

The Scriptural Principles Involved in Training Nationals To Teach Others

By Armin W. Schuetze

[Delivered at the World Seminary Conference, May 31, 1982]

The title of this conference, World Seminary Conference, suggests certain assumptions. We can assume that this meeting brings together people from many parts of the world who are interested in or serving at seminaries whose purpose is worker training. The title of the paper, "The Scriptural Principles Involved in Training Nationals to Teach Others," for such a conference leads to certain basic questions. Does Scripture have anything to say about training nationals to teach others? Does it require a national ministry? Does it give any directives for training nationals? The title assumes that we will answer these questions in the affirmative. It assumes that there are basic Scriptural principles which we will want to take into account in training nationals for the ministry. If this paper is to speak of basic principles, its purpose is introductory to this conference. It is not intended to enter into the various practical aspects of the conference theme, "Apt to Teach," but to give the Biblical principles that need to guide and undergird what we do by way of training nationals who may be apt to teach others. With this understanding of our conference and of this introductory paper, let us proceed. We shall group what we have to say under four headings:

- I. The Public Ministry
- II. Forms of the Public Ministry
- III. The Call into the Public Ministry
- IV. Training for the Public Ministry

I. The Public Ministry

If we speak in our theme of training nationals to teach others, it is apparent that we are not speaking simply of training national Christians to carry out their responsibility as priests of God. Inherent is the assumption that certain individuals from the entire body of Christians are to be trained in a special way to function in what we generally call the public ministry.

However, in addressing ourselves to the public ministry, we do not want to lose sight of God's call to all Christians to preach and teach His Word. Jesus' great commission, spoken to the eleven in Matthew 28 and Mark 16, we have correctly applied to all Christians. Every Christian has the call to "make disciples," "to baptize," to teach, to preach "the good news to all creation." Peter in the well-known passage on this subject calls Christians "a royal priesthood," "a people belonging to God," "that you may declare the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light" (1 Pet. 2:9). What is more, the Lord wants Christians to be equipped for this teaching. God's people are to be prepared for works of service, according to Ephesians 4:12, and that includes as a foremost service that of "declaring the praises" of our God.

All of this is not forgotten when we now go on to speak of training certain individuals for the public ministry. If it is true that God has made all Christians his priests to proclaim his gospel, then it is equally true that he has established a public ministry of the Word. Jesus himself distinguished between all his disciples or followers and the twelve whom he designated apostles (Luke 6:13). They received special training and were sent out to preach (Luke 9:1-2). Was this something unique that was not to continue? Not at all. Paul tells the

Ephesians that the ascended Lord “gave (ἔδωκεν) some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be pastors and teachers” (Eph. 4:11). He wrote to the Corinthians that “in the church God has appointed (ἔθετο) first of all apostles, second prophets, third teachers,” etc. (1 Cor. 12:28). Of himself and his fellow workers in Corinth Paul says that they are “servants of Christ... entrusted with the secret things of God” (1 Cor. 4:1-2).

Indeed, God has established the public ministry. Why else would he give specific qualifications for bishops and elders that are not applied in the same way to all Christians (1 Tim. 3:2-7)? The theme of our conference, “Apt to Teach,” is one such qualification that is not required of every Christian priest. According to its theme this conference is concerning itself specifically with the public ministry.

If all Christians are commissioned to “preach the gospel,” as we noted, what need is there for the public ministry? The reason for it we can see in Corinth. When the Christians there came together “everyone has a hymn, or a word of instruction, a revelation, a tongue or an interpretation” (1 Cor. 14:26). What a wealth of gifts the Lord gave these Christian priests, and each desired to share what he knew with his fellow Christians when they assembled. That resulted in disorder and confusion.. That is not the way it should be, “for God is not a God of disorder but of peace” (1 Cor. 14:33). So they were told to choose two or three prophets who should speak and the others should listen and “weigh carefully what is said” (1 Cor. 14:29). These two or three were now speaking in the name of all the others, at their request, in their behalf. In German we have used the expression, “*von Gemeinschaftswegen.*” This was necessary in the interest of good order.

It also tells us something about the nature of the “public” ministry. It is public, like any public service or public office. It is done at the request of the “public” and for its good. The difference between the Christian priest and the public minister does not pertain to each one’s relationship to the Word. Both have been entrusted with it and are to proclaim the good news. But the latter does it in behalf of the public, that is, a group of Christians.

Luther stresses the distinction between the priest and minister. He writes:

For although we are all priests, this does not mean that all of us can preach, teach, and rule. Certain ones of the multitude must be selected and separated for such an office... This is the way to distinguish between the office of preaching, or the ministry, and the general priesthood of all baptized Christians. The preaching office is no more than a public service which happens to be conferred upon someone by the entire congregation, all the members of which are priests.
(LW 13, p 332)

He compared it to the distinction between a citizen and the public official.

Good order, however, is not an end in itself. God has established the public ministry for the good of his people. This has many facets. Ministers are to “be shepherds of God’s flock, serving as overseers” (1 Pet. 5:2). They are leaders who “keep watch over you as men who must give an account” (Heb. 13:17). They are to watch their doctrine (1 Tim. 4:16) and “set an example for the believers in speech, in life, in love, in faith and in purity” (1 Tim. 4:12). They are to reach out with the gospel to the “Gentiles” (Rom 15:16) and “prepare God’s people for works of service” (Eph 4:12). This all can be summed up by saying they are “stewards of the mysteries of God” (1 Cor. 4:1). To put it another way: they are to administer the means of grace.

The Scriptural principle that emerges from all of this can be stated as follows: *God has established the public ministry of the Word for the public administration of the means of grace.*

Accordingly we read that Paul and Barnabas on their first mission journey “appointed elders for them in each church” (Acts 14:23). In his letter to Titus, Paul reminds him: “The reason I left you in Crete was that you might straighten out what was left unfinished and appoint elders in every town, as I directed you” (Titus 1:5). In our missions as the Lord gathers a flock of believers, it is his will that they be provided with the ministry of the Word. That is God’s way of looking after his sheep.

As the Lord gathers into congregations those whom he brings to faith in our mission fields, he wants them provided with the ministry of the Word. Each of the converts is immediately a priest and king before God.

When they assemble for worship, when they function as a group of Christians, the public ministry, instituted by the Lord, needs to be established among them.

II. Forms of the Public Ministry

Whenever we speak of the public ministry, we are inclined to think of the parish pastorate, the *Pfarramt*. What was called the old Missouri doctrine of the ministry identifies the parish pastorate with the divinely instituted public ministry. The Wisconsin Synod saw the divinely instituted public ministry free as to the form it might take. It would seem, however, that even those who see the parish pastorate alone as divinely instituted do not in practice define it so precisely that it always has one identical form.

The fact is that Scripture nowhere gives a direct and detailed description of the public ministry so that we can say: “This must be its precise form. This is the Bible’s job description of it.” We cannot reconstruct exactly what the office of a bishop or elder entailed. Was it the same as today’s parish pastorate? We do not know, but it is unlikely. On the other hand, there may be significant likenesses. The point is that if God had in mind that the ministry should follow one precise form, he would have said so without ambiguity. Various terms are used – bishop, presbyter or elder, but there is no clear delineation of either, in fact, the two terms seem to be used interchangeably at times. Hoenecke (*Dogmatik*, IV, 200) sees the two as essentially the same. In the Old Testament God clearly defined the office of the High Priest, the priest, and the Levite. There was no freedom in these forms. God’s law spoke in detail and precisely. Not so in the New Testament. When Paul tells the Colossians that they should not let anyone judge them “by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day” (Col. 2:16), we can add, “or with regard to the forms of the public ministry.” There is no book of Leviticus in the New Testament.

Paul can speak of various forms – apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. All of these he mentions in writing to the Ephesians (4:11). To the Corinthians he also speaks of “workers of miracles, those having gifts of healing, those able to help others, those with gifts of administration, and those speaking in different kinds of tongues” (1 Cor. 12:28). All of them God has appointed in the church; they are God’s gifts to his people. But what each did, the exact function of each can only be surmised. God gave a variety of gifts to his people and appointed these people in the church according to their gifts. Freely God gave gifts, freely the church employed them for the common good. Just how they all related to the *ἐπίσκοπος*, the *πρεσβύτερος*, or *διάκονος* mentioned in the pastoral epistles we are not told. It would seem that the *ποιμένας* mentioned in Ephesians 4:11 may have been among the *ἐπισκόπους* of Ephesus to whom Paul bids farewell in Acts 20:28 telling them to *ποιμαίνειν* the church of God. The free way in which the New Testament can speak of these offices and use terms interchangeably shows the freedom God has given his church in the New Testament times. There are a variety of forms, in some churches more, in others fewer, all serving the people toward their edification through the Gospel.

The freedom found in the New Testament can also be seen in the way offices can be added or changed. When Jesus commissioned the twelve apostles, he commanded them to teach and baptize. It would be reasonable to conclude that they actively participated in the 3000 baptisms on Pentecost. Yet Paul, who was also an apostle, says that “Christ did not send me to baptize” (1 Cor. 1:17). He does, however, claim a full apostleship for himself. Later when the twelve were overwhelmed by their work, they did not hesitate to suggest a new office, which we usually call the deaconate, to administer the distribution to the people. Was this part of the public ministry in another form? It would seem that it was, even if it handled the word somewhat indirectly. Consider the qualifications of the men who were chosen and consider what it was that got Stephen into trouble.

This all leads to the following statement of Scriptural principle: *God has given the church freedom in regard to the forms of the public ministry.*

Uralter usus can become so entrenched in a church so that “the way we always did it” becomes a divine mandate. In practice on the mission field this results in building a church and a ministry in any and every culture that in every respect fits the mold of the mother church.

The other extreme is that freedom is seen as a call to be different and to abandon the tried and tested forms of the mother church as being irrelevant before they have been tried and tested.

Freedom in any matter should lead to careful, thoughtful, disciplined use of it. Applying this to the subject at hand, the forms of the public ministry, means that we not despise or abandon what has been traditional simply to express our freedom, nor that we cling to the traditional as though it were divine command. It means that we use from the past and from another culture what is what is good and can serve in the new culture while at the same time being constructively innovative under the freedom we have. What forms of the public ministry can best be used to serve people with the Word, to reach out most effectively to those who do not know their Savior? That is the question we need to ask. And we will feel free to develop and use whatever will most satisfactorily answer that question.

Another point that bears consideration concerns what we sometimes term lay ministries. By using the adjective “lay,” the impression can be given that they are something different from the public ministry. We need, however, to evaluate them according to the essential factors that distinguish the Christian priest from the public minister and in this way determine how we should view them. What we may term a lay ministry is, I believe, generally another form of the public ministry.

III. The Call

God has established the public ministry, but how does a priest, a Christian become a public minister? The forms of the ministry are free, but how is its form determined in a given case? The answer to both questions is the *call*.

The necessity of a call is expressed succinctly in the Augsburg Confession: “No one should publicly teach in the Church or administer the Sacraments unless he be regularly called” (Art. XIV). All Christians have the call to proclaim God’s Word. To do this publicly in the Church, however, requires a call to that effect. Romans 10:15, “How can they preach unless they are sent?” and Hebrews 5:4, “No one takes this honor upon himself; he must be called of God” form the most direct Scriptural basis for this article of our confession. Moreover, “it would be contrary to love to arrogate the ministry to oneself without the consent (call) of the congregation,” is the way Meyer puts it. That raises the question: How does the individual Christian receive the call to minister publicly?

Jesus told his disciples, “As my Father has sent me, I am sending you” (John 20:21). Jesus directly and personally called the apostles. There is no need to consider this manner of calling at length here since it was used only once since Jesus’ ascension, that is, in the case of Paul.

There is some question about the call of Matthias, to replace Judas among the twelve. Hoenecke uses this example to show that “immediately the first important calling, that of Matthias, happened through the congregation, for the congregation here is choosing, and in doing that is calling” (IV,183). Meyer, however, calls it “essentially a direct call.” He concedes, on the one hand, “True, the congregation was to a certain extent instrumental in bringing it about,” but then makes the two points: 1) “They did not nominate the candidates, but simply singled out those that had the required qualifications,” and 2) “The actual choice was left to the Lord by casting lots.” I personally prefer to classify it as a mediate call since a direct call in other cases did not make use of a congregation in any way. But those who follow Meyer can speak of two direct calls after the Lord’s ascension.

So with one, or possibly two, exceptions, the customary way in which the calling was done since Jesus’ ascension was through the church. This is what the Augsburg Confession has in mind when it speaks of being “regularly called.” The Apostle Paul, in stressing that he was an apostle “sent not from men nor by men, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father” (Gal 1:1) is thereby indicating that others in the public ministry are receiving their position from (*ἀπό*) or by (*διά*) men.

That also accords with historical evidence in Scripture. In fact, Paul himself was involved in effecting mediate calls. On their first mission journey “Paul and Barnabas appointed elders for them in each church” (Acts 14:23). He tells Titus that he left him in Crete that he might “appoint elders in every town” (Titus 1:5).

That people appointed or called through the church were nevertheless called by God Paul asserts in his farewell address to the elders of Ephesus. He tells them that “the Holy Spirit has made you overseers” (Acts 20:28).

Our Confessions (S.A.) ascribe to the church the right to call because the church “has the authority to administer the Gospel” (Tr. 523,67). From this follows the conclusion: “Therefore it is necessary for the Church to retain the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers. And this authority is a gift which in reality is given to the Church, which no human power can wrest from the Church.” This is based on Ephesians 4:8. Prof. Meyer similarly, quoting also Matthew 18:18, says: “The right of congregations to appoint ministers is implied in the ‘keys.’”

However, the method the church is to use in calling is not spelled out in Scripture. In the above examples the churches appear to have been agreeable to have Paul and Barnabas or Titus “appoint” their elders. Yet one properly may ask whether these men in doing the “appointing” will not in some manner have consulted with the congregations. In Acts 6, we have a description of how the first appointments after Matthias were made. Their procedure was not far different from ours today. As long as the right of the congregation is recognized and respected, the manner of electing is an adiaphoron.

The call will also determine the particular form a certain person’s ministry is to take. It determines the scope of his responsibilities. We already referred to this that Paul’s call did not include the administration of baptism. “For Christ did not send me to baptize,” he told the Corinthians (1 Cor. 1:17). The very fact that the ascended Lord gives some to be apostles, some to be prophets, etc. leads to the conclusion that the call of each is defined in scope, with differences in responsibilities. The assignment given to the deacons in Acts 6 was defined when they were elected. The church may determine what aspects of the public ministry are to be assigned with a specific call. What this means in practice is that someone called as an evangelist or teacher without the responsibility, let us say, of administering the sacraments cannot conclude, “I have a call into the public ministry, therefore I have the authority to perform all aspects of it, including the administering of the sacraments.” The teacher cannot say, “I am in the public ministry, therefore I am called to preach at public worship.” God through the church determines the scope of the call.

We arrive at the following Scriptural principle regarding the call: *Through the call from the church God places individual Christians into the public ministry and assigns to them the scope of their responsibility.*

We add a few additional thoughts pertinent to the call. The call brings the congregation and its public servants into a relationship in which they under God are responsible to each other and for each other. Prof. Meyer notes: “Exercising the functions which are common to all Christians, they are the servants of God and of the congregations” (Notes, II, 105). While a minister’s first responsibility is to God, he also has a responsibility toward the Christians through whom the Lord has called him. He is preaching in their name. What he does as public servant he does in their name. His preaching and all he does must be in agreement with the confession of the congregation that has called him. He is their servant. The congregation will recognize its responsibility for him. Like the Bereans they will verify the message of the pastor on the basis of Scripture. The pastor is not doing his own thing but the congregation’s thing, assuming that it is in agreement with Scripture.

In stressing the call we are also saying that it is not the training as such that places anyone into the public ministry. No one can claim the right to function publicly simply on the basis of his training. In training a man the church is not yet calling him. This is where the need for a call again becomes evident. The need to train those to be called is another matter. This we shall take up in the next part.

IV. Training for the Public Ministry

That the church has the responsibility to train men for public service is beyond question. Surely what Paul tells Timothy about this is applicable to the church of all time. The command to Timothy is our divine charter for worker training: “And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable men who will also be qualified to teach others” (2 Tim. 2:2).

Christianity is a revealed religion; it has to do with truth revealed by God through chosen witnesses. It becomes known as it is entrusted (*παράθου*) by one person to another, as it is passed on by one generation to

another. Worker training involves passing God's revealed Word on to those who in turn will be "faithful" (πιστοῖς) teachers of others. That is God's plan for the preservation and continued spread of his revealed word.

The need for training is implied in some of the qualifications of an elder or bishop. The qualification we have as our theme, "apt to teach," can hardly refer only to natural aptitude. Paul writes to Titus that an elder or overseer "must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it" (Titus 1:9). On the other hand, Paul warns Timothy against certain men in Ephesus who teach false doctrine. He says: "They want to be teachers of the law, but they do not know what they are talking about or what they so confidently affirm" (1 Tim 1:7). Those who serve in the public ministry must know what they are talking about. They "must hold firmly to the trustworthy message." All of this implies careful training, solid instruction.

As to the persons to be trained, Paul warns Timothy against too much haste in placing a man into the public ministry. He says an overseer "must not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil" (I Tim. 3:6). On the one hand, if there is a sufficiently thorough training prior to the call to become a minister, the person chosen will no longer be a recent convert. But the question may also be asked how soon a recent convert should begin such study, how soon he should be drawn into worker training. This could possibly depend on the kind of status which a student has in the church.

Is it one that could contribute toward his becoming "puffed up" (τυφωθείς), even endangering his faith? But regardless of how we answer this question of maturity at the beginning of the program, that those who are finally called by the church for public service need to be seasoned in their faith and mature is beyond question. Our worker training program must contribute to that end. There can be no quick, easy course for the neophyte (νεοφυτον). "Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands" is good advice under all circumstances. It does not lose its importance in our world fields in ordaining nationals. It is another way of saying that they should be well trained and mature.

What should the training be like? If we look in Scripture for a specific course of study we will be disappointed. God does not determine this for us according to course number, setting up a curriculum. Perhaps if we lived in the Old Testament times this would have been the case. As it is, we find broad principles which can guide us in determining details.

In our charter for worker training the Lord through Paul tells us what the subject matter should be: "The things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses" (2 Tim 2:2). So what Timothy had learned from Paul he should teach to "reliable men." We might call this the *publica doctrina* of Paul, and that would be the same as the *publica doctrina* of the church. We know that Paul proclaimed "the whole will of God" (Acts 20:27). Paul was not selective in his teaching. The Lord had expressed it in these terms: "Teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). Those who are to hold a public teaching office in the church need to have a well-rounded knowledge of Scripture. "All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:15). All of it is to be used in equipping "the man of God... for every good work" (v. 16). There is to be no one-sided, limited understanding and use of Scripture on the part of the teachers lest Christians may not be adequately equipped for their life's responsibilities, for "every good work."

A training program must center on getting the future workers into Scripture, giving them as thorough and complete an understanding of Scripture truth as possible. The culture may somewhat determine how this is best done in a given place. In a field where educational standards are high, this may be done differently than in one where those standards are lower.

Should worker training include ability in the original languages, Greek and Hebrew? A church whose public ministry is dependent in its teaching and preaching only on translations of Scripture will inevitably be less certain of its doctrine and teaching. Luther points to the importance of the original languages in admonishing the German councilmen to establish and maintain schools. Here are a few selected quotations:

In proportion then as we value the gospel, let us zealously hold to the languages (LW 45, 359).

And let us be sure of this: we will not long preserve the gospel without the languages. The languages are the sheath in which this sword of the Spirit is contained; they are the casket in which the Jewel is enshrined; they are the vessel in which this wine is held; they are the larder in which this food is stored (LW 45, 360).

He points to the difficulty of interpreting Scripture without knowledge of the languages. He asks about the fathers:

But how do you account for the fact that they so often erred in the Scripture? How often does not St. Augustine err... and Hilary too – in fact, all those who have undertaken to expound Scripture without a knowledge of the languages? (LW 45, 361).

He does make a distinction between the “simple preachers of faith and a person who expounds Scripture.” He writes:

A simple preacher (it is true) has so many clear passages and texts available through translations that he can know and teach Christ, lead a holy life, and preach to others. But when it comes to interpreting Scripture, and working with it on our own, and disputing with those who cite it incorrectly, he is unequal to the task; that cannot be done without languages (LW 45, 363).

This can be kept in mind when we look at the different forms of the public ministry, recognizing that the same training is not necessary for all forms.

If Luther is correct in his judgment of the importance of Hebrew and Greek, and I am convinced that he is, then this conclusion can be drawn regarding our mission fields and the training of nationals: unless nationals are trained in the original Biblical languages, a mission field remains dependent on expatriate missionaries. It cannot become independent and hope to retain the gospel in its truth and contend for it very long without the languages. This is important to keep in mind when we consider how we should prepare a field for the eventuality that it is closed to “foreigners.”

Returning to our charter for worker training, we note that the men to be trained should “be qualified to teach others.” This corresponds to the “able to teach” in 1 Timothy 3:2. This has reference to communication. Teaching is communication. The public minister not only needs to know God’s revelation, he needs the ability to communicate what he knows to those he serves. This will be on various levels, in the pulpit, in the classroom, in private ministrations. While a degree of natural ability to communicate is desirable and possibly necessary, training in communication is certainly called for to provide the church with men “qualified to teach others.” Here again, the kind of training needed will to a degree depend on the form of the ministry in which a person is to work.

We noted that the training needs to cover “the whole will of God.” Nevertheless, what Paul wrote to the Corinthians merits our attention here. “For I resolved to know nothing while I was with you except Jesus Christ and him crucified” (1 Cor. 2:2). This does not mean that teaching “nothing except Christ crucified” eliminates from our teaching responsibility certain portions of Scripture and certain doctrines. Rather, Paul’s statement can remind us that there is a central message that must remain central, to which the “whole will of God” relates. So care must be taken that we do not become so engrossed in studying and teaching some isolated doctrine, for example, creation vs. evolution, and in doing so forget how this relates to Christ crucified.

Our confessions put it another way by saying that the doctrine of justification is the “chief topic of Christian doctrine” (Tr. 121,2). Our dogmaticians call it the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*. What all of this tells us is that in our training of public servants for the church this doctrine must remain central. Where it is perverted or even lost, the church has failed in its teaching responsibility; in fact, the church may cease to exist there.

We may sum up what has been said under this fourth point in this statement of principle: *God has assigned to the church the responsibility of training people for the public ministry so that they may faithfully communicate the whole will of God, keeping Christ crucified central.*

In applying the principles we do well to study the examples of our Lord and of St. Paul. We shall do so only briefly.

In the case of our Savior we are considering a unique situation. We have the Son of God equipping those who were to be his witnesses to the ends of the earth. Those he was training were being instructed while they were observing the very acts that produced the message they were to proclaim. And they could observe the perfect, divine model. This training program was one that lasted three years. As a part of it Jesus sent the twelve out for practical experience to the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” with lengthy instructions (Matt. 10 and Luke 9), and they reported back to him. Later (Luke 10) he “appointed seventy-two others” and sent them out. When Judas’ betrayal called for a replacement, there was concern that the replacement be someone who had “been with us the whole time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from John’s baptism to the time when Jesus was taken up from us. For one of these must become a witness with us of his resurrection” (Acts 1:21-22). The replacement was to have had the full training.

In the case of Paul the training was through self-study under the direction of the Holy Spirit. However, in all of these examples we need to remember the uniqueness of the situation, also in the manner in which there was direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

We have in Paul’s training of workers an example that is closer to our own. We think of Timothy and Titus. Much of their training was that which we would call in-service training. The pastoral letters may be considered correspondence courses. The fact that Paul circumcised the one and not the other shows how differing circumstances can lead to a different course of action in preparing the two for their work. There is a way in which we can “become all things to all men so that by all possible means I might save some” (1 Cor. 9:22). But doctrine and practice must be sound and in no way undermine the *sola gratia* of the gospel. Witness also Paul’s reproof of Peter in Antioch in a matter that in itself was an adiaphoron.

I shall close with this basic principle that I believe is of primary importance in training those who teach others: In revealed doctrine there must be firmness; in adiaphora there can be flexibility; the distinction between the two must be clearly recognized.