

THE MODELING OF MINISTERS

George J. Zemek
Professor of Theology

An often neglected part of leading a local church is the element of providing an exemplary lifestyle for the flock to follow. Modeling has its origin in the creation of man in God's image, but through the fall and new creation of man in Christ, it has assumed a renewed importance. NT usage of the τυπος (tupos, "type") and μιμητής (mimētēs, "imitator") word-groups provides a good idea of the responsibility of church leaders to live as good moral examples before those whom they lead. Only when they do so can pastoral ministry fulfil the biblical standards of that office.

* * * * *

Reportedly, a cleric once said, "Do as I say; don't do as I do." This frank adage has unfortunately characterized many past and present preachers, many of whom have reputations as great teachers of God's Word. However, when measured by the Bible's qualifications for communication *and character*, such "ministers" come up woefully short.

Saying-but-not-doing in its multiplied forms and settings has always been particularly detestable in the eyes of the Lord. Jesus spoke to the crowd about the scribes and Pharisees, telling them to follow their instructions from Moses, but not to follow their personal example, because "they keep on saying and yet are not doing" (Matt 23:3, note Greek present tenses). His indictment ultimately embraced a whole lineage of dark examples of hypocrisy throughout fallen mankind's history.

All men are accountable to God for profession without practice (e.g., Jas 1:22-27); yet certain ones by virtue of their office are responsible at the highest level of divine accountability for *prescription* without practice (e.g., Jas 3:1). Therefore, it is no wonder Paul emphasized to Timothy and to Titus God's mandate not only for exhortation but also for exemplification (1 Tim 4:12-16; Tit 2:7). Similarly, Peter, in his directives to elders, spotlights the *showing* dimension of shepherding (1 Pet 5:1-4).

The Scriptures on spiritual leadership are intimidating to contemporary ministers of the gospel. How can we who are not yet perfect hold ourselves up as ethical examples? How can we whose practice does not yet match our position say, "Do as I do"? A consideration of the macro and micro theological contexts on modeling will bring *some* relief from intimidation, but God designs all theological tensions to be constructive. As in the cases of other equally powerful biblical magnets, the poles of this one`i.e., the revealed reality that we are not yet glorified and the inescapably clear mandate for modeling should first develop in us genuine humility, and then a renewed dependence upon God and His resources.

THE MACRO-THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF MODELING

This context of modeling is exceedingly broad. It entails some of the most panoramic issues of theology`e.g., Christ as the image of God, man's *creation* in the image of God, commensurate issues of Adam Theology, salvation history with a special emphasis upon moral re-creation in the image and likeness of God, and the ethical significance of the Lord's operations of sovereign grace primarily through His efficient means of the Word and the Spirit.

The Importance of Image

A theological priority rather than a logical one is the best starting point. When viewed from a historical perspective, traditional theologies usually begin with the creation of mankind/humanity (i.e., originally Adam, or from a theological vantage point, the "First Adam") "in"/"according to" the "image"/"likeness" of God.¹

¹Both the Hebrew terms for "image" and "likeness" and the two prepositions used with them, function essentially in a synonymous fashion within the context of the early chapters of Genesis. Cf. John F. A. Sawyer, "The Meaning of $\langle y\bar{m}l \rangle$ " $\langle eq \ \backslash O(e,l) \ eq \ \backslash O(e,x) \ eq \ \backslash O(\bar{l},B) \ (b \ eq \ \backslash O(+,e) \ eq \ \backslash O(>,s)elem \ @ \ eq \ \backslash O(+,e) \ eq \ \backslash O(\sim,o)h \ eq \ \backslash O(=,i)m$. In the Image of God') in Genesis I XI," *JTS* 25 n.s. (October 1974):418-26 on a technical level; John J. Davis, *Paradise to Prison: Studies in Genesis* (Winona Lake: BMH, 1975), 81 on a popular level. **However, the theological Archetype, Christ Himself furnishes the better beginning place. Since He is uniquely the effulgence of God's glory and the exact impress of His being or essence (Heb 1:3), and since He alone perfectly displays the Godhead (John 1:18, cf. 14:9), the Lord is the image of the invisible God (Col 1:15). Consequently, He is one who fully manifests and represents God and who also concretely stands ethically as the ultimate and perfect Exemplar (cf. 1 Cor 11:1).**

Christ is uniquely the image of God, but in a derived sense God "made" or "created"¹ ¹The Hebrew is $\bar{b}r\bar{a}$ ($\#a\bar{s}a$, "made") in Gen 1:26 and $\bar{b}r\bar{a}$ (*bara*@, "create") in 1:27. Both verbs speak of the creation of humanity in Gen 5:1-2. mankind in His own image and likeness. Although "the Bible does not define for us the precise content of the original *imago*,"¹ ¹Carl F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority* (Waco: Word, 1976) 2:125. Chap. 10 of this work is particularly worthy of study. generally it appears to be "cohesive unity of interrelated components that interact with and condition each other."¹ ¹Ibid. This vague conclusion is exegetically credible, but does not consider some of the major extrapolations about the *imago Dei*. In the history of system-

atic theology, three basic views relating to the image of God in man have surfaced: the substantive, the relational, and the functional.¹ ¹Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984] 495-517. Historically, these views relate to analogy of being, analogy of relation, and dominion, respectively.¹ ¹G. C. Berkouwer, *Man: The Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962) 67-118. The following brief excerpts from Erickson describe the general characteristic(s) of each camp.

[1] The substantive view has been dominant during most of the history of Christian theology. The common element in the several varieties of this view is that the image is identified as some definite characteristic or quality within the makeup of the human. . . . [2] Many modern theologians do not conceive of the image of God as something resident within man's nature. Indeed, they do not ordinarily ask what man is, or what sort of a nature he may have. Rather, they think of the image of God as the experience of a relationship. Man is said to be in the image or to display the image when he stands in a particular relationship. In fact, that relationship *is* the image. . . . [3] We come now to a third type of view of the image, which has had quite a long history and has recently enjoyed an increase in popularity. This is the idea that the image is not something present in the makeup of man, nor is it the experiencing of relationship with God or with fellow man. Rather, the image consists in something man does. It is a function which man performs, the most frequently mentioned being the exercise of dominion over the creation.¹ ¹Erickson, *Christian Theology* 498, 502, 508.

The basic shortcoming of both the second and third views is that they are the consequences of the *imago Dei*. They are valid functions, but do not answer the apparently ontological implications of key scriptural texts.¹ ¹Ibid., 510-12. It is difficult to eliminate some sort of analogy in man's image-bearing. Yet, as historically expressed, problems have plagued the first view, especially in light of the catastrophic affects of the fall of man. Erickson seems to be on the right analogical track when he suggests "the attributes of God sometimes referred to as communicable attributes constitute the image of God."¹ ¹Erickson, *Christian Theology* 514. He is also right in making a Christological connection: "The character and actions of Jesus will be a particularly helpful guide . . . since he was the perfect example of what human nature is intended to be" (ibid.). Indeed, the moral attributes of God constitute a significantly large dimension of His image in man, a fact that is acutely relevant in a consideration of the issue of modeling.

The Retention of the Image: Devastated but Not Destroyed

After deciding for the analogy-of-being view, the haunting question remains, what about the affects of the fall? Once again, the biblicist must endure the poles of another scriptural tension. On the one hand,

the fall of man was a catastrophic personality shock; it fractured human existence with a devastating fault. Ever since, man's worship and contemplation of the living God have been broken, his devotion to the divine will shattered. Man's revolt against God therefore affects his entire being. . . . His revolt against God is at the same time a revolt against truth and the good.¹ ¹Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority* 2:134-35.

On the other hand, however, "there is some sense in which the image of God must persist even in fallen man."¹ ¹Charles M. Horne, "A Biblical Apologetic Methodology" (unpublished ThD dissertation; Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Ind., 1963) 84. The *potential* for the communication and sovereign application of the Word of grace, a restored relationship, and moral renovation remains. Avoiding endless pursuits

through logical labyrinths, Kidner wisely makes the soteriological transition with his brief synopsis: "After the Fall, man is still said to be in God's image (Gn. 9:6) and likeness (Jas. 3:9); nonetheless he requires to be 'renewed . . . after the image of him that created him' (Col. 3:10; cf. Eph. 4:24)."¹ ¹Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1967) 51; cf. O. Flender, "e1kwn," *NIDNTT* 2:287-88.

The Re-Creation of Image

By original creation man bore the image of God, including its significantly moral dimension. His fall¹ ¹For discussions of Adam Theology, i.e. the "first Adam" as representative of and in solidarity with the whole race and the "Last Adam" as representative of and in solidarity with God's elect, see John Murray's *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959); *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957); S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., "Romans 5:12`an Exercise in Exegesis and Theology," in *New Dimensions in NT Study* (ed. by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974). radically perverted the whole image, so much so that no hope for any kind of self-reformation remained. Yet the Word of God says that the image and likeness continue even with man in this horrible condition. By God's grace, men redeemed in Christ have embarked on an upward and onward journey of moral restoration (cf. 2 Pet 3:18). Their destination is moral perfection, Christlikeness. Consequently, the overarching challenge to all genuine disciples is still, "Be ye holy, for I am holy" (Lev 11:44-45, 19:2; 1 Pet 1:16).

The primary means of grace in moving the saved along that highway of sanctification is the Word of God attested by the Spirit of God, and a vital constituent of this divine testimony is the incarnate example of Christ. Indeed, He abides as God's perfect moral manifestation.

THE MICRO`THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT OF MODELING

Because of His pattern, the attitude and actions of His people should mature in integrity and consistency of Christlikeness (cf. Phil 1:27 ff.; 2:5 ff.; 1 John 2:6). As they mature morally, some more rapidly than others, they themselves are to become reflections of His moral model (cf. 1 Thess 1:7). Growth should characterize all His "saints,"¹ ¹A profession without practice constitutes a highly culpable state of pretense. For a discussion of progressive sanctification, see O. Procksch, "agiasmōw," *TDNT* 1:113; George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 519-20. but the NT holds those recognized as church leaders especially responsible to be examples. They are visible and derived moral models for the Exemplar'sē kklhs̄a (*ekklesia*, "church"). This awesome responsibility is the focus of the rest of this study. A semantical background will prepare the way for the remainder.

The Vocabulary of Modeling

The OT is replete with commands and implicit obligations concerning the holiness of God's people, but it contains no transparent teaching about following the example of God or His chosen leaders.¹ ¹Michaelis concludes that "on the whole the idea of imitation is foreign to the OT. In particular, there is no thought that we must imitate God" (W. Michaelis, "mimōomai, mimhthw, k. t. l.," *TDNT* 4:663. In the LXX this word-group appears only in the Apocrypha, where it does not refer to divine emulation (ibid.). Yet in the pseudepigraphical writings some occurrences urge the imitation of OT men of renown and even God Himself (ibid., 664). Philo exhibits his same pattern of usage (ibid., 664-66). Michaelis' controlling presupposition

distorts his interpretation of these data, however. However, the NT abounds with this concept. As a matter of fact, a whole arsenal of modeling terms surfaces.¹ ¹For a general discussion of the most significant of these terms see W. Mundle, O. Flender, J. Gess, R. P. Martin, and F. F. Bruce, "Image, Idol, Imprint, Example," *NIDNTT* 2:284-91. Their opening paragraph on essential synonymity is important, and subsequent discussions of the Christological model are worthy of special attention. Of these, the *typow* (*typos*, "example") and *mimhthw* (*mimetes*, "imitator") word-groups are the most important.

In ancient secular Greek *typos* exhibits the following usage categories: "a. 'what is stamped,' 'mark,' . . . 'impress' . . . 'stamp,'" e.g., of letters engraved in stone, images, or painted images; "b. 'Mould,' 'hollow form' which leaves an impress," . . . and in a transferred sense "ethical 'example'" . . . ; and "c. . . 'outline,' 'figure,'" i.e. of the stamp or impress.¹ ¹L. Goppelt, "*typow*, ἄντιτυπῶν, κ. τ. λ.," *TDNT* 8:247. Regarding etymology, Müller states, "The etymology of *typow* is disputed. It may be derived from *typtiv*, strike, beat, . . ." (H. Müller, "Type, Pattern," *NIDNTT* 3:903); cf. Goppelt who is more impressed with this etymological connection (Goppelt, "*typow*" 8:246-47). He suggests the development goes from a blow "to the impress made by the below," then "from these basic senses *typow* develops an astonishing no. [number] of further meanings which are often hard to define. In virtue of its expressiveness it has made its way as a loan word [i.e. "type"] into almost all European languages" (ibid.). "In the LXX *typos* occurs in only 4 places":¹ ¹Müller, "Type" 3:904. for the model or pattern for the tabernacle and its furnishings in Exod 25:40, for idols or images in Amos 5:26, for the "'wording,' 'text,' of a decree" in 3 Macc 3:30, and for "(determinative) 'example'" in 4 Macc 6:19.¹ ¹Goppelt, "*typow*" 8:248.

In the NT its full range of semantical usages include,¹ ¹This follows the classifications of BAGD, 829-30. Sub-category 2, "*copy, image*," has not been cited because they furnish no NT examples; however, two of the extra-biblical references that are cited i.e., a reference to a master being the image of God to a slave and children as copies of their parents bear illustratively upon the moral references of category 5. This fifth category encompasses the doctrine of modeling in the NT. On the history of the hermeneutical significance of sub-category 6., see Goppelt, "*typow*" 8:251-59, and Müller, "Type" 3:905-6.

1. *visible impressions* of a stroke or pressure, *mark, trace*; e.g., John 20:25
3. *that which is formed, an image or statue*; e.g., Acts 7:43
4. *form, figure, pattern*; e.g., Romans 6:17
5. (*arche*)*type, pattern, model*, both literally, e.g., Acts 7:44, Hebrews 8:5; and ethically as *example, pattern*, e.g., 1 Timothy 4:12, etc.
6. in reference to divinely ordained *types*, whether things, events, or persons; e.g., Romans 5:14.

Of the fourteen occurrences of the noun *typos* in the NT, half relate to modeling, either implicitly as a negative illustration (e.g., the adverb *typikvw* [*tupikōs*]), "typically,"], 1 Cor 10:6) or explicitly as positive patterns (Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9; 1 Tim 4:12; Tit 2:7; 1 Pet 5:3). Further, one other occurrence has a tangential theological relation:

In Rom. 6:17 [*typow* refers to] the context, the expressions of the doctrine. . . . However, the original meaning of the form which stamps can still be strongly felt. As previously sin, so now the new teaching, i.e. the message of Christ, is the factor which stamps and determines the life of the Christian.¹ ¹Müller, "Type" 3:904-5; cf. Goppelt: "*typow* is . . . the impress which makes an impress, so that in context the teaching can be described as the mould or norm which shapes the whole personal conduct of the one who is delivered up to it and has become obedient thereto" ("*typow*" 8:250).

The efficient means of the Word of God is seen here as a press and die which leaves an amazing mark on the people of God.

Though the data relating to modeling are quite conspicuous, contemporary scholarship is reluctant to attribute to the concept a fully ethical significance. For example, Goppelt refuses to allow that a disciple's life is "an example which can be imitated."¹ ¹Goppelt, "τύπων" 8:249-50. Interestingly, two sentences later he comments on 1 Pet 5:3 and 1 Tim 4:12 wherein he apparently concedes a more direct association with ethical emulation. It would seem that a good share of Goppelt's reluctance is due to Michaelis' quite dogmatic conclusions about the μιμητικῶν word-group; cf. Michaelis, "μιμητικῶν" 4:659 ff. His emphases on the primacy of the Word of God and the priority of an ultimate reference to faith are commendable, but as subsequent treatments of the key texts will reveal, the inescapable overtones are patterns from people. Müller in his discussion of this issue is not quite as one-sided. For example, he asserts that the crucial texts "are not simply admonitions to a morally exemplary life. . . . The shaping power of a life lived under the Word has in turn an effect on the community (1 Thess. 1:6), causing it to become a formative example."¹ ¹Müller, "Type" 3:905. He carefully interrelates the effectual means of the Word with a derived means consisting of ethical examples.

The *mimētes* word-group, the source of the English word "mime,"¹ ¹E.g., W. E. Vine, *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908) 2:248. furnishes a rich semantical heritage also. Generally speaking,

the word group μιμητικῶν etc., . . . arose in the 6th cent. [B.C.], and came into common use in both prose and poetry. Μιμητομαί has the sense 'to imitate,' 'to mimic,' i.e. to do what is seen to be done by someone else.¹ ¹Michaelis, "μιμητικῶν" 4:659.

Bauder sub-classifies the classical Greek usages as follows:

- (a) imitate, mimic . . .
- (b) emulate with joy, follow
- (c) in the arts (plays, paintings, sculpture and poetry), represent reality by imitation, imitate is a artistic way. . . . an actor is therefore a *mimos*, a mimer. . . . A *symmimētes* (Lat. *imitator*) is an imitator, especially a performer or an artist who imitates. When used in a derogatory sense, the words refer to quasi-dramatic "aping" or feeble copying with lack of originality.¹ ¹W. Bauder, "μιμητομαί," *NIDNTT* 1:490.

Significantly, from the earliest stages of this group's history in classical Greek, "the words were used to express ethical demands made on men. One should take as one's model the boldness of a hero, or one should imitate the good example of one's teacher or parents."¹ ¹Ibid. Such imitations are without a revelational norm, but they nevertheless illustrate a *linguistic* background for usage in the NT.

One particular nuance in classical usage deserves special attention. It is this word-group's place within the typically dualistic cosmology of the ancient Greeks. Of course, Plato is especially fond of its employment in this sense. Bauder captures the gist of it: "The whole of the lower world of appearances is only the corresponding, imperfect, visible copy or likeness (*mimēna*) of the invisible archetype in the higher world of the Ideas."¹ ¹Ibid., 491. Such thinking is antibiblical, but in the process of its development among pagan philosophers, discussions arose about "divine" imitation.¹ ¹Cf. Michaelis, "μιμητικῶν" 4:661-62. Though Michaelis concludes "that in such statements the *imitatio dei* is not too closely bound to the cosmological mimesis concept,"¹ ¹Ibid., 662. this study concludes that such ancient references "have quite plainly an ethical thrust,"¹ ¹Ibid., 663. albeit without revelational norms.

Since "The Vocabulary of Modeling" above has alluded to the Jewish usage of this word-group, it will suffice to add that two of the four occurrences in the Apocrypha speak of emulating heroes of the faith in martyrdom¹ ¹Cf. Michaelis, "mimhtw" 4:663. and that in subsequent history

the Rabbis were the first to speak of imitation of God in the sense of developing the image of God in men. In the Pseudepigrapha in addition to the exhortation to imitate men of outstanding character . . . one can also find the thought of the imitation of God (i.e. keeping his commands . . .) and of particular characteristics of God.¹ ¹Bauder, "mimomai" 1:491.

Again, apart from any accretions, eccentricities, perversions, etc., in these materials, such usages are a linguistic link in the conceptual chain culminated in the corpus of the NT teachings.

Bauder's breakdown of the word-group is succinct and accurate: "In the NT *mimeomai* is found only 4 times (2 Thess. 3:7, 9; Heb. 13:7; 3 Jn. 11); *mimetes* 6 times (1 Cor. 4:16; 11:1; Eph. 5:1; 1 Thess. 1:6; 2:14; Heb. 6:12); and *symmimetes* only once in Phil. 3:17."¹ ¹Ibid. The deponent middle verb meaning "imitate, emulate, follow" occurs with accusatives of person, and the uncompounded noun form *mimetes* ("imitator") occurs either with a personal referent or with an impersonal genitive.¹ ¹BAGD, 522. Also, "it is noteworthy that in all its NT occurrences *mimhtw* is joined with *gnēsuaī*, denoting moral effort."¹ ¹James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1930) 412. Indeed a safe assertion is that "all [words in the group] are used with an ethical-imperative aim and are linked with obligation to a specific kind of conduct."¹ ¹Bauder, "mimomai" 1:491.

Michaelis opposes this ethical-emulation thrust of the words and reinterprets according to his chosen viewpoint. He bolsters his contention with a few textual observations, especially pertaining to contextual emphases on faith, suffering, persecution, death, industriousness, obedience, etc.¹ ¹Michaelis, "mimhtw" 4:666-68, *passim*. All these contextual colorings have some credibility, but specific applications do not negate the all-embracing ethical perspective of total character and consistent life-style. Much more subjective is his discussion built upon a presuppositional foundation of apostolic authority, though nearly all interpreters will empathize with its apparent motivational tension i.e., how can any finite and fallible person, including Paul, say, "Follow my ethical example?" Despite this tension, no exegete should forge a few implicit references into a hermeneutical hammer for driving many round texts into square contexts.¹ ¹Ibid., pp. 667-74, contains eccentric applications and overstated conclusions based on some glaring examples of totality transfers which are always hermeneutically counterproductive. Bauder supports the essential thrust of Michaelis' thesis, but is usually much more careful in his expressions of it (cf. "mimomai" 1:491-92). The ensuing treatment of key passages will document the fact that the NT evidence "cannot be reduced to a demand for personal obedience."¹ ¹Bauder, "mimomai" 1:491.

The Vocation of Modeling

The best way to organize key NT texts dealing with modeling is by an essentially theological development.¹ ¹Another approach would be to follow canonical order. Still another is a biblical theological approach, i.e., modeling in the Pauline corpus, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in Peter, in 3 John, etc. Though this method has inductive advantages, it does not lend itself to viewing the total NT picture through a common lens. Another way of organizing the data is the grammatical, i.e., noting the passages which historically exemplify modeling and then examining others which command it. Yet it seems better to employ another

organizational category, at the same time calling attention to the indicatives and imperatives. Whether historically noted or ethically urged, the NT data present God's model to His people, show the moral example of the apostolic circle to all the churches, emphasize the particular area of responsibility in reference to church leaders, and advocate that all Christians be maturing moral models for the spiritual well-being of the whole body. This plan is basically consistent with both the early church's historical development and special gradations of judgment or reward pertaining to church leaders. It does not dictate some sort of ethical "apostolic succession," however. Essentially an unbreakable chain, it comes full circle, creating a theological necklace which begins and ends with the sovereign grace of God and Christ's moral model.

God: The Ultimate Model for His Church. Eph 5:1 instructs the church to "keep on becoming (or being) imitators of God." Michaelis argues that this passage along with similar ones "does not speak of true imitation of Christ or God."¹

¹Michaelis, "mimhthw" 4:673; Michaelis' presupposition of utter moral transcendence causes him to reject the implications of the thrust of Paul's argument in 4:25 ff. (ibid., 4:671-73). Yet it is in a setting that begins with an identical imperative (4:32) inculcating reciprocal kindness, tenderness, and forgiveness based on Christ's example. Furthermore, the kauw (*kathōs*, "just as") clause, which bridges to the Lord's perfect pattern, assumes analogy and infers emulation. Immediately after 5:1 comes another continuously binding imperative to "keep on walking in love" followed by another indication of Christ as the Exemplar (peripate@te . . . kauw [*peripateite* . . . *kathōs*], 5:2). Additionally, the simple adverb of comparisonv w (*hōs*, 5:1b), "as beloved children," points to the propriety of ethical emulation by believers.

On a larger scale, this command to imitate God and Christ is part of a larger section about holy living(4:25-6:20). This in turn is a subset of the practical half of the epistle (i.e., the "do" section) beginning at 4:1. All these exhortations are appropriate responses to the sovereign grace of God, i.e., the theologically "indicative" section (i.e., the "done" section) of this great epistle (Ephesians 1`3).¹ ¹See Ladd, *Theology of the NT* 493-94, 524-25, for a discussion the indicative/imperative motif related to sanctification. On yet a grander scale of inclusion is the comprehensive scriptural challenge to be holy because God is holy. From the reversed perspective, the obligation to "be holy for God is holy" receives definitive resolution through the prevalent indicative/imperative presentation of ethical obligation, with a variety of explicit exhortations as elaborations. This is the natural theological setting of moral modeling, e.g. "Be imitators of God as beloved children."

The Derived Apostolic Model in the Church. The designation "apostolic" pertains to the apostolic circle, and allows for God's use of both apostles and transition men such as Timothy and Titus in establishing churches during the first century. The latter group were not apostles, but were in a special sense apostles of an apostle. For example, they supervised the planting and the solidification of local NT churches. When doing this, they were not technically one of the pastors-teachers-elders-overseers of a given local church or group of regional churches. So this section treats them as mediate models. However, apparently in their day-to-day ministries they worked alongside and functioned similarly to pastoral leaders. Therefore, it is also appropriate to apply what is said below about 1 Tim 4:12 and Tit 2:7 to the next major division, "The 'Third Generation' Model of Church Leadership."

(1) Modeling Directly

Paul did not shy away from offering himself as an ethical model for

believers he had personal contact with (e.g., 1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; Phil 3:17; 2 Thess 3:7, 9).¹ This treatment will discuss only passages explicitly employing "model" or "type" terminology, omitting the many conceptual allusions to Paul's own example. Maintaining an accurate theological perspective requires a treatment of 1 Cor 11:1 and Philippians 3 first.

First Cor 11:1, "be imitators of me, just as I also am of Christ," is basic to all modeling on the horizontal plane. Paul was not *the* Exemplar; only Christ can be that. However, that did not exempt him from the divine responsibility of being a derived moral example. The contextual application of his statement has to do with not becoming an offense because of one's personal freedom in Christ (10:23 ff.). He closes his discussion with a command to comply (10:32), and then holds himself up as an example (10:33), then picking up that same thread but repeating it with the vocabulary of moral modeling (11:1a). He is careful to add, however, that when they follow his example, they are following the ultimate pattern of Christ's treatment of others (11:1b).¹ Bauder concludes, "Paul never intends to bind the demand for imitation to his own person. It is always ultimately to the One whom he himself follows" ("mimō omai" 1:491).

Philippians 3 has raised significant questions about the propriety of human moral example. After Paul urges the following of his own example (3:17), does he not confess his own finiteness and moral fallibility (3:3-16)?¹ Michaelis is quite dogmatic ("mimhtōw" 4:667-68), and Bauder more subdued ("mimō omai" 1:491). Or, in the words of Bauder, "Prior to the demand to imitate him, he deliberately places a confession of his own imperfection (Phil. 3:12)."¹ Bauder, "mimō omai" 1:491.

He does indeed assert he has not arrived at moral perfection. "He does not think of himself as the personal embodiment of an ideal which must be imitated,"¹

¹ibid. but this saint in process *does* urge the Philippian church to keep on becoming (or being) fellow-imitators of (or with) him (3:17a).¹ This is the only NT occurrence of the compounded plural form *symmimh-tōw*. Here it stands as the predicate nominative of the now familiar present plural imperative *gñesue* (cf. Eph 5:1). The personal pronoun in the genitive refers to Paul. In addition to Paul, others are consistently living (3:17b) according to the pattern (i.e., *typon*) of the apostolic circle.¹ In the context of 3:17c probably includes Timothy and possibly Epaphroditus with Paul (cf. Phil 2:19, 25). It is wrong to ignore one facet of biblical revelation because of another equally important truth that raises an apparent logical contradiction.

But is it possible to resolve this scriptural tension? Like most other biblical paradoxes, not fully. Nevertheless, several observations will ease the difficulty it causes our limited logic. For example, the major portion of this epistle has to do with ethical exhortation (i.e., 1:27-4:9). From the beginnings of this section the theme of unity through humility, including the preferring of others over self, dominates. But the supremely important example of Christ (2:5-8) undergirds all subsequent moral responsibilities. The Lord is the primary pattern for attitude and actions. Based directly on that perfect example, Paul challenged the Philippians to progress in their sanctification (2:12), reminding them that the resources for such a holy calling reside with God (2:13). The Philippian disciples were fully responsible, but not adequate in themselves. Interestingly, following this general challenge to holy living, Paul refers to Timothy and Epaphroditus (2:19-30) as others-oriented examples.

To begin chapter 3, he rehearses his pre- and post-conversion experiences (3:3-16). These not only compare and contrast the pre-conversion Paul (esp. vv. 4b-6) and other genuine Christians (3:7 ff.) with some externalists in Philippi (e.g. 3:1-2, 18-19), but also compare especially the post-conversion experience of Paul with that of all true disciples. Although both Paul and true believers at Philippi were positionally "perfect" in Christ, neither he nor they were perfect experientially.

Consequently, his quest like theirs should be one of an intensifying pursuit of moral purity. Such a focus, by the grace of God, qualified one to be a reflected model of ethical development. However, the perfect moral mold remains the one who said, "You are to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Mt 5:48).

This theological perspective sheds light on other Pauline statements. For example, when he writes earlier in 1 Corinthians, "Therefore I urge you to imitate me" (4:16, NIV), he does not disregard Christ as the ultimate example (11:1), nor does he intend to leave the impression that he had arrived. He has already negated any claims to self-sufficiency, especially in his exposé of all human wisdom (chaps. 1-3). In addition, he has built a solid bridge to genuine ministry (chaps. 3-4), largely from prominent personalities as illustrations. That sets the stage in chapter 4 to challenge Corinthian arrogance. By weaving in positive examples, he exposes the heinousness of their pride (4:6 ff.). He also mixes in several testimonials to God's ultimacy and sufficiency to His servants (e.g., 3:5-7; 4:1-4; etc.). This is hardly the context for a Pauline ego trip. His personal example in 4:16 once again reflects the pattern of Christ and His grace.

He wrote to the Thessalonian church to encourage them to follow the apostolic example (2 Thess 3:7, 9). Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy (2 Thess 1:1) supplied positive examples as a corrective for any who were out of line among the Thessalonians (i.e., ἀτάκτως [*ataktos*, "disorderly"], 3:6, 11; cf. the verb form in v. 7b), especially in matters of free-loading and meddling. The disciples at Thessalonica recognized "how it was necessary [for them] to imitate (μιμησάμεθα [*mimēsthai*] us [the apostolic circle]" (3:7). Paul and his associates offered themselves as a "model" (τύπον *typon*) for the members of body there to emulate (3:9).¹ ¹In this context the industry of the apostolic circle (3:8) is what provides the example for the Thessalonians to follow (3:9b).

(2) Mediate Modeling

First Tim 4:12-16 is an exceedingly important passage regarding moral exemplification. It equals 2 Tim 4:2 in importance as a qualification for Christian ministry. In fact, it stresses that in importance patterning the Word is a necessary corollary to preaching it, with the former usually preceding the latter.

Furthermore, the whole epistle places a very high priority on character and conduct. The man of God is always accountable in areas of personal and "professional" responsibility. He cannot just be faithful in teaching the truth; he must live the truth. Heralding God's gospel is a highly motivating and worthy call, yet the human instrument must possess certain qualities of integrity (e.g., 3:1-7). As with Paul (e.g., 1:12-17), he must accept both responsibilities with a profound sense of humility and in utter dependence upon the one who commissions. Indeed, by the time 1 Timothy closes (e.g., 6:11-16), the young man of God certainly understood the two primary obligations of spiritual leadership.

But chapter 4 is especially cogent. Vv. 7b-8 set the tone for vv. 12-16 with Paul's command to Timothy to "work out" strenuously (*γυμνάζω*, *gymnazo*, "I train, exercise") to develop spiritual muscle for godliness (v. 7b). For all intents and purposes, the many imperatives in vv. 12 ff. supply the why's and the wherefore's of the exhortation to holiness. In 1 Tim 4:12-16, three waves of commands pound Timothy with his two general responsibilities. The first wave crashes with an overwhelming reminder of his personal responsibility (i.e., v. 12). As it begins to ebb commands relating to his professional accountability drench him (i.e., vv. 13-14). For most conservative evangelicals, the professional requirements (e.g., v. 13) are an authoritative given. The same applies concerning personal requirements; however, the application of these is far more sensitive personally. The intimidation factor at times seems to be overwhelming. For that reason, the focus

of this brief discussion will concentrate on the modeling requirements.

The first command of v. 12 does not directly address the man of God; it addresses those he leads. Indirectly it implies that he himself must be irreproachable (cf. the first and general qualification of 3:2). The implication of v. 12a finds confirmation in v. 12b. His obligation is one of exemplifying before members of the flock: he was to "be (or become) a type (or pattern or model) (*typos*) for the believers."¹ ¹Moulton and Milligan (*Vocabulary* 645) cite an ethical parallel to 1 Tim 4:12 in an inscription from the first century B.C. It speaks of being a model for "godliness" (εὐσεβεία [*eusebeia*]), a noun used in 1 Tim 4:7b). Paul typifies the moral example in five areas: in the language (communications) of the man of God, in his general lifestyle,¹

¹The word ἀναστροφή (*anastrophe*, "way of life, behavior") relates to cognates in Heb 13:7 (discussed below); 1 Pet 1:15, 17, 18; 3:1-2; 2 Pet 3:11. Here it connects with εὐσεβεία ("godliness"), i.e., holiness of life-style. This word-group was also ethically significant in Hellenistic Judaism (cf. Tobit 4:14; 2 Macc 5:8; 6:23). in his ἀγάπη (*agape*, "love," i.e., that unselfish, extending, all-give variety which exudes tenderness, compassion, tolerance, etc.), in his "faith" (or better, "faithfulness, trustworthiness, reliability," the passive meaning of πίστις [*pistis*]), and in his personal purity. Without integrity of life, his pronouncements and preachings, his proclamations and indoctrinations (e.g., vv. 11, 13) are severely limited.

A second wave of commands comes in v. 15 to remind the man of God to concentrate on both his personal (i.e., v. 15a) and professional (i.e., v. 15b) responsibilities¹

¹Two present imperatives, μελέτα and ἑσθί, point to a continuing responsibility: "keep on caring for" these things and "be" in them. Robertson suggests that the force of the latter is "give yourself wholly to them," and adds, "It is like our 'up to his ears' in work . . . and sticking to his task" (A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the NT* [Nashville: Broadman, 1931] 4:582). so that his advancement might be clearly visible to "all." The concluding purpose clause of v. 15 stresses the importance of Timothy's modeling.¹ ¹As Stahlin urges, Timothy's moral and ministerial advancement "is to be visible, for he is to show himself hereby to be a τύπος for believers (v. 12). . ." (G. Stahlin, "prokopḥ, prokōptv," *TDNT* 6:714). His life was to exhibit significant "progress."¹ ¹In secular Greek prokopḥ (*prokope*, "progress") was a nautical term for "making headway in spite of blows," and was employed in an extended ethical way, esp. among the Stoics. Philo picked up the ethical sense and tried to give it a theocentric orientation (cf. Stahlin, "prokopḥ, prokōptv," 6:704, 706-7, 709-11). The verb form is used of Jesus' "progress" (Luke 2:52). Therefore, v. 15 not only reiterates his patterning responsibility, but it also confirms that it is not necessary for ethical models to be absolutely perfect, but they must be growing in holiness.

Two imperatives in v. 16, Paul's third crashing wave, emphasize the same two areas, "yourself" and "your teaching" (cf. vv. 12-14; cf. also Acts 20:38), but in a slightly different way. Putting person before ministry, Paul writes, "Pay close attention" to yourself and to your teaching (v. 16). Calvin summarizes, "Teaching will be of little worth if there is not a corresponding uprightness and holiness of life."¹ ¹John Calvin, *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians and the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon* (trans. by T. A. Small, in *Calvin's Commentaries*, ed. by D. W. and T. F. Torrance; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 248. Guthrie expresses it, "Moral and spiritual rectitude is an indispensable preliminary to doctrinal orthodoxy."¹ ¹Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (The Tyndale NT Commentaries, ed. by R. V. G. Tasker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 99.

Paul emphasizes even further Timothy's personal and ministerial responsibilities with his closing injunction to "persist (or continue or persevere) in them."

The rationale for these commands is overwhelming: "because as you go on doing *this* [singular pronoun referring to both duties], you will save both yourself and the ones who hear you." Almost unbelievably, personal example is side-by-side with the ministry of God's Word in a salvific context.¹ ¹Calvin's theological comments are helpful here (*Timothy*, 248-49).

Titus 2 has the same message more briefly stated. Following instructions

about appointing elders (1:5-9) and combatting false teaching (e.g., 1:10-16; cf. 3:9-11) with healthy doctrine (e.g., 2:1, 15; 3:1, 8a), come directions for how Titus is to handle various groups: older men (2:2), older and then younger women (2:3-5), younger men (2:6), slaves (2:9-10), and the whole flock (3:1-8). A major message was the priority of good deeds (cf. 1:16; 2:7, 14; 3:1, 8, 14).

Among the instructions to young men, probably Titus' age group, Paul reminds Titus of his obligation to be a moral model. Preaching alone was not enough (2:6); he must also live before them (2:7). In other words, he must both exhort *and* exemplify. For the man of God, a pattern (i.e., [*typon*]) of good works is never optional (cf. Eph 2:10). It is essential to preaching and teaching.

*The "Third Generation"*¹ "Third generation" applies to the passing of the precedent from the "second generation" of Timothy and Titus to the permanent local church leaders (cf. 2 Tim 2:2).
Model of Church Leadership

The same thread permeates the Epistle to the Hebrews, from the superior model of Jesus Christ, through the faith's hall of fame (chap. 11), into important statements about church leaders (chap. 13). Accountability of church leaders is the subject of 13:17, but 13:7 deals specifically with their modeling responsibility. The writer instructs the recipients, "Remember your leaders, who spoke the word of God to you." Consider¹ "The participle *ἀναειροῦντες* (*anatheorountes*) is best taken as imperativial in force in light of its subordination to *μιμησθε* (*mimēsthe*). the outcome of their way of life and imitate their faith" (NIV). Examining the result of their lifestyle (i.e., from [*anastrophe*]) and emulating (present imperative of *μιμησαι*) their persevering faith are parallel efforts. Such concrete examples dovetail with the total thrust of the epistle, which is to "keep on keeping on."

Peter's corresponding message addresses the leaders of the church directly. He commands the elders, "Shepherd (or tend or feed) the flock of God which is among you" (5:2a; cf. John 21:15-17; Acts 20:28). This is the only imperative in the passage, but its obligatory force permeates all the qualifiers to follow (vv. 2b-3). Three contrasts highlight motives for spiritual leadership: spiritual leaders must not serve because of human constraints *but* because of divine commitments (v. 2b), must not minister for unjust profit *but* with spiritual zeal (v. 2c), must not lead as prideful dictators *but* as humble models (v. 3).¹ Cp. v. 3b with 1 Tim 4:12b. Cf. the discussion above, esp. in reference to the vocabulary of 1 Tim 4:12b. Goppelt aptly synthesizes the key passages as follows: "Along the same lines as in Paul, the exhortation in 1 Pt 5:3 admonishes those who represent the word to become *τύποι . . . τοῦ ποιμνίου*, 'examples to the flock.' The word cannot just be recited; it can be attested only as one's own word which shapes one's own conduct. The office-bearer is thus admonished: 'Be thou an example of the believers, in word (i.e., preaching), in conversation,' 1 Tim 4:12; cf. Tt 2:7: 'In all things shewing thyself a pattern (in the doing) of good works'" (Goppelt, "*typon*" 8:250). NT shepherds have the binding obligation of being an ethical model for the flock of God. The sheep in turn are to emulate their leaders' lives (cf. Heb 13:7). This requires genuine humility (1 Pet 5:5b-6).

The Model of the Church to the Church

All believers are to be examples for other believers to follow. For example, Paul mentions two instances of this. Paul asserts that when the Thessalonians received God's gospel, they did so in a societal setting analogous to that of the Judean churches, i.e., while being persecuted (2:14-16). Paul's words, "for you, brethren, became imitators (*μιμηταί ἐγενήθητε* [*mimetai egenēthete*]) of the churches of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea" (NASB), provided an incentive to the church to keep on persevering.

Besides being a reflection of the Judean churches (2:14), the Thessalonians in their persecution modeled both the apostolic circle and the Lord Himself, and in

turn became a pattern for believers throughout the regions of Macedonia and Achaia (1:6-7). Michaelis objects to any form of "conscious imitation,"¹ ¹Michaelis, "mimhtḥw" 4:670. Some of his contextual comments are credible, but his controlling assumption that modeling relates only to authority limits his conclusion about the verses by his presuppositional mold (ibid.). but the subsequent verses not only document their persecution, but also mention continuing evidence of their faithfulness (cf. 1:8-10). These vivid exhibitions were a vital element in the pattern displayed before other believers.

Heb 6:12 speaks of modeling also. The exemplars here are all "who are inheriting the promises through faith and longsuffering." The writer urges the recipients of this epistle to join their ranks by mimicking conduct.

Michaelis is correct when he says,

The admonition of 3 Jn. 11: *mī mimoy tō kakōnā llā tōā gauōn* (*me mimou to kakon alla to agathon*, "do not emulate what is bad but what is good") is general, but it stands in close relation to what precedes and follows. Gaius must not be ensnared by the Diotrophes who is denounced in v. 9f. He should follow the Demetrius who is praised in v. 12.¹ ¹Michaelis, "mimhtḥw" 4:666. [transliteration and translated added]

The Scripture never tells believers to imitate an abstraction. As here, the example is always concrete. This passage furnishes both negative and positive patterns.

The above discussion has shown that God's people should emulate not only other mature disciples, but also the men whom God has given to them as spiritual leaders (cf. Eph 4:11 ff.). In turn, they in accord with testimonies of the apostolic circle should strive to model Christ, who alone displays the perfect moral image of God. In the NT the vital link of ethical emulation represented in church leaders is particularly conspicuous. Consequently, rediscovering pastoral ministry according to God's Word requires that today's church leaders not only recognize and teach the priority of moral modeling, but accept its overwhelming challenge personally and, by His grace, live as examples before His sheep and a scrutinizing world ready to level the accusation of hypocrisy.