CHARISMS AND ORDERED MINISTRIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: AN OVERVIEW

That charisms and ordered ministries existed in the New Testament period is not a matter of dispute today, but what has been and continues to be controversial is the relationship of charisms and structured ministries to one another, when and how ministries became ordered, whether ordered ministries are a legitimate theological development, and whether a variety of ministries and charisms still has a place in the church of today, precisely because a variety of these existed in the New Testament. Blanching at the huge amount of literature which has been produced on these topics, I offer here some personal reflections, based in part on some selective reading and in part on some independent observations.

One of the most problematic areas in dealing with charisms is the meaning and use of the word "charism" itself. Unless it is properly understood in terms of its New Testament usage, all kinds of errors are likely to creep into the discussion of charisms. The place to begin is with the writings of Paul, for with the exception of one single passage (1 Peter 4:10), all occurrences of the word "charism" appear in the Pauline corpus, and the vast majority of these are within the genuine letters of Paul. In fact, Paul may have been responsible for introducing the word, with its religious connotations, into Christian language.

Paul uses "charism" in various ways. In a broader sense, he uses the word to denote that gift from God which belongs to every Christian. Therefore every Christian has the charism which stands in contrast to trespasses: each one possesses the righteousness which brings justifi-
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cation (Romans 5:15-17), and in contrast to the wages of sin which is death, the charism of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord (Romans 6:23). Charism in this broader sense is roughly equivalent to salvation itself, that gift which every Christian possesses because God has graciously bestowed it on those who believe. But Paul uses the word also in the narrower sense of particular manifestations or services of the Spirit (I Corinthians 12:5, 7), not all of which are in the possession of all Christians, though every Christian possesses some kind of manifestation or service of the Spirit: "But each has his own charism from God, one of one kind and one of another" (I Corinthians 7:7; cf. Romans 12:6; I Corinthians 12:4). These manifestations or services are also gifts freely given by God. They are the individuation or the concretion of grace itself, even as the Greek terms charisma (charism) and charis (grace) are related to one another. Because every Christian has a particular manifestation of the Spirit -- for, indeed, no one can say "Kyrio Iesous!" ("Jesus is Lord!") except by the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:3)-- all Christians are charismatic, and Paul's list of charisms is only a sampling of possible manifestations of the Spirit.

It is this narrower understanding of charism which we normally have in mind when we speak of "charismatic gifts" today; but we should be careful in speaking this way, for there is an important distinction which we must keep in mind between our sociological understanding and Paul's theological interpretation of the term. On one hand, we use the word "charism" sociologically as the designation for the extraordinary phenomena which are a reality in the Pauline communities at Corinth or Rome --for example, prophecy, glossolalia, and the gift of healing-- and we tend to exclude the more ordinary aspects of Christian existence, such as acts of mercy, financial support, leadership and administration. If we operate on this level of understanding, we have already created a distinction between charisms and the more structured ministries, a distinction which Paul does not make; for Paul interprets all these sociologically differentiated manifestations or services theologically as charisms, because they all go back to grace, to God's gift. If charism is understood in this way, structured ministries do not necessarily form a contradiction to charisms but are themselves charisms; they are services for the community which manifest the Spirit within it.
Once when discussing charisms, Paul makes a list in which he seems to be distinguishing some order or rank of persons whom God has appointed in the church: "...first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, then healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues" (I Corinthians 12:28) and also interpreters of tongues (v. 30). The peculiarity of this list, as well as its order, seems to reflect, in part, Paul's concern for congregational problems in Corinth with regard to the exercise of these charisms.

Clearly the speaking and interpreting of tongues are mentioned in last place because they are especially problematic, the cause of discord among the members of the congregation. What many in the congregation consider to be the most obvious and spectacular manifestation of the Spirit, namely the speaking in tongues, is also the most abused charism, because it is not being used for the building up of the church. Paul mentions this charism at the end of his list, not because of some quantitative lack of Spirit-power in the gift, but because of improper use of that charism. On the other hand, he mentions "apostles" first for two reasons. First, it is to his advantage to emphasize his apostolic authority, which he must use in intervening in the problems of the Corinthian church. Paul does not mean to say that apostles have more Spirit-power quantitatively than others, but he is emphasizing his leadership role in Corinth; he is using his charism of apostleship for the building up of the community and is himself the example par excellence for the correct use of charisms. Second, Paul really does believe that apostleship is the most important charism. The office of apostle, as he speaks of it from his own experience, is a gift of grace from God in which Christ has entrusted him with the ministry of the gospel and works through him to effect obedience from the Gentiles. It is a priestly service (hierourgounta) of the gospel of God (Romans 15:15-16), and Paul, as a minister of this gospel, is a mediator of reconciliation (II Corinthians 5:18-20): his chief task is the proclamation of the gospel, whereby as an apostle he lays the foundation for the building of the church, a foundation on which others may build. He, too, may build, but that is not his particular task. Here we clearly see why the later church confesses an "apostolic church": the apostles are its true founders, Christ being the foundation which is laid by them and on which the church stands. In
this we also see the uniqueness of the office of apostle and its unrepeatability.\textsuperscript{11}

Paul also singles out prophets and teachers. Because of their special position in this list of charisms, we want to look briefly at each.

While the office of apostle obviously belongs to specific individuals, who the prophets were is not as obvious in Paul's writings. On one hand, Paul wishes that all might be able to exercise the prophetic charism (I Corinthians 14:5); but on the other, he refers to quite specific persons who do so (I Corinthians 14:29). It appears that what is taking place in Corinth is the narrowing to its use by a few specific persons of a charism which had been exercised more widely within the congregation, and the process is not yet complete. These prophets appear to be leaders within the congregation and not merely preachers who are passing through, and their prophesying consists in revealing what has been hidden and what is going to happen according to God's plan.\textsuperscript{12}

Teachers also are highly regarded in the local congregation, but they are more clearly a special group than are the prophets. The very nature of teaching requires a certain continuity between teachers and students, not a free movement of the Spirit from one person at one moment to another person at another. Also, teachers are spoken of by Paul in terms of specific persons, and no mention is made of this charism in terms of the congregation at large. Though it is commonly held that the mediation of the Christian manner of life through ethical teaching \textit{(parenesis)} is the special concern of teachers, the fact is that teaching included more than that; it included also the guarding and passing on of all the community's tradition, such as sayings of the Lord, confessional-kerygmatic formulations and narratives.\textsuperscript{13}

Despite some fluidity among these three charismatic ministries of apostle, prophet and teacher (Paul, for instance, functions in all three capacities at various points), the emphases and distinctions are nonetheless important. Apostleship is clearly unique in its origin and function. To be sure, prophets and teachers share some apostolic concerns, especially in regard to the message proclaimed, yet teaching
prevents prophecy from giving way to unrestrained enthusiasm, and prophecy, with its openness to the Spirit's movement, prevents teaching from becoming fossilized. 14

Unlike the charisms of miracle workers and healers, which Paul barely treats elsewhere in his writings, 15 he does frequently mention persons who are responsible for administrative duties and usually speaks of them in a favorable light. Therefore the question now arises whether the helpers and administrators are mentioned near the end of the list of charisms in I Corinthians 12:28 for a special reason. Because Paul does not address this issue directly, we cannot be certain, but several considerations suggest that Paul may have done this on purpose. Since the congregation at Corinth is certainly divided into factions, this probably means that the helpers and administrators have not been carrying out their duties properly. They have failed administratively to maintain the unity of the church. Some of the disciplinary problems in I Corinthians may have been due to their lack of guidance and their failure to exercise their legitimate authority within the congregation. 16 Their placement toward the end of the list of charisms may also have been due to the fact that Paul was jealous of his own authority and in the light of the disarray in Corinth has come to see them as potential rivals. For this reason Paul has to make it quite clear that he is in charge of the congregation; he is its "father", and his word surpasses that of "some arrogant people" who have challenged it (I Corinthians 4:15-21). In either or both of these cases we have no reason to suppose that Paul was opposed to the charism of administration in itself; rather, he opposed its abuse. The same attitude on Paul's part allows him to challenge his fellow apostle Peter to his face in Antioch (Galatians 2:11).

It is clear from Paul's exercise of his own apostleship that he saw no conflict between the use of authority and charism. 17 Indeed, authority is an intrinsic part of his apostleship. He certainly had no qualms about making his authority felt, as though he were in some danger of stifling the Spirit; rather, it was by his exercise of authority that the Spirit operated through him. We have every reason to believe that he expected the same to be said for the leaders of his congregations,
especially during his absences from them --namely, that if they were to use their charism of leadership for the building up of the community, they must exercise their authority over others.

Already in Paul's earliest extant letter, he mentions some who have leadership roles, speaking of "those who labor among you and are over you in the Lord and admonish you", and he asks the Thessalonians to respect them (I Thessalonians 5:12-13). The same Greek word for leadership in I Thessalonians (proistamenos) is given in the list of charisms in Romans 12:8. Other leadership roles are named by Paul in addition to the helpers and administrators in Corinth, especially the woman deacon Phoebe of the church at Cenchreae, who, Paul says, "has been a helper of many and of myself as well" (Romans 16:1-2), and also the bishops and deacons of Philippians 1:1.

While Paul uses no consistent terminology for these leadership and administrative positions, the fact that they exist in some form in a number of congregations addressed by or known to Paul indicates that there must have been some sort of ecclesiastical organization in them. Thus when Paul asks that his letter to the Thessalonians be read to the whole congregation, he presupposes that someone is responsible for taking up that task, even as he presupposes that his rule concerning the proper order in the congregational assemblies at Corinth will be enforced by someone. These specialized services are carried out by specific persons and are not left to the chance movement of the Spirit, as if there were no continuity in the leader. If this were not the case, Paul could hardly criticize the Corinthians for not exercising their charisms of helping and administrating, since the Corinthians could claim, in turn, that the Spirit was not inspiring anyone at that decisive moment to carry out those functions. The logic of Paul's argumentation, therefore, requires that we reject the viewpoint, still held by some, that in Paul's congregations there is complete freedom of the Spirit, so that the very notion of a stable "office" is a contradiction.

Likewise, the notion that the passing on of a charism is repugnant to the free movement of the Spirit and is contrary to Pauline theology must be challenged and can be done so on the basis of Paul's own
writings. In at least two instances Paul speaks about the bestowal of charisms through human agency. In Romans 1:11 Paul expresses his desire to visit the Romans "that I might impart some spiritual charism to you", and in II Corinthians 8:19 he speaks of a brother who has been appointed by the church to travel with him and carry on the task of taking up the collection for Jerusalem. Therefore, even though every service for the community is a charism according to Paul and ultimately goes back to the Spirit's inspiration, this does not prevent the Spirit from bestowing charisms through humans; charisms are not just discovered, then, but are also given by the church. This has great significance for discussing the legitimacy of the passing on of the ministerial charism in the pastoral epistles through a rite of ordination. While the two examples from Paul just mentioned do not deal with ordination itself, they do indicate that such a notion would not necessarily be contrary to Pauline thought, though we have no evidence that Paul knew of such a rite himself.

Moving beyond Paul, we find the pastoral epistles taking up Paul's charism terminology but using it differently. We find the word used in only two passages, both of which speak about a ministerial position: "Do not neglect the charism you have, which was given you by prophetic utterance when the elders laid their hands upon you" (I Timothy 4:14); and, "Hence I remind you to rekindle the charism of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands" (II Timothy 1:6). While we have seen precedent for bestowal of charisms in Paul, he never linked them to an ordination rite as the writer of the pastorals does, nor did he use the term "charism" solely with regard to a ministerial, administrative office.

The concept of charism in the pastorals is limited only to the holder of an official ministerial position, an ordered ministry. As such, charism here represents a pneumatic qualification for office and gives authority for the exercise of an official function. This is not to say, however, that some functions which are expressly called "charismatic" in Paul's letters ceased to exist in the congregations of the author of the pastorals; rather, the term "charism" is no longer used to describe them. An even more significant difference from Paul's
understanding lies in the nature of the charism itself. In Paul, for instance, we have a function or office, either bestowed or recognized, which is called a "charism"; but in the pastorals the Spirit itself is bestowed. This conflicts with Pauline theology, in that all Christians have the Spirit when they make their profession of faith (I Corinthians 12:3); Spirit is not added but merely manifested in various ways. In the pastorals, however, the Spirit itself is bestowed, and this certainly marks out the office holder in a special way, for he is infused with the Spirit in a way that non-office holders are not. There is here a clear distinction between clergy and laity which goes beyond a distinction in functions.23

The pseudonymous author of the pastorals never gives a technical name to the ordained ministry which Timothy and Titus share; but because Titus is commanded to appoint elders (presbyteroi) in every town (Titus 1:5), because it is the elders who do the laying on of hands (I Timothy 4:14), and because Timothy is told not to lay hands on anyone too hastily (I Timothy 5:22), a strong case can be made that the figures of Timothy and Titus represent the position of elders themselves. Further support for this identification is to be found when the tasks and qualifications for office which Timothy and Titus have are compared to what is said for elders and bishops (episkopoi).24

It is not clear, of course, whether the offices of bishop and elder are two distinct entities or whether some elders are more important and, therefore, have the title of bishop, which means "overseer"; or whether two separate forms of ecclesiastical government have come together --the elder system from Jewish Christianity and the bishop-deacon system first attested in Paul's letter to the Philippians (1:1), with the result that the elders and bishops both designate basically the same important leadership role. But since Timothy and Titus are cast in the role of elders (and Paul, too, in II Timothy 1:6), the most probable solution seems to be that the terms "bishops" and "elders" are used synonymously by the author of the pastorals,25 though he may be aware of a process in which the bishop is beginning to stand out.26

Two other official ministries are named in the pastorals: deacons and
widows. The office of deacon, mentioned both by Paul and by the author of the pastorals, is available both to men and women (I Timothy 3:8-13); and the office of widows, mentioned only in the pastorals, is limited to some widows (I Timothy 5:11). Entrance into these ministries is not described in any technical way: "And let them also be tested first; then if they prove themselves blameless, let them serve as deacons" (I Timothy 3:10); and, "Let a widow be enrolled if she is not less than sixty years of age..." (I Timothy 5:9). Whether any sort of ordination rite existed for these ministries cannot, therefore, be determined with any certainty. 28

More important, however, we find the coalescing of a number of specific Pauline charisms in the functions and duties of a few office holders in the pastorals, especially the bishops and elders. For example, teaching now belongs at least to some of these bishops and elders, as well as to Timothy and Titus (I Timothy 5:17; Titus 1:9). If it is the elders, who make the prophetic utterance when hands are laid on, then prophecy also belongs to them (i Timothy 4:14). Timothy is told to preach and do the work of an evangelist, roles shared by apostles and their helpers, as well as to rebuke and exhort (II Timothy 4:2, 5) and to supervise all, including other ministries (I Timothy 5:1-22); he is to set the example for believers in speech, conduct, love, faith and purity (I Timothy 4:12); he is to lead by seeing to it that worship is carried out properly (I Timothy 2:1-2; 4:13), that truth is guarded and passed on, and that what is falsely called knowledge is avoided (I Timothy 6:20). Acts of mercy seem to be associated with the office of widows (I Timothy 5:10) and perhaps also with deacons, who are servants holding the faith (I Timothy 3:8-10).

What is strikingly missing in the pastorals are some of the more spectacular charisms with which Paul was having difficulty. Working of miracles, healing, 29 and the speaking in tongues and their interpretation are simply not discussed. On the other hand, one charism remains firmly grounded in the congregation as a whole, namely the charism of contributing funds or goods for the poor and now also for the clergy (I Timothy 5:8, 18).
With the development of a professional clergy, it is not surprising that a number of duties and functions carried out by several others in the congregation should be taken over increasingly by these few office holders. That may be due in part to human nature, but the whole process was certainly accelerated by the need for strong leadership in the struggle against a Gnosticizing heresy, with which the author of the pastorals is clearly having trouble (I Timothy 6:20-21; II Timothy 2:17b-18). Therefore historical necessity may have been the primary factor for the forms of ministry as they are found in the pastorals and why they have become so powerful within these congregations.  

The only other New Testament writing outside of Paul and the pastorals to use the term "charism" is I Peter. Although this book claims Petrine authorship, it is in many ways closer to Paul than the pastorals, and I Peter's concept of charism is a case in point. Charism is used in an eschatological context which speaks of the need to keep sane and sober as the end approaches, manifesting love to one another, for, "As each has received a charism, employ it for one another, as good stewards of God's varied grace" (I Peter 4:10). This passage and its context have some definite parallels to Paul: Paul is also speaking in an eschatological context and stressing the need for love in the use of charisms; both hold that each person receives his/her charism in his/her own way; these charisms are expressed in mutual service, and there is a clear reference to God's grace.  

There is also a difference, however, in emphasis between I Peter and Paul. I Peter places less stress than Paul on the mutual service and more emphasis on glorifying of God and responsibility before God in general. Also, while Paul understands the exercise of love as a corrective to unrestrained use of charisms, I Peter views the exercise of charisms as the way of expressing love. Only two charisms are named --"whoever speaks, as one who utters oracles of God; whoever renders service, as one who renders it by the strength which God supplies" (I Peter 4:11).  

While it is true that the author of I Peter, who claims to be an elder
does not speak of himself as carrying out a charism of leadership; nonetheless, since he considers all to have charisms, his own leadership can hardly be anything else than charismatic. This is significant in terms of authority, for he exhorts other elders to "Tend the flock of God that is your charge, not by constraint but willingly, not for shameful gain but eagerly, not as domineering over those in your charge but being examples to the flock" (I Peter 5:2-3). Lack of domineering does not mean lack of authority, as is clear when the author exhorts the younger to be subject to the elders (I Peter 5:5) and in the mention of shepherding. The elders of I Peter are official ministers, and this must not be overlooked in discussions of the priesthood of all believers which finds its roots in I Peter 2:5, 9. The priesthood of all believers does not exclude the development of official ministries.

Although the letter to the Ephesians does not use the word "charism", it contains ideas so closely related to Paul's that it can hardly be omitted from discussion here. In a context where the deutero-Pauline author is stressing the unity of the church and speaks of "one body", he takes up also the varieties of the gifts, noting that each has received his/her own: "But grace (charis) was given to each of us according to the measure of Christ's gift (dorea)" (Ephesians 4:7). This is reminiscent of Paul's treatment of the charisms in the context of the body of Christ in I Corinthians 12; likewise the list which the author of Ephesians gives is similar to Paul's: "And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers for the equipment of the saints, for the work of ministry, for the building up the body of Christ..." (Ephesians 4:11-12). Christ has given each one a gift of grace which should serve the mutual building up of the body.

The five gifts listed are apparently not simply random examples, for they seem to be essential, especially since these are responsible for equipping the saints. They are leadership roles within the community. The Pauline triad of apostles, prophets and teachers is interrupted here by the addition of evangelists and pastors, the former appearing once in the pastorals (II Timothy 4:5) and the latter alluded to in
I Peter 5:2-4 and often elsewhere within the New Testament. If the "pastors" are the same as what Paul meant by "helpers" or "administrators" in I Corinthians 12:28, then in Ephesians they may have received their proper place in the order of importance, since, unlike the situation for Paul, there is no polemical reason for the author of Ephesians to modify the order. 39

This overview has shown that the relationship of charisms and structured ministries is not one of opposition nor even one of complementarity; rather, according to Paul's understanding and that of the author of I Peter, structured ministries are charisms. The tasks of ministry and gifts are united, though charisms are not exhausted by structured ministries. Charisms include but go beyond structured ministries. The understanding of "charism" in the pastoral epistles, however, is significantly different, in that what is bestowed is the Spirit itself, not a specific function or capacity to act nor a mere recognition of what is already present. The bestowal of the Spirit becomes an essential qualification for the ordered ministry of elders in the pastorals.

When and how ministries became "ordered" depends on what one means by an "ordered ministry" or "office" (German "Amt"), terms foreign to the New Testament itself. If an ordered ministry has an element of permanency and has received some recognition in the church, and if the person or persons holding the position exercise authority or have a certain dignity, then we can speak of ordered ministries from the earliest extant New Testament writings. If, on the other hand, one's understanding of ordered ministry must include an imposition of hands and a juridical recognition, then we cannot speak of ordered ministries until the pastoral epistles, for "ordination" is first attested to in these pseudo-Pauline letters, as is "enrollment" in the case of widows. 40

In attempting to answer the question whether ordered ministries are a legitimate theological development, the problem of the meaning of "ordered ministry" cannot be overlooked. If we accept the less technical sense of "ordered", then we are faced with the fact that ordered ministries were always present in some form, though not always in the
same form. This places the old question of whether ordered ministries are constitutive for the church in a new light, since the New Testament does not conceive of a church where ordered ministries are absent. Certainly, the ordered ministries of the pastorals have moved beyond Paul, and the author of the pastorals has different theological viewpoints than Paul. There is, then, a certain disjunctiveness with Paul, but is that illegitimate theologically? The answer to this question depends on how one perceives the significance of the New Testament canon and the movement of the Spirit in historical situations different from that which Paul was experiencing. Can we shackle the movement of the Spirit by confining him to Pauline theology and do justice to the New Testament?

Finally, a matter which touches all of us today is the question whether a variety of ministries and charisms still has a place in the church of the present, precisely due to its existence in the New Testament. Two observations seem particularly relevant here. First, just because something is found in the New Testament, it is not automatically good for our time. The history of the church should not simply be ignored, if we believe that the Spirit has continued to be operative in that history. Why certain charisms survived, whereas others did not, should be carefully studied, since there may be good reasons for both cases. Second, we are not dealing with a completely theoretical issue. Right now there is a variety of ecclesial structures and some of the "lost" charisms are once again a reality. In addition to this, there are new charisms and ministries which have developed in the life of the church beyond the New Testament, such as the charism of monastic life. Also, what was lower on the hierarchy of charisms in the New Testament has, in some instances, taken on greater importance in the course of time. Is this present reality valid in view of the New Testament? It seems to me that Paul's teaching on charisms allows us to ratify the present plurality of ecclesiastical structures and offices and it allows us to ratify a variety of other charisms, either revived or even new, provided they constitute a true service (diakonia) to the community, exercised in love for the building up of the church.
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