

Neophytes and Pioneer Movements: A Missiological Examination of Paul's Practice and Instructions Regarding Local Church Leadership

Robert Shipley*

Introduction

Some years ago, I visited the ruins of Ephesus. One of the items that stands out in my memory is the Basilica of St John. Among the most prominent architectural remains of the basilica is the baptistry with stairs leading into and out of a small pool. The design was quite obviously intended for baptism by immersion. From this scene I reached two conclusions. The first is obvious; baptism in fourth century Ephesus was administered by immersion rather than sprinkling. The second conclusion proceeds from the first; the primary, or anticipated, manner of church growth in the fourth century church in Ephesus was conversion of adults rather than procreation and the baptism of infants by sprinkling.

The purpose of this observation is not to argue for one manner of baptism over another. I merely want to illustrate that the interplay between context and church theology, or praxis, has long existed. The church's migration from baptism by immersion to sprinkling then, for some ecclesial traditions, back to immersion, involves not just theology but theology done in context.

Could the same be said for the qualifications we apply to church leadership? Might the fact that most ecclesial and theological conclusions are drawn by Westerners from long established churches and theological traditions influence the way we apply Scriptural instructions and prohibitions regarding church leadership?

Who Will Lead?

The church in which I will worship this Sunday is 131 years old. Would Paul expect a nascent church in Kashmir to hold to the same standards for leadership as a church that precedes its inception by 130 years? When asked in this manner the answer is an obvious no. Yet this issue of church leadership remains the single greatest objection to what have become known in the last two decades as church planting movements.

Those of us who work where, and among whom, the church does not exist must wrestle with the question of who will lead the churches God raises up through our efforts.¹

* Robert Shipley was a pastor in the United States for 17 years prior to 20 years of missionary service to the people of Ethiopia, Rwanda, Uganda, Iran, and Russia. Robert now serves as the Assemblies of God World Missions Area Director for Russia and Belarus. He earned a bachelor's degree from Northwest College in 1982, a master's degree from Vanguard University in 2000 and a Ph.D. from Pan Africa Theological Seminary in 2010. He has been married to Jeanel for 39 years. They have two daughters and seven grandchildren.

In seeking answers many missiologists begin with a hermeneutic shaped by evangelical theological training with its historic preference for the didactic and suspicion of historical narrative. This penchant can lead missiologists to ignore Paul's practice in Acts in favor of his list of qualifications for church leaders in Timothy. The above, combined with a disregard for the difference in Paul's instruction to Titus regarding qualifications of church leadership, leads to a simple conclusion. Quickly multiplying movements with young inexperienced local leaders are less desirable than slower-growing stable work with mature local leaders.

Let us acknowledge that we have reached these conclusions within a context of older established churches and theological traditions. Would we reach the same conclusions if our context bore greater semblance to what is recorded in the book of Acts or the church growth in Iran? How would those within the new and quickly multiplying churches of Iran or Afghanistan apply Paul's instructions for church leadership?

Issues in Rapidly Developing Churches

These issues come to the fore because of a recent emphasis on what are known by various terms, such as disciple making movements (DMMs) or church planting movements (CPMs). Proponents of each term would cite variations of meaning but the basic end is the same, with multiplying groups of new Jesus followers.

David Garrison defines a *Church Planting Movement* as "a rapid multiplication of indigenous churches planting churches that sweeps through a people group of population segment."² The Beyond organization adds to Garrison's definition. CPMs are:

a multiplication of disciples making disciples, and leaders developing leaders, resulting in indigenous churches (usually house churches) planting more churches. These new disciples and churches begin spreading rapidly through a people group or population segment, meeting people's spiritual and physical needs. They begin to transform their communities as the new Body of Christ lives out kingdom values. When consistent multiple stream fourth generation reproduction of churches occurs, church planting has crossed a threshold to becoming a sustainable movement.³

The most controversial aspect of CPMs is rapidity. Rapid church multiplication and mature indigenous local church leadership are mutually exclusive. They simply cannot exist at the same time.

John D. Massey's critique of CPMs is representative. He calls rapidity applied to church planting, "wrinkling time in the missionary task."⁴ His implications are not positive. The large and influential International Mission Board, once a major proponent of CPMs, no longer employs the term in its publications or embraces many aspects of CPM training or methods for its missionaries. The IMB has retained its emphasis on church planting and indigeneity but has backed away from an emphasis on rapid multiplication. In a 2018 article entitled, *The Missionary Task: Forming a Healthy Church*, D. Ray Davis, Church Connections Leader for the IMB, discourages new missionaries from expecting the church to advance rapidly.⁵

In distancing himself, and IMB, from their previous held position, Davis appears to be more concerned about missionary expectations than the theological, missiological, or ecclesial issues addressed in this article. Any change in organizational strategy, however, has antecedent causes. It is not difficult to find evidence of strongly-held opinions and resulting missiological debate both inside and outside the IMB focusing on the very issues under discussion in this article, which is church leadership.

In practical terms, this controversy over rapidity and its concomitant leadership/theological challenges had been met several ways. First, by assuming that CPMs do not exist or that the numbers reported are grossly exaggerated. If CPMs do not exist and all church growth proceeds at a moderate, slow, or predictable pace, those leading the growth can address leadership issues with processes that match the pace of growth. Using a composite of Paul's requirements, church planters can identify those meeting the basic requirements for church leadership and, through a deliberate process, train, or disciple, the convert to meet the lengthier maturity requirements.

One problem with denying the existence of rapidly expanding movements to Christ is that there are simply too many reported to dismiss.⁶ While the largest numbers of movements reported are in Africa and Asia, Christian workers claim movements in every region of the world. Are they all wrong? Is this a widespread conspiracy of exaggeration among some of the world's most dedicated Christians? Is that even possible? Yes. So, is it sufficiently probable to justify wholesale dismissal, or neglect, by missiologists and missiological researchers? No.

Let's assume that CPMs are nothing more than hype or exaggeration. We are still forced to deal with the periods in Western Church history during which the church expanded or multiplied quite rapidly. How were Paul's instructions to be followed in the frontier West's Methodist Church planting or the rapidly multiplying Pentecostal Churches of the twentieth century? And what of the church's growth in the book of Acts itself? Acts covers approximately thirty years of history during which the Gospel spread to include churches on three continents. What would we think of the church leaders in Lystra or Iconium were we to meet them today? How would they compare to the requirements for church leadership Paul would later give to Timothy (I Timothy 3:1 – 10)?

Another way this challenge is addressed is by simply renaming groups of Christ followers by calling them groups, cells, fellowships, or Bible studies instead of churches. By doing this, Paul's instructions for church leaders can be reserved for those fellowships that were established longer and have had the opportunity for leaders to mature in the faith. A cell need not concern itself with the responsibilities or leadership requirements of a church.

I will simply address this by noting that Luke does not follow this path. Rather he calls the young, very-recently planted believers converted on Paul's first missionary journey to serve as the *ecclesian*, churches (Acts 14:23).

When we consider Paul's missionary practice alongside his lists of qualifications for local church leadership, I assert that we must conclude that context plays a significant role in determining who is, and who is not, qualified to exercise leadership in the local church.

In seeking answers to the missiological dilemma concerning church leadership, we will consider Acts 14:23; 1 Timothy 3:6, 5:22; and Titus 1:5.⁷

Acts 14:23

Acts 14 establishes a sense of chronological proximity between the conversion of the believers from Paul's first missionary journey and the appointment of elders in the churches. The focus here is on timing. How long had those who were appointed elders by the apostolic band in Acts 14:23 been believers?⁸

Paul and Barnabas had been sent out on their first missionary journey in response to the missionary vision of the church in Syrian Antioch and by the command of the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:1–3). Prior to their return to Antioch (Acts 14:26), Paul and Barnabas appointed elders in each of the churches they had planted (Acts 14:23). Volumes have been written on the meaning, significance, and function of the *presbuteros*, as well as the other synonymous or overlapping terms for leadership in the New Testament churches. The focus of interest for this article however was in one very small part of the discussion on New Testament church leadership: How long had the leaders who were appointed been saved? One point is certain; the elders, chosen from among the believers in Acts 14, came from within very young congregations. Estimates for the length of Paul's first missionary journey vary from less than one year to more than three. Frederick Farrar gives voice to the shorter estimate: "Taking into account the time consumed in traveling, we are hardly at liberty to suppose that the first circuit occupied much more than a year."⁹ Even if one assumes Paul's first missionary journey to have taken two to three years, the fact remains that the last churches established were the first revisited and set in order by the appointment of elders. One must also remember that Paul spent both the beginning and ending portions of the journey in ocean travel. Thus, even the longest estimates of Paul's missionary exploits recorded in Acts 13–14 do not allow for a long period of time between conversion and appointment to service.

Commentators uncomfortable with Paul and Barnabas's actions in appointing new converts to ministry resolve their discomfort in various ways. Andrew Clarke and Alastair Campbell argue that Paul appointed elders in Acts 14:23 based on the appointed person's extant societal or familial leadership roles rather than on some type of standard for church leadership.¹⁰ Stanley Toussaint postulates that the apostles found members of the synagogue among the new converts who, by virtue of their superior knowledge of Scripture, were appointed elders.¹¹ He bases this view on assumptions about New Testament church leadership that he brought to the text, rather than direct statements or inferences from within the text and, in the process, he does not seem to recall that the very group he advocates for Paul's appointment to leadership in Acts 14 was the source of problems on Crete to be avoided by Titus (Titus 1:10).

F. F. Bruce states an alternative, more plausible, explanation: "It has more than once been pointed out that more recent missionary policy would have thought it dangerously idealistic to recognize converts of only a few weeks' standing as leaders in their churches; perhaps Paul and Barnabas were more conscious of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the believing

communities.”¹² Whether one agrees with Bruce’s conclusions regarding more recent missiology, the fact remains that Luke records the appointment of elders from among new congregations made up of new believers, indicating that most, if not all, of the appointed elders were new believers.

Titus 1:5 and 1 Timothy 3:6, 5:22

The historical setting of the Pastoral Epistles (PE) is disputed by those who hold to the view that they were written by a pseudepigrapher. However, the traditional view of Paul as author seems to answer the most questions while creating the least.¹³ Arguably, the stronger arguments against Pauline authorship of the PE are based on differences between them and his undisputed epistles. The apparent differences between the PE and Paul’s undisputed epistles may be explained by the fact that the former ones were addressed to colleagues while the latter were addressed to churches. George Knight holds this view.¹⁴ Gordon Fee suggests that the differences can be explained by the influence, or lack thereof, of an amanuensis.¹⁵

Assuming Pauline authorship still leaves the historical context unexplained. Many current scholars including Fee¹⁶ uphold the traditional view that Paul was released from the confinement described in Acts 28 and embarked on a trip east to Asia. Prior to a second Roman imprisonment, spoken of in 2 Timothy, Paul spent some time on Crete involved in evangelistic ministry. Paul concluded his season of ministry on Crete by leaving Titus to put the church in order. In transit to Macedonia, Paul and Timothy stopped at Ephesus. During this stopover, Paul discovered that false teaching had erupted from within the church. It can be assumed with some degree of confidence that the false teaching required the expulsion of two of the ringleaders Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim. 1:19–20). The details of the doctrinal error are not known, although the letter indicates that it had something to do with the Old Testament and also contained some dualistic elements of Gnosticism. First Timothy 6:10 indicates that at least part of the motive behind the false teaching was financial gain. The fact that the churches on Crete had not yet been set in order, while the church in Ephesus included multiple generations of believers, established leaders, and fully developed problems with heresy, dates the church in Ephesus as older than those on Crete.

Paul begins his letter to Titus with little in the way of personal remarks. Rather, Paul moves directly to the point, instructing his associate to “appoint elders in every town” (Titus 1:5).¹⁷ It can be assumed that these elders were to be selected from among the local believers, rather than the itinerate band or Paul would have done the appointing himself. The apostle follows up with qualifications for eldership primarily related to character. In a similar list written to Timothy, Paul adds, “He must not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil” (1 Tim. 3:6). Paul appears to reinforce the point in 1 Timothy 5:22 when he warns his young associate: “Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, and do not share in the sins of others. Keep yourself pure.”

Intriguing Questions Arise

The three texts give rise to an intriguing question. Are Paul's cautionary notes to Timothy a contradiction of his instructions to Titus and his own missionary practice, a possibility created if Paul intended for *presbuterous* (Titus 1:5) and *episcopos* (1 Tim. 3:2) to be interchangeable terms? While scholars by no means share a consensus of opinion regarding these terms, it seems best to view the terms as interchangeable general references to church leaders without technical definition. This view is supported by the fact that Paul uses *presbuterous* in Titus 1:5 and switches to *episcopos* in verse 7 with no sign of change of subject. In his well-researched conclusion, Waldemar Kowalski contends that the PE make no concrete distinction between these words. He writes, "It appears very likely that the view held with variants by Kelley, Fee, Spicq, Dibelius and Conzelmann, and Mounce that *episcopos* and *presbuterous* are to be understood interchangeably, is the best one."¹⁸ If Paul was addressing something different in Timothy than he addressed in Titus and modeled in Acts, no contradiction would exist. However, since this article adopts the position that the terms are interchangeable, the apparent contradictions must be explored.

Both the Titus and Timothy passages deal with the qualifications for church leadership; however, the contextual differences within which Paul's instructions were to be applied vary greatly. In a cautionary note against assuming too much similarity between the contexts occasioning Paul's first letter to Timothy and the one to Titus, Hayne Griffin agrees with Fee alleging, "They are letters to different churches, addressing very different situations."¹⁹ The church in Ephesus was made up of multiple generations of believers and falling prey to false teachers. Timothy's task was clear and corrective. "As I urged you when I went into Macedonia, stay there in Ephesus so that you may command certain men not to teach false doctrines any longer" (1 Tim. 1:3). Titus' task, however, was not reformation but formation.²⁰ "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). Apparently, Paul had been on the Island of Crete with Titus planting churches. Paul left the island at some point prior to the churches having been "set in order." Fee refers to Titus' purpose in appointing elders as a "prophylactic" against the level of doctrinal challenge faced in Ephesus.²¹ Upon Titus' departure from Crete, the elders would be responsible for rebuking those involved in doctrinal error (Titus 1:9).

Paul makes it clear, *hos ego soi dietaxamen*, that his current instructions to Titus are a repeat, by way of documentation, likely for the benefit of the Cretian believers, of what he had said earlier. In effect Paul's instructions would give Titus written authority to do what he deemed necessary to set the churches in order.

The verse that best sets forth Paul's intent for the book of 1 Timothy is 1:3: "As I urged you when I went into Macedonia, stay there in Ephesus so that you may command certain men not to teach false doctrines any longer." Numerous commentators see church order and structure as Paul's overriding purpose for the letter.²² They reach this conclusion based on Paul's address on church leadership in chapters 2 and 3. Fee concludes that Paul's church leadership instructions serve the purpose of preserving the church from the false doctrine spoken of in

chapter 1, rather than being an illustration of the need for proper order.²³ This notion is also supported by the wider context of Paul's writings in which he gives great attention to doctrinal issues while setting forth little in the way of ecclesiastical structural templates.

First Timothy is ad hoc in its structure and includes portions of personal encouragement for Timothy in his task of dealing with the issues in Ephesus (This, however, should not cause the reader to conclude that the letter was to be read only by Timothy.). Both Paul's personal experience with the church and his relationship to his young associate are evident (1 Tim. 1:2).

The prohibition of the Neophyton

Those who view Paul's intentions in the PE as setting forth a pattern of church structure see the prohibition against the appointment of the *neophyton*, someone who is "newly planted" in the church,²⁴ as paradigmatic of all ages and all contexts. This position however is difficult to harmonize with Paul's instruction to Titus in Titus 1:5 and his own missionary practice as recorded in Acts 14. The problem is largely removed, however, if Fee is correct in seeing Paul's letters to Timothy not as a rigid paradigm for church structure but as an ad hoc response to a church in deep doctrinal crisis.²⁵ The reason Paul gives for disallowing new believers among the *episcopoi* is that the elevation to leadership may cause "swelled-headedness," bringing the new believer under the same condemnation as the devil.²⁶ Fee then adds, "Since this is precisely what is said of the false teachers in 6:4 (cf. 2 Tim. 3:4), one wonders whether some of them were recent converts."²⁷ Thus, the literary context, Paul's instructions to Titus, and Paul's own practice during his missionary travels indicate that the prohibition against the appointment of those who are young in the Lord to places of responsibility in the church, while wise where applicable, was not intended to preclude the service of those who are young in faith in newly planted churches.

If one accepts that 1 Timothy 3:6 is intended to address specific problems in Ephesus, this influences one's interpretation of Paul's warning in chapter 5: "Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, and do not share in the sins of others. Keep yourself pure" (1 Tim. 5:22). Kowalski concludes that among the views as to the meaning of this verse too seem most plausible. "The most likely context, then, is either the installation of new leaders, whether in general or to replace deposed leaders who have sinned, or the restoration of penitent elders."²⁸ Those who see Paul's warning as a reference to the restoration of penitent elders do so with the view that verse 22 is a continuation of verses 19 and 20, the subject being errant elders.²⁹ Thus, Paul warned against the hasty restoration of a church leader who had sinned, a view held by Anthony Hanson.³⁰ It is preferable to see Paul's warning about the laying on of hands not as a narrow instruction regarding the restoration of fallen church leaders but as Solomon Andria views it as a general warning against hasty recognition for ministry in Ephesus, a course of action that may lead to grave consequences.³¹

Conclusion

It may appear that CPM practitioners promote a hasty practice out of line with Paul's instructions by giving leadership responsibilities to new believers. CPMs often give believers who are only months or weeks old in Christ responsibility for those yet younger in the faith. CPM coaches and trainers often address this issue.³² They respond to questions about appointing elders who are among the *neophytoi* by appealing to the context in which the appointment is made. Acts 13–14 records Paul's first missionary journey. CPM trainers and practitioners see the warning in 1 Timothy 3:6 about appointing a *neophyton* in a local rather than global context. The issue for them is not how long these people have believed when compared to other Christians around the world, but how long they have believed when compared to those for whom they have spiritual oversight. CPM trainers and practitioners see Paul's instruction both to Timothy and to Titus in relationship to the character of elders not as an issue of knowledge, but rather of obedience. They focus on whether the person has demonstrated good character by submission and obedience to Christ in those principles they know.

After examining Acts 14:23, Titus 1:5, and 1 Timothy 3:6 and 5:22 in both their literary and historical contexts, it is clear that Paul did not intend to curtail the involvement of new believers in the leadership of young congregations or negate their participation in the Great Commission by his warnings in 1 Timothy 3:6 and 5:22. CPM practitioners need not feel that they are responding to contextual realities in the press of the mission without a sound Biblical rationale for their practice or a well-reasoned defense for those who differ with them based on Paul's instructions to Timothy.

¹ The author first addressed this issue of appointing new converts while serving as a missionary to Uganda in the 2000s. The Uganda Assemblies of God planted 2,800 new churches between 2008 and 2010. The study of the Biblical texts of Acts 14, Titus 1, and 1 Timothy 3 and 5 were evaluated in the author's dissertation: Shipley, Robert A. *Rabbit Churches: An Inquiry into the Enabling Assumptions of the Uganda Assemblies of God Church Planting Movement*, Lome, Togo: Pan Africa Theological Seminary, 2010.

² Garrison, *Church Planting Movements: How God Is Redeeming a Lost World*, 21.

³ <https://www.beyond.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Definitions-for-Key-Strategic-Terms-2019.02.19-1.pdf>

⁴ John D. Massey *Southwestern Journal of Theology* • Volume 55 • Number 1 • Fall 2012 Accessed online at http://www.baptisttheology.org/baptisttheology/assets/File/Massey_Wrinkling_Time_SWJT.pdf

⁵ D. Ray Davis, *The Missionary Task: Forming a Healthy Church* accessed online at <https://www.imb.org/2018/11/06/missionary-task-healthy-church/>

⁶ Researchers reporting for the 24:14 Coalition claim to be tracking more than 1,000 movements in that have reached the fourth generation of church plants in multiple streams. https://www.2414now.net/wp-content/uploads/2414-Movement-Data-Dashboard_08-17-19.pdf

⁷ For a more complete treatment of New Testament church leadership, see John M. Elliott, "Leadership Development and Relational Patterns: The Early Church and the Church in Zambia Today" (DMin. diss., Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, 2007); Waldemar J. Kowalski, "The Reward, Discipline, and Installation of Church Leaders:

An Examination of 1 Timothy 5:17–22” (Ph.D. diss., University of Gloucestershire, 2005); and Benjamin L. Merkle, *40 Questions about Elders and Deacons* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2008).

⁸This study does not include a discussion about authorship or authorial intent of the book of Acts for the following reasons. The passage addresses a simple statement of a historical nature that remains largely unaffected by arguments against Lucan authorship. Second, this study does not attempt to make a case that Luke purposed to set forth a pattern for church governance. While Luke’s authorial intent may have included instituting some normative or paradigmatic patterns for church life and leadership, it was outside of the scope of this project to pursue such interests.

⁹F. W. Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1902), 220.

¹⁰Andrew D. Clarke, *A Pauline Theology of Church Leadership*, Leadership Library of New Testament Studies 362 (London: T and T Clark, 2008), 86–87. See also R. Alastair Campbell, *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity*, Studies of the New Testament and Its World (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1994), 166–171.

¹¹Stanley D. Toussaint, “Acts,” in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures*, ed. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1983), 392.

¹²F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, rev. ed., New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1988), 280.

¹³Gordon D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*, New International Biblical Commentary 13, New Testament Series (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 23–31.

¹⁴George W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1992), 51.

¹⁵Fee, 26.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 3–14.

¹⁷All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the New International Version.

¹⁸Kowalski, 31–32.

¹⁹Thomas D. Lea and Hayne P. Griffin, *1, 2 Timothy, Titus*, New American Commentary 34 (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1992), 276.

²⁰Fee, 172.

²¹*Ibid.*, 11–12.

²²While nearly all commentators who hold to a second-century date for the PE, see church order as the primary purpose, some commentators, such as Donald Guthrie and J. N. D. Kelly, take a proauthenticity stance and see church order as Paul’s primary purpose. See Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 52–53; J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus*, Black’s New Testament Commentaries (London: A. and C. Black, 1963), 59–60. For a more recent work citing multiple purposes at work in 1 Timothy, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, Scott L. Kellum, and Charles L. Quarles, *The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown: An Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: B and H Academic, 2009), 646.

²³Ibid., 7.

²⁴William Arndt, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 669.

²⁵Paul sees no room to negotiate with the false teachers. He instructs his associate to “command” the cessation of the teaching in question. In fact, he uses this same imperative some seven times.

²⁶Fee, 83.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Kowalski, 200.

²⁹Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1957), 107.

³⁰Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *Studies in the Pastoral Epistles* (London: S.P.C.K., 1968), 103.

³¹Solomon Andria, “1 Timothy,” in *Africa Bible Commentary*, ed. Tokunboh Adeyemo (Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers, 2006), 1475.

³²Bill Smith, telephone interview by author, June 11, 2009. CPMs generally have what is known by various titles including strategy coordinator. This person has an ongoing responsibility for the health and direction of the movement. In addition, a small number of CPM trainers or coaches may each work with a number of CPMs, providing advice and encouragement to the strategy coordinator or training for the practitioners. The bulk of their training deals with the characteristics of CPMs as recorded by Garrison. They also address Biblical questions such as the ones addressed here. Their responses to these issues have not as yet appeared in print but are voiced in oral responses to questions that arise in training sessions and discussed on some church-planting blogs. The body of literature related to CPMs is growing, but as of this writing, theological/ecclesiological responses have not been published in printed form. The answers to some questions, such as how to respond to 1 Timothy 3:6, are part of the oral tradition passed on in CPM training events.