

A Review of the Call with Special Emphasis on Functions and Procedures

[Chicago Pastoral Conference, January 8 and 9, 1990]

The call into the public Gospel ministry is a multi-faceted and fascinating subject. That is especially true in a group such as this one.

For reasons we shall look at later, there is growing interest among lay people in the call and the calling procedure. The interest goes beyond the usual question of “How does the call system work?” It has developed to the point of many lay people wondering if and even suggesting how the “system” might be changed.

The interest is not confined to the lay membership of our synod. There are pastors, teachers, professors and administrators with this interest, too; and they are not all of the younger generation.

The interest lies in several areas. Most of them are procedural in nature, and all of them hinge on the first matter our essay committee assigned for review in this paper.

The Function of the Holy Spirit

To my knowledge there is no serious question or contention as to whether the third person of the Triune God is involved in the calling process. On that there is unanimity among us.

For that we certainly must thank God. For that we also must pray to God that such unanimity might always exist! For it is a Scripture-based unanimity. Although the elders in the congregation at Ephesus had in one way or another been selected by human beings, God’s inspired apostle still told them: “The Holy Spirit has made you overseers”(Acts 20:28).

However, one wonders at times if maybe there is some difference among us and also between us and the Holy Spirit regarding our perception of his function on all of this. Now and again someone expresses concern that a certain method or procedure in the calling process will bypass, short circuit or otherwise thwart the Holy Spirit’s function. Or the comment is heard now and then about making sure we remember the Holy Spirit plays a role in the calling process, too.

Perhaps an example will help clarify. Mention is sometimes made of computerizing information on pastors’ or teachers’ ages, experiences, etc. and then using the computer’s memory in drawing up a call list. Some will shake their heads, shudder and say that would all but put the Holy Spirit on the sidelines of the calling process.

To say that the Holy Spirit “plays a role” is, at the very least, an unfortunate choice of words. At worst, it gives a wrong impression, because “plays a role” strikes me at least as saying the Holy Spirit is a “supporting actor”—one without whom things can be done, but not done very well (as opposed to the leading actor, without whom things cannot be done at all).

I am convinced we don’t intend to say that, because we know that if anyone is playing a role in the calling process, it is we who move adoption of candidate slates and cast ballots. We acknowledge that by beginning every call meeting in our synod with a prayer to the Holy Spirit to guide us in our discussions of the list and our selection of a person from the list.

In other words, we are saying that the process is really the Holy Spirit’s. We don’t use him in the sense that we draw up a list, decide on a person from it and then get the Holy Spirit’s stamp of approval. Rather, he uses us, helping us come up with names for a list, moving us to discuss them, enabling us to do it with insight, and then directing us to choose whom he wants called at the moment.

Likewise with the concern sometimes voiced about bypassing or tying the hands of the Holy Spirit. Sentiments and remarks like that are, for the most part, another indication of the problem we sometimes have in our perception of the Holy Spirit and his function in the calling process.

We certainly don't want to ever offend or grieve the Holy Spirit in anything we think, say or do. It is also true, as Doctor Luther said, that we must always bear in mind we can bring anything we touch or do to destruction and utter ruin. Finally, we want to do everything in a way that is decent and orderly, to the greatest possible glory of our Lord Christ, and so that the blessed Gospel ministry may not be blemished, blamed or hindered.

At the same time, I would submit it is a bit presumptuous of us to think that something we do or don't do in the calling process (especially if it is something that hasn't been part of it in the past!) is going to keep the Holy Spirit from selecting and calling the person or persons he wants. God the Holy Spirit is bigger and more powerful than that. He is almighty God, with power over all—even the most sophisticated of computers and data systems.

Another thing to remember: the Holy Spirit loves the Church too much to completely take his hands off the calling and placement of workers just because she decided to computerize data on men and women who are eligible for calls. He has too much of his personal time and effort tied up in calling, gathering and enlightening us to stride off the field because we as a church body decide we are going to include on a call list more statistical information about the congregations which the nominees are serving or have served.

I am convinced those things would not offend the Holy Spirit to the point that he would immediately pull out of the process. I am also confident that none of those things would render him powerless to continue to direct the calling process according to his desires and for the optimal benefit of the calling body.

To most suggested changes in call procedures the most common reaction will be the so-called “seven last words of the church” (We never did it that way before) or: “This isn't our practice.”

Both statements are true, but what must be borne in mind is that our practice may not always be divine decree or doctrine. And that is essentially the case with the procedure for calling public ministers of the Gospel in our synod.

It is necessary that such people be called. Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession says: “...No one should publicly teach in the church or administer the Sacraments unless he be regularly called.”

The basis for that is the series of questions in Romans 10:14-16, particularly the last one: “How can they preach unless they are sent?” The basis is also the very first verse of Romans and also I Corinthians, where Paul presents his public Gospel ministry credentials, as it were. He does so by stating he was called to be an apostle.

But by what procedure or method was and is calling to be done? By what “system”?

There is, of course, the immediate or direct call procedure practiced by God in the case of the Old Testament prophets and by our Lord Christ with the twelve disciples (also with Paul). But what about after that time?

At times, I fear, we fall into thinking that the “system” currently in use among us is biblically prescribed in virtually every detail. It is not.

Holy Scripture gives us clear and detailed lists of the qualifications that candidates for a public ministry call must have (cf. I Timothy 3 and Titus 1). God's Word also gives us records of early New Testament “call meetings” and “assignment days,” if you will.

Several are cited by Pastor Richard Lauersdorf in an essay on the call that appeared in the fall 1989 issue of the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* (p. 270):

In Acts 1:12-26 is recorded the election of Matthias to take Judas' place. The account speaks of a gathering of believers, a listing of qualifications required, a slate of two candidates, and a choice by casting lots. So a calling occurred, and we read that Matthias 'was added to the eleven apostles' (1:26). In Acts 6:1-7 the election of the seven deacons is recorded. Again we note some details. A need is recognized by the believers, qualifications are laid down, a procedure outlined, and an election follows. But in both of those instances a careful reader will note no command, no prescription which we are required to follow, though the same careful reader will note similarities in the procedures we use today.

Acts 14:23 records how Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey 'appointed elders for them in each church and with prayer and fasting committed them to the Lord in whom they had put their trust.'"

Pastor Lauersdorf goes on to point out that "appointed comes from a Greek word meaning "choose, elect by raising hands." he then continues:

"'Paul and Barnabas appointed,' whether by arranging for election by the congregational body or appointing them themselves, we are not told. In I Timothy 3 we find recorded the qualifications to be sought in bishops and deacons, but not one word about how they were to be called. In Titus 1:5 we hear Paul telling Titus to appoint elders in every town in Crete, but not one word about how.

The point is that how workers are called mediately by the church is not something spelled out in Scripture. Scripture points out that there are to be such who carry on phases of the ministry publicly as needed, that believers either elect such workers or give approval to their selection, and that no one enters any position without a call. Scripture also points out for our comfort and confidence that those properly called by believers are called by God himself just as the Holy Spirit made those elders overseers in the church of Ephesus, regardless of the procedures with which they were called (Acts 20:28)."

Another way of saying it is that in the early New Testament church the call procedure maybe wasn't exactly standardized. It maybe wasn't precisely the same from one place to another. In fact, it just may be that Paul did not always espouse and employ the same method or system in each place.

It should be noted that the previous paragraph goes contrary to what Professor Franz Pieper apparently believed. According to his *Christian Dogmatics*, he felt that St. Paul did always follow the same procedure. He cited Luther, who also seems to have felt Paul always used the same "system" and that he would have been remiss if he had not (cf. Vol. 3, p. 452f.).

Regardless of whether or not Paul always followed the same procedures, there are still some interesting and unanswered questions here. Were the Ephesian elders and Jerusalem deacons interviewed before they were called? We are not told, but it certainly could have been

done, if not formally, then informally. After all, the candidates were right there in the same community—even in the same congregation—as the people who were doing the calling!

Who drew up the call list? We are not told—probably the entire congregation. How much information was available to the calling body? Did the members of the calling bodies have personality profiles on the candidates? Probably not, but then again, they didn't really need such things either. Because the candidates were familiar names and faces, the calling bodies had a great deal of information about and knowledge of the people on their list.

It was undoubtedly more information and knowledge than most calling bodies in our midst have today. Indeed, it was probably even more information and knowledge than district praesidia have when they make up and present call lists to congregations.

Something else to be noted is that the kingdom was not hurt or hampered as a result of all that information being available. Rather, we know that after the calls were issued (appointed?), the work of the kingdom moved forward. The churches grew, souls were nourished in faith, and hearts were moved to serve their Lord.

To summarize, the extending of calls is really the Holy Spirit's work, not ours. He uses us in the calling process, not we him. But exact details as to procedure he leaves to believers to determine within the framework of order, unity and love and in the light of what will be in the best interests of speeding and furthering the blessings he wants to bestow through the public Gospel ministry.

Mention of call lists and information that calling bodies have or gather brings us to another matter assigned for review in this essay.

The Information Available to a Calling Body

You don't have to conduct many call meetings these days to know there is a fair amount of feeling that congregations do not receive very much information about people on their call lists. There is also the feeling that much of the information received is not all that pertinent to or helpful in making a decision as to whom to call.

Both feelings are understandable. Although there is no standardized, "official" form for call lists in our synod, the information made available to congregations seems to be pretty standard throughout the twelve districts. That information is age of the man, number of children and their ages, places served and length of service in each place, membership/enrollment statistics for the congregation/school at which the man is currently serving.

There is, however, no printed information on the type of congregations served (i.e., mission, long-established, big city or small town, etc.). Nor is there any statistical data/charting (i.e., membership or worship attendance increases during the man's pastorate, number of adult confirmands, etc.).

Teacher call lists have more information. There is a listing of courses of study after graduation, areas of concentration (some might call it special skills or specialized ministry!), such as music or athletics or remedial reading. Some personal strengths, such as discipline or being innovative, may also appear on teacher call lists.

This information is not supplied by the district president. It is supplied to him by the synod Board for Parish Education, and it is gleaned from that board's file of school visitation reports.

Granted, statistics and the listing of a personal strength or two never tell the entire story on a person. But most people who are involved in issuing a call do perceive those things to be more pertinent to and a greater help in the calling process than are place names and family size.

Synod boards have more information available to them than name, age, family size and places and length of service. They have additional information on the people on their call lists. Much of the information is evaluative. As you no doubt know, the information is gathered from letters of nomination submitted by the synod's constituency and also from forms the calling body has sent out to pastors or teachers who serve near or are otherwise acquainted with the people on their call list.

This practice began "unofficially" in the 1970's in what today is called the Board for Worker Training. I am told it began because some call lists had the names of lay people on them, and no one on the calling body had any personal acquaintance with the people. Hence the evaluative form that many of us have been asked to fill out for a worker training school board of control came to be.

This practice was approved for the BWT by the Conference of Presidents. Other synod calling bodies have since tried and "adopted" the practice.

A similar but somewhat different practice is followed by the Board for World Missions. When an executive committee needs to call a missionary, a request for names is sent to all the district presidents. Their suggestions are forwarded to the man responsible for making up the final call list (the district president in whose district the chairman of the Executive Committee is serving). Previous places and years of experience are not requested, but a 1-5 rating on language ability, adaptability, willingness to approach others with the Gospel, and flexibility is requested. So is a checklist of 22 personality traits, with a further breakdown of two of them ("energetic" and "practical"). There is also a section of nine questions about the nominee's wife and children. Once again, there is a checklist of personality traits, but only on the wife and on 15 traits instead of 22.

While this information gathering is not generally publicized, it is not a matter of secrecy, either. Everyone I talked to who is or has been involved with it and used it in extending calls favors it, and they give a variety of reasons for why they favor it (better "handle" on the nominees, feeling they can better match human resources with field needs, etc.).

Meanwhile, back at parish call meetings, the amount of information is considerably less, and the candidates are usually more unknown to the members of the calling body than are the nominees to members of calling bodies of the synod board variety. Like people at the synodical level, people at the parish calling level want more information.

There are several reasons for that. One is that the image of and confidence in pastors and other church leaders has been slipping for a number of years. Another reason that has been cited is the influence of the business world with its personnel performance ratings, and the like. Some suggest the request for more information is the result of fear--the fear of getting "stuck with a dud."

My experience is somewhat limited, but I think there is another factor here, and that it weighs more heavily than fear or distrust of district officials and the names they propose. It is people's increasing recognition of the varied and special ministry needs in and around their congregations, coupled with an intense desire to have in their midst a person who will be able to minister to those needs and to equip the saints to minister to those needs. So they are interested in what kind of preacher a man is, what kind of teacher a woman is, what kind of heart they have for evangelism, youth, or some other ministry they feel is very crucial in their congregation and through their congregation.

If those feelings and desires are behind requests for more information on call lists (and no one I interviewed for this paper denied that), then those requests are hardly unhealthy. But then it

will not do to simply tell a congregation that we train all people at our terminal worker training schools to do all the things that are the work of the ministry. It will not do to merely say that all the men on their pastor call list want to save lost souls and will faithfully preach Law and Gospel. Nor will it do to say it isn't the practice of our synod to give out more information than the information about age, family size, places and length of service. It may not be our practice, but it is not doctrine. Nor is it our practice in every calling situation throughout the synod.

Simply stated, the practice can and should be modified. But how? What kind of information should be given and by what means? How do we go about getting the information?

I'm not entirely sure about the matter of what kind of additional information might be given and how. The majority of the people I talked to about this subject feel that evaluative information, particularly if it is supplied by someone other than the nominee, can be trouble. Obviously it is the opinion of just one individual, who probably gave it without knowing the details of the position for which the nominee is now being considered. On the other hand, when synod boards ask for and receive evaluative information about an individual, it is with a very specific position in mind.

One man who has repeatedly been directly involved with the two call days in our synod each year says that what congregations most want to know is not nearly so much a person's weaknesses as his strengths. I believe that opinion is, with a few exceptions, very accurate.

The desire for more information on strengths could be met in many ways. Along with the printed information (expanded at least to include basic identification of the type and size of congregations previously served by the nominee), the district president might send unprinted information of a non-evaluative nature. For example: Pastor Green has an interest in music; Pastor Brown has attended two seminary summer school sessions over the last five years; or even this, that the congregation Pastor Black is currently serving has 25% of its members in formal Bible study each week.

Care would need to be exercised so as not to have an imbalance of such tidbits for any one man, as it would lay the district president open to charges of weighing and swaying the call decision. It would also seem that such pieces of information should either be related to the special needs the congregation feels it has, or the information tidbits should be "above and beyond" the congregation's stated needs.

It is often said that a lot of information is already "in there" as a result of the congregation having conveyed its particular needs to the district president at the time a call list was requested and the praesidium having submitted names with those needs in mind. That is true. But who conveys that information from and for the congregation? Most often it is the church council or board of elders. Sometimes it may be only the congregation's officers.

What about expanding that part of the process? A questionnaire could be distributed to all congregation members to fill out after worship services on a Sunday or on two consecutive Sundays. The questionnaire would ask people for their feelings as to their congregation's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and needs. A good form to use might be along the lines of a simple but very revealing one that is being used by the Board for Parish Services consulting team prior to its visit in a congregation. It can also be found on pages 56ff. of the "Gearing Up For Evangelism Workshop" ring binder.

Someone in the congregation could tabulate the information from the questionnaires and forward it to the district president prior to his contact with the congregation's council or board of elders. He could then walk the leaders through the results, telling them what he is reading, seeing and hearing there as their needs and their personality as a congregation. Then he could ask them

to confirm his reading and perspective, to prioritize their needs, etc. When a call is extended, that filled out form could be sent along with the call, as it would help the recipient get a good feel for the mood and needs of the congregation.

Several positive things would seem to result from such a procedure. One is that the congregation in general would feel it had had input into the drawing up of the call list. There would be a good likelihood congregations would feel the district praesidium had heard and considered their needs and perspectives of all their members in drawing up a call list, and so the request for more information at the call meeting would be less likely to arise. In addition, and this is probably the greater benefit, the congregation would have worked through something of a process of determining what she is and what she is about, and so perhaps she would have a sharper sense of purpose than before.

But how might more information be gathered on nominees, especially pastors? Should we get into the area of periodic personality testing, the results of which would be put into the district presidents' files? No one I interviewed was particularly in favor of that as a general information gathering procedure. All expressed reservations about it, and most felt it wouldn't provide district praesidia with a significantly greater amount of useful information than they have by personal knowledge or consulting with another district president, a circuit, or a common acquaintance. No one seemed inclined to beat the drum and push for it, particularly if the testing and evaluation of the testing would be done by "outsiders." The main reason for that would be that outsiders do not have the sense or understanding of what the ministry is or involves in our fellowship, nor would they adequately appreciate the Bible's words about qualifications and the variety of gifts God gives to his Church. In short, consulting with our spiritual brothers in evaluating men and attempting to determine if they are qualified for a particular ministry is much more preferable to consulting with outside professionals.

What about letting the congregation gather its own information on the nominees submitted to her? In short, what about congregations interviewing the nominees on their call list? This idea does not enjoy wide-spread support. The reason is not that it is generally perceived of as wrong or improper (it has been and is done on a very limited basis in certain calls extended in the name of the synod), but because of the logistics (i.e., time, money involved) and also the disruptive effect it could have on inter-congregation relations. Yet another reason expressed by a veteran of countless call meetings is that some people are good "interviewees," whereas others are not. All things being equal and human nature being what and how it is, congregations would more often than not go for the person who comes off most glib and charismatic in the interview. Yet that may not be the best man for the position. The situation may rather call for the less eloquent, generally less spectacular, slow-but-sure "plodder" type.

Such a judgment is probably best made by an outsider who knows the congregation, but has the advantage of outsider objectivity and also the advantage of years of seeing congregations, their needs, their calls, and the like. We have that advantage in our current "system" in the district presidents, most of whom have been around long enough to acquire a good sense of history and needs when it comes to congregations and their call lists.

A much more workable information gathering system might be a combination of things. Add a self-analysis which all eligible called workers would periodically submit to the district presidents (synod BPE in the case of teachers). It would not be necessary every year—perhaps every three years. Such forms are on paper in our synod. One is part of the diagnostic instruments package used by the BPS consulting team. Another is something that I believe was developed by our synod's home and world mission boards. It is called "Profile of a Mission

Explorer (Church Planter).” I am unclear at this time as to what use (if any) it has had, but it asks a person to rate himself (1-10 scale) on things like his qualifications as a pastor, his patience, his personal stewardship and spiritual leadership in his own family. Also to be rated are personal dynamism and self-image, flexibility, sense of humor, communication skills, evangelism skills and others. There is also a question about the pastor’s evaluation of his wife’s priorities. More could be added on both the pastor and his wife.

This form has another column headed “Friend.” It is for someone else to rate the same things about the pastor and his wife. Here we might bring in circuit pastors. Have them periodically rate the pastors in their circuit, and not only from the distance of their studies, but on the basis of a weekend visit in the congregation (attending Sunday worship services and Bible class, talking informally with members, talking with the church council or board of elders using a definite, standardized “talk-about-your-congregation” format to touch on vision, sense of mission, etc. alluded to earlier).

Circuit pastors could work their way through their circuit every three or four years or on some other schedule. There is certainly precedent for it in the BPE school visitation program. Like that program, the circuit pastor would then discuss his report with the pastor being evaluated. The report would then be submitted to the district presidents.

Unfortunately, while many pastors favor such a program for teachers, they are very opposed to it for pastors. Surely such a procedure could be a distinct blessing to us and to our congregations. It could help us grow in ministry, catch ruts when they are developing and before they are noticed by everyone else—the sort of things that have always been envisioned in our circuit pastor system but are seldom realized to the extent envisioned.

Admittedly, there would be cost and time factors to work out. Some training of circuit pastors would be necessary. But none of those things is insurmountable by any means. Once done and put into operation, there would be dividend returns that would make the investments more than worthwhile.

Finally, if the calling procedure is the procedure of the Spirit and Lord of the Church, it behooves us to dignify it with a great deal of diligence, forethought, consideration and preparation. Assembling and providing more information to congregations and other calling bodies of our synod who want it is not contrary to that. Rather, it is consistent with it.

A closing word or two is in order. All this talk and ink about self-analysis, personality profiles, personal strengths and weaknesses, people skills and the like can make our heads spin. Sometimes it makes us wonder if maybe congregations are forgetting the qualifications for called workers laid down in Scripture. At other times we ask ourselves if we are really qualified for the public Gospel ministry in this day and age.

There is a growing emphasis on special skills and specialized ministry. That is not new. It is just growing. Paul determined that John Mark did not possess the qualifications necessary to be an itinerant missionary. But that did not disqualify him from serving in some other form of the public Gospel ministry.

Today there are specialized ministry calls in our midst that have been with us for almost our entire history as a church body (i.e., world and home missionaries, professorships, synod administrators, etc.). There are also some new ones (i.e., family ministry calls, minister of mercy and nurture calls). Calling bodies and those assigned the responsibility of drawing up call lists for those calls will pray and otherwise wrestle with them.

When all is said and done, however, the majority of qualifications that must be considered are those recorded for us in the letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus. You know them.

They are the more common, everyday qualifications. And everything I see and hear indicates those qualifications are still the ones considered first and most in the calling process among us.

We will not explore them here. Time does not permit it, but I encourage you to look them up and study them soon and regularly thereafter. To help you do that you might want to use the “commentary” I received from the Board for World Missions when I contacted them about this essay. It is attached to this essay, and while it is entitled “The Profile of a Missionary,” it could just as well read “The Profile of a Public Minister of the Gospel.”

By the grace of God to us in Christ Jesus and his call to us by the Holy Spirit, that is what you and I are—public ministers of the Gospel. May their profile be one for which we pray and strive so that we faithfully carry out the calls we receive, wherever and whatever they might be!

The Profile of a Missionary

The Requirements Described by The Scriptures. (I Timothy and Titus)

1. *above reproach*—he should not possess characteristics or have behavior which would prove a contradiction to the Message he proclaims.
 - a. he must be orthodox in what he believes, teaches and lives.
 - b. he must be evangelical, presenting the truth in love. Thus, neither heterodox nor legalistic.
2. *the husband of but one wife*
 - a. Being a husband means placing as high a priority on pleasing his wife as pleasing himself. The missionary must be tender, caring and concerned about his wife’s needs.
 - b. The missionary’s wife needs to be as ‘sold’ on her husband’s ministry as he is. The conflicts between church work and family must be resolved quickly in love. The missionary must not be married to his work, but to a wife who loves the Lord and his ministry.
3. *temperate, self-controlled, honorable*
 - a. A high level of personal stewardship by which the missionary has control of his time and his behavior is required. He must have good work habits, not only knowing what to do, but doing it.
 - b. The effective missionary needs *intensity*, setting up sound priorities and pursuing them. He knows where his time must be open and spends it there. Thus he is a good manager of his time - an entrepreneur.
 - c. A missionary needs the reputation of one who can be relied upon for getting done those tasks which he and the members of his congregation recognize as important. Thus, he must be efficient and punctual.
 - d. The missionary needs to be a loving and fair person, who does not talk behind people’s back and keeps his cool under all circumstances, trying to understand others and being kind to them.
4. *hospitable*
 - a. A missionary must have enough self-confidence and a good enough self image that he is not threatened by strangers or suspicious of them. He is open

to them and finds a real joy in meeting them and sharing his life in Christ with them.

- b. A missionary is generous with strangers, and while he has little silver or gold; he is ready to share his friendship, time and assistance. He is not aloof or condescending to those who do not measure up to his level of character or ability.

5. *able to teach*

- a. The missionary needs to be creative, using his imagination in order to relate truth to the lives of those whom he is seeking to instruct.
- b. He must be sensitive to the people among whom he works, feeling their problems as well as accomplishments; their troubles as well as their triumphs.
- c. He needs to be flexible to the changing needs of people, adapting to changing situations. He needs an inquiring mind and is lovingly curious about people's lives, feelings and needs. He is people oriented.

6. *not given to much wine*

- a. The missionary must be on guard against solving his low points or enhancing his high points with alcohol or other substances. While abstinence is not required, it is a requirement when a pastor either detects dependence on his part or if he is likely to be in a situation where his drinking may drive others away from Christ.
- b. Smoking and eating habits must also be taken into consideration. Not only may these be injurious to health, but may also turn people away from the word he proclaims.

7. *not violent, but gentle, not quarrelsome. not overbearing. not quick tempered.*

- a. The missionary is not to be a bully either physically or with his ideas. When he has strong feelings about a matter he should be eager to compromise his ideas (not the Lord's Word) with the ideas and feelings of others.
- b. In every situation where people's feelings are involved the missionary needs to be gentle and reasonable in light of other people's culture, education, spiritual maturity, and experience.
- c. Arrogance is a contradiction to the Christian life, and should emphasize that the missionary ought to be quicker to learn than to try to tell other people what they should do. He learns more about witnessing to others by listening to their needs than by pushing his preconceived notions about what they need. He will find a more ready audience when he addresses his hearer's stated needs rather than being too eager to express his own attitudes and needs.
- d. The missionary will be faced with a number of pressures that will weigh him down. He must be on guard, however, lest he lash out at those who seem to be making his life more difficult. Nothing is gained by becoming angry and vicious with members, wife, children, mission board or anyone else, including himself. Be realistic, thoughtful, understanding, seeking to solve problems in a spirit of Christian love.

8. *not a lover of money*

- a. The missionary and his wife's greatest ambition needs to be the winning of souls to Christ and not stature, fame or security which money may seem to offer. This means that the missionary will have such a strong conviction

regarding the power of God's Word that he not only will use it to convert lost souls, but will find in it the comfort and consolation of his own life.

- b. A wife's skills, personality and personal needs, as well as the community's need for her help, may lead her to employment outside the home. Let missionary and wife beware, however, lest greed be the governing factor. Contentment, not retirement security, is great gain, according to the Bible.

9. *manage his own family well*

- a. A high priority in the missionary's ministry will relate to the spiritual leadership of his own family. This will be done by example as well as instruction in the Word. A missionary takes the time to instruct his own children in the Word, to pray with them and to discipline them in such a way that they will not bring dishonor to the Lord's ministry, but will be a credit to the heavenly Father.
- b. Leadership is an important part of the missionary's work. If he can not lead his own family in piety he will lose credibility and effectiveness in his ministry.

10. *he must have a good reputation with outsiders*

- a. A missionary should become a part of his community, meeting people and participating in the community to the extent that his skills and free time permit.
- b. While social needs are not a high priority in his ministry of the Gospel, he must not forget that as a member of his community he has a responsibility to share the community's work. As he participates he should be an example of Christian love and virtue, letting his light shine before men.