

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>

A table of contents for *The Baptist Review of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_brt.php

**A RESPONSE TO JIM CIANCA, THE BIBLICAL NATURE OF
LEADERSHIP: FROM THEOCRACY TO COMMUNITY**

Rick Smith

Introduction

I want to thank Jim Cianca for his paper on Biblical Leadership.¹ Cianca has captured some of the important issues which should generate healthy discussion.² I appreciate his challenge to reexamine sacred traditions including our models of leadership: are they, or were they ever correct for the church?³ In his paper he highlights a key question concerning a Divine Call. Should the Church look for specially endowed, divinely appointed leaders?⁴ This quest for truth and the work of reformation must continue as the Church prepares to enter her third millennium.

Cianca notes the significance of a theological perspective on leadership. Bible interpreters must take into account the different contexts, as misapplication can lead to mistaken foundations. We must never give in to using O. T. narratives as "quick guides." The need for a truly biblical hermeneutic is great and we welcome Cianca's emphasis on biblical authority.

Cianca demonstrates the need not to seek worldly paradigms of power and control, but to manifest Christ's attitude of servant leadership. Paradigms

¹ "The Biblical Nature of Leadership: From Theocracy to Community," *Baptist Review of Theology*, 6, No. 2 (1996), 33-52. I have maintained Cianca's use of the term leadership. I would prefer to speak of Eldership, because leadership suggests a broader subject than our focus, implying spheres such as the family, the community, the work place, the political arena, etc.

² I hope we concur with John Zens in not viewing this issue as a source for unhealthy contention and potential division. "The major Concepts of Eldership in the New Testament," *Baptist Reformation Review* (Summer 1978), p. 27.

³ Cianca, p. 39.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

which imply using people rather than edifying them are abusive, pure and simple. To be coercive and Christian at the same time is impossible,⁵ for the servant leader uses persuasion and example never coercion.⁶ NT leadership is not autocratic, “it allows and aids people to develop as mature contributors to the cause of Christ.”⁷ Christ’s leadership paradigm for the church, difficult or not, is functional. Obedience is worth the time and effort.

In response to Cianca’s paper, I will in the main part focus on hermeneutics and to some extent I will follow his development by looking briefly at Moses, whom Cianca sees as a watershed, the source of the concept of spiritual endowment.⁸ I will then look at Christ, the Apostles, and the post-apostolic tradition. In conclusion I will briefly address the subject of a divine call and summarize some thoughts on the nature of authority. Realizing that a vast array of scholarship has addressed this subject, I nevertheless trust that this effort will foster further discussion.

Hermeneutics

Mr. Cianca recognizes the need for a biblical hermeneutic. It is difficult, if at all possible, to understand the biblical nature of leadership without it. He says, “If the foundation of leadership authority is inappropriate or built on misapplication [*sic*] it leads to faulty understanding.”⁹ If we do not come

⁵ Anthony Campolo, Jr., *The Power Delusion* (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1983), p. 11, cited by Cianca, p. 36.

⁶ I could not agree more with Cianca in this aversion to the abuse of power. It is a shameful situation that there are leaders in the Church of Christ, who fit this description. I hope that this response to Cianca’s paper is helpful in reiterating and strengthening the challenge to “give up the often subtle ways in which we seek to gain power over one another” (James Fenhagen, “The Bishop and the Diocese in a Time of Change: Reconnecting function and symbol in the Episcopal Church,” *Anglican Theological Review*, 77 (January 1995), p. 57, cited by Cianca, p. 51).

⁷ Cianca, p. 49.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

to the text in the right way, with the right presuppositions, and with the right methodology our conclusions will be skewed before we start.

Cianca is justified in criticizing the methodology which Greidanus calls the exemplary approach, that draws direct examples from biblical narratives and applies them today.¹⁰ Cianca said, O T. narratives “with their biographical sketches cannot be used as reference manuals or quick guides to leadership formulae.”¹¹ “To use theocratic terminology in reference to church leadership becomes confusing and counterproductive.”¹² Do the biblical narratives have a place in the church today? If so, What is their role? How should we interpret the narratives?

¹⁰ Sidney Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura: Problems and Principles in Preaching Historical Texts*, (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation), gives an account of the exemplary/historical-redemptive controversy of the Gereformeerde Kerken in Holland during the 1930s and early 1940s, and from that account, which exposed weaknesses in the traditional exemplary approach, he seeks to formulate a few guidelines for interpreting and preaching historical texts. Greidanus describes the exemplary approach as a view of Scripture which sees the Bible as a “book of ethical models.” He traces this attitude to Clement in the First Century. Even if Mr. Cianca does not use the term “exemplary,” he rightly criticizes it: NT leaders are not to rule as kings, intercede as priests, or receive divine oracles; these images, he says, are to be sifted through a framework of biblical theology (cf. Cianca, p. 41).

¹¹ Cianca, p. 42.

¹² *Ibid.* He continues, “The N.T. too provides its own sayings and paradigms . . . it bears the same need to theologize.” In a concern for relevance the exemplary method does injustice to the text. Huyser states, “The specific distinguishing mark of the exemplary method is that it desires to draw a parallel between then and now” (as cited by Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, p. 70n). When this becomes a principle for interpreting historical texts, it is bound to short-circuit that interpretation by overlooking the historical discontinuity between the person(s) then and people today (Holwerda, *Begonnen*, p. 85, as cited in Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, p. 70). “The people of the text lived at a different stage of redemptive history than we do today. To neglect this . . . is to slight the nature of the historical text.” (Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, p. 70). The main objection to the exemplary method is the arbitrary and fragmentary way it breaks up the one redemptive history. “In spite of our fine tirades against those evil moderns who cut the Scriptures to bits with the knife of criticism, we use the selfsame knife insolently to scratch all the dates off God’s messages” (Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, p. 86).

All Biblical narratives must be viewed as part of the larger whole. We find their meaning as we find their place in the progressive history of salvation.¹³ When Jesus said, "Scriptures...bear witness to me" (John 5:39), he was not talking about individual passages but, as Fee and Stuart point out, of the ultimate, top level of the narrative in which Christ's atonement was the central act, and the subjection of all creation to Him was the climax of its plot.¹⁴ Greidanus finds it helpful to think of historical narratives as "proclamations of God's acts in History" which highlight three important dimensions: their unique kerygmatic nature, their theocentric focus, and their historical referents.¹⁵

The most fruitful understanding is that which recognizes both the historical and progressive character of revelation and the unity of the divine counsel which it declares.¹⁶ Vos refers to, "The process of the self-

¹³ B. Holwerda as cited in Sidney Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, p. 41. Every person named in the Bible has their own peculiar place in this history. We must understand all accounts in their coherence with the centre of redemptive history, Jesus Christ, hence christocentrically. That is not to say that messianic and typological lines are the essence of Christocentric interpretation. "Genuine Christocentric interpretation of Hebrew narrative is not dependent on a typological line here and a fulfilled messianic prophecy there but on understanding the passage in the context of the universal kingdom history which finds its goal and climax in Christ" (Sidney Greidanus, *Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text: Interpreting and Preaching Biblical Literature* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1988], p. 221).

¹⁴ Gordon D. Fee & Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth: A Guide to Understanding the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), p. 75, as cited by Greidanus, *Modern Preacher*, p. 221. Fee and Stuart find it helpful to speak of three levels of narrative text: *top level*, *middle level* and *bottom level*; the *top* being the whole plan of God worked out in creation, the *middle* being centred on Israel, and the *bottom* being all the individual narratives that make up the other levels. It is not possible to do justice to any biblical narrative without relating to all of the levels.

¹⁵ Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher*, p. 222. This is a very useful book designed for preaching, but significant for all the interpretive disciplines.

¹⁶ Edmund P. Clowney, *Preaching and Biblical Theology* (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publ. Co., 1973), p. 17.

revelation of God deposited in the Bible.”¹⁷ “The Bible is *sui generis* - a book unlike any other for it speaks to man from a perspective that transcends his own experience, a perspective anchored in eternity.”¹⁸ Moisés Silva suggests that anyone who believes that the Bible originates from God, “can hardly doubt that there is considerable meaning in the biblical text that the human authors were not fully aware of.”¹⁹

Cianca suggests, “The difference between Old Testament paradigms and those which are useful to church leaders does not lie in the *spirit* of leadership, but in the nature of their *conferred* authority.” He suggests, however, “Focusing on the spirit and motivation of leadership is the key to maintaining continuity without distorting New Testament church practice.”²⁰ Cianca says that we must make the transition from theocracy to community, from ongoing revelation to a closed canon.²¹ His solution is to limit the example to certain elements.²² If we seek our connection in psychological similarities, such as “the spirit and motivation,” this atomism is without

¹⁷ Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1948), p. 5.

¹⁸ Theodore Platinga, *Reading the Bible as History* (Burlington, Ontario: G.R. Welch Co. Ltd., 1980), p. 72. This view does not side step the historical-grammatical intent of the author, but the human author did not always realize the full significance of what he was writing.

¹⁹ Moisés Silva, “Contemporary Approaches to Interpretation,” in his and Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), p. 246. This is not to say that the human author’s intent is sidestepped, ignored, or undermined; Peter says, that they studied to understand the significance of what they were saying, but it was revealed to them that they also served people in a distant future (1 Pet. 1:10-12).

²⁰ Cianca, p. 38n, emphasis added. Cianca draws the distinction in the nature of their conferred authority: the Old was “vertical, secluded, supernatural”; but the New is “horizontal, relational, and in community.”

²¹ Cianca, p. 42. Although he still sees “obvious applications and overlaps,” metaphorically the community must have its Prophets, Priests, and Sages.

²² This is atomistic, not the whole person, but only certain “atoms” are exemplary. The selection of these “atoms” is arbitrary and subjective.

textual support, is arbitrary, and remains subjective.²³ Isolating biblical narratives from the one redemptive history is fragmentary and distorts the historical tie to Christ and hence to the present. Cianca is forced to find another unhistorical connection.²⁴ He does not get away from the exemplary method.²⁵

The influence of Mr. Cianca's exemplary method is also seen in his understanding of typology. He said of the leaders of the OT, their ministries, their divine appointment and their anointing "should be seen as having some messianic overtones," they "acted as harbingers of the final saviour", therefore the "implications must cease with Jesus."²⁶ This does not do justice to the biblical relationship between type and anti-type, between shadow and reality. It is not correct to say that the shadow ceases with the appearance of the reality, rather, the reality fleshes out, is the *bona fides* reality, in living colour, in the flesh, while the shadow is only an outline, a

²³ Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, pp. 76-77. He cites Grosheide (*Hermeneutiek* [1929], p. 174. Cf. p. 168.) as one who closely links psychological exegesis to grammatical and historical exegesis.

²⁴ Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, suggests that the exemplary method uses four subtle ways to bridge this gap: psychologizing, spiritualising, moralizing, and typologizing; which remain anthropocentric, fragmentary, arbitrary, and subjective (cf. pp. 73 - 86).

²⁵ He is saying that on the one hand it is wrong to use this approach, as with the conferral of divine authority, but on the other hand the same approach is correct, but in focusing on the spirit and motivation of OT leaders. His hermeneutical method is the same as those he criticizes.

²⁶ Cianca, pp. 40, 41. Cf. pp. 37-39, "Leadership and Tradition," where he develops from the patriarchs his understanding of anointing and the implications of continuity with these traditions. "All references or statements that imply such a possession (e.g., 'Touch not the Lord's anointed' or 'I have received unique direction from the Lord' implying 'follow me') become inappropriate." However, even Cianca recognized that the Apostles possessed some of the same characteristics as the specially anointed ones in the tradition of Israel (p. 42). They did not strictly speaking "cease with Jesus." This is not just an inconsistency on Cianca's part, but a hermeneutical weakness.

dim representation, a two dimensional image of that reality (cf. Matt. 5:17, “not to abolish, but to fulfill”).²⁷

Greidanus saw the deep seated nature of the exemplary approach in Reformed theology.²⁸ A rejection of the exemplary method has far reaching implications, including the need to rethink our use of the Scriptures in all fields.²⁹ When corrected, when interpreted christocentrically, our focus centres on the intended meaning in time and in eternity, from the human authorial perspective and from the divine. It is not possible to capture the

²⁷ It is fundamentally wrong to seek elements of the Old Covenant(s) continuing in the New Covenant, as seen in the continuity-discontinuity debate. The anti-type predates the types; the spiritual realities predate the physical copies (Ex.25:40; He.8:5, Moses and the tabernacle copies); Christ, the lamb slain before the foundation of the world, and the New Covenant in his blood predates the Old Covenant(s). There is a causal relationship between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant, but not the Old influencing the New, not the Old continuing in the New, not the Old as a cause of the New, rather we must see the New Covenant as the source of the similarities. This is not merely semantics, but a necessary, subtle shift in the paradigm through which we view the relationship of the Old and the New. The Old is not the cause, but the effect; the New is not the effect, but the cause. In history the effect was revealed prior to its cause, the types were revealed before the anti-type, the types prepared the way for the revelation of the reality. To speak of continuing elements of the Old in the New is anachronistic.

²⁸ Cianca is not alone in this. This paradigmatic shift is required in much of Reformed, Covenantal Theology. Vos is correct in seeing the progressive nature of revelation; with each revelational stage there is progressive clarity in the divine revelation even to the climax of redemptive history, the revelation of the one who is a son (Heb. 1:1-4). But it is a misunderstanding on Vos's part to say, “A typical thing is prospective; it relates to what will become real or applicable in the future.” (Vos, *Biblical Theology*, p. 144). Many within the Covenant theology tradition (including Reformed Baptists) have perpetuated this flaw, concerning the nature of revelation. We must not draw causal implications from the historical chronology of the revelation, as if what is revealed later is a continuation, or result of what was revealed before. Cf. Plantinga, *Reading the Bible as History*, pp. 77-84, interpreted from a redemptive-historical perspective, but did not see the correct causal relationship between the Old and the New and draws from a faulty paradigm the conclusion, “The law has a constant place within the framework of God's redemptive plan. Emphasis on the law is as timely today as in the days of the judges” (p. 82).

²⁹ Greidanus, *Sola Scriptura*, p. 120.

intent of the text by seeing only the human, we must also see, as the original authors knew, that their words were God's words and that there is a top level, that their narrative occupied a place in the redemptive historical purposes of God.³⁰

The Old Testament

Mr. Cianca speaks of possible biblical paradigms that are leader centred namely the anointing of Israel's kings traced to the beginnings of the monarchy and even to its roots in Moses.³¹ I would like to focus briefly on Moses as a watershed.³² When Moses was forty years old, after being trained in Pharaoh's home, in all the wisdom of the Pharaohs, he had the best education, the best qualifications, the best training for leadership in the eastern world. He decided that God had put him in that place to give leadership to his people, Israel. But, did he seek the mind of God? Did God call him to that task? God was not finished with his training. He had to spend forty years in the wilderness working with sheep to complete his training. When God called him to lead Israel he was eighty years old; he had matured. He had learned that it was "not by strength, nor by power, but by my Spirit," saith the Lord; that leading God's people required God's ministry; that godly leadership was first and foremost God's leadership, secondly that it was servant leadership.

Moses as the mediator between God and his people revealed God's name (Ex. 3:13-15) and spoke God's Word, and it is this Word accepted by the people as God's which became the source of authority in the community. Moses was the most humble man in the earth (Num. 12:3). Servant

³⁰ The anthropocentric centre of exemplary interpretation, even with a careful historical-grammatical focus, remains in a sense idolatry, i.e. to worship and serve the creature above the creator. We need to see authorial intent, but we must emphasize God's intent. Why did the event happen? Why did God reveal it to us? What is its place in the redemptive purposes of God?

³¹ Cianca, p. 40. When Moses died, Cianca said that his authority and spiritual endowment passed to Joshua, then to the Judges, and finally to the kings.

³² The limitations of this response to Cianca's paper, necessitate the deferral of the study of Israel's other leaders.

leadership does not mean an absence of power or authority, but neither is it coercive, or autocratic; it does mean you exercise authority in a humble, sacrificial, servant-like manner in the strength and under the authority of God.

Brevard Childs sees Moses' role as unique. It is important to recognize that uniqueness does not preclude the possibility of valid paradigmatic example being derived from his ministry. We notice that in the OT the Judges were not repeats of Moses, yet they in many respects followed the paradigm for leadership that he established. That Joshua, too, and the kings were to submit to and to exemplify that paradigm.³³ The prophets were also called to follow that paradigm. When the prophet like Moses should come, his paradigm was not new in contrast to Moses' paradigm, or the prophets, or the kings, or the judges, rather it was new in the sense of it being the reality of which they were shadows. So the biblical paradigm is seen completely, perfectly in Christ, but was prefigured in the OT leaders; and we can see glimpses of this paradigm in the OT biblical narratives with Moses being the supreme type of Christ.

Moses role was unique, but having such diversity that it included all the offices within Israel with its main focus as mediator of the covenant.³⁴ The central theological emphasis in his role as mediator, is that he transferred his unique role to a written record. He became the author of a book which is hereafter called by his name, the Law of Moses (Mal. 4.4). This Law carries the full authority of Moses' unique role in Israel's life, but it now functions

³³ This is not to say that those following were perfect in their reflection of the model, the potential for abuse was great. As with the kings, the people had been warned of the abuses that would follow, when their kings would seek their own ends rather than God. The abuses do not nullify the validity of the paradigm.

³⁴ Brevard S. Childs, *Old Testament. Theology In Canonical Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986). Childs' views his task to reflect on only the one portion of the Christian canon; it is the role of Biblical theology to deal with the OT's relation with the NT. He does argue that the OT functions within the Christian Scripture as a witness to Jesus Christ, but in its pre-Christian form (pp. 6-17). So when Childs speaks of "the continual witness to God's grace in providing a succession of leaders and offices by which *God* exercised and enhanced *his* rule over his people" (p. 108, emphasis added), he sees the theocentric focus which in the light of the NT is the christocentric focus.

to address the future generations with the same imperative: “Lay to heart all the words which I enjoin upon you this day, that you may command them to your children to do all the words of this law” (Deut. 32:46). It is important to note that when Joshua assumed the leadership of the nation, he did not acquire the office of Moses, which was unique. Rather, Joshua enjoined the people to obey the Law of Moses.³⁵

In the Lord’s High Priestly prayer in John 17 we find the theology of Moses being applied to, and fulfilled in, Jesus. In verses 6-8, Christ came among men not only knowing God’s name, but also bearing it. Verses 7 and 8 develop the implications of Christ’s bearing and revealing the divine name. The disciples realize all that Christ has, comes from God, verse 7, and especially his words. Since he bears God’s name, like Moses he comes from God. The description of Jesus at the beginning of verse 8 echoes the prophet-like-Moses (Deut 18:18). God put his own words in the mouth of the prophet who then speaks as God commanded.³⁶

The OT paradigm is servant leadership. Authority belongs to and is derived from God; it is in God’s Word not in the messenger *per se*. Christ wasn’t giving us a new paradigm for ministry³⁷, but fulfilling God’s OT paradigm liberated from the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees. Jesus

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-111. Childs continues that, Moses’ unique role as covenant mediator was extended to provide other models for Israel’s leadership. In Deut. 18.18 Moses is the prototype of the true and faithful prophet. Israel learns God’s will through the word of his appointed prophet, in contrast with their neighbours who sought soothsayers, augurs and wizards (Deut. 18.10ff.). Another side of Moses’ priestly role is intercessor (cf. Lev. 8).

³⁶ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1970), pp. 754-756. It is also significant that “much as in the instance of Moses, the fact that those sent by Jesus know his divine name and are committed to all it implies authenticates their mission” (p. 756). The Apostles continue on the mission of Christ in all these facets, which is also then passed on to all the church as seen in vv. 20-26.

³⁷ Contrary to Cianca “that Jesus way was a new way,” cf. 33ff. In Christ we understand what we saw with Moses, but now, in light of the reality of which Moses was typical, we see clearly that servant leadership is not a lack of power or authority, but is power in service (meekness is not weakness; it is strength under control).

perfectly and fully embodied servant leadership. The OT remains useful³⁸, as in it we gain insight into Christ, his world, his ministry, the disciples and the early church.³⁹ In this way there is a prospective sense, on the historical level⁴⁰, that the OT was looking forward, developing, revealing, and preparing the way for the ministry of Christ, the spiritual reality that would enter the physical realm.

The Ministry of Christ

From here we must go further to see that redemptive-historical interpretation is the key to the whole of Scripture. As we move into the NT we see Christ, we see his ministry. Van Elderen states, ‘The *Sitz im Leben* in the Gospels is that of the Evangelist.’⁴¹ The Gospels are proclamations

³⁸ “Theological reflection on the O.T. makes possible a more correct hearing of the N.T. by clarifying the effect of the Hebrew scriptures on the Jewish people from whom Jesus stemmed, to whom he preached, and from whom the early church was formed” (Childs, p. 17).

³⁹ So when we see Moses we see something of Christ. Hebrews points out that Moses was a meek man, as servant in the house of God, and that he is fulfilled by Christ as the one who is a son over the house. This is key to the theme of Hebrews, not just the *a fortiori* greatness of Christ. Jesus is more than “greater than Moses”, he is the culmination of God’s redemptive plan and of all God’s revelation. He is the *καρκτηρ τη υποστασεω αυτου* (Heb. 1:3) not just an image, he is the die from which the image is made, “He is not merely an image or reflection of God, but the Son himself is God, he is the absolutely authentic representation of God’s being” (IV Study Bible, notes, *ad loc.*).

⁴⁰ On this level (what Fee and Stuart call the *middle* level) I would concede to a prospective element of typology (cf. my comment on Vos’s idea in footnote 28, above); there is a chronology in revelation. We must not, however, lose the focus of the top level, and that the anti-type predates the type at this top level, in ultimate reality.

⁴¹ Bastiaan Van Elderen, “The Teaching of Jesus and the Gospel Records,” *Jesus of Nazareth: Saviour and Lord*, ed. C. F. H. Henry (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1966), p. 115, as cited in Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher*, p. 301. “Greater stress should be laid on the *Sitz im Leben des Verfassers* (of the evangelists), and since we have only the documents as they arose in the *Sitz im Leben des Verfassers*, this should be our point of departure in interpreting a passage. This

of Jesus⁴² with specific intent. We need to understand that a text in its canonical form, in that it is God's Word, has God's authority, hence the purpose of the author is a significant element.⁴³ But, we need also to see the

will deliver us from the artificial harmonizations and unnecessary attempts to remove so-called discrepancies in the gospel accounts" ("New Perspectives in Biblical Research," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 1/2 [1966], pp. 174-175.) James Dunn acknowledges that a word of the historical Jesus "may well speak to present day hearing of faith with greater force than Matthew's version, but inevitably the control against the danger of an imaginative reconstruction of the level of the historical Jesus (as in the 19th century lives of Jesus) must be the canonical form of the Gospels themselves" ("Levels of Canonical Authority", *Horizons of Biblical Theology*, 4/1 [1982], p. 45). And with Greidanus we would say, "In approaching the text, then, the life-setting of the Gospel writer is primary, but it, in turn, leads the preacher to the life-setting of Jesus. Consequently, in preaching one need not choose one life-setting over another but must do justice to both as they come to expression in a particular Gospel" (*The Modern Preacher*, p. 301, cf. footnote 112).

⁴² It is not enough even to recognize the kerygmatic nature of the Gospels. Cf. Dunn's discussion of Bultmann's emphasis on the NT use of *kerygma* in reference to the act of preaching, and Dodd's emphasis on the content of that proclamation (*Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* [London: SCM Press Ltd., 1977], pp. 11-13). The problem, as Dunn sees it, is, "Can we speak of 'the NT *kerygma*'? or ought we rather to speak of NT *kerygmata*? Was there one single, normative expression of the gospel in the earliest days of Christianity? Or were there many different expressions of the gospel, with no one having a better claim to be *the* gospel than any other, but *all* were the gospel?"

⁴³ Again, we must see the intent of the author of the narratives. What was he intending us to learn from the historical situation in the text. The same principles that we established in dealing with OT narratives apply equally in dealing with NT narratives. "Unfortunately, little is known about the recipients of the Gospels except for what can be discovered from the Gospels themselves. Nevertheless, careful research in and comparison of the Gospels will reveal something about the community addressed and the purposes of the author" (Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher*, p. 302).

relation of an individual text to the universal scope of kingdom history.⁴⁴ This need is not diminished when we move from the OT to the NT.⁴⁵

Here too the exemplary method is inadequate. Christ is not just the supreme example.⁴⁶ We do not simply do what he did. We do not ask the question, "What would Christ do in this situation?" Rather our question should be, "What does Christ want me to do in this situation?"⁴⁷ How is this

⁴⁴ "First, the Gospel writers do not merely tell a closed self-sufficient story as frequently assumed by narrative criticism but relate their 'story' to world history; second, they teach that Jesus' history on earth is central in and pivotal for world history; and third, they show that the (historical) church is a direct result of the Christ event" (Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher*, p. 304).

⁴⁵ Greidanus notes, "With so many indications that the Gospels are centered on Jesus Christ, it is strange that many sermons on the Gospels center on Mary, Anna, Peter or Judas and thus turn out to be anthropocentric rather than Christocentric." "When biographic or character preaching lifts these characters out of their place in the Gospels and makes them the focal point . . . , it is no longer true to the nature and purpose of the Gospels because it detracts from the centrality of Christ." He concludes that the focus must be ultimately on Jesus Christ (*The Modern Preacher*, pp. 305-306). Here one might identify a potential weakness in the term "Christocentric" as possibly suggesting it is acceptable to view Christ biographically, as the example *par excellence*, whereas Jesus and his acts and words also need to be seen in their role at all three levels (as per Fee and Stuart).

⁴⁶ "The message of the gospel text must also be compared with the New Testament writings ... to corroborate and strengthen [the] point with the witness of the entire canon." "Formulating the theme of a gospel text is no different from formulating the theme of a Hebrew narrative: it must be an assertion that articulates the unifying idea of the text as intended by its author. In attempting to apply a past purpose to a contemporary congregation we may well run into the historical-cultural gap." For the present, "how can we transfer...responsibly across the historical-cultural gap? The only way to cope with the historical-cultural gap is to see the text's discontinuity in the context of the all-encompassing continuity of one faithful covenant God, one covenant people, and one kingdom history. This all-embracing continuity provides the bridge across the historical-cultural gap" (Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher*, pp. 304, 338).

⁴⁷ This is a massive issue. It is at the heart of the question of biblical authority. Is what the Bible positively teaches the norm for our practice today, or negatively, what the Bible prohibits? Are believers required to pattern their lives after the example of the NT, or is the NT to be viewed as an inspired example of how to live under the

known? Some might criticize the redemptive-historical approach. They say it goes too far because the NT teaches that we are to follow the example of Christ.⁴⁸ However, the redemptive-historical interpretation does not say that there can be no exemplary element in the text.⁴⁹ In addition, the text is also treated poorly if we see examples where they were not intended as if we don't see examples where they were intended. The interpreter must limit himself to the intent of the text.

principles that Christ taught; and is it only the principles that the Scriptures specifically teach that are normative? What about the diversity within the NT tradition. Which NT pattern is authoritative? Do we need to uncover the historical Jesus behind the kerygma, to demythologize in our search for the authoritative pattern? Did Paul capture it for us, or Peter, or John? Fee and Stuart in answering the question concerning the normative nature of NT example state, "Our assumption, along with many others, is that *unless Scripture explicitly tells us we must do something, what is merely narrated or described can never function in a normative way*" (*How to Read the Bible*, p. 97). The only exception they see is when it can be demonstrated that the author intended the narrative to be normative. However, Christ, the Twelve, and the early Church taught by word and example; hence the example may well carry more normative weight. As Fee and Stuart saw in dealing with OT narratives the same principle of relating to the three levels of the text applies in dealing with the NT narratives. Each example's unique place in the one redemptive history will affect their normative value.

⁴⁸ It is possible to cite several texts that speak of Christ's example: a) explicitly, 1 Pet. 2:21; John 13:15; 1 John 2:6; b) implicitly, Matt. 11:29; 16:24; Phil. 2:5; *et al.* Cf. those that speak of the apostolic and post-apostolic example: Phil. 3:17; 1 Thess. 1:7; 2 Thess. 3:9; 1Tim. 4:12; Tit. 2:7; 1 Pet. 5:3; *et al.*

⁴⁹ The redemptive-historical method reveals our dependence on the intent of the author, if the human author intended to give us an example we need to see the example. If the divine author intended us to see an example we need to see the example. My point is, the exemplary method even in its approach to Christ is inadequate. We must ask the question, "What was God's purpose?" because God had a unique purpose for Christ and our purpose is not to repeat Christ but to follow, continue, take further, and in that sense, carry on the work which Christ our pioneer began.

As we focus on Christ's physical ministry we recognize that his style was discipleship.⁵⁰ Christ mentored twelve disciples. He taught and modelled the biblical leadership paradigm of the servant. In his union with the Father, everything that was the Father's was his. He revealed the Father; he spoke, not as one having no authority like the scribes, but as the incarnation of the very word of God.

The Apostolic Ministry

The apostolic ministry as a continuation of Christ's is to reveal God, to proclaim his Word, and to manifest his glory.⁵¹ The apostles followed

⁵⁰ A great deal of material has been written on this widely accepted idea that discipleship was the pattern of Christ's teaching. Robert Coleman in the foreword to Matt Freidman, *The Master Plan of Teaching: Understanding and Applying the Teaching Styles of Jesus* (Wheaton, Illinois: Victor Books, 1990), pp. 8-9, states that to follow Christ is to imitate him, to become like him. "Disciples, then, if they are properly taught, inevitably turn into disciples. In turn, as the new believers do the same, through the process of multiplication, God's good news of salvation will ultimately reach every tongue and tribe and nation." Understanding the nature of discipleship and the role of the teacher, we must see that uniqueness can not be exclusive of continuity. Christ is unique, yet his disciples pick up his example and follow him, they continue his work. The Apostles too were unique in their office, but there is much that continued in their disciples. The fact that some go too far and seek support for such extremes as Apostolic Succession, does not mean we over react by denying legitimate continuity.

⁵¹ "It is important to understand the overarching consideration that the ministry of the men whom Jesus chose and called and equipped was to be the ministry of Christ their lord; that is to say, in the last analysis there is only one ministry, and it is his. His ministry is continued through the church (Acts 1:1). The lord continues to work laboring in believers in the same categories of his own earthly ministry When we firmly grasp the concept of a single on going ministry, then the idea of ministry in Christ's name becomes truly significant: it is not so much something carried on *for* him as *by* him It is not enough to take the earthly ministry of the Savior as the presupposition and basis for our own, seeking to make ours accord with his Rather, there ought to be a consciousness of our need to fulfill his commission by remaining faithfully and consistently dependent on his Spirit, who was provided for the very purpose of glorifying him" (Everett F. Harrison, *The Apostolic Church* [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1985], pp. 150-151).

Christ; they embodied and taught Christ's model to the church.⁵² Christ taught his disciples not to lord their leadership over the flock, but to be servants; they in obedience to his command in turn disciplined believers teaching in word and deed servant leadership.⁵³

⁵² Cianca claims that the lack of a legitimate record of continuation of the apostolic office renders their "paradigmatic leadership metaphor anachronistic and theologically inaccurate" (p. 45). However, with Ridderbos I would say that it is not wrong to "speak of 'an ecumenical function of the apostles'. Their significance for the upbuilding of the church, therefore, in addition to being unique and unrepeatable, is in part exemplary as well, directed toward imitation and succession, as is evident so far as Paul is concerned particularly from the Pastoral Epistles" (Herman Ridderbos, *Paul, an Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Company, 1975), p. 450).

⁵³ Franklin M. Segler sees the term "servant-leader" as paradoxical. "This indicates the inadequacy of language to express ultimate reality Such paradoxical terms must be kept in tension, so that, for example, 'leadership' does not overshadow 'servanthood'", or that reciprocally, as seen in Cianca, that "servanthood" does not overshadow "leadership" ("Theological Foundations for Ministry", *The Best in Theology* [Carol Stream, Illinois: Christianity Today Inc., n.d.], II, 430, article originally from *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, 29/2 (1987).

Cianca, spoke of the Apostle's authority⁵⁴ as, "they had the power to declare divine judgment and bring justice from heaven, they could deliver individuals over to Satan for remedial punishment or bring the whip of discipline to bear," and, "For the apostles the spirit of service and sacrifice was never in conflict with their elevated status and its attendant authority, unlike contemporary church leaders their authority was divinely appointed"⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Cianca says of the apostolic ministry, because it was a unique ministry, and their calling to that ministry was unique, when the apostolic period was finished so was that calling. He concludes that their paradigm doesn't apply. However, it does not follow, given the uniqueness of the apostolic ministry and calling, that there is not a paradigmatic application for ministry today. I am not saying that the apostolic paradigm must or (at this point) even does include such a call for ministers today. This conclusion, yea or nay, must derive from the intent of the text. If Scriptures demonstrate that God intended us to expect the pattern to continue, then it continues, but if the scriptural intent was that the call was exclusive to the Apostles, then it does not apply today. We will pick up this discussion later.

Mr. Cianca suggests that if we take their paradigm and apply it to ministry today it produces an autocratic style of ministry. He has not demonstrated that his thinking on this source of autocracy derives from Scripture. His conclusion that applying the apostolic paradigm today is the source of autocracy is unfounded. The source of autocracy lies elsewhere. One might ask if a study of 1 Timothy 3:6 could shed light on this; Paul requires that an elder not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited. Gordon Fee states, "The reason for this is the great danger of swelled-headedness, **so that he will not be swelled up with pride**. Since this is precisely what is said of the false teachers in 6:4 (cf. 2 Tim. 3:4), one wonders whether some of them were recent converts, whose 'sins are seen only later' (5:24)" (*1 and 2 Timothy, Titus: A Good News Commentary* [San Francisco: Harper & Row Pub., 1984], p. 46).

⁵⁵ Cianca makes an assumption here. He has not demonstrated that the authority of contemporary church leaders is not divinely appointed. Are there not distinctions within the idea of divine appointment? Is it not correct to say that the twelve were divinely appointed, but also that the seven in Acts 6 were divinely appointed, as were Barnabas and Paul, and so too Timothy, Silas, and Titus? The question of divine appointment is an important one, but any view seeking the title "Biblical" needs to demonstrate these conclusions. I will come back to this when I discuss "The Call".

and their greatest service was in the exercise of it.”⁵⁶ This is inaccurate; it could imply apostolic infallibility. The Apostles could and did abuse their authority in the church.

Paul refers in Gal 2, to a situation in the church in Antioch.⁵⁷ When certain men came from James,⁵⁸ Peter withdrew from Gentile believers, and other Jews joined in the hypocrisy so that even Barnabas was led astray. They abused their authority through coercion,⁵⁹ communicating to the Jewish believers that they should not eat with Gentile believers, and even forcing Gentile Christians to observe Jewish customs. Paul opposed Peter to his face and persuaded them of their error.⁶⁰ It was a challenging situation

⁵⁶ Cianca recognizes “post-apostolic leaders are not exempt from correction” (p. 47), but neglects to see that the Apostles themselves and the other apostolic leaders also were not exempt from correction.

⁵⁷ James Dunn sees this passage as, “One of the most tantalizing episodes in the whole of the New Testament. If we could only uncover the full picture of what happened here, what led up to it and what its sequel was, we would have gained an invaluable insight into the development of earliest Christianity. Instead we have to be content to make what we can of the clues and hints Paul gives us - the problem being, of course, that we have only one side of the dispute, Paul’s, and just how one-sided it is we are not fully able to judge” (*Unity and Diversity*, p. 253). Dunn seems to elevate his speculative abilities and at the same time diminish the inspired text. He would have us to believe that this text demonstrates ongoing division within the early church, between Paul and the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, which continues through the NT period. I feel we have to hold the text in higher esteem, and see what it presents. We need to be satisfied with what God has given us towards understanding the situation.

⁵⁸ James had become elevated to a point of superior leadership, he was the head of the Apostles and elders in Jerusalem, though not one of the twelve.

⁵⁹ Galatians 2:12, the motivation was one of fear.

⁶⁰ Dunn sees behind this pericope, in the situation leading up to it, the likelihood of a prior agreement (implied in 2:7-10, cf. Acts 15:22-29) including a ruling about mutual relations of Jews and Gentiles. “Probably to the effect that Jewish Christians should continue to regard the law as obligatory among themselves without forcing it upon the Gentile Christians.” Reciprocally, that the Gentiles in exercising their liberty would in turn respect the Jewish dietary laws. “Otherwise they would be requiring Jews to ‘Hellenize’, to abandon something integral to their faith. They

in which Paul exercised authority. What was the source of his authority? Was it his position? Did he have positional power over Peter and Barnabas and the elders from James? No, he had persuasive power. He exercised authority and demonstrated God's approval in that exercise as he more clearly understood the Scripture, which for them was the teaching of Christ and the canon of the OT (the law and the role of the law). Paul outlined for these Apostles their error, and in so doing gives us a clear picture of the nature of authority for leadership, even for apostolic authority.

Paul, later writing to Timothy, tells him to be diligent in his gifts, in his ministry, to show himself as a workman who does not need to be ashamed. Timothy needed to demonstrate God's approval on his ministry. How was he to demonstrate God's approval? How was he to demonstrate that he was speaking with divine authority? By speaking according to Scripture. Paul said that when you correctly handle the Word of truth, you demonstrate that God is approving your ministry. That was the source of authority for the Apostles, that was the source of authority for the early church, and that remains the source of authority today. This is how to exercise biblical, Christian leadership.

By application, a pastor has the incredible responsibility before God, and before Christ, to study the Word, to demonstrate that his service has God's

would be threatening the whole Jewish Christian understanding of Christianity as a fulfilled Judaism, indeed they would be threatening the very existence of the Jewish communities within Palestine" (*Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, p. 253; cf. Dunn's discussion of the Jewishness of the earliest church, *Ibid.*, pp. 237 - 239). It is not necessary to view the diversity as permanent or normative. It may in fact be better understood as progressive. His statement concerning 'Hellenizing' the Jewish Church is insightful and comes close to reality. The Church, including Jews, is not Jewish *per se*, as even those who were Jews by birth demonstrated their need for faith in Christ (Gal. 2:14-16). Dunn undermines the text itself which states that the Jews "were not acting in line with the truth of the Gospel," and that the Jews were forcing "the Gentiles to follow Jewish customs" (v. 14). It is also possible, in my opinion even stronger than probable, that Acts 15 follows and was prompted by, the situation in Galatians 2. The final conclusion of the dispute being that the Apostles and elders with the whole church sent the letter which vindicated Paul's understanding.

approval. God is saying, "Yes, this is my servant, listen to him!"⁶¹ As the servant rightly divides the Word of truth, the responsibility then moves to the hearers to follow the leader, to willingly submit to his leadership and not to make his task more difficult by their attitude.

The only office bearer in a real sense is Jesus Christ himself, and so there is hardly any description of ministry that is not used of him.⁶² He is the

⁶¹ This idea is reminiscent of Luke 9:35 where Christ, singled out as the chosen one, is the one to be listened to, the one who knows the mind of God, the one who speaks God's Word with God's approval. As the chosen one speaks, his words carry God's authority. Cf. L. Coenen, "Elect," *Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), II, 536-542.

⁶² Cianca is not entirely fair in his criticism of the article by John E. Johnson, "The Old Testament Offices as Paradigm for Pastoral Identity," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 152 (April-June 1995), pp. 182-200. In the first place it seems inappropriate to use Johnson's article as an example of some interpreters who "imply a continuity of leadership tradition from the Old Testament to the present", based on their seeing, "occasional support in the New Testament" for the "conferred or institutional power . . . seen through Israel's Old Testament history" (Cianca, p. 39). Johnson's article explores the models Jesus brought to fullest expression. He cited Oden who made a compelling case for Christ as the model for pastoral identity. "If ministry cannot be clearly established as the continuation of Jesus' own intention and practice, we lose its central theological premise" (*Pastoral Theology*, p. 60). The point of Johnson's article is that the roots of pastoral identity are found in the OT offices of prophet, priest, sage, and king; as in Christ, the four offices came into perfect bloom. "In one figure alone were all offices adequately united, sufficiently displayed, and fully consummated - Jesus Christ." (Oden, *The Word of Life*, p. 285.) "Looking back, clearly the offices served to foreshadow and anticipate the Minister par excellence. In successive states these offices were revealed in Christ." "The offices are . . . 'key' to the purpose of the incarnation" (John F. Walvoord, *Jesus Christ Our Lord* [Chicago: Moody, 1969], p. 137). "Christ not only brought the offices of the O.T. to perfect expression; He also radically altered them." "These four offices define the essence of Christ's ministry." "It is important to note, . . . [Christ] imparted his model of ministry to those He discipled (John 20:21). This would suggest that ministers today should find their identity in the offices." While Johnson's points are worth considering, and he demonstrated how they are to be interpreted in Christ, there is a potential for misreading and misapplying some of the details of the OT offices if they are not carefully filtered Christocentrically. His treatment of the offices

servant, deacon, apostle, teacher, bishop, and shepherd; not only does his service form the basis of all ministry, but he is also its real and only rightful bearer. In the church then there is only one authority—Jesus Christ himself. The church as a whole shares in the authority of Jesus.⁶³ However the New Testament is unanimous that the church never lives without order. Church order then, as the manifestation of the Spirit, is seen in apostle, prophet, teacher, overseer, elder, bishop, deacon, evangelist, and pastor. God does not bestow all the gifts of grace on every Church member. Everyone must think within God's limits.⁶⁴

for ministry today needs to be more clearly contingent upon Christ's ministry. He states, "Confusion as to one's pastoral identity can be sorted out by examining Jesus' ministry, but beyond this by examining the ministry of the four offices." It is a potential weakness that one may lose the focus on Christ and move directly from the four offices in the OT to the present, but Johnson is justified to look to the four offices for further clarification of Jesus' ministry. The OT provides a solid framework from which to gain insight into Christ's ministry. It is helpful to view these separate aspects of Christ's ministry as the OT offices develop them, and as they are used by NT writers. With this clearer understanding they give us of Christ, we can better understand the paradigm for leadership that Christ gave us. In the second place, Cianca (p. 39, footnote 25) accused Johnson of taking "Liberties with associations" and making "assumptions based on leaps in logic (e.g., in reference to Christ embodying the four offices he says, 'Assuming the validity of all four offices [for Christ] the following summaries ['prophet,' 'priest,' 'king,' and 'sage'] *serve as a foundation to describe the pastor's identity*" (p. 186, italics added by Cianca). Johnson's assumption was that the fourth office, that of sage, which he had just laboured to demonstrate as a legitimate OT office and as applying to Christ, was valid along with the three traditional offices, prophet, priest and king. Johnson was about to summarize concerning the nature of the offices in the OT, prior to his demonstration of those offices coming to perfect bloom in Christ. Johnson concluded, "These four offices define the essence of Christ's ministry as well as his identity." Christ "imparted His model of ministry to those He discipled (John 20:21). This would suggest that ministers today should find their identity in the offices." The so called "leap in logic" is an unfair caricature of Johnson's statement and of his article which has much to commend it.

⁶³ Eduard Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961), pp. 189-190.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 194-200.

Leadership is not in lording authority over the church, "I'm the Apostle, so what I say goes"; it is "I'm the servant that God has given you, to teach you his Word." Biblical leaders communicate the Word of God to the people of God. When God's people ask, "Should we do this?" or "Is this how we do it?" the leader answers with a quest, "Let us see what the Lord says!" And so Christian ministry is one of, "What saith the Lord?"

How can we know what the Lord says? We do not, like Moses, go into the mountain to hear the voice of the Lord speaking in a physical way; or as the Prophets we do not listen for a miraculous voice from heaven; or like one of the Judges we do not "fleece" the Lord. We are on this side of the completed canon. What leaders do is devote themselves to studying the Scriptures, to prayer, to a spiritual ministry, and to teaching. They are to develop a sensitivity to the Spirit, to interpret and apply the Word properly. In this way they give leadership to the people of God from an understanding of God's Word.⁶⁵ The teaching by word and example of the Apostles remains the authoritative paradigm that NT ministry must follow.

The New Testament Post-Apostolic Ministry

In treating post-apostolic leaders Cianca says, "One encounters sayings relating to oversight and authority, which, when linked with a type of divine call, appear to justify single, authoritarian rule within the church." This "misunderstands the macro context of the New Testament believing

⁶⁵ Greidanus says, "Redemptive history did not stop with the closing of the canon . . . the Logos who spoke then, speaks today through his ministers of the Word" (*Sola Scriptura*, pp. 154-155). He quotes Veenhof, "The church's preaching is *the* means by which Christ comes and calls and warns and conquers . . . liberating the world through proclamation" (*Ibid.*, p.155, footnote 16).

community.”⁶⁶ In support he refers to 1 Tim. 5:17-20 which teaches that post-apostolic leaders are to be held accountable by those they serve.⁶⁷

1 Tim. 5:17-25 is indeed a significant passage.⁶⁸ It is recognized by most commentators that the basic thought of verse 19 is drawn from Deut. 19:15, but the role of Deut 19:15-20 in Paul’s argument suggests a much stronger relationship. “The conceptual and verbal parallels . . . are extensive, and suggest a strong dependence of 1 Tim. 5:19-25 upon Dt. 19:15-20.”⁶⁹ Paul’s

⁶⁶ Cianca, pp. 45-47. His two main reasons are, first, the inappropriateness of a divine call, which we will comment on shortly, and second, Scriptures which imply authoritarian rule, with submission being given to leaders (e.g., Tit. 2:15; 1 Pet. 5:5; Heb. 13:17) are balanced with themes of mutual submission (Eph. 5:21), shepherding (1 Pet. 5:1-4), servanthood (Matt. 20: 25-28), and stewardship (Luke 12:42) (p. 47).

Kaiser and Silva define a proof-text as: “A verse or longer passage that is used to prove a point or a doctrine. Although this method is not objectionable in principle (assuming that it reflects careful exegesis), the term often implies an approach that isolates a passage from its context and thus functions arbitrarily” (*An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, p. 285). Sometimes the concept of balance signifies a cancelling of opposite forces, like weights and counter-weights. Proof-texts can be quoted which counter (or cancel) other passages and are said to balance them. A biblical view must account for all scriptural elements and demonstrate their harmony with the overall interpretation, without resorting to balancing them with proof-texts, since this may lead to a denial of the text and its authority.

⁶⁷ Cianca, p. 47, cf. footnote 53. We also noted earlier his mistaken contrast between the Apostles and the post-apostolic leaders in regard to accountability, and we referred to Galatians 2 as a corrective.

⁶⁸ There are several interpretive problems in this pericope, one of which is whether vv. 21-25 treat the same subject as vv. 19-20. In a brief article, J. William Fuller suggests it is, “the author’s use of the O.T. (particularly the LXX) that yields some most enlightening information concerning” this question (“Of Elders and Triads in 1 Timothy 5. 19-25,” *New Testament Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), XXIX, 258-263).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 260. It seems strange to me that more recent work on this passage has not developed or refuted this thesis. In summary Fuller’s arguments are: 1.) similarity in ethico-legal situations in both passages, that is a) the concern is for fair examination of accused, b) fairness is ensured by requiring two or three witnesses, c) the sin in view is not extremely serious (as harsh penalties are not levied against guilty parties); 2.) the calculated effect of judgment on observers, that fear is produced; 3.) there is a warning against pity or partiality; and 4.) there is in each passage a triad of persons

argument develops almost step by step with Deut. 19, important implications not only that these verses deal with a common subject, but also that Paul's expression in verse 18, being, *λεγει γαρ η γραφη*, is still in his thought.

Of special significance to the discussion with Cianca, is that Deut. 19 provides helpful interpretive clues to Paul's words to Timothy. Who is the primary focus with regard to the public rebuke?⁷⁰ Of the triad who judge in Deut., Moses is explicit that the potential false accuser is in focus. This fits too significantly with Paul's reasoning to be coincidental. I conclude that the triad was invoked by Paul for the same reasons that Moses had in the original passage; Paul quoted Deut. 19:15-20 because its principle applied to his point concerning the respect that was due to elders in the Church. Both Moses and Paul were concerned to ensure the truthfulness of the witnesses.⁷¹

The implications of this is that Paul's primary concern is not that Elders be held accountable, rather that Christians respect their Elders who rule well, especially those who labour in word and doctrine. In both Deut. and 1 Tim. those bringing false accusations⁷² are to be publicly rebuked that others may fear.⁷³ Paul's point is that Elders, who are not novices,⁷⁴ who have been

who make sure the trial is fair (this fourth parallel he develops in greater detail). See his article for fuller development.

⁷⁰ This is one of the exegetical problems in this pericope in which the traditional view does not adequately account for the details and the context of the passage.

⁷¹ Fuller recognizes this in Deut., but in 1 Tim. he allows for a shift; this shift, he says, does not weaken his over all case, but on the contrary, Deut. 19 offers clear understanding as Moses is explicitly dealing with a malicious witness, v.16, (cf. v. 20 never again will *such an evil thing* be done among you), and v. 21, an eye for an eye, etc..

⁷² Fuller, p. 363, endnote 16. One final problem which has been raised in regard to Fuller's interpretation, is that in 1 Tim. 5. 18-19 'elder' is singular, yet in v. 20 'sinners' is plural, indicating that the subject has changed. This point strengthens my argument as it is the accusers (plural) who are primarily in view as "sinners" not the elder.

⁷³ Moses left it unsaid that if the accusation was substantiated, then the guilty party was to be punished. His explicit focus was to ensure a proper respect for an individuals honour (the right to presumption of innocence). Paul felt no need to alter

examined,⁷⁵ and who were found of good reputation in the church and community, prior to installation, are to be esteemed worthy of respect,⁷⁶ such that no accusation should be entertained without corroboration.⁷⁷

Servant leadership is the consistent biblical paradigm. God commands leaders in the Church to give up the abuse of positional power. Christian leaders must lead in word and deed. Any pastor who thinks he is the boss in the local church needs to return to Scripture. We must avoid the dysfunctional, subjective, arbitrary, atomistic and anthropocentric methods of approaching the sacred text. We must look for the intent of the human and the divine authors, and must never satisfy ourselves with anything less. It is a shame that some Christians can recognize that God in his Word tells them to do something and yet they refuse; how much more of a shame then when Christian leaders refuse to submit to what they know of God's Word.

this assumption. The burden of proof then lies with those who would suggest otherwise. For both Moses and Paul the fear is to motivate others to think twice before bringing false or unsubstantiated accusations.

⁷⁴ 1 Tim. 3:6, "He must not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil."

⁷⁵ 1 Tim. 3:1-8, cf. 5:22. This whole passage is not nearly as disjointed as some would lead us to believe.

⁷⁶ This is in addition to their deserving a fair wage. It is significant to note that διπλῆς τιμῆς is "twofold honour." Twofold, not primarily quantitative, twice as much, but consisting of two parts (Bauer), and honour being a word with two meanings "wages" and "respect" depends on the context to determine which is in focus at a given time. Paul is specifying both meanings of τιμῆς hence his use of διπλῆς. Some commentators seeing the dual usage of τιμῆς have suggested that an honorarium is in view, so Lidden (as cited by A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the NT* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1931], pp. 587-88). The three passages of Scripture to which Paul refers in order to support his two-fold argument are: wages, Deut. 25:4 and Luke 10:7; and respect, Deut. 19:15-21.

⁷⁷ I realize that this summary is so brief that it does little more than open the question, but I hope it challenges others to pick it up and look more closely. It seems to me that this interpretation accounts for not only all of the major difficulties in this pericope, but also most if not all of the minor ones.

The Call

Cianca is against any "subjective call to ministry in the present era."⁷⁸ He presupposes that you can not have servant leadership with a divine call, anointing, or appointment,⁷⁹ and "Further, once leadership is based on an existential call, the leader is placed outside the authority of the church and canon."⁸⁰ A great many godly leaders through the centuries have felt quite strongly that it is God's right to appoint his own representatives. While that is not to say these views are therefore valid, but, at the very least, we ought to be careful of suggestions that such a call is dangerous.

In responding to this question of the call to ministry in the Christian church we recognize that the Bible did not intend to be a modern manual of pastoral theology, yet the range of biblical terminology provides a significant basis from which to understand the organization of the New Covenant community. Ridderbos suggests that there are two primary words, among others, which stand out. They are gifts (*charismata* and once *domata*) and ministries (*diakonai*).⁸¹ Other terms used in Scripture which

⁷⁸ Cianca, p. 46. Cianca explicitly criticizes the idea of a call eight times, and there are many additional criticisms of other associated terms, such as anointed, appointed, and endowed.

⁷⁹ Cianca presupposes that a belief in a divine call to ministry precludes servant leadership. The leaders of the Old and the New Testaments, cited by Cianca as examples where a divine call was indeed appropriate, demonstrated a servant nature. Moses indeed was the faithful, most humble (cf. Num. 12:3) servant in God's house. David, after the wrong type of King in Saul, was the shepherd King, the man after God's own heart. Jesus personified the servant. The Apostles were "called" to servant leadership. It does not follow, therefore, that belief in a divine call precludes servant leadership.

⁸⁰ Cianca, p. 46. He does not demonstrate the foundation for this idea. I must conclude it is a presupposition. It is not derived from Scripture nor is it properly basic; consequently, it needs to be demonstrated or corrected.

⁸¹ Herman Ridderbos, *Paul, An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Company, 1975), p. 440. Ridderbos has provided some characteristically outstanding work in this area. I would refer the reader to chapter 11 and most notably sections 70-72 for further discussion. In addition to the two

imply a call or appointment from God include *ambassadors*⁸² which are sent by the king they represent; *stewards* who must hold their office from their master; *messengers* as heralds of Christ are appointed by his choice; *vessels* chosen of the Lord and equipped for usefulness; and the Holy Ghost made some *overseers* of the flock.⁸³

Ridderbos's thoughts concerning *ministry* are that every activity in the church is designed for the building of the saints, therefore every gift acts in the church as a ministry and finds its destiny and its criterion only in its character as service. All the gifts are placed at the service of the body of Christ.⁸⁴ "To think here only of incidental and concrete service is not only an unnatural conception of the reality, but is also in conflict with the Pauline usage, where 'ministry,' even though it does not yet have the special significance of 'diaconate,' can denote a definite, 'fixed' activity in the church that is discharged by specific persons."⁸⁵

In understanding the use of the word "gifts"⁸⁶ the Bible reader must recognize that there is no hierarchical distinction between what is valued in gifts and ministry in the church as being more or less spiritual, "pneumatic"; "it is the same Spirit" and "the same Lord" who works all things. Every dualism of visible and invisible, of form and Spirit, is alien to the NT idea

primary terms, he lists workings, work, administration, and service as the main words used in Paul's writings.

⁸² Paul speaks in the plural, therefore he includes others; perhaps he is referring to just himself and Timothy, but that seems unlikely.

⁸³ Charles H. Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954), pp. 24-25.

⁸⁴ Ridderbos, p. 443.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 445.

⁸⁶ The following is just a sampling: Rom. 12:6-8, body has many parts, different gifts in Christ; 1 Cor. 1:7; 1 Cor. 12, different gifts, but the same Spirit, the body has many parts, but one body in Christ; v. 28, in the church God appointed first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, and then . . . , desire the greater gifts; Eph. 4:11-16, God gave some pastors; 1 Tim. 4:14, do not neglect your gift; 2 Tim. 1:6, fan into flame the gift of God in you.

of the church.⁸⁷ However, Paul can speak of the best gifts, as not all the gifts are of equal value.⁸⁸ Each member of Christ's body has his own gift from God. Everyone stands under God's sovereign will (1 Cor. 12:11-18), and, according to the measure of faith (Rom. 12:3; Eph. 4:7) that God will assign, each one is to act according to the nature of his own gift (Rom. 12:3, 6-8), not someone else's gift.⁸⁹ In all of this we need to see the significance of God's prerogative in the bestowal of his gifts, and that the Presbyter-Bishops "were indeed recruited from among the persons endowed by the Spirit with special gifts."⁹⁰

As congregational life consolidated itself on the foundation of the apostolic tradition and doctrine (formation of the canon), the church had greatest need of those *charismata* which Paul designates as the foundation of, and as indispensable for, the office of presbyter-*episkopos*: the gift of government, the ability to teach, the correct distinguishing of what is in conflict with sound doctrine, and a good posture toward those without. It is primarily this office, therefore, to which he entrusts the church in its further upbuilding and development when the time draws to a close during which the apostles and their immediate helpers stood by and governed the churches.⁹¹

⁸⁷ "It is therefore a false antithesis to set the charismatic and institutional as "spiritual authority" and "human rule" over against each other (*Ibid.*, p. 445, cf. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, pp. 121-122). "We see clear signs of stability, institutionality, and orderedness of specific ministries and *charismata* in the church" (Ridderbos, p. 445).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 443. Apostles, prophets and teachers are expressly listed first, second and third, 1 Cor. 12:28; cf. Eph. 4:11. Paul puts prophecy highest in 1 Cor. 14:1. Their distinction is not more or less ecstatic/spectacular.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 459.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

The prince of preachers, in the nineteenth-century, saw the necessity of a divine call. Spurgeon said, "Nor need any imagine that such calls are a mere delusion, and that none are in this age separated for the peculiar work of teaching and overseeing the church."⁹² Charles Bridges in his evangelical classic on pastoral theology, recognized that as pastors today have "no extraordinary commission, we do not expect an immediate and extraordinary call." Yet he spoke of a call, an external and an internal call:

Our authority is derived conjointly from God and the Church—that is, originally from God—confirmed through the medium of the Church. The *external call* is a commission received from and recognized by the Church . . . not indeed qualifying the Minister, but accrediting him, whom God had internally and suitably qualified. This call communicates therefore only official authority. The *internal call* is the voice and power of the Holy Ghost, directing the will and the judgment, and conveying personal qualifications.⁹³

⁹² Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students*, p. 24. Spurgeon felt "overwhelmed with fear lest any of us should be slack in examining our credentials; and I had rather that we stood too much in doubt, and examined too frequently, than that we should become cumberers of the ground" (p. 26). A cumberer is one who hinders more than helps.

⁹³ Charles Bridges, *The Christian Ministry* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1959), pp. 91-93. Bridges continues further: "Now if there be any meaning in terms as illustrative of things, an inward movement by the Holy Ghost must imply his influence upon the heart—not indeed manifested by any enthusiastic impulse; but enlightening the heart under a deep impression of the worth of souls; constraining the soul by the love of Christ to 'spend and be spent for him;' and directing the conscience to a sober, searching, self-inquiry; to a daily study of the word; to fervent prayer in reference to this great matter; and to careful observation of the providential indications of our Master's will." Some might not like the words "inward movement of the Holy Ghost" because others use this language to signify a mystical experience. However, Bridges' explication of his terms, in language characteristic of his day, is clear that he is not implying a mystical experience (any enthusiastic impulse). His thoughts concerning a call lead to a soul searching exercise of immense value for anyone desiring to enter Christ's ministry. Is this what Christ wants me to do? This in no way threatens to place the leader outside the authority of the church, or of the

Spurgeon suggested the call consists in four elements: (1) an intense, all absorbing, thoughtful, desire for the work, without ulterior motive than the glory of God; (2) an aptness to teach and other needed qualities; (3) evidence of God's blessing on prior efforts;⁹⁴ and (4) the prayerful judgment of the church.⁹⁵ Mr. Cianca cites Gary Friesen, when he states, "There is simply no unambiguous biblical evidence" to support such a call.⁹⁶ The point that I am making, like many before me, is that the Bible used a variety of words to convey the idea that God chooses individuals for the Gospel ministry. The call is used as a theological term; it incorporates many biblical ideas. Perhaps we need to come up with a better term,⁹⁷ perhaps not.

canon.

⁹⁴ He sees this specifically as conversions, but I am taking the liberty to apply it to other forms of blessing as well, including the building up the saints.

⁹⁵ Spurgeon, *Lectures to My Students*, pp. 26-33.

⁹⁶ Cianca, p. 46, has overstated Friesen's point, who said that the usage of *καλέω* in the vocational sense was a minor one (Gary Friesen, *Decision Making and the Will of God: A Biblical Alternative to the Traditional View* [Portland: Multnomah Press, 1980], p. 314). In Friesen's discussion of divine call (chapter 19, pp.311-322) he studied the NT usage of the verb *καλέω* and its cognates, and he concluded that the Bible uses "call" in three ways: Christ used it to "summon" or "invite" sinners to enter the kingdom; Paul, primarily, used it to speak of the effectual call of God to salvation; and the third usage one of a call to specific function or office in only three instances (Rom. 1:1 and 1 Cor. 1:1; Acts 13:2; and Acts 16:9-10). He concluded, "The concept of 'the call of God' is a prominent one in the NT, the vocational sense of the term occupies only a minor place, and when it occurs, it is never presented as pertaining to all believers" (pp. 312-314).

⁹⁷ What are the alternatives? Friesen suggests none, except perhaps desire, "To sum up, according to the NT, a church leader must be a spiritually mature Christian man who desires a position of leadership in the church, and is able to lead God's people and teach God's word" (p. 317). Friesen boards on leaving God out of the equation, but Cianca goes even further. Cianca says, "Whereas the apostles ministered within a specialized and divine framework of leadership authority, servant-leaders in the church minister within a community based and derived authority" (p. 48); "in a sense the followers empower the leaders to lead" (p. 48).

In answering the question, "How to become an Elder?", Alexander Strauch did not

We do not see the terms Trinity, or inerrancy in Scripture, but these terms encapsulate significant biblical teaching. Perhaps there are better words that could be used to describe what, following centuries of church usage, is referred to as the call, but the ideas invoked by the term are not far from the truth. The NT indeed teaches such a call, even if it is not a duplication of all the physical elements seen in Old and New Testament narratives.⁹⁸ That misunderstandings exist and abuses abound does not diminish the value of a lucid understanding or the legitimate usage of the call as a theologically rich term which draws attention to God's role in the gifting, equipping, and appointing of his servant leaders in his church.

The Nature of Authority

Cianca sees potential abuses as inherent.⁹⁹ Yet why did Christ¹⁰⁰ repeatedly instruct the disciples on the differences between a Gentile power model and his own servant model if the potential for abuse was not present

use the term "call." He offered no alternative but avoided the issue by not speaking to it directly. He spoke of three required steps: 1) a Spirit given desire manifest in sacrificial service; 2) in addition to the subjective desire, objective qualifications; and 3) an examination by the church, being tested first. Elsewhere, though he speaks of being "called" by God (cf. pp. 86, 107).

⁹⁸ The scope of this response limits the space we can devote to this subject; more work needs to be done in this area. My point here is, in contrast to Cianca, the call does not put one outside of the authority of church and canon. That a power monger may misuse the call to defend his autocratic ministry does not invalidate the biblical truth that God sovereignly distributes the gifts according to his will.

⁹⁹ To cite just one example: "Many leaders throughout church history have appealed to both Old Testament and New Testament paradigms for lessons in leadership . . . Most of these are used to validate autocratic and leader-centred styles of ministry" (p. 38). This is disappointing because while wanting to give wholehearted agreement to his criticism of both obvious and subtle abuses of power, the foundations for, and methods of, arriving at his conclusions are unstable. The tendency then is to discredit his conclusions along with the faulty foundations. I have sought to strengthen the foundations and make needed adjustments without discarding all his conclusions.

¹⁰⁰ Not only did Christ deal with this in the training of the twelve, but they too deal with this in their own discipleship ministries, cf. 1 Pet. 5:2-3.

and indeed a real threat?¹⁰¹ Some leaders today do use OT and NT examples as paradigm for their ministry; Cianca says that using these structures leads to an autocratic, dictatorial ministry. Is this correct?¹⁰²

On the question of authority, I concur that Christian ministry involves both “mutual submission” and “servant leadership” it does not follow however, that authority is “gained by mutual assent.”¹⁰³ In Cianca’s concluding quote from Robert Greenleaf as “a hopeful sign of the times,” he says, “the only authority deserving one’s allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to . . . the clearly evident servant stature of the leader.”¹⁰⁴ This is not the biblical view of derived authority.

¹⁰¹ I appreciate Cianca’s desire to avoid the pitfalls which trap many Christian leaders, but is he justified to “throw the baby out with the bath water?” His aversion to authority seems to reflect Greenleaf’s attitude more than that of Scripture: Greenleaf views Lord Acton’s conclusion, “Power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely” as a maxim (Robert K. Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1977), p. 103). Scripture recognizes the potential abuse of power yet still recognizes that it has a legitimate, important role in Christian leadership.

¹⁰² It is possible that some, in spite of erroneous methods, may still arrive at or near the right destination. This does not authenticate their methods, but does manifest something of the nature of God’s grace. We should not assume that OT and NT structures, even if misappropriated, lead to autocracy.

¹⁰³ Cianca, p. 48. It is true: “In a sense, the followers empower the leaders to lead”, but this is not an adequate summary of what constitutes empowerment for Christian ministry. Cianca is willing to qualify statements like, “the followers empower the leaders to lead” with “in a sense,” yet in his very next sentence he says, “There is now no single leader who is expected to know the mind of God and rule the affairs of the church with final authority.” Here he uses superlatives and is unwilling to allow for “any sense” in which Christian leaders, by virtue of the spiritual nature of the Church, of the word and of their vocation, ought to know the mind of God, at least in some measure beyond those who do not devote themselves on a full-time basis to prayer, and the study of God’s Word, and that these spiritual exercises would equip them “in some sense” to rule the affairs of the church with authority even if that authority is derived and is not exactly “final.”

¹⁰⁴ Cianca, p. 49. This is not a biblical view of the derivative nature of authority in the Church. All authority is derived through Christ from God.

Christ presented his own authority as a derived authority. Otto Betz demonstrates this by pointing out that Christ claimed God's authority; he forgave a man his sins and confirmed the power of his Word by a healing miracle. He taught not as the scribes, but, as one who not only receives his words from God's mouth, but also as the Son who knows the Father and who alone can reveal him.¹⁰⁵ I referred earlier to John 17, the account of Christ's High Priestly prayer, where we see the significance of Jesus having received what he then passed on. Throughout John's Gospel we see the emphasis on Christ having been sent. Therefore, it is correct to speak of the derived nature of biblical authority, even in reference to Christ, however it is not derived from the followers *per se*, but from God.¹⁰⁶

Jeremias provides a lucid example, in the episode of Christ sending out his disciples: the magnitude of the authority of the messengers becomes clear in the climatic parallelism (Matt 10:40, cf. Luke 10:16). In the first half it established the right of the messenger, according to which a man's messenger is, as the one who sends him. Similarly, in the person of the messengers, Jesus himself comes. The nature of being a messenger is to represent Jesus. Therefore, just as a man's attitude toward Jesus' own words even now decides between salvation and condemnation, so does a man's attitude towards those of the messengers; with them comes either peace or judgment. In the second half it goes one step further. God himself enters the houses with Jesus' messengers.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Otto Betz, "ἐξουσία" *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), II, 610-611.

¹⁰⁶ When I referred earlier to Charles Bridges comments concerning the call, and specifically in reference to the external call, the church may in recognizing that a candidate for leadership is called of God impart a certain positional authority. Therefore, what I am saying does not eliminate every sense of the followers empowering the leaders, but on the contrary, authority is primarily derived from God, and as we have sought to demonstrate this is consistently to come from God's Word inscripturated.

¹⁰⁷ Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus* (New York: Macmillan Publ. Co., 1971), pp. 238-239. The teacher did not just use role playing. The situational methodologist created his own real life situation, to disciple his learners. They learned a lesson, never to be forgotten: their authority is derived from Jesus, the Christ of God.

Christ modelled most perfectly servant-leadership, what true Christian leadership is all about, not lording authority over followers. However, there is authority. It is being able to say, "Thus saith the Lord," and that ends the discussion. Cianca recognized that Christ, the ultimate servant-leader, also possessed ultimate, complete and final authority.

The pastor has incredible responsibility to study the Word, to demonstrate in his ministry that he has God's approval, that God is saying, "listen to him, he is my servant!" The responsibility is then shared by all believers to submit. The followers provide for the physical needs of their leaders, so those leaders are able to devote their time and energy to prayer and to studying God's Word. The leaders lead from God's Word because the followers do not have time to do it themselves. They can find time to read, study and pray every day, but not to the same extent.

The danger of denying the God-given authority for leaders, is that it undermines the authority of God's Word, which is ultimately an affront upon God himself. Cianca says, "New Testament leaders are not autocrats who for some reason have been elevated above the rest or who appeal to divinely conferred authority, but rather they seek to lead, through the assent of their followers." In other words leaders get their authority as the followers give it to them. The followers possess the authority. In church practice today this is often the situation, but it too is not the biblical position. This is a misuse of power as much as is autocracy.¹⁰⁸

The church is not a democratic organization which exercises the power of the majority, but rather the NT teaches the priesthood of all believers, that all have a part to play in understanding God's Word, but that God gives gifts to the church, e.g., pastors-teachers. Leaders are accountable to God for their leadership, and, as the Bereans, the believers must search diligently to ascertain the veracity of what the leader says, and in this way all believers

¹⁰⁸ Much of this is seen in current secular trends in leadership. When one does not recognize God's authority, when one holds to a closed system, from such a world view it is consistent to recognize no authority over the community. Christian communities, however operate from a different world view and err if they follow the current cultural pattern (then this brings us back to the question concerning the normative nature of NT practice) in lieu of the NT pattern. It is necessary, albeit difficult, to find the balance.

are involved, but ultimately it is to God that the servant of God must give an account of his stewardship.

The church, however, is not a dependent multitude under the authorities set over it. They must know that they are not the work of Paul or Apollos, nor of themselves. The church is God's building. Its boast and authority do not lie in the fact that it can appeal to men.¹⁰⁹ However:

The church is itself subject to the authority and order that have validity in its midst and owes obedience to them. And this not merely by way of mutual arrangement and as an agreement of the ecclesiastical community, but because this is the authority and order that Christ has set over it. Nor is this authority and this order an *abstractum*, but it assumes concrete shape in the persons in the church who are invested with these full spiritual powers and in the control they exercise....

It is God, therefore, it is Christ, it is the Spirit, who 'appoints,' 'gives,' 'assigns,' and 'entrusts' apostles, prophets, and teachers in the church . . . The ministry of the Spirit and the indwelling of Christ in his body become visible for them. For this reason the exercise of office and the functioning of gifts and powers in the church are never only a mutual service of the members of the church to one another and discipline never only a supervision one of another. It is the gift of Christ, it is the truth and law of the Lord; the full powers of Christ are administered and vested in them. Thus the authority and those who hold it are given by Christ for the upbuilding of the church, and thus the church has to acknowledge, honor, and subject itself to them, and obey them.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ Ridderbos, p. 473.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 474-475. Thus, with Ridderbos, we need to recognize that there is a twofold relationship in which the church is both the subject as well as the object in the exercise of God's authority. "This reciprocal dependence—does not comprise an internal contradiction, . . . [for it is] in this corporate communion between Christ as the head and the church as his body, that all the *charismata*, ministries and offices

If someone has a problem with the leader, there needs to be witnesses, prior to receiving the accusation, and without partiality every false accusation needs a public rebuke, that others may fear.¹¹¹ The respect due to God's servants is a reflection of our respect toward Christ's leadership and ultimately toward God's position as sovereign. There is a threat of congregational sin, of being proud or stiff-necked, of refusing to submit to the leadership.¹¹² Thus the biblical nature of leadership authority is not autocracy, neither is it democracy. Leaders chosen by God are gifts given to his church. God's servant is equipped with a powerful sword which is the Word of God, his source of strength. All the defences of all our enemies are unable to withstand the Word of truth. The church is being built and will prevail.

Conclusion

The Historical-Redemptive method opens the way to understand the biblical paradigm for leadership. There is one paradigm and it is fully expressed in Christ. It is seen in the shadow and preparation of the OT and is expounded in the NT. In a word it is servant-leadership. This word maintains an appropriate paradoxical tension, intimating both authority and the servant-like attitude. As Paul states, "No one can lay any foundation other than the one already laid, which is Jesus Christ. If any man builds on

are given to the church" (p. 474). "The church that has been taught of God is itself the bearer of the gifts, ministries, and full powers that Christ has conferred on it, and at the same time the object of this authority" (*Ibid.*).

¹¹¹ This is where 1 Tim.5:17-25 is so very important and is often misread: the followers have a responsibility to "respect your elders."

¹¹² Many people do not respect their pastors, they use respectful language "Mr. Smith" or "Pastor Jones," but true respect is to value them, listen to their words, heed their warnings, and to submit to their leadership. Cf. Parable of the Two Sons, Matt. 21:28-31—one son said "no", but later changed his mind, the other said "yes sir," but disobeyed. Which one showed respect?

this foundation using gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay or straw, his work will be shown for what it is, the Day will bring it to light.”¹¹³

What the church needs today is leaders who are intimate with God and thoroughly absorbed in his Word, who with profound insight into their own hearts, know the grace and power of God’s Word first hand, leaders who are equipped to lead. We need Elders who are mature, seasoned, balanced and genuine, who are not novices, who are eager to submit themselves to God’s Word at all costs, and who are not ashamed of the Gospel. We need Pastors who are pastors, who have genuine covenantal commitment to the body of believers of whom the Holy Spirit has made them overseers, who watch and see, who listen and hear, who are inclined to come alongside with a word of comfort, exhortation, rebuke, healing, and encouragement in the grace of the Saviour, who rely on God, and who focus on his Word to care for the needs of the collective and of the individual members of the body.

We need servants who are humble, who are convinced that their task is an awesome task, yet confidently expect God to do more than they can imagine. Who are real people who know the grace of God in their own lives, who as vessels of clay are not afraid to be used. We need men who have passionate conviction, who stand up to be heard, who speak no uncertain sound, and who proclaim the power of God. Success is measured by the degree to which leaders yield to God. God perfects his strength in their weakness. It is God’s Word going forth with the power of God’s Spirit that accomplishes what God intends.

Christ’s summary of the law and the prophets also sums up the biblical paradigm for leadership: love the Lord your God with all your heart, mind, soul and strength, and your neighbour as yourself. The church needs leaders who will lead, who will protect, and who will teach the flock. The church will never, until we all come to the full stature of Christ, move beyond its need for Christ’s undershepherds to lead from the front.

All authority remains with God. It is the right of Christ to call his servants to service. The church also needs followers who recognize God’s sovereignty and their own need, who see the fields ripe and ready for harvest, and who will pray to the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers.

¹¹³ 1 Cor. 3:11-15, NIV.

Followers who will take their responsibility seriously to hear their leaders,
who will continue in God's Word, and who will follow the truth.

Ye Servants of God, Your Master proclaim,
And publish abroad His wonderful name,
The name all victorious Of Jesus extol;
His kingdom is glorious, And rules over all.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ Charles Wesley.