Charismatic versus Organized Ministry?
An Examination of an Alleged Antithesis

by Ronald Y. K. Fung

Tension between charismatic and institutional ministries is nothing new in the history of the church; many examples of it lie ready to hand in our own day. But the relation between the two types of ministry in the early church has at times been reconstructed in a manner which lacks historical validation. One such reconstruction of recent date sees the rise of the institutional ministry as a symptom of incipient catholicism. This reconstruction in particular engages the critical attention of Dr. Fung in the following pages. Dr. Fung, who holds a Master's degree from Fuller Theological Seminary and a doctorate from the University of Manchester, now teaches in the China Graduate School of Theology, Hong Kong.

In an important essay entitled "Ministry and Community in the New Testament", Professor Ernst Käsemann has raised the question of the relation between spiritual gifts and ecclesiastical office in a radical form.[1] To him, the notion of office stands in diametrical opposition to the Pauline doctrine of charisma and, partly as a consequence of this, the ministry as presented in the Pastorals represents the very antithesis of Paul's outlook. In other words, Käsemann sees an irreconcilable conflict between spiritual gifts and all organization of the ministry — except such as results automatically from a free exercise of the charismata. It is to this issue that the present article would address itself.

The structure and main outlines of Käsemann's essay may be briefly indicated first. The introduction (63-64) strikes the keynote of the essay with the observation that the NT has no technical conception of ecclesiastical office, and that the ministry is exactly and comprehensively described in terms of the Pauline concept of charisma. In the first main section which follows (64-76), this concept is first defined, then explained against the contemporary situation of the church at Corinth, and finally applied to the exposition of the nature of the Christian community. The second main section (76-85) proceeds to deal with the relation between the ministry and the Church: it is claimed that both the question of church order in general, and the explicit relation between community and office in particular, are "treated by Paul exclusively on the basis of the charisma concept" (78), and the conclusion is reached that Paul "set his doctrine of charisma in opposition to the theory of an institutionally guaranteed ecclesiastical office" (84). On the basis of this understanding of the charisma concept as both explaining the nature of

---

[1] See his *Essays on New Testament Themes,* E.T. (London: SCM Press, 1964), 63-94. References to this essay in the following pages will be indicated in the text itself by the use of parentheses enclosing page numbers.

the Christian community and determining the relation between community and church order, the third and final main section (85-93) turns to a description of what Käsemann calls the "antithesis" of the Pauline outlook found in the Pastorals and in Acts — so called because the whole state of affairs reflected in these writings, manifesting as it does tendencies of early Catholicism, cannot be reconciled with Paul's doctrine of charisma.

Käsemann's treatment of the charisma concept affords some valuable insights into this Pauline doctrine. The repeated emphasis on service as the distinctive badge of genuine charisma; the stress on the inseparable connection between gift and Giver, involving the necessity of obedience to the lordship of Christ as intrinsic to the charisma concept; the appreciation of its comprehensiveness as embracing the totality of life in all its varied relationships; the setting of this doctrine, viewed as a theological critique, in the context of polemic against the Corinthian Enthusiasts — these are some of the merits of Käsemann's exposition. Nevertheless, his theses of conflict between gift and office and of opposition between the Pastorals and "the Pauline outlook" — which may be viewed as two parts of an alleged antithesis between spiritual gifts and organization of the ministry — call for a closer examination of the evidence.

Charisma And Church Order

According to Käsemann, Paul uses three "watchwords" in conjunction with the charisma concept: "to each his own", "for one another", "submission to one another in humility and in the fear of Christ" (76-78), and the way for the community to be properly ordered is for the charismata to be "subordinated to the freedom and the yoke of the Lord" (85). This is certainly true as far as it goes, but Käsemann's theory rather gives the impression that order in the Church results spontaneously from a free exercise of the spiritual gifts, not only in independence, but even to the exclusion, of organization.

What is the evidence of Paul's writings on this matter?

Ministry in the Pauline Churches. Taking the Pauline letters (aside from the Pastorals) in their probable chronological sequence, we note that the injunction in Gal. 6:6 contains a reference to τῷ κατηχοῦντι; this suggests that in the churches of Galatia there existed a class of teachers fully supported by the congregation — a form, then, of "full-time" or

almost "full-time" public ministry.[2] In the exhortation of 1 Thess. 5:12, the use of one common article "governing" the three participles (τοὺς κοπιῶντας . . . καὶ προϊσταμένους καὶ νουθετοῦντας) clearly indicates that one group of persons, not three, is in view. The notion of a leadership *vis-à-vis* the rank and file of church members is obvious, and the ground given for the high esteem to be shown towards the leaders (διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν, v. 13) seems to suggest a definite, specialized ministry.[3] Leaving the Corinthian correspondence for later treatment, we come to the notice about Phoebe in Rom. 16:1, where she is described as a διάκονος of the church at Cenchreae. Whether the term refers merely to her service to the church or indicates the existence of an office of deaconess is debated, but the latter would seem to be the more probable view.[4] In Col. 4:17, Archippus is given a special message from the apostle, to the effect that he should fulfil the ministry which he has received in the Lord. That fact that Archippus παρέλαβεν αὐτὴν ἐν κυρίῳ and is now to be solemnly charged (καὶ εἴπατε . . . βλέπε) with the responsibility of fully discharging it (πληροῖς) would seem to point to some definite, recognized ministry in the church;[5] even if the exact nature of Archippus's ministry in Colossae is perhaps impossible to as-

---

2 Cf. E. de W. Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1968 reprint), p.335. P. Parker, *IDB*, IV 523a, speaks of the teacher's work as usually consuming all his time, "so that the local congregation was held responsible for his livelihood". K. Wegenast, *NIDNTT*, III 771, not only states that "this is probably the earliest evidence we have for a 'full-time' teaching office in the early church" but also believes that κατηχῶν as a term for the teacher of the gospel was possibly introduced by Paul himself.

3 J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1972), have given examples from the papyri of the verb προΐστημι being used of officials. L. Morris, *The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians* (London: Tyndale Press, 1956), pp.98f., and *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959), p.165, argues that the people in question are elders, though such an identification is rejected by J. E. Frame, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p.193.

4 The latter is held, e.g. by W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1962 reprint), p.417; H. W. Beyer, *TDNT*, II 93; A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1965), p.396; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966). p.377 with n.3; M. Black, *Romans* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott,, 1973), p.178; K. Hess, *NIDNTT*, III 546. 549. As Michel points out, the notion of office is favoured by the words οὖσαν and τῆς ἐκκλησίας; καί, if original, also lends some support to this view.

5 A. Harnack, *The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries*, E. T. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1910), p.56, can see "the only meaning" of the words παρέλαβεν κ. τ. λ. as conferment by a solemn religious service.

certain.[6] The position of Epaphras (Col. 1:7; 4:12) also deserves consideration here. W. Marxsen (who affirms a post-Pauline dating of this letter) has put forward the view that the high praise accorded to Epaphras (cf. 1:7; 23) is intended to claim the authority of Paul for the authorization of Epaphras; he sees this emphasis upon the apostolate (as the legitimizing authority) as "tantamount in effect to the doctrine of 'apostolic succession' ".[7] While this particular interpretation of the evidence may not be accepted without question, it serves to underline what is probably true in any case —viz., Epaphras's having a special ministry, and possibly holding a special office, in the church at Colossae. With the inclusion of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι in the salutation of Phil. 1:1, we have the first (and, apart from the Pastorals, the only) mention of the term ἐπίσκοπος in Paul's writings. Not a few scholars are agreed that here the two Greek words describe not holders of ecclesiastical office but functionaries assuming responsibility in the local church;[8] but, as H. W. Beyer observes, "In the final phrase he (Paul) has in view individual members of the congregation who are unequivocally characterized by the designation. Otherwise the addition has no meaning."[9] Perhaps the terms are best taken, then, as denoting church officials,[10] though not in the highly developed ecclesiastical sense of a later age.

Another passage which bears upon our investigations is Acts 14:23, which tells of the appointment of elders in the churches by Paul and Barnabas during the first missionary journey. Consideration has to be given here to the question of the origin of the Christian elder. There is

6 D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (London: Tyndale Press, 1970), pp.635-638, discusses and rejects, rightly, the view of John Knox that Archippus's ministry is to consist in the release of Onesimus the slave as requested by Paul.

7 *Introduction to the New Testament*, E. T. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), pp.180.

8 So, e.g., F. J. A. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia* (London: Macmillan, 1908), pp.212f.; J. Knox, "The Ministry in the Primitive Church", in H. R. Niebuhr and D. D. Williams (ed.), *The Ministry in Historical Perspective* (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), pp.1-26 (p.10); *The Early Church and the Coming Great Church* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), p.92; F. W. Beare, "The Ministry in the New Testament Church: Practice and Theory", *Anglican Theological Review* 37 (1955), pp.3-19 (pp.14f.); *The Epistle to the Philippians* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973), p.49; R. P. Martin, *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians* (London: Tyndale Press, 1959), p.57.

9 H. W. Beyer, *TDNT*, II 616 with n.27; *ibid.*, p.90. Cf. K Hess, *NIDNTT*, III 546, 548.

10 So also J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963), pp.82,192f.; M. H. Shepherd, Jr., *IDB*, I 442a; C. E. B. Cranfield, "Diakonia in the New Testament", in J. I. McCord and T. H. L. Parker (ed.), *Service in Christ: Essays Presented to Karl Barth on his 80th Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), pp.37-48 (p.39).

almost unanimous agreement among scholars that the answer is to be found in the *zᵉqēnîm* of Judaism, though it is a moot question whether the elders were appointed on the pattern of Jewish synagogues,[11] or after the manner of the council of elders (commonly called γερουσία in the Diaspora) which in NT times existed in every Jewish community and which held administrative and judicial authority over it,[12] or on the model of the Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem (which in turn has its origin in the "elders of Israel").[13] In any case, the close connection between the Christian elders and the Jewish elders, who had a manifestly official status,[14] strongly suggests that the Christian elders must be accorded an official status.[15] In view of the fact that the early Christians met in private homes and that the hosts of such house churches were, by virtue of their background and ability, likely candidates for leadership,[16] Acts 14:23 would seem to mean that when Paul and Barnabas took leave of a house church they had just founded, they would put it under the charge of the host of that group, who, presumably, would assume the official title of "elder".[17] If this understanding is correct, then Acts 14:23 speaks of the appointment of Christian elders as officers in the local communi-

11 So, e.g. J. B. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp.192f.; B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London: Macmillan, 1929), p.77; F. F. Bruce, *New Testment History* (London: Oliphants, 1971), p.262 n.4.

12 Cf. M. H. Shepherd, Jr., *IDB* II 73b.

13 Is it perhaps a point in favour of this last suggestion that the word πρεσβυτέριον, used in 1 Tim. 4:14 of a local council of Christian elders, is used twice in the NT of the Jewish Sanhedrin (Luke 22:66; Acts 22:5), but not of the smaller local councils or tribunals (cf. Matt. 10:17 and Mark 13:9, where συνέδρια is used)?

14 J. Knox, *art. cit.* (see n.8 above), p.9, calls them "by all means the most important Jewish officials both in Palestine and in the diaspora".

15 Insufficient account is taken of this close connection when E. Schweizer, *Church Order in New Testament*, E. T. (London: SCM Press, 1961), 5j (p.71) n.271 and 26e (p.216), argues that "if we keep to Luke's view, it is obviously only a matter of someone's being appointed as leader in the newly founded churches. Nothing is said about . . . the assignment of an office".

16 On this see F. V. Filson, "The Significance of the Early House Churches", *JBL* 58 (1939), 105-112 (pp.111f.). L. Coenen, *NIDNTT*, I 301, well says: "The fact that small groups in individual houses are called *ekklēsia* . . . indicates that neither the significance of the place nor the numerical size of the assembly determines the use of the term. What counts is the presence of Christ among them . . . and faith nourished by him."

17 The plural πρεσβυτέρους used with the distributive κατ' ἐκκλησίαν could mean either that there were more than one church house in each of those cities or that besides the host others were appointed as elders. The force of χειροτονήσαντες is probably to indicate that the appointment was made by Paul and Barnabas.

ties, and these may be understood as representing the simple beginnings of church order.

From the above evidence, it may legitimately be concluded (*a*) that in some of the Pauline communities there was some kind of public or specialized ministry (e.g. the teachers in Galatia, Epaphras and Archippus at Colossae), with a rudimentary form of official organization (elders in Galatia, and possibly also in Thessalonica), and (*b*) that at Philippi there appears to have been a comparatively more advanced system with its twofold division of overseers and deacons. There is thus ample evidence to show that the Pauline communities, like the primitive Church as a whole, were by no means amorphous associations run on more or less haphazard lines. That the ministry should have been organized to greater or lesser degree is not only consistent with Jewish influence upon the structure of the Church;[18] it is consistent also with the practical demands of expanding communities (cf. Galatia, Acts 16:5; Ephesus, Acts 19:10, 17-20; cf. 1 Cor. 16:8f.; Thessalonica, Acts 17:4; Corinth, Acts 18:8),[19] with Paul's own administrative abilities which find illustration, quite apart from Acts 14:23 (and the Pastorals), in his organization of the collection for the Jerusalem church (1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Cor. 8-9), and with the simple fact that the local church, composed as it is of people "who belong simultaneously to the natural and the supernatural order of life . . . cannot be severed from the earthly conditions of existence"[20] — among which organization is essential and indispensable.

The picture of the ministry in Corinth, indeed, appears to lend support to Käsemann's theory of church order, since not only is there no allusion in the Corinthian letters to church officials of any kind, but the origins of the ministry there appear to have lain in the voluntary service of men who were both willing and able to render that service (cf. 1 Cor. 16:15f.) — a state of affairs which has led others than Käsemann to the

[18] J. W. C. Wand, *The Church. Its Nature, Structure and Function* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949), p.46, says ". . . no Jew brought up in the intensely realist and practical mentality of his race could ever have thought of a Church or assembly that was not an organized body of people."

[19] J. Knox, *art. cit.*, pp.12f., rightly points out the erroneousness of supposing that the administration of a first-century church was much simpler than a present-day congregation of comparable size (even though certain details in his description of the "congregational meetings" may appear to have too modern a tinge).

[20] J. Schneider, "The Local Church in the New Testament", *The Christian Review* 8 (1939), pp.13-24 (p.13).

conclusion that there were no church officers in Corinth.[21] Over against this, the following observations may be made.

(1) There is scant justification for holding up Corinth as the model of church order: the facts of the case rather suggest the opposite.[22]

(2) The enumeration "first apostles, second prophets, third teachers" in 1 Cor. 12:28 must be allowed to shed light on the organizational aspect of the local ministry. While prophets and teachers do not represent office-holders,[23] yet, there is little doubt that they do represent the two most important functions in the ministry of the local church — that is, next to the apostles, who obviously stand apart as a special class by themselves. From this, and from the prominence given to prophecy in 1 Cor. 14, it may be stated, with Streeter, that even in the Corinthian church, for all its abundance of spiritual gifts, prophets and teachers (next to the apostle Paul) held the most honoured place, just as they were the recognized leaders of the church at Antioch (Acts 13:1).[24]

(3) The place of the apostle Paul in the church must not be forgotten.

[21] E.g., T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902), p.59; H . Küng, *The Church*, E.T. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p.403.

[22] As M. M. Bourke, "Reflections on Church Order in the New Testament", *CBQ* 30 (1968), 493-511 (pp.501f.) observes, "It is perhaps significant that, as Philip Menoud has remarked, the one occurrence of the word ἐπίσκοπος in the Pauline letters (the Pastoral being excluded) comes in the epistle to that church which was, in many ways, Paul's ideal church — *which that of Corinth certainly was not*" (my italics). Cf. H. Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church,* E.T. (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), p.148: "We shall do well not to generalize from the circumstances in Corinth." Menoud (*IDB* I 623b) suggests that as Philippi was Paul's ideal church, "the simple organization which existed in this church . . . might have been the organization answering most nearly the desires of Paul."

[23] Cf. Knox, *art. cit.*, p.18: "For Paul there were teachers and prophets, but hardly the *offices* of teacher and prophet."

[24] Cf. B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.* p.77 (he prefers to call them "offices"). On the other hand, L. Coenen, *NIDNTT,* I 300, maintains that in the body-metaphor "there is no graduation according to importance". This assertion does not fit 1 Cor. 12:28: there the first three gifts seem clearly distinguished from the rest, and moreover appear to be arranged in descending order of importance (cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p.295). A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First three Centuries,* E.T., vol.I (London: Williams and Norgate, 1908), pp.334ff., relying mainly on the *Didache*, regards the ministry of the apostolic age as organized into the local ministry of bishops and deacons and the universal, charismatic ministry of apostles, prophets and teachers. For a criticism of this thesis, reference may be made to J. A. Robinson, "The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Periods", in H. B. Swete (ed.), *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry* (London: Macmillan, 1918), pp.57-92. Cf. H. von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*, E.T. (Stanford University Press, 1969), p.61.

That the apostles exercised supreme authority under Christ in the primitive Church is commonly acknowledged,[25] and here we may confine our attention to the nature and exercise of the authority of the apostle Paul. His authority is derived from the Lord himself and he is fully ready to use it if needful (2 Cor. 13:10; cf. 10:8; 1 Cor. 4:21). Even when writing to churches not personally known to him, he appeals to his apostleship (Rom. 1:1, 5f.; 11:13; Col. 1:1). He refers to "the churches" (of his founding?) in a manner which indicates that his authority extends to all of them (1 Cor. 4:17; 7:17; 11:16; 14:33f.; 16:1). He uses the language of command (1 Cor. 5:3-5; 7:10; 1 Thess. 4:11; 2 Thess. 3:4, 6, 10, 12) and expects obedience to his injunctions (2 Cor. 2:9; Phil. 2:12). He calls the churches to imitate him as a pattern of the Christian life (1 Cor. 4:16; 11:1; 2 Thess. 3:7, 9; cf. 1 Thess. 1:6; 2:14). He looks upon his own writings as the authoritative word of God (1 Cor. 14:37; 2 Thess. 3:14), as he does his own preaching (Gal. 1:11f.; 1 Thess. 2:9, 13), and expects them to be read in public worship, not only in the place of a letter's original destination (1 Thess. 5:27), but sometimes in another church as well (Col. 4:16). This authority is not, to be sure, an unqualified one. Being derived from the Lord it is subject to him and must be true to the terms of commission from him. It must therefore be used in accordance with the purpose for which it was given — "for bulding up and not for tearing down" (2 Cor. 13:10; 10:8); and it must be in harmony with the authentic gospel (Gal. 1:8f.). It is also modified in its exercise by Paul's desire and care not to "lord it over" the faith of the communities (2 Cor. 1:24); at times he prefers to entreat them by the meekness and gentleness of Christ (2 Cor. 10:1) and he draws upon the personal relationships of life for figures to express the gentler side of his pastoral oversight: father (1 Cor. 4:14; 1 Thess. 2:11f.), mother (Gal. 4:19), nursing mother (1 Thess. 2:7), the bridegroom's friend (2 Cor. 11:2). Nevertheless, the rock-bottom fact remains that Paul is an apostle invested with the delegated authority of Christ himself, an authority which is therefore absolutely binding.

Nor must we lose sight of the apostles' unique importance as custodians — and, indeed, also originators by letter-writing — of tradition. This means that not only is Paul aware of having been entrusted with an authoritative tradition (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3; 11:23), but his letters "constituted the literary deposit of his apostolic influence".

[25] E.g., O. Linton, "Church and Office in the New Testament", in A. Nygren (ed.), *This is the Church,* E.T. (Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1952), pp.100-135 (p.107); R. P. Martin. "Authority in the Light of the Apostolate, Tradition and the Canon", *EQ* 40 (1968), 66-82 (p.70); H. von Campenhausen, *op. cit.*, p.22.

Thus, as far as the Pauline communities are concerned, the Lord's authority is effectively exercised by two means: "the apostle's person, with his living presence and voice transmitting the traditions as the embodiment of the Kyrios, and the apostle's writing (thought of as his *alter ego*)".[26] Now if Paul, by the double means of his apostolic presence and his apostolic writings, exercised constant and effective oversight of the churches whenever and wherever necessary, then this fact adequately explains the apparent absence of church officials in the Corinthian community, and also makes it plausible that as long as Paul was able to exercise this sort of direction of the communities, any church officers that might have existed would be overshadowed as something of relatively slight importance.[27]

From the above examination of the evidence, we can only conclude that, unless Paul's practice was quite inconsistent with his theory, his doctrine of charisma is not incompatible with the existence of an organized ministry, and Käsemann's theory must appear untrue to the evidence of the Pauline epistles themselves.

Charisma and church office. Käsemann surely carries the doctrine of charisma too far when he says, "There is not even a prerogative of official proclamation, vested in some specially commissioned individual or other . . . " (81). Against such a statement the case of the apostles immediately springs to mind. Käsemann would, naturally, minimize the official character of the apostolate, claiming that "even the apostle is, as Paul is always emphasizing, only one charismatic among many, though he may be the most important" (81); but this assertion is difficult to maintain in the light of Paul's strong insistence on his apostolic authority as a *commissioned* representative of Jesus Christ, commissioned, moreover, to *proclaim* and transmit the authentic gospel (cf., e.g., 1 Cor. 1:17, ἀπέστειλέν με χριστὸς . . . εὐαγγελίζεσθαι; 2 Cor. 5:18ff.). It would seem that in understanding the charisma concept as the all-determinative principle, Käsemann has embraced an inadequate view of the apostolic office and of apostolic authority. The apostles occupy, no doubt, a unique position, but they serve as a needful reminder that the doctrine of charisma is not *in principle* at odds with the idea of official authority.

[26] Both quotations are from R. P. Martin, *art. cit.*, pp.75f. It may be added that Paul's *viva vox* sometimes took the form of a personal delegate, e.g. Timothy (1 Thess. 3:2,6; 1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10; Acts 18:5; 19:22; Phil. 2:19) or Titus (2 Cor. 8:6, 16f.; 12:18). And 1 Cor. 5:3f. shows that even without a representative, Paul had a vivid sense of his presence at Corinth.

[27] Cf. M. M. Bourke, *art. cit.*, p.503; H. G. Brueggemann, "The Public Ministry in the Apostolic Age", *Concordia Theological Monthly,* 22 (1951), 81-109 (p.90).

On the more specific question of church office, Käsemann believes that the notion of ecclesiastical office is denied by the charisma concept itself. In the context of this concept, all the baptized are *ipso facto* "office-bearers": "they have each his charisma and therefore each his special responsibility" (80). The Pauline community, therefore, knows of no fixed offices but only functions (81f.). With regard to this theory, the following observations may be offered.

(1) If, as suggested above, the overseers and deacons of Phil. 1:1 (not to speak now of the elders of Acts 14:23) are to be understood of definite officers, then this is factual evidence against Käsemann's denial of the existence of church officers.

(2) In the matter of church order, office would seem to be an inevitable part of organization, the need for which has also been noted above.[28]

(3) There need be no conflict between Spirit and office, a truth which H. von Campenhausen well explains in these words:

> There is . . . no need to assume that office as such . . . must . . . be set in diametric opposition to the Spirit . . . It is not unspiritual just as long as it remains obedient to the Spirit of Christ, and performs that service of the Gospel of Christ for which it was appointed. Only where this original evangelical relation is inverted, and the authority of the official as such is made absolute, is the primitive Christian concept of the Church abandoned . . .[29]

That there is no such conflict in practice is illustrated by the tradition in which Paul is reported to have explicitly attributed the appointment of the Ephesian elders to the initiative and agency of the Holy Spirit (ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, Acts 20:28).[30]

(4) It follows that there is no real opposition between spiritual gift and ecclesiastical office. Not only is there no *priori* reason why function and office should be mutually incompatible terms, or why gifts can be joined to function only and not to offices also, but there is evidence to make probable the suggestion that in Paul's view function, gift, and office can

[28] Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *op. cit.* (see n.10 above), pp. 181, 184; L. Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Tyndale, 1958), p.98.

[29] *Op. cit.*, p.80.

[30] Cf. B. Reicke, *TDNT* VI 702; J. Schneider, *art. cit.*, p.19: "In the New Testament the principle obtains that the office bearers hold their office according to the measure of the Spirit. Office and Spirit belong most closely together."

and must exist in harmonious relationship. Thus in Tim. 3:1,[31] the juxtaposition of the words ἐπισκοπή and ἔργον shows that the ministry of an overseer is at the same time an office to hold and a task to perform, while the following context goes on to speak of qualifications. It is certainly not without significance that several of the charismata mentioned by Paul find their counterparts in the qualifications laid down for presbyter-bishops and deacons in the Pastorals, thus:

διακονία (Rom. 12:7)	διακονείτωσαν (1 Tim. 3:10)
διδασκαλία (*ibid.*)	διδακτικός (1 Tim. 3:2, cf. Tit. 1:9)
παράκλησις (Rom. 12:8)	παρακαλεῖν (Tit. 1:9)
οἱ ποιμένες (Eph. 4:11)	οἱ προεστῶτες (1 Tim. 5:17; cf. 3:4, 5, 12)

Further, the gifts of ἀντίλημψις and κυβέρνησις mentioned in 1 Cor. 12:28 between the gifts of "powers" and "healing" and the gift of tongues, are almost certainly to be linked with "deacons" and "overseers" respectively.[32] This alignment of gift with office indicates, on the one hand, that gift can find expression in office and, on the other, that office must not be severed from gift. As J. A. Robinson says, "The apostle would have been startled by the suggestion that bishops and deacons could execute their office aright without the divine aid of the corresponding 'charisma'."[33] The true relationship between function, gift, and office, therefore, appears to be this: office and function are two aspects of a person's ministry (i.e. in the case of someone who holds office), for which he must have the appropriate gifts.

If the above considerations are sound, then it must be concluded that

[31] While the Pastorals are regarded as pseudonymous by most modern commentators, E. E. Ellis, "The Authorship of the Pastorals: A Résumé and Assessment of Current Trends", *EQ* 32 (1960), 151-161, has given a list of scholars "representing a considerable variation of theological viewpoint" who have argued in favour of the genuineness of these epistles: Zahn (1906), Torm (1932), Thoernell (1933), Schlatter (1936), Michaelis (1946), Spicq (1947), Behm (1948), de Zwaan (1948), Jeremias (1953), Simpson (1954), and Guthrie (1957). To these may now be added J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (London: A. & C. Black, 1963), pp.1ff.; and E. F. Harrison, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), pp. 330ff. This, as Ellis says, is a not unimpressive roster for a minority report (*art. cit.*, p. 161).

[32] So J. Knox, *art. cit.*, p.10; H. Sasse, "Apostles, Prophets, Teachers", *Reformed Theological Review* 27 (1968), 11-21 (p.11). Cf. H. W. Beyer, *TDNT* III 1036, who holds that both the "bishops" and deacons are to be regarded as the bearers of the gift of κυβέρνησις, or the προϊστάμενοι of Rom. 12:8.

[33] *Art. cit.*, p.79. Cf. E. E. Ellis, "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts", in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (ed.), *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970), pp.55-67 (p.66), who states that the Christian counterpart of the Jewish elder, whether titled πρεσβύτερος or ἐπίσκοπος within the organizational structure, would be a charismatic person, e.g. a teacher — thus again linking gift and office.

Käsemann has set up a false antithesis between ecclesiastical office and spiritual gift and that his claim, made in the name of Paul, that the charisma concept excludes the idea of church office is not substantiated by the evidence.

The Ministry In The Pastorals

With regard to Käsemann's allegation that the ministry in the Pastorals represents the very antithesis of Paul's outlook, three observations may be made by way of critique. These correspond to the elements which, according to Käsemann, make up the threefold stratagem employed by the church of the Pastorals as it took up a defensive position against the weight of Gnostic attack which was threatening the Christian community.

(1) "The method chosen was, first, to entrust teaching and administration to reliable hands and to create a settled ministry against which alien pretensions would beat in vain" (88), so writes Käsemann. It is clear that Käsemann regards the settled ministry as an upstart innovation of the church of the Pastorals, as something formerly unknown to the Pauline communities. If, however, no such dichotomy between gift and office as posed by Käsemann need or did exist, as the above paragraphs have sought to show, and if, even according to the undisputed Pauline epistles (1 Thess. 5:12; Phil. 1:1), there is evidence of a definitely organized ministry in the Pauline communities, then Käsemann's allegation must be regarded as unwarranted.

(2) The church's next step, according to Käsemann, was "to tie this newly-created ministry to a solemn ordination vow (and thus to rule out unsuitable elements) . . ." (88). Käsemann believes that in the Pastorals the primitive Christian view of every believer receiving the Spirit in his baptism has given place to the principle of ordination which, to him, means the bestowal of the Spirit and induction to an office which is "now the real bearer of the Spirit", so that "we can now speak inelegantly, but with absolute accuracy, of the Spirit as the ministerial Spirit" (87). Käsemann appears to have based his interpretation of ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν in the Pastorals on the fact that in Acts 8:17; 9:17 and 19:6 the laying on of hands is accompanied by an impartation of the Spirit. He does not, indeed, actually state this, but he does say that "the ordination mentioned in I Tim. 4:14; 5:22 and II Tim. 1:6 can only have found its way into the Pauline community from the Jewish Christian tradition [— to which the three references in Acts would belong — and that] thus it must have the same meaning as it has in Judaism" (86f.). It is precarious, however, to look for the meaning of

Timothy's ordination in those three texts from Acts. These speak of the reception of the Spirit by the Samaritans, by Paul, and by certain "disciples" at Ephesus — in each case, it would seem, the initial reception of the Spirit at conversion-initiation is in view.[34] Timothy's case, on the other hand, is entirely different: he was already a Christian and had received the Spirit (cf. Eph. 1:13).[34a] For the meaning of his ordination, therefore, it is more proper to look to the precedents of Acts 6:6 and 13:3f., where those receiving the imposition of hands were already Christians and had received the Spirit. There the ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν has the primary meaning of setting apart for divine service (a meaning which is also present in 9:17), and Timothy's "ordination" thus more probably had the signification of a setting apart for the ministry, though in this particular case there also was the actual conferment of a charisma.[35] The fact that the impartation of the charisma occurs jointly with prophecy is important: it shows that the present endowment on Timothy, just like the initial choice of him (1 Tim. 1:18), was due to the initiative of God through his Spirit. Not only has the Holy Spirit not become the "ministerial Spirit" locked up in office, but he remains very much the sovereign Spirit, who both inspired the prophecies concerning Timothy and dispensed to him the special charisma

[34] Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1970), pp.55-72; 73-78; 83-89; H. G. Schütz, *NIDNTT,* II 152; C. Maurer, *TDNT,* VIII 161; E. Lohse, *TDNT,* IX 432f.

[34a] Hence we cannot agree with the view of M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles,* E.T. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), pp.70-71, that 1 Tim. 4:14 and 2 Tim. 1:6 speak of the laying on of hands "upon those who did not have the Spirit for transmitting the Spirit".

[35] The impartation of the charisma is somewhat differently described in 1 Tim. 4:14 (διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου) and in 2 Tim. 1:6 (διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου). Many recent commentators, rightly, it seems, take these references as alluding to the same occasion, and identify it as Timothy's consecration to the ministry, which took place probably at Lystra (so e.g. C. J. Ellicott, E. K. Simpson, D. Guthrie, W. Hendriksen, commentaries *ad loc.).* The apparent discrepancy between the mention of the presbyterate in 1 Tim. 4:14 and of Paul alone in 2 Tim. 1:6 may be explained by the supposition that the elders were associated with Paul in the ordaining act, and that the one reference stresses "the corporate attestation of Timothy's commission" while the other draws attention to the particular part that Paul had played (Guthrie, *op. cit.,* p. 98). Cf. G. Bornkamm, *TDNT* VI 666 n.92, who, rejecting the view of D. Daube and J. Jeremias that the phrase ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου is to be understood in terms of the Heb. *semikath zeqenim* as installation as an elder — an interpretation which is also championed by J. N. D. Kelly (*op. cit.,* p.108) — thinks that the difference "is adequately explained by the difference in character between the two letters (congregational rule/apostolic testament)", as do also M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles,* E. T. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p.71b.

for his unique task.[35a] The word χάρισμα in 1 Tim. 4:14 and 2 Tim. 1:6 retains the usual Pauline meaning and is not, as Käsemann alleges, given a non-Pauline function to fulfil. The charisma was, indeed, imparted through human mediation, but this is not in any way intrinsically incompatible with the charisma concept, but rather illustrates the Spirit's sovereign freedom. As for the "ordination" of elders indicated in 1 Tim. 5:22, there is no warrant for supposing that it is also accompanied by the impartation of charisma, Timothy's case being exceptional;[35b] and its meaning may simply be the setting apart for service of those who have been duly tested and approved as possessing the necessary qualifications or appropriate gifts for their office.

The ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν spoken of in the Pastorals, therefore, in all probability does not mean what Käsemann takes it to mean, so that in this matter Käsemann's allegation is really without exegetical basis.[35c]

(3) The final part of the church's method was, Käsemann maintains, "to insert the ministry into a fabricated chain of tradition and to render its position impregnable by a doctrine of legitimate succession" (88). This done, "it is now tacitly accepted that the authority of the institu-
208 tional ministry is guaranteed by a principle of tradition and legitimate succession which has become the basis of all church order . . ." (88), and the freedom of the charismata exercised in subordination to the Lord had thereby been replaced. It may readily be conceded that the apostle does advocate a principle of tradition and legitimate succession, as is clear from his charge to Timothy: "What you have heard from me . . . entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. 2:2). But it is important to note the true meaning and significance of this principle.

It should be observed, first, that the apostle's concern in this verse is with succession of *doctrine*, not with succession of *office*. As W. G. Kümmel well observes, "As little as the chain of *succession* from Paul through his pupils to officials in the congregations is established . . . , so much is the chain of *tradition* emphasized, which begins with the apostle."[36] It is possible that some of the "faithful men" of 2 Tim. 2:2

[35a] As E. Lohse, *TDNT*, IX 433, observes, "charisma and office are closely interrelated". Cf. n.33 above.

[35b] M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *op. cit.*, p.98b (commenting on 2 Tim. 1:6), rightly give this warning: "The preposition 'through' (διά) must not be accorded too much importance. The grace is not yet understood as an habitual disposition transferred from person to person."

[35c] Cf. H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, E.T. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp.477f.

[36] *Introduction to the New Testament*, E.T. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p.269. Cf. E. Schweizer, *op. cit.* (see n.15 above), 6c (p.80).

would be the same as those envisaged as being set apart for the ministry in 1 Tim. 5:22, in which case it is significant that "ordination" is not so much as mentioned in the present verse. This non-mention of a succession of office is as removed from the doctrine of apostolic succession which began to find expression in Clement of Rome (*Epistle to the Corinthians*, 44) as the emphasis on a succession of right doctrine is in close accord with the importance which Paul attaches to the παράδοσις.

Second, it is only natural that an era of creative enthusiasm and inspired teaching should be followed by a period of consolidation and more normal methods of transmitting the apostolic witness. Paul must have realized that when his personal, apostolic supervision was no longer available, it would be essential to have a continuous succession of men who were loyal to the truth to whom the gospel could be committed. Now that false teachers were already upon the scene threatening to endanger the purity of the Church's faith and morals (1 Tim. 1:3-7, 19-20; 4:1-5; 6:3-5; 2 Tim. 2:14, 16, 23; Tit. 1:10, 14; 3:9), urgency was added to necessity to make such a "principle of tradition and legitimate succession" indispensable for the safe perpetuation of the Church. As Schnackenburg says, "the picture presented by the pastoral epistles is 209
not improbable for the period of consolidation of the Pauline churches."[37] From this perspective, the structure of the ministry in the Pastorals can be traced directly to Paul and need not be taken, as Käsemann takes it, as a development that found its theological justification only in a *fabricated* theory of tradition and legitimate succession.[37a]

Thirdly, it should not escape notice that besides loyalty to the truth, a second qualification required of these transmitters of the gospel is an aptitude to teach (cf. 1 Tim. 3:2), and this is a gift of the Spirit. It is, moreover, the Spirit who can enable them to be loyal to the truth (cf. 2 Tim. 1:14, φύλαξον διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου). Once again, it is by no means a case of the Spirit being put under the ministry as a "ministerial Spirit"; rather, he remains above the ministry as the Lord of charismata and the Enabler for its faithful and fruitful discharge.

Käsemann is quite right in stating that Paul "set his doctrine of charisma in opposition to the theory of an institutionally guaranteed ecclesiastical office" (84). Only, he seems quite mistaken in believing that such office is what is envisaged in the Pastorals. It should be pointed out that neither in the matter of "ordination" nor in the matter of "legitimate succession" is there reason for thinking that the office is *institutionally guaranteed*. The holding of an office is conditional upon a

[37] *The Church in the New Testament*, E.T. (London: Burns and Oates, 1965), p.30.

[37a] Cf. H. Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, pp. 476f.

person's faithfulness to the truth and his possessing the gift to teach it to others, and in both respects the person is directly dependent upon the Holy Spirit. Notwithstanding the more developed ecclesiastical structure of the Pastorals, the Holy Spirit, far from being forgotten or imprisoned, is still upheld as the sovereign Spirit in his prophetic (1 Tim. 1:18; 4:14; 4:1) and enabling (2 Tim. 1:14) as well as regenerative (Tit. 3:5) power. The ministry is still recognized to be vitally dependent on the Holy Spirit, the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith is not at stake, and the Pastorals are quite consistent with the Pauline outlook!

Spiritual Gifts And The Organization Of The Ministry

On the basis of the above study, it may be concluded that neither Käsemann's assertion that the charisma concept excludes the notion of office, nor his claim that the ministry in the Pastorals is directly opposed to the Pauline outlook, rests upon a sufficient basis. Indirectly, the above examination of Käsemann's views on "ministry and community" has been an investigation into the relation between Paul's conception of spiritual gifts and the picture of the ministry's outward organization as reflected in the Pauline corpus, especially in the Pastorals. This relation may now be indicated more directly as follows.

There is, to begin with, no intrinsic incompatibility between spiritual gift and an organized ministry involving ecclesiastical office and official authority; in thinking of Paul, charisma can find expression through office, and where an office is involved, it *must not* be severed from charisma. This is most clearly illustrated by the fact that the apostle Paul, though doubtless a "charismatic" himself, yet possessed an official status and official authority; and by the alignment of gift and office which emerges from a comparison of the charismata lists and the qualifications for bishops and deacons. In other words, not only does the concept of charisma allow for the existence of an organized and official ministry, but "the official Ministry is charismatic; every function of it presupposes the presence of a Divine Spirit acting through human weakness".[38]

Not all charismata, of course, need or do find expression through office. In the words of Hans Küng, "The charism cannot be subsumed under the heading of ecclesiastical office, but all Church offices can be

[38] A. G. Hebert, *The Form of the Church* (London: Faber, 1954), p.50, cited in L. Morris, *Ministers of God* (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1964), p.62, n.1. Cf. H. Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, p.458.

subsumed under the charism."[39] An examination of the charismata[40] shows that whereas some gifts, such as those of sharing, caring, and showing mercy, are more private gifts which are, indeed, to be used in the service of others as opportunity presents itself; others, like those of apostles, prophets, teachers, exhortation, helps, service, administrators, and pastors, are more public gifts designed to be used regularly and constantly within the community.[41] It is significant that besides "apostles" and "prophets", all the other gifts can be associated with overseers and deacons (administrators = pastors, helps) and even definitely identified with their qualifications or functions (teaching, exhortation, service, pastoring = administration). Thus it is seen that the more public gifts are intended for, and actually exercised by, those who represent the public ministry of the Church: apostles, prophets, teachers, presbyter-bishops and deacons. Again, the outward organization of the ministry is seen to be well consistent with the doctrine of charisma.

We may at this juncture refer to a certain basic tendency in respect of the organization of the ministry which is discernible in the Pauline corpus. This may be described as a tendency towards increasing recognition of and emphasis on the regular ministry. The appointment of elders in Acts 14:23 marked the provision of an official if simple leadership for the Galatian churches, and apparently in two or three short years the body of elders had acquired the nature of a "council" (τὸ πρεσβυτέριον, 1 Tim. 4:14), participating with the apostle in the consecration of Timothy to his special function as apostolic assistant, though the term may mean no more than that the elders acted together as a body and should not be regarded as indicative of a highly technical ecclesi-

[39] *Op. cit.* (see n.21 above), p.187.

[40] The following grouping may be useful as a workable classification:

I. Endowments for the ministry in word
- A. Gifts of evangelic proclamation
  - 1. Apostles
  - 2. Evangelists
- B. Gifts of inspired utterance
  - 1. Prophets
  - 2. Ability to distinguish between spirits
  - 3. Various kinds of tongues
  - 4. Interpretation of tongues
- C. Gifts of didactic speech
  - 1. Teachers
  - 2. Utterance of wisdom
  - 3. Utterance of knowledge
  - 4. Exhortation

II. Equipments for the ministry in deed
- D. Gifts of supernatural power
  - 1. Miracles
  - 2. Gifts of healing
  - 3. Faith
- E. Gifts of administrative leadership
  - 1. Administrators
  - 2. Pastors
- F. Gifts of practical help
  - 1. Helps
  - 2. Service
  - 3. Sharing
  - 4. Caring
  - 5. Showing mercy

[41] Cf. H. Küng, *op. cit.*, p.394.

astical structure. B. H. Streeter made the suggestion that the practical disorders at Corinth compelled Paul to face more clearly than heretofore the need of a new emphasis on the respect due to church leaders, and that this intention underlies the exhortation in 1 Cor. 16:15f.[42] Such an intention already lies behind the exhortation in 1 Thess. 5:12f. Streeter further observes that the very fact of Paul's summoning the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:17) is "an important piece of historical evidence of a growing desire on his part to enhance the prestige of, and foster a sense of responsibility in, officers charged with the direction of the church".[43] This desire, it may be suggested, is all the more intelligible in the light of his premonitions of imminent peril to himself (Acts 20:22-25) and impending danger to the church (vv. 29-31); Paul would realize that after his departure (μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου) these presbyter-bishops would have to serve as a bulwark against heresy. Could it be that the singling out of the overseers and deacons in the salutation to the Philippians (1:1), occasioned as it probably was by their being responsible for the Jerusalem collection or the gift to Paul — who was now a prisoner facing the distinct possibility of death (Phil. 1:20-23) — is yet another indication of the same desire? In the Pastorals, where the apostle is concerned that church leadership should be exercised by suitably qualified men, the emphasis upon the official ministry clearly comes to the fore.[44] Streeter's conclusion (which does not cover the Pastorals since Streeter considers them to be pseudonymous) may be accepted for the whole of the Pauline corpus:

> The total amount of evidence yielded up by the passages considered above is not large; nor do I claim that it is always unambiguous. But it all points in the same direction; and taken as a whole it suffices if not to prove, at least to make probable, the fact of a slow but steady movement. And it is a movement away from the state of things implied in 1 Corinthians — where pre-eminence in the Church depends on the *personal* possession of some spiritual gift (of which "government" is one of the least esteemed) — and towards a state of things where importance is attached to the holding of *an office* invested with recognised authority.[45]

42 *Op. cit.*, p.80.

43 *Ibid.*, p.82.

44 The local ministry as presented in the Pastorals shows a more advanced degree of organization than elsewhere, with apostolic delegates exercising supreme authority and transmitting the authentic gospel, with bishop-presbyters engaged in preaching, pastoring, ruling, and in their turn passing on the tradition, with deacons rendering service of a more practical and temporal sort, and with suitably qualified widows and other female workers (probably deaconesses) assisting the whole by providing ministrations particularly adapted to the needs of women. For substantiation of this statement I may perhaps be allowed to refer to my work, "Ministry, Community and Spiritual Gifts" (unpublished Th.M. thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, 1971), pp.157-175.

Now, this growing emphasis which Paul attaches to the regular or official ministry becomes all the more intelligible in the light of the distinction between the more private and the more public gifts noted above, and of another distinction which may be observed, viz., that between the miraculous and the non-miraculous gifts. For, as the apostolic age drew to a close,[46] as the apostles and prophets (and teachers as a separate class of "charismatics") disappeared from the scene and the distinctly miraculous gifts gradually ceased,[47] it was only natural that the presbyter-bishops and deacons, who all along had possessed the necessary gifts but had hitherto occupied a place of secondary importance in comparison with apostles, prophets, and teachers, should now emerge into greater prominence as leaders of the communities.[48] They now make up the staple of the regular ministry and they are responsible to take the lead in continuing the apostolic witness and work. Hence, the

45 *Op. cit.*, pp.82f.

46 G. B. Caird, *The Apostolic Age* (London: Duckworth, 1955), p.143, notes that according to Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii.17) the ministry of the apostles came to a close during the reign of Nero. If the ancient church tradition concerning him is correct, the apostle John is an exception in having lived to well beyond Neronian times.

47 Cf. G. E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p.536: "Since the gifts of apostleship and prophecy were given for the founding of the church (Eph. 2:20), it is possible that the distinctly supernatural gifts belong primarily to the apostolic period." The word "primarily" should be emphasized, since it safeguards, rightly, the possibility of even miraculous gifts being manifested in the subsequent history of the Church.; contast with this L. Morris, who takes the view that *all* the gifts were meant for the infant Church only (*Ministers of God*, pp.67f.). For a statement of the Pentecostal position that all the gifts are for today, reference may be made to F. D. Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), pp.130-132. See also S. Fowler, "The Continuance of the Charismata", *EQ* 45 (1973), 172-183, for the interesting thesis that the impartation to others than the apostles of those charismata which were inherently sign-gifts (healing, faith, working of miracles, and tongues) was dependent on the apostolic charisma and that those, like the apostolic charisma itself, ceased with the apostles (pp.178ff.).

48 The view that presbyter-bishops and deacons took over the leadership from prophets and teachers is held by many scholars, including J. B. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p.186; J. A. Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (London: James Clarke, n.d.), p.98; K. L. Schmidt, *TDNT* III 535 (he aptly remarks that "we are not (thereby) justified in speaking of an essential constitutional change from a pneumatic to a juristic form (of church government)"); H. Sasse, *art. cit.*, p.17; L. Morris, *op. cit.*, pp.79f.

increasing emphasis upon the regular ministry seems well placed. Once again, the picture of the organization of the ministry is seen to be perfectly consistent with the doctrine of charisma.[49]

China Graduate School of Theology, Hong Kong

[49] With the position of this paper cf. H. Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, pp.438-446 (esp. 442-446). We may quote in particular from the concluding paragraph of his discussion: ". . . for a right understanding of the spiritual equipment of the church the distinction between the charismatic and institutional sooner leads us astray than that it could serve us as a directive for what follows (sic) . . . Every attempt to construct an antithesis here betrays a conception of the work of the Spirit that . . . finds as little support in the Pauline conception of the building up of the church as it does in that of the remainder of the New Testament."

For a contrary opinion, cf. also Siegfried Schulz, "Die Charismenlehre des Paulus: Bilanz der Probleme und Ergebnisse", in J. Friedrich, W. Pöhlmann and P. Stuhlmacher (eds.), *Rechtfertigung. Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), pp.443-460 (esp. 451-454).