

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Indian Journal of Theology* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_ijt\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ijt_01.php)

# Diakonia and Its Cognates in the New Testament

D. F. HUDSON

It is unnecessary in this body to emphasize the fact that one of the crucial questions in the relations between the Churches is the question of the Ministry, and that one of the points which has been much under discussion is the position of the diaconate in the pattern of Ministry. My thesis in this paper is to establish that in the New Testament the Diaconate *is* the Ministry, and to try to bring out some points about what that implies. The arrangements of the Conference are such that this will inevitably provide a strong contrast to the paper which was read this morning, and perhaps that is all to the good, since it will bring out the size of the problem. In view of this contrast there are two points which should be made,—first, that this Conference is a Conference of Biblical Studies, and therefore the field of reference is the Bible, and nothing further. This paper will not therefore attempt to elucidate the Christian Doctrine of the Ministry, nor to lay down what ought to be the form of the Ministry today, without any further presuppositions. On the other hand, the second point is that the majority of Churches claim that the Bible is the primary authority, and some claim that the Bible is the only authority of Christian belief and practice. The Church to which I belong is generally in the latter category, since, whilst accepting the fact of the guidance of the Holy Spirit in interpreting the Scriptures, it would repudiate any suggestion that that guidance could be contradictory to the Scriptures or incompatible with them.

Before turning to the detailed consideration of the word *diakonia* with its cognates, *diakonos* and *diakoneo*, it will be useful to look at other parallel words which might contest the claim that *diakonia* is the Ministry in the New Testament. There are seven of these, *hierous*, *episkopos*, *therapon*, *presbuteros*, *leitourgos*, *huperetes* and *doulos*. The largest number of references concern the last of these, but in view of the usage in the New Testament, and the later history, it can perhaps be dismissed easily.

*Doulos* in the New Testament is concerned primarily with a status, and a personal relationship, and only secondarily with a function. It is used frequently in contrast with *eleutheros* or as a correlative of *kurios*, *despotes* and *oikodespotes*. In its specifically Christian usage it retains these two meanings with a particular reference to Christ. The status of the Christian is that he has been freed from sin (or death) and become a slave of Christ. This applies to all Christians alike, and apart from

recognizing that some Christians have served more faithfully than others, there has never been any suggestion of function in this. All the other words express a function, and in most cases that function is restricted to a group of Christians, and not to all, so that *doulos* is strictly not within the group which we are to consider, and has only been included here because it is quoted in dictionaries as synonymous with some of the others.

The second word which can be dismissed fairly easily, if we are considering only the New Testament, is *hierews*. I realize that this statement must be very shocking to some of the brethren, but I cannot ignore the facts, and the fact is that the New Testament knows nothing at all of Christian priests, except in the Apocalypse where in three passages (1<sup>6</sup>, 5<sup>10</sup>, 20<sup>6</sup>) it refers to all Christians. The word *hierews* is used once of a pagan priest, many times of Jewish priests, and in Hebrews of Christ. The verb *hierateuo* is used only in Lk. 1<sup>8</sup> of Zachariah, and the noun *hierateia* is used in the same passage, and in Heb. 7<sup>5</sup> of the descendants of Levi. I would go even further, and say that the Epistle to the Hebrews makes it impossible that there ever should be Christian priests, since there is one perfect priest who made once for all a perfect offering, which need not, and indeed, could not be repeated. It is perhaps possible to argue that the use of *archiereus* of Christ in Hebrews implies the existence of subordinate *hiereis*, but the point which the author is making is that the keystone of the Hebrew cultus was the entry of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies once a year, and that once this keystone is shown to be unnecessary, the whole system collapses. There is no suggestion that Christ is the top member of a hierarchy, but rather that he alone has superseded the whole hierarchy, not merely the chief priest. There are five other passages to be noted, the three in the Apocalypse already mentioned, and the two passages in I Peter (2<sup>5,9</sup>) where occur the word *hierateuma*. In each of the three passages in the Apocalypse the word is joined with *basileis* or *basileuo*, and in I Peter 2<sup>9</sup> the phrase is *basileion hierateuma* which is a translation of *mamleketh kohanim* in Ex. 19<sup>6</sup> and 23<sup>22</sup>. In the fifth passage, I Pet. 2<sup>5</sup> the phrase is *hierateuma hagion*. It seems clear that the claim of all these passages is that the designations of the Chosen People in the Old Testament have now been transferred to the new Israel. It seems further clear that the 'priesthood' is in some sense collective; it does not seem clear that this small number of usages, in at least semi-metaphorical contexts, justifies any interpretation of the priesthood of all believers which makes some, or even all as individuals, functionaries after the pattern of the Old Testament Priesthood.

*Episkopos* is, of course, a very loaded word. All the major denominations, from Catholic and Orthodox to Baptist and Congregationalist, have *episkopoi* (the Baptists have translated them into Latin and call them 'superintendents' but the principle is there). For this word the New Testament is a little more helpful,

if only in providing material for argument. It is probable that it provides no support for either the Diocesan Bishop or the Baptist General Superintendent, but we can all bring our pre-suppositions to supplement the facts. However, we are at present concerned with facts, of which there are exactly six. In Acts 20<sup>28</sup> Paul describes the Ephesian elders as *episkopoi* but since this is a metaphorical passage, it is not possible to determine whether it is intended as a technical term or not; in I Pet. 2<sup>25</sup> Jesus is described as *poimen kai episkopos*, in a passage which uses the same metaphor, and this would tend to suggest that the Acts passage is also metaphorical and not technical. There remain only three passages from which any help can be obtained, I Tim. 3<sup>1-2</sup>, Tit. 1<sup>7</sup> and Phil. 1<sup>1</sup>. The two passages in the Pastorals are very similar, setting out the personal qualities necessary for an *episkopos*, and saying nothing at all about his functions, except that he is to 'care for the Church of God'. There are two points which might be made about these passages; in I Tim. 3 it is clear that *episkopoi* and *diakonoi* are two separate groups; in Tit. 1 the use of *gar* in v. 7 suggests that the *episkopos* is the same as the *presbuteros* and probably these are intended as synonyms. The final passage in Phil. 1<sup>1</sup> does not help greatly since it merely joins together *episkopoi* and *diakonoi* in the greeting, without saying anything about either of them. If it were not for the passage in I Tim. it might be suggested that *episcopoi kai diakonoi* was a composite phrase giving two aspects of the same persons in apposition, but in view of the other passage this is perhaps impossible. Nevertheless, this survey indicates how exceedingly meagre is the evidence of the New Testament about *episkopos*.

*Presbuteros* is very much more to the fore in the New Testament, and therefore it is easier to define its content, though here again there is left room for theologians to enjoy themselves. We may ignore the occurrences of the word in the sense of 'older in age' or 'prior in time' where these have no obviously technical sense, and also the special use in the visions of the Apocalypse. Apart from these there are 28 cases where the word is used of the Jewish Elders, all except one being in the Synoptics and Acts, and the one exception being in the Pericope Adulterae. There are 18 cases where the word is used of Christian elders, and their distribution is interesting. Ten occurrences are in Acts, of which 5 are in Chapter 15, three are in the Pastorals, 1 in James, 2 in I Pet. and 2 in the addresses of II and III John. In eight of the ten passages in Acts the reference is to the Church at Jerusalem, and *presbuteroi* are joined with *apostoloi*, which indicates that they are a special group; it has already been noted that in Tit. *presbuteros* and *episcopos* appear to be synonymous; Jas. 5<sup>14</sup> says that in case of sickness the elders of the Church should be called; the two references in I Pet. may be technical, but since there is an implicit contrast with *neoteroi*, this is doubtful; whilst the two passages in II and III John do not help us since they merely tell us that the writer was a *presbuteros*, which may or

may not be technical. The most significant point of the New Testament evidence seems to be the extremely high proportion of usages which refer to the Jerusalem Church (even Jas. 5<sup>14</sup> may reflect this). In view of the Jewish background, and the general tendency in all societies to give a position of respect and honour to the older men, the word may mean no more than the senior people in the community. On the other hand, there is no evidence which prevents those who wish to think of it as a specific office from doing so, but there is very little evidence about what the office was, except for the general statement that it was for the guidance of the community. It is perhaps significant that there is not a single reference in the acknowledged Pauline letters, and the two references in Acts to the appointment of elders in the Gentile churches occur in general summaries.

The words considered so far are those which may be reckoned along with *diakonos* when we are thinking of position in the Christian church. There are three others which are more generally used as synonyms in wider Greek circles. *Therapon* may be dismissed in a sentence, since it occurs only once, in Heb. 3<sup>5</sup> where it describes Moses, in contrast to Jesus, who is the son of the household. (Perhaps along with this should be mentioned *oiketēs*, which was not included in the list given earlier, since it is used in a purely secular sense.)

*Leitourgos* occurs 5 times; in Heb. 1<sup>7</sup> in reference to the angels, and in Rom. 13<sup>6</sup> in reference to *hoi archontes* in each case with *tou theou* as a descriptive genitive. In the other reference in Heb. 8<sup>2</sup> it refers to Christ, in Phil. 2<sup>25</sup> it refers to Epaphroditus' provision of help to Paul, and in Rom. 15<sup>16</sup> to Paul himself as *leitourgon Christou Iesou eis ta ethne*. In each case there is the idea of giving something to someone else, which is in line with the original secular meaning of a person who provided a public benefit at his own expense.

The last word, *huperetes*, seems to be the nearest synonym to *diakonos* and its occurrences are interesting. It is derived from a naval background, and originally means an 'under-rower' but it came to mean various kinds of subordinate official. The most frequent usage in the New Testament is in connection with the officers of the Sanhedrin or the Synagogue, of whom it is used 14 times. Jesus uses it in Jn. 18<sup>36</sup> when he suggests that if he were a worldly king, he would have *huperetai* who would fight for him. In John 18<sup>18</sup> it may refer to the officers of the Sanhedrin, or the officers of the High-priest's household. In I Cor. 4<sup>1</sup> it is used along with *oikonomos* in a metaphorical usage of the same basic meaning. The most interesting occurrences are the other three. In Lk. 1<sup>2</sup> *huperetai tou logou* refers to those who had been eye-witnesses of Christ, and had made the gospel known, presumably orally, though this is not definite. In Acts 26<sup>16</sup> Paul uses the word along with *martus* in his account of the call on the Damascus Road. Lastly, in Acts 13<sup>5</sup> in the account of the first

missionary journey, we are told *eithon de kai Ioannen hupereten*. I wish to postpone further comment on this until later.

Before turning to the detailed consideration of *diakonia* and its cognates, *diakonos* and *diakoneo* I should like to make two general points about these words, and the words which we have just been considering. The first is the number of references in the New Testament. I do not think I have overlooked any words which might also be considered synonyms, and if I am correct, the total number of references covered by the words so far mentioned is 38. On the other hand, the total of references to the *diakonia* group is 90. The second point I would make is that for none of the other words do we find a complete set of abstract noun, personal noun and verb used frequently in the New Testament. Clearly, it is necessary to consider carefully the usage of these words, but it seems to me that these statistical facts have a significance to which it is worthwhile drawing attention at the beginning. A further point might be noted, and that is that this group of words has a much wider coverage of the different parts of the New Testament and occur in all the parts. We shall look later at the frequency with which they occur in their different significations.

*Diakonia* and its cognates have a history prior to the New Testament, and occur both in Classical Greek and in the LXX. As far as the former is concerned, it is perhaps not unfair to quote as typical Aristotle's use of the term *diakonika erga* to mean 'menial jobs', with perhaps always a derogatory twist.

This provides a useful introduction to the use of *diakonia* in the New Testament, since there is only one occurrence of the word in the Gospels in Lk. 10<sup>40</sup> where it refers to Martha getting the dinner ready! It is perhaps necessary to enter a caution here. Martha is compared unfavourably with Mary, but we should not therefore conclude that it was because of the work she was doing, but rather because of her attitude to it, and to her sister.

When we turn to the rest of the New Testament, it is possible to distinguish three levels in the use of *diakonia*. Martha's level of ministry is continued in the account in Acts 6 of the trouble which arose about the daily *diakonia* to the widows. This clearly is the provision of relief, either in cash or in kind (*trapeza* may refer to the tables on which food was served, or possibly may be used in the sense in which it was used in connection with banking). There are, I think, three points to make about this reference: first, the apostles did not consider that this mundane work was unnecessary; they did consider that it was not the work which they themselves should spend so much time on. This is in line with the comment about Martha above. Secondly, they described what they would do as *diakonia*, and whilst they clearly thought that for them this other *diakonia* was more important, the qualifications required of those who were to take their place indicate that this was considered important, and even

might be called a 'spiritual ministry'. The third point is perhaps unnecessary in this gathering, but it is a common misunderstanding, and therefore it should be mentioned that the Seven who are appointed are nowhere called *diakonoi*, and the subsequent chapters show that they also had other functions.

There are ten other references which might be included in this section. Acts 11<sup>29</sup>, 12<sup>25</sup> use *diakonia* in connection with the famine relief which was taken from Antioch to Jerusalem by Barnabas and Saul, whilst Rom. 15<sup>31</sup>, II Cor. 8<sup>4</sup>, 9<sup>1,12,13</sup> all refer to the collection which Paul took from the Gentile churches to the church at Jerusalem. An interesting point in 9<sup>12</sup> is that *diakonia* and *leitourgia* are connected together in this reference to a gift of money. I Cor. 16<sup>19</sup> refers to the household of Stephanas dedicating themselves to the *diakonia* to the saints, and this also perhaps refers to material help, and probably the same idea is behind the commendation of the church at Thyateira in Rev. 2<sup>19</sup> for their *diakonia*.

II Cor. 11<sup>8</sup> provides a transition from the first level to the second. Paul talks about plundering the other churches for his *diakonia* to the Corinthians, and whilst he is talking about the way he covered his expenses, clearly he is not merely saying that he received material help from the others in order to give merely material help to the Corinthians. The previous verse describes what he did as 'preaching the Gospel freely', and this clearly ties up with the reference we have noted in Acts 6<sup>4</sup> to the *diakonia tou logou*. In all there are 13 references to this sense of *diakonia*, which is sometimes used absolutely and sometimes with an explanatory phrase. The earliest are the two references in Acts 1<sup>17,25</sup> which refer to the choice of Matthias in place of Judas. The position to be filled is described as *diakonia kai apostole* and the person chosen must be one who is able to be a witness of the resurrection. In Acts 20<sup>24</sup> Paul describes his *diakonia* as 'to witness to the gospel of the grace of God', and in 21<sup>19</sup> he reports what he had done amongst the Gentiles through his *diakonia*. Similarly in Rom. 11<sup>13</sup>, whilst in II Cor. 4<sup>1</sup>, 5<sup>18</sup>, 6<sup>3</sup> there may be a reference to his own particular call, or to that of all Christians. Throughout these latter passages he is using the first person plural, but it seems that he is mainly using it in an 'editorial' sense, though with the implication that this ought also to apply to all his readers. There is also a reference in I Tim. 1<sup>12</sup> which may or may not be Pauline, but is certainly in line with his usage.

There are four examples of *diakonia* with descriptive genitives in II Cor. 3<sup>7-9</sup>. On the one side the *diakonia thanatou* and *diakonia katakriseos* are connected with the old covenant, and on the other side the *diakonia pneumatos* and *diakonia dikaiosunes* are connected with the new covenant. This clearly leads us to a somewhat wider usage, and may serve as a transition to the third section where the word is used in a more general sense. Here there are seven references which are not quite so homogeneous as

in the other sections. First of all there is a disputed reference in Eph. 4<sup>12</sup> where the leaders given to the Church are described as 'for the fitting out of the saints for the work of ministry'. If there is no comma after *hagion*, as in Kilpatrick and N.E.B., this indicates that *diakonia* is a function of all the saints. On the other hand, Rom. 17<sup>7</sup> seems to make it one of the *charismata*. Col. 4<sup>17</sup> urges Archippus to look to his *diakonia*, and here the reference is uncertain, whilst in I Cor. 12<sup>5</sup> *diakonai* and *charismata* are put in parallel along with *energemata*, as though they were synonymous. Clearly the usage here is not very well-defined and the same is true in Heb. 1<sup>14</sup> where the angels are described as *leitourgika pneumata eis diakonian apostellomena*. II Tim. 4<sup>5</sup> read in the light of the previous verses also seems to give a wide connotation, though the close association of the word *euaggelistes* may give a more specific reference to the *diakonia tou logou*.

The last reference is in II Tim. 4<sup>11</sup>, which is almost certainly a genuine Pauline fragment—Mark is described as *euchrestos eis diakonian*, and I should like to connect this with the previous reference to Mark when we were considering *huperetes* and again reserve comment.

When we turn to the personal noun *diakonos* there are four places where the noun is used in a purely secular sense. In Mt. 22<sup>13</sup> the king's *diakonoi* are ordered to deal with the man who has not a wedding garment; in Jn. 2<sup>5,9</sup> the *diakonoi* are serving at the wedding feast. The only point to mention here is that they are not described as *douloi* or *oiketai*, and possibly in the light of what one knows of wedding feasts in this country, they might be translated 'volunteers'. Rom. 13<sup>4</sup> describes authority as the *diakonos tou theou*, and this properly may be taken along with the reference in Matt. to the king's *diakonoi*. In Eph. 6<sup>21</sup> and Col. 4<sup>7</sup> there are references in very similar terms to Tychicus, the *pistos diakonos*, and I should like to add these to the two references to Mark, and discuss them in the section on the verb.

The largest number of references, 9 in all, have *diakonos* with a descriptive genitive, expressed or implied, describing individual Christians, *diakonos theou* is used in I Thess. 3<sup>2</sup> of Timothy, *diakonos Christou* is used of Paul in II Cor. 11<sup>23</sup>, of Epaphras in Col. 1<sup>7</sup>, of Timothy in I Tim. 4<sup>5</sup>, and *diakonos* alone is used of Paul and Apollos in I Cor. 3<sup>5</sup>. John 12<sup>26</sup> has *ho diakonos ho emos* in the mouth of Jesus. II Cor. 3<sup>6</sup> is perhaps 'editorial we', and Paul is referring to himself as *diakonos kaines diathekes*, otherwise it may be included in the next section. Lastly in Eph. 3<sup>7</sup> and Col. 1<sup>23</sup> Paul describes himself as *diakonos tou euaggeliou*.

There are four references in the Synoptics which carry the same thought, and one in II Cor. 6<sup>4</sup> where all Christians are described as *diakonoi*. In II Cor. 6<sup>4</sup> the phrase is *diakonoi tou theou*, whilst Mt. 20<sup>26</sup>, 23<sup>11</sup>, Mk. 9<sup>35</sup>, 10<sup>43</sup> have variations of the



word of Jesus that whoever wishes to be great must be *diakonos humon*, or *diakonos panton*.

In Col. 1<sup>25</sup> Paul describes himself as *diakonos tes ekklesias* for the purpose of proclaiming the divine mystery whilst in Phil. 1<sup>1</sup> he addresses the saints who are in Philippi with the *episkopoi* and *diakonoi*, and in Rom. 16<sup>1</sup> he describes Phoebe as *diakonos tes ekklesias tes en Kegchreais*. Finally in I Tim. 3<sup>8,12</sup> there are references to the qualities demanded of *diakonoi*, and here it is worth noting that there are references both to 'the mystery of the faith' and to *parresia*, which basically means ready speech. These are the only usages which might be called technical.

To complete the references to *diakonos* there are two passages where it is clearly metaphorical. In Gal. 2<sup>14</sup> Paul asks, 'Was Christ a *diakonos* of sin?', and in II Cor. 11<sup>15</sup> he suggests that it is possible for the *diakonoi* of Satan to be transformed to *diakonoi dikaiosunes*, but neither of these passages help us in our investigation.

When we turn to the verb *diakoneo*, we find a very similar range of meanings. Lk. 10<sup>40</sup>, Jn. 12<sup>2</sup> both refer to Martha in different contexts, whilst Mk. 1<sup>31</sup>//Mt. 8<sup>15</sup>//Lk. 4<sup>39</sup> refer to Peter's mother-in-law getting food ready. Lk. 12<sup>37</sup>, 17<sup>8</sup> have the same meaning, and possibly Mk. 1<sup>13</sup>//Mt. 4<sup>11</sup>, where the angels are said to have ministered to Jesus, also have a reference to providing food. Mk. 15<sup>41</sup>//Mt. 27<sup>55</sup>, Lk. 8<sup>3</sup> refer to the women who followed Jesus and ministered to him of their substance, which appears to be a rather wider extension of the same basic meaning, and this also applies to the usage in the Parable of the Great Assize in Mt. 25<sup>44</sup>. Acts 6<sup>2</sup> has the verb in the phrase 'serve tables', whilst Rom. 15<sup>25</sup> has it in connection with the relief to the Jerusalem Church. Heb. 6<sup>10</sup> almost certainly has the same reference.

Here I would like to pick up the references we have noted to John Mark as *huperetes* and *diakonos*, and the references to Tychicus in Eph. 6<sup>21</sup> and Col. 4<sup>7</sup>, and add to them the references to Onesiphorus in II Tim. 1<sup>18</sup>, to Timothy and Erastus in Acts 19<sup>22</sup> and to Onesimus in Phm<sup>13</sup>. It appears to me that the most natural interpretation of all these passages is that these young men were not 'apprentice-apostles', or even 'apprentice-presbyters', but were helpers who dealt with the everyday business of travel and other arrangements for Paul. As far as Tychicus, Onesiphorus and Onesimus are concerned, it seems quite clear that their 'ministry' was the provision of various comforts for Paul, and in the light of all the references above, it does not seem unreasonable to apply the same meaning to the others.

We have so far covered 19 references to the verb, and there are 11 others, so that the majority of references are concerned with the provision of material service in everyday life, which was apparently the accepted connotation of *diakoneo*. It must surely be with this in mind that we read the words of our Lord in Mk. 10<sup>45</sup>//Mt. 20<sup>28</sup> (The Son of Man came not to be served,

but to serve), Lk. 22<sup>27</sup> (I am in the midst of you as the one who serves). The clearest interpretation of this is a passage in which the word itself does not occur, namely John 13<sup>1-17</sup>, in which Jesus performed the most menial service for his disciples. This was, indeed, a parable, but it is only too easy to hold fast to the parable, and ignore the fact that it was also a literal example to be literally followed. When Jesus said in Lk. 22<sup>26</sup> 'let him who wants to be your leader be as your servant', he was laying down the pattern of the ministry, not merely in 'spiritual' terms, but in terms of hard fact.

Abbot-Smith quotes the technical meaning 'to serve as deacon' in connection with I Tim. 3<sup>10, 13</sup> and probably could also have included I Pet. 4<sup>11</sup>, but in each case the verb is used in an absolute sense. The suggestion that it refers to a specific office or function is in the context of I Tim. which we have already noted in dealing with *diakonos*.

There are five other occurrences of the word, which connect up with the phrase *diakonia logou*, which we have already noted. Three of these are in Paul, in II Cor. 3<sup>3</sup>, 8<sup>19, 20</sup>, and two in I Pet. 1<sup>12</sup>, 4<sup>10</sup>. Paul uses the term of his own ministry to the Corinthians, whilst Peter in the first passage uses it of the prophets who had ministered the secrets of God, and in the second of the Christians ministering the *charismata* of God to one another. Perhaps it is worth noting that in none of the uses of the verb or either of the nouns is there any sign of the phrase which is so common with us—'Minister of the Sacraments'.

This survey has not attempted to produce anything new and the obvious conclusion is the one which we all knew from the beginning, namely that there are three words which might be used in a technical sense for those who fulfil particular functions in the church, *episkopos*, *presbuteros* and *diakonos*. The only place where the first and third can be definitely said to bear a technical sense is in the Pastorals, whilst *presbuteros* may have a technical sense here, and in Acts. *Episkopos* has no content at all, except what can be derived from its basic meaning, and its use along with *poimen* in a metaphorical sense. *Presbuteros* is similar, though here there is a possible content found in the position of Elders in Judaism. Its use in contrast with *neoteros*, and the occurrence of both *presbutes* and *presbutis* in associated contexts complicate the problem of giving it a clear content. (I have heard people argue that *presbuteros* in the Pastorals could be translated 'priest' in modern terms, but they do not seem to want to translate *presbutis* in Tit. 2<sup>3</sup> as 'women priests', which would seem to me to be only logical.) The only word which has a full content, and one which is not only derived from the words of Jesus, but also from his own action is *diakonos*. We have retained the Latinized form in our use of the term 'Minister', but I don't think we are very happy when we are expected to remember the content. We attach to it the title 'Reverend', which seems somewhat incongruous when we see

what *diakonia* involves in the New Testament. I ate my first Christmas dinner in India with a colleague who was described to me as 'the kind of missionary the Home Committee think we all are'. I was never quite sure what that meant, but what I saw in that man was one who was prepared to take endless trouble for people who needed help, and even for people who did not really deserve it but who were too lazy to help themselves. Basically *diakonia* is concerned with doing things for other people, whether it is providing food, or money, or the gift of the Gospel; *diakoneo* is not used in any different sense, whilst *diakonos* is only further defined as *diakonos theou* or *diakonos Christou*. Perhaps here we should bring in again the word which we dismissed at the beginning, *doulos Christou*, and suggest the distinction, that the two words differ in that the first refers to function and the second to status. The *doulos Christou* belongs to Christ, and therefore is not his own; he is *diakonos Christou* in doing his Master's work, and that work is that he should be *diakonos panton*, as his Master also was, and is.

I suspect that both the Faith and Order Commission and the Vatican Council would demand a large pinch of salt before they even tried to swallow this, but it seems to me that any discussion of the Ministry which starts from the New Testament, must at least take these facts into account.

## Editorial

In this issue, we are very happy to make available to our subscribers the papers submitted to the Conference of the Society for Biblical Studies, held at Serampore College, West Bengal, in October, 1964. The Society was constituted at a conference of Biblical Scholars, held in August 1963, at Gurukul, Madras, and membership of the Society is open 'to persons who hold a degree or diploma of a recognized theological institution and are resident in India', subject to the approval of the Committee. The present subscription rate is Rs.5 *per annum*, and the Secretary is the Rev. Dr. R. A. Martin, Gurukul Lutheran Theological College, Kilpauk, Madras 10.

The Editorial Board of the I.J.T. are grateful to the Officers and Committee of the Society for making this joint enterprise possible, and we hope thereby both to give wider publicity to the work of the Society, and to adorn the Journal with the Society's learning! Our regular subscribers receive this enlarged number at no extra cost, though we have to give notice that the next number will be smaller than usual.

## List of Participants

Arangaden, Rev. C., The Bible Society, Bangalore.  
Amirtham, Rev. S., U.T.C., Bangalore.  
Clark, Rev. R. M., Board of Theological Education, Ratlam.  
Dillu, Rev. S. C., U.T.S., Bareilly.  
Francis, Mr. T. Dayanandan, U.T.C., Bangalore.  
Gehman, Prof. H. S., Gurukul, Madras.  
Gehman, Mrs. H. S., Gurukul, Madras.  
Hall, Rev. D. R., Andhra C.T.C., Rajahmundry.  
Harris, Rev. W. B., Tamilnad Theological College, Tirumaraiyur.  
Hindley, Rev. J. C., Serampore College.  
Hudson, Rev. D. F., Serampore College.  
Inbanathan, Rev. A. E., The Bible Society, Bangalore.  
Jamkhandi, Rev. R. T., U.T.C. of Western India, Poona.  
John, Rev. E. C., U.T.C., Bangalore.  
John, Prof. M. P., Serampore College.  
Kannavalle, Rev. P. S., B.E.M. Seminary, Bangalore.  
Kloss, Rev. Hermann, Lutheran Theological College, Ranchi.  
Luke, Rev. Fr., The Friary, Kotagiri.  
Luke, Rev. James, C.S.I., Kamalapuram.  
Mandrelle, Rev. J. P. G., U.T.C. of Western India, Poona.  
Martin, Rev. R. A., Gurukul, Madras.  
Mathew, Rev. K. V., Serampore College.  
Milling, Rev. D. H., U.T.C., Bangalore.  
Minoson, Rev. A., Gurukul, Madras.  
Nicholls, Mr. Bruce, Union Bible Seminary, Yeotmal.  
Nissanka, Rev. H. W., The Bible Society, Bangalore.  
North, Rev. J. L., The Baptist Mission, Calcutta.  
Oomen, Rev. A. C., C.M.C. Hospital, Vellore.  
Saphir, Dr. A. P., Union Bible Seminary, Yeotmal.  
Selvaraj, Rev. G., Gurusala, Tranquebar.  
Sterrett, Rev. T. N., Kotagiri.  
Stewart, Rt. Rev. W., Principal, Serampore College.  
Thoburn, Rev. C. S., Leonard Theological College, Jabalpur.  
Tiwari, Rev. Y. D., Serampore College.  
Vande Walle, S.J., Rev. Fr., De Nobili College, Poona.  
Vercrusse, S.J., Rev. Fr. O., St. Albert's College, Ranchi.  
Verghis, Rev. Jacob, Leonard Theological College, Jabalpur.  
Walker, Rev. M. B., C.S.I., Khammam.