



CHAPTER 6: THE CONTEMPORARY ECCLESIOLOGY CONTRADICTS THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY FOR CHURCH GOVERNMENT

6.1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this chapter is to explore the ecclesiology of church leadership, with special reference to some contemporary ecclesiologies, and how these ecclesiologies influence church polity and government in general. This chapter expands the hypothesis and the statement of the research question of this research to prove that the fivefold ministry is not theologically correct to apply in church government and leadership.

6.2. CONTEMPORARY ECCLESIOLOGY OF CHURCH LEADERSHIP

The fundamental structure of the church works in synergy with the images used to convey the definition of the church. The contemporary ecclesiologies suggest that there is a form of leadership needed for the expression of ecclesiality of the church.

6.2.1. Communion ecclesiology (John Zizioulas)

This Eastern Orthodox theologian stresses the ecclesiality of the local church with concrete and expressive connections with the Church universal through the episcopacy. Kärkkäinen (2002:95) captures this that “the leading theological motif in Zizioulas is the idea of *koinonia*, “communion”. It shapes and informs everything he says about the church”. A substantial number of Catholic theologians such as Doyle (2000:12) give the definition of communion ecclesiology:

Communion ecclesiology is an approach to understanding the Church. It represents an attempt to move beyond the merely juridical and institutional understandings by emphasizing the mystical, sacramental, and historical dimensions of the Church. It focuses on relationships, whether among the persons of the Trinity, among human beings and



God, among the members of a parish, or among the bishops dispersed throughout the world. It emphasizes the dynamic interplay between the Church universal and the local churches. Communion ecclesiology stresses that the Church is not simply the receiver of revelation, but as the Mystical Body of Christ is bound up with revelation itself.

This line of thinking is also rooted in Zizioulas view on ordination not as a transfer of power or authority, but as a fundamental change of status that makes the ordained person a “something within the community - an ecstatic entity” (Kärkkäinen 2002:97). The same is expressed further by Volf (page 110) that “ordination overcomes the self-enclosure of the ordained person... what he is, he is through the relations in which he stands; community forms part of the ontology of episcopacy.”

The bishop is perceived as an episcopal being determined by his relation to a specific congregation. “The constituting of a person into a bishop, proceeding as it does by way of a specific local church, makes a bishop into a bishop in the one church of God, and for that reason also (potentially) into a bishop in every local church” (Volf 1998:110). The eucharistic gathering is the image of Christ, so also is a bishop, the image of Christ. The episcopal office is understood from the vantage point of identification of ecclesiology with Christology. The head of the community is to be viewed as the image of Christ because he does visibly what the Head (Christ) does invisibly.

As far as laity is concerned, Zizioulas (1985:23-35) views them as ordained in the strict sense of election, not merely in the sense of laying hands. They are assigned a different place within the structure of the Eucharistic gathering i.e. the structure that determines who they are. Their primary function is to affirm the grace they have received. This affirmation is a liturgical expression that they are a new people of God.

The critical reaction to Zizioulas’ ecclesiology of leadership is that it devalues laity and it waters down the role of charismata in ecclesia. Volf (1998:114) evaluates it that, “corresponds to the soteriological and ecclesiological enhancement of the bishop,



whoever assumes ‘the place of God’ must be followed.” The bishop as a reflection or image of Christ arouses tension of divine and human leadership in the community. This can open the way for human reverence instead of God reverence. This also promotes hierarchical and egalitarian relationships in the community. In this model, power is inevitable. It is a legitimized power that carries with some element of respect. The community is clearly divided between the rulers and the subjects.

Positively, the communion, or the Eucharistic gathering as propounded by Zizioulas embraces leadership in the community in the image of the bishop. It promotes community formation that is connected to Christ, the Head of the Church. Leadership is acknowledged on the basis of exceptional or even extranatural or supernatural gifts attributed to it (Van der Ven 1996:297).

6.2.2. Charismatic ecclesiology (Hans Küng)

This postconciliar Catholic theologian suffered a lot under his faith community for his views on what and how the Church should look like, especially on its eschatological journey post Vatican II. Kärkkäinen (2002:104) stresses the fact that “Küng’s *magnum opus* transformed theological thinking about the church toward a more participatory, charismatically structured, open model in which the whole church of God, not only its hierarchy, is placed under the Word of God and given participation in God’s mission in the world.”

Küng’s famous and world acclaimed book, *The Church*, is his entire motif about the church. In this book, Küng’s ecclesiology of leadership is based on the premise that the fundamental structure of the church is based on the church as the people of God. As the people of God, the church is the community of faith, the pilgrim people essentially *en route*, on a journey. The ecclesiology of leadership in Küng’s (1986:125) charismatic ecclesiology is evident:



If the Church is the true people of God, it is impossible to differentiate between Church” and “laity”, as though the laity were not in a real sense “laos”. This would be a *clericalizing misconception* of the Church; the Church is directly or indirectly identified with the clergy, perhaps not with regard to duties, but at any rate with regard to rights and privileges. It is striking that the word λαός with the meaning “people of God” is so often used for the Christian community, whereas the word λαϊχός, “layman”, whether in the Gentile meaning of the “uneducated masses” or in the Jewish meaning of one who is neither priest nor Levite, simply does not occur in the New Testament. It would have been impossible to use it ecclesiologically, since in the New Testament no reference is made to a group, but only to the whole company of “the elect”, “saints”, “disciples”, “brethren”, all having one Lord and one Master alone.

Fundamentally, Küng (1986:126) sees no distinction within the community the clerics and laity. The differences observed are those of charisms, services, tasks, and functions. Faith in God is the determining factor of he who serves. “The holding of an office in the Church, of whatever kind, is unimportant compared to whether, in exercising that office, a man is truly one of the “faithful”; whether he lives in faith and obedience, in love and hope” (1986:126). It is clear Küng is critical to divisive option of distinction between the clergy and the laity. He sees this as a limiting factor for broader community initiatives and innovation. The legalistic procedures and mindset mistrusts the free flow of the Spirit, though the Spirit blows where He wills and does not wait for official permission. Every church member is a priest and his priesthood is founded in Christ’s universal priesthood.

The charismatic structure of the Church is unacceptable by the Catholic Church because the Catholic ecclesiology is confined to the Pastoral Epistles, and Küng (pages 179-180) is insistent that these epistles fail to express the pneumatic nature of the church’s structure as does, for example, 1 Corinthians.



Küng further elaborates that *charismata* are not primarily extraordinary but common. They are not limited to a special group of people, but are God's call to the individual person in view of a specific service within the community, including the ability to perform this particular service. Kärkkäinen (2002:110) elaborates further that;

To defend his proposal that the charismata are not limited to a special group of persons, Küng offers three arguments. First, he notes that in 1 Corinthians 12:28-31 Paul's ordering of church "hierarchy" places clergy near the end of his list. Second, the church is in the intermediate stage between the "not yet" and "already", which implies that no one person possesses all the charismata. And third, Scripture plainly states that the Spirit has gifted every person (1 Cor 12:7).

This is ecclesiology from the bottom. It is the communion ecclesiology that highlights the dynamic character of the church as the people of God and the priority of charismata over structure and institution. There is no doubt that his ecclesiology of leadership puts Jesus as the primary source of revelation, Scripture as the primary expression of Christ's gospel, and the ministerial offices as always in the service of the people of God, never above it (Doyle 2000:121). Christ is active through all the community members, not merely through its officeholders. The appointed leaders are there to serve the community and also to receive from the community as well as ensuring the genuineness of the operation of the Spirit in the church. Barth (1956:790) reiterates that "the task of leaders is first to animate all the members of the church to engage their pluriform charismatic activities, and then to coordinate those activities. Second, leaders are responsible for a mature church that is called to test every manifestation of the Spirit."

6.2.3. Universal ecclesiology (Wolfhart Pannenberg)

This ecclesiology emphasizes public discipline instead of piety. Pannenberg criticises the privatization of faith and theology. It endeavours to address the common concerns.



Pannenberg's (1981:38-44) ecclesiology has a churchly nature. It has three distinctive characteristics:

- *It has a strong pneumatological orientation whereby the Spirit's role is that of continuity.* The Creator Spirit is also the sustaining Spirit. The same Spirit creates new life in believers and moves the world and the church towards the final fulfilment.
- *Traditionally, systematic theologians place soteriology before ecclesiology, but Pannenberg places soteriological discussion within the ecclesiological studies.* This implies a person joining the community in order that he may be enlightened to receive faith, not the other way around as tradition has held. The church's function is to point towards God's kingdom and sensitise the community of its eschatological consummation. "As the body of Christ the church is the eschatological people of God gathered out of all peoples, and it is thus a sign of reconciliation for a future unity of a renewed humanity in the kingdom of God" (1981:43). The church does this through participation in eschatological salvation that is endeavoured through liturgical life that leads to the experience of the Spirit.
- Pannenberg attaches the doctrine of election to ecclesiology rather than to the first part of systematic theology.

Pannenberg's ecclesiology of leadership is based on his view that the church is not a group of individuals who gather together because of the common faith. Peters (2000:273) agrees with this view: "The church constitutes a proleptic and ecumenical community that anticipates the fuller reality of God's eschatological and ecumenic consummation". There is no special group called out for special task of witnessing because full knowledge of God will be as wide as the creation itself. The whole church is the witness of God's salvific acts within creation. Regardless of Pannenberg's futuristic ecclesiology that is universal, his overall theology is embedded in apostolicity and the catholicity of the church, especially when coming to its missional endeavours. He stresses (1970:429):



Only where the apostolicity and catholicity of the Church are understood as a matter of faith - and not of a simple establishment of fact – only there can both appear in the Church’s present. Then they will be the sign of God’s coming reign itself, in whose service stand both the mission of the apostles and that of Jesus, and with whose coming the true, catholic, perfect society will be realised, in which there will no longer be any division between Church and political community.

The completeness of the church is dependent on its apostolicity. Pannenberg is not detached from the hierarchical church structure.

6.2.4. Messianic ecclesiology (Jürgen Moltmann)

Moltmann’s ecclesiology as expounded in *The Church in the Power of the Spirit* (1977) is spread in some of his mammoth writings on theology that he claims to be biblically founded, eschatologically orientated, and politically responsible. For instance, in:

- *Theology of Hope* (1964), the eschatological promise given in the resurrection of Christ creates a missionary church. It is the church of dialectical hope shaped and conditioned by the death and the resurrection of Christ, and human beings. This church is called to serve the world, including political involvement.
- *The Crucified God* (1972) adds dialectical love to dialectical hope. The church identifies itself with those with whom the crucified Christ identified himself.
- *The Church in the Power of the Spirit* (1977) points away from the pastoral church that looks after people, to the people’s own communal church among the people
- *Theology and Joy* (1973), the missionary church celebrates the festival of freedom, anticipating the joy of the new creation.

Moltmann (1977:1-18) further claims his doctrine as a messianic and relational ecclesiology. “Messianic” means essentially “Christological”, the Christological foundation always points toward the eschaton, so his view is “a christologically founded



and eschatologically directed doctrine of the church” (1977:13). The church is an open society of equals, a fellowship of friends. It does not exist for itself but for others. It is a serving missionary church. The church lives for the world and for others by participating in three offices of Christ (Moltmann 1977:300-302). In its prophetic task, the church participates in Jesus’ messianic proclamation and His liberation task. In its priestly task, the church intercedes for others and bears witness before the world to the liberating representation of Christ. As the kingly people, the church participates in the divine rule.

Moltmann’s ecclesiology of leadership is based on what he calls provolution i.e. projecting a vision of the coming new order. This is also affirmed by Peters (2000:380) that “the human dream turned forward is combined with the new possibility of the future and begins consciously to direct the course of human history as well as the evolution of nature.” Giving a glimpse of the Messiah’s reign in Isaiah 11 where human harmony depends on upon harmony throughout all of nature, Moltmann’s conviction that there is a new world coming is further elaborated by Peters (2000:381):

- Organized as a single, worldwide, planetary society;
- United in devotion to the will of God;
- Sustainable within the biological carrying capacity of the planet and harmonized with the principles of the ecosphere;
- Organized politically so as to preserve the just rights and voluntary contributions of all individuals;
- Organized economically so as to guarantee the basic survival needs of each person;
- Organized socially so that dignity and freedom are respected and protected in every quarter;
- Dedicated to advancing the quality of life in behalf of future generations.

Church leadership must always think of the future and be hopeful that the best is yet to come. Moltmann’s ecclesiology of leadership is not elaborated for the present but for the future.



6.2.5. Participatory ecclesiology (Miroslav Volf)

The base of this ecclesiology is that the church is the image of the Trinity. The ecclesiality of the church and the presence of Christ play a dominant role in Volf's ecclesiology. Volf defines the church as the eschatological new creation where the triune God dwells mutually and personally with His glorified people. Revelation 21-22 is used as a textual justification of this idea. The church participates in the life of the triune God as both the future hope and the present experience. Volf rejects the idea of the ecclesiality of the church (where) based on sacraments and the bishop. His ecclesiology of leadership lies in the fact that the church is called and endowed by the Spirit of God. All members depict and offer the manifold grace of God through their actions and words. Volf (1998:228-233) highlights that the charismatic structure of the church can be summarised in five principles:

- The thesis that the church is constituted by the way of the entire called and charismatically endowed people of God presupposes that the exalted Christ himself is acting in the gifts of the Spirit
- The second identifying feature of the charismata is their universal distribution. There are no members without charisma. Division into those who serve in the congregation and those who are served is ecclesiological unacceptable. Universal distribution of the charismata implies common responsibility for the life of the church. The task of leaders is first to animate all the members of the church to engage their pluriform charismatic activities, and then to coordinate these activities. Common responsibility implies mutual subordination.
- The third characteristic feature for the charismata is their fundamental interdependence (Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 12:7-11). The life of the church members must be characterized by mutuality.
- The sovereign Spirit of God allots the charismata "as the Spirit chooses" (1 Cor 12:11). The pneumatological structure of the church follows from the sovereignty



of the Spirit in the bestowal of charismata. The church is structured by apersonal institutions that are already given (overseeing and serving); therefore these institutions are inconceivable without personal bearers. The personal participative structure of these institutions is determined by the sovereign Spirit, who bestows the charismata when and upon whom the Spirit chooses.

- Finally, Volf speaks for the synchronic plurality of charismata. Charismata can vary from time to time and from person to person.

These imply that *ecclesia* is essentially ministerial. The abundance of *charismata* constitutes the body and brings it to realisation of its missional task in the *cosmos*. The Spirit calls the church in communion to be actively engaged in communional mission. When the *charismata* operate in the church, it is the ministry in action and in public. It is the action of church members for the service of the people of God. *Charismata* move each member to communion and service. The recipients of *charismata* have the duty, and the right, to use them for the good of communion and mission.

6.3. CONCLUSION

It has become factually clear that the emerging apostolic churches paradigm of apostolic government, based on fivefold ministry, is not ideal for the contemporary church. This is not because of cessationists' view on *charismata*, but on the basis of the context of the letter of Ephesians. Paul's ecclesiology is clearly community formation. The church from the day of its inception is still on its journey towards maturity. On this eschatological discovery, the church is in the process of discovering its own *ecclesiality*, hence the necessity of *charismata* for this self-discovery. The purpose of the fivefold ministry is the building up of the church. This upbuilding must be understood as the continuing work of God with and through His people. This continuing and consummating work consists in the bringing in of those who are outside – the focus especially of apostles, prophets and evangelists. The inner strengthening and perfecting of all who are in Christ i.e. who are already the members of *ecclesia* is the focus of all fivefold ministers. The building of the



Church is made on the foundation once laid (1 Cor 3:10-11) by the apostles and prophets ordained by Christ (Eph 2:20-21; Rom 15:20). The *domata* and *charismata* in general, bear the character of a continuing confirmation and consolidation on this foundation. As a result, the church receives a character of its own, grows towards maturity, and is cleansed from all impurity and false doctrine that taints its character and throw it into confusion (Eph 4:12-14; Col 2:6-8). For the sake of the church's self-development, Christ equips the church with *domata* that He places at its disposal in order to further its welfare and livelihood.

The church is both an organisation and organism, therefore needs leaders (pastors and elders) to govern its affairs and to steer it towards God's purposes. Its *missional* mandate is an *apostolic paradosis* to be passed on. The fivefold gifts' purpose is to strengthen the church, not to govern it. The government of the church is reserved for the pastors and elders. All the *charismata* and *domata* operate in the church under the supervision (oversight) of the church officers. There is a need of a balance between democracy and hierarchy in church polity.

The ecclesiology of leadership is abundant in many of contemporary ecclesiologies. All ecclesiologies, either from the bottom or from the top are in harmony that Christ is the leader in the community and He uses humans as instruments in order for community members to experience God. This is done through the Spirit's liberal impartation of *charismata* whereby each member contributes to the livelihood of the community.



CHAPTER 7: CONSTRAINTS, DEDUCTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. INTRODUCTION

The research addressed the question of whether the fivefold ministry is a theologically correct structure to be applied to church government and polity. Arguments and deliberations were developed and it is discovered that the Ephesians 4:11-16 passage was not intended to give a guideline on church government or leadership, but to encourage and inspire the local community to be self-developing and self-building. The remaining option now is to advance the arguments and guidelines and to recommend them to the ecclesiologists as a conclusive solution. However, Moriarty (1992:196) brings researchers to attention:

God places gifted leaders in the church to challenge, guide, build up, and equip believers for various ministries. The ultimate purpose is to strengthen the entire church. When God's people are better equipped to use their spiritual gifts, the whole church grows. When these gifts are exercised faithfully according to the Scriptures, the entire church becomes healthier and more mature. But this is a far cry from believers having to surrender to the teachings of a fivefold ministry that claims a special anointing to interpret the Bible for the church. This type of clergy-laity distinction demolishes everything the Reformers worked for.

The research should not be regarded as the final commentary in the investigation of exhaustive church government based on the fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4:11.

In this chapter the following will be dealt with:

- An overview of the research.



- Constraints of the research.
- Deductions which can be made from the results of the study.
- A number of recommendations for further research in the area of church government based on the fivefold ministry.

7.2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

The main purpose of the research was to assess critically the ecclesiology of the emerging Charismatics church government with a special reference to the concept of fivefold ministry. A number of terms and concepts were defined, and evangelical Christianity with its ecclesiology expanded and defined. The study dealt primarily with fivefold ministry: its historical development, theological reflections, roots and limitations.

It was also clarified that the Pentecostal and Charismatic hermeneutics' inadequacy leads to wrong conclusions in regard to *charismata* and ecclesiology in general. The New Apostolic Reformation or emerging apostolic movement's ecclesiology and its application of fivefold ministry in church government were critiqued. The allegory, fundamentalism, lack of synergy and coherence in Pentecostal and Charismatic ecclesiology were cited as the major reason for polarisation in the emerging apostolic churches. The theological shortcomings open the way for phenomenology, *Realpolitik*, and *vox populi* to reign supreme in Charismatic theological conclusions.

In the research, the exegesis of Ephesians 4:1-16 was undertaken in order to establish the rationale behind the *domata* and *charismata* in general. The issues addressed were designed to answer the doctrinal, theological, historical definitions and problems relating to *charismata* as the basis for refuting the fivefold ministry for church government.

The concluding chapter is an argument that the fivefold ministry is not a theologically sound concept for church government. It starts with the contemporary identification of the New Apostolic Reformation sometimes called "Third Wave" churches. The distinctive characteristics of these "Third Wave" churches are highlighted and special



research attention was focused on apostolic government, workplace apostles, territorial vision, equipping paradigms, holiness doctrine, and the apostolic networks. The appeal was made to the New Testament teaching regarding the fivefold ministries and arguments tabled with special reference to the ecclesia at Ephesus. The chapter concludes by giving a brief survey of ecclesiology of church leadership. Some contemporary ecclesiologies are used to demonstrate that diversity in ecclesiology does not rule out the leadership structure in the church.

7.3. CONSTRAINTS OF THE RESEARCH

A research such as this one is by nature limited in various respects. Input was acquired; analysis made, deductions made and certain generalisations were alluded to. However, certain constraints also need to be highlighted.

7.3.1. The extent of the research.

This was limited in a number of ways.

7.3.1.1. Subjectivity is inevitable in any research. Objectivism must always underline any historical or phenomenological research, however the researcher's tradition such as theological, ecclesiastical, and cultural backgrounds still play a major role in critiquing and formulating the factual findings. The research focused primarily on the writings, assessment, and evaluation of the fivefold ministry in the emerging apostolic movement. This however leaves the researcher with transparency in order that the truth remains.

7.3.1.2. Assessment of available literature on the subject. The various books on the subject were written by a large number of authors who support the concept. The books are of diverse ecclesiastical and theological backgrounds. Some of the books are primarily subjective and theologically narrow. Some contain mostly teaching. Some contain brief references to the subject. Assessing the authors of more books, instead of



few actually assessed, would have been valuable. This would have given a more comprehensive picture of fivefold ministry and better guidelines, and could have added more value to the subject.

7.3.1.3. The limitation of terminology. Since Pentecostal and Charismatic ecclesiology is still in embryonic stage and is not fully developed as a dogma, finding the right terminology was a big challenge in many respects. One phenomenon would be given various names and titles by different promoters. A good example is the lack of a collective name for the emerging apostolic churches (2.6; 3.2-3.5; 6.2).

7.3.2. The newness of the concept of fivefold ministry

Assumption of the church government based on the fivefold ministry is a new concept and relatively few articles and books seem to have been released onto the theological debate. The proponents of the concept differ widely on when the concept was accepted by their ecclesiastical tradition – the tradition that is itself fairly new in church history and development.

The research findings indicate that the Reformed and Pentecostal interpretation (5.11 and 5.12) of the fivefold ministry does not leave the space for the concept to be applied to church government. Both approaches bear witness that these gifts were intended for the self-development of the church, not for governing it, since the church at that stage already had leadership by elders. The theological definition and the historical development of charismata reiterate the fact that charismata are for church exhortation, not hierarchical leadership where one gift is elevated above others. The sensitivity and the misinterpretation of charismata opened the way for disagreements, neglect, confusion, and abuse among the evangelical cycles.



7.4. DEDUCTIONS MADE FROM THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

Despite the limitations and constraints reviewed in 7.3, certain deductions can be made from the results of the research. These deductions refer to the assumptions of research stipulated in 1.6 which have been largely met in the research. The deductions were made based primarily upon the research findings in theological reflections of the fivefold ministry (Chapter 4) and the comprehensive exegesis of Ephesians 4:1-16 (Chapter 5). Some direct and indirect deductions were, however, made from the assessment made in Chapters 5 and 6.

7.4.1. There is disparity and lack of synergy regarding the fivefold ministry among the Charismatics.

The marks of the churches under review vary widely to formulate their unity in explainable terminology (2.6.1). Different new apostolic churches have different church structures and very few of them have a visible structure around fivefold ministry. The history, the non-professional leadership training, and the historical background of the Charismatic leaders leave some enormous polarisation on this concept (4.8.1).

7.4.2. Ephesians 4 passage cannot be used to justify the church structure based on the fivefold ministry.

The timing, wording, and nature of the Ephesians church that received the epistle argue against fivefold ministry for church government. The focus of the apostle was for the equipping of the saints, the service, and the construction of the body of Christ. The *domata* was for the enablement of *ecclesia* to carry on the catechesis and promote the apostolic *paradosis*.

7.4.3. The *ecclesia* is a charismatic fellowship

Since the church is a mystery, leadership and ecclesiastical structures must be open to the leading and the operative works of the Spirit for the mystery to be revealed to all church



members. This can be done when charismata operate in the community (charismatic fellowship) and with one purpose in mind i.e. the maturity of the church (self-developing).

7.4.4. The church needs structure for the sake of order and effectiveness in the world.

This is demonstrated by all church traditions that order and leadership structures are the necessities for the church to assert itself in the world. The research surveyed the different structures (2.4) and concentrated on fivefold ministry as a church structure based on Ephesians 4:11.

7.4.5. Most of the fivefold ministry promoters are not scholarly or theologically trained.

This is demonstrated by their hermeneutical approaches to biblical passages (allegorical), and the appeal to a “Hand Illustration” as a way of forging their fivefold leadership concept (4.3 and 4.4.), the lack of catechesis, the application of phenomenology, Realpolitik, and vox populi as a way to give theological legitimacy to their hermeneutics.

7.5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT BASED ON THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY

The fivefold ministry was identified as being of foundational importance in the promulgation and formulation of Charismatic dogma on ecclesiastical government and polity. Writing on emerging apostolic churches, and the analysis and evaluation thereof, were important focal point of the research. Specific research needs in this field emanated from the findings

7.5.1. Concise definition and the marks of the emerging apostolic churches.

During the research, it was discovered that there is a lack of acceptable definition of this ecclesiastical phenomenon. There have been various names attached to this phenomenon



from the dawn of the twentieth century (2.6; 3.5; 6.2). There is a need for ecclesialogists to look into all these identifications and formulate one universally accepted definition.

7.5.2. The formulation of theologically acceptable church government and polity among the emerging apostolic churches.

The New Apostolic Reformation churches are diverse in their church government and structure. Some such as *The Fellowship of International Churches* (Duluth, Georgia), *Jesus is Lord Church* (Manila) etc hold episcopal government in its diverse forms, some such as *Star Int*, *Deeper Christian Life Ministry* etc are presbyterial; while very few are congregational in governing themselves. With its emphasis on apostolic government there is a strong tendency towards monarchical leadership and congregational approach.

7.5.3. The ecclesiality of the emerging apostolic churches

The emerging apostolic movement needs to know itself. Its identity, distinctives, unifying essentials etc all need to be researched and formulated in such a way that there can be an experience of unity (ecumenism) proposed by Christ in His high priestly prayer of John 17. The movement needs to find its place in the universal communion with a larger Christian community so that it can become vocal and apologetic to its dogma.

7.5.4. The synergy of apostolic networks and ecumenism

The research is needed to see how to facilitate dialogue between the emerging apostolic churches and their Christian siblings (Eastern Orthodox, Catholic, Mainline Protestants, Classical Pentecostals and Evangelicals). Their place within World Council of Churches will add value to the incarnational ministry of the Church in the world. It will also be beneficial to assess and analyse their role and contribution within World Evangelical Alliance, and World Pentecostal Conference.



7.5.5. The hierarchical leadership of emerging apostolic churches as opposed to contemporary participatory ecclesiologies.

The hierarchical and monarchical leadership tendencies within the emerging apostolic churches need to be explored and compared with the contemporary participatory ecclesiologies of our century. This is a wide field where charismata will have to be examined on how to lead the church in a more democratic and hierarchical way without compromising the pneumatic character and the spontaneity of the church.

7.5.6. The African monarchical influence on the emerging apostolic movement leadership and polity.

The apostolic churches, especially in Africa, are led by the king-style apostles and prophets. Research needs to be done to assess the theological validity of this type of church government, by looking at all angles and evaluating the impact it makes on the church from the sociological point of view.

7.5.7. Critical analysis of ecclesiological nuances of C Peter Wagner in relation to New Apostolic Reformation.

This former professor on church growth from Fuller Theological Seminary has become a spokesman for this movement. His writings since the mid-nineteen nineties had become a *corpus* for the emerging apostolic churches. Some of his writings such as *The New Apostolic Churches (1998)*, *Churchquake (1999)*, *Changing Church (2004)*, and *Apostles Today (2006)* on the fivefold ministry and this ecclesiastical phenomenon had raised numerous theological questions. There is a desperate need for critical analysis of his views on this phenomenon.

7.5.8. The Classical Pentecostal stance on the fivefold ministry, with a special reference to American Assemblies of God. The American Assemblies of God is the only classical Pentecostal Church that had become openly critical to the New Apostolic Reformation,



especially the fivefold ministry as applied to church government and leadership (Wagner 2006: 17 & 64).

7.5.9. The emerging apostolic churches and theological training.

This is critical. The research needs to be undertaken to assess the training schools set up by the New Apostolic Reformation. A special emphasis needs to be attached to the curriculum development (4.8.1) and the competitiveness of curricular contents with other schools of the same convictions.

7.5.10. The critical reflection on the doctrine of holiness and its influence on the emerging apostolic churches.

The roots of all Pentecostal/ Charismatic dogma are holiness doctrine inherited from the nineteenth century Holiness Movement. A research needs to be done to assess the impact of this doctrine to the emerging apostolic movement.

7.6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this research it was demonstrated that the fivefold ministries cannot be applied in the church structure and governance. Furthermore, it was illustrated that there is little theological validity of this concept in church polity. The charismata had been expounded in such a way that misunderstandings may be cleared in relation to the church leadership. The exegesis of Ephesians 4:1-16 opens the way for understanding the rationale behind the *doma* mentioned in 4:11. The expansive explanations and definitions of each of the five ministers of Ephesians 4:11 was done from all hermeneutical traditions in order to eliminate bias and subjectivism in formulating the conclusions that work towards the support of the research hypothesis (1.7).

Very little research seems to have been undertaken on the church government based on the fivefold ministry. The research attempted a small facet of this, and more research is



required into a number of related aspects. The main distinguishing focus of this research is church government and polity as practised by the emerging apostolic movement. The research indicates that the application of fivefold ministry does not carry any theological validity for church government.