

NAIROBI EVANGELICAL GRADUATE
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

BIBLICAL LEADERSHIP WITH SPECIAL INTEREST
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND APPLICATION TO
THE ETHIOPIAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH

BY

ASSAYEHEGN BERHE

A Thesis submitted to the Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Theology

BIBLICAL LEADERSHIP WITH SPECIAL
INTEREST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT
AND APPLICATION TO THE ETHIOPIAN
EVANGELICAL CHURCH

1995

Approved:



Samuel Ngewa, Ph.D.
Supervisor



Peter Johnston, Ph.D.
Second Reader



Karl-Johan Lundstrom, Ph.D.
External Examiner

July, 1995

ABSTRACT

Chapter One is basically a general introduction. It covers the introduction of the topic; the issues involved; the significance of the problem; research questions; objectives; limitation and delimitations; definitions of terms; and approach or methodology.

Chapter two contains some of the models of Christian leadership from both the O.T. and N.T. The key O.T. models of leadership are Moses and Nehemiah. From both characters I have tried to amplify the qualities, challenges, and problems of leadership; the team leadership they developed and the principles of leadership we learn from them.

Then I moved on to the N.T. models of leadership. First, I focused on the religious leaders in the book of Luke to help us see the negative side of leadership. Second, I have discussed about leadership as exemplified by Jesus and Paul. The excellence of His leadership was building a small group of disciples (team leadership), shaping and developing their character.

I have also argued from Paul's leadership example. I have tried to show the significance of Paul's conversion in his theology and leadership. When the itinerant founder or his delegate were not present, leadership on the local scene seems to have been left in the hands of "elders", all expressions of which in the New Testament are plural.

Chapter three includes the discussion on the emerging church and the problem of authority in Acts. There are significant transitions in Acts which will help us to understand the emerging church and the need of functional and not absolute leadership styles. And these transitions are geographical, ethnic, cultic, and institutional. These transitions have a counterpart in changes in the exercise of authority within the church. In the second half of chapter three, I have brought an argument of Jesus' and Paul's idea of 'team leadership' by discussing specific examples.

Chapter Four comprises suggestions and recommendations to the Ethiopian evangelical church. I have suggested that there is a need for leadership development and a quality leadership with high integrity. We need to develop and train Godly leaders, create an atmosphere of accountability, and help them to develop an attitude of a servant leadership and a team spirit.

In my conclusion, I have emphasized that leaders who are spiritually authentic, blameless, mature, congenial, and compassionate with a servant heart must be recruited, trained, appointed, and invested with proper authority. Certainly, there is a need of developing a team leadership. This is New Testament leadership at its best.

DEDICATED TO:

My dear wife Emebet
whose wisdom and understanding
was a source of encouragement;
and my beloved daughters
Feben and Bethlehem

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. To Dr. Samuel Ngewa, who, despite his demanding responsibilities and busy schedule as an Acting Principal of NEGST, graciously accepted to be my first reader and supervised my Thesis work. His mentorship and leadership influence of directing, guiding, and encouraging can not be forgotten.
2. To Dr. Peter Johnston, who has been my second reader and helped me very much to develop, refine and focus on the issues that I have tackled in this Thesis. I would like to deeply appreciate for his special interest and concern on the historicity of the Ethiopian evangelical church.
3. To Dr. Karl-Johan Lundstrom, who was willing to be my external examiner, despite the extremely demanding leadership responsibilities that he had at Daystar University and several organizations.
4. Special thanks to my precious family: My dear wife Emebet who has typed all this document, my beloved daughters Feben and Bethlehem, and my sister-in-law Tsehay. They have been exceptionally understanding and caring during the time of writing.
5. I would like to deeply appreciate Dr. Victor B. Cole and Dr. Chester Wood, for their special insight and encouragement during the initial stages of my work.
6. To Mr. Tekle G. Selassie, Dr. Alemu Mammo, Mr. Mekuria Mulugeta, Dr. & Mrs. Tibebu & Lishan H. Selassie, Mr. Gaim Kibereab and Mr. Ashenafi Zewge for their special friendship and prayer support; Mr. Berhanu Deresse, Mr. Mulatu Belachew, Mr. Million Belete, Mr. Hailu W. Semayat, and Mr. Tesfahun Agidew for their exemplary leadership.
7. To my colleagues of NEGST-Thursday afternoon prayer group who have been touching my life through their prayer ministry.
8. To TEAR Fund, CISF, World Vision International, Overseas Council, Partners International, Grace Foundation, Hilfe Fur Bruder, Uncle Tony & Mrs. Eve Wilmot for their continuous financial assistance during my stay here at NEGST.
9. More than all, my special gratitude and thanksgiving goes to God, who has given me a favor in His eyes to invest His Grace, Power, and Time to develop me as a person for His own Glory. He has encouraged, comforted, and guided me to accomplish this great task.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
A. Issues.....	2
B. The Significance of the Problem.....	5
C. Research Questions.....	7
D. Objectives.....	8
E. Limitations/Delimitations.....	8
F. Definitions of Terms.....	9
1. Leadership	
2. The Ethiopian Evangelical Church	
3. Presbyters	
4. Overseers	
5. Deacons	
G. Approach or Methodology.....	25
H. Literature Review.....	26
I. End Notes.....	34
I. CHAPTER 2: SOME MODELS OF CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP	
A. Key Models from the Old Testament.....	37
1. Leadership as Exemplified by Moses	
a. Leadership and Submission	
b. Leadership and Confidence	
c. Leadership and Team Spirit	
2. Leadership as Exemplified by Nehemiah	
a. The Leader and His Gift	
b. The Leader and His Program	
c. The Leader and His Commitment	

B. Key New Testament Models of Leadership.....	47	D. Leadership with Integrity Needed.....	118
1. Negative Models of Leadership		1. Developmental Focus	
2. Positive Models of Leadership		2. Relationship Focus	
a. Leadership as Exemplified by the Lord Jesus		3. Accountability Focus	
b. Leadership as Exemplified by Paul		4. Servant Leadership	
C. End Notes.....	76	E. Conclusion.....	124
III. CHAPTER 3: TEAM LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW TESTAMENT		F. End Notes.....	127
A. The Emerging Church and the Problem of Authority	81	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	128
1. Authority in the Jerusalem Church		APPENDIX.....	134
2. Authority in the Gentile Churches		The Foundation of Evangelical Christianity in Ethiopia	
3. Concluding Observations		A. Ethiopia Opens Itself to Foreign Missions	
B. A Leadership Paradigm.....	93	B. The Churches During the Italian Fascist Invasion	
1. The Trinity as a Model for Leadership		C. The Evangelicals Come Together	
2. Jesus' Inner Circle		D. History of the Ethiopian Evangelical Churches Association	
3. The Need of Team Spirit			
a. Paul's Inner Circle			
b. The Team and Controversial Issues			
c. The Team Leadership and Division			
C. End Notes.....	111		
IV. CHAPTER 4: SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ETHIOPIAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH AND CONCLUSION			
A. Evidences of Leadership Crisis.....	113		
B. The Need for Leadership Development.....	115		
C. Biblical Models for Training.....	116		

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of any church and its leaders is a precarious undertaking. It is necessary to assess past performance and suggest ways of improvement for the future. It is always hoped that critiques are constructive, tempered with charity, and seasoned with salt. We must be sensitive to the fact that this is Christ's body and He said, "I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it."¹ Churches and their leaders are often anguished or indifferent, and the difficulties do not seem to be associated with any particular church polity or size. The troubles themselves are evident: interpersonal tension, schism, brief pastorates, leader burnout or dropout, laity disillusionment, status quo mentality, declining membership, upside down priorities, and the unmet needs of people all of which are indicators of spiritual impotency.

Many congregations experience a continued power struggle with their leaders or among their leaders. There is a considerable antagonism or uncertainty over the Scriptural counsel to "Obey your leaders and submit to their authority."² Evidence suggests a growing resistance to leaders amongst members, probably with sufficient cause.

The causes are less clear than the crisis and are inevitably complex. Ineffective leadership is primarily responsible for

church malfunction. No church achieves excellence in ministry without mature, capable leadership; excellent leadership generally produces effective churches. Jesus majored in leadership training during his earthly ministry. We would do well to follow His example.

Issues

What authority church leaders should have or what constitutes the proper expression of that authority is not generally agreed upon. Abuse of power and position is not unusual. The whole church suffers from each breach of trust. The Ethiopian evangelical church has not been an exception to some of the failures. It has been observed by the writer and other church leaders that there are two extreme leadership concepts in some of the mega churches and denominations across the country. On the one hand, there is what is called "One-man leadership"³ which has been exercised by some of the charismatic leaders. According to this concept, leaders do not believe in the importance and significance of lay leadership and it is only the "One-man" who does almost everything. In such a leadership style, there is no accountability either to God and or to the congregation whatsoever. Most of the time, the congregation is being manipulated to follow the ambitions of the autocratic leader. On the other hand, there is what is called "Lay leadership"⁴ which has been exercised by elders and/or deacons in some churches and denominations. According to this concept, there is no such thing as calling to a full-time ministry; it does not believe in having

pastors. If there are, they are just hired people like any other church worker. In fact, the leaders who follow this concept believe that you can produce pastors and evangelists so long as you train them. These two extreme styles and concepts of leadership, when exercised one at the expense of the other, have brought strife, division, stagnation and fragmentation within the church. When church members fail to respect their leaders, it is probably because leaders have failed to earn respect. If there is resistance to church leadership, misuse of leaders' prerogatives is likely to be found.

Leadership failure rarely occurs because of cognitive or theological defect. Rather, the deficiencies of leaders focus on inadequate relational skills, communication ability, decision making, and use of power and authority. Some of the problems that emerged in the history of the Ethiopian evangelical church could be referred to lack of theologically trained leaders. Only in recent years have some ministerial training schools deemed the teaching of leadership essential. Lack of leadership training may still be the most glaring deficiency among the church leaders in Ethiopia. To that effect, Yohannes Irenna, Dr. Karl-Johan Lundstrom and Dr. Knud Jorgensen were asked by the Ethiopian Evangelical church Mekane Yesus to critically look into whether there is a need of establishing a "Leadership Institute." According to their report of September 1993, they recommended the following (to mention a few):

1. Leadership development must focus on all types of leadership, from the congregational level to the top leadership of the church. The various types of leaders will need various forms of

training.

2. Leadership training within the church should aim at developing servant leaders whose primary function is to equip God's people for the work of Christian service.

3. Unnecessary divisions between clergy and laity must be avoided. Instead the church should aim at making the priesthood of all believers a reality.⁵

Most church leaders in Ethiopia have gained whatever leadership knowledge they have the hard way; through painful experience, through trial and error. Such experience is often an unforgiving teacher, and many are bruised along the way. Numerous anointed leaders have quit ministry altogether. Lay leaders frequently bring a leadership style that has worked successfully in the business community, and they are shocked at its ineffectiveness in the church. They fail to understand that the church is a unique entity.

We are constantly tempted to measure the effectiveness of leadership in materialistic terms (bodies, budgets, and buildings); but to do so is a tragic mistake. Rather, leaders and churches must be evaluated by two achievements: fulfilling the mission of the church (task), generally recognized to be meaningful worship, the edification of believers, the evangelization of the lost, and the meeting of a variety of other real needs; and fostering the cohesiveness of the church (relationships), defined by fellowship in unity ("one accord") and agape (love) enjoined by scripture. These two primary objectives of spiritual leadership are interdependent and interrelated. Neither can be sacrificed on the altar of expediency. To achieve only one is to fail

in a crucial dimension of biblical leadership. Moreover, it is doubtful whether one can truly be achieved without the other.

What kind of leader earns the respect of the congregation, preserves unity in the church, and accomplishes the church's task? There are no quick solutions or easy answers, but there is help and hope. Scripture and experience can lead us to an effective philosophy of leadership. There are inevitable differences of opinion, personality, and style. No one can respond perfectly to every conceivable circumstance. However, sensible guidelines can be developed and tested by scripture and common sense so that, in the pressures of differing situation, leaders are able to grow in competence and effectiveness as they guide the church.

Failure in leadership brings the inevitable consequences of church stagnation, fragmentation, and deterioration. Effectiveness in leadership brings the joy of fruitful ministry and loving fellowship.

The Significance of the Problem

Most churches have suffered the consequences of poor leadership at some point: conflict, stagnation, and impotency. Leadership exists to guide the church to spiritual vitality, unity, and effective ministry. When the purposes of the church are not fulfilled, leadership must accept primary responsibility. Of course, there are times when the very best of Christian leaders cannot function constructively because of factors entirely beyond their control. Nevertheless, churches usually are reflections of their leadership. If churches are formed by disunity and become spiritually unproductive, we must look first to see if leadership

has failed to function according to Scriptural guidelines.

Some leaders are confused over what it means to "direct the affairs of the church."⁶ Some position themselves as divinely sanctioned autocrats who "take charge" and "run the church". People resent being manipulated and managed as mere cogs in an organization. John R.W. Stott is absolutely correct when he says, "...people must be neither 'manipulated' not even 'managed'...". And he also adds, "Both words are derived from Manus, meaning hand, and expressing a 'handling' of people as if they were commodities rather than persons."⁷

Others are only paid hands who merely maintain the status quo or endeavor to gain the followers by servility; they have negligible influence or authority and receive minimal respect. Still others fluctuate wildly between these extremes of leadership styles without apparent reason or logic, desperately trying to find something pragmatically effective. The crisis of leadership deficiency may well be one of the most pervasive and pernicious problems facing contemporary Christianity. It is essential that we pause and reflect on biblical patterns of leadership.

The church must return to primary emphasis on the Scriptural qualifications and styles for spiritual leadership. Leaders who are spiritually authentic, blameless, mature, congenial, and compassionate must be recruited, trained, appointed, and invested with proper authority. Without leaders characterized by spiritual and personal integrity, true, enduring effectiveness is impossible in the church. The writer wants to look at the leadership of the Ethiopia evangelical church for the purpose of making recommendations.

Research Questions

The researcher would like to ask the following research questions as he undertakes this study.

1. What is leadership?
2. What are the different offices of leadership mentioned in the New Testament? How do they relate to each other?
3. What are the different styles of leadership?
4. How do the different styles of leadership, (i.e.. "one-man and lay-man" leadership - in their extremes) affect the church?
5. How do leadership, authority and power relate to each other? How should they be regulated or handled biblically?
6. What are the evidences of leadership crisis?
7. Why do we need to have an appropriate style of leadership?
8. What are the different church governments in church history?
9. What is team leadership?
10. How can we develop team leadership?
11. What types of leaders should be trained or educated?
12. What is our model for leadership from the Biblical perspective?

Objectives

The objectives of this study are as follows:-

1. To understand and evaluate the different styles of leadership.
2. To understand and look at the effects of two styles of leadership, ("one- man" and "layman") leadership.
3. To understand the different offices of leadership mentioned in the New Testament and see how they relate to each other.
4. To see how leadership, authority and power are inter-related and to develop a biblical understanding.
5. To develop the concept of team leadership.
6. To develop the biblical model of leadership and to show how that relates to the concept of team leadership.
7. To suggest and propose the importance of training and education and how that will help to develop and maintain team leadership in the Ethiopian church.

Limitations/Delimitations

The researcher will limit his study to the sociological structure of leadership in the New Testament. In fact, the researcher will only focus on the life, ministry and teaching of Moses, Nehemiah, the religious leaders in Luke (Pharisees and Sadducees), the Lord Jesus, the apostle Paul and the early Church in Acts in relation to leadership. Therefore, this study will not include the cultural, psychological, and historical influences upon any leadership style.

Definitions of Terms

Leadership

Leadership has been defined differently by different authors. John W. Gardner defines it as a "...process of persuasion and example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to take action...".⁸ The weakness of this definition is that it is more task-oriented than it is people oriented; and it can easily lead to manipulation of the group and abuse of power. James E. Means defines leadership as "the development of relationships... in such a way that individuals and the group are enabled to formulate real needs."⁹ The strength of this definition is that it puts leadership as people oriented; but it is weak because it leaves the group without any significant tasks or goals achieved. A more acceptable definition is that of John Haggai. This is so because his definition comprises what Gardner and Means have pointed out, both the areas of task and people-orientedness of a leader and he goes beyond that. He says that it "...is the discipline of deliberately exerting special influence within a group to move it toward goals of beneficial permanence that fulfill the group's real needs."¹⁰ He clearly indicates that leadership is a commitment and an imparting of life upon others through the God-given opportunity of a special influence that a leader has; and the leader motivates and leads the group toward goals which are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and tangible, which will in turn lead to changes that are continuing, enduring, and lasting for time and eternity for the benefit of all and for the glory of God.

Leaders tend to fall into one of two basic categories. They turn to become either task oriented or socially oriented. Task oriented leaders tend to emphasize the job or the task to be done, as opposed to individuals or groups. They tend to use or manipulate people, fail to maintain group cohesiveness, emphasize formal procedure, and substitute their agenda for group goals. People oriented leaders tend to emphasize individuals or groups, as opposed to tasks or ministries. These leaders tend to lack goals, spend time on process and procedure, fail to mobilize and motivate people to achieve worthwhile objectives, emphasize uniformity, overstress unity, and tend to be over-sensitive to criticism.

Excellence in leadership behavior requires both task and people orientation. The best leadership is not a balance between task and social dimensions, rather, the leader must be interested in both dimensions of leadership, never neglecting one for the other.

An extreme, aggressive leadership action may indicate a lack of trust and confidence in other people. The aggressive church leader may feel it is necessary to take unilateral action or control the group process because he perceives others to be incompetent or insensitive. On the other hand, extreme aggressive leadership behavior may indicate a deep insecurity on the part of the leader. Autocrats find it difficult to yield to the opinions of others, often because their ideas are tied to their egos. They feel a need to be dominant and control people as a boost of their status or sense of power. Excessively aggressive

leaders have a strong tendency to substitute their personal goals, that seem right to them, for the goals of the groups. Because they believe that they know what is best for their followers, or in the case of spiritual leaders, what the will of God is for the church.

On the other hand, submissive leaders are generally convinced that better decisions are made by the whole group working and cooperating together. Non-aggressive leaders generally regard their responsibilities as those of stimulating discussion, coordinating group activities, and guiding the process. Such leaders may feel secure enough not to feel threatened or personally rejected if their opinions do not prevail. Such leaders are marked by a deep internal conviction that others have valuable insights and contributions to make. Such leaders' external efforts are largely concentrated in securing the whole group's participation in setting and achieving group goals.

As in so many areas of life, balance, especially balance in biblical interpretation of text pertinent to authority and leadership orientation, is essential. Authoritarian leaders tend to emphasize one Biblical teaching at the expense of another. Some denominations have probably emphasized leadership authority too much and their leaders have been invested with excessive authority, an authority without checks that becomes too easy to abuse. Similarly, submissive leaders tend to focus on some Scriptural truth and neglect another. Some denominations have not emphasized leadership authority sufficiently, and their leaders have been crippled, unable to lead.

The Ethiopian Evangelical Church

Evangelicalism is the movement in Christianity that emphasizes conformity to the basic tenets of the faith and a missionary outreach of compassion and urgency. A person or a church who identifies with it is an "evangelical", one who believes and proclaims the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The word is derived from the Greek noun *εὐαγγελιον*, translated as glad tidings, good or joyful news, Gospel and the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι*, to announce good tidings of or to proclaim as good news. (1 Cor. 15:1-4). Evangelicals regard Scripture as the divinely inspired record of God's revelation, the infallible, authoritative guide for faith and practice. The Scriptures are inerrant in all that they affirm and serve as the adequate, normative, and wholly reliable expression of God's will and purpose. Evangelicals also believe in the total depravity of man. All the goodness that exists in human nature is tainted by sin, and no dimension of life is free from its effect. God Himself provided the way out of the human dilemma by allowing His only Son, Jesus Christ, to assume the penalty and experience death on man's behalf. Christ made atonement for sin on Calvary's cross by shedding His blood, thereby redeeming man from the power of spiritual death by dying in his place.

Evangelicals believe that salvation is an act of unmerited divine grace received through faith in Christ, not through any kind of penance or good works. The vehicle of God's Spirit is the Biblical proclamation of the Gospel which brings people to faith.

Finally, evangelicals look for the visible, personal return of Jesus Christ to set up Kingdom of Righteousness, a new Heaven and Earth, one that will never end.

Therefore, the term "the Ethiopian evangelical church" refers to those churches and denominations in Ethiopia who believe in the above mentioned tenets of faith.

No society of men can hold together without officers, rulers, leaders, or institutions of any kind. The Church of Christ is not exempted from this phenomena. A church has, since its foundation, found leadership in different categories of officers which include:

"Presbyters" (ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ)

Luke is the first not only to use the term $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota$ for the members of a Christian church,¹¹ but also to introduce the expression in the same context to describe the men who exercised leadership in the Christian church at Jerusalem on the Jewish Synagogue pattern.¹² This is analogous to the Sanhedrin which presupposes a "Council of elders" (γερονσια Acts 5:21), in which the leading role is played by the "Apostles." Luke has shown his readers the continuity between the old and the new covenant to find expression in the structure of the church by adopting this term. According to Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich, this term is defined as "A designation of an official 'elder, presbyter'."¹³ Louw and Nida have gone further and looked at it semantically. They defined it as "a person of responsibility and authority in matters of socio-religious concern, both in Jewish and Christian societies,"¹⁴ Among the Jews, the congre-

gation of the Synagogue in Jerusalem used "elder" to denote its officers until 70 A.D. Before that "elders" (ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ) (mostly plural; only rarely in singular) as a group of men who had been used within a tribe, family, people, or community of settlers. As soon as the expansion of the church rendered some organization necessary, it would form a 'synagogue' of its own. With the synagogue itself they would naturally, if not necessarily, adopt the normal government of a synagogue, and body of elders or presbyters would be chosen to direct the religious worship as well as watch over the temporal well being of the society.

According to Luke, there were elders in the first church in Jerusalem. They were mentioned for the first time in relation to collection at Antioch, which Luke says Paul and Barnabas brought to the "elders" at Jerusalem.¹⁵ They are then referred to in the account of the apostolic council and the formation of the apostolic creed.¹⁶ We finally meet them again in the story of Paul's coming to Jerusalem and his discussion with James.¹⁷ In fact, Coenen states, "By the time of the composition of Acts it is clear that the Pauline churches of Asia Minor had adopted the 'Presbyterian' system of government."¹⁸

Though the "elders" act as an authority for the whole church, only rarely, however, does Paul confer any title on the office bearers in a local church. For the most part he refers to them in terms of their function in the congregation as "guardians", men to whom the charisma of "helping others", "administration" and "service" is given. Yet their authority derives from the ministry accepted and discharged by them, not

from their status. Neither on the ground of age nor on that of length of membership in the community do they have authority. The constitutional principle in the congregation is that of plurality of charismata, not that of a naturally developed tradition which qualifies its bearers and sponsors to lead the church. With the growth of the church the visits of the Apostles and Evangelists to any individual community would become less and less frequent, so that the burden of instruction would be gradually transferred from these missionary preachers to the local officers of the congregation.

Paul in his pastoral epistles¹⁹ indicates that "elders" has become the title of honor for members of a body which cares for the members and life of the church. In fact, in Tit.1:5,7 Paul's usage of the two terms "elder" (*πρεσβυτερος*) and "overseer" (*ἐπισκοπος*) makes it probable that they are interchangeable. H. M. Gwatkin, in his article, gives the following reasons: (1) Bishops and elders are never joined together, like bishops and deacons, as separate classes of officials. (2) In Phil.1:1 if there had been a distinct order of elders, it could scarcely have been omitted (1Tim.3, 5:17; Ac.20:17; Tit.1:5-7). (3) The bishops described to Timothy, the elders of 1Timothy 5:17, and those of 1Peter 5:2, have distinctly pastoral functions. So, too, have the elders of Acts 20 and those described to Titus. (4) The same persons seem²⁰ to be called bishops and elders (Ac.20:17,28; Tit.1:5,7).

"Overseers" (*ἐπισκοποι*)

"Overseer" (*ἐπίσκοπος*) may be defined as a person "who has a definite function or a fixed office within a group... superintendent, guardian, bishop, overseer, visitor."²¹ The office combines concepts of both service and leadership; that is, the responsibility of caring for the needs of congregation as well as directing the activities of the membership.²² In some passages of the Old Testament, this term might be expected to represent Hebrew "Overseer, Officer, Governor" (*paqed*)²³. O'Brien says that, " *ἐπισκοπος* in classical and Septuagint Greek (from Homer on) meant an 'overseer', and was used to describe a deity (cf. Job 20:29) as the one who keeps watch over a country or people."²⁴ The title was also given to men who held responsible positions in the state, including those with judicial functions, councillors, treasurers, and military strategists, or who were overseers of religious communities, such as temple officials (cf. Num.4:16,31:14; Jdg.29:8). L.Coenen says that, "in some cases particular persons in a position of authority are "overseers", but some times it denotes the exercise of power as well as those who exercise it. In the New Testament the Ephesian elders who met Paul at Miletus are called *ἐπισκοποι* (Ac.20:28), and according to H.W.Beyer they are a definite circle of members from this settled congregation who are its regular leaders.²⁵ The qualifications required for this office are spelled out in the Pastorals at 1Tim.3:2 and Tit.1:7. Although the exact nature of the work performed by *ἐπισκοποι* is not mentioned, at the heart of it lies the ministry of oversight, super-

vision, or protective care. The climactic use of this title occurs at 1Peter 2:25, where Jesus is described as "the shepherd guardian of your souls." It is used by Paul in 1Tim. 3:1 to designate a defined office to which one could aspire. The focus seems to be not on the duties, but on the personal qualities that are necessary for that office. The term denotes one who keeps watch over the flock. In general, the terms "to shepherd" (ποιεῖν) and "to oversee" (ἐπισκοπεῖν) were closely linked in describing the work of the shepherd. Therefore, this term could be translated in terms of the ministerial "Pastor" and "Bishop". In 1Pet. 5:2, Jesus Christ is described as the "Shepherd", and "guardian" (ἐπισκοπος) of our souls. Everything that has been expressed by this term in both the Hebrew and Greek thought seems to be summed up when it is used as the title of Jesus Christ.²⁶ It has a considerable importance that "overseer" (ἐπισκοπος) is linked with "shepherd" (ποιεῖν),²⁷ for the two are already connected in the Old Testament and the New Testament.²⁸ This involves an oversight which is the loving care and concern, a responsibility willingly shouldered, that must never be used for self-aggrandizement. The model for a ministry is Christ Himself.

Originally, the need for pastoral oversight to keep the church in a well-grounded faith was duty binding on all believers. But later on this ministry became the task of a special office. The change may be seen in Ac. 20:28. In fact, "overseer" (ἐπισκοπος) is to be distinguished from that of an apostle and a prophet, and perhaps from that of teacher, for

bishops were linked with a particular place and church. This raises an important question in the history of government of the church: who is called "overseer" (ἐπισκοπος)? We may note that the wandering, charismatic preachers of the Gospel, the Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, are never called "overseers" (ἐπισκοποῦντες). This title arises only when there are settled local congregations in which regular acts are performed. For these designations "elders" (πρεσβυτεροι) or "overseers" (ἐπισκοποι) and "deacons" (διακονοι) were quickly established within the life of a congregation.

There are some who argue that those who were first called Apostles came afterwards to be designated bishops. If however, the two offices had been identical, the substitution of the one for the other would have required some explanation. But in fact the functions of the apostles and the bishops differ widely. The apostle, like the prophet or the evangelist, held no local office. He was essentially, as his name denotes, a missionary, moving about from place to place, founding and confirming new churches and brotherhoods.

The history of the name itself is helpful in understanding the origin of episcopates. If bishop was at first used as a synonym for presbyter and afterwards came to designate the higher office under whom the presbyters served, the episcopates properly so called would seem to have been developed from the subordinate office. In other words, the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localization but out of the presbyterial by elevation; and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to chief among them. The

prominence of such a system may have developed during the second and third centuries, partly because of individuals with outstanding gifts and partly because of the need for organization.²⁹ There were two stages of development in leadership of the early church. First, we have the apostles themselves exercising the superintendence of the churches under their care, some times in person and on the spot, other times at a distance by letter or by message. Second, the apostles themselves were the superintendents of each individual church. But the wider spread of the gospel would diminish the frequency of their visits and impair the efficiency of such supervision.

The fact that the episcopal office had been developed marks the transition and the shift from the missionary era of the church with its charismatic gifts to an institution with a permanent character. Once the apostles had died and the teachers and prophets became more rare, it was felt that the expanding churches needed a form of government which would ensure continuity.

"Deacons" (*διακονος*)

"Deacon" ('servant, minister') originally denoted one who rendered service of a lowly kind.³⁰ It seems quite evident that "to serve" (*διακονειν*) was specially connected with relief to the poor, among other functions.³¹ In some instances it may be best to translate as 'to have responsibility to help others,' or 'to be responsible to take care of the needs of believers.'

διακονειν does not appear in the LXX, while *διακονος* is used exclusively for court servants.³²

The basic meaning of "deacon" (*διακονος*) group of words is "humble service", particularly that of waiting at table. This was the common usage in secular Greek, though there were also technical religious usages. But it is significant that to the Greek, the idea of "service" (*διακονια*) was menial and degrading.³³

Jesus used this word in several key passages, for example, Matthew 10. The fact that they took on a completely new meaning and a rich, and deep theological content in the New Testament is due precisely to the creative and original use of Christ himself, the interpretation of His own person and mission. In Luke 22:24-27, when the dispute about greatness broke out among the disciples at the Last Supper, Christ challenged and reversed their ideas about greatness by pointing to the fact that He Himself was present in their midst "as the One who serves".³⁴ Thus in direct contradiction to Greek ideas, He held up before the disciples the figure of the servant, engaged in concrete humble unassuming service, as the ideal for the children of the Kingdom. The other fundamental text under this heading carries us even further. In Mark 10:35-45, another instance of the disciples wrangling about precedence in the Kingdom, Christ again holds up the figure of a servant as the ideal of discipleship. The basis of this reversal of human values is given in Mk.10:45; "For the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom to many". In Mark, it is quite clear. "I came to serve", He says. The whole purpose of His coming, of His earthly life and ministry can be summed up under this one word, "service" (*διακονια*). And this service finds its culmination and

fulfillment in His laying down His life as a ransom for many. Sacrificial service to the point of death is the concrete example of the Master.

The third step in our study is to observe how the idea of "service" is carried over from Christ to the disciples and the Church. We have already seen how in the terminology of "service", Christ pointed His followers to the way of sacrificial service, abandoning all forms of worldly ambition and self-assertion. They are to be "servants" ($\delta\sigma\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\lambda$), or "as those who serve" ($\omega\varsigma \delta\sigma\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$).³⁵ The disciple is primarily the "servant" ($\delta\sigma\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$) of Christ, and renders service to Him, as is made plain in John.12:26. The context shows that such "service" as this means giving one's own life. Paul thus speaks of himself and others as "servants" of Christ or of God. But this is rendered to Christ by being rendered to others. In addition these practical ways of "service", to proclaim the gospel is supremely an act of "service." Paul writes that he is "servant of the Gospel". Not only can his own life and calling as a Christian be termed a "servant", but the life and mission of the church as a whole can be described in the same way $\epsilon\lambda\varsigma \epsilon\pi\rho\upsilon\nu \delta\sigma\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma$ "for the work of ministry" (Eph.4:12). We may sum up this section by saying that as Christ came to fulfill a "service" or to be a servant, so the church as a whole and each Christian individually is sent to fulfill a "service." This involves humble service to the point of death, in seeking to meet the needs of the world in all their various forms.

Fourthly, within this one general apostolic "service" of

the whole church, there are specific, particular functions which can be termed "service", committed to individuals. In 1Cor.12:5 Paul says that within the one total "service", each member has his own differing individual "service". Paul thus speaks of his apostolic ministry as a "service"³⁶ and Peter uses the same expression in Acts 1:17, 25. Significantly, in many of Paul's references it is one of a series of designations used of his associates in his missionary activity. So Timothy is a minister of God (1Thess.3:2, 1Tim.4:6) and Tychicus a minister of the Lord (Col.4:7, Eph.6:21), while Epaphras, for example, ministers at Colossae on Paul's behalf (Col.1:8).

The "Deacons" ($\delta\sigma\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\lambda$) in the New Testament

The material concerning the "Deacons" consists of three relevant passages, which we must now examine briefly.

Acts 6:1-6 In Christian tradition the seven men appointed here to supervise the daily service to the poor are taken as prototype deacons, in the technical sense. But there are several factors which arise whether we can simply speak of these men as "deacons" and identify their office with the later deaconate. First, the term "deacons" is never applied to them. Certainly their main task is supervision of the daily "service", and their appointment is to "serve tables." But in this very passage the ministry of the apostles is also called "service."³⁷ Further, the task in which they engage is not limited to serving tables. In the following chapters Stephen and Philip engage in the work of preaching, disputing and baptizing along with the Twelve, though not with the same plenipotentiary authority. Again, from

the accounts of Stephen and Philip it is clearly apparent that these men brought to their ministry special insights into the universality of the gospel message. Even if these men are not proto-deacons, then, Luke records their appointment in such a way as to make clear some relationship to the deacons of later times. Further, those who were appointed to bear this responsibility are also seen exercising other "charismata" (*Χαρισματα*) to good effect: there is nothing static or mutually exclusive about these functions.

Philippians 1:1 Here it is probable that the two words "overseers" and "deacons" denote specific offices within the Philippian church. This association of bishop and deacon also occurs in 1Tim.3. Their number is uncertain, but at least there is a plurality. We may observe that at Philippi a church order had emerged which included a group of men who were responsible for "service", alongside another group which was responsible for oversight. They were holding some more or less formal office. O'Brien says that, "it has been suggested that these titles are to be understood in a functional rather than an official sense, that is, describing an activity rather than an office."³⁸ Paul can refer to church workers on occasion without specifying an office (cf. Rom.12:8, Gal.6:6, 1Thess.5:12). Here, however, he has in view particular members of the congregation who are specifically described and known by these two titles; otherwise the additions³⁹ seem to be meaningless. That Paul should refer to two definite groups in the prescript of his letter suggests that they have special, self-evident authority. As leaders in the congregation

they have a special responsibility for oversight and service, and this will involve them in tackling the issues the letter raises.

1Timothy 3:8-13 Here Paul gives a list of qualifications necessary for a deacon. Since they are mentioned in the plural⁴⁰ we may conclude that there were a number of them. Here too we find the deacon associated with the "overseers", whose qualifications are set out in the preceding verses. Apart from spiritual qualification and regular family life, we notice particularly that they must not be double-tongued or greedy for gain. On the assumption that their function may have given them special opportunities or temptations for indulging in these vices, we may guess that they were engaged in some form of pastoral work or house-visiting, perhaps caring for the sick and needy, and in the administration of finance.

Does the New Testament pattern of church order constitute a norm for the church for all time? Generally speaking theologians today would give the answer 'No' to this question, partly because the New Testament presents us with no system. We see a number of differing forms in process of development, still in a fluid and flexible state, subject to the fresh wind of the Spirit. But even if there was "a New Testament Church Order", it could not form a changeless norm, because the New Testament doctrine of the church is part of the gospel and cannot therefore be legalized. Rather, the New Testament offers us principles and guidelines which must be followed in shaping of church order in each time and place. If the New Testament then does not constitute a norm, church tradition certainly cannot do so.

The reader of the New Testament will find that guidelines

are hard to establish, except in the most general way. At the outset, then, it is important to note that there is no clear pattern for church leadership laid down in the New Testament documents with respect to either title or function. Various people are described as "apostle," "prophet," "teacher," "bishop," "deacon," or "elder," but the exact nature of their duties is nowhere spelled out. At most, these titles can be examined to establish their significance, and the passages referring to each can be explored for some indication of function. But the strong possibility remains that there was no standard practice of leadership in the early Church and that initially title and function varied from place to place. The needs of the individual community determined the nature of the leadership function. The office of church leadership is not static, prescribed by sacred decree, and unchangeable. It is a service-centered office which must always remain flexible enough to adapt to changing needs and changing opportunities.

Approach or Methodology

This study is under the Biblical Studies Department. Therefore, the study will be approached through an extensive exegetical work of the New Testament texts. The break-down of the chapters will be as follows:-

Chapter one focuses on the introduction, that is introducing the topic; the issues involved; the significance of the problem; research questions; objectives; limitations and delimitations; definitions of terms; and approach and methodology.

In chapter two, we will look at some of the models of Christian leadership, both from the Old and New Testaments. The researcher has decided to take Moses and Nehemiah from the Old Testament, for their excellence of leadership and team spirit; the religious leaders of the New Testament era (Pharisees and Sadducees) to see the negative side of leadership; and the Lord Jesus and Paul from the New Testament, for their excellence and exemplified leadership qualities and the team ministry they developed.

In chapter three, the researcher will look at the team leadership in the New Testament. First, we will examine the question of authority; then, we will make a discovery of the idea of team leadership in Jesus' and Paul's ministry, and other examples in the New Testament.

In chapter four, we will come to the conclusion which includes suggestions and recommendations that are applicable to the Ethiopian evangelical church.

Literature Review

Defining Leadership

In the interests of science rightly applied and in the best interests of Christian education, the term "leadership" should be defined with care and attention to the Biblical commitments and historical presuppositions of Christianity. Leadership is not a precise word. Endless-loop debates over what a leader is, what makes a leader, how to train a leader, and so forth, should be adequate warning that the semantic game does not pay. For the Christian community, the issue is not leadership, anyway, it is

servant-hood. "He who is least among you, this is the one who is great" "Let those who would be great among you become your servants"⁴¹ "The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and those who have authority over them are called Benefactors... NOT SO WITH YOU..."⁴² The church must define leadership differently. To do less, especially to borrow the secular frame of reference and concepts, is to secularize the church. In fact, Os Guinness clearly says that, "secularization... affects and influences religious people too... thus secularization works ... a double thrust: it compounds secularism, thereby increasing its power,⁴³ but it also constricts religion, thereby decreasing its power." Both secularization and secularism have the same destination, but secularization is the stronger, superior, subtler means of reaching it. It also reduces Christianity's influence in areas essential to its integrity and effectiveness.

Leadership as it should be in the church demands a dynamic definition of the sort that social scientists call a model. Leadership is not what one does so much as what one is within a given context of the development of the body of believers. Leadership is not so much bringing people out of a wilderness as it is sharing in a journey. This sharing is as a peer "you have but one teacher, you are all brothers... and do not be called leaders, for one is your leader, Christ"⁴⁴, and sharing is to be done as would a servant. In the church, those who lead are to serve as agents of the Holy Spirit's gifts to the church.

Ted Ward, in his book, describes the negative effects of the behavioristic view that are constituted in the terms "Induc-

ing, Motivating. and Congratulating".⁴⁵ He states that when the role of the leader centers on getting people involved, inducing them to do something that the leader (or "the program") has decided they need to do, and rewarding them selectively for "appropriate" behavior (good works), we see the whole vicious menace penetrating into the sanctuary of God. We need to get serious about discerning what passes as "leadership" and evaluate it against firm criteria. Ted Ward strongly suggests that "we must change the induce, motivate, and congratulate model of leadership in to accept, share and grow together or we have no business at all putting the word Christian ahead of the word leadership."⁴⁶

Certainly we need to ask "what kind of leadership?" does church in Ethiopia need today. John Haggai, in his popular book "Lead on!" mentions several things. He says that God is calling leaders. This call is necessary because of the crisis of leadership, a crisis brought about by the population explosion and the fact that our so called leaders do not want to lead. He further states that leadership is not option. That is why we need Bible-based and Christ-centered leadership, with servant-hood attitude. Haggai then goes on to establish twelve principle of leadership: "Vision, goal setting, love, humility, self-control, communication, investment, opportunity, energy, staying power, authority and awareness."⁴⁷ Haggai farther explains that Leadership begins when a vision emerges. But having a vision is not enough. There must be a commitment to act on the vision. That is called a mission. There must also be a set of specific, measurable steps to achieve the mission. Those steps are called goals.

Goals design the program for achieving the mission and thus fulfilling the vision. A leader will have one vision and one mission but many goals.⁴⁸ For a Christian, a vision of any kind must start with understanding of God, understanding of oneself, and understanding of the real needs of others.

What Leadership Styles are there?

There may be as many different leadership styles as there are types of people, but they fall into several main categories. Ted W. Engstrom mentions some of these.⁴⁹

The first one is what he calls "Laissezfaire" in which a leader gives minimum direction and provides maximum freedom for group decisions. This style lends itself best to those leaders who are away a lot or who have been temporarily put in charge.

The second is "Democratic-participative" where decisions are made for the people through participation. The emphasis is upon the group through participation of the collective. The leader in this kind of structure is there to assist, suggest, and allow adequate communication to flow. Perhaps, the greatest weakness of the democratic style is that in times of crisis there is usually much costly delay in action.

The third style of leadership is "Benevolent-Autocratic." This style is characterized by the father-like concern the leader has for his people. It is also called the "Paternalistic" style. The autocratic leaders can not get too close, but the paternalistic leader identifies closely with the group. Identification, however, tends to make the people in the group too de-

pendent and weak. It can degenerate into mere admiration and pseudoworship. Also, when this kind of leader is removed from the scene, the organization flounders. This "family" approach appeals because it creates the illusion of security and fellowship, but this is at the expense of efficiency and effectiveness. Discipline is hard to maintain, and coordination often suffers with this style.

The fourth one is what Engstrom calls "Autocratic-Bureaucratic." This is the extreme of the democratic style which is known for its "one man rule" type of leadership. This is often found in Christian groups and organization, because people tend to regard some as being led in this direction by the will of God. The leader using this style answers to no one. He uses people and rides their aspirations to increase his authority. He often gets their consent for decisions, but this is done by manipulation, hiding the true facts, and through the means of control and threat. Malice, intolerance, and suspicion are the fruits of this kind of style because resentment issues from feelings of injustice and corrupted power.

The Continuum of Leadership Style

Questions pertaining to leadership style often perplex leaders, especially those who sincerely desire to behave ethically and avoid manipulation. Leaders wonder to what extent they should attempt to influence the decisions of the church, or what circumstances call for assertive or passive behavior.

Some authors describe in painstaking detail almost as though the styles are absolute, clear-cut, easily recognized and differ-

entiated. But James E. Means says that "the truth is that one style fades imperceptibly into another style, and leadership behavior in real situation often combines styles."⁵⁰ Extremely aggressive behaviors may be considered autocratic, and extremely submissive behaviors may be considered laissez-faire, a virtual withdrawal of any attempt to influence.

The primary external indication of autocratic behavior is an attempt to control the group and dominate the decision-making process to ensure the enactment of the leader's will. The primary internal indication of autocracy is an attitude of superiority or lack of trust in members of the group.

Submissive leaders are marked by a deep internal conviction that others have valuable insights and contributions to make. Such leaders' external effort are largely concentrated in securing the whole group's participation in setting and achieving group goals.

Dangers of Inappropriate Style

When leaders choose certain behaviors, more aggressive or more submissive, they should be aware of the ramifications of repeated errors in those choices. Many church leaders have lost the opportunity to be effective because they have erred repeatedly by choosing a style of leadership inappropriate for the circumstances. Means mentions three factors that highlight the need for leaders to develop good judgment in making choices.⁵¹

First, undermined confidence: Leaders who behave inappropriately in their attempts to influence will lose credibility, and nothing is more important to successful leadership than credibil-

ity. When leaders are excessively aggressive they may be perceived as dictators. If leaders are inappropriately and repeatedly submissive, it is likely that they will be perceived as weak or as non-leaders. Second, lack of achievement: Submissive leaders tend to err in their excessive concern for congeniality and harmony, which often results in the absence of task fulfillment. In their desire to avoid controversy, they do not stimulate group achievement. Third, servility or hostility: Leadership behavior that errs toward too much control may well result in either a servile submissiveness or hostility (or both) in the attitude of followers. Aggressive leadership behavior may provoke open antagonism, sullen silence, or quiet withdrawal - all expressions of hostility.

Servant Leadership and Team Spirit Needed

New Testament leaders were selected, elected, or appointed, and they were given the responsibility of administering the affairs of the church within certain limitations. The degree of their authority in directing the church is not specified and undoubtedly differed from church to church. Those not selected for leadership were to obey and submit to their spiritual leaders.

In both the Old and New Testaments those who are qualified for leadership among God's people are always appointed to be servant leaders. In fact, Osei-Mensah says, "...Jesus Christ sets forth this same model in both word and deed ... First He referred to the style of contemporary leadership in the World, which... was concerned with status, domination and control. This style He firmly rejected, and insisted instead that Christian

leadership must be characterized by humble service.⁵² He further says that "servant-leadership only has meaning in the context of the Lordship of Christ."⁵³ Therefore, leaders are not to put importance on the status and social privileges that go along with any office, but to remember that their calling is to serve those they lead.

Multiple leaders, sharing more or less equally the burdens of spiritual oversight, were the functional norm in the New Testament churches. This was apparently a safe-guard against abuses of leadership authority.⁵⁴ Leaders need to develop a team spirit. David Cormack suggests that there is a need of balance between individual, task, and team if leaders want to maximize their development in team-leadership.⁵⁵ He says that the individual needs to be accepted by the leader, be able to contribute to the task, and be part of the team. The task needs to set clear targets for the group, set standards of performance, clarify responsibilities, and make use of the resources. The team needs to know and respond to the leader's style and vision, feel common sense of purpose, and grow and develop as a unit.

In conclusion, there is a need of developing a team-leadership and sense of collegiality, a team-spirit in ministry. We need to insist on the priesthood of all believers, so that we do not create a dichotomy between the clergy and laity which has been the cause for division and strife in the Ethiopian evangelical church.

END NOTES

1

Matt.16:18.

2

Heb.13:17.

3

By "one-man" leadership the writer means a pastor or a clergyman who exercises excessive authority and abuses power which has been entrusted to him by God in order to manipulate and "manage" the church without recognizing the role and significance of elders and\ or deacons.

4

By "lay" leadership the writer wants to describe elders of a church who are not full-time ministers and who minimize the call of a pastor and think that they can manage the church on a part-time basis.

5

Yohannes Irenna, Karl-Johan Lundstrom and Knud Jorgensen, Preparatory Study on Leadership Training, (Addis Ababa: EECMY, 1993), p6.

6

1 Tim. 5:17.

7

John Stott, "What Makes Leadership Christian?" Christianity Today, August 9, 1985, 26.

8

John W. Gardner, The Nature of Leadership: Introductory Considerations (Washington: Independent Sector, 1986), 6.

9

James E. Means, Leadership In Christian Ministry (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1989), 58.

10

John Haggai, Lead on! Leadership that Endures in a Changing World (Singapore: Word Publishing, 1986), 4.

11

Ac.11:26.

12

Ac.11:30; 21:18.

13

Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 2nd.ed. rev. (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1979), 700.

14

Louw and Nida, Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament Based on Semantic Domains (New York: UBS, 1988), 540.

15

Ac.11:30.

16

Ac.15:2,4,6,22; 16:4.

17

Ac.21:28.

18

Colin Brown, NIDNTT, vol.1. gen.ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: The Zondervan Corporation, 1992), s.v. "Presbyteros" by L. Coenen: 199.

19

Ac.15:2,6,23; Rom.12:7; 1Cor.12:28; 1Thess.5:12; 1Tim.5:17,19 and Tit.1:5; Ac.20:17,28.

20

James Hastings, ed. A Dictionary Of The Bible, vol.1 (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1931), s.v. "Episcopos and Presbyteros" by H.M. Gwatkin: 301-2.

21

Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, 299.

22

Louw and Nida, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, 542.

23

e.g. 2 Chron. 24:11; Neh. 11:9, 14, 22; 12:42; Job 20:29; Jdg. 9:28; Num.31:14; Is.60:17; Coenen, NIDNTT, 188.

24

Peter T. O'Brien, The Epistle to the Philippians-A Commentary On The Greek Text. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Pub. Comp., 1991), pp.46-49. The word group was less common in the NT. than the LXX, with ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ occurring five times, ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩ on four occasions, ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΗ eleven times, ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ and once. ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ Ac.20:28; Phil.1:1; 1Tim.3:2; Tit.1:7; 1Pet.2:25; ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ Lk.19:44; Ac.1:20; 1Tim.3:1; 1Pet.2:12; ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ Matt.25:36; Lk.1:68,78;7:16, Ac.6:3;7:23;15:14,36; Heb.2:6; Jas.1:27; ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ Heb.12:15.

25

Gerhard Kittel, TDNT2, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), s.v. "Episkopos," by H.W. Beyer: 616.

26

Colin Brown, NIDNTT, vol.1, 191.

27

Num. 27:17.

28

Ac. 20:28; Heb.12:15.

29

Colin Brown, NIDNTT, vol.1, 192.

30

Kittel, TDNT vol.2, 91-92. In Paul the term has a special reference to Christian ministry, so that one can speak of a 'minister of the new covenant' (2Cor.3:6) or 'of righteousness' (2Cor.11:5), 'a minister of Christ' (2Cor.11:23, Col.1:23; 1Cor.3:5), and of the Church (Col.1:25). At 2 Cor.11:23 and Eph.3:7 the apostle is a 'minister of Christ.'

31

Louw and Nida, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, 571.

32

Peter O'Brien, The Epistle To The Philippians, (Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1991), 46-49.

33

It occurs in the NT. particularly in gospels; e.g. the wider sense of any service-Lk.8:3, Matt.22:13; the narrower sense of service at table-Mk.1:31; Lk.12:37,17:8.

34

Lk.22:27.

35

Lk.22:26; Mk.9:35;10:43; Matt.23:11; Col.1:7; 2Cor.11:23; 1Tim.4:6; 2Cor.6:4; Col.1:23; 1Cor.3:5; 2Cor.3:8,9,18.

36

Ac.20:24; Rom.11:13; 2Tim.4:5; Col.4:17.

37

Ac.6:4; Ac.8:14; Rom.12:6; Ac.20:28; Tit.1:5-9.

38

O'Brien, The Epistle To The Philippians, (Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Pub. Com., 1991), 46-49.

39

Kittel, TDNT vol.2, 616.

40

1Tim. 3:8; 3:1-7; 3:8.

41

Matt. 20:28; Lk. 22:26; Mk. 9:35.

42

Lk. 22:25.

43

Os Guinness, The Gravedigger File (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1983), 54.

44

Matt. 23:8, 10.

45

Ted Ward, Biblical Issues in Moral Development (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 1977), 34.

46

Ibid., 34.

47

John Haggai, Lead On! (Dallas, Texas: Word Publishing, 1986), 10.

48

Ibid., 13.

49

Ted W. Engstrom, The Making of a Christian Leader (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), 70-78.

50

James E. Means, Leadership in Christian Ministry (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1989), 74.

51

Ibid., 80-82.

52

Gottfried Osei-Mensah, Wanted: Servant Leaders (Achimota, Ghana: Africa Christian Press, 1990), 10.

53

Ibid., 23.

54

1 Thess. 5:12-13; 1 Tim. 5:17; Heb. 13:17; Matt. 16:19.

55

David Cormack, Team Spirit (Eastbourne, U.K.: MARC, 1990), 97-99.

CHAPTER 2

SOME MODELS OF CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

Key Models From The Old Testament

The Old Testament is filled with models of leadership such as: Abraham, Moses, Joshua, Elijah, Elisha, Zerubabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah—just to mention a few. For our purpose we will examine the leadership of Moses and Nehemiah for their excellence of leadership and team spirit that they developed.

Leadership as exemplified by Moses

Moses was a gifted leader. As a leader of his people, Moses was not only equipped technically through his Egyptian upbringing and training (Acts 7:22), but was also a supreme leader by being a close follower of his God by faith (Heb.11:23-29, cf. Acts 7:23-37). Israel repeatedly failed to have faith in their God in all circumstances, broke the commandments, and rejected God's leadership in rebelling against Moses (sometimes Moses and Aaron) through whom that leadership was manifested (e.g. Nu.14:4,10; 16:41). Moses' own family let him down (Ex.32:1-26; Nu.12:1-15). Great indeed was Moses' forbearance and we are told that Moses was very meek (Nu.12:3). Thus when Miriam and Aaron contested his authority, he did not try to justify himself. When Korah led what appeared to a rebellion against Moses (Nu.16), once again Moses did not retaliate but said that God would declare which of the two was right. God clearly responded in favor of Moses. Moses apparently felt that, since he had been called by God to lead this people, he did not need to defend himself. Despite these

attacks he remained absolutely committed to his people and to God. In so doing he became the prototype for future leaders of Israel.

The first chapter of Deuteronomy makes it clear that those who lead in God's word are well aware concerning their personal inadequacy, and they are confident of God's unchanging faithfulness, prepared for sacrifices and willing to share responsibility with others. One of Moses' responsibilities was to judge. The task was enormous (Ex.18:13-16), and Jethro suggested that he appoint other judges to lighten the load. Moses responded positively to this suggestion, thus illustrating that he did not cling to his responsibilities but was willing to delegate work.

Leadership and Submission to the Calling

The first chapters of the book of Deuteronomy offer some of the significant qualities of Moses' leadership. Before leaving Horeb, Moses had found it necessary to organize the Israelites for judicial purposes, because of their great number.¹ Now, on the eve of their entry into the promised land, they had become even more numerous, for the Lord had fulfilled His promise to Abraham that his descendants would become as numerous as the stars in the heavens. It was his father-in-law, Jethro, who earlier advised Moses to delegate responsibility to carefully selected men who would be placed over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. Moses is portrayed as an impartial judge, an able administrator, utilizing the initial advantages of victory, a wise strategist planning carefully for the future, an encouraging colleague,² and a fervent intercessor. The address of

Moses solemnly prepares the people for the call to commitment and obedience that would be laid upon them.³

At this point, it is important that we carefully look and analyze the terms which are used to describe Moses' leadership qualities. The term "justice, ordinance, custom, manner"

(וְצִדִּיקוֹתָי)⁴ is primarily an attribute of God and therefore carrying with it His demand. When the Scripture speaks of the justice (וְצִדִּיקוֹתָי) of God the word has a particular shade of meaning and that is not so much just statutes of God as the just claims of God. God demands justice from His own people.⁵

(וְצִדִּיקוֹתָי) as God's justice, that is rightness rooted in God's character, ought to be an attribute of man in general and of judicial process among them.⁶ Wise men speak it and think it and God requires it of them. The righteous enjoy it and righteous magistrates employ it in judgment. Frequently associated with "righteous, just" (רַחֲמָנִים) and "justice or righteousness" (מִצְדִּיקוֹתָי) in Old Testament descriptions of God's reign and ways with His creatures, this idea lies at the heart of a true understanding of the Biblical Word. The word שֹׁפֵט , which occurs most frequently, adds still a further meaning, so that the judge comes to mean "to rule."⁷ He who judges brings salvation, peace, and deliverance, especially to the persecuted and oppressed. Since the judges were deliverers, helpers and saviors raised by God, they were expected to exercise and implement their power in justice for the tribes of Israel in the face of their enemies.

God used the leadership of Moses to be the instrument and mediator through whom God made His great revelation to Israel.

Through Moses' leadership the mighty act of God had been manifested in releasing the Israelites from the bondage of Egyptian enslavement. Through Moses' leadership were given the tablets of stone which were engraved with the terms of the covenant. It was Moses who patiently provided leadership during the thirty-eight years of wandering.

These verses also describe the source of the message. Moses, as a leader, shared with the people of Israel "all that the Lord had commanded Him concerning them." (v.3). It is not his message but God's. The word is not his to amend, correct, modify or strive to improve. Moses set himself to "expound" (v.5) God's word to his contemporaries. There is thus a presentation of a faithful God, whose demand was for a faithful people. By this means the people will appreciate its relevance, discern its importance and apply its teaching to their every day lives. Moses is here concerned about the Word and the Works of God, what God has said (v.3) and what God has done (v.4).

Moses honestly confesses his deep sense of inadequacy: "You are too heavy a burden for me to carry alone." (v.9). The Biblical concept of leadership begins not with natural ability but with personal inadequacy. Although the leader is not remotely self-confident, he neither depends on the meager resources of his own ability, nor grovels in his evident weakness. He is unflinchingly supported by his strong confidence in God.

Leadership and Confidence

Moses' confidence as a leader is not in himself, but in the unlimited power of God to see him through. His confidence is in

God's unchanging nature, word and deed. The reference to the Lord God as the One who has multiplied His people "as the stars in the sky" (v.10) is a deliberate echo of the promise given to "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (v.8). It is "all as He has promised" (v.11) and He will not break His Word. The God who has delivered them in the past will not fail them now. And Moses is confident in that.

We can observe that Moses was incapable of carrying such heavy "problems and burdens" on his own. Within days of leaving Egypt they were grumbling and complaining, wishing they had remained in slavery. Later, their life in the desert was marked by continual "disputes" (v.12) rather than supportive harmony. The fact that the Israelite community was quarrelsome and divisive was a constant drain on the physical stamina and emotional resources of Moses.

Leadership and Team Spirit

Moses' leadership excellence was also shown by the fact that he knew that he could succeed only if the work was properly delegated. Three leadership issues are selected for special attention in verses.13-15.

First, Moses identified the necessary qualities. Those who were to share with God's servant the demanding responsibility of leading these provocative people had to be "wise, understanding and respected men" (v.13). The task of meeting the pastoral needs of such a diverse congregation was not to be entrusted to anybody who might consider himself suitable for the work. Biblical teaching hardly encouraged self-appointed leaders.

Second, Moses utilized the various gifts. It seems that in Moses' time some were gifted as military commanders, while others were to be used as tribal leaders (v.15) and legal advisors (v.16).

Thirdly, Moses valued the smaller unit. He knew that it was quite impossible for him personally to undertake the spiritual and moral welfare of such a huge crowd. If pastoral care was to be exercised in an effective manner, the people must be divided into manageable groups. The small unit provides regular opportunities for the sharing of personal experience and for that mutual care and encouragement which is always necessary.

Moses also makes a special mention of three perils to which spiritual leaders are particularly exposed: favoritism, fear and loneliness (vv.16-17). Favoritism was forbidden. The rich and the poor must be treated exactly alike. The leader must not show partiality in judging whether the troubles affect domestic ("between your brothers"), or ethnic ("between one of them as an alien"), or social ("small and great alike") differences. There is no room for favoritism.

In addition, however, to the danger of pleasing others (by doing what they want rather than what God demands), there is also the peril of dreading others. The group leader is clearly told that he must "not be afraid of the face of others" (v.17). The fear of man is a cruel and crippling enemy and the Bible frequently warns its readers against it.⁹ Leaders who honor God have no need to fear anybody else.

The third danger that leaders face is loneliness. Those who shared with Moses the heavy responsibility of leadership knew that, if they were genuinely unable to solve any of the moral, spiritual and legal complexities which were brought before them, they had direct access to Moses himself (v.17). They had divinely imparted rules to guide them (v.18) but they were not left without the personal support and pastoral skill of their gifted leader. However carefully and necessarily leadership responsibilities are delegated, every leader should have someone he or she can talk to when the problem seems too great to solve and the pressures too intense to bear.

Leadership as exemplified by Nehemiah

The Book of Nehemiah describes how leadership can challenge and encourage people to assert themselves in a united struggle to restore their dignity and self-esteem. This struggle was neither simple nor easy. It meant going to the roots of their problems, restructuring their society, and reordering their priorities.

The Leader and His Gift (1:1-2:20)

These two chapters describe a leader's personal confrontation with a formidable problem. The report that Nehemiah received was "...the survivors...are in great distress and reproach...the wall of Jerusalem... broken down ...". The discouragement that the people had led them into a situation of distress. Their distress led them to be a reproach to God, which ultimately left them defenseless; for the walls of Jerusalem were broken down.

Upon hearing the report of the situation in Jerusalem, Nehemiah went to the Lord in prayer. Prayer was his immediate response to the bad news. For four months (Chislew through Nissan), Nehemiah prayed to God "day and night on behalf of his people." The broken wall and burned gates were symptomatic of the shattered life of Nehemiah and his nation estranged from their land, their covenant, and their God. The story clearly depicts Nehemiah's mental and spiritual anguish: he wept, mourned, fasted, and prayed. He was not seeking to merit God's favor through these actions. They were simply the sincere expressions of his heartfelt concern. Nehemiah made his humble confession to God and renewed his personal participation in it. Out of that life transforming experience, Nehemiah caught a vision of a restored city with a discouraged and despised people once again living in a community as the people of God.¹⁰ Nehemiah knew that to treat the symptom of their poverty only, a broken wall, was to miss the basic cause of their malady: a broken law.

Ultimately, the leadership responses will gravitate towards one of two poles of reaction. One is illustrated by the leadership of Nehemiah who became humble, broken, inspired, and empowered to significantly alleviate the problem. The other is illustrated by Sanballat, who became proud and resolved to oppose and exasperate the problem. Nehemiah used his time, and his resources to build the wall. But Sanballat used his time, his skills, and his resources to destroy it.

The Leader and His Program (3:1-7:4)

The book of Nehemiah suggests that any program for mending broken walls in any community will be complex and risky. It involves more than piercing together old bricks; it involves restructuring old relationships, archaic laws, and economic constraints. However, the story suggests another dimension. It places the Jerusalem predicament squarely within the providence of a powerful God, who could change the imperial mind of the emperor, challenge the domination of the elite, and persuade the people for a greater commitment.

When the people took the Jerusalem predicament to God, God inspired a man with a plan and a vision. And God used Nehemiah and his plan to acquire a Persian building permit, a requisition for building materials, and a safe military escort.¹¹ In turn, Nehemiah used his leadership skills to mobilize the people for action. He wisely worked through local leaders whenever possible, divided the work force into manageable units, and motivated the laborers to protect their personal interests, their homes, families, and sources of income. Progress in the Jerusalem predicament was accompanied by military threats, political conspiracy, crippling factions, and personal harassment. There was a pressure mounting-up from within: "no strength to continue the work"; injustice; and immorality. And there was also pressure from outside; his enemies tried three things: Physical murder; character assassination; and false prophecy.

In spite of mounting pressures, Nehemiah never lost sight of his top objective: a restored wall and law. Nehemiah's decisions and actions were characterized by strict impartiality. He

manifested no respect of persons. The nobles and rulers received his censure when they deserved it just as freely as did the common people. "I contended with the nobles, and the rulers... And I held a great assembly against them." His spiritual approach to problems did not exclude a healthy realism. "we prayed to our God... and set up a guard...day and night." In the midst of despair, Nehemiah exhorted the people that it was God's work and therefore God's presence and power would prevail.

The Leader and His Commitment (7:5-10:39)

Physical changes are frequently fragile and futile. The wall could better sustain life in the city, but it could not restore life to the city. They needed a common cause and commitment big enough to compel and command their lives. They needed a revitalized covenant to address the problems that plagued their society.

As a charismatic and capable leader, Nehemiah incorporated their immediate needs into the long term project to revitalize the covenant.¹² In the process, he demonstrated effective leadership as an agent of change. He addressed his people's immediate needs and so freed them up to work on long term solutions. He sought power in order to share power, so that he could ultimately turn the power over to the local people. While the people were more secure behind their wall, they remained separated from their covenant. Without it, their ethnic, religious, and cultural roots would continue to decay. Nehemiah had resolved his commitment to the covenant while in Persia.¹³ In the

midst of their struggles, the people called upon the Lord. And God proved Himself to be reliable and faithful even as he had promised in the covenant. The people responded with a new interest in the Law of the Lord by requesting a public reading. As Ezra read from the Law, the people experienced a radical confrontation between their present lifestyle and the lifestyle described in sacred Scriptures. It caused them to critically evaluate themselves. Chapter eight describes the dynamic process whereby the people open up their lives to the teachings of the covenant. Chapter nine describes the painful process whereby the people work their way out of their apathy and self-righteousness. Chapter ten describes the public process whereby the people record their radical commitment to live within a covenant of brotherhood as the community of God.

Nehemiah emerges as a man who was vigorous in administration, calm in crises, fearless in danger, courageous in decision, thorough in organization, disinterested in leadership, persevering before opposition, resolute in the face of threats, vigilant against intrigue - a leader who was and held the full confidence of his followers.

Key New Testament Models of Leadership

Negative Models of Leadership: the Religious Leaders in Luke

Luke's Gospel, like the other Gospels do, is primarily interested in telling the story of Jesus. Along the way, however, it has other accounts to tell: the story of Jesus' disciples, who journey with him and remain with him through his trials,¹⁴ and the story of the religious leaders, who set themselves

against him and are the cause of those trials. It is the religious leaders who are the focus of this study. Historically the religious leaders are a mixed bag. They include Pharisees and Sadducees, lawyers and scribes, chief priests and elders. Luke is aware of the distinctions between these groups, but, for the purposes of his narrative, their similarities far outweigh their differences: they are all "religious leaders" and they are all opposed to Jesus.

The first task in understanding the religious leaders as characters in Luke's narrative will be to discern the character traits and point of view he attributes to them. Next it will be important to investigate their relationship with other characters in the narrative, especially Jesus, who is the protagonist of Luke's story. Finally, an attempt will be made to trace the story line of the leaders from beginning to end and to identify the principal stages of its development.

Character Traits

The religious leaders in Luke are characters who "trusted¹⁵ in themselves that they were righteous and despised others." This one verse brings together what I believe to be the two principal traits ascribed to the leaders in Luke: they are "self-righteous" and they are "unloving." I think it can be demonstrated, furthermore, that the latter trait is actually a manifestation of the former. Self-righteousness is the leaders' root character trait from which other characteristics are derived.

Luke characterizes the religious leaders as self-righteous in several ways. The narrator describes one of the leaders as a person who seeks "to justify himself" and refers to their repre-

sentatives as people who pretend to be righteous (*Σικαίος*). Jesus also describes the leaders as persons who "Justify themselves before people" and he tells a parable in which one of them proclaims his own righteousness. The leaders are characterized as self-righteous in more subtle ways also. At various points in the narrative, Jesus refers to them as characters who are "righteous" or "well," who need little forgiveness,¹⁶ who do not need to repent, and who can claim lifelong service and obedience to God. The leaders are unclean within, full of extortion and wickedness. Jesus is aware of their corruption even if it remains hidden to others. Since Jesus does not regard the religious leaders as righteous, his description of them as such in parables must be ironic. From the total context of Luke's narrative, the reader realizes that it is the leaders' own point of view that is presented here: they see themselves as healthy people who need no physician, as responsible stewards whose debts are trivial, as sheep who have never gone astray, and as faithful children who deserve a reward. Thus, through the irony of Jesus' parables, Luke characterizes the religious leaders as self-righteous.

Luke also characterizes the leaders as "unloving." In 11:42, Jesus describes the religious leaders as neglecting "justice and the love of God," an accusation that recalls the injunction to "love the Lord your God...and your neighbor as yourself." The leaders do neither. Their lack of love for God is also brought out by the narrator's description of them as "lovers of money" immediately after Jesus has proclaimed that

anyone who tries to serve two masters (God and mammon) will "love the one and hate the other." Their love of money implies their lack of love for God. Their neglect of justice¹⁷ shows that they do not love their neighbor either. They load others with burdens and they devour the homes of widows. Finally, the leaders in Luke lack love not only for God and their neighbor but specifically, for Jesus as well. In 7:44-47 Jesus upbraids one of them precisely on this account: Simon the Pharisee's lack of hospitality reveals that he does not love Jesus as much as he should. Of course, ultimately, the leaders' lack of love for Jesus will show itself in their rejection of Him and in their plot to put him to death.

Luke, however, does not simply characterize the religious leaders as unloving; he presents their lack of love for Jesus, God, and their neighbor as derivative of their root trait, self-righteousness. According to Jesus, it is this self-righteousness that accounts for their lack of love. This view is consistent with Luke's presentation elsewhere in the narrative. In his parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector, Jesus makes it clear that "despising others" is the result of self-righteousness. This root trait accounts for other characteristics as well. It is because the leaders are self-righteous that they refuse John's baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins¹⁸ and so reject the purpose of God for themselves. It is also the basis for their "hypocrisy," which Jesus defines as "hiding" or "covering up." By presenting themselves as righteous, the leaders justify themselves before people and cover up their sins. They are like a hidden grave or a cup that has been washed only on the

outside. They are not righteous in the eyes of God, who knows their hearts. They are "greedy" and guilty of "extortion"; Jesus may call them "robbers", but he invites criminals into the Kingdom too. Their point of view is aligned with that of humans rather than with that of God. This is significant because, for Luke, the evaluative point of view of humans and the evaluative point of view of God are completely irreconcilable: what is exalted among humans is an abomination to God. Nevertheless, exaltation among humans is the very thing the religious leaders desire: they love the best seats in the synagogue and salutations in the marketplace; they like to go about in long robes and make long pretentious prayers, and they make a habit of choosing the best places at feasts. Luke's reader realizes that what is abomination to God is of great value to them.

The leaders' lack of true knowledge is a very important theme in Luke because, ultimately, it explains why they rejected and killed Jesus. They reject him because they do not know the time of God's visitation¹⁹ and the things that make for peace. They killed him because they do not know "what they do". Their human point of view, however, is not to be equated simply with ignorance; it can also be described as "unbelief". What is worse is, because of their corrupted leadership, they are able to keep others from entering as well. The leaders' exclusive, unmerciful, and unloving attitudes toward other people are also explained by their false point of view.

The religious leaders' view of Jesus is marked by confusion. As they interact with him in the narrative, they do not

know what to make of him. They are "amazed" (ἐξίστασθαι 2:47) at His insight but "astonished" (ἐξέστησαν 8:56) at his unorthodox behavior. They are literally beside themselves (ἐκστασις 5:26). His mighty deeds fill them alternately with "awe" (φόβος 5:26) and "fury" (ἀνολας 6:11). They can glorify God on account of him, but they can also "be indignant" (ἀγαυοκτων 13:14) and murmur against Him.

The religious leaders do not know how to respond to Jesus. They are frequently unable or unwilling to answer the questions he poses. Although they seem favorably disposed to him at times, inviting him to dinner and warning him of danger, they feel they must watch Him and test Him. They discuss among themselves what they should do with Him. Ultimately, they decide to reject Him and put him to death, but even then it may be said that they do not know what they are doing.²⁰

Jesus is an enigma to the religious leaders because they evaluate him from a human point of view. They do not perceive the full truth about who Jesus is and even what they do perceive is evaluated falsely. They are correct, for instance, in recognizing Jesus as a "teacher", but they interpret this to mean that He is a teacher like themselves. For this reason, they are able to have fellowship with Him, elicit His opinion, seek His assistance, and even offer Him advice. However, because they evaluate him as a teacher according to a human point of view, they also scoff at His teaching and misinterpret it. The leaders' identification of Jesus as a "friend of sinners" is also correct, but for them this is a cause for offense rather than an occasion for joy. They reject the notion that Jesus is prophet or King. They fail

to recognize Him as "Lord of the sabbath" or as one who has authority to forgive sins. And they judge any claim that He is Christ or Son of God to be worthy of death.

The Line of Opposition

The religious leaders in Luke are characters who "reject the purpose of God". The basic line of opposition between them and Jesus may be understood from the perspective of salvation history. Jesus is presented as the initiator of a new age; the leaders view themselves as custodians of the old age which they seek to preserve. They are like people who will not taste new wine because they say, "The old is good".

Nevertheless, the religious leaders see themselves as custodians of the law and the prophets and they continue to act as such without regard for the purpose of God. The numerous accounts of sabbath healings illustrate this: the leaders object to what they consider to be a transgression of the law without taking into consideration the greater principle of human need. The leaders see themselves as protectors of the law but they are actually a threat to its true intent. Similarly, they build tombs for the prophets without realizing that they are heirs of those who killed them.

But if the leaders fail in their role as custodians of the law and prophets, they also reject the preaching of the good news of God's kingdom.²¹ The religious leaders are lovers of money, but the rule of God that Jesus proclaims is good news to the poor, not the rich. The leaders love to be exalted among people, but in the rule of God those who are exalted will be humbled.

In initiating God's rule, Jesus comes to seek and to save the lost and to call sinners to repentance, but these are the very people the religious leaders despise. Ultimately, the leaders reject not only the good news of the kingdom that Jesus proclaims but also Jesus Himself. The leaders reject God's purpose in Jesus just as they rejected God's purpose for themselves in the baptism of John.

Even if the leaders reject God's invitations, Jesus does not reject theirs. He eats with them and includes them in His ministry of teaching²² and healing. If he warns them of the dire consequences of their predicament, He also prays for their forgiveness. He knows they reject the purpose of God because they do not know what they are doing.

What is the point of such a portrayal?

First, the leaders in Luke are able to serve as a negative examples of discipleship. They exhibited the qualities that Luke wants his readers to avoid. Chief among these is self-righteousness, which not only becomes a fountain-head of other vices but also renders a person incapable of benefiting from Christ's ministry. Luke wants his readers, especially those who are in positions of leadership, to learn from the tragedy that befalls the religious leaders in his story.

Second, Luke's portrayal of the religious leaders provides the background for his presentation of Jesus as one who not only preaches love for enemies but also practices it. Thus, the reader is able to see positive examples for discipleship and leadership from this narrative as well, by observing how Jesus responds to His opponents. This point is understood later in

Acts where Jesus' attitude and actions are reproduced by persecuted Christians such as Stephen.

Finally, Luke's portrayal of the conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders affects the readers' perception of what God has done in Christ. The intention of God evident in the ministry of Jesus throughout Luke is not to defeat enemies but to reclaim them. Luke's version of the conflict between Jesus and the leaders presents the mission of Christ not as a triumph over evil but as a divine offer of grace, peace and reconciliation. If Luke sometimes makes the leaders look very bad, the effect of this is not to highlight the greatness of Christ's victory in defeating them but, rather, the greatness of His mercy in forgiving them. No matter how bad the leaders show themselves to be, the picture that we get in this narrative is of Jesus weeping over their failure to accept the peace He brings²³ and, finally, of Jesus nailed to the cross, praying, still for their forgiveness.

Positive models of leadership

Leadership as exemplified by The Lord Jesus

It is to the Scripture record that this study appeals in its exploration of Jesus' merit as a leader and trainer. The most prominent function of Jesus' public ministry was to teach²⁴ (διδασκεῖν). He taught in the Synagogue, in the temple and in the open air.²⁵ While there are other titles used of Jesus,²⁶ "teacher" is the title most frequently applied to Jesus.²⁷ This is seen in the use of both "teacher" (διδασκαλος) which is derived from the present stem

(διδασκ.) and simply means "teacher or tutor"²⁸ and "rabbi" (ραββι) which has a Jewish background and has a connotation of a respect for the scribes and their pupils and the Pharisees. Gradually it became a technical term for a man who had received ordination, that is who had received authority to act as judge in religious matters.²⁹

As a teacher, Jesus maintained characteristics of "leader-disciple" relation found in Judaism. First, the leader or scribe was one who himself had followed an extensive course of study in order to master Scripture and Jewish tradition.³⁰ Second, because of his great learning and ability the leader was looked upon as a man of great authority and was held in high esteem.³¹ Thirdly, prospective students of law would request the tutelage of a leader and, if accepted, entered into a close fellowship with the leader and his other students.³² Fourth, the students lived in close fellowship with the leader. They traveled, ate, and attended weddings with Him.³³ Fifth, the disciples of a leader were characterized by complete submission to the authority of the leader.³⁴ Sixth, the training or learning method was to sit at the feet of the leader listening to him, to encounter him in a question and answer and to observe the actions of the teacher.³⁵ The seventh parallel characteristic was the vital part of repetition and rote memory played in teaching and learning.³⁶

In addition to the above-mentioned characteristics, Jesus' presentation of Himself lends credence to His identity as leader and educator. Certainly, Jesus did not seem to emphasize the prominence of His didactic and leadership office.³⁷ He did not object to being called teacher and Rabbi, although there were

other designations which He adjured His followers or detractors, as the case may be, not to use.³⁸ Even His opponents among the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Herodians, and others called Him "the teacher."

The Biblical record in the Gospels supports that Jesus aimed at character, service and community in His own course of leadership.³⁹ The excellence of His leadership and the example of His life was building, shaping, and developing their character. He was preparing His disciples for the influence of leadership that they would have in the future among their society. Jesus' challenge to the disciples to be "fishers of men" clearly indicates that they are called to service.⁴⁰ So, Jesus beckons His disciples on the Mount to be "salt" and "light" and let people see their "good works". It should be noted as well that this Sermon was delivered to those people who had begun to follow after the leader. After this exhortation, the passage continues to spell out the practical implications of living under authority, the acquisition of character, the challenge of service, and proper relationships with their fellow men.⁴¹ Jesus, throughout His recorded life, called men and women to Himself in order to fulfill the objectives of building character, spiritual development and training for service.

In the Synoptic Gospels we can observe that a great multitude followed Him, and they were amazed at His teaching, for His message was with authority and power. The People must have realized that Jesus' style of leadership was different from the religious leaders of their time. His teaching had power to

change and convict the hearts of men and women; and His authority was divine and not human in origin.

A perusal of the New Testament accounts readily reveals that Jesus gave the crowds His frequent attention and service. Yet underlying the ultimate objective of reaching the multitudes was the training of leaders from whom the larger body of people would later learn and seek leadership. Coleman writes, "It all started by Jesus calling a few men to follow Him... Men were to be His method..."⁴² Some of Jesus' closest associates were called to follow Him before a preaching engagement or other formal pronouncement of ministry ever occurred. Other disciples outside of the Twelve continued to follow Him, many of whom eventually had a significant ministry of their own.⁴³ But physical limitations and the concern for qualitative effect forced Jesus to focus upon the few and offer only a "rapidly diminishing priority" to those outside the Twelve.

When the crowd of people following Jesus began to increase, making it necessary for him to narrow the group, he called his disciples together and chose from them twelve whom He named apostles. The Greek word "apostle" (*ἀποστόλος*) signifies "one sent or commissioned for a special purpose." The use of this word by Jesus obviously accentuated the priestly role of the Twelve as they would "be with Him", thereby learning of His character and later propagating His teaching and compassion and leadership. The apostolic office implied that they were to be leaders of those who would disseminate Jesus' message. A few were chosen to be a team from the larger company in order that Jesus could more effectively communicate to them lessons from His

person and then send them out to serve on behalf of those ideals. Jesus most often used the challenge "follow me" (ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι) to invite his disciples into an intimate learning relationship. In Jesus' day, the invitation to "follow me" came to mean "simply become my disciple." "Following" in New Testament Greek was an active term.⁴⁴ In contrast, the classical Greek usage has numerous derivations.⁴⁵ Kittel, evidently with this fact in mind, writes in his own discussion of (ἀκολουθεῖν) that "...no noun ever came into use corresponding to the concept of discipleship." And Kittel continued saying that "The New Testament simply has the active term, because what it is seeking to express is an action and not a concept."⁴⁶

Upon reflection, Jesus' methodology at this point was incredibly simple. Having called the disciples, Jesus gave it a considerable importance for them to be with Him. His leadership training and development was basically to draw them closer to Himself. Coleman affirms that "He was His own school and curriculum."⁴⁷ The informality of such an approach stands in contrast to the "formal almost scholastic procedures of the scribes." In short, "Knowledge was gained by association before it was understood by explanation." Most of Jesus' teaching directed toward the Twelve and their development took place in the small group. For in that setting, the leader can focus on the individual and on the group when the small group is set apart from the masses. This relationship is not possible in the large congregational meetings. A limited number of disciples was selected because the type of learning and maturity desired demanded

intense exposure and close contact. If the call to follow was to be effective for the development of character and service, it must be in the context of a relatively small group. The training of Jesus was largely effected by the smallness of the group. It needed intimate participation and sharing both in lifestyle and common action. This is only possible when the group has a close relationship with the leader and with one another.

Such association was not exclusive, however. Jesus spent a good deal of time with others who indicated interest in His teaching. The Gospel of Luke records that Jesus spent time with Zacchaeus after initially befriending Him in Jericho and before it was time for the teacher to leave the city.⁴⁸ He stayed two extra days in Sychar to instruct those in the community who expressed interest because of His conversation with the woman at the well. The "Seventy" who later followed Him in His Judean ministry are evidence of those who attached themselves to the apostolic company. Mention should also be made of the women who followed Him and ministered to His needs including Martha, Mary, Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna and many others. Although Jesus offered both help and concern to men and women who showed consistent interest the Biblical records indicates that he lacked the necessary time to give each of them His constant attention. Hence, His strategy focused upon the concentrated few.

The deepest learning in which the disciples of Jesus engaged was the sharing together in the daily life He lived. Chandapilla states that "once the Twelve were with Him... He was with them in public and in private... He lived an utterly transparent life before them."⁴⁹ It is here that the most important

aspect of close association and the clearest meaning of "follow me" is unveiled. The metaphorical meanings, Blendinger suggests, that developed from (ἀκολουθεῖν) relate well to this understanding. They are: "follow the drift, understand, follow someone's opinion or agree, and adapt oneself."⁵⁰

The main mode of instruction Jesus employed was the example of His own life. And it was this constant showing forth of His own life to His Twelve disciples that Jesus apparently intended. The idea "follow me" seems to imply in the context of the whole of the gospel record that Jesus intended His disciples to become like Himself. Learning, to the inner circle of disciples, was all about relationship. For the disciples, learning was living, and being like Jesus. Jesus apparently realized that the power of modeling would allow the disciples to follow His leadership and be transformed into a reflection of their Master.

It was a commonplace for these disciples to observe their leader's effective use of the "teachable moment"⁵¹ In these stories He used concrete examples to teach abstract truth. And nearly always, His chosen companions were close at hand to ask questions and glean vital insights. Jesus also created the atmosphere evidently allowing the Twelve to discuss, question and assimilate His teaching. The disciples doubtless knew that they were being trained for a special purpose. Throughout His life, learning by association was Jesus' primary means of imparting His message; but there came a time when the disciples were asked to go beyond merely "being with Jesus" and began to take on challenges given by the leader. He made them to confront difficult

situations and issues; asking them to give something to eat to the five thousand; or letting the nine of them face the epileptic boy and his father while the Lord was on the Mount of Transfiguration with the other three.

Eventually Jesus considered His disciples capable of handling more than the present challenges around them. He had demonstrated for them how to serve those around them and had delivered the example of His leadership. As He embarked on His third general tour of Galilee, Jesus evidently decided that the time had come for the disciples to become involved in teaching and ministry. It was therefore, time for the disciples to put into practice the lessons they had seen and heard their leader and teacher express in word and deed. The Biblical record states that Jesus summoned the Twelve and began to send them out.⁵² Before doing so, however, he gave them precise instructions, the scope of their authority, whom to see, how to handle their finances, how to proceed with a campaign upon entering a town, and how to respond in the event that their message and ministry were refused.⁵³

Their mission had a two fold purpose: first to perform a service for those to whom they were sent and second, to allow maturation in their own lives. By that very process they were being trained in character and service under the supervision of their leader. Arenson notes that "Jesus supervised His disciples... He called them together, He could listen to their reports... of their ministry ...".⁵⁴

Jesus always stretched their understanding of leadership and He would not let them rest in success or in failure. No

matter what they did, there was always more to do and to learn. Here was on the job training at its best. Jesus would let His followers have some experience or make some observation on their own and then He would use that as a starting point to teach a lesson of discipleship. Trakatellis states, "the vision now is not a vision of a position but of function. The call of discipleship is not a call to a static position of honor, power and glory, but a call to a dynamic work of diakonia, or care for other people."⁵⁵

Jesus' final words in the Gospel of Matthew are recorded: "Go therefore, and make disciples of all nations..."⁵⁶ The grammatical structure of the sentences gives a clear perspective as to the intent of this saying of Jesus. Most translations fail to accurately portray the impact of Jesus' statement, although the original language of the Biblical record is quite clear. The main verb of the sentence is the aorist imperative "make disciples" (μαθητευσατε 2per.plural, aorist Imperative) which is the heart of the commission. Rogers says, "The structure of the passage indicates the major emphasis of the commission lies in the aorist imperative ('make disciples')."⁵⁷ This main verb is supplemented by three participles which are dependent upon it: "going" (πορευθεντες), "baptizing", (βαπτιζοντες) and "teaching" (διδασκοντες). "Going" (πορευθεντες aorist 1 participle, masculine, plural) indicates a command that is definite and urgent. The commission of baptizing and teaching without the going, the making disciples is not possible, and especially when "all nations" is the object.

The relationship of "baptizing" (βαπτιζοντες) and "teaching" (διδασκοντες) both present participles, is obviously intended to indicate the means by which the making of disciples is to be accomplished. The present tense of each stresses the continual activity involved. The structure of the passages indicates the major emphasis of the commission lies in the aorist imperative ("make disciples") which is complemented by an aorist participle ("go") which is also part of the command. The two present participles indicate how the making of disciples is to be carried out.

And Coleman says that "... the great commission is ... but to 'make disciples' - to build men like themselves..."⁵⁸

The leadership of Jesus was designed to ultimately expand from the narrow focus upon a few to a broader appeal among those whom the disciples had capacity to impact.

Leadership as Exemplified by Paul

Paul's Conversion and its Significance

When reading Acts, one is struck by the immediacy of Paul's activity as an apologist and theologian for the Christian community after his conversion. His theological views were already as profound as to be irrefutable by his first century Jewish opponents. Therefore, the encounter with the Lord Jesus must not have required the abandonment of his former learning, but informed and reoriented it toward a new understanding of salvation-history around some key theological point revealed to him in the event.

The NT includes six summaries of Paul's conversion, three in the Book of Acts, and three in Paul's Epistles.⁵⁹ In addition

to these explicit references, Paul also alluded to the Damascus event several times. These references point up the significance Paul attached to his conversion for determining his life and ministry.

Luke's first account is presented by the narrator as an "objective" historical record of the event. The second is spoken by Paul as his apologetic in Hebrew before a hostile Jewish mob. The third is part of Paul's defense in his formal Judicial hearing before Agrippa.⁶⁰ Details are suppressed and elevated in each account in order to advance the theological theme and development.

One example is the gradual heightening of the position of the Gentile commission. The first account of Paul's Gentile commission (Ac.9:15) is delivered to the reader in the oracle received by Ananias. In the second account (Ac.22:15) it is implicit in the reference to "all men" but now explicit in a temple vision (Ac.22:17-21). In the third account it is part of Paul's original Damascus Road encounter. This presents to the reader Christianity's claim as the representative of faithful Israel, a consistent theme in Paul's own defense speeches. Ananias (the pious believer who received and communicated the oracle) and Saul (the guardian of Jewish purity) present the church originating within true, pious Judaism but moving out of it under a divine command to extend the blessings of the covenant of the Gentiles.

A second example of rhetorical influence on the accounts is the means where by the supernatural phenomenon of the conversion is validated by Paul for each separate audience. Before Jews he

referred to his sudden blindness and subsequent healing. When speaking to the Gentiles (for whom the blindness would be incidental), he suppressed this aspect and elevated the Greek proverb of "kicking against the goads", (*προς κεντρα λατρευειν*), emphasizing his resistance to the divine will operative in his life.

The Damascus Road encounter also functioned as Paul's prophetic call into the new vocation of apostle to the Gentiles. In his call and ministry Paul showed the marks of the prophetic inauguration: being foreknown in the womb, a commission to include the Gentiles the seeking of divine vindication when challenged, rejection by his own people, and a future date for the revelation of the message.⁶¹ He asserted the prophetic nature of his utterance and assumed the role of an Old Testament prophet in his challenge to Agrippa. Paul's first message after the Damascus encounter was that "He is the Son of God" a focus which is given in both the second and a third Lucan accounts of his conversion.

This approach sets the center of Paul's theology in the contrasts generated by the apostle's argument. There are three passages where Paul has mentioned his conversion: Phil.3:4-11, 1 Cor.15:8-10, and Gal. 1:13-17. The presentation of 1 Corinthians is not considered significant, since it merely presents the appearance of the exalted Christ to Paul in the Damascus event. The Galatians account⁶² is colored by his apostolic defense. However, good critical inquiry argues that demands of each polemical context may reveal unique insights into Paul's appreciation of the event's significance.

The Christological emphasis of Acts continues in Paul's autobiographical statements. It also appears in his allusions to the events. Emphasis on Christ is clearest in Paul's statements concerning "to reveal His Son in me." Paul understood the Damascus Road experience to be an event revealing Jesus as the resurrected and exalted Christ congruent with Paul's understanding of the proclamation of the early church he persecuted.

Paul's Apostolic Authority

In recent writing on Paul there has been an increasing tendency to speak of and emphasize his apostolic authority. There is no doubt that he claimed to be an apostle; there is equally no doubt that he exercised authority. There are a number of questions which must be treated: what is an apostle? What led him to this awareness? In what situations does he assert his apostolic position? When Paul exercises authority under what picture of himself does he do so? How has the stress on apostolic authority arisen? The term "apostle" (*ἀποστόλος*) is used in a number of ways in the New Testament. Cremer says that 'apostle' is "primarily an adjective, 'sentforth'; then a substantive, 'one sent, apostle, ambassador'".⁶³ It first designates the office as instituted by Christ to witness of Him before the World (John 17:18). And it secondly designates the authority which those called to it possess (Rom.10:15). If we examine Paul's own use of the word we see that he terms Epaphroditus who brought him money from Philippi an apostle.⁶⁴ The same is also used of Andronicus and Junia of whom we know nothing as to what they did. At one point he appears to place Silvanus and Timothy as apostles

alongside himself and he probably also regards Apollos and Barnabas as among the apostles.

If then the use of the term leads to no clear definition of its meaning its origin is similarly shrouded in mystery. Thus the term does not go back to Jesus in any sense of defining a group, though we cannot exclude His use of it in a functional manner.⁶⁵ As a name for a defined group of people it may have originated either in the early Christian community in Jerusalem or among the first Christians in Antioch. The evidence is difficult to assess. In our case the term probably always retains some sense of being sent, whether by an individual, a group such as a church or by Christ or God. It would not however be true to say that everyone who carried out missionary work would have been called on apostle. We can also be reasonably certain that Paul was not the first to coin the term or to apply it within the church. The way it appears in his letters implies that there were those who had used it before he did.

There is no doubt that Paul traced his apostleship to his encounter with the risen Lord on the way to Damascus but it is very unlikely that he began to call himself an apostle immediately after that experience. It is not easy though, to determine when this happened for it is inextricably bound up with the question of what constitutes an apostle. In his earlier letter Paul describes himself, Silvanus and Timothy as apostles⁶⁶ but while Peter and James later recognized his claim as an apostle they would certainly not have been accepted Silvanus and Timothy as apostles in the same way. If then there is doubt whether Paul

claimed to be an apostle on a level with Peter at this stage there is no doubt that he was making this claim by the time he came to write Galatians and the Corinthian correspondence.

In the first two chapters of Galatians and in the second letter to the Corinthians he makes a great deal of being an apostle. What led him to do so? He asserts his apostleship in Galatians because some have argued that he was not an apostle and therefore inferior to those who were apostles. It is equality with Peter, and some others who cannot be identified with any certainty, that is at the heart of the argument over apostleship. Paul, however, claimed to be on a par with him and different only in so far as his field lay with the Gentiles whereas that of Peter lay with the Jews. His mission to the Gentiles⁶⁷ will have begun long before he ever thought of himself as an apostle of the Peter-type. We know the claims Paul put forward at various times of his own inclusion. He had seen the Lord. His mission work testified to his position; the Corinthians are the seal of his apostleship. He had displayed the signs, presumably miracles of healing, which were expected of an apostle (Ac. 16:16-24; 19:11-20). The definition of the qualifications may also have changed from time to time. When his opponents found that Paul met a particular set of conditions they had proposed they may simply have changed the conditions in their attempts to eliminate him. Different groups of opponents may also have had different definitions. Finally, no one of the conditions by itself would have been sufficient.

We must now examine the actual situations in which Paul claims to be an apostle. Paul claims to be an apostle in Romans,

1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians. Turning to the letters it is easy to see why Paul makes the claim in the addresses of these four letters. In both Corinth and Galatia there had been those who denied he was an apostle and in the letters themselves he intends to advance reasons why he is. He therefore sets himself up as an apostle from the outset. He uses the title in Romans because there he writes to a church which he has never visited and where he wishes to defend the Gospel which he himself linked to his apostleship. He mentions it therefore but does not make a major point of it as in the letters to Corinth and Galatia. Strictly speaking he only says here that he is an apostle to the Gentiles.

It is sufficient that he holds a position of leadership. It is however perfectly correct that we should trace back both Paul's belief that he acts under God's grace and his claim to be an apostle to his experience on the Damascus Road. In 1 Corinthians the word appears in the address. In 9:1-6, we find it used three times. Here Paul asserts that he is an apostle of the Peter group because he saw the risen Lord. Clearly he uses it here because there have been suggestions that he is not an apostle of this group since he did not accept maintenance from the church in Corinth. The word appears four times in the final four polemical chapters 10-13. On three occasions it is used of some who claim to be apostles, implying again that there is a recognizable group of apostles, and Paul asserts that he is one no less than any of them, provided they are true apostles. The only evidence he offers for his own apostleship is his ability to

perform signs.

Paul opens the letter to the Galatians with a reference to himself as an apostle, not one appointed by men but by God. The ensuing discussion centers on the truth of the Gospel he preaches rather than on his or others' authority.

When Paul uses the term of himself, it is in contexts where he was challenged that he was not an apostle or contexts in which he stresses the weakness of those who are leading Christians or in which there is some connection with the proclamation of the Gospel.

I have drawn attention to these authoritarian passages in Paul not to prove that he was an authoritarian person but in order to inquire from what he thought he derived his authority. You will have noted that he did not refer to himself as an apostle. He never described himself as an apostle. In 2 Corinthians 1:24 Paul denies that he lords it over the Corinthians and he did not regard himself to be an authoritarian kind of person. Later on, he says he writes in this way before he comes, so that when he arrives he does not have to be severe in the use of authority given to him by the Lord "for building up and not for tearing down." ⁶⁹ He exhorts those with charismatic gifts to acknowledge that what he writes is a command (*ἐντολή*) ⁷⁰ of the Lord. ⁷¹ He reminds the Thessalonians of the instructions () he had given them through the Lord Jesus.

None of these were any reference to himself as an apostle. Instead Paul regards himself to be in close touch in some way with the exalted Christ and sees his authority as deriving directly from Christ. Paul says that he rebuked Peter and those

siding with him. He does not say that he uttered his rebuke because he was the apostle to the Gentiles but because he spoke for the truth of the Gospel. Pushed to the limit Paul does not fall back on apostolic authority but on his understanding of the Gospel. The burden of Paul's defense of his apostolic legitimacy in 2Cor. 10:12-18 is twofold. First, he endeavors to define what is, in fact, a proper boast or claim to authority by establishing the proper, divine, criterion for such a claim. Paul then demonstrates that his boast, rather than that of his opponents, meets this criterion so that, when Paul boasts, he is indeed "boasting in the Lord" and the recipient of the "Lord's commendation." Paul accomplishes his first goal by once again introducing in 10:12 a negative comparison between his practice and the practice of his opponents. ⁷² In spite of all the "boldness" being attributed to him by his adversaries, he is nevertheless not "bold enough" to engage in the type of self-commendation practiced by his opponents. The irony is clear. Paul's humility in this respect is his virtue, since the method of self-commendation practiced by his opponents is faulty. As a result, they are "without understanding." The criterion they are using to establish their apostolic authority in Corinth is irrelevant, thus evoking a "human standard" rather than the approval of God.

Thus, when Paul's opponents claim authority in Corinth, they are merely "boasting" in some thing which cannot be measured or established by the criteria they are employing, ie. by their own spiritual abilities, nature, attainments and performances. ⁷³ Paul is not "bold enough" to join in such foolishness. Paul's

opponents are "boasting" in themselves, while in strong contrast, Paul is "boasting" in the Lord. Paul's argument is now complete. Since the existence of the church in Corinth is the decisive divine attestation of his claim to authority as the Corinthians' apostle, Paul's boasting concerning his authority is, in reality, a "boast in the Lord." God is the One who brought Paul to Corinth and gave his gospel success there. The Lord is thus the One who commends Paul. Moreover, this objective evidence of divine activity is the only canon of commendation that Paul recognizes. In contrast, the boast of Paul's opponents is merely an exercise in "self-commendation", since they lack the necessary divine accreditation appropriate to the claim in view. Since their claim cannot measure up to the appropriate, divinely established 'canon', they have not been commended by the Lord for this particular boast. From Paul's perspective, therefore, anyone who attempts to claim apostolic authority in Corinth on any other basis is "without understanding."

How does the rest of the New Testament portray the apostle Paul? Luke succeeded brilliantly in providing the church a definitive portrait of Paul. Luke had observed Paul closely (including the famous "we" passages), and knew such matters as the conversation between Festus and Agrippa and Lysias' letter to Felix (chap. 23). The resulting portrait of Paul has many facets, of which but a few can be noted here.

First, Paul's life and leadership unfolds, not according to blind fate, but in accord with God's will made known to Paul, beginning in Antioch.⁷⁴ His leadership ministry was led by the Holy Spirit. During difficulties in Corinth, the Lord reassured

Paul in a vision. It was "in the Spirit" that Paul resolved to go to Rome by way of Greece and Jerusalem, where the Roman destiny was confirmed, as it was again during the storm-driven voyage. God has earlier said, "He is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and Kings and the Sons of Israel, for I will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of my name."

Second, Paul's leadership was affirmed by the manifestation of God's power and glory, who knows, again through the Spirit, that suffering is his lot.

Finally, Acts shows Paul as the leader who had gone through and overcome Jewish opposition, from Damascus onward. Paul can teach "quite openly and unhindered" in Rome. Acts skillfully interweaves reports of Jewish animosity and plots against Paul's life, from which Roman authorities rescue him, with Paul's speeches in which he outlines his life and work so as to show his innocence, summed up in 26:19-23. The note struck at the beginning of Jesus' mission (the rejection at Nazareth, Lk. 4:16-30) reappears at the end of Paul's mission. The book of Acts ends: "Preaching the Kingdom of God and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no one forbid-⁷⁵ding him."

Concluding Observations

As already noted, one of the truly perplexing questions in New Testament studies is to determine the shape that leadership and structures took within the earliest congregations of God's new covenant people. The difficulties here stem from the lack of explicit and intentional instruction.

Leadership was of two kinds. On the one hand, there were itinerants, such as the apostle Paul and others, who founded churches and exercised obvious authority over the churches they had founded. On the other hand, when the itinerant founder or his delegate were not present, leadership on the local scene seems to have been left in the hands of "elders," all expressions of which in the New Testament are plural. The elders in the local churches seem to have been composed of both "overseers" (episkopoi) and "deacons" (diakonoi), who probably had different tasks.

Unless Revelation 2-3 provides an exception, there is no certain evidence in the New Testament of a single leader at the local level who was not at the same time an itinerant. The status of James in Jerusalem is at once a more complex issue. In an earlier time, as evidenced by both Luke and Paul, he appears to have been one among equals. But as the others moved on and he stayed, he apparently emerged eventually as the predominant leader.

Apart from the authority of the apostles over the churches they had founded, there seems to be very little interest in the question of "authority" at the local level. To be sure, the people are directed to respect, and submit to, those who labored among them and served them in the Lord (1Cor.16:16; Heb.13:17). But the interest is not in their authority as such, but in their role as those who care for the others. Thus, in the final analysis we know very little about the governance of either the local or larger church. That structures of some kind existed can be taken for granted; but what form these took is simply not an interest in the Biblical texts.

END NOTES

- 1 Deut.1:9,10.
- 2 Gen.15:5,22:17; Exod.18:13-23; Deut.1:17;Deut.2:32-33,3:1-3,12-17;Deut.3:18-22; Deut.3:23-27; Deut.3:28; 31:7-8; Deut.9:25-29.
- 3 P.C. Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, R.K. Harison, gen.ed.NICOT(Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1976), 94.
- 4 R.Laird Harris, ed., Theological Wordbook of The Old Testament, vol.2, (Chicago: Moody press, 1980).
- 5 Koehler, Old Testament Theology, 205-6.
- 6 Ps.106:37;37:30;Prov.12:5;Mic.6:8;Prov.21:15; Mic. 3:1; Prov.29:4.
- 7 Colin Brown, NIDNTT, vol.2 (Exeter, U.K.: The Pater-noster Press, 1980), s.v."Krima", by W. Schneider:362. Exod.2:14; 1Sam.8:20; 2Sam.15:4,6;Deut.10: 18; Ps.72:1; Jdg.3:9,15; Exod.1-9; Exod.20-40; Lev.1-27;Num.1-10.
- 8 Deut.1:31,33:11,12.
- 9 Ps.56:4,11,118:6; Heb.13:6.
- 10 Deut.30:1-5; Neh.3:1-7; 4:1-6:14.
- 11 Neh.2:7-10; Ch.4; Ch.5; Ch.13; 6:1-4,5-7,10-14.
- 12 Neh. 7: 1-9.
- 13 Neh.1:4-9;4:4,9,14.
- 14 Lk.22:28; Ac.23:6-8; Lk.1:8-23,57-80;23:50-53.
- 15 Lk.18:9;10:29;20:20;16:15;18:10-12;5:31-32.
- 16 Lk.7:41;15:7,29;11:39,44; 5:31; 7:41,15:4,29; 10:27;16:13,14.
- 17 Lk.11:42,46;20:47, eg.7:44-47;9:22;19:47,22:2;18:10-14,9;5:30;15:2;5:32,7.
- 18 Lk.3:3;7:30;12:1-2;16:5;11:44,39; 16:15,14; 11:39; 10:45,23:39-43,16:15,11:43,20:46,14,7,20:46-47.
- 19 Lk.19:44,42;23:34;20:5;22:67;11:52;7:39,37; 2:47;8:56,ekstasis,5:26;Phobos,5:26;anoia,6:11;aganakteo,13:14; 15:2;5:30;6:9;14:3-4,6;20:1-8,41-44;22:68;7:36;11:37;14:1, 13:31;6:7;14:1;20:20;10:25;6:11;19:47;22:2.

20

Lk.23:34;7:40;8:49;10:25;11:45;20:21,28,39;
7:36;11:37;14:1;17:20;13:31;16:1423:2;7:34;15:1-2;15:5,6,7,9,
10,32;7:7,39;19:37-39;23:2;6:5;5:20-21;22:67;23:2;22:70-71;
7:30,5:39.

21

Lk.16:16,14;4:18;6:20,24;11:43;20:46-47;16:15;
19:10;5:32;18:9;9:22;7:36;11:37;14:1.

22

Lk.10:25-37;11:37-41;14:12-14;15:1-32;17:22-21;
8:40-42,49-56;22:50-51;11:50-51;20:15-19;23:46;6:27-31;23:34;
Ac.7:60.

23

Lk.19:41-44,23:34.

24

Gerhard Kittel, ed. TDNT, vol. 2. (Grand Rapids,
Michigan: WM.M. Eerdmans, 1964), s.v. "Didasko," by Rengstorff:
139.

25

Teaching in the Synagogue: Mt.4:23; Mk.6:2; Lk.13:10;
Teaching in The Temple: Mt.26:55; Mk.14:49; Lk.21:37; Teaching in
the Open air: Mt.5:2; Mk.6:34; Lk.5:3.

26

Other titles used are "Lord" and "Master."

27

The title teacher is found fifty nine times in the
N.T., the vast majority of which are in the Gospels. (12 times in
Matthew and Mark respectively; 17 times in Luke and 9 times in
John). The word refers to Jesus on 41 occasions of which 29
represent a direct form of address (Colin Brown, NIDNTT, vol.3,
767).

28

Ibid., 766.

29

Ibid., 115. Nearly all the NT instances of the Greek
word Rabbi and its variations refer to an address of Jesus (the
only exceptions are Mt.23:7 and Jn. 3:26). Lohse suggests that
"when Jesus is called Rabbi by His disciples and others, this
shows that He conducted Himself like the Jewish scribes" (Edward
Lohse, "Rabbi", in TDNT, ed. Kittel, 6:964).

30

Emil Schurer, A History of the Jewish people in the
Age of Jesus Christ, 3 vols. Trans. by Sophia Taylor and Peter
Christie (London: T&T Clark, 1885), 320. Jesus demonstrated compe-
tency in handling the issues with which the Scribes and leaders
normally dealt. And all who heard him were amazed at His under-
standing and His answers.

31

Kittel, ed. TDNT, vol.4, 433.

The people at large were impressed by Jesus' leadership ability,
"for He was teaching them as one having authority and not as
their Scribes-" Matt.7:29, cf. Mk.1:22, Lk.4:31-32.

32

Ibid., 434. In John's gospel we observe that two
disciples of John the Baptist (Andrew and perhaps John) followed
Jesus. And after Jesus asked them "what do you seek?", they
said, "Rabbi, where do you stay?" (Jn.1:37-38). These two fol-
lowers later brought to Him Peter, Philip, and Nathanael, all of
whom became part of the twelve.

33

Cleon Rogers, "The Great Commission" Bibliotheca
Sacra 130 (July 1973): 264.

34

Norman E. Richardson, The Christ of the Classroom
(New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), 135. Kittel, ed. TDNT,
vol. 4, 434-435. Rogers, 263. The exclusivity of relationship
that Jesus appeared to be claiming in these instances,
(Lk.14:36, Matt.10:37), was not apparently unknown to His hearers,
and serves to reinforce His identity as teacher, Rabbai, and
leader.

35

Kittel, ed. TDNT, vol. 4., 435. By virtue of being
with Jesus constantly, the disciples were afforded ample opportu-
nity to observe and question Him (eg. the sermon on the mount).

36

Schurer, A History of The Jewish people in the Age
of Jesus Christ, vol.2, 324-325. The probability of its use is
suggested by the disciples' ability to later commit many of
Jesus' teachings to writing and also the extensive quotations of
OT Scriptures.

37

Jesus referred to Himself as "Teacher" (διδασκαλος)
or as "teaching" (διδασκειν) nine times; further He called
His followers "disciples" (μαθητες) ten times.

38

Mk.1:24-25; Lk.4:34-35; 1:40-41; 9:18-21; Matt.16:13-
20; Mk.8:27-30.

39

F.P. Graves, What Did Jesus Teach? (New York: The
Macmillan Company, 1919), 34-35.

40

A. B. Bruce, The Training of the Twelve (Grand
Rapids, Michigan: Kregel, 1971), 14.

41

Matt.5:17-7:27; 4:23-25; 7:28-29; Mk.1:21-22, 28;
Lk.4:31-32; Mk.4:10, 6:31; 7:17; 10:10; Mk.9:9; 10:45; Mk.1:16-20;
2:24; 10:17-22.

42

Robert Coleman, The Master Plan of Evangelism (Old
Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1964), 21;
Jn.1:35-51.

43 The Seventy (Lk.10:1), Mark and Luke, James His own brother (1Cor.15:7; Gal.2:9,12; Jn.2:12 and 7:2-10; Lk.6:13-17; Mk.3:13-19; 3:14, Lk.6:13; Mk.8:34; Lk.14:27.

44 Out of the eighty times it appears that, seventy are in the gospels, where it only occurs in the verbal form.

45 Colin Brown, ed. The NIDNTT, "Akoloutheo" by C. Blendinger, 1:481.

46 Kittel "Akoloutheo" in TDNT, ed. Kittel, 1:214.

47 Coleman, The Master Plan of Evangelism, 38.

48 Lk.19:7; Jn.4:39-42; Lk.8:1-3.

49 P. T. Chandapilla, "How Jesus Trained the Twelve," Evangelical Missions Quarterly 5 (Summer 1969): 212.

50 Colin Brown, ed. The NIDNTT, "Akoloutheo" by C. Blendinger, 1:481.

51 The parables: From the Greek *παρά* "beside" plus *βαλλειν* "to throw"; literally, then, "to throw beside"; designating a story or a comparative statement thrown alongside the "unknown concept" to link it with something more familiar.

52 Matt.10:1; Mk.6:7; Lk.9:1.

53 Lk.9:1-2; Matt.10:5,6,8-10; Mk.6:8-9; Lk.9:3; Matt.10:11; Mk.6:10; Lk.9:4; Matt.10:14,15; Lk.9:5; Mk.6:11.

54 Allen G. Arenson, "Making Disciples according to Christ's plan," Evangelical Missions Quarterly 16 (April 1980): 106.

55 Demetrios Trakatellis, "Akolouthei moi/Follow Me Discipleship and Priesthood," Greek Orthodox Theological Review 30 (Fall 1985), 277.

56 Matt.28:19-20.

57 Cleon Rogers, "The Great Commission," Bibliotheca Sacra 130 (July 1973): 262.

58 Coleman, The Master Plan of Evangelism, 108-109.

59 Ac.9:20-22, 28-29, 1-30; 22:1-21; 26:1-23; Gal.1:3-17; 1Cor.15:8-10; Phil.3:4-11; Rom.10:2-4; 1Cor.9:1,16-17; 2Cor.3:4-4:6; 5:16; Eph.3:1-13; Col.1:23-29; also note his various claims to apostolic status and authority.

60 Ac.9:1-30; 22:1-21; 21:27-40; 26:1-23; 25:23-27; 9:15; 22:15, 17-21; 26:23; 22:2-5; 24:10-21; 25:8; 26:2-8; 28:17-20. 22:11-13.

61 Isa.49:1; Jer.1:5a; Isa.49:6; Jer.1:5c; Isa.50:7-8; Jer.20:11; Ezk.3:1-9; Jer.1:5-10; Ezk.2:1-7; Ac.26:20; Isa., 53:1 in Rom.10:16; Isa.49:8 in 2Cor.6:2; Isa.49:6 in Ac.13:47; Ac.26:22,27; 9:20; 22:18-19; 26:18,20,22-23.

62 Gal.1:13-17,12,16; Phil.3:10; Rom.10:2-4; 2Cor.5:16.

63 Hermann Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1895), 530.

64 Phil.2:25; 2Cor.8:23; Rom.16:7; 1Thess.2:7; 1 Cor.15:5.

65 Matt.10:2; Mk.6:30; 2Cor.8:23; Phil.2:25; Phil.1:14:2-18; 1Thess.2:6.

66 A few have denied that Paul intended to include Timothy as an apostle because there is no sense in which he could have seen the risen Lord. cf. A. M. Farrer in The apostolic ministry (London: K. E. Kirk, 1946), 128. For a more recent thorough discussion refuting such views see Raymond F. Collins, Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians (Leuven, 1984), 183. Gal.4:14.

67 Rom.11:12; 1Cor.9:1; 15:8-11; 9:2; 2Cor.12:12.

68 2 Cor.11:5,13; 12:11,12.

69 2Cor.13:10; 10:8.

70 There are some Mss which omit (*ἐντολή*) eg. * d,e,g gr,lat

(D G it Origen) This however does not affect the sense in which Christ is the origin of Paul's authority.

71 1Cor.14:37; 1Thess.4:2.

72 cf. 2 Cor.2:17 and the subsequent negative comparisons in 10:13,15 and 11:12; 10:1-12.

73 2Cor.10:12a, 12b.

74 Ac.13:1-3; 22:21; 16:6-10; 18:9-10; 19:21; 23:11; 27:23; 9:15-16; 19:11-12; 20:23; see also 13:6-12; 14:8-10,16-18; 23:3-6-miracles; 14:22,19; 16:22; 21:31-32 and imprisonment suffering, 9:20; 17:3; 18:5.

75 Ac.26:22-23; 28:20,31; 22:22,30; 23:12-15; 24:1-9; 25:1-5; 22:22-29; 23:10,16-35; 24:22-23; the rejection at Nazareth, Lk.4:16-30; Ac.28:25-28,31.

CHAPTER 3

TEAM LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Emerging Church and the Problem of Authority in Acts

Among the purposes that the author of Acts must have had in mind as he wrote was that of portraying the character of the emerging church. Although the author of Acts probably intended to convey to the reader a sense of early Christian communal life, he did not write a treatise on the meaning, organization, and practices of the early Christian Church. The Acts of the Apostles is a narrative description of a historical movement, in which system and order take a back seat to activity and change. At many points no name is used to designate the body of believers. In passages where a name is used, there appears to be no standardization. At one point, Tertullus, the spokesman for the Jewish opposition to Paul, accuses him of being "a ring leader of the sect of the Nazarenes."¹ In his defensive speech Paul refers to the movement as "The way," a designation that seems consistent with Luke's approach to the ministry of Jesus in his Gospel. Acts also uses the term "Church" (ἐκκλησία) at a number of points, and it should be assumed that Luke's readers would understand the term as a designation of an assembled community. The members of the community are also variously designated by terms such as believers, brothers, and disciples, and on two occasions as Christians.

Any attempt to search out Luke's understanding of the emerging church must begin with a recognition of the dynamic character of the narrative in Acts. A careful reading of the Book of Acts shows that there are significant transitions going on in the narrative. These transitions, which affect the ways in which the emerging church may be understood, may be described as geographical, ethnic, cultic, and institutional.

The geographical changes are easily perceivable. The narrative of Acts has its beginning in Jerusalem and its conclusion in Rome, and the author is very careful to demonstrate a number of points that the geographical movement results from divine decrees. Indeed, Acts 1:8 provides a kind of rough outline of the geographical aspects of the rest of the book, as Luke describes the spread of the movement first in Jerusalem,² then turns to the work in Judea and Samaria, and finally describes the progress of Paul's activity until his arrival in Rome.

The geographical movement in the narrative parallels the ethnic change, which is of paramount importance for Luke. Not only does the early Christian movement begin in the city of Jerusalem, it begins as a movement among Jews and within Jewish religious life. One purpose of Luke's description of the Jerusalem phase of the early Christian movement is to provide for it a firm grounding in Judaism and among the Jewish people. It is not until Acts 10 that the first Gentile, Cornelius, joins the Christian movement, and even here there is great hesitation on the part of Peter and the other apostles. But later Paul vows, as he had done twice previously, that the future of the Christian

movement will be among the Gentiles: "Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen." Thus, the Book of Acts locates the beginning of the church among Jews, but the narrative concludes with a strong statement that points to the future of the Christian movement among Gentiles.

Closely connected with geographical and ethnic transitions is a third kind of alteration, cultic. The most obvious change is the alleviation of the requirement of circumcision, which is rescinded for Gentiles by the apostolic council in Acts 15. In this episode, the church leaders agree that Gentile believers must continue to observe certain laws, but the full imposition of Torah is judged by them to be a burden.

When one thinks of the cultic aspects of Jewish religion in the Hellenistic period, one inevitably thinks of the Temple. Here too Luke's narrative demonstrates a movement of the Christian group away from the Temple. In the opening narratives of Acts, the apostles and the believers seem to be intimately associated with the Temple. The community initially makes it a center of religious activity.³ During the Jerusalem phase of the story, the Temple continues to be a natural center for worship. In his review of the Old Testament history, Stephen refers to Solomon's Temple and yet denies that it can be the abode of God. For much of the narrative about Paul, the Temple recedes from view, since Paul's activity takes place away from Jerusalem and out in the Gentile World. Toward the end of the book, the Temple again appears, but now as a point of contention.

These considerations lead to an understanding of the general approach that Luke makes toward a portrait of the emerging church. For Acts, the church is dynamic, not at rest. The church is a body founded in Jerusalem, among Jews, associated with the Temple, and with no explicit challenge to the religious cult. Yet it is a body that is in the process of change from one geographical, ethnic, cultic, and institutional orientation to another. Thus the narrative moves from Jerusalem to Rome, from Jews to Gentiles, and hence away from Jewish cultic observances and from the central Jewish Institution, the Temple.

These themes dominate the picture in Acts of the emerging Christian community and thus complicate any attempt to describe the Lukan view of the church. Thus, to ask about the character of the movement requires one to recognize that the narrative describes a dynamic phenomenon, not a stable one, a phenomenon in which practices and leadership roles may not be the same at all points in the narrative. A recognition of the power of these transitions that inform Luke's narrative leads us to pose our questions about the emerging church in such a way as to determine, if possible, what things continue and what things change. Thus the questions of continuity and change is particularly acute in interpreting the Acts of the Apostles. The question becomes most acute when we turn to the problem of authority in Acts. Here the geographical, ethnic, cultic, and institutional transitions come to bear on a definition of practical authority.

Luke leaves little doubt about the source of ultimate authority: It comes from the Lord, who issues commands to His followers in the period between the resurrection and ascension,⁴

and who spoke to Paul at his conversion and at crucial points during his travels. Yet the location of ultimate authority does not necessarily solve the problem of practical authority, that is, the identity of the person or persons who may in historical situations interpret the ultimate commands and administer order within the church.

Luke's approach to the question of practical authority parallels his more general treatment of the emerging church. The geographical, ethnic, cultic, and institutional transitions have a counterpart in changes in the exercise of authority within the church. The general impression is that Acts moves from a clear and definite scheme of apostolic authority identified with Jewish Christians in Jerusalem toward a form of non-apostolic authority associated with the Gentile churches. We now turn to address the question of practical authority in connection with, first, the Jerusalem church, and second, the Gentile churches.

Authority in the Jerusalem Church

In the section of Acts which deals with Jewish Christians in Jerusalem,⁵ the apostles embody practical authority most forcefully. Indeed, when Luke describes the ideal life and character of the earliest community, he calls attention to the devotion of the believers and to the teaching of the apostles. Persons who sold property were expected to bring the proceeds from the sale and lay them at the apostles' feet. When a dispute arose between Hebrews and Hellenists, it was settled when the apostles commissioned a group of seven to administer the daily

distribution to the widows.

In the Jerusalem phase of Luke's narrative, the role of the apostles as bearing practical authority among the believers is quite clear. Apostolic authority is most dramatically illustrated in the episode of Ananias and Sapphira in chapter five and in the conflict between the Hebrews and Hellenists in chapter six. Luke's reference to fear in the church at the conclusion of this narrative (in chapter five) calls attention to the fearful authority of the Apostles.⁶ The problems in Acts 6:1-6 have been understood in a variety of ways, and no single interpretation has been commonly accepted among New Testament scholars. Despite the problems, the authoritative position of the apostles in the narrative is clear. It is they who convene the entire group of believers in Jerusalem, here referred to as "the body of disciples."

Peter plays a significant role among the apostles. Luke seems to think of him as the head and spokesman of the group. His name appears first on the list of the Twelve. It is he who conveys the judgment of the community on Ananias and Sapphira. He, with John, is involved in the healing of the lame man in Acts 3:1-10. People are healed by his passing shadow. Above all, it is Peter who addresses both the church and its surrounding community in a series of speeches. The speeches emphasize the role of Peter as more than just being one of the apostles.

The authority of the apostles is specifically associated with the city of Jerusalem but extends also to Judea and Samaria. Jerusalem is the city of the apostles, a point that Luke emphasizes in Acts 8:1, where he notes that after the martyrdom

of Stephen "a persecution arose against the church in Jerusalem; and they were all scattered throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles." Later, however, the apostles in Jerusalem send two of their number, Peter and John, into Samaria.

In this earliest era in the history of the church, Peter and the other apostles exercise practical authority, and the church is closely tied to Jerusalem and the Jewish People. As the narrative progresses, however, the authoritative role of Peter and the apostles becomes less clearly defined, and other groups and individuals emerge as leaders.

The changes in the pattern of authority may be illustrated in the changing role of Peter himself. Although he was first presented as the spokesman of the apostles, in two later incidents he occupies an ambiguous position. In Acts 10, he is the instrument for the conversion of Cornelius and his household, but in Acts 11:2-3 there is criticism of his action in visiting and eating with Gentiles. Acts 11:1 suggests that Peter was required to report to Jerusalem and explain his actions to the apostles and the brethren. To be sure, he does so successfully. In the second incident, in Acts 15:6-21, Peter's role appears to be subordinate to that of James.

In more explicit ways, Acts 15:1-21 serves to signal a move away from apostolic authority. Here we read that apostles (ἄποστολοι) and elders (πρεσβυτεροι) exercise authority jointly. Luke never explains the term, (πρεσβυτερος), a term that he uses elsewhere to designate certain Jewish leaders who oppose Jesus, the apostles and Paul.⁷ But in Acts 15, the term desig-

nates persons with a special standing in the Christian community. We first read of Christian elders in Acts 11:30, where the disciples agree to send relief to starving brothers in Jerusalem. The agreement is to send this relief, by way of Barnabas and Saul, to the elders. There are also elders in the Gentile churches established by Paul.⁸ The implication of Acts 14:23 is that those elders appointed by Paul are to exercise leadership roles in the local Pauline churches. The same appears to be the case with those elders with whom Paul met at Miletus.

Yet the elders in Acts 15 are in Jerusalem, where they are paired with apostles. Paul, Barnabas, and others are appointed to go to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles and elders about the requirement of circumcision. On arrival in Jerusalem, they are welcomed by the church, the apostles, and the elders. After a decision is reached, the apostles and elders agree to send a record of it with a letter to the believers in Antioch.

The problem with the picture of authority in Acts 15 is more complex, however. Although here the apostles and elders may be said to have a kind of formal authority, the decision about the crucial issue of circumcision is effectively made by one person, James. In this narrative, Peter, Barnabas, and Paul speak about their experiences among the Gentiles. At the conclusion of these speeches, James quotes a passage from the prophet Amos that, on his interpretation, agrees with the contentions that the other speakers have made. Then in Acts 15:19, James makes the decision: "Therefore my judgment is (Ἐγὼ κρίνω) that we should not trouble those of the Gentiles who turn to God." Then follows the so-called apostolic decree, which spells

out the four regulations that are to govern Gentile Christians. James' judgment does not appear to require ratification by apostles and elders. When he concludes his speech, they agree to communicate the decision, and there is no note of dissension.

The decree agreed upon in Jerusalem is communicated by letter to Gentile Christians in Antioch, Syria, Cilicia, and points to the west.⁹ Yet this concept is certainly not pursued by Luke, who treats the leadership of the Gentile churches in a quite different way, as we shall see below.

Thus, it seems that in the Book of Acts, the authority first exercised among Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, Judea, and Samaria, has given way to a different kind of leadership. In the beginning, in a kind of ideal setting, the authority of Peter and the apostles is clear and definite. In Acts 15, authority seems to be in the hands of James, the elders, and the Apostles. In Acts 21, we read only of James and the elders. Luke seems to signal the approaching end of the apostolic period in Acts 12:2, when he writes about the martyrdom of the apostle James, brother of John. The death of this apostle leads to the arrest of Peter, who finally escapes, but after his escape requests that James and the brothers be told the story. Then Peter goes into hiding. Acts 12:1-19 forms a kind of a transition in respect to the leadership of the church in Jerusalem. Effectively, the authority of Peter and the apostles is over with the martyrdom of the apostle James and the imprisonment of Peter. Peter appears only one other time in Acts, and that is the council of Acts 15, which focuses attention on the authority of James. The Twelve apos-

ties, likewise appear only in connection with the meeting in Acts 15 and in the report of the distribution of the decree in Acts 16:4. After Acts 12, the leadership of the church in Jerusalem moves toward non-apostolic figures, James and the elders.

Authority in the Gentile Churches

The picture of practical authority in the Gentile churches is even less clear than that in Jerusalem. To be sure, there is a sense in which authority in this realm is exercised, first by Barnabas and Paul, then later by Paul alone. The practice of evangelizing the cities and then returning to them suggests a pattern in which the evangelists themselves exercise practical authority. Paul is accompanied by a variety of other missionaries as subordinates and they created a team. Paul chooses Timothy to accompany him, and we see him giving commands to Silas and Timothy.¹⁰

Particular interest adheres to the narrative of Paul's meeting with the Ephesian elders in Acts 20:17-38. This section forms a kind of farewell speech of Paul and a portending of his ultimate fate, but it is also the only place in Acts that gives any attention at all to the matter of leadership in the Gentile churches. The leadership role of Paul is shown in the fact that it is he who summons these elders from Ephesus to meet him at Miletus. It is conceivable that the author of Acts thinks of Ephesus as a kind of Gentile-Christian counterpart to the Jewish-Christian church at Jerusalem. If so, Paul and the Ephesian elders would constitute an authoritative group parallel to that of James and the Jerusalem elders. Yet the elders are also

pictured here as Paul's successors. Paul's speech to them is suggestive of an ecclesiastical structure in which the elders themselves are expected to take charge of the "flock" after Paul's departure. Indeed, in Acts 20:28, they are referred to by the official-sounding term, (*ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΙ*), which may be translated bishops or overseers. Whether or not the term is to be understood as equivalent to the formally constituted episcopal leadership that is associated with the Pastoral Epistles, the (*ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΙ*) in Acts 20:28 clearly have a position of authority within the Ephesian church. Still, no specific responsibilities are committed to the Ephesian elders except that of feeding the flock and remaining alert for those wolves who will come in later to ravage the flock, an obvious reference to post-Pauline heretics.

How should we judge the lack of detailed information in Acts about authority among the Gentile churches? Above all, we must remind ourselves that Luke is not primarily interested in providing information on the organizational structure of the Christian community. A key to interpreting Acts is to focus attention on the transitions that accompany the movement of the Gospel from Jewish to Gentile settings.

Concluding Observations

Any understanding of practical authority as portrayed in Acts encounters many problems. The interpreter must constantly keep in mind the fact that Luke did not intend to write a constitution for the emerging church but rather a narrative of its

beginnings. The remarkable thing about this narrative is its dynamic character. As there is geographical, ethnic, cultic, and institutional movement from a beginning within Judaism to an open Gentile orientation, just so there are changes in the authority and leadership of the church. Even in Jerusalem, apostolic leadership gives way to that of James and the elders. Outside the realm of the apostles, leadership comes from Paul, who appoints fellow missionaries, and from elders, who exercise authority in his absence.

The point to be stressed is that in Acts no permanent form of authority is indicated. Luke seems to be sensitive to changing conditions that might require changing structures, and so he does not continue apostolic authority beyond a particular time and place. There is, nevertheless, a sense of continuity in his picture of authority. As the leading spokesman for the apostles, Peter points forward to the emerging roles of James and the elders.¹¹ Before Paul goes out on his increasingly independent mission, he is introduced to the apostles by Barnabas, who accompanies him on the first missionary journey.

Despite the lack of detail about organization, responsibilities of various office-holders, the relationships between local and more general authorities, the selection of successors, and the like, Acts is an interesting study in ecclesiastical leadership roles. The study would suggest that Luke thinks in terms of both continuity and change in the exercise of authority. The emphasis on change shows that Luke is sensitive to historical development and would probably not want to impose the structures of apostolic authority of an earlier age on a later. The empha-

sis on continuity suggests that whatever changes might be considered legitimate in the church, there is a sense in which later structures emerge from earlier ones and do so with the concurrence of the earlier leaders.

A Leadership Paradigm

The Trinity as a Model for Christian Leadership

It is evidently seen that the idea of team leadership had been from eternity in the persons of the Trinity and it is demonstrated in time. The writer would like to suggest the Trinity as a model for Christian leadership. While Jesus continues to be the focus as He was incarnate and shared our life, it is the total Trinitarian framework that provides our theological basis for leadership.

As Trinity, God is a community, a team within Himself. God is a Trinity. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit act in community; the Father does not act alone. In other words, the initiative and the signal to act does not always come from one direction. The flow is circular within the Trinity. And the flow is circular from them to the World. We have here a leadership team.

Within the Trinity we perceive different roles highlighting aspects of leadership. The Father provides care and security and gives people their identity. He provides them with space and opportunities to grow as any earthly father would. The Son has a different role. He became incarnate, born as one of us. He shared our humanity and carried our griefs, burdens and sin. His

role on earth was as a Servant. The Son gives the "one of us" dimension to leadership. The Spirit has yet another role. He is our enabler-companion (*ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ*). He is the One who empowers God's people with gifts for service. His gifts are our resources for us to develop by His power.

To develop an adequate theology for the practice of Christian team leadership, we therefore need to draw on the Trinitarian understanding of God: The Father who provides security and space, the Son who models Servanthood, and the Spirit who empowers others. The role of Christian leaders is to facilitate the community and the environment in which others can exercise the gifts which the Holy Spirit gives them for the benefit of all.

Jesus' Inner Circle

Those whom Jesus "took with Him" to the Mount of Transfiguration were Peter, James, and John, the inner circle of the Twelve.¹² They alone went up with the Master and beheld His glory. Out of the lists given in the Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts, Carson observes a number of significant things. First, Peter is always first, Judas Iscariot always last. Matthew uses "first" in connection with Peter; more likely it means "first among equals." Second, the first four names of all four lists are those of two pairs of brothers whose call is mentioned first. Third, in each list there are three groups of four, each group headed by Peter, Philip, and James the son of Alphaeus respectively. But within each group the order varies except that Judas is always last. This suggests, if it does not prove, that the Twelve were organizationally divided into smaller groups,

each with a leader. Fourth, some variations in order can be accounted for with a high degree of probability. For the first four names, Mark lists Peter, James, John and appends Andrew, doubtless because the first three were an inner core privileged to witness the raising of Jairus's daughter and the Transfiguration and invited to be close to Jesus in His Gethsemane agony.¹³ These members of the inner circle (the team) waited nearest to the Lord while He prayed. The fact that there is no record of the disciples complaining about the pre-eminence of the three, though they did murmur about other things, is proof that where preference is shown in the right spirit and for the right reason offense need not arise.

According to the Gospel tradition from the Twelve men who were to be rulers of Israel in the new age¹⁴ three appear to have been selected by Jesus to enjoy special access to the purpose of His ministry: Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, James and John. Of these three, James was executed by Herod Agrippa I. It is conceivable that these three were at first regarded as the "pillars" and that, on the death of one James, his namesake was co-opted to take his place as a "pillar" (not, of course to take his place as member of the Twelve). It is possible on the other hand, though perhaps less likely, that James the Lord's brother had been co-opted earlier, so that before the death of James the Zebedaeon there were four pillars.

The Need of Team Spirit

Paul's Inner Circle

Paul had developed a team leadership as the ministry expanded gradually. We can see the excellence of the art of delegation in Paul's leadership quality. The writer would like to mention some of the characters who had been in Paul's team and try to see their significance in the leadership team.

Silas/Silvanus

It is clear that one and the same person appears in Acts under the name Silas and in Paul's letters under the name Silvanus. According to 1 Thessalonians and 2 Cor. 1:19, Silvanus was one of the group of three who brought the Gospel to Thessalonica and Corinth, the other two being Paul and Timothy.

Silas was a member of the Jerusalem church, who was chosen by the leaders along with Judas (of whom we know nothing further), to carry the apostolic letter of Acts 15:23-29 to Antioch. Not only did Judas and Silas deliver the letter to Christians of Antioch; they stayed among them for some time, exercising their gift of prophecy and encouraging their Gentile brethren. Paul appears to have taken stock of Silas during those days and reached very positive conclusions about him. When Paul and Barnabas parted company, Paul had no doubt whom he wished to co-opt as a colleague in place of Barnabas. Paul must have discerned qualities of Silas which made him a congenial companion and fellow-worker in the Gospel enterprise. He certainly shared Paul's understanding of the law-free Gospel, which extended the grace of God to Gentiles on an equal footing with Jews. It

appears from the account of their imprisonment in Philippi that Silas, like Paul himself, was a Roman citizen.¹⁵ Silas collaborated with Paul in Gospel preaching and church planting in Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea and Corinth.

Timothy

Timothy's historical background is indicated in Acts and the Pastoral Epistles. He was the son of a mixed marriage, his mother being a Jewess and his father a Greek.¹⁶ That Timothy was a convert of Paul is further implied by his description as Paul's true born child in the faith. Paul, with recommendation from the other believers, made Timothy part of the missionary team. His ready self-sacrifice and unflinching devotion were deeply appreciated by Paul.

Timothy accompanied Paul and Silas west and north-east through Asia Minor to Troas, where they were joined by Luke. From there they set sail for Macedonia and going inland to Philippi. He returned to join Paul in Corinth, bringing a good report of the Thessalonian Christians' stability and witness, which prompted the sending of 1 Thessalonians. For the greater part of Paul's eighteen months stay in Corinth, and later of his three-year ministry in Ephesus, Timothy appears to have been with him until his last voyage to Judea. After Paul's arrest in Jerusalem we lose sight of Timothy, but he reappears with Paul in Rome. Paul gives Timothy a quite remarkable encomium: "I have no one like him, who will be genuinely anxious for your welfare..."¹⁷

On one occasion Paul gave Timothy a responsible commission

to be fulfilled in the Ephesian church; and later begged him to come to him with all haste. We do not know if Timothy reached Rome in time to see the apostle alive.

Luke, the Beloved Physician

Luke is mentioned three times in Paul's later letters as one of his companions. The most informative of these three comes in Colossians 4:14, "Luke the beloved Physician and Demas greet you." Writing from his place of imprisonment to the Christians of Colossae Paul sends greetings from six men. He names them in two groups of three. Of these-Aristarchus, Mark and Jesus surnamed Justus - he says, "these are the only men of the circumcision among my fellow-workers for the kingdom of God." We conclude, accordingly, that the next three companions mentioned-Epaphras, Luke and Demas-were Gentile Christians. In the letter to Philemon greetings are sent from five of those six "fellow-workers", and Luke is one of them. At a later time, in a passage evidently written on the eve of his execution, Paul says, "Luke alone is with me."

Luke played a much more important part in the New Testament than those brief references would indicate: he was responsible for two of the most important documents in the New Testament: the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles-which together make up a valuable history of Christian origins. He joined Paul, Silas and Timothy at Troas in A.D. 50 and traveled with them to Philippi, and he sailed with them to Caesarea and completed the journey to Jerusalem. Perhaps he remained in Philippi during the interval of seven years between the first and second "we" passages; it

is even conceivable that he is the "true yoke-fellow" whom Paul asks in Phil.4:3 to lend a helping hand to Euodia and Syntyche.¹⁸

If Luke was a Gentile, then he was probably the only Gentile among the writers of the New Testament (indeed, of the whole Bible). It would not be surprising to learn that, before he became a Christian, he was a "God-fearer."¹⁹

Titus

Titus is mentioned only occasionally in the letters of Paul, but it is plain that he was a member of the circle who enjoyed Paul's confidence and appreciation in an exceptional degree. In Galatians 2:1 Paul says that he "went up...to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus along." Titus himself was a Greek, and probably one of Paul's converts.²⁰

But why did they take Titus with them? Since the evangelism of Gentiles was under discussion, perhaps they judged it appropriate to have a representative Gentile convert with them. Luther suggested that Titus was taken along as a test case, "to prove that grace was equally sufficient for Gentiles and Jews, whether in circumcision or without circumcision."²¹ When Titus next appears, several years have elapsed. He is still in Paul's company, the kind of man whom the apostle could entrust with delicate commissions.

It is evident from the Corinthian correspondence that relations between Paul and the church of Corinth were far from smooth.²² And he sent Titus across the Aegean to Corinth, with instructions to him to come back and report as soon as possible. Later Paul went to Troas in hope that he would meet Titus there.

In Troas there was a wide open field for missionary activity, but Paul was too unsettled in mind to take proper advantage of it. His hope was realized later: The news was good. His letter had been completely effective. Indeed the Corinthians were loyal to Paul, Titus reported.

The Corinthians had expressed their interest of contributions for the relief fund which Paul had been organizing. In the present atmosphere of reconciliation he could take it up again, and who could be better a messenger than Titus? So he sent Titus to Corinth in the hope that as he had done so well with one work of grace (the mission of reconciliation), so he might be equally successful with another-the grace of generosity.

Why is there no mention of Titus in Acts? We do not know. There is, for that matter, no mention of Luke himself; but that could be due to the author's modesty. Besides, Titus plays a more responsible part in Paul's letters than Luke does, so that his absence from Acts is the more surprising. It has been suggested by some students that Titus and Luke were brothers.²³ But if Luke was the brother who accompanied Titus to Corinth to help in administering the Jerusalem relief fund, then a blood-relationship can be ruled out.

We must remain ignorant of such that we should like to know; but we can be grateful for what we do know about Titus: a fine example of Christian integrity and responsible service in circle of Paul's friends.

The Team and Controversial Issues(Acts 15:1-35)

The Jerusalem Council is the name most frequently given to

the church conference described in Acts 15. Luke describes the event which triggered the convening of the Council (15:1-5), the Council itself (15:6-21) and the after-effects of the Council (15:22-16:5).

Resolution of the question concerning the basis on which Gentiles could be accepted into the church was essential. It was a sensitive issue and might have remained unresolved indefinitely. However, when brethren from Judea came to cosmopolitan Antioch and taught that Gentiles could not be saved without observing the cultic requirements of Judaism, a confrontation was triggered between the champions of the circumcision party and the Antioch church leaders. This crisis served as the specific event which led to the calling of the Jerusalem council. The other side of the story is that when Peter first came to Antioch, he ate freely with Gentile Christians; his experience on the roof of Simon's house at Joppa and in the house of Cornelius at Caesarea had taught him not to "call any man common or unclean."²⁴ But when the Judeans arrived and expressed their view point so dogmatically, he withdrew from Gentile society and sat at a table with circumcised persons only. No doubt he believed he was doing so in order to conciliate the consciences of his "weaker" Judean brethren. But his example was bound to have a disastrous effect on others; it would, unless checked, endanger the whole principle of Christian unity. Even Barnabas was induced to follow Peter's example. Paul saw quite clearly the concession in the matter of table fellowship was bound, in the long run, to compromise the basic Gospel principle that salvation was the gift of God's grace

in Christ, to be received by faith alone. Refusal to have table fellowship with Gentiles would soon be followed by refusal to admit them to church membership or indeed to recognize them as Christians at all. No wonder, then, that Paul "resisted him to the face." Happily, Peter seems to have taken the rebuke in good faith; we hear no more of such untimely appeasement on his side.

But the trouble was not confined to Antioch; it spread to the young churches of South Galatia. These churches were visited by Judaizers who urged upon them that their faith in Jesus as Lord required to be supplemented by circumcision and observance of the Jewish ceremonial law. When news of this came to Paul at Antioch, he wrote his epistle to the Galatians in urgency, beseeching these recent converts not to be seduced from Christian simplicity by a totally different Gospel which in reality was not a Gospel at all. We may reconstruct Paul's approach to them by reading the book of Galatians, which was either written during this time or shortly after the Jerusalem council.

The leaders and other members of the church of Jerusalem listened with great interest to Paul and Barnabas' account of all "that God had done through them," but this interest by no means involved wholehearted satisfaction. Dissatisfaction was voiced in particular by those members of the Jerusalem church who were associated with the pharisaic party. These Christian Pharisees, then, were the leaders in insisting that Gentile converts should be instructed to submit to circumcision and the general obligation to keep the Mosaic Law which that rite carried with it.

While "the apostles and the elders were gathered together" as the responsible leaders of the Jerusalem church, to deliberate

with the Antiochene representatives, it appears from verses 12 ("all the multitude") and 22 ("the whole church") that other members of the Jerusalem church were present as well.

Acts 15:5-35 shows us six steps followed by the church leaders who are in team in solving the problem which threatened to divide the church. The first step in solving a church problem is to clearly define it. The apostles and elders met and had a full discussion on the issue. "After much discussion" (v.7) indicates that perhaps quite a number of persons presented their view points. The second step followed by the council in solving the problem was to have a full and open discussion on the issue. Peter, after much discussion, stood and recounted the experience that God had given him and the whole church in the conversion of Cornelius. God attested his salvation not through circumcision, but through the giving of the Holy Spirit. The conclusion may therefore be drawn from experience that the person who seeks to be saved by the law cannot even keep it, and God has shown through Cornelius that salvation comes by His Grace. Following Peter's address, Barnabas and Paul also tell about what God has done among the Gentiles through them. The supernatural element in their ministry among the Gentiles undoubtedly served to vindicate their mission and to indicate God's approval.

The third step in solving a church problem is to hear the experiences of persons whom God is clearly leading. On such occasions it is a time for others to keep silence,²⁵ for one's theories must yield to God's revelation. The eyes of all now turned to James, the brother of the Lord, a man who enjoyed wide-

spread respect and confidence. Whether he was counted an apostle or not is not quite clear from Galatians 1:9. Although not one of the Twelve, and indeed not a believer until the resurrection, he had apostolic qualifications as a witness of the risen Christ. The church's readiness to recognize his leadership was due more to his personal character and record than to his blood relationship to the Lord. When he said "listen to me" they listened. James began by summarizing Peter's speech. No mention is made of the report which Barnabas and Paul had just given. This indeed may have been politic: James wanted to carry a difficult audience with him, and it was the activity of Barnabas and Paul that had created the situation which roused such apprehension in the minds of the Jerusalem rank and file. James's speech has been recognized as taking the form known to the rabbis as a response, in which an appeal is made to Scripture as confirming what has been said or done already and what is about to be decided.²⁶ Therefore, James closed the debate by showing how the Scriptures substantiated the testimony of Peter.

The fourth step in solving a church problem is the application of the work of God to the situation. Once experience and Scripture have pointed the way to the right conclusion, care must be taken lest a stumbling-block be placed before those who may be on "the losing side." The decision had been reached: "whom God receives, let not the church reject." However, the Gentiles were asked, as a matter of love, not salvation, to refrain from making an exhibition of their liberty in areas where Jewish believers had questions of conscience. Four restrictions are given to the Gentile believers. Three pertain to eating (food previously

offered to idols, things strangled, blood). Because Jewish and Gentile believers were to share meals together, these considerations were important to observe lest meal times become dominated by hard feelings. The call to abstain from fornication is an ethical requirement. As F.F. Bruce notes,²⁷ this ethical requirement was included to respect the Jewish brethren's moral scruples by recommending that Gentiles conform to the high Jewish code of relations between the sexes instead of remaining content with the lower pagan standards to which they had been accustomed.

A fifth step in solving the dispute is: separate the major issues (on which there can be no compromise) from the minor issues (on which there can be compromise). When a decision is reached, both the deliberation process and the conclusion should be made known. The result of the council must not be left in doubt, nor should people go away thinking that no definite action was taken.

A sixth step in solving a church problem is this: clearly communicate the decision reached. The decision of the Jerusalem Council was communicated by letter and confirmed by personal representatives to the Gentile believers in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. Complimentary remarks concerning Paul and Barnabas (who were well-known among the Gentiles)²⁸ were made in the letter.

The Gentiles could rejoice at the Jerusalem council's decision. The leadership of the Jerusalem church and probably most of the church members were completely satisfied with the results. Recognizing that they were moving forward with God they could thus write: "it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us."

However, some of the members of the circumcision party continued to press their point in spite of the council decision. When a losing faction is shown to be clearly wrong and it continues to persist in its view against the exhortations and commands of the church and its leadership, then such persons are to be firmly rebuked and the church is to refuse to have anything further to do with them.

The Team Leadership and Division (Acts 15:36-41)

It would have been a debatable point in the early church whether Barnabas belonged to the Pauline circle or (as some would have hotly contended) Paul belonged rather to the circle of Barnabas. "But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the Apostles," and told them how Paul had already given proof of the genuineness of his conversion. This implies some prior knowledge of Paul on the part of Barnabas; it also shows what confidence the apostles had in Barnabas.

Barnabas, in fact is a man of whom nothing but good is reported: Luke sums up his character by saying, "he was a good man."²⁹ He first appears as a generous donor of a piece of land, to the common pool. Luke tells us that, "the son of encouragement", was the sobriquet given him by the apostles. Both Paul and the Jerusalem church leaders benefited greatly by his encouragement on the occasion when he brought them together. Barnabas' next appearance brings him to Antioch. When the preaching of some of his countrymen resulted in a movement toward Christianity among the Greeks at Antioch, Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem to give this movement encouragement and direction.

After he saw the impact of the Gospel, he rejoiced to see

such abounding evidence of the grace of God at work. So he settled in Antioch and gave the new believers the leadership they needed. As the ministry was expanding, he made a journey to Tarsus, found Paul, and persuaded him to go back with him to Antioch and build a team ministry.

It was Barnabas and Paul whom the young, and predominantly Gentile, church of Antioch chose to carry its gift of money to their fellow-believers in Jerusalem when Judea was hard hit by a famine.³⁰ It was perhaps in the course of this visit that the three Jerusalem "Pillars" (James the Lord's brother, Peter and John) agreed that Barnabas and Paul were as truly called by God to the evangelization of Gentiles as they themselves were to the evangelization of their fellow-Jews. Not long after their return to Antioch, the church there was divinely directed to release Barnabas and Paul for missionary service farther afield. Accompanied by John Mark, they proceeded upon what is ordinarily known as the "first missionary journey" of Paul. Barnabas as well as Paul is designated "an apostle." Up until Acts 13:43, the precedence is always ascribed to Barnabas; from that point, except in Acts 14:14 and 15:12,25, we read "Paul and Barnabas" instead of "Barnabas and Saul." Paul became the chief spokesman within the team.

When "even Barnabas" joined the other Jewish Christians who followed Peter's example of seating Jews and Gentiles at separate tables,³¹ Paul decided that a severe protest was called for. We may be sure that Peter and Barnabas felt they had good reasons for what they did-respecting the conscientious scruples of their

weaker Judaeans brethren, perhaps, but we do not have their side of the story. In retrospect we can conclude that Paul was right to protest, but the issue may not have been so clear at the time.

Luke says nothing of this dispute, but it is probable that if Paul had not lost confidence in Barnabas then, the dispute which arose between them shortly afterwards, when Paul turned down Barnabas' proposal to take Mark along again on a return visit which they planned to pay to the churches of South Galatia, would not have been so bitter.

We do not know the specific reasons why John Mark left Paul and Barnabas at Perga. We do know that Paul interpreted Mark's departure as desertion. This was the basis of his later decision to refuse to take John Mark on the second missionary journey. And this resulted in the breakup of Paul and Barnabas' missionary association, since Barnabas wanted to give his younger cousin another chance. When the three-man first team set out for Cyprus, Barnabas led it. By the time they went through the Island of Cyprus, it was no longer "Barnabas and Saul", but "Paul and his companions." Note that Acts 13:13 states he returned to Jerusalem, rather than the starting place, Antioch. Other reasons advanced for Mark's departure include the possibility of a disagreement with Paul over the direction the team was traveling; fear of the bandit-ridden mountains and swollen torrential streams which lay between Pergea and Antioch of Pisidia; discouragement from the apparent lack of success in founding churches in the first few months of the missionary endeavour; or even loss of confidence in God's calling arising out of an apparent lack of results because of Paul's sickness.³²

Barnabas and Paul had known one another for over fifteen years. They had worked together closely and had been leaders in bringing the Gospel to the Gentiles, a historic step, for perhaps seven years. Now their fruitful partnership or team leadership is dissolved over the question of John Mark. Luke records the separation without attaching blame. The events of apostolic history would have proved both men to be right. The second missionary journey would have been too severe a test for John Mark. Paul was right! But, John Mark did have potential and should not have been written off because of one failure. Barnabas was right!

No doubt the Antioch church members were grieved because of the sharp disagreement, but we read nothing of division in the church as a result of this problem. This church may have had the spiritual maturity to uphold its leaders in prayers. Had this dispute affected the welfare of the church, Barnabas and Paul would have found a solution. They were not the kind of leaders to enlist people in their own personal disagreements.

The following observation could be made on how God worked good in the separation of Barnabas and Paul: Paul chose a new companion, Silas. Silas's Roman citizenship would prove an important asset on this trip.³³ There might not have been room for Timothy and Luke if Barnabas and Mark had already been on the team. It actually means that in God's divine providence the team multiplied. Under the "son of encouragement" Mark would recover from his earlier failure and realize that God could use a man who had failed at first. In salvaging John Mark, Barnabas became the

spiritual father of all those who have begun and failed. Because of Barnabas' faith in his cousin, we have Mark's Gospel. If Mark had not been ready for the dangers of the first missionary journey, he certainly would have fainted under the stress of the second. The choice of Cyprus provided an earlier setting for Mark to find his place of ministry and gain back his courage and confidence. Paul later realized that Mark had overcome the trait of a deserter and found him useful. In fact, he asked him to come to Rome at a time when Christian leaders feared for their lives.

END NOTES

- 1
Ac.24:5,14; also Ac.9:2; 16:17; 18:25-26; 19:9, 23;
22:4; 24:22; 11:26; 26:28.
- 2
Ac.1:4-8:3; 8:4-12-25; 13:1-28:31; 1:4-8:3; 28:28.
- 3
Ac.2:46; 5:12; 1:4-8:3; 7:47-50.
- 4
Ac.1:4,5,8;9:4-6;22:6-8;26:14-18;18:9;23:11.
- 5
Ac.1:4-8:3; 2:42; 4:34-35;6:1-6.
- 6
Ac.5:11,6:2; Lk.6:14; Ac.1:13;5:15;1:15-22;
2:14-36;3:11-26;4:8-12;10:34-43; 8:14.
- 7
Lk.7:3;9:22;20:1;22:52,66; Ac.4:5,8,23;
6:12; 23:14; 25:15.
- 8
Ac.14:23;20:17;15:2,4,6,22,23;16:4.
- 9
Ac.15:23; 16:4; 12:3,6-1117.
- 10
Ac.16:3; 17:15.
- 11
Ac.12:17; 9:27.
- 12
Matt.17:1-8;10:2;20:20;26:37; Mk.5:37; Ac.8:14;
Gal.2:9(with different James); Matt.10:2-4; Mk.3:16-19; Lk.6:13-
16; Ac.1:13; Matt.16:13-20; Mk.14:33; Matt.26:37.
- 13
David A. Carson, Matthew(Grand Rapids, Michigan:
Zondervan Publishing House, 1984),vol.8, The Expositor's Bible
Commentary, by Frank E. Gaeblein, 237.
- 14
Matt.19:28; Lk.22:29; Ac.12:2; Gal.2:9.
- 15
Ac.16:37-38; H. J. Cadbury, "'We' and 'I' Passages
in Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies (New York: Cambridge Univer-
sity Press, 1957),3:128-132.
- 16
2Tim.1:5; Ac.16:1; 1Tim.1:2.
- 17
Phil.2:20-22; 1Tim.1:3; 2Tim.4:6-12; Heb.13:23.
J. D. Legg, "Our Brother Timothy", Evangelical Quarterly 40
(1968), 220-23; Col.4:11; 2Tim.4:11; Ac.16:10-18.
- 18
F.F. Bruce, Good News Commentary on Philippians
(San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 113-115.

- 19
A.T. Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the God-Fear-
ers", Numen 28(1981), 113-126; M. Wilcox, "God-fearers in Acts",
Journal for the Study of the New Testament 13(Sheffield, England:
Sheffield University Press,1981), 102-122.
- 20
In Tit. 1:3 he is addressed, like Timothy in
1Tim.1:2, as Paul's "true-born child".
- 21
In his first lecture-course on Galatians, 1516-
17.see F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Galatians (Exeter: U.K. :
Paternoster, 1982), 107; Gal. 2:3.
- 22
2Cor.2:4; Ac.20:6-12; 2Cor.1:23-2:13; 1Cor. 16:1-
4; 2Cor.8:6, 18.
- 23
See A. Souter, "A Suggested Relationship between
Titus and Luke", Expository Times 18(1906-7), 285; Ibid., "The
Relationship between Titus and Luke", Ibid., 335. See also C.K.
Barrett, "Titus", in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in
Honor of Matthew Black, ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (T. & T.
Clark, 1969), 1-14.
- 24
Ac.10:28; Gal.2:11; 5:3.
- 25
Ac.15:12; 1Cor.15:7; Ac.15:13; Jas. 2:5; J. B.
Mayor, The Epistle of St. James (London: n.p., 1987), iii-iv has
enumerated what he calls "remarkable agreements" between this
speech and the letter of James.
- 26
A response is made to the request *yelammedēnū*
rabbēnū, "let our teacher instruct us." See J. W. Bowker,
"Speeches in Acts: A study in poem and yelammeden form", New
Testament Studies 14(1967-68), 96-111(especially pp. 107-9).
- 27
F.F. Bruce, The Book of Acts, rev. ed. New Interna-
tional Commentary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan:
WB. Eerdmans Pub. Company, 1955), 311.
- 28
Ac.15:25- "we all agreed"; Ac.15:28; Gal.5:1-11;
Phil.3:2; Rom.16:17; 2Thess. 3:14; Tit.3:10.
- 29
Ac.11:24,21.
- 30
Ac.11:30; 13:3; 14:14; Gal.2:1-10.
- 31
Gal.2:11-14; Ac.15:31; Ac.13:2 with 13:13 and Col.
4:10.
- 32
Gal.4:13-14.
- 33
Ac.16:3,10,37;13:13; Col. 4:10; Ac.4:36;
2Tim. 4:11.

Discord and Conflict

With alarming regularity congregations quibble, quarrel, and divide. Church leaders typically spend a disproportionate share of their time in conflict management often with only limited success. One of the primary tasks of leaders is to promote a spirit of cohesiveness and fellowship throughout the Church. Church division and discord between any two individual members or leader is injurious to the cause of Christ. Whenever there is disunity in the church, leadership must examine itself to see where it has failed in its fundamental responsibility.

Brief Pastorates and Burnout

Conversely, some pastors behave inappropriately, particularly in their leadership efforts, and bring trouble upon themselves. Even when their personal integrity, devotion to Christ, and ministerial calling remain unquestioned, these pastors often come to doubt the viability of pastoral ministry. Another fact of deficiency in leadership is burnout. John Sanford writes, burnout is a word we use when a person has become exhausted with his or her profession or life activity."¹ And R.M. Healey reported surveys that indicate that many ministers are "leading lives of unquiet desperation."² This is evidently seen in the leaders' family crisis, brief pastorates, and leadership ministries, and communication break-down. Numerous anointed leaders have quit ministry altogether.

Lack of Accountability

There had been a severe tension between the pastors/clergy and the elders of churches in Ethiopia. Pastors/clergymen have tried to monopolize ministries, rather than multiply them by

CHAPTER 4

SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE ETHIOPIAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH AND CONCLUSIONEvidences of Leadership Crisis

There are number of major indications that churches suffer from inadequate spiritual leadership in Ethiopia. A number of symptoms suggest deficient leadership in the Ethiopian evangelical church. The writer would like to mention some of them.

Absence of Character Formation

A great number of churches fail to influence their communities, witness persuasively, and grow in terms of character formation. Poor leadership is not the sole cause of stagnation in these churches, but it is surely a significant factor in many of them. Spiritual vitality or effectiveness of ministry should not be confused with church size. Some leaders preside over spectacular numerical growth, but they sometimes fail in other, more crucial dimensions of ministry, such as character-formation. Many church leaders in Ethiopia fail to see that Godliness precedes ministerial activities and busy schedules, and effectiveness in the Kingdom of God. There is a lack of disciplined personal devotional life, and balance between private life and public performance. This has brought several questions to the genuinity and integrity of leadership in the Ethiopian evangelical church.

encouraging others to use their gifts. On the other hand, there has also been a dominance of elders over the pastors/clergy. This has brought tension, strife and unhealthy division in the church. There is no way of accountability either to God or to each other among the leaders. It robs both laity and clergy of their God-intended roles, causes pastor breakdowns, weakens the church and hinders the spread of the Gospel.

On the basis of the above leadership crisis, the writer would like to make the following recommendations:

There is a need for leadership development

It must be affirmed that an important assumption that underlies this study is that the condition of the evangelical church in Ethiopia is affected by the level of maturity of its leaders. In order for churches to remain healthy, growing and multiplying they must have relevant, viable programs of leadership training. There is a great need for training leaders in the area of developing a team-spirit and leadership, and having a wider perspective of Biblical leadership in terms of its functional role in the church in Ethiopia. Biblically, leadership is created in a space: a space for people to grow, take risks, be creative, take initiatives, and learn by their mistakes. Jesus considered His disciples capable of handling the challenges around them. He had demonstrated for them how to serve those around them and had delivered the example of His leadership. As He embarked on His third general tour of Galilee, Jesus evidently decided that the time had come for the disciples to become in-

involved in teaching and ministry. It was, therefore, time for the disciples to put into practice the lessons they had seen and heard their leader and teacher express in word and deed.

There was a research project done by the church and para-church organizations in Ethiopia on the area of urban ministries in collaboration with Dr. Roy Bakke, the Urban Ministry Strategist. Part of the findings was presented during the consultation conference of "The Nation for the Gospel, and the Gospel for the Nation" which 1,500 leaders attended on February 22-25, 1994. According to the data collected the number of evangelical Christians who are going to live in urban centers in 1998 will be 324,387 as compared to 86,736 of 1984. The growth of the church numerically will definitely bring its challenges and problems. There is a great need of leadership development.

Biblical Models for Church Leadership Training

We noted that the Bible does not give us a precise description of the form of leadership. The writers of Scripture were primarily interested in demonstrating the functions performed by the leadership of the early Church. Functions are universal; but the forms through which these functions are expressed vary.

First, Jesus' training of His disciples is in-service training. The learning took place through precept and imitation. Jesus' disciples were able to internalize new learning to the extent that they could incorporate them into their experience and practice. Jesus' teaching was event and people oriented rather than information centered. Wiseman says, "Leadership is a process-a relationship between two or more persons... for the attain-

ment of common goals..."¹ Coleman adds, "knowledge was not communicated by the master in terms of laws and dogmas, but in the living personality of one who walked among them."² In other words, His disciples were distinguished not by outward conformity to certain rituals, but by being with Him, and there by participating in His doctrine. As Coleman has expressed it, "Knowledge was gained by association before it was understood by explanation."³

Second, in many instances, heads of households were trained while involved in the actual experiences of leading and encouraging the Christians who met to worship in their homes. In fact, in the pastoral Epistles, the qualification for a church leader is his ability to manage his own family well. The context within which Timothy is to exercise his leadership is the context of the family. The church is to be a family of families and its leadership appropriate for families. This leadership is plural. We find Timothy called to appoint elders, to be a leadership team.

Third, another type of training is the Paul-Timothy relationship. Personal relationship between teacher and learner was stressed. Much learning would have taken place through precept and imitation. This training, whether formal or informal, always emphasized the experience oriented approach to learning over against predominantly intellectual approach.

Fourth, in summary, there are three methods of training leaders: formal (Bible Schools, Colleges, and Seminaries) ; non-formal (short trainings, retreats, symposiums, panel discussions, leadership institutes) ; and informal (mentoring and modeling,

delegating, life-impartment and deliberate effort of developing godly leaders). We need to combine them in a proper balance. The balance between knowledge, practical experience and spiritual growth must characterize our training models. Education and training should include life-impartment more than mere transferring of facts.

Leadership With Integrity Needed

Developing godly leadership in the decades ahead is of critical importance for the Ethiopian evangelical church. God develops leaders over a life-time. Too many Christian leaders lack credibility, because of the gap between their platform hype and public performance. And public leaders are under constant scrutiny. Therefore, personal spiritual formation must take a higher priority in leaders' thinking in the coming decades. Four practical steps can help us take discernible strides in our own character development. The Biblical record in the Gospels supports that Jesus aimed at character formation and service in His own course of leadership. The excellence of His leadership and the example of His life was building, shaping, and developing their character.

Developmental Focus

Leaders of the Ethiopian evangelical church need to focus on developing their own spiritual growth. The obvious priority needs to shift to character formation. A crucial Biblical principle evident in the lives of Moses, Nehemiah, Jesus and Paul, to mention a few, is that being precedes doing. In each case, God

was more concerned with their character development than their ministry contribution. Godliness precedes long-term effectiveness in the work of the Kingdom. As we take time to go deeper with God, He will broaden the scope of our influence.

If we are facing the realities of this leadership challenge of the 90's in Ethiopia we must ask ourselves some crucial questions. How do I see myself? Am I growing as I should? What are my plans for growth and development in the spiritual, mental, physical and professional areas? What time have I set aside as a developmental focus on my own life?

The higher our view of the Bible, the more painstaking and conscientious our study of it should be. If this book is indeed the Word of God, then away with slovenly, slipshod exegesis! We have to make time to penetrate the text until it yields up its treasures. Only when we have ourselves absorbed its message, can we confidently share it with others. Our Bible study should have at least three characteristics. First, it must be comprehensive. Sporadic and haphazard dipping into the Scriptures is not enough. Nor must we limit ourselves to our favorite passages, or concentrate on the microscopic examination of a few key texts. Every heresy is due to an overemphasis upon some truth, without allowing other truths to qualify and balance it. Biblical induction is the only safe way to begin theology, that is, moving from a wide variety of particular texts to general conclusions. If we hope to help our congregation to develop a Christian mind, we have to develop one ourselves. And the only way to do this is to soak our mind in the Scriptures. Secondly, if our study of the

ible must be comprehensive, it must also be open-minded. That is, we must genuinely desire through our Bible reading to hear and heed God's Word without distorting its meaning or avoiding its challenge. Thirdly, our Bible study needs to be expectant. It is this spirit of eager and determined expectation which God honors. So we must not give in to spiritual staleness as if it were normal or even tolerable, but must pray for the refreshment of the Holy Spirit so that, if our appetite is blunt He will sharpen it, and if our heart is cold he will rekindle within us the fires of expectancy.

Relationship Focus

Leaders need to have strong personal relationships in order to have effective on-going ministry. Leaders and emerging Christian lay persons are starved for meaningful personal, supportive relationships. The lack of personal supportive relationships is a major cause of stress. There is a great need of creating networks among leaders. Leadership that lasts must ask some important relationship questions. Do I have supportive relationships within the church? Am I in a network of relationships that are helping me grow and mature as I should? As has been shown, the first chapters of Deuteronomy offer some of the significant realities of Moses' leadership and makes it clear that those who lead should be willing to share responsibility with others. Jeremiah also wisely worked through local leaders whenever possible, divided the work force into manageable units, and motivated the laborers to protect their personal interests, their homes, families, and sources of income.

Accountability Focus

Leaders need accountability relationships if they are to grow and survive the leadership challenges. A leading contribution to failure is lack of meaningful accountability in one's personal, ministry or business life. Accountability comes through a godly character of a person who knows that he is accountable primarily to God, and then to fellow-leaders and the community at large. And we who are already in leadership must model it first! We should ask the following strategic questions: How is accountability built into my life? What personal accountability do I have? How do I develop a godly character and ministry which is accountable to God and the Christian community? Learning, to the inner circle of disciples of Jesus, was all about relationship. For the disciples, leadership was being like Jesus and being accountable to each other.

Servant Leadership

As we have observed from the study of the Old and New Testament leadership is not a synonym for lordship. When we carefully study the New Testament, we find that our Lord Jesus Christ sets forth the Servant-Leadership model in both word and deed. He taught His disciples what sort of leaders they should aspire to become. First He referred to the style of contemporary leadership in the World, which (then and now) was concerned with status, domination and control. This style He firmly rejected, and insisted instead, that Christian leadership must be characterized by humble service. Furthermore, Osei-Mensah says that,

"humble service to one another out of love for God is the mark and dignity of the true disciple."⁴ Our calling is to be servants not bosses, slaves not masters. True, a certain authority attaches to all leaders, and leadership would be impossible without it. The apostles were given authority by Jesus, and exercised it in both teaching and disciplining the church. Even Christian leaders today, although they are not apostles and do not possess apostolic authority, are to be "respected" because of their position "over" the congregation, and even "obeyed."¹⁵² Yet the emphasis of Jesus was not on the authority of a ruler-leader but on the humility of a servant-leader. The authority by which the Christian leader leads is not power but love, not force but example, not coercion but reasoned persuasion. Leaders have power, but power is safe only in the hands of those who humble themselves to serve.

What is the reason for Jesus' stress on the leader's service? Partly, no doubt, because the chief occupational hazard of leadership is pride. The pharisaic model would not do in the new community Jesus was building. The pharisees loved deferential titles like "Father", "Teacher", "Rabbi", but this was both an offense against God to whom these titles properly belong, and disruptive of the Christian brotherhood. Jesus' main reason for emphasizing the servant role of the leader, however, was surely that the service of others is a tacit recognition of their value. Manson expressed the difference by saying, "In the Kingdom of God service is not a stepping-stone to nobility: it is nobility, the only kind of nobility that is recognized."⁶ If human beings are made in the image of God, then they must be served not exploited,

respected not manipulated. As Sanders has expressed it, "true greatness, true leadership is achieved not by reducing men to one's service but in giving oneself in selfless service to them."⁷ Here also lies the peril of seeing leadership in terms of projects and ministry activities. Leadership will inevitably involve the development of these, but people take precedence over projects. And people must be neither manipulated nor even managed.

So Christian leaders serve, indeed serve not their own interests but rather the interests of others. This simple principle should deliver the leader from excessive individualism, extreme isolation and self-centered empire-building. For those who serve others serve best in a team. Paul had developed a team leadership as the ministry expanded gradually. We can see the art of delegation and accountability in Paul's leadership. Leadership teams are more healthy than solo leadership, for several reasons. First, team members supplement one another, building on one another's strengths and compensating for one another's weakness. No leader has all the gifts, so no leader should keep all the reigns of leadership in his own hands. Secondly, team members encourage one another, identifying each other's gifts and motivating each other to develop and use them. Thirdly, team members are accountable to one another. Shared work means shared responsibility. Then we listen to one another and learn from one another.

In all this Christian emphasis on service, the disciple is only seeking to follow and reflect his Teacher. For though He

was Lord of all, Jesus became the Servant of all. Now He tells us to do as He did, to clothe ourselves with humility, and in love to serve one another. No leadership is authentically Christlike which is not marked by the spirit of humble and joyful service.

Conclusion

In the secular World, research in the field of leadership is confusing, ambiguous, and, frequently, contradictory. Hence, the study of leadership can be a frustrating endeavor. Ralph Stogdill exhaustively surveyed the voluminous research on leadership and concluded, "The endless accumulation of empirical data⁸ has not produced an integrated understanding of leadership." Michael Lonbardo and Morgan McCall, Jr., concluded that students of leadership have discovered "1) the number of unintegrated models, theories, prescriptions, and conceptual schemes of leadership is mind-boggling; 2) much of the literature is fragmentary, trivial, unrealistic, or dull, and 3) the research results are characterized by Type III errors (solving the wrong problem⁹ precisely) and by contradictions." In the light of such damaging admissions, how can we generalize, much less specify, the essential requirements for effective church leaders?

Despite the mass of confusing data in the secular world, the most conspicuous and proven fact is that effective leadership depends upon integrity, the leader's character as perceived by followers, which is based on the Biblical account for leaders. The Bible describes in detail the impeccable personal characteristics necessary for spiritual leadership. Unless leaders are

perceived to be people of outstanding integrity they cannot lead for long. If they lack integrity, leaders will be revealed eventually for what they really are: manipulators and power grabbers. They will be rejected by followers. There are those who seem to defy this rule for a time, but inevitably their power over followers degenerates to some form of coercion; it is not genuine leadership.

The Ethiopian evangelical church must put a primary emphasis on the Scriptural qualifications for spiritual leadership. Leaders who are spiritually authentic, blameless, mature, congenial, and compassionate with a servant heart must be recruited, trained, appointed, and invested with proper authority. Without leaders characterized by spiritual and personal integrity, true, enduring effectiveness is impossible in the church. Spiritual leaders were never intended to be authority figures to followers, but fellow workers, servants, and colleagues in the work of the ministry. Leaders in the church exist to facilitate the ministry of the whole body; they are not appointed to dominate or control the body.

The most fundamental leadership need of the church is visible demonstration of Spiritual discipleship. Leaders must be able to say, "This is what it means to be a disciple of Jesus Christ." Spiritual leadership begins with setting an example of "rightness, godliness, faith, love, endurance and gentleness."¹⁰

There is a need of developing a team-leadership. Effective leaders never bring others to submission, but bring them to active participation in the life, maturing, decision making, and

outreach of the church. Therefore, there is no alternative to the promotion of a sense of collegiality, a team-spirit in ministry. The true and genuine leader uses his influence to build a team. Robert Greenleaf puts this concept simply, bluntly, and beautifully: "And if one is to preside over a successful business, one's major talent will need to evolve from being the chief into the builder of the team."¹² For those who serve others serve best in a team. Team members supplement, build, and encourage one another; and they are accountable to one another. This is New Testament Leadership at its best.

END NOTES

- 1 John Sanford, Ministry Burnout (New York: Paulist, 1982), 1.
- 2 R.M. Healey, "The Ministerial Mystique," The Christian Century 91 (1974): 121-25.
- 3 Neil B. Wiseman, Leadership, (Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1979), 27.
- 4 Robert E. Coleman, The Master Plan of Evangelism (Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1964), 38-39. Jn. 18:19; Ac.4:13; Mk.3:14.
- 5 Ibid., 39; 1Tim.3:5; Tit.1:6,7; Mk.10:42-45.
- 6 Gottfried Osei-Mensah, Wanted: Servant-Leaders-The Challenge of Christian Leadership In Africa Today (Achimota, Ghana: Africa Christian Press, 1990), 12.
- 7 1Thess.5:12; Heb.13:17; Matt.23:1-12.
- 8 T. W. Manson, The Church's Ministry (London, U.K.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948), 27.
- 9 J. Oswald Sanders, Spiritual Leadership (Chicago: Moody Press, 1989), 13; Jn.13:14,12-17; 1Pet.5:5.
- 10 Ralph Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership (New York: Free Press, 1974), vii.
- 11 Morgan McCall, Jr. and Michael Londbardo, eds., Leadership: Where else can we go? (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1978), 3.
- 12 1Tim.6:11; see also 1Cor.11:1; 2Thess.3:7.
- 13 Robert Greenleaf, Servant Leadership (New York: Paulist, 1977), 72.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CITED SOURCES: BOOKS

- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, and Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Brown, Colin, gen. ed. The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 4 vol. Exeter, U.K.: The Paternoster Press, 1980.
- Bruce, Alexander Balmain. The Training of The Twelve. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel, 1971.
- Bruce, Frederick F. The Book of Acts. Rev. ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955.
- The Epistle to The Galatians. Exeter, U.K.: Paternoster Press, 1982.
- Good News Commentary on Philipians. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.
- Carson, David A. Matthew. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1989.
- Coleman, Robert E. The Master Plan of Evangelism. Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1964.
- Collins, Raymond F. Studies on The First Letter To The Thessalonians. London: Leuven, 1984.
- Cormack, David. Team Spirit. Eastbourne, U.K.: MARC, 1990.
- Craigie, Peter C. The Book Of Deuteronomy. R.K. Harrison gen. ed. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976.
- Cremer, Hermann. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1895.
- Davies, William David, and Dale C. Allison. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. International Critical Commentary. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

- Engstrom, Ted W. The Making of a Christian Leader. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.
- Foster, Richard J. Celebration of Discipline. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1978.
- Gardner, John. The Nature Of Leadership: Introductory Considerations. Washington: Independent Sector, 1986.
- Graves, Frank Pierreont. What Did Jesus Teach? New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919.
- Haggai, John. Lead On! - Leadership That Endures in a Changing World. Singapore: Word Publishing, 1986.
- Harris, Laird, ed. Theological Wordbook of The Old Testament. Vol. 2. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Hastings, James A. Dictionary Of the Bible. vol.1. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1931.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed. Theological Dictionary of The New Testament. Translated by G.W. Bromiley. 10 Vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida, eds. Greek - English Lexicon of The New Testament Based on Semantic Domains. 2nd. ed. 2 Vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Manson, Thomas Walter. The Church's Ministry. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948.
- Mayor, Joseph B. The Epistle of St. James. London: n.p., 1987.
- McCall, Morgan, Jr. and Michael Lombardo, eds. Leadership: Where Else Can We Go? Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1978.
- Means, James E. Leadership in Christian Ministry. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1989.
- O'Brien, Peter T. The Epistle To The Philippians-A Commentary On The Greek Text. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Pub. Com. 1991.
- Osei-Mensah, Gottfried. Wanted: Servant Leaders - The Challenge of Christian Leadership in Africa Today. Achimota, Ghana: Africa Christian Press, 1990.
- Richardson, Norman E. The Christ Of The Classroom. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.
- Sanders, J. Oswald. Spiritual Leadership. Chicago: Moody Press, 1989.

- Schurer, Emil. A History Of The Jewish People In The Age Of Jesus Christ. 3 Vols. Translated by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. London: T. & T. Clark, 1885.
- Stogdill, Ralph. Handbook Of Leadership. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- Ward, Ted. Biblical Issues in Moral Development. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 1977.
- Wiseman, Neil B. Leadership. Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1979.

CITED SOURCES: ARTICLES

- Arenson, Allen G. "Making Disciples According to Christ's Plan." Evangelical Missions Quarterly 16 (April 1980): 106.
- Barrett, C.K. "Titus." in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black, edited by E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1969.
- Bowker, J.W. "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Peom and Yelammeden Form." New Testament Studies 14(1967-68): 96-111.
- Brown, Colin, ed. NIDNTTvol.1. Exeter, U.K.: The Paternoster Press, 1980. s.v. "Akouloutheo," by C. Blendingen.
- NIDNTTvol.1. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Corporation, 1992. s.v. "Presbyteros," by L. Coenen.
- NIDNTTvol.2. Exeter, U.K.: The Paternoster Press, 1980. s.v. "Krima," by W. Schneider:362.
- NIDNTTvol.2. Exeter, U.K.: The Paternoster Press, 1980. s.v. "Open," by Brown Muller.
- Cadbury, H.J. "'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts." New Testament Studies 3(1957): 128-132.
- Chandapilla, P.T. "How Jesus Trained the Twelve", Evangelical Missions Quarterly 5(Summer 1969): 212.
- Ellis, E. E. and M. Wilcox, eds. Neotestamentica et Seitica: Studies in Honour of Mathew Black. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969. s.v. "Titus," by C.K.Barret.
- Hastings, James, ed. A Dictionary of the Bible. vol.1. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1931. s.v. "Episkopos and Presbyteros," by H.M. Gwatkin.

OTHER SOURCES

- Kingsbury, J.D. "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem." Journal of Biblical Literature 98 (1979): 67-83.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed. TDNTvol.1. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964. s.v. "Akoloutheo," by G. Kittel.
- TDNTvol.2. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Publishing Com., 1964. s.v. "Didasko," by Karl H. Rengstorf.
- TDNTvol.3. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1964. s.v. "Ev," by A. Oepke.
- TDNTvol.3. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1964. s.v. "Kalupto," by A. Oepke.
- TDNTvol.3. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1964. s.v. "Kleis," by J. Jeremias.
- TDNTvol.4. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1964. s.v. "Mathetes," by Karl H. Renstorf.
- TDNTvol.6. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1964. s.v. "Rabbi," by Edward Lohse.
- Kraabel, A.T. "The Disappearance of The God-fearers." Numen 28 (1981): 113-126.
- Legg, J.D. "Our Brother Timothy." Evangelical Quarterly 40 (1968): 220-3).
- Lundstrom, Karl-Johan, Yohannes Irenna, and Knud Jorgensen. Preparatory Study On Leadership Training. Addis Ababa: Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus, 1993.
- Rogers, Cleon. "The Great Commission." Bibliotheca Sacra. 130 (July 1973): 264.
- Souter, A. "A Suggested Relationship Between Titus and Luke," Expository Times 18(1906-7): 285-335.
- Stott, John R.W. "What Makes Leadership Christian?" Christianity Today (August 9, 1985): 26.
- Trakatellis, Demetrios. "Akolouthei Moi/Follow Me...Discipleship and Priesthood." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 30 (Fall 1985): 277.
- Wilcox, M. "God-fearers in Acts." Journal for the Study of the New Testament 13(1981): 102-122.

- Adams, Jay. Pastoral Leadership. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1975.
- Aren, Gustav. Evangelical Pioneers in Ethiopia. Uppsala, Sweden: Offsetcenter ab., 1978.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. ed. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WB.Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- Bennett, David W. Biblical Images For Leaders and Followers. England: Regnum Books, 1993.
- Banks, Robert J. Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Historical Setting. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B.Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.
- Burns, James. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Cedar, Paul A. Strength in Servant Leadership. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987.
- Cole, V.B. "A Paradigm For Training Church Leaders." In Perspectives on Leadership ed. by Ross Gaskin. pp. 32-52. Evangel Press, 1993.
- Dale, Roberts D. Ministers as Leaders. Nashville: Broadman, 1984.
- Pastoral Leadership. Nashville: Abingdon, 1986.
- Erickson, Edwin. Toward Designing a Culturally Relevant Program For The Training of Ethiopian Rural Church Leadership: With Special References To The Eastern Mecha Galla - Microfilm of Typescript. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1973.
- Fleming, Kenneth C. He Humbled Himself: Recovering The Lost Art of Serving. Westchester, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1989.
- Gardner, John W. The Heart of the Matter: Leader-Constituent Interaction. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, 1986.
- Leadership and Power. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, 1986.
- The Moral Aspect of Leadership. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, 1986.
- Greenslade, Philip. Leadership - A Biblical Pattern For Today. London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1984.

- Leadership, Greatness, and Servanthood.
Minneapolis, Minnesota: Bethany House Publishers, 1984.
- Greenleaf, Robert K. Servant Leadership - A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power & Greatness. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Guinness, OS. The Gravedigger File. London: Hodder And Stoughton, 1983.
- Jennings, Eugene. An Anatomy of Leadership. New York: MacGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Kruse, Colin G. New Testament Models of Ministry: Jesus & Paul. Nashville, Tennessee: T.Nelson, 1985.
- Lloyd - Jones, D. Martyn. Authority. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1984.
- Nouwen, Henri J.M. Creative Ministry. New York: Doubleday, 1978.
- Quayle, William A. The Pastor-Preacher. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979.
- Ramm, Bernard. The Pattern of Authority. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Richards, Lawrence O. and Clyde Hoeldtke. A Theology of Church Leadership. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.
- Selznick, Philip. Leadership and Administration. Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press, 1984.
- Smith, Donald. Clergy in the Cross-Fire. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- Southard, Samuel. Pastoral Authority in Personal Relationships. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1969.
- Stabbert, Bruce. The Team Concept: Paul's Church Leadership Patterns or Ours? Tacoma, Washington: Hegg Brothers Printing, 1982.
- Swindoll, Charles. Hand Me Another Brick. Nashville: Nelson Publishing Company, 1978.
- Whitehead, James D. and Evelyn Eaton. The Emerging Laity: Returning Leadership to The Community of Faith. New York: Doubleday, 1986.

APPENDIX

THE FOUNDATION OF EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY IN ETHIOPIA

Ethiopia Opens Itself to Foreign Missions

The Swedish Evangelical Mission (SEM) became interested in sending missionaries to the Oromo people as it had received a letter of recommendation from Krapf in September 1864. The Swedish Evangelical Mission was founded in 1856. Meanwhile, the foreign missionaries in Ethiopia had been put in prison by Atse Tewodros. Bishop Samuel Gobat from Jerusalem wrote a discouraging letter that they should not try Ethiopia, though he had expressed his great interest to reach the Oromo with the Gospel. But Krapf wrote them insisting that they still could reach the Oromo south of the Abbai from Sudan, by passing the civil war in northern Ethiopia under Tewodros in the 1860's. Thus the board of the Swedish Evangelical Mission favored the idea of Krapf and at its annual conference held on June 8, 1865 unanimously approved the enterprise to explore the countries of the Nile and the Red Sea Coast in order to reach the Oromo.

The new venture began on March 15, 1866, when these missionaries arrived at Massawa. When they arrived, they were advised to begin missionary work among the Kunama as the conditions in Ethiopia under Tewodros were not promising at the moment. Here it can be noted that Tewodros' defeat was marked in 1868 when the British force came to get the imprisoned diplomatic

personnel and missionaries released. The SEM three missionaries' stay in the Kunama area became brief; for one of them died, and the other two were killed. So the SEM sent missionaries and started a base at Massawa. The first thing they started was school work at Massawa. Some of the boys who were to be transported through the Egyptian controlled Port of Massawa were later on freed by the Europeans. They were received by the Swedish missionaries and got education in the School. Most of them were Oromos. Among the first two was a young boy Nesib, who was converted and adopted the name Onesimos. He was to become God's most important tool for evangelizing the Oromos. He developed a way of writing his mother tongue in Ethiopic letters and started to translate hymns, catechism and the Bible into the Oromo language. He was assisted by a girl named Aster Ganno. Their translation is still widely used. Besides Onesimos and Aster, others who later carried the Gospel to Western Ethiopia received training there. These schools at Massawa also became the place of the first evangelical congregation in Ethiopia. With the baptism of Onesimos in March 1872 and with the celebration of Holy Communion with him and three Orthodox students on December 1, 1872, Lundahl initiated the mother congregation for the Evangelical church of Eritrea and the Mekane Yesus church. Under the name "Bethel Congregation", it grew continually.

Another development was to be of great importance for both the future of the Evangelical church of Eritrea and the later Mekane Yesus church. Much to their surprise, the Swedish missionary, Lager, met a group of Orthodox Bible readers in Tseazega in Hamasen (north of Asmara). They were familiar with the Bible

since the pilgrim missionary, Flad, had left quite a number of Bibles for distribution in Tseazega. The movement of Bible readers grew, supported by Lager and other missionaries. Several Orthodox priests belonged to it. Persistent difficulties with their church, and persecution from the officials, led many of them to seek close contact with the SEM. Some of the Orthodox reformers became teachers and evangelists for the mission in Eritrea, while others stayed on to serve in the Orthodox church. These believers and their congregations joined hands with the Swedish missionaries and the Bethel Congregation in their efforts to reach the Oromo. Several of the believers volunteered and went out as missionaries to Wollega.

The efforts done by the SEM could be divided into five expeditions. The "First Expedition" (1877-1884) was done by Niguse Tashu because of his going to Jimma. Niguse was a trader from Gonder who attended the school at Massawa for some months in 1877. He had been so deeply moved by the Gospel given to him earlier that he came to attend the boys' school though he was then 40 years old. After he arrived at Jimma, he was appointed to be a secretary of Abba Jifar and he also got a chance to tell the Gospel to the king himself. But the king stuck to his Muslim faith. Niguse was only permitted to continue teaching on his own land. In 1895 it was reported that his small community counted about 60 persons. He continued this ministry until his death in 1920, supported by his son. It was a remarkable first step in a series of attempts to reach the Oromo people to whom the Swedish missionaries felt to be called.

In the "Second Expedition" (1881-1882) which started in 1881, there were five men who took part: two Swedes and three Ethiopians. It was led by Rev. Gustaf E. Arrhenius, and the three Ethiopians were Onesimos who had just come back from Sweden and Filipos who both were Oromo and the third person was Hailu who was from the highlands and had volunteered to go with Niguse Tashu, in the first expedition to Jimma. Their aim was: to reach the Oromos by going around the Abyssinian territories through Egyptian controlled land. The expedition was not successful because of misleading advice. They lost two of their group, Filipos and Arrhenius, during the expedition. Onesimos also suffered a lot from illness on the way back.

The "Third Expedition" (1884-1886) to Jimma was undertaken in 1884, this time through Showa. First, oral permission was secured from king Menelik of Showa to pass through his kingdom. The missionaries were two Swedish and three Ethiopians (Onesimos and his wife Mehret and another young Oromo man of 28 years-Ibsa). But later Menelik refused them passage and ordered their immediate return to Massawa. Because it was the time when the Emperor Yohannes IV tried to purge the Orthodox church and to impose only the Tewahido on all the country. A new bishop Mateos (1881-1926) implemented this policy in Showa which was also directed against all foreign influences. Menelik was afraid to break the strict religious policy of Emperor Yohannes who had banished all missionaries from northern Ethiopia.

The "Fourth Expedition" (1893-1895) was that in December 1893 a small party arrived at Lamu (Kenya), with Cederqvist as the leader. He was ordained as a pastor in 1885. He had also

taken some training in medicine before sailing to Africa. The group soon realized that it was impossible to penetrate Somali territories between the Coast and the Borana area. Cederqvist sent the other missionaries away while he himself stayed on at Lamu until 1895. Then he gave up and returned to Eritrea.

The "Fifth Expedition" (1896-1898), the last attempt through Lamu and Harer had a clear result: the way through the South was barred to foreigners. On the other hand, Niguse Tashu had reached Jimma, and had limited possibilities to work there. The lesson was clear: for the time being, only indigenous persons would be able to reach the Oromos south of the river Abbai.

After the expedition that he participated in had failed in 1886, Onesimos settled down to translate the Holy Scriptures (which he did in 1899) into Oromo in order to reach the Oromo people, Hoping a door might be opened for it one day. Later he reached Addis Ababa in early 1904 and was introduced to Abuna Mateos and later to the Emperor Menelik to get permission to go and work in Wollega. He gave them a copy of the Bible that he had translated into Oromo. He was permitted to go to Wollega where he was received warmly.

The religious policy of Emperor Menelik II was ambivalent: on the one hand, he was eager to import technical advance to Ethiopia. So he opened the country to foreign influence. On the other hand, he was a pious son of the Orthodox church and saw in the Orthodox church a unifying bond for the Empire. So he permitted Karl Cederqvist to have a school in Addis Ababa from 1904 onwards (the so-called "English School"), but he did not give

permission for preaching.

The situation changed under Lij Iyasu who was proclaimed Crown Prince in 1909. In his first year there was still severe persecution for the evangelical preachers. But in 1916 things had changed: Lij Iyasu who had shown his Muslim tendencies, was not interested in the religious unity of the country and he permitted the Swedish Evangelical Mission to work. This meant, that now Cederqvist and his friends in Wollega could preach openly.

Things went still further under Ras Teferi Mekonnen, who came to power in the same year. He was genuinely interested in Western education and development, and he understood that he would get the support of missions only if he gave them possibilities to preach. However, in his first years he was hampered by the Empress Zewditu who was influenced by conservative Orthodox circles. She would withhold travel and residence permits as much as possible.

Nevertheless, the next few years saw the expansion of the work of the Swedish Evangelical Mission and the Catholics, the return of the Falasha Mission, and the start of the work of the American Presbyterian Mission, the Adventists, the Sudan Interior Mission, the German Hermannsburg Mission and the British Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society. We shall look now into the coming and work of some of them in this period. The year 1936, when the Italians occupied Addis Ababa and most missionaries had to leave Ethiopia, marks the end of this period.

Karl Cederqvist did not attempt to establish an independent congregation. Even after permission was given in 1916 he preferred to work with evangelicals in the Orthodox church. They had

formed an "Evangelicals Association" in order to promote the teaching of the Bible in their church. Cederqvist supported this "Evangelical Association". They wanted to stay as a lay movement allied to the Orthodox church. It was only when the Evangelicals were excluded or denied burial, that they started their own congregations, and with the permission given in 1916 it had become possible to officially start their own congregational life.

This brief overview shows again why the rulers became interested in Western missions: they looked for modern medicine and education. These became the door openers. But it meant that the missionaries got tied up in institutional work. They could evangelize only indirectly - through their students.

Most of them accepted this situation and tried to use it wisely. Not all were satisfied. Among those who were not happy with it was Dr. Lambie. He felt that the missions should not be tied up in the main towns but should advance to those people who had not heard the Gospel. And as his mission board hesitated, he separated from it and inspired a new enterprise. That was the beginning of the Sudan Interior Mission work in Ethiopia.

Dr. Lambie was not satisfied with sitting in the capital and treating patients. He proposed to his mission board to go on to Southwest Ethiopia to the many un-evangelized peoples here. But his home board felt not able to undertake another activity.

So, when on furlough in 1926, Dr. Lambie united with some other Christians in England and the United States of America to form a new society: the "Abyssinian Frontiers Mission" (AFM).

The name already revealed its aim. Next year the AFM joined with Sudan Interior Mission (SIM) which had worked so far mainly in Nigeria. Already in 1927 the first group of 11 missionaries entered Ethiopia, to reach Addis Ababa in December. Dr. Lambie was their leader (Field Director). His friendship with Ras Teferi Mekonnen helped him a lot. Even though the conservative group around Empress Zawditu made a lot of problems and caused delays, they finally got permission to travel in the country, though not to acquire land to engage in missionary activity. With this paper they started in March 1928.

So Hosanna, Soddo and Garbicho (later Homacho) in Sidamo became the main stations from which the SIM missionaries started preaching. Later, other places (in Gammu Gofa and Jimma) were added, but they never became so important as these three.

The missionaries had to struggle for two years until they got permission to work. Without permission from the capital, the local governors could not give their consent and also land. It became easier only when Teferi Mekonnen won power and became King and finally Emperor with the throne name Haile Selassie. But even after they had the permission, there was lot of local resistance - from Orthodox priests and traditional believers. Even after they found acceptance it still took time until the first people believed in Christ. Not before 1932 were the first baptisms reported. By that time there were about fifty missionaries labouring with the SIM!

Responsibility was quickly handed over to the believers. Also in matters of church discipline, questions of marriage, unworthy behavior, and the nationals took the initiative and

decision. Expatriates had advisory roles only.

This principle extended to material stewardship also. Building of churches, support for evangelists etc. were the full responsibility of the congregations from the very beginning. In this way, indigenous church principles were implemented from the very start: the "indigenous", i.e. national believers took the leadership role from the very start. There was, however, assistance in the training of preachers and other leaders in the Bible Schools.

On the other hand, institutions which meant a financial burden and needed skilled personnel, like clinics, hospitals, schools stayed under the responsibility of the mission. In this way the congregations were not burdened with the need to support institutions which were beyond their financial capabilities. Such institutions were soon started and continued to be administered by the mission.

The number of believers grew gradually, in comparison to the few number of missionaries. In 1936 there were around a hundred baptized members, most of them in Wollaytta. That was almost the same number as the missionaries who had laboured and preached! This was not really much, but it was the start of a big movement which began when the missionaries left in 1936-37 because of the war. It was the start of the Kale Heywet Church.

Pastor Louis Harms and his mission society which was founded in 1849 had heard a call to the Oromo people and had tried to send missionaries there via Dar-es Salam. Twice they tried, 1853-54 and 1858, twice they failed. Another attempt was made

twenty years later, but did not get far.

But the idea of reaching the Oromos was not dead at Hermannsburg. It was noted meanwhile that the Oromo people had been incorporated into Ethiopia. When news came in the 1920s that Ethiopia was opening itself to Western missions, the German Hermannsburg Mission (GHM) responded quickly.

In 1927 the first group of four missionaries was sent. They reached Addis Ababa just two days after the SIM group arrived. They had the same problem to obtain travel permissions. They even had almost the same people and area in mind - the Jimma region. Both were assisted by the same Ethiopian Christian: Kantiba Gebru Desta. But as the SIM was led to other areas, so also the German Hermannsburg missionaries were led to another place than the one they had in mind.

In the middle of the rainy season they got their permission which was valid for four weeks only. The hope of those who gave that travel permit was that they would not be ready and would not dare to travel there quickly. But the missionaries were prepared and the first ones went - a journey of five weeks at that time. Towards the end of the year, the others followed. It was Pastor Dietrich Wassmann, who became a leading figure for some years. One year later, Daffa Djamo was ordained pastor as the missionaries prepared to leave again.

By that time, the first preaching places had been established, and cooperation with the congregations at Boji and Nejo was strengthened. First Wassmann and later Qes Daffa served all evangelical Christians in the area, in that way contributing to the foundation of the later Western Synod of the EECMY.

Other Initiatives

To complete the survey of evangelical groups and initiatives in Ethiopia between 1916 and 1936, we have to look at four other groups. They all played a special role in those years and in the years to follow: the Swedish Mission Bible-True Friends, the Adventists, the Falasha Mission and the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society.

The Swedish Mission Bible-True Friends

In 1921 they officially opened work in Ethiopia. In the first fifteen years the main emphasis was in Harer where they built a hospital at the request of Ras Teferi, but also in Addis Ababa there was educational and other work. The Rev. Simon Rostin, one of this group, contributed much to the life of the EECMY, too. Many of the hymns which he translated into Amharic and adapted are still in use.

The Falasha Mission

This was actually not a new work. It was established already in 1859, when one of the Pilgrim missionaries from St. Chrishona, Martin Flad, got permission to preach to the Falashas near Gonder. The Falashas claim to be of Jewish origin. With the help of two British societies working among the Jews, he started preaching and teaching among the Falashas. The promising work came to an end six years later when Flad and his colleagues were imprisoned by Emperor Tewodros. After they were freed in 1868, none of them could return to their places of work.

Under the leadership of Debtera Birru and Mikael Aregawi the Falasha Christians preserved through much hardship. Finally,

Pastor Flad continued to support the Falasha Christians in all possible ways - the most important being translation and printing of Amharic literature in St. Chrishona. His son - born near Gonder - continued to be concerned and kept contact with the Falasha Christians. When he heard that it again was possible for foreigners to come to Ethiopia, he did so in 1923. He went back to Europe, but prepared the way for some new missionaries. In 1927 they reached Ethiopia and went to Begemder to strengthen the Falasha Christians.

As the Falasha Christians stayed formally in the Orthodox Church, they had no official connection with other evangelicals. But being, next to the followers of Peter Heyling, the oldest evangelical group in Ethiopia, they could not be forgotten.

Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society (BCMS)

This is the last evangelical group to enter Ethiopia before the Italian war. They had no intention to start a church of their own, but rather tried what the missions in the 19th century had as their aim: to revitalize (renew) the Ethiopian Orthodox Church.

In 1934 Alfred Buxton and some other English Christians came to Addis Ababa and started to work mainly with Orthodox priests and debteras. Then these men started to preach in Amharic and to read from the Amharic Bible, which was quite unusual at that time.

This group known as the BCMS had only two years before the Italian occupation drove them out of Ethiopia. But they had made some contacts and returned after the war. Through Christian

literature in Amharic (Bible translation and commentaries) they have contributed to the growth of all the churches. Several men trained in their Bible School were later employed in the Mekane Yesus Church. But mainly they worked within the Orthodox Church. "Serawite Kristos" - the army of Christ - is the name of the evangelical minded association in the Orthodox Church which derived from these beginnings.

The Churches During the Italian Fascist Invasion

Italy never had forgotten its defeat at Adwa in 1896. Nor had it forgotten that it wanted a bigger colony than Eritrea. After the Fascist leader Mussolini had taken power in Italy in 1922, it was only a question of time until the Italians would try again to conquer Ethiopia. At the end of 1934 the first clash between Italian and Ethiopian forces happened in the Ogaden.

The missions saw this development with concern. They knew that this was a threat not only to Ethiopian independence but also for the Gospel work. The Italians who in the first 20 years were supportive of evangelical churches and missionaries in Eritrea, had become more and more hostile from 1920-1930. They had closed schools and expelled missionaries.

When finally in October 1935, Fascist Italy declared war on Ethiopia, most missions more or less took sides with Ethiopia. Many of the doctors and nurses volunteered and became leaders of Ethiopian Red Cross teams which were caring for wounded Ethiopian soldiers. To name only a few: Dr. Lambie from SIM, Dr. Fried Hylander from SMBV and Manfred Lundgren from SEM. When the

Italians got control they acted as expected. Almost all missionaries were expelled or forced to leave: most of them in 1936, a few in 1937. That was a severe blow to the evangelical cause. After all - the work of most of them had started just eight to twelve years earlier!

When the missionaries had to leave the country, they were naturally much afraid concerning the new congregations. They assumed that they would be scattered soon. The Italians were not at all friendly to the evangelicals. Many had to suffer persecution. Stations were occupied by Italian Catholics. Leaders were put in prison. In Addis Ababa, the regular services in the SEM congregation first went on with an Italian Protestant minister of the Waldensian Church in charge. But persons like Ato (later Dr.) Emmanuel Gebre-Sillasse and Ato Kanaa Baji were imprisoned after they conducted evangelistic services in several places in the capital. These men and many other leading persons were deported to Somalia. Some - like Kantiba Gebre Desta - were sent to Italy for detention. In Wollaytta and other places, Christians were severely beaten and put in prison. The congregations could only meet at night. Italian military or Catholic orders took over many of the mission stations in the countryside. But the Ethiopian evangelical Christians were not at all deterred. They not only persevered - they increased in number! The most remarkable developments took place in Qelem and in Wollaytta.

In 1941 there were reports of 10,000 believers. The development in Kambatta was similar. In 1942, there were 80 churches in Wollaytta and 70 in Kambatta-Hadiya! God worked wonderfully - and he used indigenous (national) leaders and evangelists to

build his church.

The Evangelicals Come Together

In May 1941, the Emperor returned to Addis Ababa from exile. In January 1942, the last Italian groups gave up. Ethiopia was independent again and started to rebuild the nation. For the churches this meant freedom from outside interference. But it meant also that the Orthodox Church became stronger and resisted the rapid spread of evangelical churches. Therefore, local difficulties continued. The years of the Italian occupation had brought not only growth to the congregations, but also an independent, strong willed indigenous leadership.

Starting from 1942-43, a few missionaries returned to Ethiopia, but they did not interfere in the church's affairs - except when they were asked for advice. The Ethiopian evangelicals were determined to stay independent, and to become one national church. The question was only, how?

Since a conference held at Nekemte in 1944, there were regular - annual - conferences with this question in mind. The initiative came from leaders in Addis Ababa and Wollaga. The first meeting was attended only by ten delegates from these areas. Missionaries were not present. From 1947 onwards, also delegates from Wollaytta and Kambatta and sometimes from SMBV congregations attended, once also observers from the BCMS.

What was discussed in these meetings? Questions of how to deal with polygamy, whom to offer baptism, how to train and ordain ministers, etc., were some of the topics. But also the

question of unity: whether the evangelicals needed to unite to become one body, or if it was enough to appoint one congregation in Addis Ababa to act as "leader church" in relation to the Government.

The "Conference of Ethiopian evangelical churches" (CEEC) was an important sign of Christian unity and a useful tool for discussions. As such it continued until 1963. To achieve full unity, a common basis was needed. Soon it was felt, that a "Confessional Book" was necessary in which the teaching of the evangelicals was stated as an expression of unity. This became the difficult point: the "Confessional Book" was never finished. Finally in 1954 a committee was appointed for this task at which also missionaries were represented. But they only came up with a draft for a federation of evangelical churches. It was not possible to agree on a confession which was acceptable for all. Instead - that was the idea - the different groups should organize themselves as denominational (Lutheran, Presbyterian, Baptist) churches and then have a loose fellowship or 'Federation'. That seemed to be the only form of unity which could be achieved.

Among the reasons for the failure of a united or an "Ethiopian evangelical church" was the missionaries presence. As they came back the missionaries were allowed to open secular and Bible Schools in their respective areas and they began to teach and employ the national evangelists. They also began to inculcate denominational feelings among the Ethiopian evangelicals who were not aware of these differences before.

Another reason was that the people who were entrusted with the preparation of a common confessional book were not theolo-

gians. There might have been other reasons, too. In any case: the differences could not be bridged, and that is to be regretted.

Brief History of the Ethiopian Evangelical Churches Association

The Ethiopian Evangelical Churches Fellowship came to an inception in 1971 as a result of the prayer of church leaders in the UBS Headquarters. The prayer has been going on for number of years, but in 1971 the idea of having a leaders conference came powerfully. Following that vision a committee was delegated to organize and plan a grand conference for evangelical church leaders in Ethiopia. The conference was held annually and it continued from 1976-1979 in a place called Nazereth Bible Academy, in which the researcher attended.

But the Marxist regime began the expansion of severe persecution in 1979 and after, where church leaders had been taken as a target and church buildings were also confiscated and nationalized. As a result, the Association did not function effectively until 1984. During the years 1979-1984 several leaders were imprisoned and tortured; thousands of Christians persecuted; church buildings confiscated by the Marxists. But the leaders were strengthened and their visions revived, and the church of Jesus Christ was well grounded. Therefore, the church leaders met again in 1984 and courageously decided to continue having the annual conference for leaders, despite the opposition from the Government. The constitution was revised in 1988 and the General Assembly elected Executive Board. In 1990 in their second Gener-

al Assembly, they appointed an Organizing Secretary.

The Association comprises the following different denominations as full members: Kale Heywet Church, Ethiopia Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus, Full Gospel Believers Church, Hewet Berhan Church, Baptist Evangelical Church, Meserete Keristos Church, Genet Church, Baptist General Conference, Faith Church, and New Testament Baptist Church. There are other associate members of the Association: UBS - United Bible Society of Ethiopia, IBS - International Bible Society of Ethiopia, Eva SUE - Evangelical Students Union of Ethiopia, SU - Scripture Union of Ethiopia, Ethiopian Evangelical Churches in N.America, Life Ministry in Ethiopia, Wengiel Begater, and Evangelical Church Fellowship of Ethiopians In Kenya.