Evangelical Review of Theology

A Global Forum

Volume 42 · Number 2 · April 2018

See back cover for Table of Contents

WEA

WORLD EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE

Theological Commission

Published by

Paternoster:
thinking faith

ERT (2018) 42:2, 157-170

Apprentices or Pupils? An Analysis of Teaching in the New Testament

Russell L. Huizing and Kye James

In the last hundred years, teaching in Western culture has passed through a monumental shift, transitioning from a pedagogical foundation of apprenticeship to one of pupilship.[1] Although the two approaches are complementary and not mutually exclusive, each one has particular strengths and weaknesses.[2]

For instance, an apprenticeship approach to teaching creates a far more relational environment due to the interaction between apprentice and master.[3] Apprenticeship provides specific direction and purpose through direct role modelling. However, it can also limit learning opportunities and can be exploited to undergird an unjust social order.[4] On the other hand, pupilship, according to Yilmaz, offers academic forms of training to the masses and allows people to fully pursue their potential;[5] however, given the wide variety of academic options available, it can also lead to a stifling uncertainty and sometimes distances the educator from the student.

This research analyses evidence from the New Testament to assess the impact of both types of pedagogy on the life of the early church, whose central mission required both teaching (Mt 28:20) and teachers (1 Cor 12:28). The Great Commission of Matthew 28 stresses making disciples under the authority of and in communion with Jesus, and this command is accomplished

1 Scott Christman, 'Preparing for Success through Apprenticeship', *Technology & Engineering Teacher* 1, no. 72 (2012): 22–28.

2 Clark Backus, Kevin Keegan, Charles Gluck, and Lisa M. V. Gulick, 'Accelerating Leadership Development via Immersive Learning and Cognitive Apprenticeship', *International Journal of Training & Development* 2, no. 14 (2010): 144–48. doi: 10.1111/j.1468—2419.2010.00347.x

3 Chris Echeta, 'The Traditional Pottery and Social Engineering: Beyond the Apprenticeship Façade', *Journal of Sustainable Development* 11, no. 6 (2013): 98–104. doi: 10.5539/jsd.v6n11p98.

4 Echeta, 'Traditional Pottery', 101.

5 Kaya Yilmaz, 'The Cognitive Perspective on Learning: Its Theoretical Underpinnings and Implications for Classroom Practices', *Clearing House* 5, no. 84 (2011): 204–12. doi: 10.1080/00098655.2011.568989.

Russell L. Huizing *(PhD, Regent University) is Assistant Professor of Pastoral Ministry at Toccoa Falls College. He is also an adjunct instructor for Regent University's School of Business and Leadership and its Department of Biblical Studies and Christian Ministry. Dr Huizing has diverse leadership experience in a variety of church, corporate and entrepreneurial contexts. He has been a featured speaker at seminars and has consulted with ecclesial organizations.* ***Kye James*** *(BA, Toccoa Falls College) was the Greek Student of the Year, 2016.*

through going, teaching and baptizing.[6] Whereas 'going' is part of everyday life and 'baptizing' is regulated by the ritual elements surrounding the practice, 'teaching' can have less distinctly defined boundaries, being reshaped in any given cultural context.

For instance, in a contemporary American context, the concept of teaching is most often associated with the practice of imparting knowledge, typically in a formal or informal classroom environment.[7] Although skills may be involved in this exchange to some extent, for the most part Americans think of teachers as engaging in cognitive enhancement of their pupils.

In contrast, as one moves along the spectrum from cognitive enhancement to skills acquisition, the learner moves from pupil to apprentice.[8] But the use of apprenticeship has shrunk significantly in Western culture over the past 150 years, causing teaching to become much less associated with apprenticeship.

When Christian scripture speaks of teaching, is it speaking of pupils, apprentices, or both? Given the global influence of Western religious organizations and their definition of teaching, the answer to this question is critical. If our conception of teaching is based on cultural conceptions rather than a New Testament model, this departure from Christian tradition could have far-reaching consequences.

1. Pupil, Apprentice or Both?

In this research, we defined pupilship as an exchange of information between a teacher and student to provide cognitive enhancement for practical purposes.[9] Apprenticeship was defined as an exchange of skills through active participation between a master and apprentice for the sake of proficiency acquisition.[10]

A review of the Christian literature on teaching suggests a rather mixed interpretation of the relevant concepts. Some interpreters understand New Testament teaching as pupilship. Typically, they define church teaching as the public instruction of doctrine and view teaching primarily as cognitive.[11] To some people, believers should be taught the principles of Scripture as though it were a manual.[12] In other words, once believers have placed their faith in Jesus, they should receive instruction that fosters intellectual understanding, much like teaching in the educational realm.[13]

6 Steve S. Kang, '"Your Kingdom Come": Practical Theology as Living out Three Great Pillars of Christianity', *Christian Education Journal* 1, no. 8 (2011): 114–29.

7 Yilmaz, 'Cognitive Perspective', 209.

8 Christman, 'Preparing', 23.

9 Yilmaz, 'Cognitive Perspective', 205.

10 Robert L. Saucy, 'Women's Prohibition to Teach Men: An Investigation into Its Meaning and Contemporary Application', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 1, no. 37 (1994): 79–97.

11 Ed Glasscock, 'The Biblical Concept of Elder', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 573, no. 144 (1987): 66–78; Cornelius Krahn, 'Office of Elder in Anabaptist—Mennonite History', *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 2, no. 30 (1956): 120–27.

12 Edgar Krentz, '"Make Disciples": Matthew on Evangelism', *Currents in Theology and Mission* 1, no. 33 (2006): 23–41.

13 Krentz, 'Make Disciples', 23; Ronald E. Osborn, 'The Meaning of Presbyter in the United Church', *Mid-Stream* 1, no. 8 (1968): 88–105.

Such an interpretation creates a dichotomy, in that the content of teaching is distinguished from the embodiment of that teaching.[14] From this perspective, all leaders must have the ability to teach believers in a pupilship manner.[15] This role is distinguished from the 'proclaiming' role aimed at unbelievers.[16] Follower and leadership development in ecclesial contexts has called for drawing leaders from a pool of teachers,[17] who are adept in their intellectual understanding of the faith and in the ability to transfer this knowledge to pupils[18] in a public, classroom-like environment.[19] The ability to exercise classroom-based teaching skills becomes, in this model, the primary indicator of readiness for higher leadership.[20] Although this perspective does not overlook the importance of embodying what is taught, the embodiment is a result of teaching rather than a form of the teaching.[21]

Others understand teaching in the New Testament as more reminiscent of apprenticeship. In this approach, the follower is involved in many aspects of the discipler's life, such that the disciple begins to mimic the discipler.[22] Saucy describes this understanding as rooted in a Jewish mind-set that aims at a change in lifestyle rather than simply the impartation of knowledge.[23] Thus, a biblical approach to teaching from this perspective would require an observation and practice of the behaviours, emotions and thinking modelled by Jesus.[24] Follower and leadership development in church contexts within this paradigm has emphasized the need for teaching to explicitly include embodiment of what is to be learned.

A literature review also finds those who follow a middle ground in this debate, arguing that learning should encompass both Christian education and praxis.[25] From this perspective, teaching includes both specific instruction and expected responsive activity.[26] Thus, discipleship is concerned with both the disciple's activity and his or her knowledge about the activity.[27] This approach views effective teaching as producing both comprehension of in-

14 Derek Penwell, 'The Changing Role of Elders in the Disciples of Christ', *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 2, no. 35 (2000): 63–82.

15 Penwell, *Changing Role*, 81.

16 Daniel W. Ulrich, 'The Missional Audience of the Gospel of Matthew', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 1, no. 69 (2007): 64–83.

17 Krahn, 'Office', 124.

18 Osborn, 'Meaning', 88.

19 Glasscock, 'Biblical Concept', 70.

20 Penwell, 'Changing Role', 63; Ulrich, 'Missional', 64.

21 Penwell, 'Changing Role', 63; Ulrich, 'Missional', 83.

22 Cleon L. Rogers, Jr., 'The Great Commission', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 130, no. 519 (1973): 258–67.

23 Saucy, 'Women's Prohibition', 82.

24 Roy B. Zuck, 'Greek Words for *Teach*', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 122, no. 486 (1965): 158–68.

25 Mortimer Arias, 'Rethinking the Great Commission', *Theology Today* 47, no. 4 (1991): 410–18; Oscar S. Brooks, 'Matthew 28:16–20 and the Design of the First Gospel', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 10 (1981): 2–18.

26 D. Edmond Hiebert, 'Expository Study of Matthew 28:16–20', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149, no. 595 (1992): 338–54.

27 C. S. Keener, 'Matthew's Missiology: Making Disciples of the Nations (Matthew 28:19–20)', *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 12, no. 1 (2009): 3–20.

formation and proper conduct.[28]

The present research sought to identify which of these three approaches—a pupilship approach emphasizing knowledge, an apprenticeship approach emphasizing activity, or a combination of the two—is best supported by the relevant textual data.

II. Content Analysis Methodology

To analyse the meaning of teaching in the biblical context, we applied content analysis, relying on the work of two leading researchers in that discipline, Krippendorff and Neuendorf.[29] For Neuendorf, content analysis is the

> quantitative analysis of messages that relies on the scientific method (including attention to objectivity—intersubjectivity, a priori design, reliability, validity, generalizability, replicability, and hypothesis testing) and is not limited as to the types of variables that may be measured or the context in which the messages are created or presented. (p. 10)

With a long history including ecclesiastical, media, psychological, historical and political applications, content analysis provides a research method that is prescriptive, analytical and methodological.[30]

One important element of content analysis involves identifying indices or measurements of particular phenomena occurring within the text.[31] These indices historically have included frequencies, attributions and qualifications.[32] Using multiple methods of analysis assists in triangulating the results,[33] since any one index alone can produce skewed results.[34]

Neuendorf recommended a nine-step process for content analysis: (a) theorizing and rationalization, (b) conceptualization, (c) operationalization, (d) coding development (using humans and/or computers), (e) sampling, (f) providing human coding training, (g) coding, (h) calculating human coding reliability, and (i) tabulation and reporting.[35] This process comports well with Krippendorff's components of content analysis, which include data making (utilization, sampling, recording), data reduction, inferencing and analysing.

Once the conceptualizations of constructs have been drawn from a theoretical foundation, hypotheses or research questions can be developed to drive the research.[36] The variables contained within that theoretical premise must be translated into units within the text that can be measured. These can be physical, syntactical, referential, propositional or thematic units

28 David A. Mappes, 'Moral Virtues Associated with Eldership', *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160, no. 638 (2003): 202–18.

29 Klaus Krippendorff, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, vol. 5 (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980); Kimberly A. Neuendorf, *The Content Analysis Guidebook* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002).

30 Krippendorff, *Content*, 2.

31 Krippendorff, *Content*, 26.

32 Krippendorff, *Content*.

33 John W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methhods Approaches*, 3rd ed. (Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2009), p. 38.

34 Krippendorff, *Content*, 26.

35 Krippendorff, *Content*, 50–51.

36 Neuendorf, *Content*, 48.

within the text.[37] Any measurement instrument(s) developed to assist in the coding of data must be developed with an eye towards reliability and validity.[38] This model was used for both the quantitative and qualitative analysis.

1. Testing word domains

Words have distinct meanings, but those meanings are connected with other words that have similar or supplementary features, in what can be called a domain.[39] Of course, a single word can also have multiple, diverse meanings (e.g. the word 'point' makes my point). Louw and Nida's *Greek-English Lexicon* is unique in setting up lists of words in a semantically driven way based on their meanings, similar in concept to a thesaurus. Thus, a single word may show up in a number of different semantic domains since it carries multiple diverse meanings. Words related to multiple domains can be defined in a given context by means of the presence of other similar or supplementary domain words within the same context.

When a word is identified with a domain of meaning, one can associate it with other terms that would be considered similar in meaning. Louw and Nida identified 93 diverse meaning domains, each with various sub-domains. The words associated with those domains are then each numbered. For instance, 'God' (*theos*) is listed as word 12.1, or the first word under domain 12 (Supernatural Beings and Powers). The word 'Lord' (*kurios*) is listed ninth in the same domain and thus is 12.9. Louw and Nida attempted to arrange the words of each domain in order from the more general to the more specific.

For the analysis of the New Testament term 'teaching' (*didaskō*), two domains were identified representing apprenticeship and pupilship. Louw and Nida do not present a set of words specifically associated with apprenticeship, but the words within the domain of Guide, Discipline, Follow (domain 36) and the subdomain of Follow, Be a Disciple (36.31–36.43) are similar to "conforming one's behaviour to a system of instruction or teaching."[40] For pupilship, the words within the domain of Learn (domain 27) and the subdomain of Learn (27.1–27.26) were used since these categories represent the terms associated with acquiring information.[41]

To identify the population of relevant pericopae, all 97 instances of the use of *didaskō* and its cognates in the New Testament were listed. The boundary of each pericope was indicated based on the sections demarcated by the New Revised Standard Version. Although, of course, the section headings were not part of the original text, they are useful pericope markers and are located with relative consistency across most contemporary English versions.

The apprenticeship domain words that appeared in these pericopae

37 Krippendorff, *Content*, 55.

38 Neuendorf, *Content*, 94.

39 J. P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, vol. 1 (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988).

40 Louw and Nida, *Greek-English*, 470.

41 Louw and Nida, *Greek-English*.

were the nouns *mathētēs* (36.38), *huios* (36.39), *teknon* (36.40), *mathētria* (36.41) and *summathētēs* (36.42) and the verbs *mathēteuō* (36.31 and 36.37), *akoloutheō* (36.31), *parakoloutheō* (36.32), *exakoloutheō* (36.33), *peithomai* (36.34) and *arneomai* (36.43). The pupilship domain words that appeared in these pericopae were the nouns *mathētēs* (27.16), *grammata* (27.21), *grammateus* (27.22) and *idiōtēs* (27.26), the adjectives *logios* (27.20), *agrammatos* (27.23), *amathēs* (27.24) and *apaideutos* (27.25), and the verbs *manthanō* (27.12 and 27.15), *paralambanō* (27.13) and *odēgeō* (27.17). The other words contained in these two sub-domains were not present in these pericopae.

Within each pericope, we calculated the number of times that one of the related domain terms was used. Since pericopae were selected based solely on the use of *didaskō* and then the related domain terms were calculated within that pericope, we anticipated that a relationship would appear between *didaskō* and the domains. As might be expected, sometimes a particular pericope contained only apprenticeship items, sometimes only pupilship items, and sometimes both. To evaluate which domain was more likely to be associated with *didaskō*, a paired-samples *t*-test was conducted. The results indicated that the mean for apprenticeship domains ($M = 1.23$, $SD = 1.41$) was significantly greater than the mean for pupilship domains ($M = .85$, $SD = 1.41$, $t(80) = 2.56$, $p < .012$). The standardized effect size index, d, was .27. The 98% confidence interval for the mean difference between the two ratings was .08 and .68.

These results indicate that the word *didaskō* was associated with apprenticeship domain items 27% more than with pupilship domain items. When the data were analysed by genre, the differences in both the gospels and the New Testament's lone history book (Acts) were not statistically significant. However, the epistolary genre yielded results barely outside the 95% confidence interval, with a mean for the apprenticeship domain ($M = 1.21$, $SD = 1.44$) greater than the mean for the pupilship domain ($M = .42$, $SD = .69$, $t(18) = 2.04$, $p < .056$, $d = .70$).

This analysis establishes that for New Testament writers, there is a stronger relationship between *didaskō* and apprenticeship than between *didaskō* and pupilship. This finding does not mean that every use of *didaskō* imports only apprenticeship into its context. In actual practice, apprenticeship entails some pupilship and vice versa. However, if we think in terms of shades of meaning, it appears that apprenticeship coloured the New Testament understanding of *didaskō* more than pupilship.

2. Coder analysis

Although the quantitative analysis provides some indication of the weight of a word's association, meaning cannot be statistically determined. Rather, the meaning of words is determined by how the original author used them in their original context.

By way of illustration, consider this remark that parents often make to children: 'It is not what you said, it is how you said it.' Whereas the word domain testing described above focused on the 'what you said' portion of that statement and yielded quantitative results, the coder analysis focuses on the 'how

you said it' portion and derives qualitative results. The two aspects are intermingled in every communication, including biblical texts.

To conduct a proper analysis at this level, human readers who can code the meaning of each use of the word in question are required. The coders must balance their familiarity of the material being measured with the ability to properly measure the data.[42] To ensure quality performance in this article, co-author Kye James, winner of the Toccoa Falls College Greek Student of the Year award, was selected to do the coding.

Coder analysis should not be conceived in a strictly quantitative framework. In identifying each pericope as focusing on apprenticeship, pupilship and/or both, the coder sought to determine the original author's intent. To accomplish this, the coder analysed all 97 pericopae in their original language prior to knowing the quantitative results, so as to avoid bias.

The coder used a qualitative meta-analysis process,[43] pooling all the results of the qualitative analysis together to identify new insights that are not immediately apparent in any single passage. In this way, the coder sought to grasp the unified voice of Scripture on the topic rather than analysing the particular perspective of any one biblical author or genre. The next section presents overall results while referring to specific passages as examples.

III. Discussion of Qualitative Results

The generally established worldview in the first century ran counter to Christian teaching about such pedagogical essentials as the nature of man, the ultimate purpose of knowledge and education, and the role or existence of a higher power and its part or lack thereof in the learning process, which used *didaskō* self-referentially. However, the 97 relevant passages in which *didaskō* and its cognates appear become more interpretable when one applies the definition of apprenticeship exemplified by Saucy rather than the definition of pupilship represented by Yilmaz, aligning with the earlier quantitative results.

This distinction is particularly pronounced in three specific texts (Mk 4:2; Jn 9:34; Acts 5), which strongly suggest an approach to producing disciples that looks more like apprenticeship than pupilship. It is also notable in the Great Commission (Mt 28:19) and Paul's discourse on the variety of spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:12ff).

As Backus et al. recognized, the two approaches are complementary from a leadership development perspective, as both ideally include 'immersive learning and cognitive apprenticeship'.[44] The term *cognitive apprenticeship* is a significant and innovative one to which we will return in the concluding remarks of this section. This view of complementarity is easy to affirm, yet it has not been generally accepted and applied in the educational system on which Christian training institutions in the West have modelled themselves in recent decades.

42 Krippendorff, *Content*, 133.

43 Ladislav Timulak and Mary Creaner, 'Experiences of Conducting Qualitative Meta-Analysis', *Counseling Psychology Review* 28, no. 4 (2013): 94–104.

44 Backus et al., *Accelerating*, 144.

Many Christians today may be operating under assumptions about the nature of teaching and learning that are debilitating their spiritual lives, just as many pastors and Christian educators may have made fundamental missteps in the ultimate purpose and methodology of their teaching. Increasingly, we expect, it will be necessary for us to choose between two vastly different educational paradigms—the Western cultural one and the Christian one.

Most Western educational systems are paradigmatically geared towards pupilship at the expense of apprenticeship. Probably, few readers of this article have ever been apprentices in the strict sense of the word, but all of them have been pupils. Given that tendency, many Christians today are operating with false assumptions about the nature of teaching and learning, and therefore about what they should teach and to whom and how they should learn.

Western culture as a whole views education, and especially learning, as a means of cognitive enhancement towards a developmental stage at which a person is able to acquire necessary skills. It does not tend to view learning as equipping people to genuinely interact with the world, to understand themselves and others, and to live in a right relationship with God. In the Western system, learning is approached as a means to an end (usually money and happiness) rather than a source of personal growth, and acquiring information becomes a pragmatic concern rather than a personally vested interest.

Approaching Christian discipleship in such a way is very dangerous. The truly Christian educator is not primarily interested in an exchange of information that may lead to acquiring skill, attaining one's dreams, finding one's best life or attempting to evoke God's blessings. Rather, he or she is concerned with *teaching a lifestyle* through effective modelling that leads to living as God intended. Undoubtedly, this includes the exchange of information, and therefore the fullest expression of the biblical meaning of *didaskō* incorporates aspects of both. Ultimately, though, the Christian is called primarily to a lifestyle that is enhanced through knowledge, not an understanding that leads to a lifestyle. This priority necessarily makes the pupilship of a believer subordinate to apprenticeship.

Some discussion of New Testament passages should make the distinction more concrete. In Mark 4:2, perhaps the most instructive passage on the topic, the word *didaskō* appears twice: 'and *He taught* them many things in parables, and *in His teaching* He said to them …'. Pupils are not instructed through parables. If Jesus intended for his followers to be more like pupils than apprentices, he went about the task in entirely the wrong way. These people had a hard enough time believing that Jesus was divine when he told them so outright, let alone when they had to determine the meaning of parables that served to conceal the truth from many: 'This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand' (Mt 13:13 ESV).

Mark explains that Jesus intentionally left the parables unexplained, except to his disciples: 'With many such parables he spoke the word to them, as they were able to hear it. He did not speak to them without a parable, but

privately to his own disciples he explained everything' (Mk 4:33–34). In this case, *didaskō* refers to teaching that may provide nothing to the hearer in terms of information or cognitive growth. And this is certainly not an isolated incident, since parables were Jesus' most consistently used educational tool.

This passage suggests that Christ placed very little value on creating a system of dictated information in his effort to produce disciples. He was primarily interested in making people consider the way they lived by changing the way they think, not by the delivery of new information. That is the essence of *didaskō* in this passage—an effort to change the thinking process, not just the content of one's thoughts. Mark 4:33–34 also emphasizes that Jesus put his fullest efforts into people with whom he had an intense relationship and for whom he was an intentional role model.

Notably, though, Mark 4:34 presents the Greek verb *epeluen* ('explained') instead of *didaskō* as Jesus interprets the parables for his disciples—a style of didactic teaching much more akin to contemporary pupilship than the original delivery of the parables was. That is, Mark uses a different word for Christ's explanation to his disciples than for his teaching of the crowds. Only the disciples, not the crowds, seem to be considered as pupils. So it is reasonable to assume that Greek writers understood a natural distinction between the public *didaskō* and a more technical explaining reserved for one's closest students.

This reading of the passage by itself does not warrant reconstructing the teaching methods of any established church body. Parables cannot serve as definitive demonstrations of New Testament teaching. The neglect of *didaskō* in favour of *epeluen* in the more intimate setting, though, indicates that in the vernacular of the time, *didaskō* was a specific manner of communicating from a position of authority rather than the establishment of any kind of relationship.

However, the relationship that Jesus had established with his disciples included both public teaching and more intimate explaining, suggesting that while *didaskō* itself may have encompassed pupilship, in its New Testament usage it is not meant to be understood as relational or even successful outside the purview of an established apprentice relationship.

John 9:34, at first glance (in English, at least), seems to provide a different perspective: 'Answering, they said to him: "You were born entirely in sin, and *you* [would] *lecture* us?" ' Kohlenberger, Goodrick and Swanson here render *didaskō* as 'lecture', one of only two instances where they deviate from their normal 'teach' (the second case is also noteworthy and will be discussed below).[45] The blind man's confrontation with the elders in John 9 is a rather unique glance into the inner workings of the Pharisaic–Sadduceean court. But it also yields revealing observations about the meaning of *didaskō* and the increasing influence of a Western mind-set on contemporary English translations.

From the entirety of John 9, it is

45 John R. Kohlenberger, Edward W. Goodrick, and James A. Swanson, *The Exhaustive Concordance to the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995).

obvious that the young, formerly blind man does not carry any educational authority, which would be necessary to initiate a pupilship relationship with his audience. In fact, he says nothing about Christ or about his experience beyond what is absolutely necessary, until his sharp rebuke at the end of the story. That rebuke, labelled by the elders as *didaskein* ('teaching', or 'lecture' according to Kohlenberger et al.), contains absolutely no new information! The young man is simply reviling the Jewish leaders quite openly for their lack of understanding.

This text is certainly not intended as a guide to diplomatic teaching style, but it suggests again that *didaskō* represents the kind of authoritative position the blind man was assuming (or was perceived as trying to assume) over the elders. The word does not primarily signal the transmission of information here but an expressed interest in generating a lifestyle change—a purpose that could speak volumes to fledgling Christian educators, though it came as an offense to the members of that court.

The Pharisees' rage arose from their clear perception that an uneducated blind man was presenting himself as more enlightened and experienced than they were, not from his attempt to educate them about things they already knew about and openly denied. Again, the natural usage of the word, without any linkage to specific doctrinal content, suggests that the nature of *didaskō* is more naturally in line with the modern concept of apprenticeship than with modern pupilship, as it seeks to draw on the authority of the teacher to create a follower relationship.

Perhaps more broadly applicable is the usage of *didaskō* in the book of Acts. For example, Acts 5 contains the word *didaskō* and other cognates four times, all with reference to Peter and John's forbidden teaching in the temple. 'They entered the temple at daybreak and began *to teach*' (5:21b); 'Look! The men whom you put in prison are standing in the temple and *teaching* the people' (5:25b); 'We strictly charged you not *to teach* in this name' (5:27a); 'And every day, in the temple and from house to house, they did not cease *teaching* and preaching that the Christ is Jesus' (5:42).

As Ulrich highlights, teaching (*didaskō*) and preaching (*karussō*) are described here as different tasks with different responsibilities.[46] In fact, according to Acts, the Sanhedrin never forbade Peter and John to speak or to preach, but only to teach. There is a profound difference. The Greek *karussō* can refer broadly to any type of proclamation or publication, including 'Hail Caesar!' or the declaration of a new edict by a ruler.[47]

Some historical common sense is also helpful here in recognizing the difference between the meanings of the two terms. Everyone in Jerusalem who had any shred of public influence knew about Jesus Christ, especially considering the recency of his public trial and execution. The people of Jerusalem must have still been talking frequently about the man whom many of them greeted as their hoped-for Messiah two

46 Ulrich, 'Missional'.

47 W. E. Vine, *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words: With Topical Index*, edited by Merrill F. Unger and William White (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1996).

months earlier. Everyone knew Jesus and what he was about. Telling people not to talk about Jesus in public would have been about as useful as telling them not to talk at all.

Our point is that the Sanhedrin had no need to prohibit people from learning about the man Jesus, or from discussing his life and what he did. Their concern was to prohibit *following* him—something that apprentices by their very nature must do, unlike pupils.

Peter and John were not itinerant evangelists knocking on doors and speaking to nominal Christians; they were entrenched in a deeply religious society that had very little to do and to discuss beyond their beliefs about God and his law. In the temple, they were not encountering people who needed instruction on the tenets of Judaism, including Messianic prophecy, or about current events. Moreover, Peter and John certainly had not attained any type of formal status among the people as respected educators, given that one of the main strikes against them was their 'uneducated, common' nature (Acts 4:13).

Therefore, the teaching performed by the apostles in this passage—or in their subsequent ministry—cannot be described as an exchange of ideas with the purpose of rote instruction, and certainly not as the simple proclamation of truth. Rather, their teaching is a call to action and to a complete change of lifestyle, from imitating and following the Pharisees to imitating and following Christ. This would readily be recognized as a call to apprenticeship by people familiar with apprenticeship as a way of life and means of education.

Seen in this way, the disciples' teaching is transformed from simple public speaking into an invitation to an organic relationship. Their purpose was to persuade their listeners, through both logic and emotional appeals, to change how they lived and, more specifically, to imitate the apostles and the recently crucified Jesus. This principle has enormous implications for the proper motivations and purposes of Christian education.

The two passages mentioned earlier in this article, the Great Commission and Paul's discourse on spiritual gifts, further cement this principle. Jesus commands his followers to disciple all nations by baptizing them—initiating a relationship with God—and teaching them how to relate to God, namely, by 'obeying all that I have commanded' (Mt 28:19; cf. Acts 1:7–8). The only imperative in the Great Commission is *mathēteusate* (make disciples). This imperative is modified by the three participles *poreuthentes* (going), *baptizontes* (baptizing) and *didaskontes* (teaching), which capture the entirety of the responsibilities involved in making disciples.

The disciples' assignment here is to mediate the establishment of a relationship between unbelievers and Christ, and to ensure its maintenance by teaching them to observe his commandments. Those two elements, the call to individual relationship and the call to obedience by imitation, are the practical core of any apprenticeship; in contrast, they are tertiary elements of pupilship, attained only by pupils who have a vested interest in becoming like their mentor, at which point the relationship will metamorphose into something more akin to an apprenticeship at any rate.

Paul, in his list of spiritual gifts in 1

Corinthians 12, identifies at least nine separate categories of gifts: teaching ('For to one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit', v. 8), faith, gifts of healing, gifts of miracles, prophecy, spiritual discernment, tongues, interpretation of tongues, and helps or service (1 Cor 12:4–11, 27–29). Two key points should be observed here. First, the gifts, taken together, constitute all the necessary aspects of the life of the church, some being more necessary than others (1 Cor 12:31). These gifts include but are not limited to teaching. Therefore, for people who have received Christ's imperative of making disciples, the impartation of knowledge and/or wisdom is not sufficient to enable other Christians' development. There is an aspect of Christian life that must be lived in community in order to be learned.

Second, Paul makes a peculiar distinction between *sophias* (wisdom) and *gnōseōs* (knowledge) in verse 8. Earlier in 1 Corinthians, Paul has made this distinction clear: *gnōskō*, in a religious sense, is available to every Christian as a kind of foundation (8:1), though it is highly doubtful that Paul intended to say that any Christian could learn *all* relevant knowledge. On the other hand, the application of that knowledge, i.e. wisdom, is not available to all. Wisdom is reserved for those brothers and sisters whom Paul calls 'strong' (cf. Rom 15:1), whereas the lack of wisdom characterizes the 'weak' (1 Cor 8:7-11).

In 1 Corinthians 12, those two categories of learning are both referred to as *logos* ('word' or 'utterance'), though they occur separately and presumably through differently gifted individuals. This means that there is a body of knowledge considered Christian, commonly called doctrine or dogma (*didaskalia*, from *didaskō*), which a person may possess but which does not equip that person to actually live like a Christian (1 Cor 1:18–31, 2:6, 8:1). Certainly, many people today would fit that description. It is essential, as an indispensable component of Christian education, for the learner to move beyond a place of informed consent—the beginning of the relationship—into one of informed practice. The defining factor appears to be the maturity of the individual's relationship with Christ and the quality of his or her imitation of Christ, not the sum total of the individual's factual knowledge.

In summary, the New Testament's general use of *didaskō* appears most consistent with what we referred to earlier as cognitive apprenticeship—a constructionist pedagogy grounded in the assertion that 'learning is not just a cognitive process but involves knowledge gained by applying and testing the knowledge in relevant real-life environments.'[48] Sociologists, psychologists and educators have much to offer Christian pedagogy in developing a framework for enabling this process to occur as naturally as possible. The meaning domain of *didaskō* in the New Testament, when investigated according to the semantic categories of Louw and Nida, is a pedagogical framework that more closely resembles appren-

48 Francine M. Bates, R. Waynor William, and Joni N. Dolce, 'The Cognitive Apprenticeship Model: Implications for Its Use in Psychiatric Rehabilitation Provider Training', *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 1, no. 78 (2012), 5–10.

ticeship than the primarily pupilship-driven modern incarnation of education.

Careful work is needed to properly synthesize the insights of educational theorists and psychologists with a balanced biblical view of the means and purpose of Christian education. However, this research suggests that the truest sense of the New Testament conception of teaching also requires us to distance ourselves from too closely reflecting predominant cultural conceptions of education today.

IV. Conclusion

Preaching in Western culture is generally equivalent to the words delivered by a pastor during worship gatherings. However, the New Testament word for preaching, *kerygma*, is closer to the idea of evangelism in which all believers are exhorted to engage (e.g. Rom 10:14–15; 1 Cor 1:21; 1 Tim 3:16). In the same way, if Christian teaching is nudged too far towards pupilship by its surrounding culture, then the structure of church leadership development may be significantly altered. The potential result of this imbalance is the cultivation of followers who are full intellectually but whose lives are emaciated with regard to acting upon their cognitive information.

At another extreme, mistakes in educational theory can be expressed through mistakes in content and method. If the church accepts certain pedagogies and andragogies wholesale without biblical scrutiny, the ramifications for the church and its engagement with the culture around it can be extensive and debilitating. Such effects can be seen today.

Carelessness about how to interpret and apply the New Testament's concept of teaching ministry is tantamount to ignoring altogether the command to make disciples by teaching. Word meanings change slowly and can morph into something completely different from their original intention. One implication of this research is that the church must continually challenge itself to find words that properly communicate to contemporary hearers the original meaning of the biblical text.

Similarly, to the extent that teaching is a measure of leadership (1 Tim 3:2), its definition must be properly understood within the process of selecting church leaders. Frequently in the Western ecclesial context, we appoint spiritual leaders based on their observed ability to teach pupils. To some, a weakness in teaching pupils represents a weakness in spiritual leadership. We do not wish to demean the importance of didactic teaching, but if Scripture's emphasis leans more towards the apprenticeship style of teaching, how many current leaders might be found wanting in this ability?

Consider two possible church leaders. One has a strong track record of teaching pupils in a classroom setting but little if any experience in shaping fellow believers through apprenticeship. The other has a strong track record of apprenticing Christians to maturity but is weak in classroom teaching skills. Which leader would the New Testament writers prefer? Our research suggests that they would place a stronger emphasis on apprentice-based discipleship than on classroom instruction. Although the two overlap, the measure of a leader should be weighted more towards the former

than the latter.

Likewise, to the extent that ecclesial leadership contributes to general organizational leadership, an emphasis on apprenticeship and mentoring rather than pupilship training is of significant importance. Corporate training has recognized the benefits of pairing individuals with those who can provide direction in a mentoring or apprenticeship relationship. A stronger emphasis on apprenticeship within the ecclesial context as a framework for discipleship would contribute to an understanding of follower development in general. Based on the results of our analysis, it would seem wise to carefully examine the mentoring literature and identify insights from that field that are consistent with Scripture and applicable to cultivating church leaders. This step could encourage our spiritual leaders to focus more intently on a mentoring style of discipleship relationships rather than simply on instilling information in their followers.

Although we do not claim that our research is entirely conclusive, it does at least present a strong argument that the primary purpose of Christian educational ministry should be a call to a lifestyle, not to the acquisition of information. We are by no means dismissive of pupilship, but we contend that it is insufficient by itself and, in many situations, should be secondary to apprenticeship. Applying this understanding to our discipleship activities could strengthen the spiritual lives of Christ's followers, the leadership and organization of his church, and ultimately the quality of our obedience to his Great Commission.