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CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Identifying a Paradigm for Church Leadership from I Corinthians

This study will examine Paul's proposed model for the administration of the Corinthian Church, as reflected in I Corinthians, with a view toward identifying a biblical paradigm for contemporary church leadership.

Paul's Analysis of Corinthian Leadership Structures

In I Corinthians, after a brief opening and thanksgiving, Paul quickly brought up his major concern for the Corinthian Church — there were dissensions. This occupied the major part of Paul's thought in chapters 1-4 and he came back to it throughout the letter. Paul obviously was concerned about the Corinthian leadership as he wrote,

I appeal to you, brothers, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree with one another so that there may be no divisions among you and that you may be perfectly united in mind and thought. My brothers, some from Chloe's household have informed me that there are quarrels among you. What I mean is this: One of you says, "I follow Apollos"; another, "I follow Cephas"; still another, "I follow Christ" (I Cor. 1:10-12 The New International Version of the Bible is used throughout this paper).
Paul began his discourse concerning this problem with the verb "encourage", which had meanings of "appeal to, urge, exhort, encourage" (Arndt and Gingrich 617). Paul had come to some conclusions about the Corinthian leadership structures which led him to urge for change. This paper has sought to discover Paul's conclusions in this matter.

Paul's Model for Corinthian Leadership Structures

Paul's model for leadership in I Corinthians is based on his own example. Paul told the Corinthians to "Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ" (I Cor. 11:1). Paul does not make this request as an outsider. He had spent over a year and a half with the Corinthians (Acts 18:11). He worked with them, talked with them, and led them into relationship with Jesus Christ (Acts 18:1-18). Paul had nourished the Corinthians in their new found faith (I Cor. 4:15). He had lived the Christian life before them (I Cor. 4:17). So, it is without imposition that he brings to a close his discussion of Corinthian leadership, started in chapter 1 verse 10, with the same urgent plea, "Therefore I urge you to imitate me" (I Cor. 4:16).

Paul's model for leadership in Corinth is best evidenced in chapter 4 verses 1-5 of I Corinthians:

So then, men ought to regard us as servants of Christ and as those entrusted with the secret things of God. Now it is required that those who have been given a trust most prove faithful. I care very little if I am judged by you or by any human court; indeed, I do not even judge myself. My conscience is clear, but that does not make me innocent. It is the Lord who judges me. Therefore judge nothing before the appointed time; wait till the Lord comes. He will bring to light what is hidden in darkness and will expose the motives of men's hearts. At that time each will receive his praise from God.

Paul went on to say, "Now, brothers, I have applied these things
to myself and Apollos for your benefit, so that you may learn from us . . . ." (I Cor. 4:6). This report has attempted to examine Paul's proposed model for the leadership structures of the Corinthian Church as reflected in the above passage and Paul's own example in I Corinthians.

The Hypothesis

The first aspect of the hypothesis is that Paul's analysis of the leadership structures at Corinth, as they then existed, can be extracted from I Corinthians.

Second, it is proposed that Paul's model for the leadership structures of the Corinthian Church in I Corinthians is discernable and applicable to the contemporary church.

The Delimitations and Assumptions

This study is an examination of the leadership structures in the first century document of I Corinthians. This study will not work with the biblical leadership materials outside of I Corinthians, except as they specifically relate to I Corinthians. The data cited will attempt to specify what leadership structures actually existed in the Corinthian Church as evidenced in I Corinthians, as well as Paul's analysis and proposed model for leadership structures in that epistle.

Paul's authorship and the reliability of I Corinthians is assumed. Though some scholars have questioned the unity of I Corinthians, in this paper its unity will be assumed. The dating of I Corinthians at A.D. 55-56 is also assumed (Harrison 282-291).

The Importance of the Study

Contemporary Western Christianity has been searching for something that will help re-establish its unity. The founding of the World Council of Churches is one evidence of this. The wide acceptance of the charismatic movement across most denominational
lines is another.

However, the need for unity does not end with the outward fractures of the church. That is only the tip of the iceberg. There is a deeper division within Western Christianity for which there is no New Testament precedent: the division of "clergy" and "laity" (Küng 465-495).

There is an assured leadership role among "clergy" who are paid to operate and "shepherd" the church while the "laity" occupy a submissive role and "enjoy the pasture." Some may claim a basis for this in Peter's "shepherd-sheep" model found in I Peter 5:1-5. However, Peter warned of the inherent weaknesses of his model (I Peter 5:23). His model was not intended to be the underlying worldview or paradigm for ministry. Jesus' paradigm for ministry is found in the Gospels (i.e. Mark 10:35-45). It is the paradigm of servanthood. The servanthood paradigm allows no room for the lifting up of clergy over laity.

In order to breach the dividing wall between clergy and laity there needs to be a rediscovery of the biblical paradigm of servanthood. Biblical models must be used that clearly reinforce that paradigm. Such a model is found in I Corinthians.

The Definitions of Terms

Charismatic. Church structure or leadership that has its basis in the free leading of the Holy Spirit. This stands opposed to clericalism and legalism (see Küng 236ff and 508ff).

Submission is due to those who labour, not because of their appointment to a particular ministry, but because they are actually seen to perform that ministry. Anyone who is qualified for a particular ministry — as prophet, teacher, helper, superior, bishop or deacon, etc. — and who performs it properly, has received the call of God and the charism of the Spirit. Authority in the community is derived not from the holding of a certain rank, not from a special tradition, not from old age or long membership of the community but from the performance
of a ministry in the Spirit. The obedience of all is due to God, Christ, the Spirit; only a limited, and never a unilateral obedience is due to other men in the community. The consequence of the obedience of all to God, Christ and the Spirit is voluntary ministry of all to all, voluntary obedience to the different charisms of others (Küng 512-513).

**Church.** The local congregation, "a gathering of God's people," "an assembly" (Kittel 3:505). It also is used to mean the universal community of Christians (Kittel 3:506-509).

**Mystagogue.** "One who initiates into or interprets mysteries," "a teacher or disseminator of mystical doctrines" (Webster). Particularly referring to those leaders of the various mystery religions existant in the Greco-Roman world.

**Paradigm.** "Example, Pattern" (Webster). More than just a simple model, but an underlying principle or worldview. A pattern or example that is foundational and shapes all thinking on a certain subject.

**Parenthetical Documentation (MLA).**

The placement of both first and subsequent references in the text within parentheses, an alternative to the note - bibliography system (Campbell 87).

When you cite an entire work by the name of the author alone or with author and title, you do not need a parenthetical reference. A reader will be able to find bibliographical information by looking up the author's name in your list of works cited (Campbell 89).

This paper follows the MLA form of documentation.
CHAPTER 2
THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In the past, the problem of biblical interpretation has primarily been considered as an aspect of theological study. However; there has been a movement among biblical scholars to consider the problem within the context of sociology. This study has attempted to use theological tools for its exegesis, especially in its discovery of a model for leadership structures in I Corinthians 4:1-5. However, the main thrust of this research has been in the realm of sociological studies. Various available documents and studies as they bear on first century culture, religion, and social structures in Corinth have been examined.

Historical Documents

The first century. I Corinthians, and other related New Testament material have been the primary documents used. Roberts and Donaldson's edition of "The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians," written as early as 68 A.D. or as late as 97 A.D. throws light on Corinthian leadership structures from the viewpoint of a contemporary and possible co-worker of Paul's (Phil. 4:3).
Barrett furnishes an important selection of first century documents pertinent to the culture, religion, and social structures of first century Christianity (New Testament Background).

The Church Fathers. Ferguson's study provides a chapter on "The Organization of The Early Church" where selections of works from the Early Church Fathers showed the progression from a charismatic structure to an official episcopate (Ferguson 167-178). References to Paul's espoused model of leadership given in I Corinthians 4:1-5 are very minimal in the church fathers. Ignatius (Roberts and Donaldson, 1: 67), Athanasius (Schaff and Wace, 4: 93), and Gregory Nazianzan (Schaff and Wace, 7: 255) comment on the responsibility and honor of the bishops and deacons as "stewards of the mysteries." Jerome pointed out that some stewards are better than others (Schaff and Wace, 6: 405). Finally, Augustine implied that any disciple of Christ is "God's minister" and "is a steward of the Mystery" (Schaff, 8: 507). Chrysostom was noticably lacking in any comment on I Corinthians 4:1-5 in his Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians (Schaff, vol. 12).

The Reformers. Calvin and Wesley commented on I Corinthians 4:1-5 in their respective commentaries. Calvin's and Wesley's thought coincided along with that of Ignatius, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzan, and Jerome, with the emphasis upon the official minister as a responsible steward. Luther's comments on I Corinthians 4:1-5 took up where Augustine concluded. The responsibility of stewardship of the mystery was upon all Christians, since all Christians are considered priests (Luther, 39: XVII). Paul's model in I Corinthians 4:1-5, according to Luther, comprised all Christians and especially those elected by the community to serve as their leaders (Luther, 40: 34-35).

Modern Commentators. Godet adequately deals with the textual problem of I Corinthians 4:2. Variants of this text would differ in meaning as to whether the Apostle was referring to stewards in general or, more particularly, to himself and Apollos, as in verse
The third edition of the Greek New Testament by Aland, et al., however, does not even mention a variant. The historical reading of 证监会 sterile is accepted in all modern translations; thus, giving the verse the meaning of faithfullness required of stewards, specifically speaking of Paul and Apollos.

This reading of I Corinthians 4:2 gives the 4:1-5 passage a coherence, which enables it to be lifted out as a model for the church. Paul encouraged the Corinthians to imitate him (I Cor. 4:16), and I Corinthians 4:1-5 was the epitome of Paul's example, especially verses 1-2.

Moffat, Fee, and The Jerome Biblical Commentary emphasized the meaning of I Corinthians 4:1-2 as designated for Apostolic ministry. This is where the passage receives its force. If the Apostles themselves were to be considered "servants" and "stewards", then how much more so others who follow them in ministry. Robertson and Plummer, and also Barrett saw this significance and were quick to see in this passage a model for all ministers.

Emil Brunner, like Luther, saw the significance of this passage not just for ministers, but for all Christians. "In essence the words of this text — minister of Christ and steward of the divine mysteries — apply to every single Christian" (184). W. R. Inge in his sermon, "The Priesthood of the Laity," used I Corinthians 4:1 as his key text. This model was perceived as being for all christians and especially applying to all ministers.

Theological Reflection

The New Testament and Pauline Thought. The social context of I Corinthians is not complete until one attempts to penetrate the mind of Paul. Campenhausen looked at Paul's thought from the standpoint of the later development of ecclesiastical authority. Porter stressed the Christ mindset of Paul. Burkitt illustrated that Paul's letters showed more the influence of Judaism than Hellinism. He pictured Paul as a Jewish scholastic. On the other
hand, Deissmann perceived Paul as far more practical than theoretical. "He is far more a man of prayer, a witness, a confessor, and a prophet, than a learned exegete and close thinking scholastic" (Deissmann 6). Furnish saw love as the main theme in the New Testament. He used the undisputed Pauline letters to outline Paul's model of love as the basic church structure.

Paul's understanding of "church" constitutes a basic issue for our analysis. Cerfaux allowed Paul's thought on the church to develop out of his epistles. That however, is a hard thing to do with one's own biases. In König's extensive biblical theology of the church, Paul's thought is weaved throughout, showing how the church has misunderstood and corrupted his model. Paul's understanding of church, according to Kittel, destroys all divisions that center on man's thoughts and control. The church is grounded in Christ and belongs to God. It is not under man's jurisdiction (3: 487-509).

Gnosticism in Corinth. Schmithals identified Paul's opponents in the Corinthian correspondence as gnostics. According to this source, the gnosticism of the first century was well organized with a strong missionary movement and offices of Apostle-prophet-teacher. Some in Corinth boasted of such an office and tried to exert influence in the church.

Baird's analysis of the social problems at Corinth suggested a variety of opposition and problems indicated in I Corinthians. Gnosticism, Judaism, or whatever else has been suggested cannot be lifted out as the major problem.

The findings from Wilson's study were that those who accept a narrow definition of gnosticism see no conclusive evidence of a pre-christian gnosticism. Those scholars who operate under a broad definition of gnosticism see it in the New Testament and many other early documents. However, there is no conclusive evidence for a pre-christian gnosticism. A proto-gnosticism in Corinth is possible.
**Sociological Studies**

*Introductions.* Smith's book, *The Social Description of Early Christianity*, was a working paper that outlined the various directions in which social studies of Early Christianity could proceed. He related the different schools of thought, made some critical assessments, and offered a lengthy bibliography. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* by Gager, researched Christian beginnings as any other religion would be researched. It offered a somewhat technical description of the field.

*The Graeco-Roman World.* There is quite a bit of general information on first century culture, religion, and social structures. Authors such as: Grant, Koester, Latourette, Meeks, and Tenney considered the general Graeco-Roman background of first century Christianity and its effects upon Christianity, as well as, Christianity's effects upon it. Lietzmann, Nock, and Tarn dealt more specifically with the Hellenistic religious atmosphere of early Christianity. Broneer offered an archaeological approach to research in his article, "Corinth: Center of St. Paul's Missionary work in Greece."

*Conflict at Corinth.* Robinson and Koester saw the schisms in Corinth as developing out of the wisdom tradition. "The Corinthian 'parties' referred to in 1 Corinthians are really schools, as it were, in which the teacher (Peter, Paul, Apollos, Christ) is considered as the leader into divine wisdom" (223).

The significance of early christians meeting in houses cannot be overlooked. Filson gives five important aspects of the house churches in his article. In Judge's book, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century*, social institutions are described as overlapping but not systematically related circles. Barchy deals with the topic of slavery and freedom in the first century church as it relates to the new freedom in Christ. The house churches in Corinth included people from all social strata (1 Cor.
who had to learn to get along with each other.

Hollenweger's book is an innovation in Biblical studies. He used "narrative exegesis" to provide an interpretation of I Corinthians. The conflict between the different social strata at Corinth is more easily comprehended as it is acted out dramatically. Hollenweger's interpretation was grounded in Gerd Theissen's work, The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity.

Peter Marshall also supported the conclusions reached by Theissen (Social Setting), but by a different approach. Marshall's analysis of Paul's relations with the Corinthians revealed a friendship/enmity polarization. Theissen contended that the internal conflict in the Corinthian community was caused by the attempted social integration of different socio-economic levels into one association. Theissen discussed this same theme in a section of another one of his works, The First Followers of Jesus (111-119).

In both books, Theissen argued that a love-patriarchalism developed in the Hellenistic churches, based on the need for social interaction within the community. Love-patriarchalism allows that the socially strong in the Christian community may continue to live characteristic to their social status as long as they show consideration to those socially weak and dependent in the community.

Engberg-Pederson disagrees with Theissen's view that the Apostle Paul supported love-patriarchalism in I Corinthians (Social Setting, 107). Engberg-Pederson argues that the gospel Paul preached was directly about social practice. As Paul instructed and encouraged the Corinthian Church, he did so without demeaning anyone or issuing laws. Rather, he stated the truth and allowed for concessions due to human carnality. Primarily, Paul gave his own practical example of sacrifice and self denial in applying the gospel of love.

Willis deals with the conflict of whether or not a Christian should eat meat sacrificed to idols. Despite many division theories, Willis is convinced of the unity of I Corinthians 8-10. In chapter 8 Paul deals with the topic of idol meat in general terms, referring
to the Corinthians' questions and argument. In chapter 9 Paul gives his own example of foregoing his rights for the good of others. In chapter 10 Paul gives his argument and specific answers on the topic of idol meat. Paul has the good of the community in mind (I Cor. 10:23,24,33). Paul hopes that his own example will secure the Corinthian conformity to his advice of always considering the other person (I Cor. 10:31-11:1). The community of faith must be grounded in love. Christians are free to love and therefore forego our own rights for the sake of others, always desiring to build up the "body" and seek the good of others. So goes Willis' argument. Very similar to Engberg-Pederson, it stands in contrast to Theissen's love-patriarchal view.

Hock's study of Paul's tentmaking brought the idea of self-supporting ministry into the center of this discussion. Paul's socio-economic position and his rolemodeling was based on the Apostle's trade as it was understood in first century society. The relevance of Paul's tentmaking has long been overlooked in biblical studies.

Miscellaneous. The work of Abraham Malherbe was of great value in this study. Most of the books mentioned above are referred to in his book. Finally, Robert Banks' Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting has been a major impetus in this research.
CHAPTER 3
PAUL'S ANALYSIS OF THE LEADERSHIP STRUCTURES AT CORINTH
AS REFLECTED IN I CORINTHIANS

The Investigation

Cultural Influence. First century Corinth was ideally situated at the narrowest point of the isthmus connecting mainland Greece to the Peloponnese. All north and south travel had to go through it, making it an important commercial city for Greece. Even more importantly however; it acted as a land bridge between the Aegean sea, leading to Asia, and the Ionian sea, leading to Italy. Corinth, therefore, had the prestige of being a major commercial sea port for the Roman Empire.

Ancient Corinth was destroyed in 146 B.C.; then refounded in 46 B.C. by Julius Caesar as a Roman Colony. It was this new Corinth, filled with settlers from throughout the Roman Empire, that sets the social stage for Paul's entrance at about 50 A.D.

Lietzmann gives a good summary of the religious climate during Paul's ministry:

The religious tone of the early empire is characterized in the first place by the fact that the religion of the ancient Greek gods, i.e. the religion of the official cult and its links with city, race,
and family, died away. It was still officially carried on but it lived no longer in the heart. In its place came either irreligious indifference of the philosophers' habit of mind; or on the other hand religion took possession of the solitary soul of the individual as a question of practical life and hope. . . . This kind of religion had spread in the form of the mysteries from the east and at an early date had found its way into Greece (223-224).

The mystery religions were built around a myth of a god who died and rose again, usually in connection with the vegetation cycle. The adherents were initiated through some secret rites. Through these initiations the initiates were to obtain salvation from fate and attain to a higher life. The mysteries came in many varieties, each serving their own faithful adherents.

Judaism, along with the mystery religions, was an officially recognized religion (religio licita) of the Roman Empire (Tenney 303). There were synagogues in most of the major cities. It was in the Corinthian synagogue that Paul began his evangelization of Corinth (Acts 18:4). However, for many of the Jews, Paul's message of salvation in the Anointed One of God who died and rose again, was more than they could tolerate (Acts 18:5-6; I Cor. 15:1-4). So Paul left the synagogue and entered into a nearby Gentile home (Acts 18:6-7). The Gentiles received him gladly and Paul continued to preach and teach in Corinthian homes (Acts 18:8-11; I Cor. 1:11,16; 16:15,19).

Paul's language in I Corinthians and in others of his letters betrays the fact that he understood the background and appeal of the mystery religions. Paul used the term μυστήριον, "mystery" twenty-one times in his epistles. Its only other uses include once in each of the Synoptics and four times in Revelation. It was clearly a Paulinism used by the great "Apostle to the Gentiles." In each case, except for one where Paul used the term to speak about the antichrist (II Thess. 2:7), it was used to refer to Christ and the truth surrounding Him. Six times it is used in I Corinthians
Paul also made heavy use of the term, \( \text{γνῶσις} \), "knowledge" in his Corinthian correspondence (16 times, out of a total N.T. usage of 29 times). Another favorite term of the mystery religions was \( \text{σοφία} \), "wisdom". Out of its fifty uses in the New Testament, Paul used it fifteen times in the first three chapters of I Corinthians.

Paul was not afraid to communicate the gospel in forms the Corinthians would understand (I Cor. 9:19-23), in terms of their religious world view. However, this did not prevent some from confusing the content with the form.

There are numerous indications that many members of the congregation at Corinth were newly converted from mystery cults and still clung to old ways such as ceremonial drunkenness, fornication, participation in idol's feast, the noisy clamor of worship, and the ritual cries of women. It was syneretization of Christianity and mystery religions which, according to Hippolytus and others, produced the heresies known as Gnosticism (Elwell 744).

Gnosticism came later, but its roots were already evident in Corinth. Paul understood its inherent danger and wrote to correct it. According to Koester,

The Corinthians were convinced of their possession of divine wisdom and related its mediation to the specific apostles through whom they had been initiated into Christianity by baptism (I Cor. 1:13-17; see also Paul's emphasis upon the general significance of baptism for each and every member of the church in I Cor. 12:13) (121).

Whether or not this was fully the case cannot be proven, but it is obvious that the Corinthians were elevating the Apostles to a position beyond that which was acceptable. Barrett pointed out that

The party slogans all bear witness to an overvaluing of human wisdom, and a failure to understand, or rightly value, the Gospel, which Paul was sent (1:17) to preach (Commentary 51).
Charismatic Structure. Paul ministered in Corinth approximately one and one-half years, establishing house-churches (Acts 18:8-11; I Cor. 1:11,16; 16:15-19). Apollos followed-up Paul's ministry in Corinth (Acts 18:27-19:1); most likely establishing some new house-churches in the process (I Cor. 3:5-6). Sometime between Paul's departure and the writing of I Corinthians (3 years), Peter also came to have influence on some of the house-churches in Corinth (I Cor. 1:12; 3:22). These gatherings in the house-churches were small; the largest meetings with about forty to forty-five present (Banks 42).

The leadership in the Corinthian house-churches was charismatic (I Cor. 12:27f; 14:26f). Küng makes great use of I Corinthians while discussing the charismatic structure of the church. He said, "No other New Testament writing gives such original and detailed information about the external and internal ordering of a Church" (236). Yet, there were no officially appointed leaders. Nowhere in I Corinthians does Paul make mention of bishops, deacons or elders. Paul always addressed himself to the whole group (used the term "brothers" 38 times), never to a designated officer. Each Christian received a gift(s) from God and was expected to use it in service and ministry to others (I Cor. 12-14). Within this charismatic structure a leadership was developing. These were leaders not assigned or elected, but out of their own love for God they spontaneously rose up for service to the church (I Cor. 16:15-16).

Paul recognized this type of leadership (I Cor. 16:15-16). It characterized his own self concept of apostolic leadership (Gal. 1-2; I Cor. 9:1-2; II Cor. 5:11-21; 10:7-18; 11-12). Emphasis was on Christ, not the human instrument (I Cor. 1:4-9,17-18,30-31; 2:2-5; 3:5-4:7; 15:1-11).

Many of the Corinthians, and most likely entire house-churches were losing the focus of this charismatic structure and were taking pride in various apostolic leaders and what they had attained through them (I Cor. 1:11-15; 4:6-7). Emphasis was taken off Christ
and placed on men (I Cor. 3:1-5). Filson pointed out that the "existence of several house churches in one city goes far to explain the tendency to party strife in the apostolic age" (qtd. in Malherbe 61). Paul attempted to correct this (I Cor. 3:5-4:21).

Summary

First century Corinth was a large commercial Roman sea port. Through it came people and ideas from all over the Empire. Among the ideas that gained popularity were the mystery religions. They appealed to the individual's desire to belong to a group, find salvation from fate and receive wisdom for this present life through the secret mysteries.

Paul came to Corinth preaching salvation from sin and new life in Jesus Christ who died and rose again. Upon being forced out of the Jewish synagogue, Paul preached to small groups in Corinthian homes. The Corinthians received his message gladly as Paul delivered the context of the gospel in the popular forms the people understood. The major use of such terms as "mystery", "knowledge", "wisdom", among others in I Corinthians indicates Paul's attempt to indigenize the gospel into the Corinthian religious setting. Some of the new converts out of the mysteries, however, apparently clung to some of the old content of their past beliefs. They were forming parties around their honored Apostles who initiated them into their new faith much like a mystagogue.

The charismatic structure and multiplicity of the Corinthian house-churches did not help matters at this point. The focus which was meant to center on Christ and depend on the Holy Spirit was shifting in some of the house-churches to men. When referring to this thirty years later, Clement said, "that inclination for one above another entailed less guilt upon you, inasmuch as your partialities were then shown towards apostles, already of high reputation. . . ." (Roberts and Donaldson 18). Still, the Corinthians were guilty of boasting and taking pride in men rather
than in God (I Cor. 1:11-12; 28-31; 3:3-4,21-23; 4:6-7). This is the misconception of leadership Paul must correct.

Conclusions

Paul is urgent in his plea that the Corinthians change their conception that the Apostles have any power or unique authority in themselves (I Cor. 1:10-4:16). The Corinthians were confusing some of the old content of their previous belief with the new content of faith in Christ. The fact that Paul used some of the same terms or form for his message may have created some of the confusion. However, it evidently was also richly used by God to bring many of the Corinthians into the Kingdom. Paul simply had to face the problem head on and clarify the true position of Apostles (the content). He does not forsake his method of contextualization however; he writes his correction in the same popular terms the Corinthians understood.
CHAPTER 4

PAUL’S PROPOSED MODEL FOR THE LEADERSHIP STRUCTURES IN THE
CORINTHIAN CHURCH AS REFLECTED IN I CORINTHIANS

The Exegesis

Paul’s Model. Paul urged his brothers in Corinth to find unity in Christ (I Cor. 1:10; cf. I Cor. 1:2,4,30; 6:15-1; 12:12-31). Meeks observed,

When Paul was faced with incipient divisions, jealousies, and spiritual elitism among the charismatics of Corinth, it was to the unity of the Lord (Christ) and the Spirit that he appealed (I Cor. 12) “(166).

This unity of the Lord and the Spirit had its basis in the spiritual gifts that had been distributed to all the believers (I Cor. 12). Leadership was to arise out of the gifts manifested by the Holy Spirit in the congregation (I Cor. 12:27f). Küng noted that, "The rediscovery of the charisms is a rediscovery of specifically Pauline ecclesiology. . . ." (238). The Corinthian charismatic context however, must be understood within Paul’s theme of love. Emphasis was placed on the correct use of the gift given, not on the gift per se, or on the individual who had received the gift. Use of the gift without love amounted to nothing (I Cor. 13).

If true spirituality was measured by love, then the Corinthians
came up short (I Cor. 3:1-4). Their concern was with the gift and who had it. Specifically, the apostolic gift: "For when one says, 'I follow Paul,' and another, 'I follow Apollos,' are you not mere men" (I Cor. 3:4). Paul countered their carnal thinking: "What, after all, is Apollos? And what is Paul? Only servants, through whom you came to believe---as the Lord has assigned to each his task" (I Cor. 3:5). Emphasis was placed back on the use of the gift, not on the individual or gift itself.

Were the Apostles mystagogues? Did they have any power or unique authority in themselves? No! They were "only servants." I planted the seed, Apollos watered it, but God made it grow. So neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but only God, who makes things grow. The man who plants and the man who waters have one purpose, and each will be rewarded according to his own labor (I Cor. 3:6-8).

What is that one purpose of those who had received the apostolic gift? — To concentrate on the correct use of the gift; and thereby prove to be faithful servants, "δομήτοροι." In this case, the apostles were "servants" of the Lord. The word is used four other times in the Corinthian correspondence, each time referring to the apostles. The apostles were considered as: "servants of a new covenant" (II Cor. 3:6); "servants of God" (II Cor. 6:4); "servants of Christ" (II Cor. 11:23); and were contrasted with false apostles, who were servants of Satan (II Cor. 11:13-15). The apostles had no power in themselves; it was all in the One whom they served (I Cor. 3:7). They simply were willing instruments, through which God could work (I Cor. 3:5-9). The emphasis however, had to remain on Christ otherwise all work was futile (I Cor. 3:10f).

Paul continued his argument in I Corinthians 3, stressing the charismatic nature of the church (verses 16-17) and the potential for each believer (verses 18-23). Paul had shown that the apostolic gift of leadership was given to the church for its upbuilding in Christ. He had encouraged the Corinthians to focus on the Giver of
the gift, not its possessor. He closed his case by emphasizing the
unity and the potential believers have through God's Spirit.

The problem still remains however; How should the Corinthians
view those possessing and using the apostolic gift? Paul's epitome
for apostolic ministry surfaces here,

So then, men ought to regard us as servants of
Christ and as those entrusted with the secret things
of God. Now it is required that those who have been
given a trust must prove faithful. I care very
little if I am judged by you or by any human court;
indeed, I do not even judge myself. My conscience is
clear, but that does not make me innocent. It is the
Lord who judges me. Therefore judge nothing before
the appointed time; wait till the Lord comes. He will
bring to light what is hidden in darkness and will
expose the motives of men's hearts. At that time
each will receive his praise from God (I Cor. 4:1-5).

The greek term translated as "servant" here is different than
the one in 3:5. Outside of the Gospels and Acts, this is its only
usage. A proper understanding of σερβερτος, "servants of Christ," is important for an apprehension of Paul's
proposed model of apostolic leadership.

σερβερτος is used mostly in Matthew, Mark, and John with
reference to the chief priests of the temple (Matt. 26:58; Mark
14:54,65; John 7:32,45,46; 18:3,12,18,22; 19:6). It is best
translated in these cases as "attendant" or "officer." The
σερβερτος served as the administers of the chief priests' rules
and judgments. They were not domestic servants or waiters as in the
sense of the word found in I Corinthians 3:5. They were given
authority and responsibility to act in the chief priests' behalf and
to carry out their word.

There are two other occurences of σερβερτος in Matthew
and John. In Matthew 5:25 it is used as an officer who administers
the word of a court judge in one of Jesus' parables. In John 18:36
it is used by Jesus, before Pilate, to refer to his disciples, who
were willing to protect and fight for him (cf. John 18:10-11). The
first instance is much the same as the others. The second instance develops the sense of ardent commitment in the servant, and brings it into the setting of Jesus' followers.

is used by Luke six times. Twice it is used in the sense of officials carrying out the word and will of the chief priests as shown above (Acts 5:22,26). Its two uses in Luke's Gospel were interesting. Luke 1:2 refers to the apostles as "servants of the word," who handed down what they had received to others. Its other reference in Luke is of an "attendant" in the Nazareth synagogue, who had charge of the scroll (Luke 4:20). According to Harrison, the attendant in the synagogue was an indispensable figure "who had charge of the rolls of Scripture and frequently doubled as teacher of the synagogue school" (19). The Lukan parallel between 1:2 and 4:20 seems very probable. The "attendant" had the responsibility to hand down the word which was committed to him.

Luke's final two uses of are in Acts 13:5 and 20:16. The first of the references is to John Mark, who was an "attendant" or "helper" to Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey. The second reference is to Paul's charismatic conversion experience in which he received his appointment to be an apostle: After Paul saw the blazing light and heard the word of the Lord, Jesus said to him,

Now get up and stand on your feet. I have appeared to you to appoint you as a servant and as a witness of what you have seen of me and what I will show you (Acts 26:16).

The meaning of attendant here is the same as that used in Luke's Gospel: The attendant was appointed to hand down the word which was committed to him.

The related meanings of found from this study were: First, one who was appointed to administer an authority's word on his behalf; Second, one who was ardently committed to the authority s/he served; Third, one who was appointed to hand down the
word committed to him.

The "servants of Christ" of Paul's apostolic model therefore, were those ardent followers of Christ who were appointed by Christ to administer and hand down the word he committed to them.

Another Greek term of importance in this model is the word \( \text{O} \). It is used five times by Paul (twice in this passage), once by Peter, and four times by Luke in two of Jesus' parables.

In Luke 16:1-8, Luke used \( \text{O} \) three times to refer to the "steward" or "manager" of a rich man's estate. The lesson of the story can be found in Luke 16:10-11:

\[
\text{Whoever can be trusted with very little can also be trusted with much, and whoever is dishonest with very little will also be dishonest with much. So if you have not been trustworthy in handling worldly wealth, who will trust you with true riches?}
\]

The faithful \( \text{O} \) responsibility over riches is further illustrated in Luke 12:42-44:

\[
The Lord answered, "who then is the faithful and wise manager, whom the master puts in charge of his servants to give them their food allowance at the proper time? It will be good for that servant whom the master finds doing so when he returns. I tell you the truth, he will put him in charge of all his possessions.
\]

To receive an appointment of responsibility over the riches of the master, the servant first had to prove himself/herself faithful; thereby, becoming "the faithful and wise manager."

\( \text{O} \) is used by Paul in Romans 16:23 to refer to the city "treasurer." In Galations 4:2 Paul used it in the illustration of a young heir who is still subject to the "trustees" of his father's estate. In both cases the riches entrusted to the \( \text{O} \) was not to be used upon himself/herself, but was to be guarded and preserved for the use upon some other(s) for whom it was promised.
I Peter 4:10 speaks about the riches given to God's and how they should be used:

Each one should use whatever gift he has received to serve others, faithfully administering God's grace in its various forms.

"God's grace in its various forms" are the riches (gifts) each one has received. Now, how should one "faithfully administer" the gift s/he has received? —— By using it to serve others. Emphasis is not on the gift or the individual possessor, but on its correct use. The gifts are entrusted to those who have the responsibility to faithfully use them to serve others. Note that in this verse, the refers to all believers.

Titus 1:7-9 depicts the characteristics expected of the "overseer" as God's :

... he must be blameless. ... He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it.

The spoken of here is a specific church leader, "overseer." The riches he is responsible for is the "trustworthy message" he has received. He must guard and preserve it, "hold firmly," teaching it to others and refuting those who oppose it.

This study has led to the meaning of as being a person who has proven himself/herself faithful, and therefore is entrusted with the riches of another. S/he is then expected to guard and preserve those riches until they can be used upon another. God's are given the riches of his gifts which are to be used to serve others. Specifically, God's as a leader in the church must faithfully guard and preserve the "trustworthy message" he has received with the purpose of teaching it to others and refuting those who oppose it.

In its feminine form, has the meaning of "management," "trusteeship," and "stewardship" (Luke 16:2-4; I Cor. 9:17; Eph. 1:10; 3:2,9; Col. 1:25; I Tim. 1:4). I Corinthians 9:17
and I Timothy 1:4 use it to refer to the preaching of the gospel and the refuting of those who oppose it, respectively. In Ephesians and Colossians Paul used it when speaking of the mystery, "οἱ τῆς ἀνθρώπου", of God now revealed. This is also the way in which it is used in the passage under study, I Corinthians 4:1-2.

The ἀληθευμένον of I Corinthians 4:1-2 are specifically the apostles (refer to chapter 2). The "trustworthy message" (riches) they had received, as God's proven followers, was the θυσία of God. Their responsibility was to faithfully guard and preserve the κεφαλή, teaching it to others and refuting those who oppose it. This leads to the next word study.

bishop is used twenty-eight times in the New Testament. Except for its three uses in Revelation to refer to different signs (1:20; 17:5,7), and its one use in II Thessalonians to refer to the antiChrist (2:7), it otherwise is used unanimously to refer to Christ himself and the gospel which surrounds him (Matt. 13:11; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10; Rom. 11:25; 16:25; I Cor. 2:1,7; 4:1; 13:2; 14:2; 15:51; Eph. 1:9; 3:3,4,9; 5:32; 6:19; Col. 1:26,27; 2:2; 4:3; I Tim. 3:9,16).

Of particular interest to this study have been the uses of bishop when in combination with ἀληθευμένον:

And he made known to us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in Christ, to be put into effect when the times will have reached their fulfillment — to bring all things in heaven and on earth together under one head, even Christ (Eph. 1:9-10).

Surely you have heard about the administration of God's grace that was given to me for you, that is, the mystery made known to me by revelation, as I have already written briefly. In reading this, then, you will be able to understand my insight into the mystery of Christ, which was not made known to men in other generations as it has now been revealed by the Spirit to God's holy apostles and prophets. This mystery is that through the gospel the Gentiles are heirs together with Israel, members together of one
body, and sharers together in the promise in Christ Jesus.
I became a servant of this gospel by the gift of God's grace given me through the working of his power. Although I am less than the least of all God's people, this grace was given me: to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make plain to everyone my administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things (Eph. 3:2-9).

Now I rejoice in what was suffered for you, and I fill up in my flesh what is still lacking in regard to Christ's afflictions, for the sake of his body, which is the church. I have become its servant by the commission God gave me to present to you the word of God in its fullness — the mystery that has been kept hidden for ages and generations, but is now disclosed to the saints. To them God has chosen to make known among the Gentiles the glorious riches of this mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory (Colossians 1:24-27).

Paul clearly stated in the above verses that the mystery of God is that, through the gospel (the atoning death, burial, and resurrection of Christ Jesus — I Cor. 15:1-8), Jew and Gentile can be united together in Christ. All can partake of the promises in Christ. The glorious riches of this mystery is that the eternal Christ comes to live in the believer, this is the hope of glory — eternal life.

Therefore, the "trustworthy message" (riches) entrusted to the apostles, as God's proven followers, was the gospel of Christ and the knowledge that through believing the gospel the eternal Christ came to live in the believer. In this was eternal life. The responsibility of the apostles was to guard and preserve this mystery until all for whom it was promised had the opportunity to receive it (Acts 2:38-39).

This trust was given from God, so Paul made it clear in I Corinthians 4:3-5 that he was responsible to no man. God alone would judge how well he fulfilled the responsibility that
was entrusted to him.

Paul's proposed model of leadership for the Corinthians focused on a correct understanding of the apostolic ministry. The apostles, according to Paul, were only "servants" of Christ. The emphasis needed to be on Christ, not the apostles. They served Christ as his "attendants." That is, they were the ardent followers of Christ who were appointed by Christ to administer and hand down the word he committed to them. They had no power or authority in themselves. They were simply the "trustees" of God's riches in the gospel. Their responsibility was to guard and preserve the gospel truth, just as they had received it from Christ, until all for whom it was promised had the opportunity to receive it. I Corinthians 4:1-2 is a clear statement of Paul's model for apostolic ministry. It was the handing down of the "trustworthy message" that was important. The apostles were not to be judged as one better than another (I Cor. 4:3-5). That was to be left in God's hands. The Corinthians were simply to receive the word handed down to them, allowing the eternal Christ to live in them and give to them his eternal life. This shared life in Christ was the catalyst for unity and love.

Paul's Example. "Now, brothers, I have applied these things to myself and Apollos for your benefit, so that you may learn from us..." (I Cor. 4:6). Paul took serious his example; he did not give to the Corinthians a lifeless model. Paul's model of leadership, which was based on the most esteemed position in the church (apostolic ministry), was applicable to all. So Paul concluded his exhortation, which began in chapter one verse ten — an "appeal" for unity and love, with the same, "Therefore I urge you to imitate me" (I Cor. 4:16). Paul could say this because he was confident that his life was an embodiment of the gospel. "Follow my example," said Paul, "as I follow the example of Christ" (I Cor. 11:1). Paul lived Christ (Phil. 1:21), and Christ lived through Paul (Gal. 2:20). So too, the Corinthians could live Christ and allow Christ to live through
Paul's appeal to unity and love could be realized by the Corinthians if they would apply his model which was exemplified in his own life. Paul's faithfulness to guard and preserve the gospel truth, just as he had received it from Christ, and to pass it on to others is evident in I Corinthians 15:1-4:

Now, brothers, I want to remind you of the gospel I preached to you, which you received and on which you have taken your stand. By this gospel you are saved, if you hold firmly to the word I preached to you. Otherwise, you have believed in vain.

For what I received I passed on to you as of first importance: That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures.

Paul's faithfulness, at all costs, to hand down the gospel truth to the Corinthians is also evident in I Corinthians 4:15; 9:1-2,12,22-23; 10:31-33; 14:36-38. The Corinthians were to do likewise:

So whether you eat or drink or whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God. Do not cause anyone to stumble, whether Jews, Greeks or the church of God—even as I try to please everybody in every way. For I am not seeking my own good but the good of many, so that they may be saved (I Cor. 10:31-33).

Paul's ardent commitment to serve Jesus Christ is evident throughout I Corinthians, especially 1:17; 2:1-5; 3:10-11; 12:12f; 16:10. Such commitment is expected of the Corinthians as well, Paul told them:

I am saying this for your own good, not to restrict you, but that you may live in a right way in undivided devotion to the Lord (I Cor. 7:35).

Therefore, my dear brothers, stand firm. Let nothing move you. Always give yourselves fully to the work of the Lord, because you know that your labor in the Lord is not in vain (I Cor. 15:58).
Paul's witness and service of Christ was characterized by the Christ-like qualities of self-sacrifice and incarnation (Phil. 2:1-11). Jesus' parables in Matthew 13 illustrate the self-sacrificing attitude in God's kingdom. For example:

The kingdom of heaven is like treasure hidden in a field. When a man found it, he hid it again, and then in his joy went and sold all he had and bought that field.

Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a merchant looking for fine pearls. When he found one of great value, he went away and sold everything he had and bought it (Matt. 13:44-46).

The surpassing worth of knowing the gospel and gaining Christ was worth the sacrifice of everything else (Phil. 3:8).

For Paul, helping others come to know and receive Jesus Christ was also worth the continued self-sacrifice. Whether it was forgoing his right to eat (I Cor. 8:13; 9:4), marry (I Cor. 9:5), or receive support (I Cor. 9:6-18); Paul was willing to "put up with anything rather than hinder the gospel of Christ" (I Cor. 9:12). Neither did persecution and suffering deter him from his witness and service of Christ (I Cor. 4:10-17).

This attitude of loving self-sacrifice runs contrary to the perception of love-patriarchalism contended by Gerd Theissen. When speaking of the Hellenistic Christian communities, Theissen said:

In these congregations there developed an ethos obviously different from that of the synoptic tradition, the ethos of primitive Christian love-patriarchalism. We encounter it particularly in the deuto-Pauline and pastoral letters, but it is already evident in Paul (namely, in I Cor. 7:21ff.; 11:3-16). The love-patriarchalism takes social differences for granted but ameliorates them through an obligation imposed upon those who are socially stronger. From the weaker are required subordination, fidelity, and esteem (Social Setting 107).

The findings in this study however, suggest that if love-patriarchalism was present in the Corinthian Church, then it
was the very thing Paul was arguing against. Paul's model and example had nothing of the stigma of class structure in it (I Cor. 1:10-31; 4:6-7).

Willis concluded from his exegesis of I Corinthians 8-10 that the Corinthian Christians' question about sacrificial meat was raised in a defensive manner. The "strong" Christians had "knowledge" that "idols are nothing" (I Cor. 8:4). Therefore, they claimed their "liberty" in Christ to eat idol meat (I Cor. 8:8-9). Paul did not disagree with their knowledge and liberty. But Paul claimed that christian maturity was not in knowledge, but in love. True freedom was that love which willingly forgoes one's liberty for the sake of another's well being (110ff).

Paul did not simply suggest a benevolent use of social rights; he encouraged and exemplified the loving sacrifice of one's social rights. The ratification of Paul's model was in his own example. "If," according to Engberg-Pedersen,

the people addressed by Paul call themselves christians but in such a way that they are still very far from being genuinely committed to and fully understanding the gospel (like the Corinthians of 3:1-3), then the appropriate form of exhortation will be that of the example, that of showing by indirect means what in actual fact the content of the gospel will consist in (575).

The content of the gospel Paul exemplified was of self-sacrificing love and incarnational ministry. This is most evident in Paul's decision to remain self-supporting while engaged in ministry (I Cor. 9:15-18; II Cor. 12:14; I Thess. 2:9).

Paul made his living from tentmaking (Acts 18:3). Artisans could expect to earn their daily necessities, but only after long hours of labor (Hock 31f). Paul confessed to the Thessalonians:

Surely you remember, brothers, our toil and hardship; we worked night and day in order not to be a burden to anyone while we preached the gospel of God to you (I Thess. 2:9).
Tentmaking was an easily portable trade with the requisite knives and awls (Hock 25). However, due to Paul being itinerant in his trade, he was never able to establish a sound reputation in any one city. This gave Paul's competition in the trade an edge on him; therefore, he often did not even make enough to provide for his own needs (Hock 35). He testified to the Corinthians,

To this very hour we go hungry and thirsty, we are in rags, we are brutally treated, we are homeless. We work hard with our own hands (I Cor. 4:11-12).

Paul's determination to preach the gospel free of charge to the Corinthians at one point necessitated his willingness to receive some support from the churches in Macedonia (II Cor. 11:7-12; Phil. 4:14-18). However, Paul was not dependent on their support:

I am not saying this because I am in need, for I have learned to be content whatever the circumstances. I know what it is to be in need, and I know what it is to have plenty. I have learned the secret of being content in any and every situation, whether well fed or hungry, whether living in plenty or in want. I can do everything through him who gives me strength (Phil. 4:11-13).

Paul identified with the Corinthians' lowly estate through his own lowly trade (I Cor. 1:26-31). Paul humbled himself for the sake of the gospel:

To the weak I became weak, to win the weak. I have become all things to all men so that by all possible means I might save some. I do all this for the sake of the gospel, that I may share in its blessings (I Cor. 9:22-23).

This was not the talk of one promoting class elitism, but of one promoting love and unity through self-sacrifice and incarnation.

It did not matter what one's social status was (I Cor. 7:17-24). The emphasis for Paul was not on the individual, but on Christ. That the Corinthians know and live Christ is what mattered. Paul exemplified Christ, and he was encouraging the Corinthians to do the same. The life of the messenger is what ratifies his/her message.
The Christ life is what will lead others to Christ (I Cor. 14:24-25).

Summary
Unity and love were lacking in the Corinthian Church. The Corinthians were quarrelling over their status as followers of men. Paul quickly corrected their misconception that there existed a spiritually elite. The men whom the Corinthians prided themselves in were simply that—men. The apostles had no special power or authority in themselves, it was all in the One whom they served—Christ. The apostles were simply the trustees of God's riches in the gospel. Their responsibility was to faithfully guard and preserve the gospel truth until all for whom it was promised had the opportunity to hear and receive it. It was in the reception of the gospel, and thereby the reception of Christ that true unity existed. As the Corinthians focused on Christ and allowed Christ to live through them, unity and love would be the natural outcome.

Paul exemplified the life in Christ he was calling the Corinthians to. The power for it was Christ in the believer. When the cost was calculated it was figured that gaining Christ was worth the loss of all things. Paul's life in Christ was characterized by self-sacrificing love and incarnational ministry. It was through the faithful Christ-life that the gospel received could also be transmitted to others. Love and unity would be the abundant outflow of the shared Christ-life.

Conclusions
Paul did not support any conception of a class or spiritual elitism. The first letter to the Corinthians was an argument against such a conception. There was a model for Christian leadership clearly discernable in I Corinthians. Paul exemplified that model and he challenged all the Corinthians to imitate him. The model, therefore, was not limited to the apostles as if they
were an elite group. The model stressed the centrality and lordship of Christ, and it was applicable to all.
CHAPTER 5
REVIEW, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review

Dissension in Corinth. "I appeal to you, brothers, . . . that there may be no divisions among you . . ." (I Cor. 1:10). The problem of dissension was already in Corinth (I Cor. 1:11-12). Paul's major concern in I Corinthians was to correct the problem before it turned into full blown divisions.

The cultural influence of the mystery religions led some of the Corinthians to misunderstand the position the apostles held in the Church. They were exalting the apostles much like mystagogues and were forming parties around the apostle that had initiated them or most influenced them into the faith.

The charismatic structure of the Corinthian church was dependent on the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Focus needed to be on the proper use of the gifts the Holy Spirit had given to each one. Problems arose when the focus shifted from off the Giver of the gift to its possessor. The Corinthians had shifted their focus to the apostles as the possessors of the apostolic gift. Unity and love could only be maintained if the focus returned to Christ.

Unity and Love Urged. Unity and love would be the natural outflow of a community that was focused on Christ and allowing
Christ to live through them. The apostolic model that Paul gave the Corinthians in order to correct their misconceptions was fully centered on Christ and the riches of His gospel. The apostles were merely men, entrusted with the responsibility to faithfully preserve and hand down the gospel committed to them. In receiving the gospel a person was receiving Christ and thereby eternal life. As Christ was allowed to live through the believer, love and unity would be the abundant outcropping.

Paul's own example was the ratification of his model. Paul's use of the apostolic gift consisted in self-sacrifice and incarnational ministry. These were the building blocks of love and unity. All was done through Christ and for the sake of Christ. Paul's model was not limited to apostolic leadership; it was applicable to all Christians. Paul encouraged the Corinthians, like him, to look to Christ and be used by Christ: "Therefore I urge you to imitate me" (I Cor. 4:16).

Conclusions

Application of Paul's Model. Paul's model was applicable to all Christians, especially to those believing themselves to be Christian leaders. Paul's model of apostolic ministry was one of humility and total dependence on Christ. There was no elitism; one lead by example. Those claiming to be apostles, who did not conform to Paul's model, were considered as "false apostles" by Paul (II Cor. 11). The relevant application of Paul's model for all the Christians in Corinth was evident in Paul's repeated challenge to the Corinthians to imitate his example.

Indigenization of the Gospel. Paul analyzed the cultural structures at Corinth and he used some of their forms to communicate the gospel (particularly from the mysteries). Paul wanted the Corinthians to receive the gospel and live it in their own cultural context. Though there was always a risk of some syncretization, as happened in Corinth, Paul continued to use his method of relating
the gospel to the people, allowing it to take root in their own soil. This placed all the more responsibility on the apostle to faithfully preserve the “trustworthy message” as he handed it down in different forms.

Recommendations

The Servant verses The Shepherd. In Peter's first letter to the church, he issued a leadership model and warning at the same time:

To the elders among you, I appeal as a fellow elder, a witness of Christ's sufferings and one who also will share in the glory to be revealed: Be shepherds of God's flock that is under your care, serving as overseers—not because you must, but because you are willing, as God wants you to be; not greedy for money, but eager to serve; not lording it over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock” (I Pet. 5:1-3).

The church has taken Peter's Shepherd model, but has not paid heed to his warnings. There were many implicit connotations in Peter's Shepherd model; such as, the ideas of ownership, profit, and subjugation. Peter warned that the church must remain "God's flock," not "my flock." He warned against avarice by encouraging servanthood. He downplayed the exalted controlling shepherd, by emphasizing leadership through example which would empower the sheep. Peter's Shepherd model has lead to many misconceptions in the Church, because his warnings have not been heeded.

In a recent edition of The Short Circuit, an ATS student struggled with the need to discover a biblical and practical paradigm for ministry different than the Pastoral model. He asked:

Isn't there more to ministry for some of us than becoming a 'traditional Pastor'? I believe so, and I believe there are many in the Asbury community who feel uncomfortable with pastoral ministry as it is modeled, but who fail to see enough other models and opportunities to give them the courage to risk breaking away from the system... Where are the models? How can I even consider preparing for an area of ministry when I don't see a living model” (2)?
The exclusive use and misuse of the Shepherd model has lead to many frustrations and misconceptions. A rediscovery of another biblical paradigm is needed. One that is fresh and relates to the needs of today's Church. Such a paradigm is found in I Corinthians: Paul's Servant model.

**Stewardship verses Ownership.** Apostolic succession is just a theological justification of the old Corinthian problem. The apostolic gift has been looked upon as something that could be owned. Emphasis has been placed on the possessor or supposed possessor of the gift, rather than on the Giver and the correct use of the gift. Paul's corrective model for Corinth is desperately needed for the Church today.

Paul's model in I Corinthians is a charismatic model, not an episcopate. There is no room for paternalism in Paul's model, only the faithful carrying out of a responsibility that has been entrusted to somebody from God. All that any believer has is a gift from God (I Cor. 4:6-7)). As faithful trustees/stewards of God's gifts every Christian must glorify God.

Stanley Tam is a modern example of one who lived Paul's model. Tam was not supported in a full time "religious" office; rather, he was a self-made millionaire. In his autobiography, God Owns My Business, Tam related how from the beginning of his business career he learned that everything belonged to God, and therefore, must be committed to God's glory.

Tam knew that he couldn't buy off God with 10%, when God had paid for him with the price of His own Son's blood (I Pet. 1:18-19; I Cor. 6:19-20). So, when Tam's business prospered he made God majority (51%) stock holder. He was able to do this with a legal contract. Most of "God's money" went to support missions. As the business continued to prosper, Tam increased God's share until finally God owned 100% of the business and Tam took a salaried position.
Did Stanley Tam feel he was in "the ministry"? Of course he did. He was not fooled by ecclesiastical misconceptions. As a businessman, during his most active years, Tam personally lead over one person a day into the saving and transforming grace of God.

Tam did not claim ownership of any of God's gifts. As a faithful steward he handed down to others what God had entrusted to him. In particular, he faithfully handed down the "trustworthy message," so that others were able to enjoy the gospel riches.

**Incarnation verses Subjugation.** "'For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,' declares the Lord" (Isa. 55:8). The "Servant of the Lord" in Isaiah was a suffering servant. He was simple and humble; more like a sheep than a shepherd. He was faithful to the point of a cruel death (Isa. 53). God's suffering servant in Isaiah was not at all like the exalted servant/king man had hoped for.

God came to earth as man, born in a stable, worked with his hands, walked among the people. He lowered Himself in order to lift others. God's model was not of a professional Christian who commanded others, but of a Christian professional who inspired others.

Paul's model was a challenge to all believers to live like Christ whatever their profession (I Cor. 7:17-24; 10:31-33). For Paul, mission was not being in a certain state; mission was a state of being. An old Chinese poem sums it up:

Go to the people, live among them,
learn from them, love them.
Start with what they know.
Build on what they have.

**Unity and Love verses Clericalism and Legalism.** The very thing Paul feared would happen to the Church in Corinth has happened to the Church worldwide—divisions. Is there a way back to unity and love? Yes, through the application of Paul's model by the clergy and the laity until all are one in Christ, and the Giver of the
charismata again reigns supreme.

Peter Hocken provides a modern example of Paul's model in his book, One Lord One Spirit One Body. Hocken is part of the modern ecumenical charismatic movement. His book examines the present charismatic movement and seeks to understand its meaning for the Church in regards to ecumenism and present leadership structures. With a quote from Hocken, this study comes to a close——

This confirming work of the Spirit of God illuminates the core or center of the faith of each tradition. From being a people who perhaps believed in a list of doctrines or those who had distinctive theological emphases, we become believers with new clarity on the centrality of Jesus Christ. We see how the Incarnation is the climax of salvation history and Jesus' passion and death on the cross is the climax of his human life, leading to his glorious resurrection and ascension into heaven. .........

This rediscovered center is the point of our new-found unity in the Spirit. For the Christ who is center of my tradition is the same Christ who is center of yours. That is why the unity of those baptized in the Spirit is a deep spiritual reality, not just an emotional feeling of oneness (84).
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