

General Topics :: Biblical qualifications for 'ministry'

Biblical qualifications for 'ministry' - posted by dougkristen (), on: 2005/5/19 16:13

Can we discuss what are the Biblical qualifications for ministry?

In Christ,
Doug

Re: Biblical qualifications for 'ministry' - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/5/19 16:23

Quote:

dougkristen wrote:
Can we discuss what are the Biblical qualifications for ministry?

Maybe being a little to simplistic, but I would say that being born-again is the major qualification for ministry.

Re: Biblical qualifications for 'ministry' - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/5/19 16:24

To be called :)

Re: Biblical qualifications for 'ministry', on: 2005/5/19 16:30

Knowing you hear from God; believing what He shows you and acting on it; generally exercising faith as a lifestyle - not a series of specific challenges.

Re: Biblical qualifications for 'ministry' - posted by Tears_of_joy, on: 2005/5/19 16:36

Daily walk with Jesus!

Good message about (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid3861>) Full Time Ministry

Description: Think you're too busy to pray? No matter how busy or what your occupation in this life, every Believer is called into "Full Time Ministry."

Re: Biblical qualifications for 'ministry' - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2005/5/19 17:04

Gotta agree with Zeke, being born-again is the only real qualification and every born again believer has a common, all-important ministry. Paul speaks of it in 2 Corinthians;

Therefore *seeing we have this ministry*, as we have received mercy, we faint not; But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.(2Co 4:1-2)

And what is this common ministry? The preceeding verse tells us, it is looking upon Jesus;

But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.(2Co 3:18)

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/20 5:06

Quote:
-----And what is this common ministry? The preceeding verse tells us, it is looking upon Jesus;

But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.(2Co 3:18)

Hi Ron
is the ministry 'looking to Jesus' or 'bearing the image'?

Re: Eph 4:11, on: 2005/5/20 7:38

God gave us leaders (not dictators) anointed and called by God to train up the saints for the work of the ministry. "Saints" must be born again, and all saints have a ministry.

Jesus died for your sins, your healing, your deliverance, your righteousness (His imputed to you), your holiness (His imputed to you), and your ministry. The Word says we were purchased with a great price. Is He getting what He paid for? Are we doers of the Word and not merely hearers only?

Jesus said that not everyone would enter in, but he/she that doeth the Will of the Father. Do you know His will for your life, ie, your ministry? Are you obedient to it?

Re: Dual - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/5/20 8:37

Pardon the interruption *Rons*...

But this is a wonderful revelation here
Quote:
-----is the ministry 'looking to Jesus' or 'bearing the image'?

But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.(2Co 3:18)

Just to ponder on that...

Re: - posted by DezCall (), on: 2005/5/20 13:17

Quote:
-----Is the ministry 'looking to Jesus' or 'bearing the image'?

I think looking to Jesus is our ministry. Bearing His image will be the result. People who try to "bear the image" sooner or later are more busy with the "bearing" part (and start looking at themselves) than the "Image" part (Jesus). I suppose John the Baptist had the perfect ministry...when Christ came, he went!

Maybe a similar question would be: "Is the ministry 'abiding in Him' or 'being fruitful'?"

Jesus tells us to be more concerned with "abiding in Him" than "bearing fruit". Why? Because "apart from Me you can do nothing" (John 15:5). Yeah, we can do things, but not the things that are valuable to God and that will change the lives of men forever for God's glory. John 15 is the end of all superficial "Christianity".

I have to think of what Oswald Chambers wrote:

“A missionary is someone sent by Jesus Christ just as He was sent by God. The great controlling factor is not the need of people, but the command of Jesus. The source of our inspiration in our service for God is behind us, not ahead of us..the Lord Jesus Himself”

Just a quick thought..

Blessings, Paul

Re: For what its worth...Amen - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/5/20 13:32

Quote:

DezCall wrote:
I think looking to Jesus is our ministry. Bearing His image will be the result. People who try to "bear the image" sooner or later are more busy with the "bearing" part (and start looking at themselves) than the "Image" part (Jesus).

Good Point.

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2005/5/20 14:01

Quote:
-----is the ministry 'looking to Jesus' or 'bearing the image'?

I agree with what DezCall wrote concerning your question and I will add this; I believe that Jesus spoke of this ministry we all share, as recorded in Luke 17;

But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat? And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?(Luk 17:7-8)

The serving in the field is really secondary and flows out from the primary ministry which, I believe, is that of girding ourselves and serving the Master that He may eat and drink. This is the real heart of "beholding His face". We minister to Him and it is God's food and drink that we simply sit at His feet and behold His face in quiet time of prayer, study, and meditation.

Ron, I'm interested in hearing your comments on this subject.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/20 16:55

Quote:
-----Ron, I'm interested in hearing your comments on this subject.

I think ministry is the consequence of relationship. I think ministry 'to the Lord' is the consequence of relationship with the Lord, and ministry 'to the saints/world' is also the consequence of relationship with the Lord.

Real 'image bearing' is not a conscious thing so no-one is going to be sidetracked by trying to 'be' something. I was in Clossians for the last few days and came across this little gem...

Col. 1:7 even as ye learned from Epaphras our beloved fellow-bondman, who is a faithful minister of Christ for you, (Darby) ...seemed to me that the order was significant, first the 'beloved bond-slave' then the 'faithful minister'.

Re: Who are called to be ministers? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/5/20 17:35

I assume that the question about qualifications refers to pastors.

It seems like they qualify for the position because of their education and experience as leaders - not necessarily because of their relationship with God (that's hard to measure).

We can discuss the qualifications forever, but the reality is: What do we do if our pastor doesn't meet the standards? Do we go looking for a church whose pastor meets these qualifications? Wouldn't that be like a young woman looking for a man who fits the biblical description of a husband? She may end up single for a long time.

I think we sometimes must accept the situation God puts us in. Maybe these days God is doing what he did in the OT: he gave the Israelites the kind of leaders that they wanted - those who would "tickle their ears" and not speak of judgment for sin.

I say these words because I have endured a lot of turmoil at various times in my past - being burdened about unspiritual leaders. God taught me to rely on the Holy Spirit, faithfully serve God, and He would take care of the pastors.

Another thought:

Who really are called to minister? Is it not all who are called to Christ? And, can't they serve God anywhere - wherever God puts them - without any labels?

Re: Bishops and deacons - posted by ReceivedText, on: 2005/5/20 17:50

I hope we all agree that every saint of God should have a ministry according to their gift(s).

Having said that, I think this may be referring to church leadership. If that is the case, while there are many gifts, there are TWO main offices in the local church Biblically: bishop and deacon. Pastor as such is a gift, not an office. Paul lists qualifications for these two distinct offices (for men only of course ;-)

Here's the Scripture:

1 Tim. 3:1 "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.

2 A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;

3 Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous;

4 One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;

5 (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)

6 Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.

7 Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

8 Likewise must the deacons be grave, not doubletongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre;

9 Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.

10 And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless.

11 Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.

12 Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well.

13 For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus."

I think this is awesome that God would not leave it up to us to make these qualifications. It really takes all of the stress off explaining why we have our standards OFF of us. God is so good to do this for us.

I know that there will probably be some who disagree with my statement about men only. But egalitarians really have no defense in Scripture. Away with Jezebel! Remember that in order to have a Jezebel, you first must have an Ahab. I don't want to be an Ahab. How about you?

RT

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/21 2:41

Quote:
-----It seems like they qualify for the position because of their education and experience as leaders - not necessarily because of their relationship with God (that's hard to measure).

This puts a finger on the spot. Is 'the ministry' in this thread a 'position' or a 'function'?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/21 2:44

Quote:
-----Pastor as such is a gift, not an office. Paul lists qualifications for these two distinct offices...

The Jacobean was obsessed with the notion of 'office' and fed it into the KJV. I repeat what I have often said that the KJV is a 'hostile witness' when it comes to understanding the patterns of church life and function in 1st century.

Certainly 'pastoring' is a gift but from whom and to whom? The 'from' is easy; these are Christ's gifts but the 'to' is not so obvious. Is it to 'the Church' or to 'a church'? The other functions in Eph 4 which go along with 'shepherds' were all itinerant in the 1st Century.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/5/21 15:34

Quote:

The Jacobean was obsessed with the notion of 'office' and fed it into the KJV. I repeat what I have often said that the KJV is a 'hostile witness' when it comes to understanding the patterns of church life and function in 1st century.

I don't think there is anything wrong with the notion of an "office" so long as one understands an "office" to be appointed individuals who are given to a certain task. There can be no doubt in the NT that individuals were appointed to various "offices" in this sense. There is no evidence that men ever just assumed these offices on their own either (as often happens in non-denominational church plants).

In this sense, there are certain qualifications set aside for that office. 1 Tim 3 lists the qualifications for the "offices" of elder and deacon. However, these offices were not hierarchical and totalitarian in nature as they often have been and are often today. Rather, they worked in conjunction with the rest of the non-office ministry gifts of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastor-teachers.

later edit

For example, the elders and deacons are charged with the responsibility of carrying out oversight (elders) and service (deacons) to the entire local body of believers. However, the other ministries such as prophet and pastor-teacher work within this sphere of oversight (if such exists) at the local level. Contrary to modern practice, these individuals don't have to first gain permission and the like to minister to a local congregation... they just do. The elders are simply responsible for overseeing the affairs of these men and women, and the deacons are to help these ministers do whatever is physically needed to fulfill their ministries (as in the case of Acts, to help the apostles with the widows).

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/21 17:26

Quote:
-----I don't think there is anything wrong with the notion of an "office" so long as one understands an "office" to be appointed individuals who are given to a certain task. There can be no doubt in the NT that individuals were appointed to various "offices" in this sense. There is no evidence that men ever just assumed these offices on their own either (as often happens in non-denominational church plants).

This is a circular argument. First you assume that there are officers and then offices to which they are appointed. There are also some assumptions that deacons were charged with the responsibility of carrying out 'service' to the entire local body of believers. The 'seven' of Acts were appointed by the apostles in Jerusalem 'over this business' KJV Acts 6:3 but the word 'business' is necessity.

the 'office' of a deacon was not an 'office' waiting to be filled but men were appointed to do necessary work as appropriate. We know almost nothing about 'deacons' as referenced in the pastoral epistles. The 'seven' were appointed for the highly specific role of ensuring that the Greek speaking widows received fair shares in the daily distribution. The 'seven' were not appointed for the whole body to make adequate provision for the Greek speaking widows. This is borne out by the fact that each of the 'seven' have Greek names. They are Greek speaking members of the Greek speaking community who are given a specific role towards that community by the apostles.

The 'seven' did not have an office they had a function.

The word 'office' is never used in the Hebrew or Greek; it is the legacy of the Jacobians and we have been stuck with it ever since. You might like to check on 50 KJV instances of 'office' none of which is in the original language.

Gen. 41:13; Ex. 1:16; 28:1,3-4,41; 29:1,9,44; 30:30; 31:10; 35:19; 39:41; 40:13,15; Lev. 7:35; 16:32; Num. 3:3-4,10; 4:16; 18:7; Deut. 10:6; 1Sam. 2:36; 1Chr. 6:10,32; 9:22,26,31; 23:28; 24:2-3; 2Chr. 7:6; 11:14; 23:18; 24:11; 31:15,18; Neh. 13:13-14; Psa. 109:8; Ezek. 44:13; Luke 1:8-9; Rom. 11:13; 12:4; 1Tim. 3:1,10,13; Heb. 7:5

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/5/21 19:52

Ron, I think you missed my main point. My point is not the word "office." I don't know greek and am not ready to argue about matters of translation. My point is the fact that people were appointed and given an label to reflect this appointment.

Further more, these officially appointed individuals were assigned to carry out a certain task, or perform a certain function. Biblical offices are functional in nature. Should individuals fail to live up to the function of their office, 1 Tim 3 provides procedures for removing such people from such a position. The place Matthias took over from Judas who abandoned who post was to be a witness to the resurrection. The seven (though impossible to prove, but my opinion is they were deacons), likewise were assigned to a certain task to take care of waiting tables for the widows. The elders appointed in the various locals were given the charge to shepherd those placed in their care.

These were all appointed positions, or "offices."

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/5/22 0:49

Ron
what is the difference between a function and an office?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/22 2:46

Jimmy

Quote:
-----My point is the fact that people were appointed and given an label to reflect this appointment.

My point is that people were publicly recognized for what they were doing and were NEVER given labels. ;-) (emphasizing not shouting :-))

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/22 2:48

Quote:
-----what is the difference between a function and an office?

the first is organic, the second is organisation.
The first is an outflow of life, the second is a tool for control.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/5/22 6:42

Quote:
-----the first is organic, the second is organisation.

Quote:
-----The first is an outflow of life, the second is a tool for control

what does that mean in the simplest of terms, the above seems rather philosophical to me :-?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/5/22 9:05

Quote:

My point is that people were publicly recognized for what they were doing and were NEVER given labels.

There is no evidence the seven were already doing what the apostles and rest of the church set them aside to do before the church set them apart to do it. They were without a doubt already doing ministry, and doing ministry beyond what they were appointed by the apostles to do. For example, Stephen and Phillip were evangelists apart from their appointment in the seven.

The same goes for what we see in 1 Tim 3. In 1 Tim 3, Paul told Timothy to first put elder/deacon candidates to the test before appointing them in those positions (1 Tim 3:10). Only after they have been tested is Timothy to "then let them serve as...", showing that if they failed this test then they could not serve in this position. Furthermore it is shown in 1 Tim 3:1 that these positions that one can aspire to become through Timothy's appointment of them. If they are aspiring to be something, then they are clearly not yet that which they aspire to be.

Scriptural evidence is clear that men were indeed given labels, otherwise they would not have been assigned names such as "overseer."

I believe this is perfectly Biblical, and have experienced it in practice. Prior to a month ago, I have served in my church, faithfully preaching inside and outside of church. I've preached to the congregation at large, in informal small gatherings, and one on one. I've also preached outside of the church in the streets and have been active in door knocking and homeless ministry. About 6 months ago, my pastor asked me if I would be interested in taking oversight of the singles/college ministry we have at our church (for it's pastor at the time was getting ready to leave for another ministry elsewhere). I prayed about it and told him I felt at peace about such. Shortly thereafter, the other pastor left for another church and about a month ago my pastor made me the Singles & College Pastor at our church.

Was I already functioning in the gifts and such prior to my formal appointment? Was I already even ministering to my peers at the college level? Yes. The only difference between now and then is that I have been charged by the other pastors to oversee this area of church life. I now have a responsibility to all those appointed to my care. Such appointment has only given me further opportunity and responsibility that I did not have before. However, even should I have my position

on of overseer taken away from me one day for whatever reason, that will still not have any bearing on the gifts I was flowing in prior to my appointment and will still continue to flow in after.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/22 9:09

Life shows itself in growth. The NT appointment is simply the public recognition of that life. The man was behaving like an 'elder' so they publicly acknowledged him as one. There were no public acknowledgements of apostles, evangelists, prophets or pastor/teachers. There is no evidence that they ever had any titles other than 'our beloved brother'. We confuse descriptions with titles.

The more modern approach is to fill in the names on an org chart. You create your project and org chart with names in some boxes but the letter TBA (to be advised) in the others. The man then has to fit the box. Making a man fit a box is organic. Making room for a man to be what God has made him is organic; ie a natural life process.

The reason you are having difficulty with my explanations is because it is a paradigm shift. You think I have a different kind of organisation but I don't. We become occupied with a sort of franchise system where every church has to have one of these and one of those...

I was with some good folks recently who have appointed elders in their church. They already have a pretty clear picture of what an elder is and of what a church is. They have an invisible career path for the church and for the elders. They know how this works; they have read the book! But they were so occupied with 'being elders' and 'being church' that it obscured the life that was growing in their midst. My counsel was 'just be'; stop trying 'to do' for and just 'be'. Some 'church plants' have a franchise blue-print and life sometimes struggles to keep up with the schedule. One phrase which I always think is ominous is 'we are setting in the elders'. It always makes me think of concrete. Concrete is not known for being a good environment for developing life. :-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/5/22 9:11

Quote:

the first is organic, the second is organisation.
The first is an outflow of life, the second is a tool for control.

The second *can* be used as a tool for control, such is why the Scriptures exhort such people to not use their authority in a lording fashion. Rather, they are to only use their position as an opportunity to serve others. If abused, it can lead to a controlling spirit. On the positive aspect, it can be used to shepherd.

All organisms have organization.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/22 9:27

Quote:

-----All organisms have organization.

No they don't. Organizations are created by organizers.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/5/24 9:36

God gave Adam and outward structure before he actually brought Adam to life to function in that structure.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/24 10:28

Quote:

-----God gave Adam and outward structure before he actually brought Adam to life to function in that structure.

Do you really think of the human body as an organisation? Eccl. 11:5 As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit, n or how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child: even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all. I have no problem with God's structures...