Many Members, One Body: Corrective Honour and Reciprocal Care in 1 Corinthians 12:12–27

Simon Mweetwa, Hamaundu Chipo, Wellington Makuyana, Raphael Chinkuli, Shadreck Kabwela, Macdonald Moonga

Rusangu University, Monze, Zambia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1311000147

Received: 26 October 2026; Accepted: 01 November 2026; Published: 26 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Church leadership can affirm shared membership while distributing attention and recognition according to office, visibility, or perceived usefulness. This conceptual article examines the tension through a grammatical and literary reading of 1 Corinthians 12:12–27. It argues that Paul connects differentiated participation with corrective honour and reciprocal care: membership arises from incorporation into one body, differences do not warrant exclusion, and those regarded as less honourable receive particular attention. The study distinguishes textual observations from theological synthesis and contemporary institutional proposals. Engagement with scholarship on Pauline unity and disability qualifies any claim that the relationship between the body metaphor and inclusion is a neglected subject. The contribution is instead a focused account of leadership responsibility within an obligation addressed to the whole congregation. Leaders should enable members to give and receive care, direct attention towards those whose needs are overlooked, and assess whether formal commitments result in accessible relationships and practical assistance. Equal concern need not mean identical provision, and membership must not depend on measurable productivity. Published studies from Zambia and Zimbabwe inform the application to recognition, participation, confidential care and review of unmet needs. They are offered for contextual assessment rather than as empirically validated interventions or a governance system prescribed by Paul.

Keywords: 1 Corinthians 12; body of Christ; church leadership; dignity; mutual care; honour; disability; practical theology

INTRODUCTION

The body metaphor can be used to invite participation while leaving a congregation's distribution of honour largely undisturbed. A church may encourage every member to serve yet continue to direct recognition towards public ministry, defer to wealthy supporters, or overlook people unable to undertake regular responsibilities. These are possible institutional patterns, not findings from a congregational survey. They expose a theological question: does a member belong because the person contributes, or does shared belonging establish obligations that remain when contribution is difficult?

First Corinthians 12:12–27 connects the diversity of members with the treatment of members. Paul moves from incorporation through one Spirit to the rejection of self-exclusion and exclusion by others, and then to greater honour and reciprocal concern. The proposal advanced here is that leaders are responsible for enabling a congregation to embody this movement. Their responsibility arises within the body's shared vocation; it does not replace that vocation with a clerical monopoly on care.

Problem statement

The problem is the possible disconnection between confessed membership and experienced belonging. Assigning every person a task does not establish that members receive appropriate recognition, can influence decisions affecting them, or obtain care when needed. This study therefore asks how Paul's account of incorporation, differentiated functions, and greater honour constrains leadership practices, and how those

constraints can guide institutional decisions without equating belonging with productivity or turning care into paternalism.

The argument therefore makes a limited claim. Paul does not provide a modern theory of management, equal access to every office, or a procedure for allocating a church budget. Nevertheless, his account supplies criteria for evaluating leadership practices: whether they make belonging contingent on status or output, whether members considered less important receive appropriate honour, and whether suffering and rejoicing become matters of shared concern. These criteria require interpretation before institutional application. Its central claim is that greater honour responds to diminished standing, while reciprocal care protects belonging from becoming conditional on performance. Leadership should be evaluated by how its practices enact those two obligations together.

The article contributes a practical theological account of corrective honour. This expression denotes the deliberate recognition of persons whose standing or needs have been diminished in communal practice. It is an interpretive description of verses 22–25, not a phrase coined by Paul. Corrective honour is distinguished from publicity, identical treatment, and paternalistic charity. The question is how leadership can make reciprocal membership effective without turning persons into service providers or passive beneficiaries.

METHODOLOGY

This conceptual study reads 1 Corinthians 12:12–27 within chapters 11–14. It proceeds from clause-level syntax to rhetorical function, then from theological synthesis to congregational application. Transliteration uses ē and ō for eta and omega, h for rough breathing, and n for gamma before a velar consonant. English biblical renderings are the authors' own.

The base text is the SBL Greek New Testament (Holmes, 2010). Where a variant affects a form discussed below, the analysis identifies the base-text reading and explains what turns on it. The argument distinguishes the morphology of a form, its place in a clause and the inference warranted by the passage as a whole.

The literature was selected purposively. The exegetical comparison draws on published analyses of rhetorical persuasion, ancient body fables and disability theology. Regional practical theology and a published Zambian study inform the contextual application. The Shema proposal is cited at the level of its published abstract and serves as a contextual possibility.

The transition to leadership is normative. If Paul addresses the congregation as a mutually dependent body, and leaders have responsibilities for its common practices, then those responsibilities should enable rather than obstruct reciprocal care. The second premise is a contemporary account of institutional responsibility. It is not a translation of a Greek term in the passage. This distinction allows practical proposals to be criticised without confusing them with the authority of the biblical text.

Interpretive proposals are checked against the sentence, the passage's rhetorical sequence, and the treatment of worship in chapters 11–14. Applications must identify both their textual norm and the contextual judgement required for implementation. This permits criticism of a practice without equating that criticism with rejection of Paul's argument.

Limitations

This study offers a reading of 1 Corinthians and a constructive account of leadership. The Zambian and Zimbabwean material comes from published studies with different populations and questions. Those studies help identify issues for congregational discernment. Estimating the prevalence of neglect, assessing particular denominations or testing the effects of the proposed practices would require separate research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Kukuni (2024, pp. 5–7) locates the passage within Paul's persuasion of a gifted but divided congregation. The speaking limbs dramatise two related failures: measuring one's own belonging against another role and

denying dependence on other roles. The absurd image of a single-organ body exposes the logic of both positions. This rhetorical reading explains the progression from verses 14–20 to verse 21. Verses 22–25 take the argument further by asking how a body should treat members when the distribution of honour is already unequal.

Byers (2016, abstract) proposes that the Shema helps explain Paul's language of oneness. That proposal and the comparison with ancient fables address different questions. The former concerns the theological identity of the one body, while the latter illuminates the social force of its speaking parts. Within the passage itself, the application to Christ in verse 12 and the explanatory reference to the one Spirit in verse 13 already ground unity in divine agency.

Zimmermann (2021, pp. 5–6) reads Babrius 134 as defending established rank and Paul as moving towards equivalence. In Babrius the tail's attempt to lead ends in humiliation. In Paul the head is itself rebuked when it claims independence from the feet. The comparison makes the reversal visible without requiring direct borrowing. Paul's ordered list in verses 28–30 limits the inference from equivalence: the passage challenges rank as a warrant for dispensability even as it differentiates responsibilities.

Massmann (2024, pp. 406–408) argues that the language of healing and power surrounding the body analogy can make some contributions easier to recognise than others. He also questions approaches that assign people with disabilities the role of illustrating universal vulnerability. This puts pressure on an account of inclusion framed solely around distributing tasks. A congregation needs to consider how its expectations shape what it can recognise as a contribution, while continuing to offer care when a member's contribution is difficult to see.

Bartling (1969, pp. 75–77) reads the gifts in relation to service, love and the congregation's shared participation in the Spirit. Read alongside Massmann, this emphasis raises a practical question about discernment: which forms of service count in a congregation that publicly prizes visible manifestations of power? Chapter 13's account of love and chapter 14's concern for edification provide criteria for examining that preference.

The contextual conversation also matters. Mukuka (2025, Introduction and Conclusion sections) connects moral leadership with missiological engagement in exclusion and injustice. Its relevance here is conceptual: a church's public concern for justice invites scrutiny of its internal relationships. It is not evidence that the practices proposed below have been tested in congregations.

Two retained sources offer more specific pastoral connections. Sanou (2023) addresses pastoral leadership as a catalyst for whole-church ministry; the article is a pastoral resource rather than an empirical test of a leadership intervention. Gabasiane (2010) locates ministry to marginalised persons within relational care. These contributions help frame the practical discussion without carrying the exegetical argument on their own.

Regional studies sharpen the question of who defines inclusion. Mwale and Chita (2016, pp. 68–69) ask what selected Zambian Pentecostal ministries communicate about disability through public healing practices. Chisale (2020, "African women's theology of disability and ubuntu" section) starts from women's accounts of contesting exclusion in Matetsi, Zimbabwe. Together they direct attention to who frames a person's needs and whose account can shape a community's response.

The contribution is a focused account of leadership responsibility for honour and care, developed from established scholarship on unity and inclusion. It protects members against both instrumentalisation and imposed dependency.

The three approaches place different demands on an interpretation. The rhetorical reading explains why the congregation must remain differentiated. The comparison with ancient fables tests whether differentiation gives prominent members authority to dismiss others. Disability theology asks how the resulting account of mutual dependence is experienced when congregational standards of ability make a member's gifts difficult to

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue XI November 2026

recognise. Reading verses 21–26 together connects these questions: the prohibition of dismissal leads to a directed allocation of honour and then to reciprocal concern.

Exegetical Analysis and Theological Discussion

Literary context and the problem of status

The immediate context already prevents an individualistic reading of gifts. In 12:7 their manifestation serves common benefit, while 12:11 attributes their distribution to the Spirit. The body argument elaborates how difference can serve a shared life. Chapter 13 then denies that impressive gifts can substitute for love, and chapter 14 evaluates public speech by its contribution to the assembly's edification. Kukuni (2024, pp. 5–7) similarly situates the body within Paul's persuasion towards unity.

The preceding account of the communal meal gives the discussion material force. Paul identifies conduct that humiliates those who have nothing and contrasts one person's hunger with another's excess (11:21–22). This does not prove that every gift dispute maps onto an economic class division. It does establish that worship, status, and the treatment of vulnerable participants cannot be separated in the letter. A reading confined to assigning ministry tasks would miss that context.

The head and eye in Babrius and Paul show how similar imagery can support different accounts of authority. In Babrius the body's disorder vindicates the head. In Paul the head speaks as a member whose assertion of independence the argument overturns (12:21–22). Divine agency then enters explicitly in verse 24. This sequence explains the direction of Paul's argument even where the origins of his imagery remain open (Zimmermann, 2021, pp. 5–6).

Shared incorporation in verses 12 and 13

The comparative construction beginning with καθάπερ (kathaper, "just as") culminates in οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός (houtōs kai ho Christos, "so also Christ," v. 12). Its compressed application to Christ prepares for the explicit address to the congregation as Christ's body in verse 27. The explanatory καὶ γάρ (kai gar) in verse 13 links this identity to shared incorporation. The first-person plural passive ἐβαπτίσθημεν (ebaptisthēmen) includes Paul among the recipients. The phrase εἰς ἓν σῶμα (eis hen sōma) supplies the destination of that incorporation.

The opening phrase ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι (en heni pneumati) admits an instrumental reading, with the Spirit as the means, and a reading that treats the Spirit as the sphere in which incorporation occurs. The Spirit's active distribution of gifts in verse 11 supports the former emphasis, while the parallel drinking clause makes shared participation in the Spirit explicit. The two occurrences of πάντες (pantes, "all") frame the named social distinctions. Both Jews and Greeks, enslaved and free, are included in the same first-person plural claim.

The second passive, ἐποτίσθημεν (epotisthēmen, "we were given to drink"), returns to the same inclusive subject and makes the one Spirit the object of shared reception. The clauses therefore describe both incorporation into a common body and participation in a common gift. The passage can be read with a baptismal emphasis, or with emphasis on the Spirit's incorporation of believers. The coordination of the clauses makes shared participation central to either account. It supplies the grounds for Paul's subsequent rejection of status as a measure of membership.

The leadership implication is correspondingly specific. Leaders may recognise gifts and regulate responsibilities, but they cannot make social prestige the basis of a member's value. Nothing here requires the conclusion that every member must hold identical responsibilities. The distinction between shared belonging and differentiated responsibility becomes explicit in the verses that follow.

Difference and self-exclusion in verses 14 to 20

In verses 15–16, the conditions introduced by ἐάν (ean) with the subjunctive present hypothetical speech. Within that speech, ὅτι (hoti) introduces the reason the limb gives for its supposed exclusion. Paul's reply

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue XI November 2026

turns on παρὰ τοῦτο (para touto, "on that account"): the asserted reason does not entail the consequence. The counterfactual body in verse 17 then demonstrates what the premise would cost. If the eye supplied the standard for every member, hearing would disappear.

Verse 18 answers the hypothetical loss of differentiation by naming God as the subject of ἔθετο (etheto, "placed"). The appositional ἓν ἕκαστον (hen hekaston, "each one") individuates the collective object, "the members", and καθὼς ἠθέλησεν (kathōs ēthelēsen, "as he wished") grounds their placement in divine intention. The balanced μέν … δέ (men … de) construction of verse 20 then holds plurality and unity together. The argument concerns the body's constitution and leaves particular appointments open to congregational discernment.

These verses give leaders grounds to challenge a congregation's narrow account of significant participation. Yet membership should not become dependent on successful gift discovery. A person experiencing illness or profound limitation need not first demonstrate a recognisable contribution before receiving care. The passage begins with incorporation, and its later account of suffering makes need a shared concern rather than a reason for exclusion.

The language of necessity nevertheless raises an objection. If members are indispensable because a body needs their functions, does the passage still make worth depend on usefulness? The analogy begins with functions, but its argument does not end there. Greater honour is directed towards the member lacking it, and the community shares a member's suffering without first assessing output. The ethical inference therefore follows from the whole sequence. Function explains differentiation; it does not exhaust the grounds or obligations of belonging.

Refused exclusion and greater honour in verses 21 to 24

In verse 21, οὐ δύναται (ou dynatai) governs εἰπεῖν (eipein), the infinitive introducing the eye's address to the hand. The corresponding speech of the head to the feet carries the same governing construction. The physical impossibility of literal speech has already been set aside by personification. Within that device, the negated modal makes the claim to independence untenable. The head is a speaker within the illustration, alongside the eye, and its position supplies no warrant for identifying it with Christ or a contemporary pastor.

In verse 22 the articular participle δοκοῦντα (dokounta, "seeming") qualifies the members and takes ὑπάρχειν (hyparchein, "to be") with the comparative ἀσθενέστερα (asthenestera, "weaker"). The main assertion predicates ἀναγκαῖα (anankaia, "indispensable") of those same members. The syntax shifts the judgement from perceived weakness to necessity. A reading that takes the weakness as real and a reading that stresses others' perception can both account for the comparative. Neither can infer dispensability from it.

Verse 23 moves from judgement to action. The relative clause beginning with ἃ (ha, "those which") identifies the parts we consider less honourable, and the resumptive dative τούτοις (toutois, "on these") identifies the recipients of the greater honour we bestow. The next clause about greater presentability makes clothing or shielding less presentable parts a plausible concrete image. The image leaves the precise anatomical referent open. Its force lies in the additional attention directed towards parts that would otherwise receive less public esteem.

The semantic range of τιμή (timē), "honour," includes valuation, esteem, and, in some contexts, monetary value (Mounce, n.d.-c, lexical entry). These senses cannot all be imported into verses 23–24. Here, the contrast between less honourable parts and greater honour selects the language of regard and treatment. Financial assistance may embody that regard when needed, but the noun does not itself instruct leaders to assign monetary rewards. Nor is honour exhausted by verbal affirmation: the analogy concerns how members are treated.

The movement towards greater honour provides the basis for corrective recognition. It does not require placing every person on a platform. A member may need accessible space, private acknowledgement, inclusion in deliberation, or practical help rather than public praise. These possibilities are contemporary

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue XI November 2026

proposals, not hidden definitions of the Greek vocabulary. Their common rationale is that inherited patterns of honour should not determine who receives attention.

Divine composition and reciprocal concern in verses 24 and 25

In verse 24, ὁ θεός (ho theos) is the subject of συνεκέρασεν (synekerasen, "composed") and of the aorist participle δούς (dous, "giving"). The participle explains how the divine composition addresses disparity in honour. The SBL text reads τῷ ὑστεροῦντι (tō hysterounti), an articular present active participle in the dative identifying the recipient. The variant τῷ ὑστερουμένῳ (tō hysteroumenō) has the same recipient function. The comparison with verse 23 supplies what is lacking, namely honour, and leaves the precise social form of that lack open (Holmes, 2010, 1 Cor. 12:24 and apparatus).

Verses 23–24 move from the first-person plural practice of bestowing honour to God's act of composing the body. Reading the participle as a coincident action would still identify the recipient of divine generosity. Reading it as explanatory fits the movement into the purpose clause: God composes the body by attending to the disparity that threatens its relationships. On either reading, the recipient receives greater honour because of a present lack of it. The lexical sense of combining or uniting (Mounce, n.d.-b) describes God's composition of the body. The giving participle and its dative recipient establish where corrective attention is directed.

One ἵνα (hina) construction governs the negative subjunctive ᾖ (ē, "there be") and the positive subjunctive μεριμνῶσι (merimnōsi, "they care"), linked by ἀλλά (alla). The two clauses state the aim of divine composition from complementary directions: freedom from division and active care among members. The reappearance of σχίσμα (schisma, "division") recalls 1:10 and 11:18, where Paul has already confronted communal fracture.

The subject of μεριμνῶσι is τὰ μέλη (ta melē, "the members"). The expression τὸ αὐτό (to auto, "the same") characterises their concern, and ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων (hyper allēlōn, "for one another") gives it a reciprocal direction. Verses 24–25 thus combine shared concern with a deliberately differentiated allocation of honour. Equal regard can call for different kinds of practical help, depending on what a member requests and what prevents participation.

The lexical range of μεριμνάω (merimnaō) supports this contextual reading. Its lexical range includes anxious thought and concern for another, with 1 Corinthians 12:25 and Philippians 2:20 illustrating the latter orientation (Mounce, n.d.-a, lexical entry and concordance). Context therefore supports concern here without commending anxiety. The reciprocal phrase makes the whole membership responsible for care. Organised provision should enable those relationships.

A further distinction follows. Paul attributes the body's constitution to God and articulates the intended form of its relationships. It is therefore too strong to say that leaders produce unity by operating a care system. Their task is better described as enabling practices consistent with a unity already given and confronting practices that contradict it. This formulation preserves divine agency and human responsibility without confusing them.

Shared suffering and rejoicing in verses 26 and 27

The paired εἴτε (eite) clauses in verse 26 set one member's suffering and one member's honour alongside the responses of all the members. In each response clause, the singular verb agrees idiomatically with the neuter plural subject πάντα τὰ μέλη (panta ta melē, "all the members"). The repeated συν- (syn-, "with") compounds make the shared response explicit. The paired construction includes rejoicing as fully as suffering, so reciprocity concerns how the congregation responds to another person's good as well as to need.

The verse depicts solidarity through the bodily analogy. It does not require every member to experience an identical emotional state or to know confidential details. Suffering together can involve practical assistance and faithful presence; rejoicing together can involve recognising another person's good without competition. The theological claim is that a member's condition matters to the shared life. Institutional proposals should serve that solidarity without pretending to measure inward affection exhaustively.

The emphatic plural ὑμεῖς (hymeis, "you") in verse 27 applies the metaphor directly to the Corinthians. The two predicate expressions identify them collectively as Christ's body and distributively as members, with ἐκ μέρους (ek merous) qualifying the latter. In verse 28 the ordered adverbs and in verses 29–30 the questions introduced by μή (mē) preserve differences of role. Paul can therefore give certain ministries priority while ruling out the claim that a member's role determines whether others need or should care for that person.

The shift from third-person body parts to the second-person plural also governs application. Paul addresses the Corinthians together. The body's shared suffering and rejoicing therefore name obligations of the assembly that holds particular offices. The adverbs in verse 28 specify order within the list, while the questions in verses 29–30 deny that everyone shares every role. This makes it possible to distinguish priority of service from rank in belonging. The former is compatible with mutual dependence and the latter would undermine the refusal of dismissal in verse 21.

The distinction between value and function becomes especially important in the transition to 12:28–31. Paul names apostles, prophets, and teachers in an ordered sequence and asks questions expecting negative answers about whether all possess particular ministries. Any account of this passage as abolishing every ordering of responsibility must explain that continuation. Corrective honour therefore does not require identical office. Conversely, an ordering of ministry cannot authorise the superior member's claim of self-sufficiency that verse 21 has already prohibited.

Implications

The leadership argument rests on a sequence of reasons. First, incorporation establishes a shared identity that differences of status cannot nullify. Second, the passage prohibits treating another member as unnecessary and directs honour towards the one lacking it. Third, reciprocal concern is the stated alternative to division. If leaders shape the practices through which members are recognised, heard, and assisted, those practices fall within the scope of this ethic. Leadership is accountable for conditions that enable mutual care, while the care itself remains a responsibility of the body.

The theological claim places limits on both productivity-based recognition and paternalistic assistance. Incorporation establishes the obligation of care, and the command of mutual concern leaves room for members to exercise agency in giving and receiving. Massmann's discussion of contributions overlooked by prevailing expectations shows why those responsible for ministry should listen before deciding what a person can offer or needs.

Two further objections clarify the proposal. First, greater honour might appear to reverse rather than overcome competition, making disadvantage a new route to prestige. The purpose clause answers that concern: honour serves the prevention of division and reciprocal care, not the enthronement of a new elite (12:24–25). Corrective honour fails its purpose if it humiliates other members, fixes recipients permanently in a lesser category, or rewards the public display of suffering.

Reciprocity concerns the direction of care across the body. It permits sustained assistance when a person is unable to return help in a recognisable form. Verse 26 grounds the response in the member's suffering or honour. Requiring repayment or an equivalent contribution would place a further condition on that response.

Dignity is used here as a constructive theological category for the treatment appropriate to shared belonging. It is not a translation of a particular noun in 12:12–27. The image of God can provide a wider canonical account of human worth (Gen 1:26–27), but Paul does not explicitly invoke that doctrine in this passage. Creation and incorporation should therefore be related through theological synthesis rather than collapsed into one exegetical claim. Nor should an ecclesial argument imply that persons outside the congregation lack dignity.

Corrective honour can be justified without equating different offices or denying competence. A person may require particular training before exercising a ministry, and harmful conduct may require restriction. What the body argument challenges is the inference that limited authority, limited capacity, or low visibility makes someone disposable. Accountability and appropriate boundaries can protect the body's members. Solidarity does not oblige a person who has suffered harm to remain exposed to the source of that harm.

The proposal also qualifies appeals to unity. A complaint about neglect may reveal division rather than create it. Leaders should therefore distinguish suppressing disagreement from responding to the relationships that made disagreement necessary. A congregation can display outward agreement while some members lack an effective voice. The practical question is whether the affected person can raise a concern and receive a considered response without being treated as disloyal.

Congregational Contexts in Zambia and Southern Africa

Mwale and Chita (2016, pp. 53–54, 68–69) examine representations of disability in three selected Pentecostal ministries using interviews, documents and video material. They identify the social recognition healing gatherings can offer and the risk that public attention makes a person primarily visible as someone awaiting healing. Their findings concern the ministries studied. The question they pose for other congregations is whether access, ministry and public recognition remain available when a person declines prayer in public or reports no change in impairment. Paul's sequence provides grounds for asking that question: common incorporation in verse 13 precedes the treatment of members in verses 22–26, and the gift of healing in verses 28–30 is one of several gifts.

Chisale's (2020, "African women's theology of disability and ubuntu" section) study of Ndebele women in Matetsi, Zimbabwe, describes how participants contested expectations about bodies, relationships and motherhood. Her constructive use of ubuntu takes solidarity seriously while attending to women's own accounts of how inclusion is negotiated. Read with 1 Corinthians 12:21–25, this gives congregations a reason to invite affected members to shape a decision from the start. Leaders remain responsible for changing arrangements that obstruct participation even when the people affected are unable or unwilling to campaign for change.

For example, a Zambian congregation reviewing its worship arrangements could invite members with mobility or hearing impairments to choose how they want to participate in the review and which barriers should be addressed first. The congregation might agree an access change and check with those members whether it helped. In a setting where public healing prayer is practised, leaders could make public prayer and testimony voluntary and ensure that a member can continue to participate in worship and decision-making regardless of whether they give testimony. These are examples for local discernment based on the issues raised by the studies.

The two studies also identify different responsibilities. Mwale and Chita's analysis asks how leaders and public ministries frame disability. Chisale's account asks whether the people concerned can challenge the categories and expectations imposed on them. A congregation can take both questions into a single review by asking members which aspects of participation they want changed, making an agreed change and checking privately whether it has improved access. The wider relevance of such a review depends on the congregation's own practices, resources and members' accounts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recognition and participation

The prohibition on dismissing members in verse 21 and the greater honour given in verses 23–24 warrant including affected members when deciding which barriers to address. A congregation can examine whose work and experiences receive attention in its ordinary communications and decisions. The purpose is not to calculate each person's worth through a recognition score. It is to identify recurring patterns: whether public roles receive nearly all acknowledgement, whether financial supporters dominate consultation, and whether less visible members can influence decisions that affect them. Such a review requires local evidence before conclusions about a particular church can be drawn.

Recognition should be agreed with the persons concerned. Public praise may be welcome, but it can also expose a need or impose an identity someone does not wish to perform. Participation can include flexible responsibilities, accessible meeting arrangements, and permission to decline a task without loss of standing.

Sanou's (2023) whole-church ministry emphasis offers a pastoral point of contact, while the present argument adds that shared ministry must include freedom from coercive expectations of service.

Organising care without monopolising it

Because the members themselves are the subject of reciprocal care in verse 25, the coordinator's responsibility is to help members respond together, with the person's consent. Leaders can support small care networks with clear responsibility for responding to disclosed needs. The network should help relationships rather than replace friendship with reporting. Where a member requests assistance, someone should establish what response is appropriate, who can provide it, and whether further help is needed. These arrangements are practical judgements, not procedures specified in 1 Corinthians 12.

Gabasiane (2010) provides a relational orientation for ministry to marginalised persons. An institutional extension of that orientation is to ask whether the intended recipient experiences assistance as useful and respectful. Food provision may help one person while transport, companionship, or a referral is more urgent for another. Those examples show why identical allocations are not the only expression of equal concern.

Resources remain finite. A congregation should explain its capacity, agree reasonable priorities, and communicate when it cannot meet a request. Shared suffering does not promise unlimited institutional provision. It does rule out using a member's low status as a sufficient reason for indifference. Confidentiality, consent, and a person's informed refusal should shape any follow-up. Care must not become a demand for disclosure.

Reviewing commitments and unmet needs

Theological commitment, volunteer activity, and a member's experience of care are related but distinct. A locally proportionate review could ask whether requests received a response, whether agreed help was accessible and whether recipients identified continuing obstacles. A person chosen to coordinate the response could follow up privately and report recurring access problems without sharing identifying details. This applies the purpose of reciprocal concern in verse 25 to the question of whether the care promised was actually received.

No single indicator establishes the health of Christ's body. Counts of visits or volunteers may reveal activity while concealing exclusion, unwanted attention, or dissatisfaction. Review should therefore combine modest records with voluntary feedback and attention to exceptions. The objective is to notice preventable neglect, not to give leaders exhaustive knowledge of members' lives.

Mukuka's (2025, Introduction and Conclusion sections) connection between moral leadership and justice raises a further question for mission: whether public advocacy is supported by internal practices of fair treatment. This is a normative consistency test rather than a claim that internal care automatically produces successful evangelism. A congregation's treatment of members matters even when its effects on growth cannot be demonstrated.

CONCLUSION

First Corinthians 12:12–27 links differentiated membership to obligations of honour and care. Shared incorporation precedes the distribution of functions; neither a member's self-doubt nor another member's apparent sufficiency determines who belongs. Greater honour is directed towards the member lacking it, and suffering and rejoicing become matters of shared concern. These claims do not supply a complete governance system, but they constrain how church leadership may justify its practices.

The contribution of this study is a focused account of leadership as enabling reciprocal membership. Recognition should challenge diminished standing without making publicity compulsory. Care should respond to particular circumstances without making recipients passive or subject to intrusion. Evaluation should attend to unmet needs without reducing belonging to a performance measure. These proposals give practical expression to the passage's ethic while remaining open to local correction and empirical assessment. The

Zambian and Zimbabwean studies clarify why local assessment should include the accounts and priorities of members who experience barriers to participation.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research could examine how members in differently structured congregations understand recognition, reciprocal care, and the freedom to refuse ministry assignments. Interviews should include members whose participation is constrained by disability, illness, age, poverty, or caring responsibilities, without presuming that these experiences are equivalent. Comparative work could explore whether formal care structures support reciprocity or reinforce a lasting division between helpers and recipients. Any assessment should include members' own judgements rather than relying solely on leaders' descriptions of provision.

REFERENCES

1. Bartling, W. J. (1969). The congregation of Christ—A charismatic body. *Concordia Theological Monthly, 40*(2), 67–80. https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol40/iss1/7/
2. Byers, A. (2016). The one body of the Shema in 1 Corinthians: An ecclesiology of Christological monotheism. *New Testament Studies, 62*(4), 517–532. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688516000163
3. Chisale, S. S. (2020). Politics of the body, fear and ubuntu: Proposing an African women's theology of disability. *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies, 76*(3), Article a5871. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i3.5871
4. Gabasiane, O. O. (2010). Relational care as ministry to the marginalized. *Journal of Adventist Mission Studies, 6*(2), 14–21. https://doi.org/10.32597/jams/vol6/iss2/3/
5. Holmes, M. W. (Ed.). (2010). *The Greek New Testament SBL edition*. Society of Biblical Literature; Logos Bible Software. https://sblgnt.com/
6. Kukuni, T. J. (2024). Spiritually gifted and divided? A text-centred interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12:1–31a. *In die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi, 58*(1), Article a3043. https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v58i1.3043
7. Massmann, A. (2024). Fleshing out the strength of weakness: Intercorporeality in the theological discourse on disability. *Harvard Theological Review, 117*(2), 391–416. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816024000063
8. Mounce, W. D. (n.d.-a). Μεριμνάω (merimnaō). In *Greek New Testament dictionary*. Retrieved October 26, 2026, from https://www.billmounce.com/greek-dictionary/merimnao
9. Mounce, W. D. (n.d.-b). Συγκεράννυμι (synkerannymi). In *Greek New Testament dictionary*. Retrieved October 26, 2026, from https://www.billmounce.com/greek-dictionary/synkerannymi
10. Mounce, W. D. (n.d.-c). Τιμή (timē). In *Greek New Testament dictionary*. Retrieved October 26, 2026, from https://www.billmounce.com/greek-dictionary/time
11. Mukuka, C. K. (2025). A missiological perspective on moral leadership and social justice. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9*(9), 7825–7835. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000637
12. Mwale, N., & Chita, J. (2016). Religious pluralism and disability in Zambia: Approaches and healing in selected Pentecostal churches. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae, 42*(2), 53–71. https://doi.org/10.17159/2412-4265/2016/622
13. Sanou, B. (2023). Pastoral leadership: A catalyst for whole-church ministry. *Ministry, 95*(7), 10–12. https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/pubs/5066/
14. Zimmermann, R. (2021). The body fables in Babrius, Fab. 134 and 1 Corinthians 12: Hierarchic or democratic leadership in crisis management? *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies, 77*(4), Article a6524. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v77i4.6524