

# DMM and Traditional Perspectives in Dialogue: Two Missiologists Interact on the Role of Expat Disciplers

By Matthew Miller and Don Little

**From the Editorial Team:** After each writing an article on the topic, [Matt Miller](#) and [Don Little](#) take turns responding to one another's articles, further explaining and defending their perspectives on the role of cross-cultural disciplers in frontier church planting.



## Matt's First Response to Don's Article

I want to begin by recognizing and appreciating the many years of service Don has given to the cause of Jesus among Muslims in North Africa, without a doubt one of the most challenging contexts for cross-cultural ministry in the world. I recognize that Don's context is very different from both of my fields of service—Togo, West Africa (primarily animistic) and Rwanda (traditionally Christian with an animistic history). There are undeniable advantages in the timeline of mobilizing already-believing people to become disciple makers and apostolic workers, though even then much deconstruction of theology, ecclesiology, and tradition is necessary.

With that said, many of the East African leaders upon whom my research is based work in challenging Muslim contexts such as northern Kenya, Somalia, and Sudan, and are finding DMM principles to be very effective. In the end, I believe it is a holy process of discernment for the workers in each field to determine the roles and strategies that best fit their context, while knowing that none of us will discover the perfect

method of ministry and should all be hesitant to pass judgement on anyone else's choices.

As I have reflected on [Don's article](#), one of the most obvious differences in our thinking is the place of the ministry of Jesus in informing cross-cultural ministry. Because of his focus on church planting, Don seems to suggest that only the ministries developed after Pentecost are useful for informing the role of cross-cultural missionaries. He does recognize that the development of communities of obedient disciples (churches) is implied in the Great Commission in Matthew 28, which I also affirm. I also agree that the ministry of Paul and other apostolic workers after Pentecost are essential sources of insight for cross-cultural ministry.

My concern with his approach is that it assumes a kind of discontinuity in the ministry goals and principles of Jesus and Paul that I do not see in Scripture. Though Paul was not present when the Great Commission was given, I think all would agree that his missionary journeys were in fulfillment of that great command to make disciples of all nations. It is interesting that the Great Commission does not include any strategic or tactical instruction beyond baptizing and teaching to obey everything Jesus commanded. I believe this is because the three years Jesus spent with the disciples provided them with all the training they needed to fulfill the commission. In particular, I believe the "limited" commissions of the twelve and seventy-two in Luke 9 and 10, and in Matthew 10, would have been the experiences that informed their understanding of how to fulfill the Great Commission.

The scope of the commission was expanded by Jesus in Matthew 28, but the strategic and tactical foundations laid during the disciples' years of ministry with Jesus would shape how they fulfilled that commission.

An interesting exercise to test this theory is to take the core strategic focus of the limited commission described in Matthew 10 and Luke 10 of finding a "worthy person" or "person of peace" and apply it to the ministry of Paul. In nearly every location where Paul established churches,

there was a person of peace who served as a foundational host of the gospel and through whom a community of disciples was established (i.e., Lydia, the Philippian jailer, Cornelius, Jason, Crispus). It seems clear to me that Paul continued the strategic focus established in Jesus' training of the twelve and seventy-two, and he was likely taught these principles during his interactions with the apostles after his conversion.

Concerning the use of the term "church planting," I would fall among those who would question its appropriateness. My unease with this term has grown after spending ten years ministering in Rwanda, a nation full of churches that were planted but failed to make disciples and whose gathering places became the host locations of genocide. It is possible to establish something called "church" that does not lead to communities of obedient disciples who practice what Jesus taught. I believe when the focus remains as Jesus commanded—making obedient disciples of all nations—the church will emerge.

It is also interesting that Jesus was very clear in his teaching about what should be planted, and that is the seed of the Word and obedience to it as presented in the parable of the sower (Mark 4:1-20). I therefore prefer to talk about the role of a disciple maker being a Word-planter who looks for fertile soil that leads to exponential multiplication.

I really appreciate Don's five points on lessons from the ministry of Paul—especially point three on the Church belonging to Christ, not the disciple maker, point four on the need to train and equip others, and point five on humility. These themes featured strongly in the comments of my East African friends concerning the attitudes and practices of effective outside leaders that I shared in my article. I do feel, though, that Don's points fall short of highlighting the full impact and vision of Paul, which was not only to establish churches that multiply, but to also catalyze movements that grow generationally to reach entire regions for Jesus.

Steve Addison has done an excellent job of highlighting this aspect of Paul's ministry by focusing on the extremely fruitful three years of ministry he completed in Ephesus (2012, 150–159). It is the climax of Paul's ministry and the place where he was most fully able to implement his strategy as an apostolic outside leader. The result was a movement that Paul said led to the entire province of Asia being reached. This was accomplished through an intentional development of multiple generations of disciple makers and apostolic workers who did the work of teaching and establishing churches while Paul was based in Ephesus. Paul's instruction to Timothy in 2 Tim. 2:2 lays the blueprint for catalyzing a movement with its four generations (Paul, Timothy, reliable people, others).

I believe that the move from "churches that plant churches" to movements that reach entire nations or people groups requires that outside leaders consider the different roles they must play as each succeeding generation emerges. Nathan and Kari Shank (2014) have provided an excellent model to highlight the kinds of generational roles that lead to movements: Seed Sower, Church Planter, Church Multiplier, Multiplication Trainer, and Movement Catalyst. Each role represents a different relationship to the previous generation of disciples and a larger sphere of influence. When the outside leader reinserts himself into the process in the place of an insider by continuing to be a seed sower or church planter, the chain of generational empowerment may not be established. So, I believe even Paul, the great "church planter," eventually became a catalyst of generations of workers by taking on the characteristics of an encourager and equipper who stepped back from those pioneering roles to develop movements that reached entire regions.

## Don's First Reply to Matt's Response

First, let me begin by saying that I am glad [Matt](#) stated that it is vital that workers in each field determine the roles and strategies that best fit their ministry context, since one of the main points of my article was that

the kinds of roles which cross-cultural workers fruitfully take on must be significantly shaped by their ministry context.

I agree that one could get the impression from reading my article that I think that only the ministries developed after Pentecost are useful for informing the ministries of cross-cultural church planters. I did say that Jesus leaves us “no actual *model* or *example* of how to preach the gospel and plant churches.” And I did suggest that we can learn more from Paul than from Jesus about planting churches, since the goals of Jesus’ ministry and the realities of Paul’s ministries were different. In my mind, it is clear that Jesus came to inaugurate the kingdom of God, whereas Paul was chosen and sent to preach that recently inaugurated kingdom and disciple those who responded into new covenant churches. Their tasks and roles were different. However, I do not “assume a kind of discontinuity in the ministry goals and principles of Jesus and Paul.” I am simply highlighting the developments that occur in ministry following Pentecost.

I also agree that Paul’s ministry was an example of the fulfillment of the Great Commission. It is vital that we understand that the disciples were undergoing a period of intensive training in preparation for their post-Pentecost ministries during the three years that they spent with Jesus. And a vital part of this was the short “hands-on training” in mission that we see in the sending of the twelve and of the seventy-two. Along with their proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom, a key part of the ministry of the twelve and the seventy-two was to heal the sick, raise the dead (!), and cast out demons (Matt. 10:7-8). Perhaps we might see a greater response to our proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom if we more regularly included healing the sick, raising the dead, and casting out demons as a normal part of our cross-cultural ministries today! However, I have difficulty with Matt’s suggestion, that the “*worthy person*” of Matthew 10:11-13 (NIV) and the “*someone who promotes peace*” of Luke 10:6 (NIV) represents a “core strategic focus” of Jesus’ training of

the twelve and the seventy-two, and in the rest of the New Testament, despite how widely this is believed and taught among the DMM advocates.

Seeing such incidental items in the gospel accounts as “core strategies” only happens once one is already convinced of the DMM model. But may I gently suggest that the “person-of-peace strategy” is not in Jesus or in Paul, or anywhere else in the NT. In the gospel accounts of Jesus sending out the twelve and the seventy-two, Jesus was not telling them to prayerfully seek out a “person of peace” who would open their family and social networks to them. Rather, he was simply telling them to be practical, use the norms of hospitality, and stay with whoever first offered them hospitality when they arrived on their brief visit to a town to preach and demonstrate the kingdom to the lost sheep of Israel.

Furthermore, the people in the book of Acts whom Matt lists as examples of this “person-of-peace” strategy do not, on closer inspection, fit the model. Lydia was a wealthy God-fearing Gentile who responded to the message and opened her home. Also, Paul and Silas introduced the jailer to Lydia before they left town, seeming to suggest that the local church met in Lydia’s home. In Acts 10, it was *God* who took the initiative with Cornelius in sending an angel to him and a vision to Peter, to open the door to the gospel to the Gentiles. Peter was not looking for a person of peace! Jason (Acts 17:5–7) was one who responded to the message in the synagogue – he was not sought out as a person of peace. And in Acts 18:8, Crispus was the leader of the synagogue who believed, but it was the Gentile Justus who welcomed Paul into his home, apparently hosting the new house church, not Crispus. We see no evidence in Acts or his epistles that Paul sought out “persons of peace” nor did Jesus teach the disciples that they ought to.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Though I do not believe that the “person-of-peace” strategy was part of NT thinking, the strategy itself has considerable sociological merit and can be used to balance our often-individualistic approaches in ministry. We do not adopt this strategy because it was Jesus’ strategy, but *because* it can be a fruitful approach. We are not disobeying Jesus if we adopt other approaches to evangelism and church planting.

Matt says that he is uncomfortable with the term “church planter” because of having seen so many churches in Rwanda that were filled with un-discipled people. He suggests that the term “Word planter” might be more helpful. In saying this, Matt echoes the deep concern for effective discipling that I also have, which led to my research into discipling believers of Muslim background. Converting people and putting them into churches that do not disciple their members is indeed a very serious and widespread problem.

But I do not think the solution is to stop planting churches, but rather it is to make discipling a core part of church-planting ministry. The post-Pentecost reality is that the way that those who respond in faith to the gospel are disciplined (so that they can bring forth thirty-fold and hundred-fold fruit) is by being welcomed into Christ-honoring communities of believers which take seriously Jesus’ call to follow him together and live and love like he loved.

This abiding concern to keep discipling at the core of our church-planting ministries is a concern Matt clearly shares. Yet it is this very concern that makes me hesitant to embrace the proposed shift from the goal of planting maturing, multiplying churches to, as Matt expresses it, “catalyzing movements that grow generationally to reach entire regions for Jesus.” I cannot help but wonder whether such a strategy will merely repeat the unfortunate reality that Matt talks about encountering in Rwanda, of a Christianity that has been famously described as a mile wide and an inch deep, and which tragically saw the slaughter of thousands of Christians by Christians, often in church buildings.

My own experience in discipling more than a dozen BMBs, the experience of the dozens of disciplers whom I interviewed throughout the Arab world, and the experience of many dozens of others whom I have met in fifteen Muslim countries, indicate that it nearly always takes time, often very significant time (even years), to see new believers grow strong enough to be able to disciple others to maturity and plant and

lead spiritually healthy house churches. Recently, a colleague described his tragic experience of discipling a new believer over a couple of years who had been instrumental in seeing multiple house churches begun in several unreached Muslim people groups, who has now fallen into sin, is unrepentant, and has completely left the church. The DMM model appears to me to stress rapid multiplication in ways that too often lead to tragic collapse. How can a newborn Christian disciple and lead dozens of other new believers, without being first solidly disciplined?

This strategy of shifting from being *church planters* to being *catalysts for movements* has far too often led, from what I have seen around the world, to movements that often shrink as rapidly as they have grown.<sup>2</sup> The movements which remain and grow strong are those built on the foundation of patient, deep work in discipling and church planting, and in raising up indigenous leaders mature enough to multiply themselves many times over. I cannot see how the work of building the foundations can be avoided such that we focus simply on building the superstructure of a movement, of catalyzing movements (1 Cor. 3:10-15).

While I acknowledge that I fell short of “highlighting the full impact and vision of Paul,” I am not convinced that the churches that Paul founded followed the twenty-first century DMM strategy of multiplying cell groups of new believers using various forms of discovery Bible studies, which some DMM advocates find in Paul and especially in the

---

2 I have participated in numerous discussions about movements, am part of the Motus Dei network, and have friends who are convinced proponents of DMM-type ministry strategies. I am very hopeful that many of the small and large movements that are described in the literature are as strong and healthy as the writers believe them to be. However, it has been disturbing to me, that among the movements that are described in the literature with which I have *personal* acquaintance over the past twenty-five years, none of them come close to matching the descriptions given in the published literature. Several proved to be fabricated by local “movement catalysts” and others were far smaller than reported or had shrunk and collapsed. The enthusiasm for reporting fantastic growth and massive numbers of churches is deeply concerning. Two of the healthiest and largest movements in the world, with which I am acquainted, were *not* established using DMM or CPM principles, though DMM writers sometimes claim these movements as illustrations of DMM.



church in Ephesus (Cooper 2022).<sup>3</sup> Matt cites Steve Addison's book (which I have not read) in suggesting that it was in Ephesus that Paul modeled this role of being a movement catalyst. Matt states:

It is the climax of Paul's ministry and the place where he was most fully able to implement his strategy as an apostolic outside leader, and the result was a movement that Paul said led to the entire province of Asia being reached. This was accomplished through an intentional development of multiple generations of disciple makers and apostolic workers who did the work of teaching and establishing churches while Paul based in Ephesus.

Although it is theoretically possible that this accurately describes the nature of Paul's ministry in Ephesus, it is not what Paul himself said about his ministry there. He says that during his three years in Ephesus he laid a solid foundation by teaching the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:27-31). It does not seem that he spent those three years "catalyzing a movement." He was deeply concerned with the possibility of false teaching. We do well to imitate the Apostle Paul: "*Remember that for three years I never stopped warning each of you night and day with tears*" (Acts 20:31). If we do not build with tears, then we will probably finish with tears as we see the movement that we helped catalyze collapse. Surely Rwanda is one of the most sobering contemporary reminders of this danger of poorly disciplined leaders and churches.

Though I am concerned about aspects of the DMM strategy of seeking to *catalyze movements*, this does not mean that I do not fully embrace the clear Pauline principle found in Paul's instruction to Timothy in 2 Timothy 2:2, to disciple reliable people who will be able to disciple others. This is the core foundation of all church-multiplying ministry. We pray and

---

3 In *Ephesiology: A Study of the Ephesian Movement*, Cooper devotes a whole book to finding the principles of twenty-first century DMM methodology in the New Testament. Yet, in the end, I believe that he fails to demonstrate that the New Testament is full of examples of DMM methodology. He is finding what is not, in fact, there.

work toward seeing God raise up local people, who develop into leaders, who can in turn lead and disciple others, who continue the cycle of multiplying apostolic church planters and churches.

As God blesses the ministry of cross-cultural workers, whether they be Western, Eastern, African, or Latino, and as God births movements of believers being disciplined in maturing churches in our ministry contexts, the nature of our roles will necessarily change to support the ongoing growth of such God-initiated movements. Apart from Matt's embrace of certain elements of DMM approaches, he and I are not so far apart in how we believe God desires to work in and through those who are called into cross-cultural ministry. The attitudes of humility and service which he highlighted so well are absolutely key for all ministers of the gospel, whether cross-cultural or near-cultural.

## A Final Word from Matt

As I have reread through our articles and responses, it is clear to me that Don and I share many key perspectives—especially the need for deep discipleship to be at the heart of all cross-cultural ministry. We obviously have different opinions on some methods. Don has shared several concerns that he has with DMM principles that I will address below. Some of his concerns seem to be less about whether DMM principles are effective and more about the attitude with which they are sometimes shared. I agree that it is important to distinguish clear biblical commands from inferences concerning strategies and methods from passages like Luke 10, and I apologize if my enthusiasm for the way I have seen DMM principles work has blurred that line.

Making disciples who obey everything that Jesus commanded is non-negotiable. The stories of how Jesus and his disciples did this are helpful, but do not provide a step-by-step method. Rather they point to principles that must be interpreted and applied to each context. In my own ministry, opening my mind to the possibility that the methods

Jesus used to train his disciples could inform how I approach establishing churches led to significant breakthroughs in my work, both in Togo and Rwanda.

I also believe it is important to recognize that the Holy Spirit is a wind that blows where he wills. He often upsets our expectations and does things differently than we could have planned or imagined, including at times the miraculous. With that said, I have personally found using Discovery Bible Studies with households of peace to be the most effective tool to make disciples. Nevertheless, I do not believe this is the only method that God uses.

At the same time, I am also not sure how Don can say that the strategic focus on people of peace is “not in Jesus” and “not in the New Testament.” Whatever you think about DMM, it is clear that the seventy-two were sent by Jesus to find households who responded to the offer of peace, offered hospitality, and became the center of the proclamation and demonstration of the kingdom of God in their community. If such a household was not present, they were to move on to another place. To me, this does not seem incidental to their mission. And the fact that Jesus chose this approach in training his disciples makes me want to seriously consider that it may have a place in effective ministry in other contexts as well. Don is right that I am making a further inference in suggesting that this focus reached and influenced the ministry of Paul. I have personally noted to share this as only a possibility, however likely it may seem to me.

Each experience I have had with a household of peace is unique and does not follow a prescribed pattern. At the same time, there are similarities: 1) a deep response to the offer of sharing a message of peace, 2) the offer of hospitality, and 3) a connection to others in the community (usually family members). I am unconcerned with the variations Don highlighted in the stories of key people in Acts through which God worked to establish churches and save entire households. Sometimes the disciple maker finds the person of peace, sometimes God

causes the person of peace to find the disciple maker. Paul, Peter, and others may not have articulated a “person of peace strategy,” but the basic principle remains the same.

God prepares people in communities to be conduits through which the gospel will pass, disciples will be made, and churches will be established. The person of peace principle only suggests that such people should be prayed for (as in “*pray for workers for the harvest*”) and sought out as key to reaching a new community. I believe that God wants to use people from within a context to establish his church and transform society. An entire household, as a group of believers, is the ideal initial context for such ministry.

This touches on our original question of the role of outside leaders in cross-cultural ministry. When a person or household of peace is identified, the role of the outsider is to teach, disciple, and equip them to reach their community and to make disciples who make disciples that form churches.

Don also shared his concern that those who emphasize catalyzing movements are overly focused on rapid multiplication which can lead to immature or weak churches. Though rapid multiplication of churches is often the result of disciple-making movements, the strategy and behaviors that lead to this multiplication are anything but rapid. They require years of building relationships, discipling, and training key inside leaders. I agree that if this stage is skipped, it is likely such a “movement” will not endure.

I also remain unconvinced by Don’s critique that the ministry of Paul in Ephesus was not purposefully related to catalyzing a movement. The text is clear that Paul’s three years “teaching the entire counsel of God” and “warning with tears” in Ephesus resulted in the entire province of Asia hearing the message and many coming to Jesus. Though the details of how this happened are not shared, such a movement did in fact occur, and it is most unlikely that Paul was the one who physically reached all

the places in that region. His teaching resulted in generations of new disciples and the multiplication of churches throughout a large area. Thus, it must have included the discipling, equipping, and sending of many new disciples to accomplish this mission. And this all happened in a relatively short time. His core generational instruction to Timothy in 2 Tim. 2:2 was surely what he himself would have practiced. Such a movement would have been impossible otherwise.

A further point is that I fear that my comments on the term “Church Planting” may have been misunderstood. Like Don, I believe the establishment of churches that make disciples, and multiply, is a key component of fulfilling Jesus’ commission. My concern with the term is that Jesus is very clear about what needs to be planted—the Word—and what disciples are to focus on in their ministries—making disciples. When obedience to the Word is established and disciples are made, the church will emerge. You cannot read and obey the teaching of Jesus and the New Testament without the church having a central place in your life and ministry.

Yet it is a sad reality that actually being a disciple of Jesus is not really a requirement for being a part of many churches. Attendance (and often financial giving) is usually sufficient to maintain membership. This is the reason that I prefer, rather than using the word “church planting,” to retain the language Jesus used of planting the seed of the Word and making disciples by teaching them to obey everything he commanded, so that true churches can emerge. It does not mean that I believe that the emergence of the church through the work of disciple makers and apostolic workers is unimportant. This may seem like semantics, but I have seen too many “churches” that were planted in Rwanda that are now national genocide monuments. The current disciple-making movement in Rwanda, that now counts more than 1500 house churches, is a direct response to these “churches” that did not disciple people to obey Christ. The recent rapid multiplication of the Rwandan house churches (from 500 to more than 1500 during 2020–2021) was preceded

by almost ten years of intense leadership training and discipleship, and many tears by both inside and outside leaders. The growth was much slower at the beginning before the season of rapid growth began.

I do appreciate, though, that Don brought up the issue of rapid multiplication. I have observed that in the retelling of the stories of movements, too much emphasis can be placed on reports of rapid growth. (One of my colleagues once referred to these as “ministry porn.”) It is too easy to skip over the intense time required for prayer, building relationships, discipling, and training that precedes the multiplication. But none of this will make me shy away from talking about, praying for, and training others to be a part of movements of disciples who make disciples resulting in churches that multiply and reach entire cities, people groups, and nations for Jesus and his kingdom.

Finally, I would like to thank Don for this incredibly helpful discussion and his tone of gentleness and grace throughout. It is easy to fall into missiological echo-chambers in which people who share assumptions continue to repeat the same ideas without considering other perspectives. Don’s comments and critiques have helped to sharpen my thinking and consider ways I may have read my own ideas into the text. Except for my preference to use language other than “church planting,” I can wholeheartedly affirm Don’s statement that it is God who births movements, and that we “pray and work toward seeing God raise up local people, who develop into leaders, who can in turn lead and disciple others, who continue the cycle of multiplying apostolic church planters and churches.” I hope that in all our discussion of methods, the principles shared by my East African friends concerning how outside leaders can be most effective will be helpful regardless of the strategic approach used.

## A Final Word from Don

In being invited to offer a final brief reply to Matt in our dialogue, I will limit myself to two points. But first I want to emphasize that I, too, have appreciated the tone of this conversation. It is good to be able to talk about these matters. I am delighted to hear that Matt has found a significant shift towards greater fruitfulness in ministry by applying DMM principles. We all greatly desire to see more and more people come into a life-giving relationship with Jesus that results in life-long disciples. I am *very encouraged* that Matt is seeing considerable breakthrough in his ministry in East Africa. I truly do rejoice with him.

I want to further clarify that I welcome much of the recent (in the last twenty years or so) stress on working with groups, especially with households and existing social networks, in our efforts to advance the kingdom. From the beginning of ministry in North Africa, I sought to focus on working with social networks, long before it was the accepted thing to do.

The main thing I am concerned with is the conviction that this new DMM approach was actually *the* strategy of Jesus and Paul. A lot of problems arise when we assume that a new, often fruitful, sociologically conceived approach is modeled, or even mandated, in the New Testament. I would feel far more comfortable with the principles and language of DMM proponents if they would simply say that they have “discovered” or “been led to” a new strategy that they find very fruitful. Great, let’s try out the new strategy! Reports of fruitfulness encourage many to try it out.

But the attempt to argue that the Scriptures *teach and model* this new method is exegetically unwarranted. Or at least this is the way I see it. When one is convinced (through poor reading of the text) that this method is what Scripture teaches and models, it can lead to negative consequences. One can feel misplaced guilt when one follows the new model year after year, full of faith and earnest prayer, yet sees little or

no fruit. After all, how can there be no fruit if this is Jesus' method? Why doesn't Jesus bless his own method? Additionally, one risks modeling poor habits of Scripture reading.

Matt's assertion is that a "person-of-peace strategy" was what Jesus was modeling and training the disciples to do. He wrote, "Whatever you think about DMM, it is clear that the seventy-two were sent by Jesus to *find households* who responded to the offer of peace, offered hospitality, and became the center of the proclamation and demonstration of the kingdom of God in their community" (emphasis added).

I disagree. The seventy-two were not sent to "find households... who became the center of the proclamation...." The seventy-two were sent out to *proclaim the kingdom of God, to heal the sick, and to cast out demons*. They were sent out to *announce* and *demonstrate* the arrival of the kingdom of God. This is even clearer in the sending out of the twelve, reported in Luke 9:1-2 and in Matthew 10:1, 7-8. They were sent without any supplies on a short trip of perhaps a week or two (Matt. 10:5-6). They were sent to proclaim the arrival of the kingdom and to demonstrate it through healing people, expelling demons, and even by raising the dead (Matt. 10:8)! This was done to prepare the way for Jesus' upcoming visits to those towns.

Jesus told them to pronounce a blessing on "*whichever house they entered*" (Luke 9:4, 10:5) and remain there until their few days of kingdom proclamation and demonstrating were done. If someone received their blessing, then they were "a son of peace," which seems to be connected to what Jesus says in Matthew about finding and staying with a worthy person. They needed shelter and food for a few days, and they were to expect someone in each town or village that they went to, to provide it for them. They were not building relationships with their hosts. Their mission was *not* about finding "people of peace," but about *proclaiming* the arrival of the kingdom and *demonstrating* its reality through healings and deliverances.



Matt also argues that a rapid CPM-style multiplication of house churches planted by brand new believers that Paul had rapidly trained best explains the success of Paul's ministry in the province of Asia. However, when we carefully re-read the account of Paul's ministry in Ephesus, we see something quite different. Yes, we see a major movement of thousands coming to faith in Christ in just three years. But Luke clearly attributes this amazing response to Paul's reasoning/preaching daily in the hall of Tyrannus for two years until "all the residents of Asia heard the word of the Lord," to the fact that powerful signs and wonders were done which demonstrated the reality of the kingdom that he preached (Acts 19:9-20, etc.).

Yes, Paul recruited and trained men and women "from the harvest" to work with him. Once they were trained, he sent them out to appoint elders and to help the local churches organize. He was continuously working to disciple and train leaders for the ministry of the gospel, but the churches were initially established in response to the powerful work of the Spirit through Paul and those he trained, in proclamation, in healing, and in delivering multitudes from the power of Satan. The churches were not established by these trained new believers as a result of going out everywhere and leading Bible studies. Those trained, following the pattern that Jesus taught to the twelve and the seventy-two, were, like Paul, proclaiming the arrival of the kingdom of God, healing the sick, and driving out demons. There was *a movement* because the kingdom of God was triumphing over the kingdom of Satan.

There are frequent reports of the powerful working of the Spirit being released in some DMM movements. May God give Matt, and all he works with, the joy of experiencing fresh outpourings of the Spirit of God. May they be able to increasingly demonstrate the reality of the kingdom to which they are inviting men and women to enter as they become disciples of the King. Then they will be operating with the model that Paul and the other apostles actually used.

## Questions for Discussion

- What are the key differences between Matt's and Don's perspectives on the role of expatriate disciplers in cross-cultural kingdom work? Where are the key points of agreement?
- Evaluate Matt's and Don's biblical argumentation for their positions. How do you interpret the key passages cited, and what are the implications for how you view your role in your context?

## Bibliography

Addison, Steve. 2012. *What Jesus Started: Joining the Movement, Changing the World*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books.

Cooper, Michael T. 2022. *Ephesiology: A Study of the Ephesian Movement*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Publishing.

Shank, Nathan, and Kari Shank. 2014. *Four Fields of Kingdom Growth: Starting and Releasing Healthy Churches*. Rev. ed. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/588ada483a0411af1ab3e7ca/t/58a40ef11b631bcbd49c-88c0/1487146760589/4-Fields-Nathan-Shank-2014.pdf>