Schweizer, *Church Order* 111 (=9b).

⁸¹ Cf. W. Grundmann, *TDNT* 3 (1965) 399; also R. Y. K. Fung, ‘The Nature of the Ministry according to Paul’, *EvQ* 54 (1982) 129–146 (138).

⁸² So Kelly, *Peter and Jude* 180–181; cf. O. Michel, *TDNT* 5 (1967) 151.

⁸³ In view of the difficulties mentioned by Kelly, *Peter and Jude* 202, τῶν κληρῶν (taken in the sense of the flock entrusted to a presbyter; cf. [Acts 17:4](#), προσεκληρώθησαν) is surely to be understood of various local churches rather than particular parts of a church (the two are regarded as alternatives by Schweizer, *Church Order* 112 [=9b] n. 422); cf. G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 665 n. 89, who further suggests that the plural ‘is perhaps due to the encyclical character of the epistle’.

⁸⁴ Cf. Schweizer, *Church Order* 111 (=9b); Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 116; Kelly, *Peter and Jude* 196; G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 665. Pace Guthrie, *Theology* 784, who thinks that in *1 Peter* the term ‘elder’ is used in the sense of ‘seniority in age’ only.

⁸⁵ So A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (6 vols; Nashville: Broadman, n.d.) 6.131.

trust, as those in charge of the community funds, into a means of personal gain.⁸⁶ Alongside the ‘charisma constitution’ of [4:10–11](#), then, is placed ‘the constitutional office of the elders’ here;⁸⁷ on the basis of the earlier passage, it is reasonable to assume that the elders would have received gifts for their office⁸⁸—thus confirming the evidence of, or at least providing firmer evidence than, [1 Peter 4:10–11](#) that gift, function and office can blend together in harmony.⁸⁹

In the *Epistle of James*, where the unique use of συναγωγή in the sense of the Christian assembly ([2:2](#), note ὑμῶν) alongside the common New Testament word for church (ἐκκλησία, [5:14](#)) reflects an early stage of church development,⁹⁰ we find mention of [p. 33](#) ‘teachers’ ([3:1](#)) and ‘elders’ ([5:14–15](#)). The former passage suggests that there was a recognized group of teachers (among whom the author places himself, vv. [1, 2](#)) comparable to those in other early Christian communities (cf. [Acts 13:1](#); [1 Cor. 12:28–29](#); [Eph. 4:11](#)), and that unworthy candidates were eagerly going after the office without taking its responsibilities—and particularly the greater liability to the penal judgement which it involves—seriously.⁹¹ In the latter passage, the elders of the church—church-bearers rather than just senior men of the congregation (note τοὺς)⁹²—are envisaged as praying over a sick member who is then miraculously cured in response to the prayer of faith (cf. v. [16b](#)), i.e. prayer which proceeds from confident belief and does not doubt (cf. [1:6](#)).⁹³ This presupposes the early Christian experience of charismata and involves in particular the gifts of faith and of healing—or perhaps we should say the charisma of ‘healing intercession’.⁹⁴ It has been suggested that the elders here are clearly ‘regarded as endowed with the gift of efficacious prayer in virtue of their office’ and that ‘the bearer of the office has merely inherited what at first belonged exclusively to the pneumatics’;⁹⁵ but if τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους may be understood as a generalizing plural, it is unnecessary to suppose that each elder will have the particular gift of healing intercession *by virtue of his office*; it seems preferable to suppose that

⁸⁶ So Kelly, *Peter and Jude* 201. Cf. J. Jeremias, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 498 n. 124; G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 665.

⁸⁷ Goppelt, *Apostolic Times* 187.

⁸⁸ Cf. Ernest Best, *1 Peter* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1971) 167; Schweizer, *Church Order* 216 (=26f) n. 846 (God’s gifts are presupposed in the appointment of elders).

⁸⁹ That 1 Peter reflects an earlier stage in the evolution of church government than that seen in the Pastorals is held by both Kelly, *Peter and Jude* 197, and Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 116. But see also G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 666.

⁹⁰ So Guthrie, *Theology* 781; James B. Adamson, *The Epistle of James* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977) 105, cf. 197. συναγωγή is taken in a Christian sense also by Martin Dibelius/Heinrich Greeven, *James*, trans. Michael A. Williams (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 132b; W. Schrage, *TDNT* 7 (1971) 837–838, cf. 828.

⁹¹ Cf. Guthrie, *Theology* 782; Adamson, *James* 140; Dibelius/Greeven, *James* 183; also K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 152.

⁹² So, correctly, G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 664; H. Schlier, *TDNT* 1 (1964) 231; Dibelius/Greeven, *James* 252b–253a; Adamson, *James* 197; Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1954) 169. *Pace* Guthrie, *Theology* 782.

⁹³ R. Bultmann, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 206 (with n. 244); Mayor, *James* 173.

⁹⁴ G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 664; cf. Dibelius/Greeven, *James* 254b.

⁹⁵ Respectively, Bornkamm (as in previous note) and Dibelius/Greeven, *James* 255a (cf. 254a, 253a).

those who possessed the charismata in the largest measure would be included in the body of elders, and the latter would, on notification of a case of sickness, consider whether it was a fit case for the exercise of the charisma and depute some of their number to pray for the sick person.⁹⁶ It is also noteworthy that this gift is not confined to the body of elders as their sole prerogative: verse [16](#) suggests that anyone with the gift of healing intercession [p. 34](#) could heal the sick by prayer.⁹⁷ Thus [James 5:14–15](#) not only illustrates (for the fifth time) the harmony between gift, function and office but also hints at another important principle, viz. that while charismata can and do find expression in office, not all charismata can be subsumed under the heading of ecclesiastical office; taken with verse [16](#), the passage also illustrates the distinction—to which we have drawn attention elsewhere⁹⁸—between the ‘specialized ministry’ (here the elders) and the ‘common service’ (whoever has the charisma).

The community in *Hebrews* is exhorted to remember their past leaders and imitate their faith ([13:7](#)), to render their present leaders due respect and obedience ([13:17](#)), and to greet them on the author’s behalf ([13:24](#)); thus a distinct group of church leaders is given special mention and prominence, perhaps with the intention of strengthening their authority, and a definite congregational order is developing.⁹⁹ It has even been suggested that ‘this high estimation of office implies transition to early Catholicism’.¹⁰⁰ However, the actual word used (ἡγούμενοι) is one which suggests authority rather than office,¹⁰¹ and obedience is urged not as due to an office as such, but to the pastoral ministry that the leaders are actually exercising, just as the ministry of teaching is based on spiritual maturity expressed in discernment ([5:14](#)).¹⁰² On the other hand, it would seem exaggerated to say that ordering of offices is completely abolished and that *Hebrews* combats the institutional church,¹⁰³ since the intense concentration of ministry in the final and perfect High Priest, Jesus Christ, is occasioned by the author’s apologetic aim to present the absolute superiority of the New Order to the Old and need not in itself preclude the existence of officials in the church. In view of the clear distinction between the leaders and the led, it might be best to regard [p. 35](#) the epistle as reflecting ‘a primitive form of church order’¹⁰⁴ without excluding the possibility that the ἡγούμενοι are the people elsewhere called bishops or presbyters.

⁹⁶ So Mayor, *James* 169. Cf. Dibelius/Greeven, *James* 253b: ‘... one can probably presuppose a certain patriarchalism which is inclined to bestow upon especially experienced members of the community the official rank as well’.

⁹⁷ Dibelius/Greeven, *James* 254b; Mayor, *James* 232–233. The latter suggests that ‘one reason why the elders, rather than others, were to be called in, may have been that they were better able to judge what was the will of the Spirit’.

⁹⁸ ‘The Nature of the Ministry according to Paul’ (see n. 81 above) 141.

⁹⁹ Cf. Johannes Schneider, *The Letter to the Hebrews*, trans. William A. Mueller (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 135; also H. Windisch, *TDNT* 1 (1964) 500–501, who notes that among all the greetings in the imperative form in the epistles ‘only here is prominence given to the leaders as compared with the whole community’.

¹⁰⁰ F. Büchsel, *TDNT* 2 (1964) 907.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Guthrie, *Theology* 780; Schweizer, *Church Order* 114, 115 (=10b).

¹⁰² Schweizer, *ibid.*; Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 119.

¹⁰³ Schweizer, *Church Order* 115 (=10b), 116 (=10c); Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 119–120, 121–122.

¹⁰⁴ H. W. Montefiore, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1977) 242.

Finally, in the *Johannine Epistles*, as in the *Gospel of John*, there is no mention of special ministries, charismata or offices.¹⁰⁵ *Revelation*, likewise, makes no reference to any church officials: the elders who appear in the heavenly throne-room (e.g. [4:4](#); [5:5](#); [7:11](#); [11:16](#); [14:3](#); [19:4](#)) are probably best understood as an exalted order of angelic beings, the celestial counterpart of the twenty-four priestly and twenty-four Levitical orders of [1 Chronicles 24:4–18](#) and [25:1–30](#);¹⁰⁶ the apostles appear ([21:14](#)) as the foundation-stones of the New Jerusalem and so belonging to the founding era of the church; the references to prophets ([10:7](#); [11:12](#); [18](#); [16:6](#); [18:20](#); [24](#); [22:6](#), [9](#)) in themselves shed little light on church order in the Apocalypse, but since ‘testimony’ is expected of the church in general ([12:17](#)) and testimony to Jesus is supremely the hallmark of ‘the spirit of prophecy’ ([19:10](#)),¹⁰⁷ in principle the whole church is understood as a community of prophets, even though some are specially called to seal their testimony and ‘prophecy’ with their blood ([6:9](#); [12:11](#)).¹⁰⁸ Insofar as this may be accepted as a determining factor, we may concur [p. 36](#) that the church as presented in *Revelation* ‘is guided spiritually and prophetically rather than according to fixed offices’.¹⁰⁹

V CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

On the basis of the evidence surveyed above, we may now draw the threads together in an attempt to answer the question which we set ourselves at the beginning, viz.: Is there any contradiction between charisma and church order, and what is the true relation between function, gift, and office?

(1) The existence of some kind of specialized ministry, or more specifically of church officers, is attested for the primitive church in Jerusalem, for all the Pauline churches with the sole exception of Corinth, and for some of the churches in the General Epistles (1 Peter, James).¹¹⁰ If a different picture obtains in the Gospel and Epistles of John and

¹⁰⁵ So Schweizer, *Church Order* 124 (=11i), 127 (=12c); Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 119. (Mention should be made, however, of certain ‘adumbrations of functions within the coming community’ noted by Guthrie, *Theology* 725–726). Schweizer (127=12c) further observes that in the Gospel and Epistles of John ‘office’ exists only among the Jews and in the case of Diotrephes ([3 John 9](#)), whom he takes to be something like a monarchical bishop (more confidently, Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 122). However, ‘it is not certain that Diotrephes was a bishop: he may only have been a successful ecclesiastical demagogue’ (T. W. Manson, *The Church’s Ministry* 61, quoted in C. W. Dugmore, in *A Companion to the Bible*, ed. H. H. Rowley [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963] 554); cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles of John* (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1970) 152–153.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *The Book of Revelation* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1974) 114; George Eldon Ladd, *A Commentary on the Revelation of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 75; Robert H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (NLC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1978) 135. Also interpreting the elders as angels are G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1971) 63–64; Schweizer, *Church Order* 135 (=13e); O. Schmitz, *TDNT* 3 (1965) 166, 167; W. Michaelis, *TDNT* 4 (1967) 249 with n. 56; G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 668.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. F. F. Bruce, ‘The Spirit in the Apocalypse’, in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (see n. 47 above) 333–344 (esp. 337–338); Lampe, ‘“Grievous Wolves”’ (as in n. 52 above) 257.

¹⁰⁸ Schweizer, *Church Order* 135 (=13f). Cf. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity* 121.

¹⁰⁹ G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 669; cf. Dunn (as in previous note).

¹¹⁰ G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6 (1968) 669, has remarked: ‘That Ephesus and the other churches of Asia Minor, of Paul’s old mission field, were still spiritual and prophetic communities and had no office-bearers towards the end of the 1st. century is quite out of the question; such a view cannot possibly be reconciled

Revelation, this shows, at the most, that church organization was still fluid during *the* New Testament period, that ‘there is no such thing as the New Testament Church order’, and that different lines of development are discernible;¹¹¹ the existence of an organized and official ministry remains unaffected.

Further, it is possible, and perhaps even likely, that varying nomenclature used of church leaders refers basically to the same group, so that while ‘functional’ terms are sometimes employed to emphasize that aspect of the ministry, they point to the same ‘functionaries’ who are elsewhere described with a more official title: here we think especially of the προϊσταμένους of [1 Thessalonians 5:12](#), the ποιμένες of [Ephesians 4:11](#), and the ἡγούμενοι of [Hebrews 13:17, 24](#), all of whom may well be identical with those described elsewhere as [p. 37](#) elders and overseers.¹¹² In any event, there is good reason to believe that most, if not all, of the early Christian communities had at least a rudimentary, and some had a more advanced, form of church organization, although, on the other hand, there are no grounds for thinking that the moniscopate is to be found within the pages of the New Testament.

(2) Time and again in the course of our survey of the New Testament evidence, it has clearly emerged that function, gift and office are perfectly fused into a united whole: not only in Acts (the appointment of the seven, [6:1–6](#); the Ephesian elders, [20:17, 28](#)) and in Paul (the Pastorals), but also in 1 Peter ([4:10–11; 5:1–4](#)) and in James ([5:14–15](#)), there is ample evidence to substantiate the conclusion that in the case of an office-bearer, office and function are twin aspects of his ministry, for which he must have the appropriate gifts. This is further supported by the alignment of gift with office we have noted elsewhere.¹¹³ All this goes to show that the antithesis which Käsemann and others have set up (in the name of Paul) between charisma and office is a false one; rather is it ‘highly questionable whether in Paul’s mind or in Peter’s, for that matter the two things

with the picture presented by Ac., Past., 1 Pt. ...’ This emphasis on the existence of officers in the churches concerned is well placed, although we do not subscribe to Bornkamm’s late dating of the documents named and consider the implied contrast between ‘being spiritual and prophetic’ and ‘having office-bearers’ unacceptable. Cf. Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 9.

¹¹¹ Schweizer, *Church Order* 13 (=1a), 17 (=1d). Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 19, makes the following important observation: By contrast with 1 Clement, ‘the Pastoral Epistles do not give us any norm whatsoever as to how the ministry must in fact be structured and differentiated; they simply say that the ministry is needed to preserve in a living way the apostolicity of the community’s tradition. Only this last point is theologically relevant; giving it specific form is thus evidently a pastoral question, which the church must consider afresh on each occasion’. See also *ibid.*, 146 n. 17.

¹¹² Cf. Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles* 286; *idem*, *NBCR* 116a (this, however, may be a former opinion no longer held by the author, as is suggested by his remarks in *1 & 2 Thessalonians* [WBC; Waco, Texas: Word, 1982] 120); also Guthrie, *Theology* 761 (the ἡγούμενοι were probably elders); Marshall, *Thessalonians* 147 (the προϊσταμένους refer to elders or bishops in terms of their function); E. J. Forrester/G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 697a ([Acts 20:17–28](#) shows that ‘the office of elder, bishop, and pastor was one’); D. G. Stewart, *ZPEB* 1.618b (‘In the local churches it seems probable that prophets, pastors and teachers were all appointed to the single office of elder’); G. W. Kirby, *ZPEB* 1.853b (‘elders have the functions of both pastors and teachers’); Barth, *Ephesians* 2.438 (elders, bishops, teachers, shepherds—all these functions probably belong together’). Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 145 n. 10, considers ‘pastors’ in [Ephesians 4:11; Acts 20:28](#) and [1 Peter 5:1–4](#) (texts which he assigns to the post-apostolic period) ‘a general term for all church officials’.

¹¹³ ‘Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?’ 205; ‘Spiritual Gifts or Organized Ministry? (2) Some Conclusions’, *The Harvester* 60/5 (May 1981) 34–35 (34c). On the linking of ἀντιλήμψεις with the work of deacons and κυβερνήσεις with overseers respectively, cf. also C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (HNTC; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1968) 295–296; J. E. Forrester/G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 697a; Barnett, *The Diaconate* 30–31.

were ever separated'.¹¹⁴ There is in fact a necessary healthy tension between charisma and office, which has been well described by Edward Schillebeeckx as follows:

Ministry without charisma becomes starved and threatens to turn into a power institution; charisma without any institutionalization threatens to be p. 38 volatilized into fanaticism and pure subjectivity, quickly becoming the plaything of opposing forces, to the detriment of the apostolic communities.¹¹⁵

(3) This does not mean, however, that gifts cannot be expressed independently of office. The truth is rather that while office must be accompanied by charisma corresponding to the function of the office,¹¹⁶ charisma can be employed in service either through office or apart from office. As far as the actual lists of charismata are concerned (cf. [1 Cor. 12:8–10, 28–30](#); [Rom. 12:6–8](#); [Eph. 4:11](#)), a distinction may be drawn between the more private gifts (sharing, caring, showing mercy) to be exercised in a personal capacity and the more public ones intended for those representing the regular ministry of the church: apostles, prophets, teachers, presbyter-bishops and deacons.¹¹⁷ A further distinction should probably be made between 'gifts of permanent validity and value, and gifts of temporary and apostolic usage, now withdrawn'¹¹⁸—among which apostles and, to a large extent, prophets may be classed.¹¹⁹ These distinctions may be correlated with a third one, viz. that between the 'specialized ministry' and the 'common service' clearly presented in [Ephesians 4:7–16](#); ¹²⁰ the specialized ministry comprised the more public gifts and hence the regular ministry of the church, which, with the passing away of the unique order of apostles and the distinctly miraculous order of prophets, became essentially identical with that of the presbyter-bishops p. 39 and deacons.¹²¹ [James 5:14–15](#) brings a salutary reminder that a supernatural charisma (such as that of healing intercession) is by no means incompatible with the official ministry of presbyter-bishops.

¹¹⁴ Guthrie, *Theology* 765; cf. 768, 771, 772; G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* (1979) 695b.

¹¹⁵ Schillebeeckx, *Ministry* 24.

¹¹⁶ Or else the 'serious symptom' described by Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority* 1, results—'when the office-bearer ... invests his office with dignity only to the extent to which he himself is invested with the dignities of office'!

¹¹⁷ Cf. Fung, 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 211; 'Spiritual Gifts or Organized Ministry? (2)' 34d. G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 (1979) 517b, can speak of 'a distinct NT tendency ... for the various functions of prophecy, teaching, and even perhaps evangelism to be assimilated to that of oversight in more settled congregational conditions'.

¹¹⁸ Ralph P. Martin, *1 Corinthians—Galatians* (London: Scripture Union, 1968) 32. 'The danger in refusing this distinction is seen in attempts made to recapture 'apostolic Christianity' which are (a) forgetful that the Spirit is our contemporary and fashion new gifts for the needs of the twentieth century and (b) guilty of theological anachronism, harking back to a past which is beyond recall' (ibid., 32–33).

¹¹⁹ Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1961) 85: 'In the churches of the first generation the apostles and prophets discharged a unique rôle, which in some essential features has been taken over by the canonical writings of the New Testament'; Davies, *Christian Origins* 244: 'these prophets soon disappeared from the life of the Church'; and Fung, 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 213 n. 47.

¹²⁰ See n. 98 above.

¹²¹ Cf. Fung, 'Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?' 213 with n. 48; R. A. Bodey, *ZPEB* 4.240b: 'In view of the NT evidence, there seems to be no reasonable doubt that the apostolic Church had only two official orders of local ministry: presbyter-bishop and deacon'.

(4) We have repeatedly pointed out, in discussing the passages mentioned under point (2) above, the priority of the Spirit or his gifts in the mutual relations of function, gift and office. It is the charisma, not the office, that creates the ministry: the office is but the channel through which the office-bearer may exercise the given charisma for a particular function;¹²² and the church's appointment to office (where such is involved) is but a sign of recognizing a person's spiritual gifts and a response to God's will made known in the bestowing of those gifts.¹²³ In this sense, it is correctly said that 'all order is an "afterwards", an attempt to follow what God has already designed'.¹²⁴ At the same time, we may not go so far as to say that church order in the New Testament is 'functional, regulative, serving, *but not constitutive*; and that is what is decisive';¹²⁵ for, in as much as the Church does confirm by its order those whom the Spirit has marked out in freedom (as, e.g., in the case of the Seven in [Acts 6:1–6](#), or of the presbyter-bishop in [Acts 14:23](#); [20:28](#) and in the Pastoral Epistles,) it gives evidence that church order even in the New Testament is not entirely devoid of a constitutive character.¹²⁶

Dr. Ronald Y. K. Fung is Professor of New Testament at China Graduate School of Theology, Hong Kong. [p. 40](#)

Evangelicals and the Doctrine of the Church in European Church History

Klaas Runia

Printed with permission

In this paper the author discusses some of the tensions concerning the nature of the church that developed within Evangelicalism in Europe during the past 450 years. He gives special attention to Luther's concept of 'Church within the Church'; to the tension between the

¹²² 'We have perhaps to learn from the NT that function is more important than office' (G. W. Bromiley, *ISBER* 1 [1979] 517a). The author speaks of 'the two *functions* of episcopate and diaconate' even in the Pastorals (ibid. 517b, emphasis added).

¹²³ G. Lambert, *ZPEB* 1.861b: 'In the NT church emphasis was placed upon the possession of spiritual gifts as a necessary condition for ministerial leadership'.

¹²⁴ Schweizer, *Church Order* 102 (=7m); cf. 187 (=22g), 200 (=24h) n. 753. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* 12 n. 40, thinks that the words just quoted 'can be misleading'; but in context there should be no danger of their meaning being misunderstood.

¹²⁵ Schweizer, *Church Order* 205 (=24l) (emphasis supplied).

¹²⁶ Cf. Barnett, *The Diaconate* (see n. 14 above) 15–16. The author objects that Schweizer's position (as cited in our text, see previous note) 'would seem to lead to a kind of subjectivism that is not in accord with the record of Scripture and that serves to weaken the unity of the Church' (15), and that while 'a major concern of Schweizer ... is to maintain the freedom of the Holy Spirit to work in the Church', yet 'it is surely limiting the freedom of the Spirit to argue that he does not act here in a constitutive way'. (16).