



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

**A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ECCLESIOLOGY OF
THE EMERGING APOSTOLIC CHURCHES WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE NOTION OF THE
FIVEFOLD MINISTRY.**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
PHILOSOPHIAE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY –
DOGMATICS AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS**

BY

KELEBOGILE THOMAS RESANE

SUPERVISOR: PROF Dr J BUITENDAG

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

July, 2008



DECLARATION

I declare that *a critical analysis of the ecclesiology of the emerging apostolic churches with special reference to the notion of the fivefold ministry* is my own work, that it has not been submitted for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by complete references.

KELEBOGILE THOMAS RESANE

DATE _____

SIGNED _____

Note: All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the Holy Bible: New International Version®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society.



DEDICATION

It was He Who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers, to prepare God's people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ (Eph 4:11-13)

This work is dedicated to all members of my family, especially my dearest wife Tabby, who gave me moral support. My son, Koketso was exceedingly understanding and tolerant of my technology limitation and edited most, if not all of the documentation put into place. My two daughters, Mamosa and Duduetsang also provided their moral support and love. They accommodated my excuses for not being with them due to this research, when they needed me.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have given their support, encouragement, and inspiration to this academic endeavour. The following, however, were singularly helpful, and deserve a mention.

During the six years that I spent at the University of Pretoria, where the basic work for my postgraduate theological study was undertaken, I received help from several members of the Faculty of Theology in the Department of Dogmatics and Christian Ethics. The most helpful of these, on whom I depended for guidance and encouragement, were Prof J Buitendag and Prof C Wethmar. The Faculty of Theology has done much to ensure that I obtain bursaries and scholarship assistance for the entire period of my studies at the university. The library assistants at the university were always helpful during my research and I appreciate them for that.

To several people in Youth for Christ International: Dr Ajith Fernando (Sri Lanka), who is my mentor and source of inspiration, Don Osman (Sierra Leone), Emmanuel Chijindu (Nigeria), Joseph Aryee (Ghana), and David Kadalie (South Africa) who are my colleagues in Youth for Christ International/Africa and have been comrades in arms with me. They have allowed me the opportunity to undertake these studies by always understanding when I was behind with my normal job deadlines. To the former Training Director of Youth for Christ South Africa, Geoff Rutter who brought me into the ministry three decades ago.

I am especially grateful to the late Reverends B S Mookapilo and P Moletsane of Assemblies of God in South Africa who encouraged, mentored and nurtured me in the formative years of my spiritual development and growth.



ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this research is to explore and analyze the ecclesiology of the emerging charismatic or apostolic churches with a special reference to their church polity based on the fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4:11. The survey of the traditional church government is done as a basis and directional guide for church government and polity.

Since the Classical Pentecostals and Charismatics form a sizeable part of evangelical Christianity, their ecclesiology is explored and it is discovered that this is generally not formulated into certain cohesion. This mainstream evangelical Christianity does not formulate dogma, but adds pneumatological dynamism to their faith. However, the ecclesiastical understanding of the emerging apostolic movement is endeavored as a way of trying to understand the premise of ecclesiological understanding.

There is a historical survey of the fivefold ministry since the dawn of the twentieth century, especially starting with the Latter Rain Movement. As in all researches of this kind, the marks of this phenomenon are identified and the different terms used to refer to it explored. These marks are highlighted in view of their theological and hermeneutical approaches to doctrinal conclusions.

The rationale behind the movement's fivefold ministry hangs on the doctrine of restoration, whereby the church is believed to be prepared in the last days for a great eschatological realization, and that to accomplish this, the restoration of church government structure based on the fivefold ministers is to be applied. It is believed that the church can only fulfill its mission here on earth when it operates under the guidance of apostolic structure as laid out in Ephesians 4:11.

The research argues the theological bases and the roots of the fivefold ministry and compares this with the current scenarios found among the apostolic churches. This is examined in regard to the leadership in the early church, the principles of ecclesiality and contextuality, phenomenology, *Realpolitik* and *vox populi*. The argument is enhanced by



the fact that the Charismatic theology lacks cohesion and synergy because of the lack of *catechesis* and apostolic *paradosis*.

The Ephesians 4:1-16 exegeses acts as a precursor to understanding the fivefold ministry and the *charismata* in the church as supported by history and the application of *domata* that the fivefold ministry was intended for *ecclesia's* growth, life and nourishment. The *domata* of Eph 4:11 were intended for maturity, not for the government of the church.

The climax of the research endeavours to answer the hypothesis if the fivefold ministry can be a theologically legitimate application for church government. The apostolic churches are reviewed and their distinctive characteristics surveyed. The fivefold ministry is critically discussed and the arguments against it for church government brought forth. These arguments are evaluated by comparing them with the contemporary participative ecclesiologies.

Some further valuable deductions can be made from research:

1. There is disparity and lack of synergy regarding the fivefold ministry among the Charismatics.
2. Ephesians 4 passage cannot be used to justify the church government structure based on the fivefold ministry.
3. The *ecclesia* is a charismatic fellowship.
4. The church needs structure for the sake of order and effectiveness in the world.
5. Most of the fivefold ministry promoters are not scholarly or theologically elite.

A few constraints have been encountered which have a limiting effect on the research. The research highlights a number of important areas which can be further researched.



CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION

1.1.	INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
1.2.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM	2
1.3.	BACKGROUND AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	2
1.4.	STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION	4
1.5.	DEFINITION OF TERMS AND CONCEPTS	4
1.5.1.	The church government	4
1.5.2.	The church polity	5
1.5.3.	Evangelical Christianity	5
1.5.4.	The fivefold ministry	5
1.5.5.	Ecumenism	5
1.5.6.	The New Apostolic Reformation	5
1.5.7.	The Charismatic Movement	5
1.5.8.	The classical Pentecostalism	5
1.5.9.	<i>Realpolitik</i>	6
1.5.10.	<i>Vox populi</i>	6
1.6.	ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY	6
1.6.1.	Church orders for the sake of order and effectiveness in the world	6
1.6.2.	Need for theological clarification for acceptable polity	6
1.6.3.	Limited resources on the subject	6
1.6.4.	Limited scope	7
1.7.	RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS	7
1.8.	DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	7
1.8.1.	The evangelical review is narrowed down	8
1.8.2.	Survey of major church government systems	8
1.8.3.	Research focuses on Fivefold ministry within Charismatic groups	8
1.9.	RESEARCH DESIGN	8
1.9.1.	Literature study	8
1.9.1.1.	Theological understanding of church government and Fivefold	



Ministry	8
1.9.1.2. Historical development of ecclesiastical governance	8
1.9.1.3. Evaluation of different understandings of church polity	8
1.9.2. Development of a model and guidelines	8
1.10. CHAPTERS OUTLINE	9
CHAPTER 2	
EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT	
2.1. INTRODUCTION	11
2.2. EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY	11
2.2.1. The evangelical definition	11
2.2.2. The evangelical dogma	12
2.2.3. The evangelical identification	14
2.2.3.1. New evangelicals	14
2.2.3.2. Fundamentalists	14
2.2.3.3. Confessionals	14
2.2.3.4. Charismatic Movement	14
2.2.3.5. Radicals	14
2.2.3.6. Ecumenical evangelicals	15
2.2.3.7. Black evangelicals	15
2.2.3.8. Pentecostals	15
2.3. EVANGELICAL ECCLESIOLOGY	16
2.3.1. Definition	16
2.3.2. Distinctives	17
2.4. THE COMMON PROTESTANT POLITIES	18
2.4.1. The Episcopal Church Structure	18
2.4.1.1. Definition	18
2.4.1.2. The mainstreams within the episcopacy	20
2.4.1.2.1. The monarchical episcopacy	20
2.4.1.2.2. The managerial episcopacy	20
2.4.1.2.3. The pastoral episcopacy	20
2.4.2. The Presbyterian Structure	21
2.4.2.1. Definition	21
2.4.2.1.1. The Representative Eldership	23
2.4.2.1.2. Leadership by appointment and seniority	25
2.4.2.1.3. Leadership by discernment	24
2.4.2.2. The Presbyterian <i>editio princeps</i>	26
2.4.2.3. Summary	28



2.4.3.	The Congregational Structure	29
2.4.3.1.	Definition	29
2.4.3.2.	The connective congregationalism	30
2.4.3.3.	The associational congregationalism	31
2.5.	THE PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC ECCLESIOLOGY	32
2.5.1.	Introduction	32
2.5.2.	Ecclesiastical definitions	33
2.5.2.1.	Koinonia	33
2.5.2.2.	The people of God	34
2.5.2.3.	The kingdom of God	34
2.5.2.4.	The covenant community	35
2.5.3.	Charismatic ecclesiology: A debatable issue	36
2.6.	THE EMERGING APOSTOLIC MOVEMENT: THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH	37
2.6.1.	Definition and biblical base	37
2.6.2.	The marks of the apostolic churches	37
2.6.2.1.	Donald Miller (Vineyard, Calvary Chapel, Hope Chapel)	37
2.6.2.2.	George G Hunter III	38
2.6.2.3.	Elmer L Towns	38
2.6.2.4.	Peter Wagner	39
2.6.3.	Historical and theological bases	39
2.6.4.	Views and church government and polity	41
2.6.4.1.	Restoration of church government through fivefold ministry offices	41
2.6.4.2.	Structure insufficient to produce spirituality and God's mission	41
	Table 2.1. Some of the well-known fivefold churches	42
2.6.5.	Reasons for fivefold ministry	42
	Table 2.2. The well-known preachers of the fivefold doctrine	43
2.6.6.	Summary	44
CHAPTER 3		
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY		
3.1.	INTRODUCTION	45
3.2.	THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING ON GIFTS	45
3.2.1.	From the apostolic age to the first few centuries of the church age	46



3.2.2.	From the Middle Ages	46
3.2.3.	The Reformation Period	47
3.2.4.	The Twentieth Century	48
3.3.	THE LATTER RAIN MOVEMENT	49
3.3.1.	The historical background	49
3.3.2.	The historical figures associated with the movement	50
3.3.3.	The reaction received	51
3.4.	THE SHEPHERDING MOVEMENT	52
3.4.1.	The leading historical figures	52
3.4.1.1.	Don Bashan	52
3.4.1.2.	Ern Baxter	52
3.4.1.3.	Bob Mumford	53
3.4.1.4.	Derek Prince	53
3.4.1.5.	Charles Simpson	54
3.4.2.	Their unique contribution	54
3.4.2.1.	Inadequate church structure that enhances community	54
3.4.2.2.	Relational base for pastoral care and discipleship	55
3.4.2.3.	Non-professional leadership and non-traditional leadership training	55
3.4.2.4.	Relational organic nature of the church	55
3.4.2.5.	Authority based on fivefold ministry	55
3.5.	THE POSITIVE CONFESSION MOVEMENT	56
3.5.1.	The historical background	56
3.5.2.	The prominent promoters	57
3.5.2.1.	Kenneth Hagin	57
3.5.2.2.	Kenneth Copeland	58
3.5.3.	Their contribution to the fivefold ministry	58
3.6.	THE “THIRD WAVE” CHURCHES	58
3.6.1.	The ecclesiastical practices of the “Third Wave” Churches	59
3.6.1.1.	Apostolic government	59
3.6.1.2.	Making new disciples	60
3.6.1.3.	Raising new leaders	60
3.6.1.4.	Planting new churches	61
3.6.1.5.	Pioneering new territories	62
3.6.1.6.	Unity in the body of Christ	62
3.6.1.7.	Power and miracles	63
3.6.1.8.	Workplace apostles (Public apostles)	64
3.6.1.9.	Territorial vision	65



3.6.1.10. Equipping paradigms	65
3.6.1.11. Holiness doctrine	67
3.6.1.12. The apostolic networks	68
3.6.12.1. Autonomous	69
3.6.12.2. Voluntarily	69
3.6.12.3. Relationships	70
3.6.12.4. Interdependency	70
3.6.12.5. Apostolic oversight	70
3.7. THE NEW APOSTOLIC REFORMATION (NAR)	72
3.7.1. Its origin	72
3.7.2. Names and designations	73
3.7.2.1. Postmodern churches	73
3.7.2.2. Independent churches	73
3.7.2.3. Charismatic churches	73
3.7.2.4. Restoration churches	74
3.7.2.5. Grassroots churches	74
3.7.2.6. Neo-denominational churches	74
3.7.2.7. New-paradigm churches	74
3.7.2.8. The Next church	74
3.7.2.9. The Emerging Apostolic Movement	75
3.7.2.10. The New Apostolic Churches	75
3.7.2.11. The New Apostolic Reformation	75
3.7.3. Its polity and church government	75
3.7.4. Its view of the fivefold ministry	76
Table 3.1. Men alive in 1990 representing forty years of renewal	77
3.8. SUMMARY	78
CHAPTER 4	
THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS ON FIVEFOLD MINISTRY	
4.1. INTRODUCTION	79
4.2. NEW APOSTOLIC REFORMATION’S FIVEFOLD MINISTRY	79
4.3. THE THEOLOGICAL ROOTS OF FIVEFOLD MINISTRY	80
4.3.1. It is all about restoration	80
4.3.2. The fivefold ministry “Hand Illustration”	84
4.3.2.1. The thumb: Apostle	85
4.3.2.2. The index finger: Prophet	85



4.3.2.3.	The middle finger: Evangelist	85
4.3.2.4.	The ring finger: Pastor	86
4.3.2.5.	The little finger: Teacher	86
4.3.3.	The allegorical interpretation of Scriptures	87
4.3.4.	The influence of fundamentalism	90
4.3.4.1.	Biblical infallibility	90
4.3.4.2.	The virgin birth of Christ	91
4.3.4.3.	Christ's substitutionary atonement	91
4.3.4.4.	Christ's physical resurrection	91
4.3.4.5.	Christ's imminent, visible, and personal second coming	91
4.3.5.	The New Testament church leadership as a precursor	94
4.3.5.1.	The charismatic leadership attitude	94
4.3.5.2.	Leadership in the early church	94
4.3.5.3.	Two principles in the early church	96
4.3.5.4.	Ecclesiality and contextuality demonstrates organization	98
4.3.6.	Lack of synergy and cohesion	102
4.3.6.1.	The ecclesiastical and theological background of the founders/leaders	102
	Table 4.1. The historical development of Pentecostal Systematic Theology	104
4.3.6.2.	The charismatic training schools curriculum limitation	107
4.3.6.3.	The lack of theological academia	112
4.3.7.	The charismatic dogma is undeveloped	112
4.3.8.	Phenomenology in charismatic studies	116
4.3.9.	Realpolitik and Vox populi influence charismatic ecclesiology	116
4.3.9.1.	Realpolitik (Power politics)	117
4.3.9.2.	Vox populi (the voice of the people is a form of Realpolitik)	118
4.3.10.	The lack of catechesis	121
4.4.	THE BIBLICAL SURVEY ON CHARISMATA	124
4.5.	THE CHARISMATA: TRADITIONAL, REFORMED AND CHARISMATIC UNDERSTANDING	124
4.5.1.	The traditional understanding of charismata	126
4.5.2.	The reformed understanding of charismata	128
4.5.3.	The charismatic understanding of charismata	128
4.6.	THE PROBLEMS CITED IN RELATION TO CHARISMATA	128
4.6.1.	Disagreement	129



4.6.2.	Neglect	130
4.6.3.	Confusion	130
	Table 4.1. Distinctions of gifts and fruit	131
4.6.4.	Abuse	131
4.7.	CONCLUSION	135
CHAPTER 5		
EPHESIANS 4:1-16 EXEGESES: PRECURSOR TO UNDERSTANDING THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY AND CHARISMATA IN THE CHURCH		
5.1.	INTRODUCTION	136
5.2.	AUTHORSHIP	136
5.3.	LANGUAGE AND STYLE	139
5.4.	THE SETTING	141
5.5.	THE PANORAMIC VIEW OF EPHESIANS 4:1-16	142
5.6.	BROADER UNDERSTANDING OF THE EPHESIANS PASSAGE	143
5.6.1.	Four parts	144
5.6.2.	Two parts	145
5.7.	TWO PRINCIPLES OF TRUTH	145
5.8.	POSSIBLE DIFFERENCES OF INTERPRETATION OF EPHESIANS 4:11	146
5.8.1.	Gifts, but not leaders to the church	146
5.8.2.	Leadership gifts are for the universal church	146
5.8.3.	The King James Version phraseology	146
5.9.	THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINES IN EPHESIANS 4:1-16	147
5.9.1.	Christian ethics	147
5.9.2.	Theology proper – The premise of apostolic argument	150
5.9.2.1.	The <i>unitas singularitatis</i>	151
5.9.2.2.	The <i>unitas simplicitatis</i>	152
5.9.3.	Revelation – The context of apostolic argument	153
5.9.4.	Christology – The basis of apostolic argument	154
5.9.5.	Pneumatology – The inspiration for apostolic argument	157



5.9.6.	Ecclesiology – The focus of apostolic argument	158
5.9.7.	Gifts – The content of apostolic argument	163
5.10.	THE TWO ECCLESIASTICAL EXEGESIS OF EPHESIANS 4:11 – REFORMED AND CHARISMATIC	165
5.10.1.	Reformed Tradition	165
5.10.1.1.	He gave some to be apostles	167
5.10.1.2.	He gave some to be prophets	173
5.10.1.3.	He gave some to be evangelists	177
5.10.1.4.	He gave some to be pastors	180
5.10.1.5.	He gave some to be teachers	184
5.10.2.	Pentecostal/Charismatic Approach	186
5.10.2.1.	The apostles	187
5.10.2.2.	The prophets	190
5.10.2.3.	The evangelists	192
5.10.2.4.	The pastors	194
5.10.2.5.	The teachers	196
5.11.	THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS: THE NEW APOSTOLIC REFORMATION	197
5.12.	ARGUMENTS AGAINST FIVEFOLD MINISTRY FOR CHURCH GOVERNMENT	202
5.12.1.	The timing of the letter of Ephesians	202
5.12.2.	The wording of the Ephesians 4:11-13 passage	203
5.12.2.1.	The equipment of the saints	203
5.12.2.2.	The servant work	204
5.12.2.3.	The construction of the body of Christ	205
5.12.3.	The nature of the church at Ephesus	206
5.12.3.1.	The <i>ecclesia</i> is a <i>mysterion</i>	206
5.12.3.2.	The <i>ecclesia</i> is an organism and organization	207
5.12.3.3.	The Ephesians church received apostolic <i>paradosis</i>	208
5.12.3.4.	The Ephesians church needed to be a <i>charismatic</i> fellowship	208
5.12.3.5.	The Ephesians church was expected to be a self-developing community	209
5.13.	CONCLUSION	211
CHAPTER 6		
THE CONTEMPORARY ECCLESIOLOGY CONTRADICTS THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY FOR CHURCH GOVERNMENT		
6.1.	INTRODUCTION	214



6.2.	THE ECCLESIOLOGY OF CHURCH LEADERSHIP	214
6.2.1.	Communion ecclesiology (John Zizioulas)	214
6.2.2.	Charismatic ecclesiology (Hans Kung)	216
6.2.3.	Universal ecclesiology (Wolfhart Pannenberg)	218
6.2.4.	Messianic ecclesiology (Jürgen Moltmann)	220
6.2.5.	Participatory ecclesiology (Miroslav Volf)	222

6.3.	CONCLUSION	223
------	------------	-----

CHAPTER 7

CONSTRAINTS, DEDUCTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1.	INTRODUCTION	225
7.2.	AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH	226
7.3.	CONSTRAINTS OF THE RESEARCH	227
7.3.1.	The extent of the research	227
7.3.1.1.	Subjectivity is inevitable	227
7.3.1.2.	Assessment of available literature	228
7.3.1.3.	The limitation of terminology	228
7.3.2.	The newness of the concept of fivefold ministry	228
7.4.	DEDUCTIONS MADE FROM THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH	228
7.4.1.	Disparity and lack of synergy	229
7.4.2.	Eph 4 passage cannot be applied to church structure	229
7.4.3.	The ecclesia is a charismatic fellowship	229
7.4.4.	Church structure is needed for order and effectiveness	230
7.4.5.	Fivefold ministers not scholarly or theologically elite	230
7.5.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT BASED ON FIVEFOLD MINISTRY	230
7.5.1.	Concise definition and the marks of the emerging apostolic churches	231
7.5.2.	Formulation of theologically acceptable church government and polity	231
7.5.3.	The ecclesiality of the emerging apostolic churches	231
7.5.4.	The synergy between apostolic networks and ecumenism	231
7.5.5.	Hierarchical leadership as opposed to contemporary participative ecclesiologies	232
7.5.6.	The African monarchical influence on the emerging apostolic	



	movement	232
7.5.7.	Critical analysis of ecclesiology of C Peter Wagner in relation to NAR	232
7.5.8.	The classical Pentecostal stance on the fivefold ministry with special reference to Assembly of God	232
7.5.9.	The emerging apostolic churches and theological training	233
7.5.10.	Critical reflection on the doctrine of holiness and its influence on the emerging Apostolic churches	233
7.6.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	233
	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INTERNET REFERENCES	235



CHAPTER 1: ORIENTATION

1.1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Researchers within the Systematic Theology, Biblical Studies, Church History, and Practical Theology have sought to identify the relevant church polity. The theological institutions of higher education do not say much about church polity. The volumes of Systematic Theology, especially those specialising with ecclesiastical studies mention church polity briefly and in passing. What one comes across on the subject is mainly booklets, periodical articles or one short chapter in a book. The fact of the matter is that the advocates of church polity had been delinquent in adequately articulating this subject. Thus this study is aimed primarily at church leaders that are caught up in the confusion and misunderstanding of the biblical church government. The purpose is to define as accurately as possible from Scriptures, Historical accounts, and Theological Traditions, what church polity is all about, with special reference to the fivefold ministry.

The twentieth century ecumenism has necessitated the introspection of how the church is to be governed. The ecumenical ideals and cooperation call for agreement upon the seat of authority. In its final analysis, a question of where authority resides within the church and who is to exercise it is inevitable.

The critics of the church are insistent on the fact that the institutional structure quenches the flow of the Spirit. It is theologically agreed that the task of the church here on earth is both ethical and missional. It is ethical because it exists to inform the moral sensibilities in the decadent societies. By so doing, it claims back the respect and enhances the integrity of life in these societies. It is expected to become the “academy of justice in the very crucible of culture creation” (Stackhouse et al 2000:37). It is missional because it was brought into being by Christ to fulfil His intention for it. It is to carry out His ministry in the world. It is here to perpetuate His deeds as if He had been here Himself. The Church is involved in the spiritual task of worshipping God, nurturing the people of God, and above all, to bear witness to the world through mission.



1.2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to investigate the church polity based on fivefold ministry in terms of its evangelical character. With an emphasis on church government, there is the important role of church officers such as pastors, elders, and deacons. The concept under the scrutiny in this research is the fivefold ministry as practised by some independent Charismatic and Pentecostal churches.

Church History bears witness that Protestants reacted vehemently to Roman Catholic's universal structure. Unfortunately among the Protestants there are extremists who stress the freedom at the expense of order and decency in church discipline and life. This research seeks to provide a clearer picture of what is occurring in some independent Charismatic and Pentecostal churches and how the development has gone far to embrace the fivefold ministry as an alternative.

1.3. BACKGROUND AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The desire to assist ministers of the Gospel to adjust and learn the theological truth is at the heart of most dogmatic teaching regardless of flaws that can be detected. One significant means of leading a healthy church is the implementation of God-ordained structure. While the secular world (businesses, hospitals, schools etc) are implementing programmes to encourage job satisfaction, the post-modern church leaders are left on their own to see what works for them in their own situations. The effort to properly prepare these servants of God theologically is minimal.

Part of the problem lies in the fact that virtually less research has been done to examine how the Biblical church structure can be applied in our post-modern society. There has been very limited research on church leadership satisfaction in this demanding task of leading God's flock. This study is done to increase the information in this area with the hope to better understand the meaning, the function, and the role of officers in church government.



This research correctly finds itself within Systematic Theology since it is part of ecclesiology, which is a classical topic in Dogmatics. The magisterial epistle to the Hebrews concludes with the exhortation, “Obey your leaders and submit to their authority. They keep watch over you as men who must give an account. Obey them so that their work will be a joy, not a burden, for that would be of no advantage to you” (13:17). Calvin’s Book Four of the *Institutes of the Christian Religion* sets out his plan of instruction, beginning with the church, its government, orders, and powers. This demonstrates the importance of the church and its government within the theological studies of the church. The church polity is determined by one’s understanding of the church. The fivefold ministry as practised by the independent charismatic churches reflects their understanding of ecclesiastical practices. As part of Systematic Theology, church polity and discipline inevitably evolved through the ages. As part of ecclesiology, church government can be located within Church History that has been evolving since time immemorial. However, as part of ecclesiology, polity cannot solely be a historical phenomenon. It is more than that since it is a way the institution is structured. It cannot find itself within Practical Theology discipline since it has the *canonical* roots and has been part of the *apostolic paradosis* and *catechesis*.

A particular important time to study church government is in its Biblical and historical development of the church. There is a proliferation and diversity in the ecclesiastical circles, and many structures emerge all the time. Macquarie (1971:343) correctly asserts: “they may have to be differently weighed in different historical situations, but each must receive some weight if the Church is to have both the stability and the dynamism necessary to her health.” These structures inevitably form some values and attitudes. Consequently, they call for dogmatic research and theological scrutiny. Research demonstrates that examining church polity, can aid both the individual and the church to function more effectively.

During the course of this study one will try to find answers on theological reflections and analysis of 1) the church government models in different ecclesiastical traditions, 2) the exegesis of Ephesians 4 passage, 3) the evaluation of the so-called fivefold ministries in



the church, 4) the evangelical critique of the local church government based on the fivefold ministry, 5) the church polity and the pneumatic community of believers. Basically, there are two questions that this research would like to answer: 1) what kind of leadership actually exists in the church of today? 2) What kind of leadership structures can be found in the New Testament and in the early church?

Historically and theologically, there have been three basic types of church government. The Episcopal type is the government by three different orders of ministers: bishops, priests, and deacons. The centre is on the bishop or overseer. The Presbyterian is the government by presbyters or elders. It provides for different strata of government: the session, the presbytery, the synod, and the general assembly. The order in the ministry has been pastors, elders, and deacons. Pastors and elders participate in the meetings of the presbytery, synod, and general assembly. The congregational type of church government vests all legislative authority in the local church. The district and general organizational structures are merely advisory with the purpose of cooperation in mission and education work of the church. Each of these has the Scriptural texts to legitimise their authenticity.

1.4. STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4 passage practised in some independent Charismatic and Pentecostal churches is not a theologically legitimate church polity to be accepted by the twenty-first century church.

1.5. DEFINITION OF TERMS AND CONCEPTS

1.5.1. The **Church Government** is the structure or the organisation of the church, which best facilitates the carrying out of the ecclesiastical mandate in the world.

1.5.2. The **Church Polity** is the organised life of the church. It reflects the reigning theological consensus concerning such things as the nature of the church, the source of



authority, the reality of sin, the prospect of salvation, and the content of hope. Polity is a theological reflection on the life of the church.

1.5.3. **Evangelical** refers to the broad base of Christians who uphold and confess the orthodox Christian doctrines as they are embedded in the Apostles' Creed. It is the belief that holds to the traditional creeds of the church and a personal commitment to Jesus Christ in the life of the individual where He comes to reign as Lord and King.

1.5.4. The **Fivefold Ministry** is the church government concept based on Ephesians 4:11, made up of apostles, prophets, pastors, evangelists, and teachers.

1.5.5. **Ecumenism** is a universal definition of the church's visible unity here on earth.

1.5.6. The **New Apostolic Reformation** is a term that was coined by C Peter Wagner in 1998 and 1999 to refer to the emerging church government and leadership paradigm among certain growing congregations and church movements. It is a revival movement whereby God is restoring the fivefold ministry to govern the church and take it back to the former glory where the apostles and the prophets are the key role players in determining the vision and direction of church life.

1.5.7. The **Charismatic Movement** is the section of the church that came into being at the dawn of the 1960s. In its original usage, the term "charismatic movement" refers to the practice of spiritual gifts and the baptism in the Spirit in the mainline churches since the Pentecostal Movement in its classical form already existed as separate and in various denominations.

1.5.8. The **Classical Pentecostals** refers to the mainline denominations of this stream that was born out of Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles around 1907. The known family churches of this tradition in South Africa are the Assemblies of God, Apostolic Faith Mission, and the Full Gospel Church of God.



1.5.9. **Realpolitik**, simply known as power politics is when self-interests are prioritized over the interests of others especially over those who may be regarded as subordinates or subjects. Due to its inherent manipulative nature, it undermines the essential nature of revelation.

1.5.10. **Vox populi**, or voices of the masses is the concept whereby people's ideas or ideologies play major roles in decision-making processes. It endeavours to establish some sacred alliances of relative values that form the basis of laws, therefore rewards those who support the common ideals and punishes those who oppose them. It shuns the absolute demands of revelation by softening the radical nature of faith in favour of popular expectations.

1.6. ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The assumptions of this study are as follows:

1.6.1. Given the nature of a church with an emphasis on government and polity, it is assumed that the related concepts of church structures do occur among Christian churches for the sake of order and effectiveness in the world.

1.6.2. Given the nature of diversity and proliferation of church polities and that each claims theological legitimacy; there is a strong need for theological clarification for the church polity that is acceptable in the twenty-first century.

1.6.3. Given the nature of limited resources on this subject, it is understood that the research findings will be broad in order to accommodate all notions regarding church government. It is nevertheless, assumed that the research findings can be applied to churches that still disregard the issues of governance and organisation.



1.6.4. An extensive research will be undertaken into the aspect of church governance based on fivefold ministry. This probably limits the scope of the research, because it is not possible to locate the research in a broader context and to review it as such. The availability of such research results will enable comparisons therefore leading to better assessment of the results of the research.

1.7. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Church polity is a wide field and calls for extensive research. Proliferation and diversity within this ecclesiastical concern is complex. The fivefold ministry is a new ecclesiological challenge that needs attention. This research focuses on the history, operation and the praxis of the fivefold ministry confined to some independent Charismatic and Pentecostal groups. *Research demonstrates that examining church polity, through the evangelical lenses, can aid both the individual and the church to function more effectively.*

The point of departure is that the charismatic view of *charismata* is intertwined with ecclesiastical understanding of the church as fellowship. The dynamic of the fellowship is lived out through the *charismata*. The struggle still continues within the charismatic constructs for the balance between charism and institution. However, since the underlying message of Charismatic Movement is *restoration*, “they believe that as the church is restored, she will be brought to a higher level of supernatural performance” (Moriarty 1992:100). In other words, the church *restored* is the church *charismatized*. The gifts must be functioning in the church in order to bring its spiritual growth and health. The *charismata* are for both personal holiness and effective witnessing for Christ.

1.8. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The following limiting factors are determined for this study:



1.8.1. The “evangelical” review is a broad concept that needs to be narrowed down. There are four groups that form the bulk of this brand of the Christian faith. These are the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians (Reformed), the Congregationalists, and the Fivefold Ministry Movement found among some Pentecostal and Charismatic groups.

1.8.2. The major church government systems will be surveyed by giving their main beliefs in such a way that one specific system, (Fivefold Ministry) will be chosen and researched.

1.8.3. The apex of this study is to give a critical reflection on the fivefold ministry church government as reflected in the emerging apostolic churches.

1.9. RESEARCH METHOD

This study is descriptive in approach, guided by theoretical notions with evaluative elements. A review of relevant literature will be undertaken, which should lead to the clarification and defining of different concepts employed in this field of study

1.9.1. Literature Study: This will be undertaken for the purpose of: -

1.9.1.1. Assisting in determining the theological understanding of church government and polity with a special reference to the fivefold ministry practised in some Charismatic and Pentecostal groups.

1.9.1.2. Assessing the historical development and the criteria used in understanding the different polities in ecclesiastical governance.

1.9.1.3. Evaluating the different ecclesiastical understandings of church polity

1.9.2. Development of a model and guidelines: Research will be undertaken on the rationale behind the fivefold ministry as a theologically unsound option for church



government. Criteria will be developed to formulate theological basis for the rejection of this model. These criteria will form the basis for the formulation of guidelines on understanding the fivefold ministry structure for church's self-development, not for church government.

1.10. CHAPTERS OUTLINE

Chapter 1 is an orientation or a general view and an introduction to the research.

In Chapter 2, a review of the evangelical church government provides a more extensive description of the major constructs included in this study. Facts such as the identification of evangelical Christianity, its categories, its historical development, and its beliefs (essentials) are undertaken. An overview is given of church government and the different shapes it takes in different *ecclesiastical* traditions. Some background information on church polity is given, with special emphasis on the three major polities (Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Congregational). A brief analysis is undertaken of what these polities believe. The chapter continues with endeavours to define the Pentecostal/ Charismatic, its dogma, and identification that leads to the description of its ecclesiology. This serves as bedrock or premise from which the common polities will be surveyed and the definition of Pentecostal and Charismatic ecclesiologies attempted. The chapter concludes with the identification and definition of the emerging apostolic movement with a special reference to the fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4:11. The rationale behind the fivefold ministry will be researched. Some definitions for the study are provided. A review of the literature is given.

Chapter 3 presents the historical development of the teaching on *charismata*, and the fivefold ministry as promoted by some movements that arose within the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements since the middle of the twentieth century. Special historical references are made to the Latter Rain Movement, The Shepherding Movement, The Positive Confession Movement, The "Third Wave" Churches, and finally the New



Apostolic Reformation, which is the focus of this research. Each movement is discussed in such a way that its contribution to the development of fivefold ministry is highlighted. Chapter 4 elaborates on the critical theological reflections on the fivefold ministry. The theological roots as promoted by the emerging apostolic churches are examined and the reasons for taking that route are also scrutinized. For instance, it is alleged that the hermeneutical conclusions on the fivefold ministry are based on the allegorical interpretation, the influence of fundamentalism, the role by the New Testament church leadership, the lack of synergy and cohesion, and *Realpolitik* and *vox populi*. The chapter continues to explore the Reformed and Charismatic understanding of charismata and concludes by citing the problems related to *charismata* in general...

Chapter 5 is the exegesis of Ephesians 4:1-16, as a precursor to understanding the fivefold ministry as *domata* in the church. The chapter gives the panoramic view of the Ephesians passage and the Ephesians church in general. The biblical doctrines in the passage are explored and the ecclesiastical exegesis (Reformed and Charismatic) are critically evaluated. The theological reflection is made from the vantage point of the Emerging Apostolic Churches and this is crowned by the theological definition of *domata* (fivefold ministry). The argument against the fivefold ministry as ideal for church government is the climax of the chapter.

Chapter 6 is a critical ecclesiological discovery that the fivefold ministry cannot be theologically justified for church government. The arguments are set forth to dismiss the fivefold ministry as a proper construct for church government by contradicting it with the contemporary ecclesiologies.

Chapter 7 summarises the research by highlighting the constraints, deductions, and the recommendations for further researches related to this study.



CHAPTER 2: EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT

2.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter investigates the *genesis* of church polity within Evangelical tradition. It is observed that the teaching on discipline, the offices of the church, and the effort to institute an autonomous ecclesiastical discipline, have been *foci* of interest and controversy within the evangelical Christianity. This chapter reviews a brief survey of the *evangelical* Christianity and the *evangelical ecclesiology* including church structures as to their theoretical bases, popular practices, and the latest research findings. There will be identification of the *Pentecostal/Charismatic ecclesiology* with special reference to the emerging apostolic churches, its categories, historical development, and authority. Church officers' role within Evangelical ecclesiology is presented as the context for this research study. The review concludes with a description of the *fivefold ministry* as encountered in the apostolic church movement today.

2.2. EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY

2.2.1. The Evangelical Definition

Evangelical Christianity is the stream within the Protestant faith that holds on to the orthodox doctrines of Christian faith. John Webster (2001:191) gives the unbiased definition of this as a theology “which is evoked, governed and judged by the gospel. In this sense, evangelical is simply equivalent to Christian; all Christian theology, whatever its tradition, is properly speaking evangelical in that it is determined by and responsible to the good news of Jesus Christ.” It is therefore, a Christian faith with strong conviction that *Iesus Hominum Salvator* – Jesus is the Saviour of humanity. The primacy of its agenda is that evangelism is to be expedited with a strong sense of urgency, since salvation, which is the supernatural act of God the Holy Spirit is the mandate given by Christ to the Church for the whole world.



The attempt is made to sketch the definition and the historical identity of the three major views of polity among the evangelicals. The evangelicals are historically divided into three groups. They emerged as a result of eighteenth century revival. The first group is the Methodists who came out of the Church of England after John Wesley's death. The second group is the Calvinists out of George Whitefield and the Countess of Huntingdon. The third group is the Evangelical Anglicans closely associated with Samuel Walker of Truro, Henry Venn of Huddersfield and John Newton of Olney. The later groups to join the movement include the Pentecostals and the Charismatics. The scope of this research is to concentrate on the modern-day Charismatic ecclesiological governance of the latter group.

2.2.2. The Evangelical Dogma

The evangelicals' dogma is summarised in the belief of the sinfulness of man, the atoning death of Christ, the unmerited grace of God, and the salvation of the true believer. Millard J Erickson (1993:13) refers to Evangelicals as

Those who believe that all humans are in need of salvation and that this salvation involves regeneration by a supernatural work of God. Based upon his grace, this divine act is received solely by repentance and faith in the atoning work of Jesus Christ. Further, evangelicals urgently and actively seek the conversion of all persons worldwide to this faith. They regard the canonical Scriptures as the supreme authority in matters of faith and practice.

The same sentiment is expressed by the former president of the National Association of Evangelicals in USA, Ted Haggard, that an evangelical is “a person who believes Jesus Christ is the Son of God, that the Bible is the Word of God, and that you must be born again... Evangelicalism is a continuum of theologies all the way from Benny Hinn to R C Sproul. The R C Sproul crowd has a hard time with Benny Hinn, and the Benny Hinn crowd has a hard time with R C Sproul. But they're all evangelicals” (Christianity Today,



November 2005 pp 42). However, it is to be recognised that “Evangelicals were not so much interested in polity and doctrine as in the practical expression of Christianity in a redeemed life of piety that gained its inspiration from Bible study and prayer” (Cairns 1978:432).

Evangelical faith is not a recent innovation. It is not a new brand of Christianity in the process of invention. In the words of English preacher and author, John Stott, evangelical faith “is original, apostolic, New Testament Christianity” (1999:14). It is an attempt of going back to the beginning and the recovery of the authentic, original gospel. It is not a new teaching, but the establishment of old things that were taught by the apostles and the godly teachers of the early centuries of the church. The evangelical faith is not a deviation from Christian orthodoxy. John Stott (1999:15) continues to shed light that

evangelical came into widespread use only in the early eighteenth century, in relation to the so-called Evangelical Revival associated with John Wesley and George Whitefield. But in the seventeenth century it had been applied both to the Puritans in England and to the Pietists in Germany, and in the sixteenth century to the Reformers. They called themselves *evangelici*, short for *evangelici viri*, ‘*evangelical men*,’ a designation which Luther adopted as *die Evangelischen*.

Stott’s (1994:15-18) evangelical defence continues to convey that proto- evangelicals include figures such as John Wycliffe- the Morning Star of the Reformation who was called *doctor evangelicus*; and the great church father Augustine who promoted the ideas of back to the basics of the New Testament in reference to ‘*euangello*’ from which evangelical Christians derive their name. All these attributed ultimate authority to Scripture and salvation to Christ crucified alone and that the divine grace is the only remedy for human guilt. The epitome of this notion is captured by the British evangelical preacher, Clive Calver (1996:26) in support of R T France and A E McGrath that



The distinguishing features of evangelicals have always included an insistence on four priorities:

- The supreme authority of Scripture.
- The uniqueness of redemption through Christ's death.
- The need for personal conversion.
- The urgent necessity for evangelism.

2.2.3. The Evangelical Identification

The struggle for definition and identification of evangelical Christian continues. Dr Christina Maria Brenman (1996:22-33) in her published doctoral thesis on the *Association of Evangelicals in Africa*, laboriously gives at least four scholarly definitions of evangelical faith – an exercise that reflects the polarisation of this field of study. She commences by outlining Dr Peter Beyerhaus' (1975:307-308) definition who divides evangelicals into six categories:

2.2.3.1. New evangelicals, (middle position) with people such as the internationally renowned evangelist, Billy Graham. This is a group that strives to liberate itself from the clutches of the modern science and political conservatism of fundamentalism. They are ecumenical in world evangelisation.

2.2.3.2. Fundamentalists, (the right wing) who possess separatist attitudes. They have anti-ecumenical sentiments.

2.2.3.3. Confessionals, who are very church oriented and emphasise the renewal of faith that is different from that of Ecumenical Movement.

2.2.3.4. Charismatic Movement, which accentuate the pneumatological expressions within the existing churches.



2.2.3.5. Radicals, emanating from Latin America. Their focus is the socio-political engagement associated with the proclamation of salvation in Christ.

2.2.3.6. Ecumenical evangelicals found in mainline churches and voluntarily choose to take membership of World Council of Churches, though with some reservations to certain aspects of the Ecumenical Movement.

To these categories, Brenman (1996: 25) adds Waldron Scott's two other categories:

2.2.3.7. Black evangelicals, including many African Independent Churches. This includes, until recently, the Concerned Evangelicals (CE) in South Africa. They split from the Evangelical Fellowship of South Africa (EFSA) in 1985, accusing the mother body for not playing a critical role to address the apartheid ideology. It was only after the dawn of democracy that the two re-united and became The Evangelical Alliance of South Africa (TEASA).

2.2.3.8. Pentecostals, the classical group that see themselves as evangelicals. Not all these churches are in the Charismatic Renewal Movement.

The book that explores the controversial field of Anglican ecclesiology from an evangelical Anglican viewpoint; *The Olive Branch*, by Bradshaw (1992:129) admits:

It is becoming increasingly hard to pin down today precisely what the term '*evangelical*' means. It can indicate a certain zeal for the Lord; a particular attitude to the Bible; a tradition of 'low church' ritual in liturgy. In terms of 'church ministry and sacraments', however, the classical reformed heritage remains the presupposed foundation for evangelical Anglicans.



In a nutshell, evangelicalism is not something fundamentally ecclesial but a renewal movement with a distinctive ethos, an ethos uniquely compatible with free church ecclesiology

2.3. EVANGELICAL ECCLESIOLOGY

2.3.1. Definition

How does one define the evangelical ecclesiology? The definition of evangelical ecclesiology is murky and it will continue to be so. Jonathan R Wilson (2005:63) in his paper to *The Community of the Word: Toward an Evangelical Ecclesiology* conference, held in April 2004 by the Wheaton College Graduate School highlights: “To explore evangelical ecclesiology, we must turn to more popular authors, who tend to be other pastors and practitioners of church leadership, not theologians located in the academy, not even the evangelical academy.” After laborious exegesis of evangelical ecclesiologies of Francis Schaeffer, Charles Colson, Rick Warren, and Brian McLaren, Wilson (2005:70) concludes that “Both the best and worst of evangelical ecclesiology are rooted in the passionate evangelical commitment to mission.” Recently, Bruce Hindmarsh (cited in Stackhouse 2003:15-37) labelled evangelical ecclesiology as oxymoron – false truth or two ideas opposite each other. They are united in mission and friendship, but not united under one visible church order. Their unity is not sacramental. It does not reside with authorized orders, forms, or rites. The principle by which unity is discerned is evangelical piety itself. The evangelical ecclesiology is the ideal of narrative community i.e. radical congregationalism. Their ecclesial outlook is *ecclesia intra ecclesium* i.e. the small church within the mixed church. The broader evangelical ecclesiology dominating the modern thought is the interconfessional and international brotherhood.

The conference further affirmed that “evangelical ecclesiology is so frequently charged with being ‘in crisis’ or even ‘nonexistent’ that we could no longer ignore the question of what constitutes an ‘evangelical ecclesiology’ (Husbands & Treier 2005:9). This is due to criticism labelled against evangelical Christianity for the lack of scholarly debates and



production of rational matters relating to Christian faith. The critics of evangelicals attach misnomers such as right-wing zealots, religious nuts, fanatics, demagogues, hopelessly out of date, anti-intellectual, and simplistic brethren in our midst. As a result, evangelical ecclesiology experienced less pressures to devise a clear and binding polity by which the church could conduct its own affairs.

2.3.2. Distinctives

The strength of *evangelical ecclesiology* rests in its practices of *missio Dei*. The evangelical ecclesiology holds itself accountable to the gospel. For evangelicals, the church is called into being through Jesus Christ and is empowered for witness to the gospel. Evangelical ecclesiology is *missional* in character and form. The theological study field is in agreement that despite the downplay of evangelical faith, the fact remains, *fax mentis incendium gloriae*. The real passion that glorifies God is when God is known from the heart. This is *bona fides* – the real faith. Bruce Hindmarsh (Stackhouse 2003:31-37) outlines the evangelical ecclesiology as follows (summarised):

1. There is no distinctively evangelical doctrine of church order. Evangelical ecclesiology is articulated around the local fellowship of true believers and the consciousness of the universal church. The ecclesiastical constructions e.g. church orders are radically reduced to *adiaphora*.
2. The mystical church is discernible among the divided visible churches. True believers recognise in one another a mystical bond, as God's own love causes them to love one another. The religious affections are accepted as ecclesiological principle. The church is not constituted by stated ecclesiastical authority but by elective affinity of a spiritual sort.
3. The oxymoron of evangelical ecclesiology is that while celebrating the spiritual union of all the truly regenerate, the movement itself was dogged by separatism. This characterises the evangelical history. For instance, Whitefield split in the free grace controversy in 1739 over Calvinism. Wesley, Whitefield, and the Moravians split in 1740



over quietism. The Anglican evangelicals and the Nonconformist evangelicals divided over regularity. This is prevalent in evangelical movement of today – they proclaim unity, but so often they experience schism. In many circumstances, they reject visible order, but sooner or later fill the vacuum with another form of visible organisation. However, the inability to cooperate organisationally does not abort spiritual fellowship.

The above definition gives an impression that there is no clear, coherent evangelical ecclesiology. Evangelical theology lacks a clear understanding of its own identity since it is driven by a pragmatic understanding of the church and its mission. The church is seen as a pragmatic organisation to fulfil certain tasks. It is this lack of coherence that leads to proliferation when dealing with church polity and governance in the Charismatic stream of evangelical Christianity.

2.4. THE COMMON PROTESTANT POLITIES

2.4.1. The Episcopal Church Structure

2.4.1.1. Definition

The proponents of episcopalianism such as P Ton (Engle & Cowan 2004:24) attach patristic origins to this polity. This is a strong belief that this

polity is based upon that which developed in the providential guidance of God from the apostolic age through the first few centuries of the Christian church... it is both wholly in accord with apostolic teaching and takes into account the practical results of the evangelization, church planting, and teaching of the apostles, their fellow workers, and their successors

The scholars inclined to this ecclesiastical governance argue that from the second century, a *threefold* ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons was evident among the



churches. This is supported by the Letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch who was insistent that there should be one bishop in charge of each congregation. In **A Lion Handbook of the History of Christianity**, David F Wright, highlights the fact that, “by Ignatius’s time churches in Asia Minor were ruled by the three-fold ministry... This pattern became universal before the third century, though the churches of Rome and Greece had no single bishop in Ignatius’s day, nor did Alexandria until about AD 180” (1977:117).

According to Peters (2000:315), different scholars of this century are unified in the fact that Episcopal polity “is the church ministry of oversight, continuity, and unity in the church to be carried out by the bishops.” It is the institution by which bishops govern the visible church. It is in short the government of the church by bishops or overseers. Dr Paul F Zahl (in Brand & Norman 2004:225-228) agrees with Peters that within this polity there is a “*threefold Order of Ministry*.” First, there is a diaconal (presbyters in training) ministry to the world. It is when an individual is ordained (set apart) to serve the next orders of polity, which are presbytery and a bishop in their work. The presbyteral (priest in Episcopalian/Anglican polity) ministry is that of preaching, teaching and pastoral care in the local congregation. This function includes officiating at the Holy Communion and also administering the other sacrament, which is baptism.

The basic ministry of the bishop is that of oversight. Some evangelical traditions, such as the Lutherans and the United Methodists, refer to it as “superintendent.” The Catholics and Anglicans see episcopacy as guardians of unity and continuity. The other Episcopal function is to ordain presbyters and deacons; and also to perform the rite of confirmation. Dr Paul F Zahl (Brand & Norman 2004:228) captures it on the dot that “Episcopacy is thus the form of church government by which bishops represent the true catholicity, continuity, and Christianness of the Christian family. This catholicity of the church is expressed in its ministry.”

Peters (2000:314-315) alludes to the fact that the Episcopal polity sometime embraces a “*Twofold Order of Ministry*” of deacons and pastors (presbyters). The two are separated



by some special rite, where the bishop, like other pastors, is ordained to the ministry of word and sacrament, but later separated for the particular service in the office of a bishop.

2.4.1.2. The Mainstreams within the episcopacy

There are some varying emphases of episcopacy. Edward Leroy Long Jr (2001) has done some scholarly research that the governance by bishops is divided into three mainstreams. These are the monarchical, managerial, and pastoral episcopacies.

2.4.1.2.1. The *monarchical episcopacy* is where “the functions of episcopacy are carried on by persons of immense symbolic stature, who bear full responsibility for maintaining the integrity of the church as an institution” (2001:13). This is basically a Catholic episcopacy in which a single official has three official responsibilities of *protecting the faith, preserving the right doctrine, and supervising the church life within a given territory*. Erickson (1999:343) captures it sensibly that the “Roman Catholic has the most complete system of hierarchy, with authority being vested especially in the supreme pontiff, the bishop of Rome, the pope.”

2.4.1.2.2. The *managerial episcopacy* is when “the bishop uses clearly defined and officially delineated authority to see that an ecclesiastical organisation functions with maximum effectiveness” (Long 2001:13). This is the simplest form of episcopal government with one level of bishops, found within the Methodist tradition. The point of reference for Methodist polity is “**The Book of Discipline**”. The primary function of managerial episcopacy is the effective functioning of the church. The office of the bishop is functional, and involves managerial skills, rather than theological affirmations. The bishops are both the administrative and the executive heads of the church. The bishop’s leadership functions include guarding the faith, order, liturgy, doctrine, and discipline of the Church. The functions are extended to seeking and becoming the sign of the unity of the Church, supporting and supervising Church’s life, work and mission throughout the world. This is furthered by leading those entrusted with worship, the celebration of sacraments, and the mission of witness and service to the world.



2.4.1.2.3. The *pastoral episcopacy* is when “the bishop facilitates the conduct of affairs within the church, primarily by means of nurture and persuasion” (Long 2001:13). This is a polity commonly found within the Episcopalian or Anglican tradition. The Anglican Communion is held together by common experience of worship, not by any form of dogma or conformity to any ethical expectation. The Anglican polity is measured by doctrinal standards as laid out in a “**Canon Law**”, sometimes referred to as a “**Book of Common Prayer**”. This book is a symbol of unity and it embodies the ceremonial and symbolic functions of the bishop. The bishops rely greatly on persuasion in order to govern their parishes. In other words the Church “preserves its togetherness by allowing individual bishops and parishes to act, regarding many matters, on their own convictions, rather than by imposing strict demands for conformity” (2001:43). Conformity in liturgy and vestments do not necessitate common doctrinal persuasion. Bishops “can vary enormously in their theological positions, church practice, and social advocacy” (Long 2001:44). The Anglican bishop’s role is that of unity and the preservation of the apostolicity and the catholicity of the church. His liturgical functions of ordination and confirmation of the new church members makes his role not merely managerial. He acts as a mentor to win people’s hearts to respect the policies and procedures of the church.

2.4.2. The Presbyterian Structure of the church

2.4.2.1. Definition

This structure accentuates authority in a particular office referred to as elder. Millard J Erickson (1999:343-344) captures this church government system correctly that

This authority is exercised in a series of governing assemblies. At the level of the local church the session (Presbyterian) or consistory (Reformed) is the decision making group. All the churches in one area are governed by the presbytery (Presbyterian) or classis (Reformed). The next grouping is the synod, made up of an equal number of lay elders and clergy chosen by each presbytery or classis. At the highest level the



Presbyterian Church also has a General Assembly, composed again of lay and clergy representatives from the presbyteries. The prerogatives of each of the governing bodies are spelled out in the constitution of the denomination.

Normally, this polity has only the teaching elder or a pastor. There is no higher level such as the bishop. Certain individuals are selected from below to preside or to supervise, with no special authority attached to their position since there is no special ordination attached to their office. The Presbyterian system has the deliberate coordination of clergy and laity. These groups are included in all governing assemblies, still with no special powers or rights to make them distinctive from others. This sentiment is echoed by the late Presbyterian theologian and teacher, R B Kuiper (1998:135), in the debate of the relation of the universal and special offices of the church, that

the members of the church choose their own special officers, that they are governed with their own consent by those officers, and that they choose their officers from their own number – all this exemplifies the truth that the special offices in the church are rooted in the universal office.

The hallmark of the Presbyterian polity is the centrality of Christ. Christ is viewed as supreme king and head of his church. As a result (Brand & Norman 2004:87), he

has given to his people all the oracles, ordinances, and officers necessary for their edification and maturation in this world. In his messianic role as king, from his throne of glory he rules and teaches his people by his Word and Spirit through the oversight ministry of these officers. Moreover he has ordained for his church, in order that all things might be done decently and in order therein, a system of government, the details of which are either expressly set forth in Scripture or may be deduced there from by good and necessary inference.



This Christological centrality of the Presbyterian Church government dominates many scholars of this tradition. For instance, Clowney (1995:203) in his voluminous work of *Contours of Christian Theology* asserts that “Christian obedience to church rule is obedience in the Lord, for his Word governs the church, not the other way round.” In the same work, Clowney (1995:15) minces no words that “a doctrine of the church that does not centre on Christ is self-defeating and false.”

The Christological approach to church government as reflected in the Presbyterian Church is also of the unwavering opinion that there is the sufficiency of Scripture for church government. There is a strong appeal to the Pauline writings in defence of the church polity by the evangelical thinkers of our day. Furthermore the evangelical Presbyterians scrutinize the etymologies and usages of “*presbyteros*” and “*episkopos*” to prove that the scriptural church government is both Presbyterian and Episcopal, though the two terms are the same in reference to the overseers or the same officeholder. The Episcopalian notion should not be attached to hierarchical description of the elders. The proponents of this polity are in agreement that “Scripture knows nothing of the governmental church polity of a hierarchical episcopacy, and if the church has an archbishop (or “arch-elder”), that archbishop is Jesus Christ” (Brand & Norman 2004:93).

The latest research development on Presbyterial government, as discovered by Long Jr (2001) points out that there are three types of the recent Presbyterial government.

2.4.2.1.1. First, there is a polity of ***representative eldership***. This is common in “the Reformed tradition, where governance is by elders who are elected by democratic procedures” (2001:63). These are the functional elders elected to operate in the covenanted communities according to constitutional provisions. The polity allows for the elders to lead the church, protect the church from false doctrines, visit the sick and pray for them. They share the governance of the church with elected representatives chosen by their own congregations. They are ordained for governance that calls for commitment and



competency. They are called the *Session* and their responsibility is the spiritual oversight of the parish members. These elders in session “participate in the policy making of the denomination as a whole by being designated as a delegate to a higher judicatory” (2001:64).

The notable observation of this polity is the role of deacons. They are not ordained in every case, and where they are ordained, this is for life. Their primary responsibility is to serve the physical aspects of the church such as the addressing the needs of the poor, the church property, and the finances of the church. The Presbyterian polity is heavily *connectional*. This means that the local congregations are subject to considerable control by higher ecclesiastical authority relating to matters of common interests. As a result, the Presbyterian polity creates a widely and carefully recognised denominational identity.

2.4.2.1.2. The second type of Presbyterian government is the ***leadership by appointment and seniority***. Since this practice is common among the “non-evangelical” group known as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons), it will not be given much attention here. “The governance of this church is highly controlled; it is authoritarian rather than democratic. Those on top appoint most of the lesser officials while they themselves come into governance by fidelity and influence and, at the very top, strictly by seniority” (Long 2001:79). The governance of this group is very complex, and very rhetoric in the levels of priests, elders, and bishops. The higher governance roles in the church work from top down rather than from the bottom up. The president of the church is at the top, and is regarded as a prophet, seer, and revealer of truth. He has the authority and legal power, as one of their scholars asserts; “to act or command, as exercised by a person through virtue of his office, trust, or calling, whether original or delegated” (Keeler 1904: III). In the volumous work of the Mormon scholar, James Vernon Bartlet (1899:476-508), the church leadership is a moral obligation and responsibility than just a position. This group attempts to convey the truth that the early and apostolic church was popular in its government and simple in its worship. The lesser priesthood in the early church as perceived by the Mormons is the criteria for the authentic church. This notion is stressed in the writings of Lyman Coleman and Augustus Neander (1844).



2.4.2.1.3. The third type is *leadership by discernment*, commonly practised by the Mennonites and the Quakers. The leaders are traditionally selected from the community in a process of discernment. Decision making is designed to attend to the Spirit. The gifts and graces upon an individual are taken into consideration as opposed to a popular vote. The evangelical distinctive of the Mennonites is not a belief system, but the ethical response to the gospel. As the descendants of the Anabaptists, the Mennonites see Christianity not merely as churchmanship but as a community lifestyle.

The Mennonites govern themselves according to some Articles of Schleitheim Confession of Faith that was adopted by the Swiss Brethren in 1527, and Dordrecht Confession of Faith of 1632 respectively. Both these documents exemplify the need and the teaching functions of spiritual leaders. The documents are widely open to allow the different Mennonite groups to formulate the polity regarding church leaders. The diversity among them ranges from those with elders and/or bishops who work like anybody else for living, those who are in full time ministry and are being paid by the communities they serve, some are strictly led by males – with no consideration for female leadership. The leader is expected to live an exemplary life. His role has some expectations attached to it. Long (2001:89) highlights the fact that “the role of the leaders is facilitative rather than domineering, symbolic and pedagogical rather than sacerdotal.” The local church reflects the community, and it is a locus of decision making. All the practices and the governance of the church are determined or decided by the local congregation. The congregations confer with other congregations of the like-mind and deliberate on issues of standards of faith, polity and administration, and common mission and projects.

The Quakers’ governance is a matter of discerning the Spirit than the institutional structures or the exercising of official roles. It is of great interest to note that “The Quakers have no paid clergy, they do not take votes in order to make decisions, they eschew formally designated rankings that carry unique authority; and they rely for



support on generosity stemming from devotion rather than on assessments imposed by fiat” (Long 2001:95).

The elders’ role is to guide and counsel the gathering of Friends. Their qualifications to do this are spiritual quality, exemplifying of Quaker characteristics, maturity, and depth of character. Elders lead by stature. There is no ordination ceremony. The typical Quaker procedure is to deliberate according to the Spirit rather than according to parliamentary rules. The sense of the meeting leads to decision, not the majority vote. The minority opinion is won over, not voted down. For them the process of deliberations leads to agreement and concession. The governance empowers the community rather than dividing it.

2.4.2.2. The Presbyterian *editio princeps*

The original edition of this church government is seen as *ex gratia*, the act of grace. There are some minor diversions within the Presbyterian structure. The fundamental factor is that the Presbyterian church government asserts that its principles are directly derived from the Scripture. Church polity is the theological science which should, in the light of the written Word of God and the normative response of the confession to the Word of God, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, study and formulate the justice of God and, consequently, the reign of Christ in the church, and to make all these available to serve and build up the ecclesiastical *ethos* and structure. In other words, church polity is a theological science that studies the fundamental principles of the subject as they are taught in Scripture (the *ius constituendum*) and the order (*ius constitutum*) in a specific ecclesiastical context. This conviction is confirmed by recent writers such as Elsie Anne Mckee (1988:22) who once wrote that; “Reformed theologians claimed to base their teaching (doctrine) on scripture alone, but unlike many other reformers, they also maintained that the proper form of church order is given (or at least sketched) in the Bible.” The similar train of thought can be traced in the popular reformed theologian, Berkhof (1941:581-584) who lists the following five fundamental principles regarding the Reformed tradition’s polity:



1. *Christ is the head of the Church and the source of all its authority.* His authority is manifested in the following considerations:

- 1.1. He instituted the Church of the New Testament
- 1.2. He instituted the means of grace which the Church must administer, namely the Word and the sacraments.
- 1.3. He gave to the Church its constitution and officers, and clothed them with divine authority, so that they can speak in his name.
- 1.4. He is ever present in the Church when it meets for worship, and speaks and acts through its officers.

2. *Christ exercises his authority by means of his royal word.* “The reign of Christ is not in all respects similar to that of earthly kings. He does not rule the Church by force, but *subjectively* by His Spirit, which is operative in the Church, and *objectively* by the Word of God as the standard of authority” (1941:583).

3. *Christ as King has endowed the Church with power.* The ecclesiastical power is committed by Christ to the Church as a whole. This to the ordinary members and the officers alike, though the officers receive some additional measure of power in order to perform their respective duties in the Church of Christ. They receive their power and authority as officers directly from Christ. They are representatives, not just deputies or delegates of the people.

4. *Christ provided for the specific exercise of this power by representative organs.* The officers are called and confirmed by the Lord Himself, and it is from Him that they receive their authority in order to serve His Church responsibly.

5. *The power of the Church resides primarily in the governing body of the local Church.* “It is one of the fundamental principles of Reformed or



Presbyterian government, that the power or authority of the Church does not reside first of all in the most general assembly of any Church, and is only secondarily and by derivation from this assembly, vested in the governing body of the local Church, but that it has its original seat in the consistory or session of the local Church, and is by this transferred to the major assemblies, such as classes (Presbyterian) and synods or general assemblies” (1941: 584). It is out of this statement that conclusion can be arrived at that the Reformed system honours the autonomy of the local church, though with some limitations in matters of cooperation with other congregations. The local church is expected to maintain the unity with other churches on a common confessional basis for mutual growth.

The Reformed notions above express the fact that in the light of the Scripture, the field of study of church polity as an ecclesiological subject is the church itself. In the ecclesiological subjects, church history focuses on the church of the past, whereas church polity concentrates on the present and the future church. The primary function of the church polity is to enable the church in the world and to render the services determined by God to be the task of the church. Like du Plooy (1997:175) highlights: “Church polity is not merely a chain of rules and regulations, but constitutes a theological science which should study the rules for the architecture of the church (as a building) and for people’s conduct and existence in the building. It has to study in Scripture the justice of God which obtains, and should obtain in the church.”

2.4.2.3 Summary

The Presbyterian polity is the government of the church by presbyters or elders. It provides for the following four courts:

- The Session is governance by elders who are elected by democratic proceeding in the local congregation.



- The Presbytery, which is the geographically defined body consisting of all ministers residing within it, together with an equal number of governing elders from the area churches. It is the body by which congregations are established, legitimised, and monitored.
- The Synod is geographically larger than the presbytery and their primary purpose is to advance the mission and the programme of the church's life in their specified area.
- The General Assembly is the highest governing body that meets at least annually to deal with various issues affecting the church.

The typical Presbyterian ministry is ordered by pastors, ruling elders, and deacons. Both the pastors and ruling elders take part in the meetings of the Presbytery, the Synod, and the General Assembly.

It is understood that church polity is *sui generis*, since the church has a unique character. The Reformed Church is expected to have a true and legitimate constitution, and a well-organised form of government. This was the spirit of Calvin in the Institutes regarding the church polity. In the paper, *The Foundation and Relevance of Reformed Church Polity as a Theological Science*, du Plooy (1997:169) points out that “from the angle of scientific theory, it is imperative that church polity as a theological science should be able to account for its points of departure, fundamental principles, sources, presuppositions, and its function and task.” This puts a huge demand on church polity since it *is scientia sacra regendi ecclesiam visibilem*.

2.4.3. The Congregational Structure

2.4.3.1. Definition

The seat of authority is the local congregation. The two fundamental principles are autonomy and democracy. The local congregation is independent and self-governing. Every member of the local congregation has a voice in its affairs. “The congregational type of church government vests all legislative authority in the local church. District and



general organizations are merely advisory in power and instituted simply for the purpose of cooperating in missionary work, educational work, and so forth” (Thiessen 1979:317-318). There is no external power that can dictate to the local church as to what direction it should take or action to undertake in its own context. It is a polity that clearly states (Akin et al 2004:157) that

it is that form of church government in which final human authority rests with the local or particular congregation when it gathers for decision-making. This means that decisions about membership, leadership, doctrine, worship, conduct, missions, finances, property, relationships, and the like are to be made by the gathered congregation except when such decisions have been delegated by the congregation to individual members or groups of members.

There is a range within this polity, where one finds the liberals who are liturgical, and the conservatives who are against any form of formality in worship. One finds that among these Congregationalists, there are two main streams. These are the ***connective and associational*** congregationalism (Long 2001:103-136).

2.4.3.2. The ***connective*** congregationalism is when the local churches come together in agreement of the spread of the gospel and for the sustenance of catholicity. The churches have some supervisory interaction with each other. The authority in the local church can be extended over that of other congregations. It is further asserted by E L Roy (2001:104) that

there is an effort to obtain commonality in faith and practice that provides distinguishing features to the ecclesial family. Creeds are usually involved and considered important. Patterns of worship may also be similar. Acceptance of such standards comes about, however, because they are adopted by the congregations acting together and not because



they are imposed by a supervisory “over-body” with an existence prior to, or an authority superior to, that of the local congregations.

From 1838 when the Missouri Synod was enacted, until 1988 when the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America was formed, the American Lutheran polity had always reflected connectional congregationalism. This fact is attested by Lull (1983:140) that “the strength of the Lutheran church continues to be at the parish level... Most (Lutherans) have felt the congregations to be the primary reality, and the wider church a secondary and more problematic matter.” Lull continues to engross the fact that assuring validity for the word and sacraments requires connections among congregations in order to guard against idiosyncratic manifestations of local control, or a parish life that bears little resemblance to practices of the wider church. This polity have not developed as a response to historical and contingent circumstances, but from deliberate and theoretical design.

This had put Lutheran polity in a dialectical contradict between the local determination and denominational control. The Lutheran bishops’ role is not sacerdotal like that of the Episcopalians. The bishop’s responsibilities cover the areas of worship and spiritual oversight, pastoral care, mission planning, mission interpretation, mission administration, ecumenical relations, and liaison. The Lutheran Presbyterial leniency does not clarify the role of the clergy and laity at the local congregation level. The unifying factor is faithfulness to the Word and sacraments. As Long (2001:111) further highlights; “while theoretically free to determine their own sense of what it means to be a Christian community, local congregations cannot ignore the oversight of a body seen as a means of guiding proper practice and insuring correct doctrine.” It is clear then, that Lutheranism stresses the primacy of the local parish. The local parish is the centre of their strength.

2.4.3.3. The *associational congregationalism* gives local churches the freedom to shape their practices according to their own judgement about the gospel’s requirements. Freedom is given greater emphasis than control. The group of denominations following this government is sometimes called the *Free Church Tradition*, sometimes known as



Independency. Cooperation among churches is for support and reinforcement. The serious note is that the associational congregationalism has less control over local churches than connective congregationalism.

The Baptist traditions are well-known for this tradition. The lengthy quotation from Long (2001:129-130) is critical

The foundational unit of Baptist ecclesiology is the local congregation. While the local congregation enjoys the right to govern its own affairs – to admit (and dismiss) members, to call (and, if necessary, ordain) its own ministers, to possess (or dispose of) its own property, and to write its own covenants of purpose (which in some sense serve as doctrinal standards) – most Baptist churches conform to recognizable patterns that do much to counteract the otherwise centrifugal consequences that might flow from purely local decision making. To be sure, there are often differences (particularly in theological stance) between one local Baptist church and another, or between one Baptist association and other Baptist associations. Yet churches within the various Baptist associations have similar set of worship practices (marked by fervour and informality). Although this similarity in posture and practice is voluntary, it is sufficiently in evidence to give Baptists a recognizable identity, despite the differences.

The diversity within the Baptist tradition is remarkable. Some groups allow for congregational freedom that tolerate theological diversity and ecumenical cooperation, while others cling to theological rigidity and ecumenical cooperation is frowned upon.

2.5. THE PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC ECCLESIOLOGY

2.5.1. Introduction



The predecessors of the twentieth century Pentecostal Movement are the “Irvingites” stemming from Edward Irving (1792-1834), a Scottish Presbyterian minister who believed that the Church should enjoy the *charismata* that it had during the apostolic era. His followers emphasised speaking in tongues and the imminent return of Christ. They were organised in 1842 and were called the Catholic Apostolic Church. Vidler (1974:66) refers to this church that “its apocalyptic character” emphasised miracles, judgement, prophecies, and the coming of Christ to the world. Irving’s ministry in Rowe became vocal to for the need of restoration of apostles and prophets in the church. Moriarty (1992:32) stresses the fact that Irving “believed that the church lost most of its spiritual dynamic because it had abandoned the fivefold offices of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. Irving believed the full restoration of these offices would enable the church to be the dominant force it was intended to be.” He is seen as a forerunner of today’s Pentecostal Movement that raise a question whether the historic, institutionalised churches have not lost something that was essential in apostolic Christianity.

Since its *annus mirabilis* (1906) at Azusa Street, Los Angeles, the hallmark of Pentecostal movement has been the experience of a free flow of *charisms* in the church. The realisation of this Pentecostal experience was never only for enthusiasm, but transcending denominational and ideological chasms without demanding structural or doctrinal constructs in any ecclesiastical grouping. In the words of Quebedeaux (1983:185), Pentecostals were “a non-sectarian movement that could unify Christians.”

2.5.2. Ecclesiastical Definitions

This Christian renewal movement of the twentieth century embraces *ecclesiastical* definitions as

2.5.2.1. *Koinonia*. The genesis of Catholic ecclesiology post Vatican II, especially the one embraced by Küng (1986:222-241), highlights ecclesia as the *fellowship* of the redeemed of the Lord- *communio* with the glorified Lord. This fellowship was never, until recently, associated with *ecumenism*. The use of the language of fellowship is



favoured above the *hierarchical* and *institutionalised* church. The church is a charismatic fellowship, a *pneumatologically* constituted reality. The church of today should reflect the New Testament *koinonia*. This New Testament fellowship is “a common experience of baptism into the body of Christ through the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 12:13). This fellowship is something to be experienced, a shared experience in the everyday life of the community” (Kärkkäinen 2002:75). The community and the Spirit are inseparable. The community enjoys fellowship through the *charismata*. The community lives in the expectation of *auxilium ab alto*. The waiting for the power from on (The Holy Spirit empowerment) high is a motivating factor for the survival of *koinonia*.

2.5.2.2. *The People of God*. The Charismatic ecclesiology perceives the church as the disciplined community of those obedient to Jesus Christ. They are the believing people of God that are built together into a spiritual building for God’s habitation. In some detailed quotations of the Shepherding Movement teachers, Moore (2003:72) concludes that Charismatics believe that “the church was to be a visible alternate society which sets forth unequivocal norms for behaviour and community life that will produce the kind and quality of people capable of influencing our society...” The same notion is paradoxically expressed by Bishop Payne (2004:46) of Christ Churches of God in Christ, that “the visible, physical church is a community of believers who are under constant development by the principles of the kingdom of God. These principles of the kingdom are the standards, rules, and guides for church’s procedures.” The Charismatic leaders are of one opinion that Christ is busy building His church, making an alternate society – the righteous nation that keeps faith. This society, which is sometimes referred to as the third nation is different from the Jews and the Gentiles. It is a new people of God made up of the believers in Christ from both the Jewish *Diaspora* and the Gentile *societas*.

2.5.2.3. *The Kingdom of God*. The Pentecostals and Charismatics interpret the New Testament Church as the expression of the kingdom of God where God’s plan and purpose are effected. The church is where God is to rule and reign. The church is where God is the source of all activities and the source of wisdom, knowledge, and directions in life. The kingdom of God is greater than the church, but can be experienced through or in



the church. This notion is prevalent in the emerging Apostolic/ Charismatic churches that had impacted the Pentecostal theology in the recent decades. One of its proponents, Payne (2004: viii) strikes the differences between the New Testament Church and the Kingdom of God

The New Testament Church is that body created by Christ to carry forth the last day mission of Christ and his Kingdom in the earth. The Kingdom of God through the New Testament Church is much greater than simply the physical Church we see today in the earth. The New Testament Church is a mystery of God and is involved in the eternal purpose of God in this present earth. The greater apostle Paul was given an understanding and a revelation of what God was moving toward in the church in bringing forth His' will into the earth through the church. The Pauline Epistles teaching on God's Kingdom through or in the Church is clearly made known and the clarity is that the Kingdom's order, principles, and design must be operational in the present church.

2.5.2.4. *The Covenant community.* In the early eighties, the Pentecostals and Charismatics were grappling with their ecclesiological understanding. In the midst of these wrangles, the voice of one of their significant teachers, Don Basham echoed what a Covenant church ought to be. Moore (2003:150) quotes Basham's article in the New Wine Magazine

A community of God's redeemed people: bound together in covenant love, submitted to compassionate authority and rulership, and manifesting peace, holiness, and family fidelity expressed through revered fatherhood, cherished woman and motherhood with secure and obedient children. A community where loving correction and instruction produce healthy growth and maturity, where dedication to excellence produces the finest results in arts, crafts, trades and commerce, providing prosperity and abundance for all its members. A community of faith, worship, praise and a selfless ministry, manifesting individually and



corporately the gifts and the fruit of the Holy Spirit. A continuity where all life is inspired and directed by the Spirit of Jesus Christ and is lived to His glory as a witness and testimony to the world.

These teachers believe the church to be God's expression of love in the world. It is intertwined with Christ in a covenant relationship and love. This love is expressed by the church's fulfilment of the Great Commission here on earth. Since its inception at the dawn of the twentieth century, the Pentecostal/Charismatic ecclesiology has been a very low priority. The *ecclesiastical* focus has always been the preaching of the Gospel throughout the whole earth as preparation for Christ's *Second Advent* (Matt 24:14). The missional mandate was to be accompanied with Pentecost experience. This *charismata* was speaking in tongues, and the gift of healing. The purpose of *charismata* was to equip God's people for personal holiness, and evangelistic endeavours for the end-times. This *ecclesiological* outlook is emphasised *missiologically* by a South African missiologist, J J Kritzing (1994:11) that "for Pentecostals the essence of the Christian church is to be found in the Pentecost experience, revealing itself in the charismata (spiritual gifts) given at Pentecost to equip the church for its task to be witnesses to the ends of the earth and the end of time (Acts 1:8)."

2.5.3. Charismatic Ecclesiology: A Debatable Issue?

There is a debate within theological studies regarding the Pentecostal or Charismatic ecclesiology. Does it exist or is it a hidden revelation still to be unfolded? This question covers not only ecclesiastical concerns, but other theological avenues. Pentecostal theology is not thematised or systematised. Kärkkäinen (2002:72) captures it rightly that "the central point to note is the accent on lived Charismatic spirituality rather than on discursive theology." There is, to a certain extent, a rejection of traditional evangelical premise *littera scripta manet*- that what is written is permanent and cannot be altered. In this case, the Scriptures, though *sacrosanct*, cannot contain God since He is continuing to reveal Himself through the ministry of the Holy Spirit in the *koinonia*. Moore (2003:191) asserts that "ecclesiology has never been a strong point in Evangelical theological study,



and this is especially so for Pentecostal – Charismatics. This must change. Instead of simply mimicking the latest successful models and methods for church growth, what is needed is the wedding of ecclesiological orthodoxy and orthopraxis.” There is a dire need for more theological dialogue. The dialogue must be rooted in biblical texts

2.6. THE EMERGING APOSTOLIC MOVEMENT: THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

2.6.1. Definition and Biblical Bases

The five-fold ministry is a concept of church leadership based upon the ministry of men and women who are divinely called and anointed with one of five ministry gifts found in Ephesians 4:11. These are Apostle, Prophet, Evangelist, Pastor, and Teacher. The proponents of this church government are insistent that these gifts are not the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but an extension of Christ’s headship ministry of the Church. Their primary ministry and function are to teach, train, activate, and mature the saints for the work of their ministries as directed in Ephesians 4:12-13. The *Christian Research Institute Journal, Volume 22, Number 1 (1999)* carries a full article on the background of the five-fold ministry. On page 1 it states: “The doctrine of fivefold ministry dates at least as far back as the Latter Rain movement, which emerged in 1948.”

2.6.2. The Marks of the Apostolic Churches

It is of great interest in ecclesiology to identify the marks or identities of any ecclesiastical body. The following marks of the emerging apostolic churches are identified:

2.6.2.1 The marks identified by Donald Miller (1997:11) after researching Vineyard, Calvary Chapel, and Hope Chapel are

1. They were started after the mid-1960s.
2. The majority of congregation members were born after 1945.



3. Seminary training of clergy is optional.
4. Worship is contemporary.
5. Lay leadership is highly valued.
6. They have extensive small group ministries.
7. Clergy and congregants usually dress informally.
8. Tolerance of different personal styles is prized.
9. Pastors tend to be understated, humble and self-revealing.
10. Bodily, rather than mere cognitive, participation in worship is the norm.
11. The “gifts of the Holy Spirit” are affirmed.
12. Bible-centred teaching predominates over topical sermonizing

2.6.2.2. On the other hand, George G Hunter III of Asbury Theological Seminary in the *Leadership Network Forum* (1996) letter, identifies ten features of apostolic congregations as follows

1. Strong biblical content.
2. Earnest in prayer.
3. Compassion for the lost.
4. Obedience to the Great Commission.
5. Vision for what people can become.
6. Cultural adaptation to the target population.
7. Small groups.
8. Strong lay ministries.
9. Every member and every seeker receives regular pastoral care- from lay person.
10. Many ministries to the unchurched.

2.6.2.3. Elmer L Towns (1996:3) of Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia, considers the following eight characteristics as significant in the new apostolic churches

1. Large size.
2. Family feeling, but not exclusive.
3. Cross socioeconomic classes.
4. Led by “charismatic” pastor-leaders.



5. Congregation both independent and interdependent.
6. Reflect New Testament theological bias.
7. Passion for outpouring of God's Spirit.
8. Bonded by methodology, not theology.

2.6.2.4. Peter Wagner goes on in another book, *New Apostolic Churches* (1997:18-25), to identify his own marks of the apostolic churches, or New Apostolic Reformation, as he coins these churches.

1. New name.
2. New authority structure
3. New leadership training.
4. New ministry focus.
5. New worship style.
6. New prayer forms.
7. New financing.
8. New outreach.
9. New power priorities.

2.6.3. Historical and Theological Bases

Moriarty wrote a book in 1992; *The New Charismatics*, published by Zondervan. In that book, he identifies seven points as the Latter Rain movement's doctrinal contributions to neo-Pentecostalism. I take the liberty to summarise these seven points as pointers to the historical basis of the fivefold ministry:

- 1. Restorationism:** This is the belief that God has progressively restored truths to the church since the Reformation. According to the neo-Pentecostal theology this restoration includes justification by faith, baptism by immersion, holiness, divine healing, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the fivefold ministry.
- 2. Fivefold ministry:** This is the view that the church cannot function effectively without all five offices in the body of Christ.



3. *Spiritual disciplines:* In this, the disciplines of deliverance, fasting, and the laying on of hands are included.

4. *Prophecy:* Prophecy is no longer restricted to general words of exhortation, but would include personal detailed revelations for guidance and instruction.

5. *Recovery of true worship:* God's manifested presence is dependent upon a certain order of worship involving singing in tongues, clapping, shouting, singing prophecies, and a new order of praise dancing.

6. *Immortalization of the saints:* Only those believers moving in the truth of the Latter Rain restoration, not necessarily all in the church, will attain an immortal state before Christ returns.

7. *Unity of the faith:* The church will attain unity of the faith before Christ returns.

The New Apostolic Churches are the offspring of the Charismatic Movement that sprang out of the mainline denominations in the early sixties. The Charismatic Movement (Neo-Pentecostalism) appeared to be a continuation of Pentecostalism in the mainline Protestant churches. Hayford & Moore (2006:189) give a glimpse of its origin: "It was Palm Sunday, April 3, 1960, an Episcopal priest Dennis Bennett stood before his Van Nuys, California, congregation... That morning Bennett didn't preach; he just gave his testimony about his life-changing experience of being baptized in the Holy Spirit and speaking with tongues." Bennett became a true patriarch of neo-Pentecostalism – a movement that made some remarkable strides in the modern day Christendom. The movement *metamorphosised* since then and in its different shapes is influencing Christendom.

In retrospect, the Pentecostal and Charismatic movement of the seventies and the eighties received a scourge for lack of accountability. This led to the formation of the Shepherding Movement or Discipleship Movement in October 1970. The five respectable preachers: Don Basham, Bob Mumford, Derek Prince, Ern Baxter, and Charles Simpson banded together to form this



movement. Like their predecessors from the dawn of the century, they developed a magazine called *New Wine*. This became their powerful mouthpiece to promote their convictions pertaining to *ecclesiological* understandings, submission and spiritual authority, and accountability. This accountability was accomplished by the forging the relationship of each believer being connected to a personal pastor or shepherd. The Shepherding Movement is the springboard of the modern day apostolic churches, which are the focus of this research.

2.6.4. Views on Church Government and Polity

The movement's *logia* were not scholarly or theological constructs to be placed within *academia*. Doug Beacham (in Green 2005:13) agrees: "The Charismatic/Pentecostal community is facing a challenge – and it's not about theology, worship styles, or spiritual gifts. It all comes down on the (until recently) dry topic of church government." These teachers are convinced that:

2.6.4.1. God is restoring biblical church government, delegating His authority through the fivefold ministry offices. Apostles and prophets are the foundational government structure of the church. "These five ministries are the governmental ministries of the church. They carry with them the accountability, authority, and responsible government of the church...These are the central and main ministries of the church" (Payne 2004:89). The fivefold ministry is a demand for the church. They are designed for growth and health of the church.

2.6.4.2. Structures alone will not produce spirituality and God's mission on earth. Denominational governments are rooted in *democracy*. *Theocracy* and *democracy* are never in balance. Leadership must be appointed and anointed by God. *Ecclesiastical* leaders are not to be equated with employees. The Bible must reign supreme over church constitutions, bylaws, and conventions. The New Apostolic Reformation labels the present ecclesiastical structures



dysfunctional and irrelevant for God’s move in the world today. Wagner (1999:6) points out that “structures that were originally developed to facilitate evangelism, Christian nurture, worship, social service and ministry in general are now considered by some as causes of much inefficiency and ineffectiveness in the same areas. Dysfunctionalism has been setting in.” Church structures or government is regarded as tantamount to the progress of the church. It is seen as a way of limiting people’s creativity, and exercising their call from God to fulfil God’s mission on earth.

Table 2.1: Some of the well-known fivefold churches

<i>Name of the Church</i>	<i>Leader</i>	<i>Location</i>
<i>Antioch Churches & Ministries</i>	<i>John P Kelly</i>	<i>Southlake, Texas</i>
<i>Christian Int Ministries Network</i>	<i>Bill Hamon</i>	<i>Santa Rosa Beach, FL</i>
<i>Christian Life Church</i>	<i>Barry Hill</i>	<i>Spokane, WA</i>
<i>Crusaders Ministries</i>	<i>John Eckhard</i>	<i>Chicago, Illinois</i>
<i>Deeper Christian Life Ministry</i>	<i>William F Kumuyi</i>	<i>Lagos, Nigeria</i>
<i>Dove Christian Fellowship Int</i>	<i>Larry Kreider</i>	<i>Ephrata, Penn</i>
<i>Embassy Christian Centre</i>	<i>Roberts Liardon</i>	<i>Irvine, California</i>
<i>Faith Community Baptist Church</i>	<i>Lawrence Khong</i>	<i>Singapore</i>
<i>Grace Korean Church & Missions</i>	<i>David (Kwang Shin) Kim</i>	<i>Anaheim, California</i>
<i>Grace Presbytery</i>	<i>Michael P Fletcher</i>	<i>Fayetteville, NC</i>
<i>His People Christian Ministries</i>	<i>Paul Daniel</i>	<i>South Africa</i>
<i>Hope Chapel</i>	<i>Ralph Moore</i>	<i>Kaneohe, Hawaii</i>
<i>Hope of Bangkok Church</i>	<i>Joseph C Wongsak</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>
<i>Jesus is Lord Church</i>	<i>Eddie C Villanueva</i>	<i>Manila, Philippines</i>
<i>Kings Community Church</i>	<i>John Knight</i>	<i>Spokane, WA</i>
<i>Marshall Community</i>	<i>Toby Tobin</i>	<i>Spokane, WA</i>
<i>Ministers Fellowship Int</i>	<i>Dick Iverson</i>	<i>Portland, Oregon</i>
<i>Morning Star International</i>	<i>Rice Broocks</i>	<i>Brentwood, TEN</i>
<i>Sandpoint Christian Centre</i>	<i>Miles Nelson</i>	<i>Idaho</i>
<i>Spokane Christian Centre</i>	<i>Rick Sharky</i>	<i>Spokane, WA</i>
<i>The Fellowship of Int Churches</i>	<i>Wellington Boone</i>	<i>Duluth, Georgia</i>
<i>Victory Christian Centre</i>	<i>Billy Joe Daugherty</i>	<i>Tulsa, Oklahoma</i>
<i>Victory Ministries</i>	<i>Dwayne Stone</i>	<i>Denton, Texas</i>
<i>Willow Creek Community Church</i>	<i>Bill Hybels</i>	<i>S Barrington, Ill</i>
<i>Word of Life Church</i>	<i>Ulf Ekman</i>	<i>Uppsala, Sweden</i>

2.6.5. Reasons for Fivefold Ministry

The adherents of fivefold ministry are emphatic that the church will better fulfil its mission and hasten the second coming of Christ if it will accept the five offices of church



government. This assertion has brewed a critical reflection from some evangelical camps. The broad evangelical spectrum does not question the continuing importance of evangelists, pastors, and teachers. The bone of contention had been on the offices of the prophets and apostles beyond the early church, though the Catholic and the Anglican bishops had believed in apostolic succession. By this, the bishops assert that their ordination lineage can be traced back to Jesus’ apostles. On the contrary, Rev Rafael D Martinez, the Co-Director of Spiritwatch Ministries is of the persuasion that

the raising up of the five fold ministry in the local church is seen as a provision of divinely appointed leadership for the body of Christ. Since they have been raised up by God’s express will, the person of the five fold minister is seen as a Spirit-led ‘gift’ to the church which it must heed and follow. They are leaders with special ‘offices’ and ministries to guide and govern the Christian Church that drew upon the leadership gifts present in believers other than the traditional Pentecostal leadership roles of pastors (www.spiritwatch.org/fivespab1.htm).

Table 2.2: The well-known preachers of the fivefold ministry doctrine

Name	Ministry	Location
<i>Cannistraci David</i>	<i>Evangel Christian Fellowship</i>	<i>San Jose, CA</i>
<i>Hayford Jack</i>	<i>The King’s College & Sem</i>	<i>Los Angeles, CA</i>
<i>Haggard Ted</i>	<i>The New Life Centre</i>	<i>Colorado Springs</i>
<i>Payne J L</i>	<i>Christ Churches of God in Christ</i>	<i>Jackson, MS</i>
<i>Wagner C Peter</i>	<i>World Prayer Centre</i>	<i>Colorado Spring</i>

The bone of contention in this debate is how does the fivefold ministry operate as a church government? Does it repeal the traditional polities that have been a *locus* of Christendom for ages? This question is not a *sancta simplicitas*. It is very difficult. Most of the apostolic church leaders, if not all, remain convinced that the traditional structures remain the same, but the ministry is to change. The fivefold ministry though has an enormous impact on church government and polity, does not replace the traditional structures, but enhance them. Bishop Dwayne Stone (1999: xvi) is emphatic that “in this day God is bringing about reformation in the realm of true apostolic and prophetic ministry. The fivefold ministry... is being restored. The ministry of these gifts is being



formed and released into new understanding. God’s chosen ones are being set in office by the Holy Spirit. The church is being equipped (informed) and perfected (transformed).”

2.6.6. Summary

The focus of this research is to establish the fact that there is a balance in the *spontaneous structure* and the *functional structure* of church polity. The *spontaneous structure* is primarily based on the experience, feelings, and attitudes that originate in the extraordinary charismata. It is where the church “is characterized by a strong pneumatic emotiveness, prophetic inspiration, and charismatic community formation on the grounds of a realized eschatology” (Van der Ven 1996:303). This is where the fivefold ministry finds its expression. On the other hand, in the *functional structure*, certain rational considerations play a role. It stems from pastoral aims and motives. It is founded on the ordinary charismata.



CHAPTER 3: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

History must be interpreted objectively, though subjectivism is always inevitable. Objectivity is always a challenge in historical research. In fact, objectivity is impossible because the historical process itself is subjective. The fact of the matter is historical origins are complex and multidimensional. The Pentecostal and Charismatic historians have a tendency to sideline the historical development of the fivefold ministry as is seen today. This chapter endeavours to capture the historical *genesis* and *synopsis* of the Pentecostal/Charismatic Movement with a special reference to the *charismata* and how these relate to fivefold ministry.

3.2. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING ON GIFTS

The major spiritual awakenings were accompanied by the manifestations of the Spirit. The New Testament presents the believers as those accorded the opportunity to be anointed by the Holy Spirit and be used of God. People were given the opportunity to exercise their different ministries. Each believer was aware that she had a ministry blessed by the Holy Spirit. The *charismata*, as per Pauline instructions in 1 Corinthians 14, were widely exercised, and Christians experienced the essence of the priesthood of all believers without restraints.

As the church grew and touched many cultures, the organisation, structure, and professionalism took the centre stage of the ecclesiastical life. The priesthood of all believers was slowly abandoned, and as a result the manifestation of the Spirit's gifts also declined. The clergy became the focal point of authority. As a result, heresies swarmed into the church. The church was encountered with the proliferation of small groups, and a high degree of participation of lay individuals utilizing their talents, abilities and gifts diminished.



3.2.1. From the apostolic age to the first few centuries of the church age, the debates about “*charismata*” were limited. Justin Martyr (108-168) and Irenaeus (130-202) in the second century acknowledged the miraculous operation of the gifts of the Spirit in the church. Tertullian (160-222) in *Against Marcion*, cited by Holdcraft (1979:138)

declared that his subject would prove himself orthodox if he could produce prophets who have foretold things to come, and also made manifest the secrets of the heart, or if he could produce some psalm, some vision, some prayer in the spirit of ecstasy, which means apart from the exercise of mind, to which is added also an interpretation of tongues.

There is also a historical reference to the charismatic gifts by Hippolytus (170-235) in the third century. He even defended the brothers who believed to have received the gift of healing by a revelation.

3.2.2. From the Middle Ages, one comes across the utterances of people like Simeon (940-1022), the New Theologian of Constantinople who vehemently promoted the pursuit of spiritual gifts and deep godliness in the lives of his monastic associates. He is quoted by Holdcraft (1979) as saying that “it is impossible for a man who seeks with all his soul not to find Him and be enriched by His gifts.” There is also Hildegard of Bingen (1098-1178) who enjoyed a ministry of singing in tongues and as she claims, it was a singing in the spirit.

The conventional terminology of the manifestations of the *charismata* was retained during the early Christian era and through the Middle Ages. The problem of the decline of the role and the significance of the spiritual gifts was exacerbated by the weakness and the failure of the church in developing a thoughtful, scholarly, Biblical doctrine of miraculous spiritual gifts. So the insights and the attainments of the church of the early and medieval eras were not transmitted into the modern era.



3.2.3. When one observes the Reformation period, one can easily concur with Ruthven's (1969:25) comment: "By the time of the Reformation, the doctrine of miracles in the church had degenerated into virtually animistic superstition." The Reformers rejected almost all visible miraculous elements and leaned towards cessationist theology that the age of miracles was past. Consequently, Protestantism for many centuries was committed to the denial of the miraculous. Any systematic effort to study the gifts of the Spirit has traditionally been discouraged. For instance, Martin Luther's theology of the Holy Spirit is closely tied with faith, and even the person of the Holy Spirit is emphasised with no reference to His work, except in relation to sanctification. He agrees that the Spirit was "never trapped in external things like scripture or the sacraments... the spirit cannot be institutionalized in such a way that certain structures can force the Spirit to be present" (Gaybba 1987:99). The leading reformer, however, scantily acknowledges that God "acts within us by the Holy Spirit and by faith as well as by our gifts" (1987:99).

John Calvin is referred to as a theologian of the Holy Spirit. The modern church history and systematic theology believes that it was only within the Reformation that the true biblical doctrine of the Spirit was re-discovered. The Spirit is seen as God in action. Despite this deep theological insight in the Holy Spirit, Calvin was never keen to look into the "*charismata*" in details. The emergence of people like McLeod Campbell and Edward Irving in the middle of the nineteenth century called for attention. Vidler (1974:65-66) takes this further that, Edward Irving became

associated with a development in Campbell's parish at Row where it was claimed that the gifts of the Spirit that had been manifested in the Apostolic Church were a permanent endowment of the Body of Christ, and were restrained only by the faithfulness of Christians. Both at Row and elsewhere there were outbreaks of apparently with tongues, which aroused widespread interest in Scotland.



The arousal of interest in spiritual manifestation came to the fore during the times of Methodist Revival and the birth of the Holiness Movement. Bruner (1970:47) correctly summarised that “methodism was the modern soil upon which Pentecostalism flourished. Revivalism was in part and increasingly the American practice of Methodist theology, and Finney was the individual and the holiness movement the corporate vehicle of that theology and practice.” The Spirit’s role in the believer was embraced, yet a little emphasis on His manifestation was heard of.

3.2.4. It was only during the first decade of the twentieth century that the new movement was born. This is the movement that endeavoured to go to the roots of the Spirit’s activity in the believer’s life - the Pentecostal Movement. It was born as the spiritual protest to modernism, secularism, and cold orthodoxy of the church. The movement was met with some vigorous criticisms from the mainline streams of Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant. They were the church of the poor and marginalised people in the peripheries of the cities. Their distinctives were small groups, manifestations of the gifts of the Spirit, especially speaking in tongues and the miraculous healings.

The historical survey shows clearly that there were, and still are the problems regarding the spiritual gifts. The controversy over the issue should not allow for a license to go into one of two extremes: (1) to entirely neglect the subject, (2) the overemphasis of the spiritual gifts as the panacea to making the church scene relevant in our day. One of the esteemed scholars of the twentieth century dispensationalism, Chafer (1978:215) is right in asserting that “regardless of the all but universal disregard of it, the doctrine respecting service gifts which are wrought by the Spirit in the believer occupies a large place in the New Testament and demands its full recognition in any work in Pneumatology.”



3.3. THE LATTER RAIN MOVEMENT

3.3.1. The Historical Background

The historical journals on Pentecostalism have the tendency to marginalise an important piece known as the “Latter Rain Movement.” This is due to its controversial nature of sensationalism and ecstatic religion that emphasised the miracles. Like all other consequent movements of charismatic nature, it assumed the status as a *cultus privatus*, a private cult dedicated to the *new thing* the Spirit is doing. This movement, like many of our present-day para-church missions, was born after World War II. It is associated with North Battlefield in Canada around 1947. Its spontaneous inception can be highlighted here

- It was born out of the Bible School, so was led by students, leaders, and supporters.
- It emphasised the “laying on of hands” to impart spiritual gifts, especially the gift of prophecy.
- Its early proponents were brothers, Ern and George Hawtin, and led the movement into Pentecostalism.
- The movement’s main emphases were spiritual songs with singing in tongues in mass, the restoration of the fivefold ministry as taught in Eph 4:11, with a special emphasis on the rigid authoritarianism of the apostles and that of the prophets.

Moriarty in his famous book called “**The New Charismatics**” summarises the scope of this movement precisely as the springboard of the modern day Apostolic Churches of the fivefold ministry emphasis

The Latter Rain movement was a loosely directed and enthusiastic union of cobelligerents united by their fierce opposition to mainline denominations. This meteoric movement boasted of being a fresh revival displacing the ‘apostasized’ Pentecostals. While its impact was



on a small scale, its effects were nevertheless felt worldwide, and it became one of several catalysts for the independent charismatic movement of the 1970s and the ‘new’ (restoration) charismatics surfacing in the 1980s and 1990s. In reaction to the spiritual dryness existing in Pentecostal circles, the New Order of the Latter Rain viewed itself as a refreshing return to the ‘full gospel’ of the first-century church (1992:44).

3.3.2. Historical Figures Associated with this Movement

William Marrion Branham (1909-1965) was the major influence on the Latter Rain movement. His ministry was marked with the miracles and the supernatural. This was accompanied by healing ministry, raising of the dead, and the supernatural revelation of what was going on in people’s hearts. His message was people’s deliverance, and this always intercepted by angelic visits.

Frank Hall took the Latter Rain Movement a step forward. ‘His contribution was the ‘body-felt salvation’ theory, which he espoused to be 700 percent greater than ordinary healing power” (Moriarty 1992:56). This notion was expanded that a willing believer can receive additional baptism of the Spirit for purification. Hall called this ‘Holy Ghost fire experience’ that enables believers to live victorious life without sin. This would mean freedom from sickness, tiredness, and even body odour. This experience could be obtained through extreme rhetoric of fastings.

Another contributor to the ideals of the Latter Rain Movement was George Warnock. Accentuation on prophecy and eschatological aspirations marked his ministry. This was accompanied by insistence on deeper insights into the Word of God.



3.3.3. The Reaction Received

The movement was not welcome by the Pentecostal movement of the day. The Assemblies of God General Council in 1949 adopted a resolution disapproving the practices of the Latter Rain movement. Wagner 1999:135) alludes to this fact that “Understanding that the Assemblies of God (AOG) has begun to travel down the road of the sect becoming church may help explain why it would reject the sectlike Latter Rain Movement of the post-World War II era, and the sectlike Charismatic Movement that began in the early 1960s”. The movement however, made some indelible imprints at Elim Bible Institute in New York, and was embraced by the City Bible Church in Portland, Oregon under Pastor Frank Damazio. It was out of this movement that the concept of the fivefold ministry emerged.

Regardless of its controversy, the Latter Rain Movement is a historical force to be reckoned with. The Pentecostal historiography is incomplete without it. This movement blazed the way for the independent and autonomous government of the local church led by the apostles and the prophets. This critical analysis is confirmed by Allan Anderson (2004:52) that it was

A movement purporting to ‘restore’ a fallen and ‘cold’ Pentecostalism to its former glory. This movement emphasized the restoration of the ‘ministry gifts’ of apostles and prophets to the church, spoken prophecies, and the independence of the local church, tending to shun ‘denominationalism’. Many of the independent Charismatic churches that constitute a large portion of Pentecostalism in North America today have roots in the Latter Rain Movement

The Latter Rain movement contributed enormously to the shaping and promotion of the church government based on the fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4:11 – the widely expressed church structure by the emerging apostolic churches of today.



3.4. THE SHEPHERDING MOVEMENT

3.4.1. The Leading Historical Figures

The early seventies brought into being the new wave known as “Shepherding Movement”, sometimes referred to as “Discipleship Movement”. It was led by the five famous teachers, sometimes called the ‘Fort Lauderdale Five’.

3.4.1.1. Don Basham: He was born on 17 September 1926 in Wichita Falls, Texas. Don grew up in a Disciples of Christ denomination, and was married to Alice in 1949. Academically, he obtained a BA and BD degrees at Phillips University, Enid in Oklahoma. He experienced Spirit baptism in 1953 under the guidance of the pioneer Charismatic leader, Harald Bredesen. His formative years of the ministry took him through pastorates in Washington DC, Toronto in Canada, and Sharon, Pennsylvania. He moved to Ft Lauderdale in South Florida at the dawn of 1968. He became a reputable family man committed to his wife and five children. Don’s character and teaching style is well captured by Moore (2003:35):

Don Basham was a gentle, casual man who spoke and taught in a relaxed, conversational manner. His messages and prose were clear, strong, and laced with stories and humour... His manner and leadership style never brought him the public recognition the other four received.

The focus of his ministry was deliverance from demonic powers, and the Spirit baptism.

3.4.1.2. Ern Baxter: A native of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada, was born on 22 June 1914 and grew up in Pentecostal tradition. He became a rebellious teenager and after serious illness, committed his life to Christ in 1932. He embraced Reformed theology while at the same time holding on to Pentecostal persuasions. He pastured the



Evangelistic Tabernacle Church in Vancouver for 25 years. He became closely associated with the itinerant ministry of the Charismatic evangelist, William Branhan. After seven years in this ministry he was burnt-out. Consequent to his recovery he started a new church, Open Bible Chapel. His wife, Margaret died in 1961. Together with his second wife, Ruth, engaged in extensive itinerant teaching and preaching ministry. In 1975, they settled in Ft Lauderdale. He was the oldest and experienced seasoned preacher in the Shepherding Movement. "During his years in ministry, Ern Baxter participated directly or indirectly in Classical Pentecostalism, the Healing Revival, the Latter Rain movement, and the Charismatic Renewal" (Moore 2003:37).

3.4.1.3. Bob Mumford: He was born on 29 December 1930 in Steubenville, Ohio. He was converted at the age of 12 in the Church of the Nazarene and backslided for 12 years. While in the navy in 1954, he recommitted his life to Christ in Assemblies of God church. Later enrolled at Eastern Bible Institute and graduated in 1959. He married Judith and in 1960 was ordained as an Assemblies of God minister. He later taught at Elim Bible Institute, New York. Bob was greatly influenced by David du Plessis and as a result felt called to transdenominational ministry. He pursued further studies at Episcopal Reformed Seminary (1967-1969) while at the same time pastoring in Wilmington, Delaware, ministering in Full Gospel Businessmen Fellowship, World Missionary Assistance Plan (World Map), and Holy Spirit Teaching Mission. The Mumford family moved to Ft Lauderdale in 1970 where their four children were raised. He became a figurehead and spokesman of the Shepherding Movement.

3.4.1.4. Derek Prince: He was born to British parents on 14 August 1915 in Bangalore, India. Prince in his formative years excelled in academia and mastered Hebrew, Latin, and Greek. He was converted to Christianity in 1941. While in the army at the height of World War II, he was stationed in Jerusalem where he met Lydia Christianson, who later became his wife in 1946. They adopted eight daughters of different nationalities. In 1957, the Prince family became missionaries in Kenya under Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada. They took up the pastorate in Seattle, USA, in 1962, and in 1968 they settled in Ft Lauderdale. Lydia died in 1975 and Derek married his second wife, Ruth, in 1978. His



teaching focused on the deliverance from demonic powers, intercessory prayer, and *glossolalia* as the initial physical evidence of Spirit baptism.

3.4.1.5. Charles Simpson: This gifted pastoral leader was the son of a Southern Baptist minister, born in New Orleans on 6 April 1937. After rebellious life, he was converted to Christianity in 1951 and at the age of 20 entered the ministry at Bayview Heights Baptist Church in Mobile, Alabama. He married Carolyn in 1960 and was blessed with three children. Simpson was introduced to Charismatic understanding of Spirit baptism by his friend, Ken Sumrall in 1964. He embraced Charismatic teachings and became a travelling preacher after settling in Ft Lauderdale. He shaped the Shepherding movement than any of the other teachers.

3.4.2. Their Unique Contribution

The five teachers played a major role in shaping the Shepherding movement as bedrock for the ecclesiological governance around the fivefold ministry concept. Their diversity created a premise of today's New Apostolic Reformation. Moore (2003:41) says of them

they were an unlikely mix: Basham, a Charismatic Disciple of Christ teacher and journalist; Baxter, a unique blend of the Pentecostal and Reformed traditions; Mumford, a Pentecostal trained at an Episcopal Seminary; Prince, the scholarly Classical Pentecostal; and Simpson, a Charismatic Southern Baptist pastor...

How did the Shepherding movement influence the fivefold doctrine?

3.4.2.1. The founders felt that *there was an inadequate church structure that was biblically authentic to enhance the community*. They shaped the movement into a house church movement. "In their ecclesiological practice the basic building block of church structure was the house church or cell group led by a pastor" (Moore 2003:181). The cell group was an ideal venue for practising pastoral care, developing relationships, and



experiencing true community. It was where “charismata” became operational for a purpose of

equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building of the body of Christ; until we all attain to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ (Eph 4:12-13; New American Standard Bible).

The notable characteristic of the cell group was the personal pastoral care focused on a church structure led by lay pastors. In a nutshell, the Shepherding movement focused on developing a practical ecclesiology, where the fivefold ministry could be applicable.

3.4.2.2. The movement emphasised *a relational base for pastoral care and discipleship as fundamental to the maturing of the believer*. The *locus* was that every believer needed a pastor. This relational aspect of pastoral care in a cell group was the premise for the fivefold ministry operation in the body of Christ.

3.4.2.3. The movement *emphasised non-professional leadership and non-traditional leadership training*. Most pastors were serving part-time in their roles. There were no minimum standards required for theological training. Leadership was developed through personal coaching and mentoring through the pastors and regular ministry training events. Entry into the ministry required personal calling and charismatic gifting.

3.4.2.4. The Shepherding movement *emphasised the relational organic nature of the church*. The best assessment is highlighted by Moore (2003:182) that “The church was a covenant community that valued interdependence and mutuality”. The Spirit’s operation was seen as the bonding force within the church.

3.4.2.5. Regardless of all these, it is justifiable to assess the movement’s exercise of authority *as hierarchical in a sense that the strong emphasis on submission to God’s*



delegated authority was a demand. In this regard, the authority was vested on the fivefold leaders (apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, and teacher). There was a strong and highly controversial emphasis on submission to shepherds or church leaders. Moriarty (1992:76) summarises the movement as follows:

They taught a pyramid form of church government that placed the members of the congregation at the base of the church; above them on the pyramid were the house-group leaders, who were to oversee the church members to ensure that each is disciplined properly; next in order were the elders, who held the house-group leaders accountable with regard to both their own lives and the lives of those under their authority; then the pastors, who held the elders accountable, and at the top was the apostle or apostles, who were accountable to one another. The rising levels of authority in pyramid form were designed to restore to the church its New Testament structure.

The critical analysis of Moriarty's assertion clearly reveals the hierarchical structure pinnacled by the apostles and the rest at the base of the pyramid. The other fivefold ministers are assumed to be following in the pyramid, but the emphasis is on the hierarchical authority of the apostles and/or the shepherds, who happened to be pastors in some instances.

3.5. THE POSITIVE CONFESSION MOVEMENT

3.5.1. The Historical Background

There are number of names associated with this movement: 'word of faith'; 'name it and claim it'; 'health and wealth'; 'happiness movement'; and 'faith-formula theology'. Its detractors call it prosperity gospel. The movement traces its origin to the controversial



Baptist evangelist known as E.W Kenyon of the early 1880s. The home base of this theology was Emerson College of Oratory in Boston. Kenyon was neither Pentecostal nor Charismatic, but promoted divine healing based on the strength of one's confession. His persuasion is well summarised by Moriarty (1992:79) that

He insisted that according to Isa 53:4, Mt 8:17, and 1 Pe 2:24, the perfect atoning work of Christ on the cross "has provided" (past tense) complete physical healing for 'all' sickness and disease. The believer's job is to believe and to positively confess (or claim) physical healing, which was already provided for in the perfect redemption of Christ on the cross.

For Kenyon, physical healing and prosperity were equated. The teaching of victorious, prosperous, healthy living, in the natural and spiritual emerged from three camps (B Hamon 1990:132):

1. Oral Roberts's ministry of teaching the seed faith principle of sowing and reaping, of sowing finances to reap finances.
2. Robert Schuller's ministry of positive living and success principles.
3. The group of ministers who became known as "prosperity preachers," the "Faith message teachers," or the "Word People."

3.5.2. The prominent promoters of this theology are:

3.5.2.1. Kenneth Hagin: He was born on 20 August 1917 with a deformed heart. He was converted to Christ on 22 April 1933 and had some supernatural encounter with God on 1 January 1934 when Mark 11:23-24 filled his thoughts. Out of this repeated confessions of healing, Hagin built his theology of 'Believe in your heart, say it with your mouth, and receive it'. This became a renowned faith-formula theology of the positive confession movement. Hagin's ministry reached its zenith in the 1970s. In 1974 he built Rhema Bible Training Centre in Tulsa, Oklahoma. The graduates of this institution spread



throughout the world propagating Hagin theology of health, wealth, and happiness through confession.

3.5.2.2. Kenneth Copeland: Very little is known of his background, but was admirer of Hagin theology in its totality. Hagin prophesied over him and anointed him into the ministry. Copeland mentored some prominent positive confession movement leaders such as Jerry Savelle, Fred Price, Charles Capp, and Robert Tilton.

3.5.3. Their Contribution to the Fivefold Ministry

The movement was not emphatic on church structures like its predecessors. However, their primordial emphasis on *charismata* included the *doma* of Eph 4. The emphasis on the conspicuous gifts such as miracles, healings, and *glossolia* marked their movement without any marginalisation of the leadership gifts of Eph 4. Like their predecessors, the church structure was pyramidal with a strong emphasis on grassroots networking. This fact is also highlighted by Richard Quebedeaux (1983:89) that “the pentecostal movement is a *weblike network*. Its structure is weblike, the cells and groups are all tied together, not at a central point, but by intersecting sets of personal relationships and other intergroup linkages.” It is at this interaction level that all charismata are expected to operate. This has always been practised around the trusted authority figure who, in many cases, is a Charismatic leader and the organisational leader at the same time. Their theological constructs especially ecclesiological understanding became a precursor of the epitome of the fivefold ministry as is seen in today’s apostolic movement.

3.6. THE “THIRD WAVE”

The name was coined by Peter Wagner, Church Growth professor from Fuller Theological Seminary in 1980. The coining of the term was influenced by the consequent two waves of the Classical Pentecostal movement and the Charismatic movement. The name was closely connected with John Wimber (1934-1997), Wagner’s fellow lecturer at Fuller Theological Seminary, specialising with ‘Signs and Wonders’ course. Wimber



established Vineyard Christian Fellowship in Anaheim, California where emphasis was laid on the renewal of churches throughout the English-speaking world. Its doctrinal distinctive is observed by Allan Anderson (2004:159):

The Third wave movement moved completely away from this idea of a ‘second blessing’ experience of the Spirit to Spirit baptism occurring at conversion and an emphasis on the gifts of the Spirit in evangelism and as part of Christian life, a concept that many evangelicals found more acceptable.

3.6.1. The Ecclesiastical Practices of the “Third Wave” Churches

3.6.1.1. Apostolic Government

The apostles and the prophets are the foundational government structure of the church. Myer (2006) captures the fivefold ministers by alluding that the apostles govern, the prophets guide, the evangelists gather, the pastors guard, and the teachers ground. The apostle and the prophet are like spearheads, and the church is built on the foundation they lay (Eph 2:20). Failure to lay a proper foundation makes the church to lose direction, strength, anointing, and spiritual insight. Myers (2006:57) continues that these leaders are called by Christ to exercise authority over their spheres of influence:

Apostles have always been foundation layers and spiritual parents. They are parenting-type figures who have the ability to attract and birth other leaders. They are master builders who have a strong passion to see the church built on right foundations. They are servants of the church who are sent out by the church to evangelize and to plant churches, thus having an itinerant ministry as they often exercise general leadership over a group of churches.



The apostolic pastors cast the vision of the church and are its primary leaders. Their primary functions include:

3.6.1.2. Making new disciples.

This is in line with the Apostolic Mandate, as stipulated in the Great Commission (Matt 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-18). A primary manifestation of apostolic ministry is to win souls and then father them in Christ. This is believed to be in line with Paul's theology that sees disciple making as a primary badge of apostleship:

- *Even though you have ten thousand guardians in Christ, you do not have many fathers, for in Christ Jesus I became your father through the gospel (1 Cor 4:15).*
- *Even though I may not be an apostle to others, surely I am to you! For you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord (1 Cor 9:2).*

Paul's *modus operandi* was to go into the new territory, engage in *kerygma*, establish the new churches and leadership, and move on. His apostolic method focused on disciple making and establishment of the *ecclesiastical* community.

3.6.1.3. Raising new leaders.

Giving birth to new lives (converts) includes giving birth to new leaders who in turn produce new life. A vital area of the apostle's ministry is the ability to train disciples and develop support teams. An apostle is God's architect, who has received a mandate from Christ – an architect or master builder, who knows that building is a process. The track record of an apostle is the leaders raised in the particular ministry. The Emerging Apostolic leaders constantly justify this step by referring to history that in 1530, at the Diet of Augsburg, a certain group of princes and cities submitted to His Imperial Majesty Charles V what is popularly known as 'The Augsburg Confession' which emphasised that a local church that is producing new converts, making and training disciples and



releasing new leaders will necessarily be one where, to use the Reformational formula, “the gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered” (Peters 2000:270). For the emerging apostolic churches, the church is neither the church *in credendo* i.e. passively receiving the deposit of faith from the teaching office, nor the church *in docendo* i.e. in teaching. It is all about people and leadership development. Leadership development is emphasised by promoting and maintaining corporate culture and values. This is enhanced further by promoting the leadership that emerges from within. The apostolic leaders are rarely incorporated from outside.

The apostolic mandate of raising new leaders is derived from Paul’s style or relationship with Timothy. The apostle teaches and trains the disciples: *You then, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable men who will also be qualified to teach others (2 Tim 2:1-2).*

3.6.1.4. Planting of new churches

Apostles are anointed church planters. They plant strong, healthy local churches. They have an anointing to bring supernatural power and efficiency to the vital task of planting new churches. In the lengthy words of Brooks (2002:182)

Churches that do make disciples and train leaders will inevitably end up planting new churches. Everything that is living and healthy reproduces. As new churches multiply, they become a family of churches that have a common ‘spiritual DNA’ and mission. Protecting the mission and these ‘family ties’ then becomes a great responsibility, particularly when other congregations want to be grafted in. It can be difficult, even destructive, to bring ‘orphaned’ churches into a spiritual family when they haven’t been birthed and nurtured in the common mission and value system of that family.



The apostolic leaders make vision clear from the beginning in order to preserve the unity and the direction of the church.

3.6.1.5. Pioneering new territories.

The emerging apostolic movement is insistent that the apostolic task is the *kerygmatic* one where the gospel had not been heard before and plant churches where none had existed before. This apostolic task is completed when the local church is planted, and it had received sufficient *didaskalia* to enable it to understand its Christian status and *missional* responsibility. The apostle is driven by the territories that have had little or no Gospel witness. This is the Pauline motif expressed in Rom 15:20; *It has always been my ambition to preach the gospel where Christ was not known, so that I would not be building on someone else's foundation.*

3.6.1.6. Unity in the Body of Christ.

Ecumenical cooperation plays an important role in the emerging apostolic churches. The apostolic churches' vision is expected to extend beyond their own growth. When other ministers are seen as competitors, unity is compromised, and with it, spiritual power. Wagner (1993:139) agrees with this assertion:

The unity necessary in a given city for effective spiritual warfare must begin with unity among pastors and top Christian leaders. The pastors of the local churches are the spiritual gatekeepers of the city, and as such they have divine authority. Apparently Satan knows much better than many pastors that 'by uniting we stand; by dividing we fall.' In city after city, Satan has succeeded in keeping pastors divided and thus maintained the authority of whatever strongman he has assigned to the city. For good reason, the thing these territorial spirits fear the most is the unity of the pastors, and through them the unity of the Body of Christ.



The local church is critical for people's growth and development. The Trinitarian nature of God is the object lesson for the apostolic leaders to work with one another to prevent divisions and to facilitate the growth of the body for the edifying of itself in love.

3.6.1.7. Power and miracles.

The Lukan reminder in Acts 3:19-21 plays a pivotal role as a promise to be fulfilled in this day and age

Repent, then, and turn to God, so that your sins may be wiped out, that times of refreshing may come from the Lord, and that he may send the Christ, who has been appointed for you- even Jesus. He must remain in heaven until the time comes for God to restore everything, as he promised long ago through the holy prophets.

The miracles of the evident presence of the power of God are expected when the apostolic gift is in operation. It should create hunger and thirst for the word of God. It should dismiss the chains of doubt and realise that *Jesus is the same yesterday, today, and forever (Hebr 13:8)*. Wagner (1998:14) acknowledges this fact that power and miracles accompanying the apostolic ministry lead to church growth: "I noticed that the churches worldwide that seems to grow the most rapidly were, for the most part, those that outwardly featured the immediate present-day supernatural ministry of the Holy Spirit". This is attested by Pauline defence or affirmation of apostleship: *The things that mark an apostle – signs, wonders and miracles – were done among you with great perseverance (2 Cor 12:12)*. The power of the Holy Spirit is the current that gives the emerging apostolic movement its intensity. This apostolic wave rises up in obedience to the command of the Spirit of God. Cannistraci (1996:160) drives this home:

Although having a miracle ministry is not proof that a person is an apostle, nowhere in Scripture is apostolic ministry endorsed as



anything less than supernatural. We have already seen that after patience, signs, wonders and mighty deeds are the authenticating marks on the touchstone of apostleship (see 2 Cor 12:12). The idea of apostles without supernatural anointing falls short of the picture of apostolic ministry painted in the New Testament.

3.6.1.8. Workplace apostles (Public apostles)

This concept, as controversial as it may seem, was coined by Wagner in his book, *Changing Church (2004)*. The concept comes out of the influence of kingdom mind-set or what the emerging apostolic movement commonly calls kingdom vision. It is sometimes called “market-place Christianity”. People minister where they are. There is no division between sacred and spiritual sphere of influence. There is no such a thing as secular business people and spiritual church people. In the words of Myer (2006:118), “There are many fivefold gifts at work in the marketplace, and often there is no place given for them to function in the local church. They flourish in the marketplace and the local church continues on without their gift or input.” This is the paradigm shift whereby church is viewed not as a physical building structure in a local setting. It is the view that Christians in the market place influence their environment with kingdom principles that are rooted in Scripture. The workplace apostles are convinced that their influence in the market place is not for personal aggrandizement, but the gate of social transformation and transference of wealth. The New Apostolic Reformation insists on kingdom vision in order to challenge the denominations to find ways to discover and release the principles of apostolic, transforming relationships within their structures.

3.6.1.9. Territorial Vision

This research discovered a strong missional spirit within the emerging apostolic churches. This is intertwined with *ecumenical* endeavours that seek opportunities with other *ecclesiastical* bodies in order to accomplish God’s purposes in a given territory. This is enhanced by the apostolic leaders’ self-evaluation whereby they see themselves as



ecclesia on divine assignment regarding their cities, districts, regions, and countries. Many apostolic networks around the world emphasise relational and territorial authority. Cannistraci (1996:153) quotes Dick Iverson positively that “relationship, not hierarchy, is the basis of spiritual authority. Holding a position, filling an office, or being elected to a place of importance is not how spiritual elders are made – they earn it! One qualifies to be a leader by developing relationships.” It is a matter of building a rapport. The emerging apostolic church leaders take command from the history that territories were designed for feasible governance, so why not the same for church? After elaborating on historical divisions of territories, Cannistraci (1996:154) concludes:

Apostles have historically been burdened for specific territories of the earth. If Satan has established territorial spirits to run the global battle against the Church, as many today believe, is it not possible that God also has established territorial apostles to help counteract their destructive activity? The dynamics for world evangelisation that become possible when apostles properly relate to one another in all these aspects is thrilling.

3.6.1.10. Equipping Paradigms

Like the classical Pentecostals, New Apostolic Reformation has a critical, suspicious and reserved eye towards rationalism associated with academic endeavours. Stackhouse (2004:258) addresses this that, “as a phrase, ‘equipping the saints’ is something of a euphemism for a particularly anti-clerical, democratic ecclesiology.” It has been invoked regularly in the emerging charismatic churches as a slogan that embraces the importance of every member’s ministry, the realisation of that ministry in the church and the workplace, and the focusing of church leadership on the effective mobilisation of that ministry. The task of leadership is not to do ministry, but according to Ephesians 4:11, to equip others to do the ministry. The seminary is associated with dry knowledge, blatant information, criticism, and liberal approach to spiritual dynamics. The anti-intellectual stereotype that has marked Pentecostalism for a century is noticeable in the new apostolic



movement. The absence of clear Systematic Theology and passion for Church History makes the movement vulnerable to past theological flaws. This approach does not adequately prepare future leaders who can carefully prepare future leaders to sensitively discern and communicate the historic Christian *faith that was once for all entrusted to the saints (Jude 3)*.

Positively, one of the distinctive characteristics of the emerging new apostolic movement is the paradigm shift towards “equipping” of Ephesians 4:12. The apostolic mandate includes equipping the saints. In the broader arena, the fivefold ministry exists for equipping of the saints, and for setting order in the church. This is not done through formal education but an engagement in teaching and training the apprentices. Basically it is when the spiritual leader gives advice about every detail of life. When the leader is not sure of an answer, he waits to hear wisdom from heaven. This creates an atmosphere of training and helping around the fivefold minister. The same atmosphere around the fivefold minister, especially the apostle, will eventually be transferred to the local church.

The conviction here is that the goal of the fivefold ministers is to bring the saints to *unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ (Ephesians 4:13)*. Their goal is to prepare the saints for ministry. When the fivefold ministers release *domata* they have received from Christ, believers receive an impartation so each one can be better equipped to fulfil God’s call and purpose in one’s life. Their ecstasy is fanned when believers are trained and equipped and released for the work of ministry. The fivefold ministers equip others to take the church to the people. The bottom line of the method in equipping the saints is what is commonly known as mentoring or fathering. This fact is also confirmed by Myers (2006:54); that “modeling ministry is just as important as teaching methodology or theology. Jesus not only taught His disciples what to do, He showed them how to do it.”



3.6.1.11. Holiness Doctrine

The emerging apostolic movement has not desisted from its roots in Wesleyan heritage. Holiness is viewed as a definite experience to be attained, an eternal approximation toward an unrealizable ideal. It is an experience attained by faith and has the capacity to bring spiritual upliftment that marks an epoch in the recipient's life. Holiness is spiritual attainment that addresses the issue of accountability that does not come through legal systems. It is this holiness that provides the biblical framework for an apostolic lifestyle that is rooted in the fear of the Lord and humility. The New Apostolic Reformation's clarion call is a renewed personal and corporate holiness, void of legalism and an arrogant sinless perfectionism. Wagner (1986:131) appeals to Pentecostals; "Hold purity high. I do not see much change as yet in biblical authority or doctrine, but I do detect some watering down of the Christian lifestyle as distinctly separated from the world around. Keep strict, and God will bless." The doctrine of holiness plays a major role in theological determinations and endeavours within the apostolic tradition – including the polity issues. Responsibility, accountability, and integrity are personalised in such a way that a leader or any of the fivefold ministers is accountable only to God and himself or herself. The private life (personal holiness) dictates the public life (corporate holiness). It is for this reason that *theological* utterances or statements are deflected and *ecclesiastical* directions are determined subjectively. It is all about *sancta simplicitas* – holy simplicity in church leadership.

The New Apostolic Reformation disregards the fundamental truth that Systematic Theology plays a crucial role in determining the church structure and polity. To use Sauter's (2003:87) injunction: "Dogmatics is the aid to memory for the spiritual life; it helps us not to forget essential things." Just as philosophy is analogously and scholastically defined as the *ancilla theologiae*, theology is rightly defined as the *servant of faith*. Ogden (1996:63) explains the task of theology and the theologian as *Servus Servorum Dei* – the servant task, serving God as a servant above all. It is for this reason



that the church must eschatologically see herself as *Ecclesia discens* (learns) and as *Ecclesia docens* (teaches).

3.6.1.12. The Apostolic Networks

The New Apostolic Reformation detests the denominational structures and organisations that are based on policies and rules. These had been replaced with the *apostolic networks*. Cannistraci (1996:190) gives the elaborative definition of these networks as a family of local churches:

An apostolic network can take many forms. Essentially, it is a band of autonomous churches and individual ministries that are voluntarily united in an organised structure. This framework of human relationships is sufficient to facilitate interdependency between network members and their apostolic oversight. Network members possess a common vision and demonstrate a tangible expression of New Testament apostolic ministry. Although each network may accomplish organisation through varied methods, values, philosophies, and goals, they all share the essence of connecting relationships and combining resources.

The concept of apostolic networks plays a pivotal role in the church polity of the emerging apostolic movement. They are the system designed to give support to each other in any area of ecclesiastical expression such as emotional, financial, and/or intellectual support. Like in the early classical Pentecostal Movement, the emerging apostolic movement is a weblike network. In the words of Quebedeaux (1983:89); “its structure is weblike, the cells and groups are all tied together, not at a central point, but by intersecting sets of personal relationships and other intergroup linkages.” There are personal links among the church members and personal ties among the leaders of various churches themselves. This is evidenced by participation in conferences or training events.



The Apostolic Network alludes to church polity:

3.6.1.12.1 Autonomy: The emphasis on the autonomy of the local church gives the movement vitality. The principle of local autonomy is never compromised in the apostolic networks. It is the congregational system that embraces the concept of independency. Each local church, under the authority of Christ, governs itself. There is no ecclesiastical authority outside or above the local fellowship of the believers. The apostles' translocal authority does not override the local authority. The local autonomy and self-rule remain constant. Though not vehemently stated by the emerging apostolic movement, this church government concept promotes and embraces the principles of democracy that rest on the persuasion that Christ is the sole head of His church; and that all believers are priests serving God. The unfortunate situation is that in many of these churches, the churches are the law unto themselves.

3.6.1.12.2. Volunteerism: The key factor is mutual respect and true submission to each other. The ecclesiastical community is blessed because of the voluntary submission to the apostolic leadership. Relational submission is voluntary. Cannistraci (1996:150) reinforces this idea that

As the people voluntarily submitted, the apostles led and governed. This is the true pattern for submission and godly authority in the home, the church and the government. A leader cannot lead unless people willingly follow, nor can an apostle demand a response because he is an apostle. Apostles are servants who minister to those who will freely receive their authority.

This includes the principle of voluntary association. The emerging apostolic movement promotes voluntary church membership which produces fervent evangelism in the form of apostolic incarnation in market places. This voluntarism, in the words of Volf (1998:2) is the incorporative act which “is deliberate on the part of the candidate and the



community alike.” It is when people, not under compulsion, voluntarily unite and join the newly-found fellowship of the believers.

3.6.1.12.3. Relationships: The strength of the apostolic network lies with relationships that are voluntary and are all driven by God *kingdom mentality*. Mutuality breeds accountability that is manifested by openness, communication, and teachability. This notion is enhanced by Hayford and Moore (2006:275) that

around such leaders were growing networks, large and small, or what could almost be described as mini-denominations, except that they are organized relationally, not organizationally. These associations of pastors and churches under the apostolic leader are based on affinity rather than strict doctrinal statements or hierarchical structures.

3.6.1.12.4. Interdependency: The interdependent cooperation subjugates control, domination and manipulation. The apostolic authority enhances the principle of interdependence in the local church. This interdependence is an intricate interlacing of apostolic leadership, local leadership and the local membership. This is different from independency, which promotes isolation and separation. For the emerging apostolic movement, independence is tantamount to ecclesiastical unity. Their unity is echoed by Akin (2004:141) that “the only unity that lasts and that glorifies God is that unity that is based upon a passion for God’s truth, a passion for the gospel. Extra biblical ecclesiastical organisations have been tremendously effective in creating *disunity* over time.”

3.6.1.12.5. Apostolic Oversight: The apostolic oversight is servant (*leitourgos*) leadership. An apostle’s greatness and authority come from serving. The authoritative apostolic ministry takes the form of servant leadership. “In new apostolic thinking, trust is in individuals, not in boards, committees, teams or councils” (Wagner 1999:128). The apostolic networks have one leader, who gathers around him an apostolic team that



voluntarily submits to the final authority of one leader – the *primus inter pares* (first among the equals).

The key factor in the emerging apostolic churches is the networks based on and around the relationships. These are the main source of organisational strength. For these churches, the body of Christ had become an authentic and dynamic network. The focal point of relationships is fellowship – a cherished priority for the New Apostolic Churches. Fellowship refines and produces the glow of purity in the church life.

The apostles or the apostolic teams of territorial churches have their primary power-base in the local churches. Local churches flow in and out of apostolic networks. Despite all this, the power-base of apostolic leaders is parochial and not eclectic or free-standing. They unintentionally diminish their own power-base when they give succour to sectarian ideas of the church. This is evidenced by some apostolic pastors who reside in one city but leads a church in another city. He flies in on Saturday evenings or Sunday mornings to come to preach and after that depart for the city of his residence. This brings the pastoral care (shepherding) into debatable ethics. The identity of ecclesiastical community needs to be serviced by cultivating the power-base of affirmations within the community itself.

The inevitable process of *routinisation of charisma* needs to be reckoned with. The charismatic Christians follow a charismatic leader who possesses qualities that are believed to be emanating from superhuman sources. This notion is attested by Quebedeaux (1983:88); “leadership in a decentralized movement is, by and large, based on personal charisma rather than the fulfilment of bureaucratic training requirements and progression up through ranked positions.” The leaders who establish apostolic networks carry an enormous authority since they cast the vision which others voluntarily and unreservedly implement. After the death of a leader, the followers devise the ways and means of perpetuating the charisma, not the democratic structures where the power shifts from God to an elitist group. The intention is to maintain the trust not in a group, but in a charismatic leader. This is what Wagner (1999:143) refers to as cultivating charisma as



opposed to routinisation of charisma. In fact, he is of the strong opinion that cultivating charisma, if done well and persistently, can prove to be the salvation of the New Apostolic Reformation. This will stop the generational routinisation of charisma, especially if there is a multiplication of networks.

3.7. THE NEW APOSTOLIC REFORMATION (NAR)

3.7.1. Its Origin

This movement, in its varied forms and names, is the key subject of this research. The term “New Apostolic Reformation” was coined by the church growth professor out of Fuller Theological Seminary, and the author on Pentecostal/Charismatic theological perspectives. His name is C Peter Wagner, the cofounder of the World Prayer Centre in Colorado Springs. Wagner (2004:10) gives the rationale behind this new terminology:

I use “Reformation” because, as I have said, I believe it at least matches the Protestant Reformation in its overall impact; “Apostolic” because the most radical of all the changes is the widespread recognition of the gift and office of apostle in today’s churches; and “New” to distinguish the movement from a number of denominations that use the word “Apostolic” in their official names yet exhibit patterns common to the more traditional churches rather than to these new ones.

These are the new apostolic charismatic churches that emerged towards the close of the twentieth century. They are normally independent, but as Wagner (1998:19) in another book asserts: “... but for the most part they are taking the form of loosely structured apostolic networks.” Wagner recognised an emerging church government and leadership paradigm among certain growing churches and movements. His two well researched works, *The New Apostolic Churches (1998)*, and *Churchquake (1999)*, attest to this new terminology. The “Third Wave” terminology describes evangelicals who see themselves



as neither Pentecostal nor charismatic but who believe and act like them. Recently, *Christianity Today* (2007:23-24) magazine covered an article, “Health and Wealth in Africa: How the Prosperity Gospel is Taking a Continent by Storm” and in it, this ecclesiastical phenomenon is referred to as “renewalists” (a term that includes both Pentecostals and Charismatics). These renewalists move beyond traditional Pentecostal practices of speaking in tongues, prophesying, and healing to the belief that God will provide money, cars, houses, and even spouses in response to believers’ faith – if not immediately, then soon. Like a chief leading his followers toward better lives, an apostle is a larger than life figure whose largeness proves he is worth heeding. The New Apostolic Reformation churches are very personality-driven.

3.7.2. Names and designations

The latest literature has different names and designations attached to this movement:

3.7.2.1. Post denominational Churches: This term does not enjoy popularity among the apostolic churches, because there are some churches within established traditions that align themselves with the New Apostolic Reformation character. A relevant example will be a well-known fivefold teacher, Jack Hayford of Foursquare Church, known as The Church on the Way, based in Van Nuys, California.

3.7.2.2. Independent Churches: In external perspective, this term sounds relevant, but internally it is seen as pejorative since these churches see themselves as connected to the Body of Christ. They prefer to be categorised as *interdependent*. They are called to give up their declaration of *independence* and embrace the declaration of *interdependence*.

3.7.2.3. Charismatic Churches: Wagner (1999:40) observes that in United States of America 80% of the new apostolic congregations are charismatic, while 20% are noncharismatic. The notable examples of the latter are the Crystal Cathedral, Willow Creek Community Church, and Community Church of Joy. Very few of the apostolic



leaders would typify themselves as “cessationists” and they would not regard themselves as charismatic.

3.7.2.4. Restoration Churches: This is the concept that subsequently emerged out of the Latter Rain Movement after World War II. The implication is that they are in the process of restoring true biblical Christianity since New Testament era. This is sometimes confused with the nineteenth century Presbyterian Restoration Movement of Barton Stone, which gave birth to the denominations such as Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, and Churches of Christ. The church historians regard these denominations as the original owners of this brand name.

3.7.2.5. Grassroots Churches: This is the term that was coined by Mike Berg and Paul Pretiz in their book, **Spontaneous Combustion: Grass-roots Christianity, Latin American Style (1996)**. The term never held water for apostolic churches since it is the exact description of the indigenous Third World churches established in what used to be the mission field.

3.7.2.6. Neo-denominational Churches: They are not the rejection of the denomination, but the endorsement of them. The term encapsulates the denominational marks of centuries past; as Simpson (1996:5) of Fuller Seminary remarked: “strength in numbers, power in cooperation, edification in fellowship, safety in accountability, effectiveness in synergy, and fruitfulness in relationship.”

3.7.2.7. New-paradigm Churches: This term was coined by Miller (1997:18) of University of Southern California after some intensive research on selected new apostolic churches

3.7.2.8. The Next church: Charles Trueheart in *Atlantic Monthly* (August 1996) wrote a provocative article with a title; “The Next Church” and in that article he termed these churches as the Next Church and on page 37 he recorded:



No spires. No crosses. No robes. No clerical collars. No hard pews. No kneelers. No biblical gobbledygook. No prayerly rote. No fire, no brimstone. No pipe organs. No dreary eighteenth-century hymns. No forced solemnity. No Sunday finery. No collection plates... The Next Church, as the independent and entrepreneurial congregations that are adopting these new forms might collectively be called, is drawing lots of people.

3.7.2.9. **The Emerging Apostolic Movement:** This was popularized by David Cannistraci in his book, *Apostles and the Emerging Apostolic Movement* (1996). In this book, Cannistraci belabours the fact that apostles are to be restored to church government today. He exhausts the rationale behind the apostolic government and the *raison d'être* for the apostolic churches and their impact in the universal church of today.

3.7.2.10. **The New Apostolic Churches:** The name was suggested by Peter Wagner, and he wrote a book with the same title in 1998 wherein he surveys eighteen apostolic churches in USA, Hawaii, Singapore, South Africa, Nigeria, The Philippines, and Thailand as case studies for New Apostolic Reformation.

3.7.2.11. **The New Apostolic Reformation:** This is the brainchild of Peter Wagner. It has become a new *terminology* referring to the group of churches that embrace fivefold ministry as a legitimate New Testament structure.

3.7.3. Its Polity and Church Government

The amount of spiritual authority is delegated by the Holy Spirit to individuals. The apostolic pastors are the leaders of the church, not the employees of the church. The congregations are expected to trust their pastors. The New Apostolic Reformation shifts from the democratic church government. As far as they are concerned, the traditional democratic church governments came largely from the historical culture rather than from biblical exegesis. They are of opinion that a democratic rule in the church has become a



de facto doctrine. Wagner (2004:27) insists that “the corporate spirit of religion targets its most decisive work on the minds of leaders, individually and collectively. Its goal is to preserve the status quo of the old wineskin, not allowing the wineskin to move into God’s new times and seasons.” The goal is to break the shell of tradition and go beyond the traditional boundaries regarding the church polity, where God is moving. Van der Ven (1996:297) cautions this leniency:

In *charismatic authority* leadership is acknowledged on the basis of exceptional or even extranatural or supernatural gifts attributed to it. The founders of the religions and of new movements within these religions are often attached to charismatic authority. Jesus himself is an eminent example of this, but so are people like Francis and Ignatius, who stood at the beginning of religious movements or renewal in Christianity. Charismatic authority is personal authority.

It is this kind of leadership that experiences problems when succession plan is to be implemented. The successor might not have the *charisma* that the predecessor had.

3.7.4. Its View of the Fivefold Ministry

The movement has the tendency of seeing the fivefold ministry not as just gifts, but as church offices that operate as *leitourgoi* – the recognised leaders in a public domain. Typical of the Charismatic pneumatological analysis, the New Apostolic Reformation aims to bring revolutionary and restorational work of the Holy Spirit. This perception is inseparable from the notion of renewal of church structures and polity. Bishop Bill Hamon, one of the staunch promoters of the fivefold ministry, as a contributor to Wagner’s book (1998:152) highlights this fact that “The New Apostolic Reformation is bringing about the removal of many man-made traditions within the Church, such as distinctions between laity and clergy, spiritual and secular, and members and ministers.” This is a constant point of departure in the Charismatic theology of today. Doug Beacham (Green 2005:13) confirms:



The Charismatic/Pentecostal community is facing a challenge- and it's not about theology, worship styles, or spiritual gifts. It all comes down to the (until recently) dry topic of church government... Leaders in the New Apostolic Reformation (NAR) suggest that traditional denominations are jettisoned in favour of a more biblically based ecclesiastical structure governed by modern-day apostles and prophets.

This idea says volumes regarding the church government. The apostolic leaders are insistent that the apostles and prophets are the foundational government structure of the church. They are called by Christ to lead authoritatively over their spheres of influence. They are called to cast the vision of the church and to become its primary leaders

Table 3.1: Men known to be representing forty years of renewal (Hamon 1990:50)

<i>Oral Roberts</i>	<i>Laying on of hands for healing; seed faith</i>
<i>Billy Graham</i>	<i>Evangelism and the born-again experience</i>
<i>Paul Cain</i>	<i>Demonstration of prophets in the Church</i>
<i>Dick Iverson</i>	<i>Prophetic presbytery and the local church</i>
<i>T L Osborne</i>	<i>Mass evangelism with miracles</i>
<i>David Wilkerson</i>	<i>Gang and street ministry, the Jesus Movement</i>
<i>Demos Shakarian</i>	<i>Charismatic renewal among businessmen</i>
<i>Pat Robertson</i>	<i>Christian television networks, his own CBN</i>
<i>Paul Crouch</i>	<i>TBN church ministries and television evangelism</i>
<i>Dennis Bennet</i>	<i>Charismatic renewal; gift of the Holy Spirit</i>
<i>Charles Simpson</i>	<i>Discipleship; accountability and relationship</i>
<i>Kenneth Hagin</i>	<i>Faith; financial prosperity and deliverance</i>
<i>Yongghi Cho</i>	<i>Mega-churches, cell groups, intercessory prayers</i>
<i>Earl Paulk</i>	<i>Kingdom of God message, witness and ministry</i>
<i>Larry Lea</i>	<i>Daily early morning and warfare prayer</i>
<i>Bill Hamon</i>	<i>Prophets, prophetic ministry, warfare praise</i>



3.8. SUMMARY

The emerging apostolic movement regards the historical unfolding of these movements as a Holy Spirit orchestrated restorative endeavours of restructuring the church for the new thing God is planning to do. This new thing is the restoration of apostles and prophets to their original position in church government. Bill Hamon (1997) calls this God's end-time plans for His church and planet earth. The fading away of these movements in history does not nullify their authenticity, but they were raised for a specific purpose at the certain time. They are the consistent methods that God the Father directs the Holy Spirit to use in restoring Christ's Church to the place of purity and maturity for the presentation as a proper Bride to Jesus Christ the Bridegroom. In another book (1990:25), Bill Hamon asserts: "He prepares a **people**, a **product**, and a **place** to perpetuate His plan. The Lord Jesus then raises up a **man** with a **message** and a **ministry** which produces a **movement** that further fulfils His will by various **methods** and **means**."

Every movement, from the early church age through Protestant era to the latest Charismatic renewal, had the purpose of activating the period of great restoration of the Church. Most of the emerging apostolic leaders are of the opinion that the Protestant Movement was to restore faith in Christ to the Church. The central message was repentance from dead works. The Holiness/ Evangelical Movement were to restore Christ to the Church. The central message was faith toward God. The Classical Pentecostal Movement came into being to restore the Holy Spirit back into the Church. The message was the expectation of miracles especially speaking in tongues and healing. The Latter Rain Movement sensitised the Church of the need for experiencing God in a real way. The Shepherding Movement echoed the need for the small fellowship under the shepherding leaders. The prosperity gospel preachers reminded the Church of the dynamic faith that can bring out a better life. The New Apostolic Reformation ushered in the fivefold ministry as an ideal church government that promotes church growth in the last days of God's plans for the church.



CHAPTER 4: THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS ON FIVEFOLD MINISTRY

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter debates the emerging apostolic movement's understanding of the fivefold ministry, and its theological roots as demonstrated by the concept of restoration, the 'hand illustration', the broader understanding of Ephesians 4 passage, the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, and the influence of fundamentalism. The New Apostolic Reformation is used as a case study representing these views. The research continues to explore the understanding of *charisms* within the context of Traditional, Reformed, and Charismatic ecclesiologies. The New Testament Church leadership is scrutinised as a precursor that influences charismatic understanding of leadership especially in reference to the *ecclesiality* and the *contextuality* of the early church organisation. The chapter further explores the rationale behind the lack of cohesion within the charismatic ecclesiology – basing this on the ecclesiastical and theological background of charismatic leaders, the lack of *catechesis*, the lack of theological scholarship, the limitations of charismatic institutions curricular, the narrow charismatic dogma, the influence of phenomenology, and the role of *Realpolitik* and *vox populi* in influencing the emerging apostolic churches government and polity. The chapter concludes with the highlights of the misunderstandings of *charismata* within the current ecclesiastical practices.

4.2. NEW APOSTOLIC REFORMATION'S FIVEFOLD MINISTRY

Following the famous Azusa Street revival in Los Angeles in 1906, the restoration of the fivefold ministry and a mighty outpouring of the Holy Spirit just before the return of Christ picked up new steam. This spawned a new generation of apostles to appear, and the restoration of the fivefold ministry somehow faded until the late forties of the twentieth century. The doctrine of fivefold ministry dates as far back as the era of the Latter Rain Movement, which emerged in 1948. Moriarty (1992:44-64) gives an in-depth into this movement. The adherents of this doctrine believe that the church will better fulfil its mandate or mission here on earth by accepting the five offices of church



government as stipulated in Ephesians 4:11. These are the fivefold ascension gift ministers as revealed by this passage. They are not gifts of the Holy Spirit, but an extension of Christ's headship ministry to the Church – not *charismata*, but *doma*. Their primary ministry and function are to teach, train, activate, and mature the saints for the work of their ministries (Eph 4:12-13). There is also some *eschatological* perception that embracing this doctrine will also hasten the second coming of Jesus Christ – the notion promoted by Payne (2004:78)

The fivefold ministry is a demand for the church to be Lord's church in this age. Education is good, but we need more than education or ambition within Church's government. The Church needs a ministry equipped with supernatural power and gifts. We will understand five ministries in the governmental ministry of the church.

Generally, the fivefold ministry is a concept of church leadership based upon the ministry of men and women who have been supposedly divinely called and anointed with one of five ministry gifts listed in Eph 4:11. It is seen as a provision of divinely appointed leadership for the body of Christ. The fivefold ministry leaders are raised up as by God's express will, and are seen as Christ's gifts (*domata*) to the Church. The church is expected to heed them and follow them. They are leaders with special offices and ministries to guide and govern the Christian Church that drew upon the leadership gifts present in believers other than the traditional Pentecostal leadership roles of pastors, elders, and deacons.

4.3. THE THEOLOGICAL ROOTS OF FIVEFOLD MINISTRY

4.3.1. It is all about restoration

The New Apostolic Reformation insists that the Holy Spirit is activating a restoration movement within the corporate Church of Jesus Christ today. This is a new thing that God is doing: - to restore Christ's ascension gift ministry of the five offices. "This is the



beginning of the kingdom's order and structure given to the New Testament Church of this age. This is God's Government for Church's Leadership" (Payne 2004:34). In this context, to restore is to reactivate and re-establish something back to its original state and purpose. In the Charismatic context, restoration implies the sovereign act of the Holy Spirit within the Church to restore a biblical truth or ministry back to its proper order and function. It is a divine scheme in which God progressively restores truths to the Church. It is a belief that God is reviving His Church in this generation. The adherents view themselves as a Spirit-empowered church being restored to its New Testament glory. In the words of Moriarty (1992:95-96):

The new charismatics believe that in order for the church to experience New Testament results, it must recapture the New Testament pattern. This means the offices of apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, and teacher must be restored to equip the saints for the work of ministry. The church will not be as effective in the dominion process unless the fivefold ministry expounded in Eph 4:11 is restored and recognised by the church at large. For the body of Christ to come to full maturity, it needs to embrace all of the God-ordained ministries outlined in Eph 4:11; they are essential, not optional.

The New Apostolic Reformation movement's theological bulwark is that the restoration is God's act of consecration of everything to the Lord, the transformation of a new people by the Spirit, and the beneficent presence of Christ among His people by the operation of the fivefold ministers.

Since the era of the Reformation, God has been in a process of restoring His Church to its former glory and power. As Christ's return becomes more imminent, the process of restoration becomes realistic as the Church is expected to become complete and rise to take its centre stage in the *arena* of events in the *cosmos*. The fivefold ministry endeavours to address the charismatic emphasis on current church *apostasy* as *katharsis*



(cleansing) and the beginning of the new era. The Spirit's operation is not seen as restricted by a rebellious and unresponsive humanity. The Spirit removes obstacle, changes structures, and renews people as He ushers in the new era of restoration.

Hamon (1997:19) gives the *dispensational* panoramic view of the Holy Spirit's restorational work through church history *epochs*. This view sounds inimical to church history scrutiny, but is vital to highlight:

Here is a general overview of what accelerating restoration means: Restorational movements since AD 1500 have accelerated in their frequency of occurrence from three hundred years apart to one hundred to fifty to every ten years during the last half of the 20th century. Each prepared the way for the next over the past five hundred years. The Protestant Movement prepared the way for the Holiness Movement and so on, the Pentecostal for the Latter Rain Restoration for the Charismatic Renewal and Faith Movement for the present Prophetic Movement, which is now preparing the way for the Apostolic Movement, which will in turn prepare the way for the Saints Movement, which enables the saints of the Most High to fulfil Daniel 2:44; 7:18, 22, 27; and Revelation 11:15; 1:5-6; 5:9-10.

In examining this view closely, one comes to the conclusion that restoration is the certainty of the new age that lies in God's *monergistic* involvement with His church and the free fulfilment of His promises of the Holy Spirit. God promises to deal graciously with all who know Him by releasing these *doma* to His *oikodome*.

Typical of the Charismatic hermeneutics, one observes allegory and symbolism that reigns supreme in their biblical interpretation. The *epochs* mentioned above leave a great number of gaps in the *genesis* of events in regard to church history. There is no *eclectic* critique of history, which inevitably leads to *subjectivism* in interpreting historical events – the bias that is dangerous to historical truth. This type of historical interpretation needs



to bear in mind that one of the fundamental principles of *reality* interpretation is the ideal of *objectivity*. It demands some deliberate elimination of personal prejudices. Facts need to be qualified and quantified with collective facts in a broader spectrum.

The theological understanding of restoration is inimical to the Charismatic understanding. It is attached to *katartismos* as found in Ephesians 4:12. This *katartismos* was a medical term used to refer to “setting a limb or bone or a restoration of a shoulder” (Hoehner 2003:549). The term is only encountered here in the New Testament and in those days it meant furnishing a room, or mending of a garment. Its basic meaning is to adjust, put in order, restore, to reconcile political factions, to equip, to be instructed, or to be trained. It occurs seventeen times in the LXX (Barth 1974:44-45), where it translates nine different Hebrew words. For instance:

- i) To establish (Ps 74:16 – LXX 73:16)
- ii) To equip, to restore (Ps 69:9 – MT 68:10, LXX 67:10)
- iii) To complete, finish (Ezra 4:12,13,16; 5:3,9,11; 6:14)

The word appears in its verb form about 13 times in the New Testament (*katartizo*) with the following connotations:

- i) To restore or to mend fishing nets (Mt 4:21; Mrk 1:19)
- ii) To restore a fallen brother (Gal 6:1; 1 Pet 5:10)
- iii) To prepare (Rom 9:22; Heb 10:5)
- iv) To put into proper order, complete, furnish (1 Thes 3:10; 1 Cor 1:10; Hebr 13:21)
- v) To perfect (Mt 21:16)
- vi) To instruct (Luk 6:40)

In the context of *doma* of Ephesians 4, the term refers to the preparation that includes instructing and equipping believers for effective ministry in the church. The passage does not allude to restoration of order out of a chaos. Hoehner (2003:550) explains further that the “gifted persons were given to the church for the immediate purpose of training or

preparing believers. It is important to be endowed with the gift(s) of the Spirit but it is also



important to learn to use the gift(s) effectively in the church for its edification.”

4.3.2. The fivefold ministry “Hand Illustration”

The fivefold ministers within the New Apostolic Reformation claim their biblical references on Eph 2:20; 4:11-13; 1 Cor 12:28; 1 Kings 18:44; as foundational to their understanding of what ‘fivefold’ ministry is to be. Some of their prominent teachers especially Ulf Ekman (1995) and J L Payne (2004), and Bill Hamon (1997) give a hand illustration to explain fivefold ministry:



4.3.2.1. The *thumb* symbolises the **apostle**: He can touch every member of the hand easily. It is stronger than the other fingers and vital if the hand is to grip anything. The apostle can therefore become any of the other four ministries. His anointing flows easily to all other ministers. The apostle has the stability and flexibility necessary for church's growth, maturity, and strength in the Lord. As Payne (2004:122) points out: "The apostle serving as the thumb is most effective in touching every governmental ministry providing establishment, order, balance, leadership, direction, and guidance." The critical reflection of Hamon (1997:151-152) regarding the restoration of the apostolic authority expatiates the fact that

The hand of God of the fivefold ministry has been greatly restricted in its powerful purposes. The hand of God has had to function with only four fingers. The power and function is limited greatly by the lack of a thumb. Now the apostle-thumb of the hand of God is being restored to proper placement and power. Since all elements of the hand of God are being restored fully, the hand of God will be extended in full power and demonstration.

The movement of the thumb gives power to the hand. The thumb is designed to complete the hand for its full function and power.

4.3.2.2. The *index finger* symbolises the **prophet**: His task is to point out the direction. He points at the spiritual condition of the church, reveals sins, and shows which road to take. The index finger (prophet) is closely related to the thumb (apostle). Together they have the closest working relationship in the hand ministry to the body of Christ.

4.3.2.3. The *middle finger* symbolises the **evangelist**: It is the far-reaching of them all, therefore the external ministry of the church. An evangelist is set apart to do a work descriptive in soul winning and with great focus on reaching the lost. "It is in the middle of all activity of the hand. It is usually the largest of the fingers. The evangelist usually



has the largest meetings in evangelistic campaigns. The evangelist is a vital part of the ministry of the hand” (Hamon 1997:152).

4.3.2.4. The *ring finger* symbolises the **pastor**: The pastor has a marital relationship with a church he serves. The pastors are shepherds who love the flock, care for it, encourage it, and meet its spiritual needs. The pastor is in a position of authority and service. To use Payne (2004:129); “he is in rulership and servitude in the governmental ministry.” The pastor is therefore expected to be involved in gathering the scattered people, establishing a governmental order, and caring for the weak and the misguided. The pastors are bound to the local saints by the ring of their shepherding relationship.

4.3.2.5. The *little finger* symbolises the **teacher**: The teacher explains, expounds, and analyses the written word to the church. All the *didache, rhema, biblos* including *logos* are all centred on the teacher. It is his ministry to edify the church and to disciple believers to the full maturity in Christ.

So, each finger represents one of the fivefold office, which comprises of the total hand ministry. The rational questions are inevitable:

- ***If a hand is employed to figuratively portray the fivefold ministry, what is the significance – if any?***

The answer one gets is that the thumb and index finger of this dubious illustration of the fivefold ministry relate are fulfilled by the apostolic and prophetic offices. The fivefold teachers in this category go on to elaborate expansions upon the symbolism of the word picture. Others make no such distinctions and in fact downplay them.

- ***When were apostles and prophets restored to the church?*** This question receives the diversity of answers:

Moriarty (1992:190-253) gives the survey of how different Charismatic scholars give different answers to these questions. For instance the Neo-Charismatic teachers answer by saying that the restoration of these offices occurred at the beginning of the Pentecostal outpouring about 100 years ago. The Shepherding Movement leaders respond by saying



‘ascension gift ministries’ were restored under the auspices of the Latter Rain revival in Canada around 1948, while the New Apostolic Reformation says the prophets were restored in the 1980’s and apostles in the 1990’s. The latter view is prevalent within the emerging apostolic movement or New Apostolic Reformation that is under scrutiny in this research. Some are eschatological in thinking on this question. The New Apostolic Reformation claims that greater restorations and revivals will come as a result of their emergence into the church world. Their view is that the fivefold ministry is a divinely restored ministerial institution that God has raised up to lead the Christian Church in the last days.

4.3.3. The allegorical interpretation of Scriptures

The Pentecostal and Charismatic biblical preaching and exposition are characterised by allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures. This is the use of a figure of speech to communicate truth by expressing the hidden meaning of the utterance – spoken or written. All the literal expressions are given other meanings. Another sense is expressed than that which the words convey. A good example is in the early church when believers discovered Jesus Christ and the Christian message all over the Old Testament. The actual events such as the crossing of the Jordan River, is seen as a symbol of baptism or some other Christian truth. The morning star of allegorism was the influential teacher from Alexandria named Origen. He made Africa the bedrock of allegorical interpretation of the Bible, the legacy that is still observed today. Within the literature, teaching, and culture that developed within the emerging apostolic movement, novel spiritualising and interpretations of biblical passages, and the usage of symbolism and allegory are employed to make them fit their theological framework.

A good example is 1 Kings 18:44...

The seventh time the servant reported, “A cloud as small as a man’s hand is rising from the sea.” So Elijah said, “Go, and tell Ahab, ‘Hitch up your chariot and go down before the rain stops



you. This refers to a cloud seen by the prophet Elijah that was the size of a man's hand during the approach of a rainstorm. The rainstorm signified God's sovereignty to apostate nation of Israel. The fivefold ministry teachers, using this verse, employ allegorical interpretation that is theologically questionable. For instance, George Kirkpatrick, the pastor of a New Jerusalem Fellowship in Fort Fairfield, Maine, reports: *"When Elijah defeated the prophets of Baal, the glory of God appeared to Elijah's servant... Elijah was on Mount Carmel with Ahab and four hundred prophets of Baal. Seven times Elijah sent his servant to look for any signs of rain. The seventh time he went, (seven is God's perfect number) he saw a little cloud, as a hand, raising out of the sea. As we view what God is revealing spiritually, we discover the cloud shaped like a man's hand rising out of the sea represents something very special. The sea represents a multitude of peoples, nations, and tongues. The hand coming out of the sea of people represents the fivefold ministry God is raising up in the earth: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers... Ephesians 4:11. The fact the hand is little reveals this is a small group or remnant that will rise out of the great multitude of people to do God's service. The cloud represents God's glory. God's glory will shine upon this remnant ministry to usher in the Kingdom of God upon the earth. Today there is a sea of over six billion people on the earth. There has never been this many people on the earth at one time in history. Out of that sea of people, God is raising the little hand ministry. It is coming with the cloud of glory, and it will minister with the power and glory of God (www.newfoundationspubl.org/mercy.htm - 04/06/2005)*

In a critical reflection, going through this website, and looking at George Kirkpatrick's writings, one is regularly confronted with numerous unsound Biblical interpretations such



as the one above. He is not alone in this circle. One comes across “prophetic statements” that are hermeneutically questionable such as: “**A new day has dawned for the Church that Jesus is building in the Year 2005.** The Biblical significance of the number five is **GRACE** and **GIFTS** (both five- letter words). **2005 will be a year of mega-grace and mega-gifts!** That will be the **Divine Emphasis** of 2005! **God is doing a New Thing in 2005!** (www.slm.org/slm/rtf - 22/11/2006)

Allegorical interpretation and symbolism reigns supreme in the New Apostolic Reformation. The Old Testament is seen and interpreted through the symbolic lenses. A good example is quoted here from one of the famous fivefold teachers, Hamon (1997:152-153)

There are many more applicable illustrations that can be made to the fingers and thumb representing the fivefold ministry of Christ. Some have tried to say that the pastor and teacher is one ministry and therefore there are only four ascension gifts. But there are several Biblical illustrations that portray the fivefold ministry: the hand, the five bars on the sides of the tabernacle, the five pillars at the entrance to the Holy Place, the five senses and the five being the number of grace and redemption. The fivefold ministry is God’s main group of ministers for ministering God’s grace and redemption.

The declarations like the three cited above, together with the numerous ones in literature and websites, show some concepts that are not Biblical, or theologically sound. There are some that are extremely *anthropocentric* instead of *Christocentric*, therefore nature instead of grace. As in the broader evangelical hermeneutic, the Charismatic Movement uses a wider application of *sensus plenior* – the fuller or deeper meaning intended by God but not clearly intended by the human author, which is seen to exist in the words of a Biblical text when they are studied in the light of further revelation or development in the understanding of revelation. These are some imbalances and abuses of the concept that



has adversely affected Christians worldwide. There is a real need for the charismatic hermeneutics to adopt some theologically authentic approaches that are more explicitly consistent with the historical theology and Biblical data. For Charismatics, especially the New Apostolic Reformation, seeking a theological method and hermeneutic which are consistent with their roots and *ethos*, the price may indeed be high. The apostle Paul in 2 Timothy 2:15 instructs Timothy that he is to handle rightly the word of truth (*orthotomeo*) i.e. to cut a straight line, or to guide the word of truth along a straight line. The right use of the Word of God is its proper interpretation.

4.3.4. The influence of fundamentalism

Though the Pentecostals and Charismatics subscribe to *biblical literalism*, the questions arise in regard to allegorical interpretation and symbolism that is very prevalent in their hermeneutical expressions. The historical reflection on classical Pentecostalism bears witness that their systematic theology and theological ethics gradually reflected the basic tenets of fundamentalism. They accepted the “Five Fundamentals of the Faith” (Stott 1999:13-34):

4.3.4.1 Biblical infallibility

This is based on a historical recapitulation of the steps that led to Martin Luther’s *sola scriptura dictum*. It means that the Bible is the only *infallible* authority in the church. This developed at the time when the Church asserted that Scripture could be considered on a *primus inter pares* (first among equals) basis with ecclesiastical authority, giving it a kind of primacy among the errant sources such as councils, popes, traditions etc. Fundamentalism embraced the Bible as carrying unique authority solely on the basis of its being the primary historical source of *Euangelion*. The principle of *sola scriptura* involves inspiration, inerrancy, and authority.



4.3.4.2. The virgin birth of Christ

Christ's birth was as a result of supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit in Mary's pregnancy. He was not born out of any sexual union between any two human beings. In fundamentalism, the virgin birth confirms salvation as supernatural, and as an act of grace that enhances the uniqueness of Jesus Christ as the Saviour. It is seen as the evidence of God's power and sovereignty over nature.

4.3.4.3. Christ's substitutionary atonement

It expresses the entire work of Christ on the cross. This is when Christ is presented as the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world. He died in our place so that our broken relationship with God may be restored.

4.3.4.4. Christ's physical resurrection

The resurrection was historical, literal, and significant for faith. It is the basis for the believers' hope.

4.3.4.5. Christ's imminent, visible, and personal second coming

The second coming of Christ is indispensable to eschatology. It is the basis of the Christian's hope. It will mark the beginning of the completion of God's plan. Its main character is that it will be personal, physical, visible, unexpected, glorious, and triumphant.

These beliefs, together with moral negativism were reinforced by dispensationalism within the Pentecostal movement. These influenced the hermeneutical principles applied in Biblical interpretation for both the Charismatics and the Pentecostals.



One of the well-known critics of Charismatic Movement in the twentieth century is John MacArthur. In his well-published book, **The Charismatics** (1978:199-200), he elaborates the incompatibilities of Charismatic Movement and Fundamentalism as follows:

1. *The issue of revelation:* Charismatics claim that God is giving them the new revelation as they prophesy under the inspiration of the Spirit.
2. *The issue of interpretation:* Growing out of their approach to “new revelation,” charismatics get strange meanings out of Scripture with an *ad lib* - “this-is-what-it-means-to-me” approach.
3. *The issue of authority:* The charismatic emphasis on experience relegates Scripture to a secondary status of authority.
4. *The issue of apostolic uniqueness:* Charismatics insist that the miraculous manifestations of the first century should be normative for today.
5. *The issue of historic transition:* Charismatic interpretation of Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 uses specially selected historical events to build a theology of the Holy Spirit.
6. *The issue of spiritual gifts:* Today’s charismatics run a course perilously close to the church at Corinth, where spiritual gifts were counterfeited and practitioners of pagan ecstasies ran amok.
7. *The issue of Spirit baptism:* Charismatics insist that every believer needs a second work of grace called “the baptism of the Holy Spirit.”
8. *The issue of healing:* Charismatics confuse the biblical doctrine of healing by insisting that the gift of healing is still in use today.
9. *The issue of tongues:* Charismatics claim that the ecstatic prayer language practiced in private is the same kind of tongues described in Scripture.
10. *The issue of spirituality:* True spirituality, say the charismatics, can be ours through the baptism of the Spirit, but Scripture teaches us to “walk in the Spirit,” who already dwells in every Christian.

This perception received a lot of criticism, and in fact, this book turned McArthur into the enemy for the Charismatic believers. Even Catholic critical thinkers such as Quebedeaux (1983:206) commented:



Such a negative evaluation, however, has more to do with differences in biblical interpretation than it does with the fundamentalist versus charismatic view of scriptural authority per se. Christian churches still grounded in the principle of Scripture alone as the absolute rule of faith and conduct often declare that charismatic renewal is not in keeping with their tradition, but they cannot find a *convincing* scriptural argument for their opposition – only post-biblical interpretations now increasingly unacceptable among exegetical scholars.

It is of great importance to mention that Charismatic theology is coloured by an intense premillennial eschatology. In 2006, Allan Anderson, the former Pentecostal minister in South Africa, and currently a professor of Global Pentecostal Studies at the University of Birmingham, gave an inaugural lecture and highlighted (2007:8)

The first feature of global Pentecostalism is the role of premillennial eschatology. One of the convictions of early Pentecostals was that their experience of Spirit baptism was a ‘fire’ that would spread all over the world, a last-days universal revival to precede the return of Jesus Christ. The conviction was part and parcel of the prevalent Premillennialism that pervaded the radical fringes of Protestantism – a belief in the imminent return of Christ to set up a thousand years reign on earth.

Premillennialism, dispensationalism, and the belief in the imminent return of Christ enhanced the evangelistic fervour of the movement. The Charismatics, just like the classical Pentecostals, interpret the promises of Joel 2:28-32 as being for today. They take the promises of the former and the latter rain (Hosea 6:1-3; Joel 2:23-27; James 5:7-8) to be the last days’ spiritual outpouring just prior to Christ’s imminent return. This eschatological intensity serves as a motivation for Charismatic missions and church growth and expansion in general. The Great Commission in Mark 16:15 is fired up by the



eschatological texts of Matt 24:14. These texts are both the motivation and the justification for their evangelistic activities

4.3.5. The New Testament church leadership as a precursor

4.3.5.1. The charismatic leadership attitude

There are some particular ecclesiological attitudes embraced by a large number of Charismatic groups. For the great majority, the charismatic ecclesiology remains basically untouched by their insistence on the direct experience of the charismata. Van der Ven (1996:311-312) elaborates that for some, the supernatural *ekchuno* - the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, can be limited or hampered by the structures of the historical church. This can impede the progress of the kingdom of God and often deny the *pneumatic* expressions in the church. This explains why the charismatic dogma has eschatologically-oriented framework for ecclesiology. It is for this reason that Bradshaw (1992:172) stresses that “the traditional order of ministry, authorised forms of service and church regulations can often seem to hinder this *eschatological* work of the Spirit, in the eyes of many charismatics.”

4.3.5.2. Leadership in the early church

Church leadership implies the structure and the interactions of the members with the intentions of the transformation (*metamorphoo*) of the community. Development in this context implies a process, a movement, or gradual growth. Basically it means changing from one state or form to another. It is a process that brings about fundamental changes in the community thereby stimulating, promoting, and guiding growth and giving meaning or *raison d’etre*. The structured church’s central theme is a metaphor of growth. This is growth manifested in the organism, therefore expected to be directional and purposive in its governance. Paul definitely had this in mind when after listing the *doma* of Eph 4:11 that, *to prepare God’s people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and*



become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ (Eph 4:12-14). My personal view is that the church as the community is people who live in spatial relationship to one another and who share the same interests and values. The structure can be either spontaneous or functional.

- Spontaneous structure: This is when explanations, principles, or laws are reduced to the absolute minimum. This structure requires simplicity and growth that is characterised by fruits (*karpos*) or production of good character. The spontaneous church is marked by constantly improving capacity of organising itself to achieve a particular goal. The wisdom of Van der Ven (1996:303) adds some invaluable contribution here: “The spontaneous structure is primarily based on the experiences, feelings, and attitudes that originate in the extraordinary charismata.” The New Testament churches were the *pneumatic* communities that were full of *charisma* and exuberance about their new-found faith. They were settled in their *locales* and worshipped in expectation of fulfilment of Christ’s promise of His second advent. Van der Ven (1996:303) continues to describe these New Testament believers as those who

were characterised by a strong pneumatic emotiveness, prophetic inspiration, and charismatic community formation on the grounds of a realized eschatology. These were the foundation for a charismatic-egalitarian ecclesiology: those who were filled by the Spirit exercised authority in the community.

- The functional structure: This is when the rational decisions, vision or core values had to be devised and harnessed in order to achieve a certain goal. It is a functional-pastoral structure characterised by *oikos*, the Graeco-Roman family household that included not only the immediate family, but also the servants, slaves, and other people. The limitation of space compelled members who came for community meetings to sit closer to each other and saw each other face-to-face. A good example is the church that met in Acquilla and Pricilla’s house in Ephesus (1 Cor 16:19).



These initiatives are always pastoral aims and motives. The functional church is a structural church with problems of formalisation, centralisation, and legalisation.

4.3.5.3. Two principles in the early church structure

These principles are observed in the Social Sciences domain even today. They can serve as an orientation for the further development of the church.

a) The principle of ecclesiality: This is when the ecclesial structure is turned to the development of the church community. It is the question of what makes the church to be the church. This fact is supported by the understanding of the church as people who are called by God to do something, to examine their lives and mission here on earth. It is when the ordering of the church is made subordinate to its aims and tasks. The focus becomes the vision and the mission of the church. In using Volf (1998:128) terminology, it is the identity and identification of the church, the sacramental structure that is *sacrosanct*. It takes precedence over all other structures of church polity.

The heart and centre of ecclesial life is the event of worship in the congregation, and it is this that pumps the lifeblood of faith and work throughout all the derivative limbs of the body of Christ on earth. The principal organ or nerve centre is not the institution of the clergy, the annual convention, the denominational headquarters, the Vatican, or even some theological ideal of what the church should be. It is rather the concrete event which the assembled believers in Christ actually hear the gospel and share in the sacramental presence of the living Christ (Peters 2000:272).

The ecclesiality of the church is measured by its success based on loving and leading consistently and ending well. A long tradition does not guarantee the maturity of the church and rapid changes of church government or polity does not guarantee maturity either, but the church exists for a purpose for times such as these. This leads to the next principle.



The church must maintain its identity in a world full of flaws and chaos. It is expected to fulfil its purpose in the world, which is the proclamation of Christ-centred gospel and the celebration of the sacramental presence of Christ. The *ecclesia* has been called out from the rest of society, and must continue to remain distinguishable from it. In regard to its discipline and governance, *ecclesia* must maintain her unity, holiness, vocation, and *apostolicity*.

b) *The principle of contextuality*: It is when elements from the surrounding societal formation are taken up into the structure of the church; so long they serve the church's development. The early church took over elements from its environment e.g. synagogue, temple, oikos, the empire etc). Norman R Ericson, in his paper, *Implications From the New Testament for Contextualization*, part of the book edited by David Hesselgrave (1971:71) stresses that the New Testament literature arises out of context – the same can be applied to the New Testament Church.

The authors did not so much intend to be transhistorical as historical; they did not so much intend to be transcultural as culturally relevant, and they did not intend for their message to be antisocial or asocial, but directly instructive as to the proper expression of the Christian faith.

The church was born into an environment, a context. It cannot be fully understood or transmitted into another context or environment without a full comprehension of its original context. Failure of this comprehension breeds the tendency to think of the biblical literature as a programmed manual of operations. It is the approach that leads to mechanistic form of *ecclesiastic* hermeneutic that narrows the dynamic of the original context or the variables of the contemporary context. The New Testament church was never seen by Paul as static, therefore needing the designed manuals of operations in a form of epistles as we see them in our *canon*. The New Testament writers dealt in the dynamic of the situations, working under the spontaneous influence of *charismata*. That is the area where Charismatic leaders must learn that though the Bible is the firm



foundation, yet our hermeneutical methods must always be scrutinised for the elimination of the blind spots.

The contextuality of the church has nothing to do with syncretism, indigenization, or enculturation of the church. It says volumes regarding the historical era or context in which church polity, structure, or government was created. Without it, the church would never have broken out of the Hebrew community and into the larger world. The church would have remained locked up in Palestine – never universal, and never *inscriptured* for.

The *reformé* of church structures must respond to the present situation of the Church or of the world. This should not relegate *dogma* to less importance, or the biblical authority in matters of polity, sacraments, and *missio ecclesia* to less functioning. In the words of Alston Jr (2002:83); “The church as a human community requires form and order if it is to function effectively in the world... But the church is like other social groups in that it cannot exist as a viable human association without structure and organization.”

4.3.5.4. The ecclesiality and contextuality demonstrate organisation

The Protestant approach to ecclesiality and contextuality of the church stands firm as from the dawn of the Reformation: The Willowbank Report (1978) sponsored by Lausanne Committee for World Evangelisation highlighted:

The church is also a historical fellowship and has received from the past a rich inheritance of Christian theology, liturgy, and devotion. No group of believers can disregard this heritage without risking spiritual impoverishment. At the same time, this tradition must not be received uncritically, whether it comes in the form of a set of denominational distinctives or in any other way, but rather be tested by the Scripture it claims to expound. Nor must it be imposed on any church, but rather be made available to those who



can use it as a valuable resource material, as a counterbalance to the spirit of independence, and as a link with the universal church (Winter & Hawthorne 1981:514).

Organisation is wisdom's first step for a people associated together in a common cause. It is for a purpose and therefore not a means in itself. The infiltration of institutionalisation is highly cautioned by the New Apostolic Reformation leaders. They insist that *ecclesiastical* endeavours in the world should be marked by spontaneity and an unpredictable dynamism. The *ecclesiastical* structures and organisation are deemed as necessary, but never intended to drift toward the *institutionalisation* and *bureaucratization* which plague the Protestant denominations of today. Structure and institutionalisation are primary questions in the apostolic churches of today, hence the proposal of theologically imbalanced fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4:11.

There are some internal evidences that the New Testament church had some form of organisation. The organisation emerged as the emanating need prevailing at the time. It looks like even the apostle Paul was to a certain degree desirable of his injunction to the disordered Corinthians: "For God is not a God of disorder but of peace" (1 Cor 14:32).

1. **Acts 6:1-7.** The principle we learn from this Lucan passage is that the *pastoral work* (by apostles) and the *services work* (by deacons) existed for the benefit of the church. The leaders were appointed to administer the ministry activities of the church.
2. **Acts 2:46-47; 5:42; 20:7; 1 Cor 16:2.** All these passages demonstrate the regular meetings for worship for both the ministry of God's Word and administration of sacraments, and the *diaconal* activities, especially to the poor. This was accompanied by a Trinitarian experience of *koinonia* i.e. the common share in God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. They expressed what they shared out together, what they gave, and what they received. They had *koinonia* for generosity among themselves. This could



not happen without the proper organisation of people knowing what services to render to the *gathered* community.

3. ***Acts 1:23-26; 14:23; Titus 1:5***. The early church leaders were diligent in appointing leaders. In the first chapter of the book of Acts, God's will for the replacement of Judas Iscariot was realised. It was deemed as a *Scriptural principle* (vv 16-21), the *common sense* was applied in determining the qualifications of the incumbent (vv 22-23), *prayer* was engaged (vv 24-25), then they *cast lots* – the method that was common before the leading of the Holy Spirit who was not yet manifested (vv 26) to lead believers to conviction and judgement.
4. ***1 Tim 3:1-13; Tit 1:5-9; 1 Tim 5:1,17-22; 1 Pet 5:1-4; Act 20:28-35***. These passages lay out the qualifications and the tasks of the bishops (elders) and deacons. In his farewell speech to the Ephesians elders (Acts 20:28-35), the apostle Paul implored the church leaders to “watch over God's flock” and become shepherds (*poimaino*) who should tend, lead, and feed the flock.
5. ***Matt 18:17; 1 Cor 5:1-5; 2 Thes 3:6-16; 1 Tim 1:18-20***. Each church had the authority to discipline or exclude members whose life was not consistent with Christian behaviour and dogma. It has always been a Christian Matrix that

The purposes of discipline are to prevent dishonour to God, to protect the godly from contamination, and to bring sinners to repentance. Censure is to correct, it does not imply condemnation. Calvin clearly and repeatedly demands moderation in discipline; excessive zeal breaks the canon of love and may lead to the sacrilege of schism. Moreover, individuals should not reject the fellowship because the



council of elders might be more lax than could be wished; judgement on morals is given only to the legitimate tribunals established to act for the body as a whole (McKee 1988:31).

6. *1 Thes 5:12-13; Hebr 13:7, 17, 24*. The church members were admonished to respect and obey their leaders. It is observed that the New Testament churches had some form of government in place at the time of the writing of epistles.
7. *Acts 13:1-3*. The missionary journeys started out of the cosmopolitan church of Antioch, which had five resident ‘prophets and teachers’ already. The missionaries were sent forth by the church with official sanction.
8. *Acts 15:1-35*. The Council was convened in Jerusalem in order to clarify doctrine, end controversy, and promote peace. The *dogma* and *praxis* were at stake, and the organised church dealt amicably with this. The end was order and decency was restored in the church.

Gleanings from the Pauline ecclesiology show that the churches he planted during his missionary journeys had *pastoral leaders* to care for the spiritual needs of Christians in a given *locale*. There are two distinctions of these designated local leaders. There were *elders (presbyters)*, who were known as *bishops (overseers)*, or *pastors (shepherds)*. Their functions were to establish new converts in faith, lead in public worship, and to maintain discipline. Then there were *deacons*, who assisted the presbyters in every duty except presiding at the Lord’s Supper. The New Testament Church was therefore organised and had some form of structure. The *domata* listed in Ephesians 4:11 are understood not as transitory manifestations of the Spirit but as the provision of Christ the head for His body, the church. The church cannot function properly without leadership in areas of preaching, teaching, and pastoral care.



4.3.6. Lack of synergy and cohesion

The evangelical ecclesiology, including all its tributaries such as Charismatic one, had never come up with their distinctive and clearly defined ecclesiology. The struggle continues in identifying the Pentecostal/Charismatic ecclesiology. From the embryonic stage of the movement at the turn of the twentieth century, the Pentecostal Movement had inclined itself to non-theological discourses or researches. Kasper (2004:25) highlights this notion clearly:

The Pentecostals are not always easy dialogue partners... They are very firm in their Trinitarian and Christological beliefs and their ethical convictions. In a word, they are serious Christians, but they lack a developed ecclesiology, especially a universal ecclesiology which transcends their respective local communities...

The rationale behind this shortage can be cited as follows

4.3.6.1. The ecclesiastical and theological backgrounds of the founders and/or leaders

Many of the Charismatic leaders emerge from one particular church tradition. They receive *the baptism of the Holy Spirit* and later join or champion the Charismatic group. They do so with a baggage of their historical origin. William J Seymour, the founding father of the modern Pentecostal Movement came out of Holiness Movement; hence the Movement embraced some, if not all, the Holiness doctrine, such as separation from the world, ethical lifestyle based on some *ascetic* practices etc. Dennis Bennett, an Episcopal priest at the forefront of the Charismatic Renewal Movement left the legacy of Episcopalian polity (apostolic) that is so prevalent in the New Apostolic Reformation Movement. The *Latter Rain Movement* of the 1940s to 1950s enhanced the eschatological aspirations that were brought along by the *dispensationalists*. The Shepherding Movement, spearheaded by five teachers could not hold cohesion or synergy, for as Moore (2003:84-85) asserts:



The unusual confluence created by varied backgrounds and theological pedigrees of the five teachers also affected the growing movement's ecclesiological development and practice. Significantly, only Simpson was a true pastoral leader. Baxter pastored for a long period, but he did so as a pulpiteer more than a pastor. Mumford and Prince were primarily Bible Teachers, and Basham, while also a Bible teacher, was most comfortable as a journalist. The challenge was that their united ministries and distinctive teachings had thrust them into pastoral and governmental roles as leaders of a movement of churches.

The New Apostolic Reformation leaders, in general, are better trained than classical Pentecostals and at least equally as competent as the declared Protestant Charismatics. These men came from diverse ecclesiastical backgrounds that made their movement tantamount to cohesion. Basham was a Charismatic Disciple of Christ, hence emphasised the ministry of the Holy Spirit, especially the Spirit's baptism work. Baxter had a unique blending of Reformed and Pentecostal traditions, therefore emphatic on the *church order*. Mumford was a Pentecostal trained at an Episcopal seminary tended to support a pyramidal church structure. Prince was a classical Pentecostal who emphasised teaching of the fundamentals of Christian faith. Simpson, a Charismatic Southern Baptist could not let go his *sola scriptura* and *sola fide* tradition without a balance.



Table 4.1 The historical development of Pentecostal Systematic Theology

1900 – 1920s	Tracts, Handbills, Personal Testimonies. Theology was extracted from situational letters, reports and descriptions of exorcisms and physical healings.
1930s	Pentecostal Theology leaned towards Holiness writers e.g. Asa Mahan (1799-1889) especially Scriptural Doctrine of Perfection; Baptism of the Holy Spirit .
1938 – 1948	Myer Perlman’s (1898 - 1943) doctrinal summary, Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible: Assembly of God expression of Systematic Theology. No footnotes, Bibliography, consistency, or coherence Seeing the Bible (1930). Scoffed Reference Bible in King James Version
1929 – 1949	Ernest Williams' (1885 - 1981) Systematic Theology , edited by Frank Boyd. Lectures to students at The Bible Institute of Assembly of God. Lots of referenced works.
1945 – 1960s	Nelson's Bible Doctrine . Primitive Dogmatics designed for Assembly of God ministers without theological training
1983 – Present	Foundations of Pentecostal Theology (Guy P. Duffield and Nathaniel M. Van Cleave). Commissioned by Foursquare Megachurch under Jack Hayford though LIFE Bible College. Makes references to Systematic Theologians such as L.S. Chaffer, C. Hodge, A.H. Strong, H.C. Thiessen, and M. Perelman. Cites books and few articles. No bibliography given but 39-page index of biblical references shows the Pentecostal Theological tendency of biblical citation.
Present	Fundamentals of The Faith (1983 - 1984) by Raymond Pruitt, commissioned by Church of God of Prophecy.
Present	Stanley M. Horton - The House Theologian for Assembly of God. Obtained Th.M from Harvard Divinity School and Th.D from Central Baptist Theological Seminary. Respectable for writing " What The Bible Teaches About The Holy Spirit ".

4.3.6.2. The charismatic training schools curriculum limitation

It strikes the mind of any observer who looks into the Charismatic College curricular of limitations with regard to the depth of theological scholarship, and questionable coding of the courses offered. In visiting some websites of the fivefold ministries training syllabi, one is taken a-back by what is offered on line. Recently, some of these electronic institutions confer degrees with questionable names and titles, such as Bachelor of Apostle’s Ministry, and in fact all the fivefold ministries have degrees up to the Masters level. The question that arises is the accreditation and the recognition of these courses and qualifications. The study matter apportioned a degree is one of a Group Bible Study for the local church. It is observed that the colleges run by the Charismatic groups lack a content that can challenge their graduate to enter the professional higher learning of matters of faith. Wagner (1999:235) labels these scholarly endeavours as tombstone



markers and applause the New Apostolic Reformation curricular as the ones that bring forth a new breed of faculty that is surfacing:

- Historians are replaced by visionaries.
- Biblical exegetes are replaced by cultural exegetes.
- Theologians are replaced by entrepreneurs.
- Critics are replaced by cheerleaders.
- Distinguished scholars are replaced by dynamic pastors.

This notion is promoted further by an injunction that impartation, not information should be provided. The curriculum and the institution should impart life, vision, and anointing to students. Wagner (1999:236) continues to elevate the New Apostolic Reformation curriculum that it is broad and practical:

- History of dogma is now history of revivals.
- Greek is now Bible software including Strong's Concordance.
- Homiletics is now preaching.
- Exegesis of certain books is now English New Testament survey.
- Epistemology is now prophetic intercession.

The Biblical Studies, Systematic Theology, Ethics, and Science of Religion are not offered at a level of producing scholars that can be *workmen who do not need to be ashamed and who correctly handle the word of truth (2 Timothy 2:15)*. The kind of Systematic Theology one encounters in both Pentecostal and Charismatic literature is the one that is detached from the historical *genesis* and the social context out of which it develops. Woodbridge and McComiskey (1991:302) capture this sentiment accurately:

The pneumatological penchant of Pentecostals is well-known: their constant reliance on the Holy Spirit, who would teach them all things in Jesus' absence, who would facilitate "greater works" than Jesus himself performed, who would grant a "word of knowledge"



understood as divinely originated disclosures of hidden information, and whose empowerment would result in accompanying signs (Mark 16:17). The Johannine reminder (1 John 2:27) “you do not need anyone to teach you” is often cited among Pentecostals to obviate academic study.

The time has come for the New Apostolic Reformation to abhor isolation from real academic activities of theological field. The involvement of their theological institutions at all levels, and especially, at tertiary level, in research and productive work will establish a vital link to dialogue with the broader theological academy. The kind of education they need to engage in is the one that gains purpose and significance to the extent it is consistent with and contributes toward accomplishment of God’s highest purpose for humanity. It must be the one that John MacArthur (2003:245) refers to, one that embraces what is commonly known to be Bloom’s taxonomy: “The highest goal of education must then be to assist individuals in developing the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will enable them to better glorify and enjoy God”. This education emphasises the knowledge, change of heart or attitudes, and equips one with skills to handle issues in life honourably. It is appreciated as Wagner (2004:139) implies that “at least 80 percent of apostolic curriculum has a direct, practical application to active ministry. Saying this, however, must never soften the need for providing excellent biblical and theological foundations for every minister. The 20 percent is also very important.”

However, it is to be acknowledged that these leaders are excited and enthusiastic about their faith and evangelism in the world. The passion for Christ and His message in all their endeavours is beyond question or doubt. This lack of theological insight and depth leads to proliferation and incoherency within the movement. It inevitably breeds the lack of clarity in ecclesiological undertakings such as structure, polity, and conduct. It also brings home the thesis that the fivefold ministry is not the legitimate church government for the twenty-first century church, since theological scrutiny of this structure was never undertaken or properly dialogued.



The fivefold ministers are called to realise that the curriculum is something to be learned and experienced. Experience should come through some deep engagement of the mind as a result of wide range of interaction, debates, and self-evaluation. Curriculum is the meaningful experiences and purposeful activities provided and directed by the institution to achieve its objectives. The objectives are not just for effectiveness in *ecclesiastical* activities or *missional* endeavours, but for systematic arguments that defend the faith and its cause (apologetics). It is now the high time for the fundamentalist theologians, especially the Charismatics to embrace the historical-critical methods and exegesis of the Bible. This should be embarked upon without jeopardising the dogmatic perspective of the canon, and the mechanical view of the inspiration of Scripture.

4.3.6.3. The lack of theological academia

Peter Wagner defends the Charismatics lack of theological ambition by stating that they move from theological education to equipping ministers. In his book, *Changing Church (2004)*, he critiques theological education in the spheres of academia, critical mind, monastery mind-set, intellectualism in leadership, and ordination. Wagner (2004:138-139) continues to expand the new model of leadership training the Apostolic Leaders and I summarise this below:

- No academic requirements: Instead of pursuing the traditional college degree requirement for theological seminaries, the apostolic institutions avail themselves to train all of God's saints for the work of the ministry.
- Impartation along with information: In his own school (Wagner Leadership Institute), Wagner instructs his own faculty to focus primarily on transferring a body of knowledge from their heads to the students' head as much as imparting to them tools and anointing for fruitful ministry. The information is secondary while the impartation is primary.
- No exams or grades: The focus on impartation makes exams or grades impractical. The powerful impartation for ministry validates the quality of education.



- No resident students or resident faculty: The focus is in-service rather than preservice. The students cannot be extracted from their families, jobs, and communities. Giving three years of study is impractical. The visiting faculty used utilises the best resources on the field.
- Variable delivery systems: All available and possible delivery systems are used, as long as they do not temper with the students or faculty's vocational callings.
- Curriculum: Courses are tailor-made to the needs of the students. Few courses are required. Those experienced in ministry know better about what they need to be more effective than would a remote school administrator or an impersonal accrediting association.

The heart of the emerging apostolic movement's mission is 'power', which is the recapturing of the visibility of the miraculous in the Christian life. This power serves to sum up the whole impact of renewal Christian life. The Charismatic leaders insist that passions never show themselves more violently than in religious discussion. Christ, not some doctrine about Him, is the "issue". The gospel is not theological debate, but to know Christ. This notion is carried out into church government. The emerging apostolic movement argues that the church was in the beginning a community of brothers and sisters, guided by a few of the brethren. The church is demobilised by too much leadership spirit. This divides the body, it separates the saints. The wider spectrum of Charismatic ecclesiology embraces pneumatology that emphasises the experience of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit than the rational articulation of theology, especially systematic theology.

The New Apostolic Reformation is diverse in its government and polity. Looking to the list of prominent Apostolic Churches around the world, one is confronted by wide diversity as to how they govern themselves. They take the form of loosely structured apostolic networks and each church decides how to govern herself. The majority of these churches base their church government on the fivefold ministry. They are structured on team leadership, apostolic hierarchy, presbytery, fivefold translocal structures, and cell-



base. The marks of the apostolic churches are networking, partnerships, and fellowship. The reasons for the lack of emphasis on theological formulation are threefold:

- Both the Pentecostals and Charismatics are not convinced that their theology of the Holy Spirit is best defended on an academic level. Their convictions are expressed as “By their fruits, you shall know them”. Their theology affirms a belief in God’s mighty acts. Buoyant, life-changing, paradigm-shifting individual experience figures prominently. Such a belief can legitimately be defended by genuine display of these mighty acts. Their doctrinal distinctiveness is a sharply focused reflection on the experience. “Their clarion call is that Christianity should not be moribund but active, penetrating every aspect of the human life and society without losing the eternal dimension of the human soul” (E K Larbi 2004:80). This sounds very much like subjective apologetic, though the Charismatics’ mighty acts are too objective to be evaded with such neat terminology. The fact of the matter is a minister who does not have a theological education with an academic background cannot compete with the post humanistic philosophers of the post modern era found in ecclesiastical circles of this century. Any ecclesiastical leader whose biblical and theological background is not strong may not make much impact on the secular situations the church is today.
- The Charismatic leaders point out that the abundance of theological training in the modern church has little to be said for it if the life and growth of the church is the criterion of judgement upon such theology. References are made to Western European countries such as Germany and Britain where theology is constantly formulated, but the church there still dwindling into insignificance. Peter Wagner in one of his books, *Churchquake* (1999:235) reinforces this stance: “New apostolic churches do not allow degrees to become prerequisites for ordination.



In most apostolic networks, having a degree or desiring one is not a qualification for ministry. Degrees are clearly optional”. After all, the aim of Charismatic theologizing is edification and not criticism or controversy

- The movement is relatively recent in church history. Any successful analysis of classical Pentecostalism cannot be based solely on printed materials. It has the culture that is profoundly oral in its style. The classical Pentecostal churches have just turned hundred years old in the early twenty first century. The Charismatic Movement is just about to turn fifty years old. Church history indicates that in most cases experience precedes theology. The mighty acts of God in historical revival movements were not grasped at the beginning until later on. The Charismatic leaders insist that the early church went through the same experience. First came the experience of Christ’s incarnational presence (1 John 1:1-4), followed shortly by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2) and the spread of the gospel from Judea to Samaria and Antioch (Acts 1-13). Then came the great missionary movement (Acts 13), and only then did the earliest Christian writings emerge (Epistles). These were followed by the Gospels, and the most theological part of the Gospel material (John) is dated at the end of this process.

The Pentecostal and Charismatic leaders that emerged, quite naturally developed a deep suspicion of theology in academic arena. These leaders hypothetically emerge from mostly the lower strata of society and tended to be loyal to the movement which produced them through conversion. They have responded faithfully to apprentice-style training because they are not accustomed to the elite practice of seminary level education. In numerous occasions, they shun the opportunity for tertiary level study because of the applications of worldly respectability and irrelevance to the grassroots. The Charismatics



and the Pentecostals are reputable for effectively using imitation modelling training and other informal styles. Educational requirements should never substitute spiritual gifts as the basis for ordaining new ministers. As a result the movement has existed for decades with academic prejudiced sentiments, and it has only been in recent years that the Classical Pentecostal movement have begun to see that theological training can be of benefit to the church. These reasons answer the lack of theology in the Charismatic movement, and wherever it is developed, it always lacks in theological and ecclesiastical in-depth.

It is observed that the New Apostolic Reformation is critical to what it calls the “current maladies of theological seminaries” (Wagner 1999:234). The local church occupies the centre stage of ordaining the new pastors or church workers. The church staff members are home grown, trained in conferences and are local church DNA compliant. The teaching curriculum is radically innovative and different from the mainstream college or seminary ones.

In general terms, as observed by Anderson (2004:243-249), the emphasis on rationalism in western theology led to an indifferent attitude towards spiritual experience and power. To qualify for Charismatic leadership, the emphasis usually has been on the spirituality and call of the leader rather than on intellectual abilities or ministerial skills. There is a tenuous relationship with theological education and both the Pentecostals and the Charismatics have spoken of a dead intellectualism that sometimes stifles the Spirit-filled life. The academic scholarship is perceived as anti-spiritual. It is perceived as conflicting with Pentecostal and Charismatic fundamental doctrines such as the priesthood of all believers. It creates a division between the clergy and laity – abhorrence for the operation of the Holy Spirit in the pneumatic community in which charismata are expected to flow in order to build the community (church).



4.3.7. The charismatic dogma is undeveloped

The doctrinal debates had been a hallmark battle within the Charismatic ecclesiology. The classical Pentecostals make up an ecclesiastical distinctive, while the Charismatics embrace a pentecostalized spiritual lifestyle. It is easier to speak about the theological lifestyle of Pentecostals than to do the same for Charismatics. This justifies Woodbridge and McComiskey's (1991:293-294) generalisation that; "Global Pentecostalism presents a predictable set of theological beliefs, but charismatic theology results from the mix of Pentecostal supernaturalism with one or other of the mainstream Christian tradition." Dogma determines polity. A belief system leads to value system. There is no institution without dogma. The Classical Pentecostals approach to doctrine is that it is the skeleton of the structure. It is the framework of the body. The world and the church need flesh on the bones, the Spirit within, to give life. The church needs the living Christ, not dogmatic, doctrinal contention. If this is true, then the direction of charismatic theology within the context is *axioma media* – a generalisation from experience that may be subjective, and therefore needs *auxilium ab alto* - a help from above. All theological exegesis must be subjected to a systematic review. This must be done against the background of the history of dogma, theology, the church and the world context. The unhistorical dogma is insufficient and selective, therefore authoritarian and unscholarly.

4.3.8. Phenomenology in charismatic studies

Phenomenology is a school of thought which suggests a unique way of understanding a phenomenon. The Greek word '*phainomenon*' means 'that which appears' while '*phainestai*' means to 'reveal or show' (Bromiley 1985:1244). Phenomenology is the philosophical approach which attempts to bracket off a phenomenon. Reality is a matter of how the individual interprets his world or environment. The bottom line is the understanding of subjective personal experiences of reality as perceived from a non-objective viewpoint. It is on this basis that most of Charismatic theology is full of relativity whereby truth is judged by what an individual leader or individual perceives reality, irrespective of whether others see it the same way.



A group of South African educationists give a synoptic view of the historical development of phenomenology as follows:

The word phenomenology was first used by the rationalist J.H Lambert (1728-1777). I. Kant also used the term, while G. Hegel used it as a concept to describe a method whereby he departed from immediate information to penetrate to underlying knowledge. However, it is E. Husserl (1859-1938) who can be regarded as founder of phenomenology. Other contributors from different academic fields are M Heidegger (1890-1976), who was also existentialist in his thinking. F Brentano (1838-1917), D Katz (1884-1953), M J Langeveld (b.1905) and M. Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961). In the United States, A. Giorgi is well-known and still active. In South Africa, C.K. Oberholzer, B.F Nel and W.A Landman interpret phenomenology uniquely in the field of education (Duminy et al 1992:96).

Phenomenological school of thought maintains that in attempt for knowledge, the conscious is not involved in intentional data but is directed to things as they appear in reality. The British theologian, John Macquarrie's *Principles of Christian Theology*, uses this philosophy apologetically. He explains phenomenology as "a methodology, a technique of description designed to provide a new inroad into philosophical problems" (1971:20-31). He elaborates in justifying this philosophy by explaining it as a

careful analytic description; or, to express the same idea in another way, it is letting us see that which shows itself (the phenomenon) by removing, as far as possible, concealments, distortions, and whatever else might prevent us from seeing the phenomenon as it actually gives itself.



This is common in hermeneutical approach among the charismatic preachers. The biblical data must be accepted as it is. The core of interpretation is literal acceptance of what is written. Nothing must be explained from the metaphysical stance. This implies that all theoretical knowledge, assumptions, and beliefs should be put aside to allow the biblical data (phenomenon) to speak for itself and reveal its ultimate essence.

The data is collected and grouped together to make a unified fact. This is observed by the collection of different Bible verses to make a point, without a proper exposition or exegesis of the passages where these verses are derived, so that subjectivism could be eliminated, and the context verified. The Bible and the student are to be allowed to reveal their true nature and essence. In the phenomenological view, as practised by the charismatic teachers, the reader of the Scriptures lives intentionally within and in relation to the environment. The reader and the environment or contexts are interdependent. This implies that no fixed nature can be ascribed to a reader, hence the *progressive revelation* as embraced by the emerging apostolic churches. As the world of meanings changes, so God's revelation to *His chosen ones* changes. This opens a wide door of subjectivism in the way God communicates and reveals Himself.

The Charismatic theology agrees with phenomenology. Wagner (2004:77) tightens the screws in this regard:

I want to make it clear that my research methodology is not philosophical or theological (in the classical sense) nor exegetical or revelational, but rather phenomenological. I am not saying that any of these methodologies is right or wrong. Phenomenology clearly is not superior to exegesis... The phenomenological approach leads me to employ terms not found in the Bible, because I believe it is not necessary to only use the *Word* of God but to also combine the Word of God with accurate observations of the present-day *works* of God. I am not approaching this so much from the question of what God *ought* to do as much as what God is *actually doing*. What the Spirit



has said to the churches is one thing, but what the Spirit is *now saying* to the churches is another.

I have taken T S Mwamwenda's (1996:337) tenets of phenomenology and compared them with charismatic theology to validate their synonymy:

- An individual's conscious experience is a better guide than his unconscious experience. In normal circumstances, a leader (apostle or prophet) receives revelation and it becomes authentic that it cannot be open to external critical scrutiny.
- Reality is how an individual (mostly apostle or prophet, though an individual charismatic Christian can also comply) interprets events (biblical texts) in a subjective manner.
- Every person has an internal organising system (Holy Spirit) known as self. This is a part of the conscious and is responsible for regulating human behaviour (character) as it both guides and predicts. A person's behaviour is governed by subjective reality rather than external reality. The Charismatic leadership undermines theological criteria set by scholars other than themselves. The emerging apostolic churches leaders base their decisions and life directions upon the values of their leaders
- Phenomenology is concerned with the here and now and not with the past. This is demonstrated by the charismatic emphasis of restoration. The *motif* is happiness or prosperity now, and restored life when all things are being restored to God's original intentions. It is on this basis that *catechesis* has no role in charismatic theological framework. The past (tradition) has no place in charismatic theology.
- Phenomenology focuses on normal behaviour rather than abnormal behaviour (Christian ethics). The principal theme of this approach is a person's inherent capacity and potential to grow, develop, and fulfil his potential. It is held that a human being is unique and has a free will and as such is capable of making choices. This justifies the charismatic anthropocentric *exegesis* above



Christocentric one. It is all about “I, me, and myself”. The charismatic theology has very little to do with the sovereignty of God.

The good news about Charismatic phenomenology is that Christians in this world are “*not-yet*.” People, especially Christians are beings who are not yet restored, but are still in that process. They are not yet walking, talking, or independent. God is busy fashioning them towards His likeness (maturity). As a result, they are striving to become someone Christ intended them to be; hence the insistent call to life of prayer and faith.

4.3.9. *Realpolitik* and *Vox Populi* influence charismatic ecclesiology

The challenge facing both classical Pentecostalism and Charismatic theology is the difficulty in living by revelation of God alone based on *sola scriptura* and *sola fidei*. The Reformation tradition of *littera scripta manet* (what is written is permanent) in biblical hermeneutics makes Charismatics theological perspectives difficult.

The *littera scripta manet* is intertwined with *sola scriptura*, whereby it is agreed that the only source and norm of all Christian knowledge is the Holy Scripture. Boyce (1979:103) reinforces this idea that “this thematic statement introduces *De Scriptura Sacra* of Heinrich Heppes classic work in Reformed dogmatics and provides succinct expression of the Reformation slogan: *Sola Scriptura*. The two key words that are used to crystallize the *sola* character of Scripture are *source* and *norm*.”

The way out is the subtle embrace of *Realpolitik* and *vox populi* approach in ecclesiastical constructs of governance.

4.3.9.1. *Realpolitik* (power politics)

In the highlights of Van Gemeren (1990:26), *Realpolitik* “is a pragmatic application of any technique by which an individual or a group can maintain or enhance life. It is manipulative, works at the expense of others, and undermines the essential nature of



revelation.” In a real situation, *Realpolitik* gives coherence to all human structures such as power, society, economics, and religion. It is readily adaptable to new situations or crises. As exemplified in 2 Chron 28:16-23, it is a religion of manipulation whereby the end justifies the means. Anything is fair as long as it can achieve the goal.

4.3.9.2. *Vox Populi* (the voice of the people) is a form of *Realpolitik*

It is a system that rewards all who support the common ideals but punishes anyone who challenges them. It shuns the absolute demands of revelation by softening the radical nature of faith in favour of popular expectation. The masses devastated by abject poverty and ill-health, search for freedom, prosperity, and happiness by establishing a sacred alliance of relative values that form the basis of laws, social interactions, politics, economics, religious expressions and traditions with any cultic leader who claims to restore these things back into their lives. *Vox populi* can be an ideology that holds on to traditions shaped by a selective interpretation of revelation, and adapted by the masses as a way out of crises.

The *Realpolitik* and *vox populi* combine to form the post modern concept of consumerism. The post modernists go to any community event, including the church gatherings, not because they want to be confronted with the truth, but where they can be made to feel good. The ecclesiastical mandate of presenting the truth (*kerygma*) of salvation is challenged by antagonism aroused against it by human commitment to pragmatism (*Realpolitik*) and the popular views and traditions (*vox populi*). Popular expectations encourage optimistic and pragmatic way of life. The people selectively listen to the oracles of the popular preacher. The gradual shift from *sola scriptura* and *sola fidei* to *vox populi* explains the marginalisation of Christocentric preaching in the New Apostolic Reformation’s ecclesiastical praxis.

The New Charismatic leaders depend on the *vox populi* for credibility and vindication. The popular theology defines their apostolic or prophetic utterances. They foster illusions by advocating the capacity to solve people’s social, political, and economic problems.



The New Apostolic Reformation governs itself through *Realpolitik* system. The ecclesiastical structures based on the fivefold ministry are the revelation given to leaders; normally ‘apostles’ and these revelations are never questioned. Those who question the theological authenticity and validity of this revelation are regarded as less saintly, sometimes excommunicated, or cursed. The “Thou shalt not touch my anointed ones” maxim authenticates the leaders to impose their decisions. The *Realpolitik* and *vox populi* approach to *ecclesiastical* structure open the door for humanism, secularism, and relativism that compromises the validity of dogma. The slogan “The people shall govern” sounds democratically right, but cannot always be theologically correct. The church is governed by the theological principles as derived from the biblical data and the church tradition handed down by the Christological utterances and canonical assumptions.

4.3.10. The lack of *catechesis*

Since their inception in the dawn and the middle of the twentieth century, the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements emphasised non-professional leadership training. There is a lack of *catechesis* (the task of handing on the core beliefs and practices of the faith tradition to the next generations and the new converts) in Charismatic theology. The Charismatic ecclesiology lacks the structured Pauline notion of *didomi*, meaning “to hand on” or “to pass on” as expressed in passages such as:

- *For what I have received **I passed on** to you, as of first importance that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (1 Cor 15:3).*

- *I praise you for remembering me in everything and for holding to the teachings, just as I passed them on to you... For I received from the Lord what **I also passed on** to you... (1 Cor 11:2, 23).*

- *So then, brothers, stand firm and hold to the teachings **we passed on** to you, whether by word of mouth or by letter (2 Thes 2:15)*



The traditional *catechetical* schools within most of the mainline Protestant churches have been vehemently undermined by the Charismatic leaders. The rationale behind this negativism is due to dry formalism accompanied by the lack of inspiration, change of life, moral upliftment, and the conviction of the heart of the learners through the system. The ancient church instituted and maintained a *catechumenal* system in order to prepare converts for Christian baptism and to equip them with Christian fundamental beliefs so that they could defend the faith in the decadent cultures where pagan learning and influence abounded. It is a biblical mandate that Christian faith promotes itself and be apologetic in its beliefs. Pazmiño (1997:20) brings this to attention: “The educational mandate of Deuteronomy 6:4-9 requires passing on the commandments of God to the next generation. Its ultimate goal is to foster the love of God expressed in loyalty and obedience.”

The Christian faith is a tradition, and its vitality depends on its successful transmission from person to person. The Singaporean theologian Simon Chan, interviewed by Christianity Today Magazine of June 2007 issue regarding the Pentecostal view of missional theology had this to say

We need to rediscover this ancient word, catechism. In a way, it is very straightforward. Its purpose is to help people to become the body of Christ and be incorporated into the church. And I don't think that the modern church can improve very much on what has already been given: the creeds, the great commandments, the Lord's Prayer. Those are the basic things that help the church develop its identity as the church of Jesus Christ. We can certainly add other training programs, but I think the catechism should be central to any training of disciples.

No religion can survive unless it is passed on to succeeding generations, who have to learn it (*manthano*), to understand it (*ginosko*), and to *incarnate* it. Thorough *catechesis* is needed for the transmission of a religious tradition and for its further *metamorphosis*.



The *catechesis* of tradition means more than transmitting *dogma*, but passing on the truth of life, lest it becomes indoctrination.

The Eastern Orthodox churches *catechesis* focuses on making candidates familiar with the liturgy. Sauter (2003:151) reinforces this belief that “Training in the liturgy is a constant treading of the path of the church’s faith set forth liturgically.” Meanwhile the Catholic *catechesis* involves participation in the faith of the church and sharing in the church’s tradition. For the catholic ecclesiology, tradition is the deposit of the workings of the Holy Spirit, who has guided the church and kept it constantly in the faith. For the Reformed, *catechesis* is a theological task of the church in a new way and with new methods. It is God’s action through the Holy Spirit, and therefore as the church created by the Word, teaches faith that can make *dogmatics* real and experienced.

The reason for lack of *catechesis* and/or *didomi* is due to the Charismatic rejection of professional training of leaders. Most of the Charismatic leaders serve part-time in their leadership roles. They serve vocationally as pastors with no formal theological training. As a result, they cannot enter the debates of professional standards in apologetics, ethics, or Christian dogma in general. Some emerge out of learned world systems in natural and social sciences, but this cannot guarantee the theological soundness or correct ecclesiastical polity. When one peruses through Wagner’s, *The New Apostolic Churches (1998)*, the academic achievements, except the honorary doctorates, of some of the New Apostolic Reformation leaders have no theological bearing whatsoever. This leads to little or insufficient production of theology, since the Charismatic leaders lean towards experiential rather than the biblical basis of theology. For them there is too much dogmatic controversy. To analyse Christ is to destroy Him.

This does not mean that the Charismatic ecclesiology is not *missional* in its character and sense of calling. The contrary is true. The secret of the rapid growth of the modern Charismatic movement lies in its *missional* aggression and passion. The problem lies with *didomi* – what do they pass on? Their catechesis is neither definitive nor descriptive, hence the lack of cohesion and synergy within the movement.



4.4. THE BIBLICAL SURVEY ON CHARISMATA

There is no *canonical* definition of the spiritual gifts. Pneumatologists and theologians in general, rarely commit themselves to define the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The Pentecostal and Charismatic writers are not scholarly conversant regarding the subject. In spite of the numerous manifestations of the Spirit in the New Testament church, the majority of systematic theologians ignore the subject of spiritual gifts; else they devote a single paragraph or two to their discussion, much of which is negative, applying cessationist theology to it, or branding it as something demonic.

The Pauline application of *charisma* refers to the voluntary work of God's Spirit. It was the apostle Paul who gave the Greek word, *charisma*, a technical meaning that expresses the dynamics of the pneumatic community. The term describes the privileges or the gifts that the members of the community receive in order to live out the expected ethical life of that community. In the words of Banks (1980:95), "these charismata are the fundamental gifts of God and they undergird whatever other presents he may give to those who are in relationship with him." The gifts are derived not from the Spirit (*pneuma*), but from God's grace (*charis*). They are the concrete expression of God's *charis*.

The different terms used to describe charismata bring to the fore different facets of their character. The New Testament uses these words to denote the work of God the Holy Spirit gives among His people. The first reference to the spiritual gifts is found in the first letter to the Corinthians; which was written by Paul around 55 AD. The chapters that highlight the gifts are 12-14, and here we are confronted with six different words. The first is "*pneumatika*", which literally means "spirituals" or "things of the Spirit". This word appears in 1 Corinthians. 12:1 and 14:1. One has to make the observation that the root of the same word in 1 Corinthians 14:28 refers to spiritual persons. As Holdcraft (1979:143) says; "the term '*pneumatika*' is an adjectival form of the Greek word for spirit, and it connotes whatever is of or from the spirit."



The second word, which is very common, is “*charismata*” which basically refers to spiritual gifts. The root meaning of “*charisma*” is “*charis*”, which means, “*grace*”. The wisdom of Wagner (1979:87) is of valuable reference here that “the Greek word “*charisma*” appears nine times in 1 Corinthians 12-14. It means “spiritual gift”. In agreement with this notion, Graham (1978:132-133) the renowned evangelist of the twentieth century, also agrees that the word “*charismata*” is the plural of *charisma* and, except for one passage in 1 Peter, is found only in the writings of the apostle Paul. If we define it precisely, it means “manifestations” of grace, and is translated gifts. It is therefore theologically sound for one to conceive of the *charismata* as the gifts of God’s grace, a unique capacity given by the Holy Spirit to each believer regardless of their age, physical or geographical limitations.

The Corinthian passage brings forth the third word i.e. “*diakonia*.” This word is translated “*administration*”, but is better rendered “*ministries*.” It speaks of forms of service. Like *charismata*, these are given to people for the benefit of the body, the church. It is therefore theologically correct to believe that the ministries are the gifts in application.

There is the fourth word in 1 Corinthians 12:6, where Paul says; “*There are different kinds of working, but the same God works all of them in all men.*” The “*kinds of working*” here refers to “*energemata*”, which is commonly translated as “*operations*”. These are energies, activities or powers through which God inspires His people. It can be concluded that, “the *spirituals* are operating in the sense that they are gifts and ministries ‘operated’ by the Holy Spirit” (Duffield & van Cleave 1987:329). “*Energema*” gives the English word “*energy*” its root. There is an elementary meaning of effect when one considers the spiritual gifts as “*energema*”. Duffield and Van Cleave (1987:329) go further to expand and attach this meaning that “the spiritual gifts are activities of the spirit bringing spiritual effects, they are operations energized by the Spirit producing effects in the body. A gift that does not operate nor minister nor produce an effect is of little value.”



1 Corinthians 12:7 continues to exhort: *Now to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good.* The word “*manifestation*” is the Greek word “*phanerosis*”. Many of us believe that manifestation is interpreted as “*outward evidence*” or “*external sign.*” It is a tangible evidence that proves that something is happening in the inside. It is this concept that drives the leading Pentecostal figure of the twentieth century, du Plessis (1970:150) to embrace the gifts as the instantaneous, miraculous, and supernatural manifestation of the Spirit Himself. When the Holy Spirit is in action, it is believed that gifts are in operation. The effects of the Spirit’s action are observed in praise and worship. In a nutshell, “*phanerosis*” points out that the exercise of a gift is a manifestation of the Spirit in a believer’s life.

1 Corinthians 12:7 brings out the sixth word that relates to gifts as “*diairesis*”. This is the word associated with “*diversity.*” There are numerous varieties when coming to the manifestation of the Spirit of God. This word gives the connotation that not everyone can have all the gifts. Though the one Spirit may give variety of gifts, the distribution is to the believers only. The Spirit is the source of spiritual gifts, and He gives as He wills to God’s people since “it was he who gave some... (Ephesians 4:11).

The emphasis is Ephesians 4:11; *It was he who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers...* The opening sentence of the verse brings the seventh word: “It was he who gave” (*kai autos edoken*) leads the exegete to the etymological study of the word “*edoken*”. This word is a first aorist active indicative of *didomi*. This term is associated with love as a gift in the New Testament. This is common in the Johannine writings especially the Gospel (John 5:36; 6:37; 17:11; 3:35). The gospel writers, Matthew (7:11), Mark (10:45) and Luke (11:13; 22:19), together with Paul (Gal 1:4; Eph 4:8) used the term. In Ephesians 4:8, the word “*doreas*” is used to imply the divine gift and it is this term that is alluded in 4:11 that Christ divinely imparts *domata* to His church. Verses 7-8 show gifts given; while verse 11 shows that the gift given is distinct from an occasional token of God’s and Christ’s good will that may be received, consumed, and soon forgotten. The emphasis is on “the concrete character of the gift, than to its beneficent nature” (Vine 1939:477). They are the



specific and effective ways in which God communicates Himself so that the ecclesiastical community may be corporately strengthened.

4.5. THE CHARISMATA: TRADITIONAL, REFORMED AND CHARISMATIC UNDERSTANDING

4.5.1. The traditional understanding of charismata

This refers to the Catholic and Orthodox understanding of *charismata*. The word *charisma* was introduced into theological terminology by the Apostle Paul to mean free gift. For the Catholic faith, “Charism is bestowed, assigned, distributed not on one’s own behalf, but on behalf of others, it is not a natural talent, but a call of grace, a call to service” (Küng 1986:184). The Catholic reference to charismata leans towards Küng’s charismatic ecclesiology. He is one of the few Catholic scholars who think of the church as “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” (Kärkkäinen 2002:104).

Charismata are potentialities created by the Spirit of God. They are given as a free will of God in His grace. *Charism* is a gift of the Holy Spirit that anoints a believer for the service of the people of God. Charism is not a reward for good behaviour or a result of church office. The *charismata* are assigned to community members in order to discharge variety of services which the community needs. They are given for the renewal and building of the church. The *charismata* are given in order that the Church may not become a one-man show.

The Holy Spirit showers gifts on each member of the body and moves each to communion and service. This view is expressed by Lawler & Shanahan (1995:15) that “the *charismata* of the Spirit fit the body of Christ for communion ministry in the fallen world. They also ensure that the body’s ministry is in continuity with the ministry of Christ, for there is no ministry in the body other than Christ’s ministry.” The *charismata*



are given to constitute the body of Christ and to bring it into existence. They are for internal enhancement and external expansion. It was this understanding that prompted the Dutch theologian, F van der Meer (1966:288) immediately after Vatican II, to write: “the *charismata* are free gifts and serve for the establishment of the Church, not for individual sanctification; moreover, they are subordinated to the preaching of the gospel, which is the real process of establishment, and are controlled through Church authority...”

In relation to the gifts of Ephesians 4:11, the Catholic tradition does not see a difference between them and the other *charismata* in other epistles. The *charismata* are generally not limited to those who hold office in the church, though there is order and rank in a hierarchy. It is on this basis that Küng expresses the fact that “God has appointed in the Church first *apostles*, second *prophets*, third *teachers*, then workers of miracles, then healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues... But earnestly desire the higher gifts” (1 Cor 12:28, 31). The charismatic ecclesiology of Küng finds itself trapped within the Pauline ordering that places the clergy near the end of his list, and also that the *charismata* cannot be possessed by one particular individual – the Spirit has gifted every individual.

It is worth quoting the original intentions of Küng (1986:186) concerning the order of *charismata* in the church:

In this charismatic order of preference the *apostles* come first, which for Paul include more than the original twelve (cf Rom 16:7; 1 Cor 9:5); they are the original witnesses of the risen Lord, sent out by him and authorised to preach in his name. Second the *prophets* who are mentioned elsewhere (Eph 2:20) together with the apostles as the foundation of the Church; they light up the road of the individual and the community, in present and in future, by the freedom of their Spirit-inspired proclamations; they too have been chosen and authorised by God. Third come the *teachers* who hand on and interpret the message of Christ, shedding light on the



tenets of faith and the commandments of that message, and interpreting the Old Testament according to the ideas of the young Church. Like the prophets, they derive their message from the original testimony of the apostles, and direct the present and the future of the community, but instead of intuitive proclamations their work is rather the systematic and theological development of ideas.

This view, regardless of prevailing notion of hierarchy, leads to ecclesiological constructs that view the church as a more participatory, settled and living a community lifestyle wherein individuals are empowered for the ministry tasks. Since the Church is founded upon the sovereignty of the Spirit, it is expected to be an open system where the Holy Spirit must take supreme rule, and has primacy over its structures. The livelihood, the order and the sustainability of the Church is all dependent on the Holy Spirit. The Spirit's sovereign freedom in dispensing the charismata to the church reigns supreme.

The Eastern Orthodox does not differ much from the Catholic view of charismata, except that for Eastern Orthodox, the Spirit constitutes the relation between Christ and the ministry. Kärkkäinen (2002:101), making a commentary on John Zizioulas, the Eastern Orthodox scholar and theologian that: "The life and the ministry of the body of Christ are conceived pneumatologically, in terms of the gifts of the Spirit... The charismatic life is constitutive of and not derivative from the church's being." In other words, Christology is pneumatologically constituted in order to put ecclesiology and eschatology into perspective.

4.5.2. The Reformed understanding of charismata

The *charismata* are the gifts of God's grace. They are the Spiritual gifts, certain capacities bestowed by God's grace and power, which fit people for specific and corresponding service. A *charisma* is neither a capacity by itself, nor a ministry or office by itself, but is a capacity which qualifies a person for a ministry. It is a manifestation of



grace given to individuals for the benefit of the Church. In Eph 4:11 the apostle uses two other words translated gifts: “*dorea and doma.*” These are the gifts of ascended Christ to the Church. Some scholars differentiate them from the other *charismata* of 1 Cor 12-14. The entry of Christians into communion with Jesus Christ enables them to receive through the Spirit, authority, and capacity for serving Him and the Church.

Volf (1998:226) drives the point home that “the *charismata* are empowerments for pluriform service in the church and in the world, empowerments which come from God’s grace and which can change and overlap.” The church is constituted by God’s Spirit, so it is a charismatic church that is christologically empowered. The *charismata* is distributed universally and sovereignly to enact common responsibility and mutual subordination. Jürgen Moltmann (1977:291-300) belabours the issue of the Charismatic rule of Christ in the church. These *charismata* are given for order and peace in the community. “The ecclesiastical orders of Christ’s church are historical portrayals of God’s eschatological *order of peace*” (1977:291). They are released so that the community can experience freedom in Christ, and the rule of Christ. *Charismata* are the energies of life for service.

However, the *charismata* and *domata* are seen as different since the former are related to the Spirit while the latter are related to Christ. *Charismata* are released to individual believers while *domata* are released for the church leaders. Many Reformed theologians lean towards cessationism in the exegesis of Ephesians 4:11. This is the belief that the first three *domata* (apostles, prophets, and evangelists) were temporary, while the last two (pastors and teachers) are permanent. The following two examples from antiquity confirm this assertion: “These three (apostles, prophets, evangelists) thus were temporary, so that no other apostles should be expected. But the Lord also gave the prophets and evangelists after those first times, when he pleased. There remain the two ordinary and perpetual offices, namely pastors and doctors” (Zanchius 1889:47). In the same vein, Diodati (1607:224) elaborated: “He does not name all the gifts, but only the principal ecclesiastical and public ones; see 1 Cor.12.28. Of these offices the first three were extraordinary, given for a certain time. The last two were perpetual and ordinary.” The scrutiny of these two above-stated works implies that there are two parts of



ecclesiastical ministry. The first one is the preaching of the Word and administering of the sacraments (pastors and teachers); the second part, caring for the discipline and correcting morals (apostles, prophets, and evangelists). The third part is added which is that of caring for the poor (deacons).

4.5.3. The Charismatic understanding of charismata

In relation to the fivefold ministry of Eph 4:11-16 passage, Peter Wagner (2006:10) has this to say:

The five foundational, governmental, equipping offices are apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor and teacher. The “He” is Jesus, who gave these gifts to His people when He ascended into heaven after rising from the dead and spending 40 days with His disciples (see Eph 4:8). He subsequently gave gifted *people* to the Church on two levels: (1) the foundational or governmental level (see Eph 4:11), and (2) the ministry level through the saints (see Eph 4:12).

The purpose of *domata* is for the perfecting (*katartismos*) of the saints, which denotes fitting or preparing fully. This implies leading to consummation or completion. They are given for the work of ministry (*diakonia*) and for the edifying (*oikodome*) of the body of Christ. This speaks of service and strength, hence from the dawn of Pentecostal revival, charismata has always been associated with power and holiness. In other words it is for character and deeds.

4.6. THE PROBLEMS CITED IN RELATION TO CHARISMATA

The distribution of gifts is under the sovereign direction of the Holy Spirit. However, there is a wide band of thoughts when coming to the limitation of time in regard to these gifts.



4.6.1. The *disagreement* within the theological scholarship is very wide. The text that is used for the rationale of the cessation of spiritual gifts is 1 Corinthians 13:8-10. This has led the dispensationalists and cessationists such as Lloyd-Jones, Ryrie, Chafer etc to believe that some of the spiritual manifestations have ceased from operating. They go to an extent of claiming that some gifts are the manifestations of the demonic activities. The wider evangelical ecclesiology holds the fact that the charismatic gifts are all still in operation, just as they were in the early church. I align myself with Grudem (1988:233-234), that the statement “when perfection comes...” refers to when Christ returns. This would imply that they (gifts) will continue to exist and be useful through the church age, including today, and right up to the day when Christ returns”. Paul’s suggestion here is that gifts are a temporary provision to equip believers for ministry until the Lord returns. In another place (1 Corinthians 1:7), Paul seems to be suggesting that the possession of spiritual gifts is tied to the activity of waiting for the Lord’s return.

This disagreement is not only based on whether some gifts are in existence or not, but also on the definitions. Some scholars who promote the cessation of charismata go to an extent of replacing gifts with the modern scientific inventions. This is a kind of extreme one encounter in the work such as Warfield’s *Counterfeit Miracles* (1918). Nowhere in the New Testament are the spiritual gifts defined explicitly. Qualifying phrases help describe them. Some are illustrated. Some of the functions that they seemingly involve are commanded in the Scripture for believers e.g. the reciprocal commands. Thus any definitions of spiritual gifts require interpretation. On some of the named gifts very little etymological studies can be used to try to identify them. There are no exegetical arguments which exclude the existence of any of the gifts today. One’s system of interpretation or philosophy of closure with regard to unresolved topics may require such a position. Since the gifts are an essential part of the interdependent nature of the church, their functions will be accomplished as God sees them necessary to the ongoing of the church whether by the gifts named in Scripture or through other abilities, talents etc.

4.6.2. The *problem related to the spiritual gifts is that of neglect*. This can currently be observed in many churches. Many in Christian community know something about the



Holy Spirit but very little if nothing at all about His gifts. The controversy surrounding *charismata* is due to the historical development, not due to biblical blurriness on it or peripheral treatment of it. The neglect of spiritual gifts goes in line with ignorance. De Haan (1974:139) drives the point home that “the errors and the extremes in Corinth were the result of ignorance, and the remedy was good, solid, Biblical teaching, the meat of the Word, rather than emotional preaching of the milk of the Word.” The neglect and ignorance regarding the spiritual gifts make it almost impossible for the community to enjoy the body life and ministry that should be.

4.6.3. *The problem of confusion.* The confusion concerns the relationship between the spiritual gifts and the natural abilities. There is also confusion about the relationship between the spiritual gifts and the fruit of the Spirit. Two extremes must be cautiously avoided here: (1) there is no difference between them, (2) there is no link whatever between the two. Biblically we learn (Stott 1979:91) that God prepares “people in terms of their temperament, upbringing, and experience, and then inspired by the Holy Spirit to communicate a message which was entirely appropriate to the kind of person they were.” John Stott continues to speak of the link between pre-conversion natural talent and post-conversion spiritual gift. He authenticates his agreement on the basis of God as the God of re-creation, and of nature and grace. He links the temperament with spiritual gifts. He drives the nail into the coffin with the rhetorical question: “But would it not be more harmony with the God of the Bible, whose plans are external, to suppose that his spiritual gifts dovetail with his natural endowments?” (Stott 1979:93). Stott reminds us that biblically we are warned not to draw too hard and fast line demarcation between the natural and spiritual gifts. The Jesuit, F. A. Sullivan (1982:13) stresses that the Spirit’s contribution is to add something over and above the natural talent. The natural talents can be changed by the Holy Spirit to glorify Christ. The notion is driven home by Gaybba (1987:219); “Certainly it is clear that for any contribution to be regarded as a *charism* or gift of the Spirit there must be a contribution of the Spirit that goes beyond the purely natural.”



There are no conflicts in the Scripture on truth for all truth originates from God and will be consistent. This does not mean that there are not inconsistencies and contradictions. Sometimes the confusion lies with human subjectivism. Such is the case with the gifts of the Spirit and the fruit of the Spirit. The key text on the fruit of the Spirit is Galatians 5:22-26. The fruit referred to here is never plural, but singular. The fruit of the Spirit refers to the corporate character of the Christian life.

Table 4.2. Distinctions of Gifts and Fruit

GIFTS OF SPIRIT	FRUIT OF SPIRIT (GAL 5:22-23)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Related primarily to the collective body of believers</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Related primarily to individual believers in body</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Related to ministry</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Related to character</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>May be classified as to order of Importance</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All are essential</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>May be exercised in such a manner as to offend others, and cause discord and division in the body</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Can never be misused</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Normally no single believer receives all the gifts</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Every believer must bear all the fruit all the time</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No gift can be demanded of all believers</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>All of us can be commanded to manifest the fruit of the Spirit</i>

Many authors classify the gifts in different ways. For instance, Hans Küng (1986:184) agrees with Käsemann that there are three groups of gifts i.e. *charisms* of preaching, *charisms* of service and *charisms* of leadership. The other authors think of gifts that have the primary focus towards maturity, numerical or organic church growth. This is found within the mainstream of evangelical scholarship. Within the Neo-charismatic movement, people like Green (1989:195-248) divide gifts between those of utterance, those of action, those of knowledge, and those of charismatic nature. On the other hand, when one looks into the fruit of the Spirit, all of it is essential. It cannot be classified or categorized.

4.6.4. *The fourth and the final problem regarding the gifts of the Spirit is that of an abuse.* Some theologians are of the opinion that certain *charismata* are signs of a



necessary work of the Holy Spirit. This emphasis causes spiritual pride and can cause rifts and splits. This is the improper balance of some gifts to the exclusion of other gifts. The gifts are basically for the glorification of Christ and the edification of the church, never a sign of spirituality. The gifts that suffer an enormous abuse are those that are expressive and conspicuous in nature e.g. teaching, healing, speaking in tongues, prophecy, etc. Some of these gifts, if not all of them are the *corollary gifts*. That means they do not function independently. They are accompanied by other gifts or some instructions. For instance, speaking in tongues in the church must be accompanied by the gift of interpretation and that of discernment. There is an instruction as to how many, and how it can be exercised in the congregation. The same will be for teaching. It must be tested. The spiritual gifts are the endowments conferred by the Holy Spirit, and are for the use of the church, and “no one should value himself above his brother, and no one should feel himself dishonoured because he had not been thus favoured” (Barnes 1979:224).

The full understanding of the *charismata* is better understood in the exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12-14 together, not in isolation. 1 Corinthians 13 cannot be separated from this theological motif and construct. In fact it is a crux that underlines the attitude that should accompany the exercise of the gifts. It is an ethical demand that is reinforced in Ephesians 4:2. Here in 1 Corinthians 13, the apostle “recommends *love* – as of more value than all other spiritual gifts put together, and recommends that *that* should be especially the object of their desire”. (Barnes 1979:224): All these manifestations of the Spirit, Paul says, “must be motivated by the greatest grace of love or they are useless” (Anderson 1994:111). In another place, in reference to Ephesians 4, Barnes (1979:76) mentions it that “one should not complain that another has more distinguished endowments than he has...” Love as part of the fruit of the Spirit should characterize the manifestations of God’s Spirit in Christian community life. “Although Christians are bound to acknowledge the supremacy of love, they must not allow their profession of it to run ahead of their real feelings for others, for those who do are guilty of hypocrisy” (Wilson 1976:202).



Paul's thoughts of the Christian church as a body in Ephesians 4:1-16 is that members under the headship of Christ must use Christ's gifts, not for personal prestige, but for the privilege of contribution to the common good. This is in line with Barclay (1962:173) who once highlighted that

each part of the body carries out its own function, however, prominent or however humbly unseen that function may be. It was Paul's conviction that the Christian church should be like that. Each member of the Christian church has a task to do; and it is only when each member contributes the help of his or her own task that the body of the church functions as it ought to function.

The *didactic* teaching on *charismata* lies at the very heart of the essential nature of the church as an interdependent body therefore must not be ignored regardless of problems associated with it. Gillquist (1976:94) nails it down; "the gifts of the Spirit are absolutely vital to the proper functioning of the government of God. They help provide the real life of the eternally true doctrines or our divine Magna Charta."

In retrospect, it can be summarised that ***the spiritual gift is a unique capacity, given by the Holy Spirit, to each believer, for service in connection with the church in order that the church may grow as God intended it to.*** This notion is affirmed by Chafer (1978:216)

It may be said that a gift in the spiritual sense means the Holy Spirit doing a particular service through the believer and using the believer to do it. It is not something the believer is doing by the aid of the Holy Spirit, nor is it a mere augmentation of what is termed a native or natural gift. According to 1 Cor. 12:7, a gift is a manifestation of the Spirit.



The Spirit is the one who plays a major role in the exercising of the *charismata*. The manifestation of the Spirit is expressed in the gift as it operates in the believer. The *charismata* are the supernatural signs to assure the believers of God the Holy Spirit's operation in their lives. They are the divine provision to assist in the growth of the church and its missional task here on earth. They are God's gracious enablement or endowment bestowed as a free blessing on His people for a special purpose in life. The *charismata*; in other words, involve grace on the part of God as the Donor. It is God's endowments upon the believers by the operation of the Holy Spirit in the churches and in individual believers (Romans 12:6; 1 Corinthians 1:7; 12:4, 9, 28-31; 1 Timothy 4:14; 2 Timothy 1:6; 1 Peter 4:10). To reiterate, ***a spiritual gift is a revelation or manifestation of the demonstration of the operation of the Holy Spirit for the building of the saints.*** Graham (1980:134) explains,

a gift might also be called a “*tool*” or an instrument that is to be used, rather than a piece of jewellery for decoration, or a box of candy for personal enjoyment. We could think of the different types of tools a carpenter uses, or the different types of tools a surgeon needs. These “tools” have been given to people for use in the functioning of the Body of Christ.

This is in agreement with Barnes (1979:76) that:

the gift is bestowed upon all the believers, and all have enough to enable them to live a life of holiness. It is in Romans 12 that we are taught that this is a gift. It is bestowed on us. It is not what is originated by ourselves. It is by a certain measure. It is not unlimited and without rule. There is a wise adaptation, an imparting it by certain rule. It is the gift of Christ, given in Christ. It comes through him. All have enough for the purposes for which has called them into his Kingdom, but there are not the same endowments conferred on all.



In reference to 1 Peter 4:10, the gift means endowment of any kind conferred by the Holy Spirit. It refers to any kind of endowment by which we can fulfil our religious calling to serve others. The gifts and graces enable us to contribute to the welfare of others. The spiritual gifts are not just for our benefits, but for the other members of the body.

4.7. CONCLUSION

The emerging apostolic churches tend to go the route of the post-apostolic Roman and Jewish concepts of status, power, and centralised priesthood. This was when the church government was clericalised and sacrilised. The Christian faith started in Jerusalem as a relationship with Christ. When it hit the Roman contours, it became institutionalised. Later, when it hit Europe, it became a culture. These days in almost the utter parts of the world, it has become an enterprise. The elaborately structured institution emerged to corrupt the simple, family structure of the apostolic churches. It robbed people of their lofty position and ministry in Christ. It has exchanged Christ's supremacy over His Church for the supremacy of the institutional church. The New Apostolic Reformation is not different from this. Their organisational structure is determined by their theological perceptions and their actions. Their theology and beliefs determine their ecclesiology. They have been audacious in challenging hierarchical models of the church, though paradoxically, in many circles, has buttressed male, authoritative patterns of leadership.



CHAPTER 5: EPHESIANS 4:1-16 EXEGESES: PRECURSOR TO UNDERSTANDING THE FIVEFOLD MINISTRY IN THE EMERGING APOSTOLIC CHURCHES

5.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter surveys the analytical research on Ephesians 4:1-16, with a special emphasis on chapter 4:11-12. The chapter looks at the brief views on authorship, style and the setting of the book of Ephesians, the panoramic and the broader understanding of the book, principles, and the doctrinal perspectives. It expands on the ecclesiastical understanding of Ephesians 4:11 from both the Reformed and Pentecostal perspectives followed by some theological reflections. The purpose of this chapter is to scrutinize the understanding and analytical interpretations of Ephesians 4:1-16. The chapter plays an important role in this research because it explains the rationale behind different conclusions on the fivefold ministry as the structure for church leadership. In this case the Reformed and the Pentecostal understanding of the fivefold gifts of Ephesians 4:11.

5.2. THE AUTHORSHIP

The Pauline authorship of Ephesians was universally accepted by the early church and throughout the church history. However, there has been recent New Testament scholarship that detaches this letter from the Pauline *corpus*. This is based on internal arguments drawn from the style, vocabulary, impersonal character of the epistle, and the theology of the epistle, especially its lack of eschatological tone. Rudolf Schnackenburg (1991:24) brings this to attention; “Theodore of Mopsuestia and Jerome recognised at an early date the difficulty of its being addressed to Ephesus, and Erasmus saw its style as deviating from that of Paul; but it was not until E. Evanson (1792), L Usteri (1824), De Wette (1826), and especially F.C Baur and his school that Paul’s authorship was disputed.” The historical panorama gathered from R F Collins (1988), Peter T O’Brien (1999), and Schnackenburg (1999) demonstrates this:



- In 1790, William Paley indicated that the contents of Ephesians came from a “mind revolving a second time the same ideas.”
- In 1792, Edward Evanson, a Unitarian, boldly expressed in print doubts about the Pauline authorship of the epistle by appealing to its contents.
- In 1824, Leonhard Usteri expressed doubts about the origin of this letter on the grounds of its manifest similarity with Colossians.
- In 1826, W.M.L de Wette appealed to the style and address of Ephesians to question the Pauline authorship.
- From 1845 to 1876, F.C. Baur rejected the Pauline authorship in his two volumes on Paul, and situated it in the early part of the second century.
- In 1868, Sytze Hoekstra advanced this view that “Ephesians was a paulinizing corrective of Colossians, a pseudonymous work which the putative corrector thought to have strayed too far from the apostle’s thought” (R F Collins 1988:134).
- In 1870, Ferdinand Hitzig advanced the view that the letter was the work of an epigone who subsequently introduced some of his own ideas into the original text of Colossians.
- In 1872, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann was convinced that Ephesians was a revision of Colossians emanating from other Pauline texts by an editor who subsequently introduced some of the new composition into Colossians.
- In 1917, Johannes Weiss proposed that Ephesians had been composed by an unknown author who had been compiling a collection of the Pauline correspondence, the notion embraced by an American called Edgar J Goodspeed who proposed Onesimus as the possibility of this unknown author. John R W Stott (1989:20) highlights Goodspeed’s assumption: “He speculated that about the year AD 90 an ardent devotee of the apostle Paul, dismayed by the contemporary neglect of his hero’s letters, went the rounds of the churches he has visited in order to collect and later publish them. But before publication he saw the need for some kind of introduction. So he composed ‘Ephesians’ himself as a mosaic of materials drawn from all Paul’s letters, especially



Colossians (which he had memorized), and attributed it to Paul in order to commend him to a later generation.”

- In 1918, James Moffatt held the opinion that Ephesians was a ‘tract for the times’ written by a paulinist imbued with his master’s spirit.
- From around 1951, C Leslie Mitton of England, promoted the idea that Ephesians was written by someone who was quite familiar with the Pauline letters and acquainted with Colossians.
- The popular German theologian, Rudolf Bultmann and some of his disciples, such as Ernst Käsemann and Heinrich Schlier linked Ephesians with Gnostic background, therefore divorcing it from Pauline authenticity. This view popularised the non-Pauline authorship that is prevalent today.

However, the author of the letter to the Ephesians claims apostolic authority and describes himself as a suffering prisoner for Christ, the gospel, and the Gentiles (3:1, 13; 4:1; 6:19-20). The Pauline encounter with the Ephesian Christians authenticates the relationship that makes this letter personal as the Lukan narrative recalls:

1. At the end of his second missionary journey in the autumn of A.D. 52 (Acts 18:18-21)
2. A year later on his third missionary journey remained there for two and a half years. He left in spring of A.D.56 (19:1-20:1).
3. A year later on the way from Corinth, he visited the Ephesian elders in Miletus (Acts 20:16-38).

The internal evidence, together with the ancient tradition, concedes to the Pauline authorship which is beyond questions. The epistle contains some features in the history of interpretation that leaves an imprint upon Paul. The author fits someone who was not a lonely distorter of Scriptures but belonged in the company of *bona fide* interpreters and writers. The letter bears the name of Paul and there are personal references in line with the known facts of his life (Ephesians 1:1; 3:1; 4:1; 6:20). The letter’s resemblance to the wider Pauline *corpus* (Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians) may be accounted for by the fact that they were written by the same person and under the same circumstances.



These were written while Paul was under house arrest, probably in Rome between AD 60 and 62. In that imprisonment, he was surrounded by friends such as Luke, Timothy, Aristarchus, Epaphras, Onesimus, and Tychicus – all of whom are mentioned in his letters to the churches.

The two extreme views regarding the authorship of this letter – whether it is Pauline or not, leave one with a range of views concerning the letter. Collins' (1988:136-139) views are highlighted:

1. The minority of scholars who continue to maintain the Pauline authorship e.g. Donald Guthrie, Markus Barth, J B Polhill, F D Howard, Aart van Roon.
2. The *amanuensis* hypothesis. This notion embraces the fact of Pauline authenticity in the sense that it would have been composed by someone at Paul's direction, or that the text results from an unknown interpolator's additions to a letter originally written by Paul. This is prevalent in the twentieth century Catholic theologians such as Joseph Grassi, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, Wilfrid Harrington, and Karl Hermann Schelkle etc.
3. The *non liquet* (It is not clear) scholarship e.g. Adolf Jülicher, Martin Dibelius, Benjamin Wisner Bacon etc.
4. Contemporary critical scholarship e.g. Raymond Brown, H Langkammer, Rudolf Schnackenburg, and some German Catholic scholars.

This research maintains the Pauline authorship which holds that the letter was written by Paul during his first Roman imprisonment (61-63 A.D.)

5.3. LANGUAGE AND STYLE

It has been observed that the letter shows some significant differences of language and style from the generally accepted Pauline letters. O'Brien (1999:5) observes; "Forty-one words are used only in Ephesians, and a further 84 are not found elsewhere in Paul's writings but appear in the rest of the New Testament".



Ephesians also shows the significance of the combinations of unique words and phrases which reflect the author's distinctive mode of expression. Examples that can be cited are:

- Spiritual blessing (1:3)
- The creation of the world (1:4)
- The forgiveness of sins (1:7)
- The mystery of his will (1:9)
- The word of truth (1:13)
- The Father of glory (1:17)
- The desires of the flesh (2:3)
- To know Christ (4:20)

The other observable feature of the language of Ephesians is the recurrence of the words:

- “heavenlies” (1:3, 20; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12) rather than in the heavens
- “devil” (4:27; 6:11) rather than Satan.

The letter to the Ephesians is also characterised by “*pleonastic*”. This is the lengthy sentences that are extended by relative or causal clauses and participial constructions e.g. 1:3-14; 15-23; 2:1-7; 3:1-13; 4:11-16; 6:14-20.

Furthermore, Ephesians is characterised by Paul's expression “in Christ” (*en Christo*). This is sometimes called “in the Lord” or “in Him”. This occurs 160 times in the Pauline writings, and 36 times appear in the letter to the Ephesians. The term expresses the union of a Christian with Christ now living as a redeemed being in a new environment. The epistle expresses Christ as the dignity of the Church, the Body of Christ.

There is a liturgical character of prayer and *mystagogy* in Ephesians. It is a letter full of *exordium* i.e. songs that typify the crystallization and representation of hymnic language. These features dominate the first half of the letter, where Paul uses the lofty language of eulogy, praise, prayer, and doxology.



The purpose of the epistle is correctly summarised by Macquarrie (1990:140): “According to this epistle, God’s purpose for the creatures has been revealed in Christ. It is, to bring together in a unified community the many rival groups of human beings, whose differences are typified by the division between Jews and Gentiles.” The epistle makes Christ a glorious cosmic figure, and the church is invested with an aura of glory. This epistle is the embodiment of dogma in totality. It is a grandeur of the revelation of Christ, and contains majesty and dignity.

The authorship is important in any Biblical Studies because it enacts balanced hermeneutical processes. It authenticates the conclusions to the exegetical results so that doctrine is not distorted. For instance, accepting authorship of Ephesians different from Paul, can easily lead to wrong conclusions of the contents and the context of the text. In a nutshell, “the method whereby we reconstruct the authorship of the Bible involves, first, the differentiation of literary works and secondly, the identification of the writers responsible for the different works” (Van Dyk 1987:9-10). It is often of great importance exegetically to know the human author of any Bible book. The knowledge of a writer is indispensable to the most effective exposition of the original intentions of writing. Only as an interpreter becomes familiar with the author will he be in a position to deduce properly the language used style of writing, and the context as a whole. This leads to correct conclusions regarding the content and the context of the text.

5.4. THE SETTING

One of the characteristics of Ephesians among all of Pauline *corpus* is that this letter is the most general and least situational in context. The letter is not addressed to the nomadic or rural people. It is a dialogue with a community which lives in a pluralistic society. The letter does not carry or convey any particular problem or some sense of urgency or response to any crisis as observed in other Pauline letters. It is addressed to the church of those blessed with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ (1:3). They are the chosen ones who heard and responded to the gospel of salvation for



their lives. These recipients receive positive commendations from the apostolic pen and are affirmed to remain rooted in *catechesis* that had been handed down to them.

The city of Ephesus was the capital of Asia Minor since 133 B.C and was a government seat of the Roman proconsul. It was built by the genius Lysimachus who called it after his wife, Arisinoeia. The city was known for its beauty of nature. It was a commercial centre for Asia Minor due to its excellent geographical position. It was a port of outstanding industrial and commercial networks. Many commentators speak incessantly of its industrial activities such as silversmiths, textiles, carpets, handicrafts, and fisheries.

It was a religious city with a famous temple of Artemis the Greek goddess (Romans called her Diana) who was a symbol of unity. She was worshipped as a fertility goddess and a nursing mother who was also a virgin with many breasts. Paying homage to her involved offering sacrifices, dances, and illicit sex. Obviously, most of the Ephesian Christians of Paul's time were out of this cultic background.

5.5. THE PANORAMIC VIEW OF EPHESIANS 4:1-16

Chapter 4 of Ephesians is the beginning of the ethical section of the book. It starts a lengthy *paraclesis* (admonition) on ethical living. It is a direct appeal based on the foundation of Christians being reconciled in Christ and made part of God's "*workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God prepared in advance for us to do*" (Eph 2:10). Furthermore, the chapter highlights the Christian behaviour (ethics) by starting to use the word "live" or as some translations say "walk"- a term that is used four times until the end of the letter (4:1, 17; 5:2, 8, 15). The letter shows that theology and ethics cannot be compartmentalised. Instead, theology and ethics are intertwined. The attitudinal and behavioural implications laid out are to flow from proper understanding of the apostolic teaching. The canonical style, especially the Pauline style, combines theological and ethical statements, with theology providing the bases for ethics. This is in agreement with Barth (1974:426) that



during the past decades it was often and vigorously stated that Paul's imperatives are dependent upon his indicatives, his *didache* (teaching) is determined by his *kerygma* (proclamation), and all things ethical are derived from dogmatic doctrine. However, the content of Eph 1-3 is doxological rather than dogmatic. The direct connection of the ethical chapters 4-6 with the praise of God rather than with a doctrine of God is a specific feature of Ephesians.

As a matter of emphasis, O'Brien (1999:67) reminds the reader; "Maintaining the unity of the church, which is on the road to maturity, through the diverse ministries which the ascended Christ has poured out upon his people is the key admonition of this first exhortatory section (4:1-16)". The panoramic view of this chapter looks like this:

- The unity and diversity of the maturing church through the gifts of Christ (4:1-16)
- The follower of Christ is called to walk differently from the outsiders (4:17-24)
- The direct exhortations of showing unity and love in a practical way (4:25-32)

5.6. BROADER UNDERSTANDING OF EPHESIANS 4 PASSAGE

It is an ecclesiastical confirmation to regard Ephesians 4:1-16 as a major passage on gifts (*domata*). This passage contributes less to the actual information on gifts than 1 Corinthians 12-14 and Romans 12:1-8 do. It is extremely important since it connects the teaching of gifts to the eternal purpose of God for the church and thus implying that gifts within the church are an essential part of the nature of the church. Ephesians is primarily an *ecclesiastical* epistle. It teaches that the revealed wonder of *ecclesia* demands a holy *orthopodeo* – walking in a straight path. The revealed wonder of the church relates to a cosmic purpose that God has for the church. This purpose is to show His *exousia* and *dunamis* to integrate into oneness the diverse elements in the universe. This wonder of the church came to the apostle Paul as an "*apokalupsis*". Because of its wonder and eternal significance there are demands made upon believers to live out their part of this revealed wonder. The very first demand made upon believers regards unity (*henotes*) in



Ephesians 4:3, 13. This passage is a practical application toward this unity based and directed by *domata*. Its primary purpose is to show that gifted leadership was given to the church for the purpose of progress toward a unified spiritual maturity. It also indicates how these *leadership gifts* are part of an interdependent exercise of gifts of all members of the church. The *locus* of this passage is that the proper interdependent exercise of leadership gifts and other gifts will bring about a maturity of oneness in believers and continued progress toward Christ-like living.

In Ephesians 4:1-16, especially 4:11-16, Paul indicates several gifts indirectly by *metonymy* - naming the leaders rather than by directly naming the gifts. He does this by emphasizing the importance of the role of leadership gifts in directing the church towards maturity. The gift of evangelism is added to the others to highlight the importance of it. The teaching gift is qualified by the idea of shepherding, or vice versa. Some text readers would list a gift – the pastoral gift, as a result of the inclusion of the pastor in this list of leadership gifts. In agreement with some New Testament scholars, Barth (1974:451-452) divides this passage into four parts, while it can also be divided into two parts. These are summarised as:

5.6.1. Four parts

The emphasis and the dictating dictum is the famous Pauline statement; “live a life” or “walk” of Chapter 4:1

- ***Ephesians 4:2-3***. The chosen saints are admonished to live humbly, to bear one another, and to preserve unity. Here ecclesiology and ethics are completely identified that they can neither be separated nor distinguished.

- ***Ephesians 4:4-6***. The contents and the fact of the church’s confession are reminded to demonstrate the essential of oneness to the very being and life of the church. The church can only live as confessing church.



- ***Ephesians 4:7-12***. The text of Psalm 68:18 is used to show that the exalted Christ gives the church diverse gifts. Each of her members benefits from the gift given from above. In order that the ‘one’ ministry entrusted to all the members be fulfilled, ‘several’ specific ministers are given by Christ to the church. They proclaim the Messianic peace, the salvation of those near and far

- ***Ephesians 4:13-16***. Ecclesiology is confronted with eschatology. The church is promised that she will meet her Lord face to face. *Christology* rules over the other body of dogma. *Ecclesia* seeks no other perfection than that contained in, and brought by, Jesus Christ. On its *eschatological* journey, ecclesia must beware of heresy, to grow toward Christ and from Him – enjoying and manifesting the provision He is making for her life, her unity, and the needs of each one of her members.

5.6.2. Two parts

Barth (1974:452) cites that Schlier and others promote the approach of the contraction and expansion (*systole and diastole*) of the heart is an analogy to the movement from unity to diversity in this passage. In almost all of these sixteen verses unity and diversity are equally highlighted. No one group of verses ought to be understood as discussing only or primarily either oneness or multiformity. The two parts take the following pattern:

- ***Ephesians 4:1-6***. The admonition for unity

- ***Ephesians 4:7-16***. The diversity of gifts

5.7. THERE ARE TWO PRINCIPLES OF TRUTH DRAWN FROM THIS PASSAGE (4:11-16)

- People with leadership gifts are to train others so that every member can contribute to the overall growth of the whole body. The primary purpose of the passage is to demonstrate that gifted leadership was given to *ecclesia* in order that



it might progress toward a unified spiritual maturity. These leadership gifts are part of an interdependent exercise of gifts of all members of the church.

- The church as a whole will not reach a unified maturity unless each of its members is exercising his gift in concert with other members. The proper interdependent exercise of gifts brings about maturity of oneness in believers and strengthens the *ecclesia's eschatological* journey towards Christ-likeness.

5.8. POSSIBLE DIFFERENCES OF INTERPRETATION OF EPHESIANS 4:11

5.8.1. The list of ministers given in verse 11 does not represent (by figure of speech, metonymy) gifts *but leaders given to the church*. However, two of these roles are listed in parallel passages as gifts (prophecy, teaching). It seems logical to conclude that the other two (apostles, evangelists) also represent gifts exercised by the people called by those titles. As a matter of fact all gifts given to the church are in the form of people.

5.8.2. The leadership gifts listed here belong to the universal church (roving apostolic type ministry) and would thus say the saints they are equipping would have lesser gifts. However, other gifts passages describing local church situations mix these so called leadership gifts in with the lesser gifts and assume all of them present among the local saints.

5.8.3. The King James Version phraseology: “some pastors and teachers”, has been interpreted in various ways. There is a school of thought that says they represent two different people or gifts. If so then, to be consistent and interpret by *metonymy* one would have to have a gift of pastoring as a distinct gift apart from the teaching gift. The other school of thought (Clinton 1975:33) interprets the original Greek construction **not** as pastors and teachers **but** as pastors who also are teachers. Again to be consistent in interpreting by *metonymy* this is a gift of pastoring which includes with it the gift of teaching.



5.9. THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINES IN EPHESIANS 4:1-16

The passage is full of wealth regarding *dogma*. Its diversity of doctrine and ethics appeals to some scholarly scrutiny:

5.9.1. Christian Ethics

The opening paragraph is a list of attitudes that fit the conduct of the members of *ecclesia*. It is an ethical appeal to life (virtues) that is in line with the calling Christians have received (*hes eklethete*). An appeal is connected to what Christ had done for the recipients already. This opening statement implies: *in view of the great and glorious truths which God has revealed; since God has done so much for you; since He has revealed to you such a glorious system; since He has bestowed on you the honour of calling you into His grand plan – show your sense of His goodness by devoting yourself to His service*. As a prisoner by God’s will the apostle pleads with the Ephesians to:

- *Be humble*: Humility (*tapeinophrosune*) speaks of the lowliness, with which one serves the Lord. It refers to an abject, servile, subservient attitude. It speaks of submissiveness of one to other Christians. This is what F F Bruce (1961:88) calls “the crouching submissiveness of a slave.” It is a model of Christ as demonstrated by His appeal in Matthew 11:29, where He reveals Himself as one who is gentle and humble in heart. The poetic language of Philippians 2:6-11 expresses this humility where Jesus humbled Himself to death on the cross, and God exalted Him by bestowing on Him the name that is above all names. Christ was giving a pattern to follow that His followers in humility must esteem others better than themselves and to be concerned about others’ welfare.
- *Gentleness* (*epiekeia*): It is a non-violent means (considerateness) of dealing with other people. It is to bear patiently with the faults and weaknesses of others.



- *Patient (makrothymia)*: Steadfastness and/or forbearance. Make an allowance for others shortcomings. It is a delay that allows or gives a time (*kairos*) for repentance or God's wrath. It is a *kairos* that makes God's purpose clear in its eschatological dimension to take its cause.
- *Love (agapao)*: This word is the characteristic word of Christianity. It describes the attitude of God towards His children and conveys God's will to His children concerning their attitude to each other. Love in this sense expresses the essential nature of God (1 John 4:8). When *agapao* becomes *phileo*, then it means tender affection. It is more of feelings than facts, though the two terms cannot be separated concretely
- *Unity (ten henoteta)*. The unity of the Spirit is to be maintained in the bond of peace (*en toi sundesmoi tes eirenes*). Peace has the bonding effect, so it is the means by which the recipients of this letter will maintain and display the unity of the Spirit. Peace is the bond in which their unity is kept. The strong motivation for apostolic appeal for unity is presented in seven acclamations, each using the word "one" to remind the recipients of the fundamental unities on which the Christian dogma and faith are based. The apostle here moves from exhortation to assertion:
- *One body (hen soma)*: This refers to one mystical body of Christ, the Church which is made up of both the Jews and the Gentiles. They are one body in the heavenlies, therefore one Body here on earth. In the words of Tucker (1983:117), "The unity determined in the heavenlies must be displayed on the earth." It is a complex organism, with many functions, each in its own place, working in harmony This Body of Christ is, by definition, *one*. This is the first mark of the Church (*nota ecclesiae*), as expressed in our confession: "We believe in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." This unity is not invented by any human endeavours. It is engineered by Christ Himself and it exists beyond any human capability. Moltmann (1977:139) echoes this notion from Tübingen:



The unity of the Church is not primarily the unity of her members, but the unity of Christ, who acts upon them all, in all places and at all the times. Christ gathers His Church. Consequently the unity of the Church lies in his uniting activity. The result of his gathering activity is the unity of believers in Christ (Gal 3.28) and their unity of mind in the Spirit (Eph 4.1ff).

The “one body of Christ” is a concrete, intensified, and *somatised* (actualised) dynamism of Christ. It is the community of Christ that exists for the glory of God and for the sake of the world. This expression is designed to make the invisible Church in the heavenlies visible here on earth.

- *One Spirit (hen pneuma)*: The membership into the one body of Christ is due to the indwelling and animating activity of the Holy Spirit. There is only one Holy Spirit, who is indivisible.
- *One hope (en mia elpidi)*: It is the same hope that results from the calling of all humanity to exercise faith in Christ
- *One Lord (heis Kurios)*: This expression means the Lord Jesus Christ and him alone. The unity is the work of Christ. This reveals the unity of the Church in view of the doctrine of the second Person in the blessed Holy Trinity, the Son of God, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The emphasis here is that “the Lord Jesus Christ in and of Himself leads to unity and always produces unity, so one of the best ways in which we can see and understand this biblical doctrine of unity of the Church, and preserve it, is to keep our eyes steadfastly on the doctrine of the Person of the Son of God” (Lloyd-Jones 1981:95).
- *One faith (mia pistis)*: This is one act of trust in Christ, the same for both the Jews and the Gentiles. It is one way of being saved. One faith is connected to one Lord and one baptism. This is objective faith that calls the recipients to trust in something



outside themselves which they can apply to themselves, and by which they can test themselves. This does not refer to a complete compendium of theology or the so-called *regula fidei* i.e. Confession of Faith, but to the *kerygma* concerning salvation, justification, and forgiveness of sins. Barth (1974:468) captures this that “faith is always a bond that unites not only God and the saints, but also the diverse members of the church and the congregations.” Christians have the same trust in Christ, as a living, practical principle – and they should, therefore, be one.

- *One baptism (hen baptisma)*: There is only one act of baptism for all who confess Christ by means of this sacrament. They are not made the disciples by this act, but they merely profess Him publicly as Lord (*Kurios*) of their lives. The Pauline connection of baptism with unity surfaces in his ecclesiology as demonstrated in Galatians 3:27-28; and 1 Corinthians 12:13. Baptism is in this sense a sacrament of unity.
- *One God and Father of all (heis theos kai patēr pantōn)*. God is not separate for each nation or religion. He is one God for all creation. This verse demonstrates the involvement of the Holy Trinity in creation and the human affairs: “who is over all (*ho epi panton*), and through all (*kai dia panton*), and in all (*kai en pasin*). The three prepositions (*epi, dia, en*) express the universal domain of power of God in human lives and affairs. God has the supreme transcendence and pervasive imminence.

The message of unity which Ephesians reveal must permeate human social, ecclesiastical, and environmental spheres. Unity as expressed in these seven acclamations invites the *pneumatic community* to demonstrate their faith as a reflection of union with Christ, the Lord above all creation (Erickson 1999:76-78).

5.9.2. Theology Proper – the premise of apostolic argument

The echo of the indicative and declarative *Great Shema* of Deuteronomy 6:4; “Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one” is evident in Ephesians 4:6 (*heis theos kai*



pater panton). The rigorous *monotheistic* faith is exclaimed in this verse where God is perceived as *omnipotent, immanent, and transcendent*. In a sense, Ephesians 4:6 reveals the unity of God as

5.9.2.1. The *unitas singularitatis*

It is the attribute of God that stresses both the oneness and the unity of God. This means God is numerically one and as a result is unique. L Berkhof (1943:61) explains this further that “it implies that there is but one Divine Being, that from the nature of the case there can be but one, and that all other beings exist of and through and unto Him.” The theological importance of the term ‘unity’ as applied to God is that God is one essence. The principal theme of the Bible is the fact of the unity of God. The unity of God is a predicable. It does not determine what God is in Himself. It has to do only with His mode of existence. “God, and only God, is God or divine” (König 1982:103).

The Old Testament is strict about the *echad* (unity) of God. The Decalogue opens with the declaration of the unity of God: *I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery. You shall have no other gods before me* (Exodus 20:2-3). The second commandment also carries the weight regarding the unity of God by calling for worship only to Jehovah. The uniqueness of God can be discerned in King Solomon’s prayer: *so that all the peoples of the earth may know that the Lord is God and there is no other* (1 Kings 8:60).

The New Testament is explicit to the oneness of God. Paul does not mince words to declare: *We know that an idol is nothing at all in the world and that there is no God but one... yet for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom all things came and for whom we live, and there is but one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things came and through whom we live* (1 Corinthians 8:4, 6). Timothy was reminded: *For there is one God, one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus* (1 Timothy 2:5). The Pauline theology agrees with the Mosaic Law by excluding all polytheistic conceptions of God, including idolatry, on the grounds that there is only one God.



5.9.2.2. The *unitas simplicitatis*

This is the perfection of God that is expressive of the inner and qualitative unity of the Divine Being. It is the simplicity of God which implies that God is not composite and is not susceptible of division in any sense of the word. God's essence and perfections are not distinct. Chafer (1978:214) after giving a lengthy definition of the simplicity of God by Hodge concludes:

When attempting to define simplicity as manifest in God, conclusion sometimes arises. (1) Simplicity of being in God is not a contradiction of the Trinity of Person in which mode He subsists. The act of the Trinity does not predict three Essences; it rather predicates one Essence and the one Essence is simple in itself. The whole of the Essence is in each Person. (2) The attributes of God are not detached portions of His Being which when compounded compose God. His Essence is in every attribute and each attribute sets forth some fact related to his uncompounded Essence... And (3) God, being infinite simplicity, is not diffused as an efflux of particles might go out from a source to form new entities of existence. As creator, He is the author of all things. He breathed into man the breath of life and man was made so that he manifests the "image" and "likeness" of God; but human life is not a part of God as a contributing element in the being of God. Whatever is God retains its uncomplicated character as God, invisible and undiminishable. Nothing can be compounded without the possibility of its being divided. Added to this is the fact that a thing which is compounded is the workmanship of some other being and God is the First Cause of all things and Himself compounded or created by none. The simplicity of God is essential to the very mode of His being.



It is therefore theologically correct to conclude that Ephesians 4:6 reflects the doctrine of unity and simplicity of God. It expresses the truth that the Pauline theology, though *Christo-centric* is also *monotheistic* - there is one God (1 Corinthians 8:4-6; Romans 3:30; Galatians 3:20; 1 Timothy 2:5). This is the starting point of Christian theology – that there is one God who is a supreme Creator and is the loving source and destiny of the whole universe. The doctrinal explanation of Apostle Paul is based on the fact that God is one and is above all.

5.9.3. Revelation – the context of apostolic argument

The text in verse 1 exclaims: *As the prisoner for the Lord, then, I urge you to live a life worthy of the calling you have received.* The antecedent, *eklethete* refers to “calling”. This is an invitation of God to humanity to accept the benefits of salvation. The Pauline context of ethical lifestyle subsequent to this verse is that *as people who have received a special revelation of God’s salvation, you are expected to live a different kind of life.* Some English Bible versions start the statement with “Therefore”, implying the emphasis on the logical dependence of ethical advice upon the preceding doctrinal statements. The doctrine is revelation on its own. From Chapter 1 to Chapter 3, *dogma* is expounded and elaborated in full. It is on the basis of this *dogma*, that ethics is called for. Paul’s imperatives are dependent upon his indicatives. His *didache* is determined by his *kerygma*. All things ethical are subject to doctrinal expositions. Moral indoctrination is derived from *dogma*.

This is not the beginning of something new. It is a continuation. Turning from the doctrinal to the practical is not a break or a breach. There is no dichotomy between dogma and ethics – between faith and works. There is a relation between interpretation and application. A heavenly calling (revelation received) is followed by earthly conduct. This is an undeniable logic, an inevitable deduction. Truth has been revealed, therefore, truth must be applied. Revelation is a public and universal historical reality recognised and interpreted as an act of God. The doctrine of revelation is the context of apostolic



argument that since truth had been revealed, ethical lifestyle that pertains to this revelation is expected.

5.9.4. Christology – the basis of apostolic argument

The expression, *en Christo* (in Christ) describes the dynamics of Christ's involvement in *ecclesiastical* processes. The Christian unity is based on the unity with Christ. Soteriology is applied Christology. All the salvific acts of God in the New Testament revolve around Christ. The locus of Ephesians 4:1-16 Christology is that Christ is the giver of gifts to His Church. Christology is the basis of *doma*. The Pauline declaration: *kata to metron tes doreas tou Christou* in Ephesians 4:7 means that each gets the gift that Christ has to bestow for his special case. The Messiah is Himself the gift, and God Himself is the Giver of all good things. Many gifts received by people are an outflow of the Great Gift of God. The Messiah, the Great Gift, is disclosed in the various gifts received by the church. On the other hand, the Paul's Christology also promotes the Messiah's activity as the donor (Ephesians 1:10; 2:14-17). Paul's theology reflects God as the giver, and his Christology reflects Christ as a generous distributor of gifts to His *ecclesia*, the Church (Ephesians 1:8). The epitome of the matter is that

Christ has given his gifts 'for building up the body of Christ, until we all attain to the unity of faith and of the knowledge (*epignosis*) of the Son of God, to mature (*teleios*) manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness (*pleroma*) of Christ' (4:12-13); the goal of the process is that 'we are to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love' (4:15-16); finally, we are told that Christ loves the church 'because we are members of his body' (5:30) (Macquarrie 1990:140).



The acclamation; *grace has been given as Christ apportioned it* shifts the focus of attention to the unity of the body in which each member has a distinctive service to render for the effective functioning of the body. Barth (1974:430) describes the meaning of this statement:

Three elements of this statement are equally important: (a) The saints experience God's good will, power, and presence by receiving grace; (b) the grace given is neither a pillow for sleeping nor a comfortable warm feeling, but a ministry, it is a privilege implying responsibility and action; (c) this gift is given to each one of the saints, not solely to an inner circle of office-holders inside the church.

The Ephesians 4:7 central message is that a sharp distinction between clergy and laity in the church is inappropriate. In Paul's Christology, Christ is the great theme of dogma and ethics. Christ is the centre of charismatic community where charismata are distributed liberally according to God's will.

Ephesians 4:8-10 reinforces the context with an Old Testament quotation and its exegesis. The apostle introduces citation from the known Bible of the day. The connective motif "it says" or "it is written" discards legalistic and polemical undertone from the text and context. Paul was equating the voice of the Scripture with the voice of God. The words of Ephesians 4:8 is the peculiar text of Psalm 68:18. The bestowal of gifts by the ascended Christ is confirmed by the application of an important Old Testament text. The words quoted are God's therefore comes with His glory.

Christ's ascendance alluded in Ephesians 4:8 refers historically to the Lord's triumphant ascent of Mount Zion. The statement "When you ascended on high" is understood of Christ's exaltation, an event of momentous theological significance referred to in Ephesians 1:20-22. Kasper (1985:149) helps to define the importance of this exaltation: "Exaltation means therefore heavenly enthronement and installation in divine dignity and



authority. When exalted, Jesus shares in divine power... and divine glory (*doma*)". The language used ('lower earthly regions', 'far above all the heavens') here "seem to suggest an all-encompassing cosmic journey, from the highest heaven or beyond it to the depth of the underworld, and back again. Such an interpretation would consort well with Ephesians' vision of the cosmic Christ who fills all in all (2:22) – his dominion reaches even into hell" (Macquarrie 1990:142). As the exalted Christ, He intercedes for Christians, and continues to protect them. He is not detached from the world, but is with His people in a new way. He is with God as our advocate, *semper interpellans pro nobis* (Hebrews 7:25).

The apostolic concern here is Christ's triumphant ascent and the gifts. The concern is not Christ's leading a host of prisoners captive. The notion of Ephesians 4:8-10 is the establishment of Christ's supremacy over the evil powers. These evil powers are the captives in mind in the application of Psalm 68:18. The text reflects the cosmic supremacy of Christ in a new way. The statement; "and gave gifts to men" points to the fact that it is Christ who gives these gifts to people. Paul has copied the textual tradition as per Targum, and appealed to a common technique of early Jewish hermeneutics, called *midrash peshet*. The method of exposition of the text is applied in the light of its fulfilment in Christ. In reflection, O'Brien (1999:291) asserts

the application of Psalm 68:18 to Christ's ascent and subsequent distribution of gifts stands in contradict to the rabbinic tradition as reflected in the Targum which associates Psalm 68:18 with Moses' ascent of Mount Sinai, an ascent that was understood as a going up to heaven to receive the Torah and other heavenly secrets (O'Brien 1999:291).

This clearly reflects Christology that has supremacy over any other power that can be perceived in either a visible or invisible world. It establishes Christ as superior to even Moses. Christ has ascended far above all the heavens in order to fill the whole universe (Ephesians 4:10). His gift is not the Torah, but grace (Ephesians 4:7). His special gifts of



ministry are for building up the whole body (Ephesians 4:11-16), not heavenly mysteries reserved for the privileged few. Christ received these *domata* in order to give them back to His people in the church. The fact is that Ephesians 4:1-16 exhilarates Christology above all other doctrines. McGrath (1994:200) in summarising Bonhoeffer's Christology captures it explicitly that "Christology is prior to soteriology, in that it is the identity of the person which determines the significance of his or her actions." All of the dogma revolves around Christology. Christ is supreme over all other powers and as a result qualifies to bestow gifts to the Church. He is depicted as the Head of the Body (Ephesians 4:15). It is Christ, the Head, alone from whom the body derives unity, nourishment, and growth. *Praxis* is essential to Christology, and the expression of this *praxis* is ecclesiastical processes. Christ's supremacy and sovereignty do not exclude but create the activity of a church engaged in its own growth and upbuilding.

5.9.5. Pneumatology – the inspiration of apostolic argument

There are two references to the Spirit in Ephesians 4:1-16. In both cases the reference connects the idea of the unity of the Spirit: (1). *Make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit (4:3)* (2). *There is one Spirit (4:4)*. These reinforce the pneumatological crux that the Holy Spirit and the Son, is of the same essence as the Father, and is therefore consubstantial with Him. Kärkkäinen (2002:32) judges it correctly that "Paul's Pneumatology is Christologically founded: The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ... To be 'in Christ' and 'in Spirit' are virtually synonymous, therefore, the Spirit cannot be experienced apart from Christ". Just like other members of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Spirit possesses the divine names, divine perfections, and divine works. The unity of the Spirit embraces all the children of God. Barth (1974:428) associate the unity of the Spirit with the unity of the church; "the unity of the church rests upon the oneness of God rather than upon some common enthusiasm in the community of the church". The unity of the Church is created by the unity of the Spirit. God has inaugurated this unity in Christ in order to reconcile all creation under Him. It is true as Peters (2000:243) asserts;



the Spirit integrates, unifies, and brings things into relationship. The Spirit does not simply demand conformity to an already existent or static state of oneness... Rather it engages in the dynamic process of integrating what is presently estranged. Unity in the Spirit is a reconciling unity, or better, a process of entering into unity, a holomovement. This unity is not simply a matter of turning plurality into oneness, of eliminating every distinction by collapsing all things into a single, universal mass of undifferentiated being. It is rather a matter of coordination, cooperation, integration, and harmony.

It is out of this inspiration that Paul argues that the unity of the Spirit is the bond that keeps the church together. The church without the unity of the Spirit is dysfunctional and does not deserve to be called church. The church derives her ethical lifestyle from the activity of the Holy Spirit. Ecclesiastical life intertwines with pneumatic activity in order to make Christology an experiential reality. Pneumatology gives the church its real ecclesiality.

5.9.6. Ecclesiology – the focus of apostolic argument

The passage of Ephesians 4:1-16 contains some ecclesiastical images such as one body (4:4); God's people (4:12); and the body of Christ (4:12, 16). The church is the dramatic demonstration of God's marvellous wisdom and perfect plan of reconciliation. The church is the **body of Christ** – a common metaphor used only by Paul in the New Testament to refer to the church (Romans 12; 1 Corinthians 12; Ephesians 4:16). The church is the body of Christ by which He fulfils His earthly mission. This image emphasizes the church as the focal point of Christ's activity here on earth. It is the image that emphasizes the connection the church has as a community of believers with Christ. The "body" metaphor highlights the central idea of *UNITY* of many members of the church. The Ephesians church is radically one where everybody received a special gift from Christ. Therefore the body of Christ is not merely a collection of individuals who



subscribe to its philosophy. The members are the interrelated parts. This image is described by the apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians.12:18, 20, 21, and 26: *But in fact God has arranged the parts in the body, every one of them, just as he wanted them to be. As it is there are many parts but one body. The eye cannot say to the hand, "I don't need you!" And the head cannot say to the feet, "I don't need you". If one part suffers, every part suffers with it; if one part is honoured, every part rejoices with it.* Therefore this image reflects the church analogy of a human body equipped with various organs.

The image of the body is forceful because it portrays the union of the church with its Lord. Christology is closely related to ecclesiology. Christ relates to the church as a head to its body. Christians relate to one another as limbs that cooperate. *From him the whole body, joined and held together by every supporting ligament, grows and builds itself up in love, as each part does its work* (Ephesians 4:16). It is true then, as Peters (2000:269) asserts:

Because he is the first – born of all creation” and “all things hold together” in him, “he is the head of the body, the church” (Col 1:15-18). From this head the body is “nourished and knit together through its joints and ligaments,” so that it “grows with a growth that is from God” (Col 2: 19). The sacraments indicate this corporal unity. “In the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body” (1 Cor 12: 13), united with Christ in his death and now raised to live the resurrected life (Rom 6:4-5). Of the Eucharist Saint Paul writes, “Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread (1 Cor. 10:17).

The image of the church as the body of Christ in essence speaks of “the mutual union, mutual concern, and mutual dependence of the members of the local community upon one another” (Dulles 1987: 50). This image gives the impression of a democratic tendency with a special emphasis on the immediate relationship of all believers in a non-hierarchical structure. The attention is on the mutual service of the members towards one



another within the body. Pauline ecclesiology elaborates the great variety of services, functions and charisms in the Body of Christ (Romans 12:4; 1 Corinthians 12:12-27; Ephesians 1:22f; 3:6; 4:4, 12, 16; 5:23, 30; Colossians 1:18, 24; 2:19; 3:15). In a nutshell Paul emphasises the church “as an organism, as having a vital connection with Christ, as under the superintendence of Christ, as being a unit, although made up of Jews and Gentiles, as having a diversity of gifts among the members, and as ideally co-operating in the performance of one common task” (Thiessen 1979:307). This calls for a concept of ministry as the fostering of fellowship. The church as the Body of Christ is the gathering of God’s family together as a brotherhood of living unity. They are together under Christ to build one another up.

The church is seen as **people of God** (*laos tou theou*) that are built together into a spiritual building for God’s habitation. Lawler and Shanahan (1995:10-12) endorse the fact that the story of the church starts with Israel, the Old Testament people of God. One of the positive aspects about Vatican II is the challenge levelled to the comprehensiveness of the “body of Christ” metaphor and bringing back the “people of God” idiom: “It has pleased God to make men holy and save them not merely as individuals without any mutual bonds, but by making them into a single People” (1995:10). Some reputable Catholic theologians such as Hans Küng, Heribert Mühlen and Karl Rahner promoted this metaphor before and after Vatican II. God’s people are His own possession, His treasure. The church is defined by belonging to God. Lawler and Shanahan (1995:10) stress the fact that

Such was the Deuteronomist’s message to Israel: ‘The Lord your God has chosen you to be a People for his own possession, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth’ (Deut 7:6). Such also was Peter’s message to the new people of God, the Church: ‘You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation; God’s own people (1 Pet 2:9).



The people of God is the Church, they are the new people of God, the messianic people whose head is Christ. As the people of God, they are the pilgrim people on the way to the heavenly city. They have the new law which is “the new commandment to love as Christ loved us” (John 13:34). Their goal is the kingdom of God. Again, in the words of Lawler and Shanahan (1995:12); “The Church is not a political democracy, which emphasizes equal *individuals*. Neither is it a political monarchy, which emphasizes unequal *individuals*. It is a *koinonia*, a communion of persons, individuals in relationship, sharing equally in the good things of the one people of God...” These people share life, love, and truth. They are constituted in a special way by God Himself. It is God’s choice to create this society, hence the expression, the people of God asserts the priority and the power of God’s action. The people of God is that people to whom God sent His Son as Saviour and King. Kūng (1986:125-132), the renowned Catholic theologian, calls upon the Church to understand that the new people of God must understand

(a) *All* the faithful belong to the people of God; there must be no *clericalization* of the Church. The real church is the faith community composed of sinful men and women and it exists for them.

(b) Everyone belongs to the people of God *through God’s call*: there must be no attempt to make the Church private and exclusive. There is no distinction between the invisible and the visible church. The real church is made up of the real people therefore cannot be invisible. The visible church is the true church. According to Kung, the church is simultaneously visible and invisible.

(c) We all belong to the people of God through our *human decision*: there must be no *hypostatization* of the Church. What makes the people of God distinctive is that every member belongs to it through God’s call. The church must never be made private or exclusive. It is not a free association of like-minded religious affiliates. “The Church is always and everywhere dependent on the free choice and call of God, who wills the salvation of all men (1986:126).

(d) The people of God is an *historical* people: there must be no *idealization* of the Church. The Church can never be a static and supra-historical phenomenon. The church is an eschatological community, *en route* through the midst of time.



The Pauline usage of these two metaphors (body of Christ, and people of God), comes with God's particular expectation of the church's unity, maturity, cooperation, and upbuilding of itself (Ephesians 4:12-16). These are the genuine marks of the ecclesiality of the pneumatic community under the headship of Christ. The apostolic focus is the ecclesiastical community that is eschatological, on the pilgrim towards maturity, characterised by unity.

Unity is not just a mark of Christ's church, but also a confessional mark, a sign of the church's creed in a divided and estranged world; *that the world may believe*. (John 17:21). The church as a unifying force is the messianic people of Christ. This is due to the fact that unity is not merely an attribute of the church; it is also the church's task in the world. The unity of Christ is the unity with His disciples and believers, as well as with the oppressed, the humiliated and the marginalised. Moltmann (1977:345) is correct that the church's unity "would no longer be a 'predicate of the time of salvation' if it were not to achieve liberation for the downtrodden, justice for those without rights, and peace in social conflicts. It is not 'one' for itself; it is one for the peace of divided mankind in the coming kingdom of God."

Regardless of differences in doctrine, organisation, polity, liturgy, history etc, the church remains one, since it is the gathering of believing citizens of the Kingdom. The church remains the one body and the one and only bride of Christ. It is the unity of fellowship with God and with one another. The church's unity is also the practical unity of service. This service is determined by Christ's service, hence the church is "the community of those who serve" (Heyns 1980:120). The church's unity must be discernible in the world. It should be discerned as the unity that can be seen, heard and experienced. It must be the unity of relationship, of action, of attitude as expounded by Jesus in John 17. Generally it must be the unity that finds concrete expression in word and action.

The unity of the church does not dismiss the dimensions of pluriformity, uniformity and diversity. All these are the inevitable phenomena of the church, yet the unity of the church is God's command to transcend the natural boundaries of language, culture and



customs. It is the sign that testifies against the sinful fragmentation of human relationships and a false human unity. It is a unity of those who are in Christ i.e. a unity in the truth.

5.9.7. Gifts – the content of apostolic argument

Since Christology is the basis and the running theme that brings all the *dogmata* together in the Christian faith, *charismata* are a necessity for ecclesiastical maturity. The apostolic argument regarding *domata* is that Christ's followers should:

- Reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of Christ (*pros ton katartismon*)
- Attain to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ
- Stability in doctrine (4:14)
- Maturity

The goal of the apostolic argument is maturity that comes through perfecting (*katartizo*). This word carries the meaning of mending or repairing of the saints. "Building up" (*eis oikodomen*) is the focus of the apostle in this passage. The growth is the process "until we all reach" (*mechri, katantesomen hoi pantes*) maturity. It is the goal or the process all Christians must attain. This *katartismon* in 4:12 is employed in some New Testament passages to give some *symbiotic* meanings to the original. The summary of Gordon (1994:69-78) elaborates this fact by highlighting the five ways this word is employed:

- i) *Of fishing nets, "mending" (though some think "folding")*: Matt 4:21; Mark 1:19.
- ii) *Of a variety of different matters, "fashioning" or "preparing"*
 - "Have you never read, 'Out of the mouths of infants and nursing babies you have prepared (*kateriso*) praise for yourself?'" (Matt 21:16).
 - "A disciple is not above the teacher, but everyone who is fully qualified (*katertismenos*) will be like the teacher" (Luke 6:40).



-
- “What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the objects of wrath that are made (*katertismena*) for destruction?”(Rom 9:22).
 - “Consequently, when Christ came into the world he said, ‘Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired, but a body you have prepared (*katertiso*) for me” (Heb 10:5).
 - “By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared (*katertisthai*) by the word of God” (Heb 11:3).
- iii) *Of Church unity, either confessional or governmental*
- “Now I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you be in agreement and there be no divisions among you, but that you be united (*katertismenoi*) in the same mind and the same purpose” (1 Cor 1:10).
 - “Finally, brothers and sisters, farewell. Put things in order (*katartizesthe*), listen to my appeal, agree with one another, live in peace; and the God of love and peace will be with you” (2 Cor 13:11).
- iv) *Of Christian sanctification or health*
- “For we rejoice when we are weak and you are strong. This is what we pray for, that you may become perfect (*ten hymon katartisin*) (2 Cor 13:9).
 - “Now may the God of peace, who brought back from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep, by the blood of the eternal covenant, make you complete (*katartisai*) in everything good so that you may do his will” (Heb 13:20-21).
- v) *Of restoration of something/someone damaged, incomplete or injured.*
- “My friends, if anyone is detected in a transgression, you who have received the Spirit should restore (*katartizete*) such a one in a spirit of gentleness” (Gal 6:1).



- “Night and day we pray most earnestly that we may see you face to face and restore (*katartisai*) whatever is lacking in your faith” (1 Thes 3:10).
- “And after you have suffered for a little while, the God of grace, who has called you to his eternal glory in Christ, will himself restore (*kartisei*), support, strengthen and establish you” (1 Pet 5:10).

The deduction can be made out of these verbal and nominal form of *katarismo* that the expression was intended to mean ‘perfecting’ or ‘constituting’ or even ‘joining’. This justifies the implications that the word could mean ‘put in order’, ‘restore’, ‘put into proper condition’, ‘make complete’, ‘prepare’, ‘equipping something’, ‘training’, ‘discipline’ or ‘to create’. It is for this reason that Gordon (1994:73) concludes,

it is preferable to understand the expression to mean either “perfecting” or “constituting/joining” because the language and thought of the body, unified and growing to perfection will continue throughout the chapter. That is, Christ, the heavenly Head, is uniting and growing the body into perfection by means of these “gifts,” the officers.

The Pauline metaphor of the body consisting of many parts with Christ as the organising and governing Head is beyond questions. As the Head, He manages to join and knit together the whole body so that each part may work properly.

5.10. THE TWO ECCLESIASTICAL EXEGESIS OF EPH 4:11 – REFORMED AND PENTECOSTAL

5.10.1. REFORMED EXPOSITION

The foundational theme of this passage is the unity of the church. The apostle’s thesis is that there is “a unity in variety, a unity in diversity” (Lloyd-Jones 1984:168). The legitimacy of the *exegesis* of this passage should commence from verse 7: “But to each



one of us grace has been given as Christ apportioned it”. The root “was given” implies that the agent was Christ, who is the focus of the subsequent verses. Each believer receives *charisma* that Christ sovereignly bestows for special task of the ministry. Charisma is the favour of God. In the commentary work of Barnes (1979:75-76), “The *grace* referred to here, most probably means *the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit*, or his operation on the heart in connection with the use of the means which God has appointed.” These gifts operate under the Headship of Christ. He is the One who gives them.

The debatable and theological question is whether these *charisms* are the gifts or the offices. The Reformed tradition leans towards the perception that they are the gift, not ecclesiastical position. Hendriksen (1976:195) confirms this notion by quoting Harnack “that the apostles were not in any sense intended to be ecclesiastical officers but merely bearers of a message; that they were not vested with authority over life and doctrine but merely endowed with special spiritual gifts; or that, if they exercised any authority at all, it was not official but organic, spiritual, ethical.” One of the leading scholars of dispensational theology of the twentieth century, Ryrie (1980:83) captures the Reformed view that “A spiritual gift is not primarily a place of service. The gift is the ability, not where that ability is exercised”. The Reformed fundamental approach is that verse 11 begins with the third personal pronoun, “It was he who gave...” (*kai autos edoken*). The word “*edoken*” is the first aorist active indicative of “*didomi*” which signifies the character of the gift than its beneficent nature, hence “the emphasis in this passage (Ephesians 4:11) does not lie on the apostles, prophets, etc. as officers but as gifts of Christ to his church” (Roels in Hendriksen 1976:195). It is therefore theologically correct to think of these gifts as enablement for holiness in lifestyle, but also for the extension and the edification of the church. Many Reformed scholars are convinced that some of these gifts are dormant or are foundational that there is no need of them in today’s church. For instance, Best (1997:157-158) asserts:

In 2:20 and 3:5 it is implied that the ministry of apostles and prophets is in certain important respects over. In 2:20 they are termed the



foundation of the church, and a foundation can only be laid once; in 3.5 they are said to be the recipients of the revelation that the gospel is for the Gentiles as well as Jews; once this truth has been made known and accepted there is no need for it to be revealed again. In those senses then the ministry of apostles and prophets belongs to the past.

5.10.1.1. He gave some to be apostles

The word “apostle” is derived from the roots *apo* and *stello*, meaning one sent forth as a messenger or an ambassador. In the New Testament, the apostles were the leaders who laid the foundation of the church (Ephesians 2:20), and were accredited by special signs (2 Corinthians 12:12). An apostle is an official representative who is commissioned to carry a message or to perform an official duty. In the Old Testament, the related word is *shaliach*. In the words of Phillips (2004:98), a *shaliach* was someone in the Jewish community who acted as an official representative... had the authority to speak for someone else”. It is like the child speaking on behalf of the father. Though I have some reservations regarding Lloyd –Jones’ description of the apostle, I summarily highlight his view below:

An apostle was a witness of Christ. “An apostle was a man of whom the following things had to be true. First and foremost, he must have seen the risen Lord; he must have been a witness of the resurrected Christ” (Lloyd- Jones 1984:184). The same notion is reinforced by Hendriksen (1976:196) that the apostles “are the *charter-witnesses of Christ’s resurrection*, clothed with life-long and church-wide authority over life and doctrine...” The Reformed scholars are in agreement that an apostle was called and commissioned by the Lord. He was given the supernatural revelation of the Truth. The apostle had the power to speak not only with authority but also with infallibility. The apostle had the power to work miracles.



- Reflections on this View.

Lloyd-Jones is in agreement with the dispensationalists and cessationists that the apostles' role and some gifts were limited to the foundational stage of the church – the argument based on 1 Corinthians 13:8. This view is emphatic that there is no successor or replacement of the apostle, since “the apostolate was a temporary office and that its continuance was never intended by the Lord” (1984:187). Unlike other Reformed scholars, he ascribes the Eph 4 gifts as the offices in the church. He is emphatic that the apostle has always been men, not women. He divides these gifts into two categories of temporary (apostles, prophets, and evangelists); and permanent ones (pastors and teachers). Lloyd-Jones sees revelation as a past event given only to the apostles; hence Truth about God is complete and finalised in the canon. In reaction to this school of thought, I concur that Truth as the dynamic concept, *perceptio divinae veritatis tendens in ipsam*; (a perception of divine truth, tending towards this truth) must be the guideline. The preceding view is narrow hence leaves questions about the doctrine of God as He continues to reveal Himself without confines or restrictions of the *canon*. I have some problem with the fact that the apostolicity was a test of canonicity, since only the apostle could speak infallibly with divine authority. I rather see *apostolicity* as authenticity of the originality of the church. *Apostolicity* affirms *ecclesiality*. The apostle's role speaks “of going back to the beginning, back to the authentic Christianity of the early church” (Phillips 2004:94). They were Christ's delegates who went abroad as authorised heralds (*keryx*).

There is no dispute that the etymological meaning of the word *apostolos* is “one who is sent.” This is identified as unique to the verb *apostello* where emphasis is on the commission attached to the sending. With the noun *apostolos* (the primary use in the New Testament), again the stress is on the person who is sent in full authority. The sentiment accompanying the apostle encompasses the sense of authoritative sender, a mission or a goal, and the destination. In the New Testament literature, the Pauline dominance reigns supreme when referring to the concept of apostle. The apostle cannot be separated from the apostolic authority. The apostle is a father figure with fatherly



authority. He mobilises gifts and resources for the growth of the church. His primary focus is that the *communitas fidelium* becomes *discens* and at the same time to be *docens*. The community of faith must have a time to listen and a time to speak. There must be a time of learning of revelation and a time of witnessing to revelation. Boff (1985:139) enlightens us that

Docens and *discens* are two aspects of the one community; they are the two adjectives that describe two practices of the whole community. They are not two nouns that split the community. To be *docens* and *discens* springs from two functions of the same Church and are not two parts or divisions within the Church.

This encompasses the non-negotiable teaching ministry of the apostle, whereby he keeps church members founded on Christ. It is his passion to uphold a vision for God's purposes for the community. As an apostle, he is expected to impart callings and gifts and releases people into the ministries that God has called them to. His concern is to maintain unity in the body of Christ by setting things in order within the community. Above all, the apostles lay foundations for new congregations.

Apostleship is associated with itinerancy. The Pauline literature and ministry methodology is prevalent with the concept of itinerant ministry. Relevant examples are:

- Andronicus and Junia, fellow prisoners with Paul (Rom 16:7)
- Peter ministered itinerantly between Jerusalem, Antioch and Jerusalem (Gal 1:8; 2:11; 2:7-8; 1 Cor 1:12).
- Paul missed some apostles in Jerusalem because they were all out on mission (Gal 1:19)

Apostles bear full authority by the commission of the one sending them. Apostles listed first by the New Testament epistles. These epistles regard apostles as God's first appointment in the church (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11). The apostle's commission comes through a resurrection appearance (Acts 1:21-26). This appearance does not create



apostleship, but is confirmatory. The basis of the apostolic mission of Paul stems from his citation of the kerygmatic formula in 1 Cor 15:3-8. Here the risen Jesus appears to James, to all apostles, to Peter, to over five hundred believers, and finally to Paul himself. The impetus for the apostles' mission and the basis of their witness are clearly the resurrection appearance of Jesus Christ.

Apostles are the marturia to the kerygma. Of twenty-four usages of the word *apostolos* by Paul, the tendency links it with persons engaged in preaching as itinerant missionaries. They proclaim the story of the death and the resurrection of Jesus. They do this not as objective reporters but as those who possess *gnosis* of Christ's death for them and bear witness of the *aletheia* that the resurrection of Jesus is not just an event but the *dunamis theou estin*- the power of God that makes those who listen to respond by faith. The goal is to lead people to faith, to discipleship. The apostolic mission is accomplished only when *ecclesia* is established and has governing structure in place. A living faith is a personal goal of apostolic witness. The role of apostles in the Lukan account is rightly summarised by Wehrli (1992:27):

The role is still clearly marked as a gift (Acts 1:2). The apostles are *preachers* of the kerygma (6:2) as well as guardians of the faith. They are the continuers of the mighty works performed by Jesus (2:42-43; 5:12). They are communal leaders, witnesses to the Resurrection (4:32-37), administrators of offerings (5:2). There is a clear danger that apostles will be diverted from their primary task, which is not charity but preaching the Word so that persons can come to faith (6:2-5).

The apostle is a catechist of God's salvific activity. *Kerygma* becomes alive when the apostle makes the authoritative testimony, which is not eyewitness recounting, but proclaiming the mighty acts of death and resurrection. This *catechesis* is declared by Paul as it has become the formula at the Last Supper:

- "For I received from the Lord what I also *passed on* to you: ..." (1 Cor 11:23)



- “For what I received I *passed on* to you as of first importance: ... (1 Cor 15:3)

Apostolic Ministry in the Contemporary Church. From the cessationists within the dispensational theologians to hyper-Calvinists, the question of apostolic ministry in the contemporary church is a hot debate. I attach my own commentary in answering this question as laid out by Wehrli’s (1992:31-34):

- *The loss of the office of apostle has led to the loss of the awareness of the dynamic of the gospel as a power and reality that is life-shaping and in which service and the life of the servant preacher are given profound meaning regardless of the outcome.* To consider the role of apostle in the contemporary church as outmoded is to lose the foundational and fundamental ministry of the church and is to deny Christ’s power and His resurrection. The apostolic marginalisation reflects the loss of awareness of the gospel as a durable force and power in the contemporary church. The clarity about the apostolic function of *kerygma* could well keep the centrality of faith alive.
- *The recovery of the centrality of the resurrection in Christian faith is, in part, a recovery of apostolic identity.* This inevitably leads to the lack of awareness of the *dunamis* and *exousia* in the church governance and to those in the leadership role. That *exousia* is deeply rooted in knowing the risen Christ as Lord of life. The apostle is in *synergy* with other gifts to strengthen the *ecclesia* and its polity.
- *The fact that the church has neglected this foundational ministry is reflected in the establishment mentality of the modern church.* The modern church embraced the detrimental shift of consigning theological studies to the institutions of higher learning, instead of maintaining the local community (*ecclesia*) as a centre of learning. This resulted in making Paul a doctrinal theologian, instead of a missionary of the church. The Pauline theology became extremely rationalised, and Paul, in his self-identified role as an apostle, was bypassed. Theology ceased to be for *ecclesia*, but for rational debates. Instead of embracing the apostolic gift to the church, the modern church marginalised it, hence missed Paul’s primary concern of transforming



life by structuring alternative community that is charismatic (energized) to incarnate the person of Christ, and is self-developing.

- *Rationalism that upholds universal or general truth devalues special times (kairos), places, commitments, and roles.* Rationalism has trouble with perceiving special persons such as apostles, set apart for unique functions of the gospel. The *modus operandi* whereby maximum participation in and by the community for self empowerment and development counters this tradition. The operation of *charismata* in *ecclesia* also counters imperialistic and paternalistic leadership in the community. The denominational hierarchy clips the wings of those in leadership because their creativity will be perceived as deviant of faith.
- *Recovering apostolic identity and ministry as a foundational part of the church's life focuses on nurturing and promoting the apostolic paradosis.* It is important to note Wehrli's (1992:32) comment that: "Apostolic ministry includes the will to guard and keep the centrality of the cross and the Resurrection in a world of competitive values, especially of superpower, superarms, and superegos." The apostolic identity brings the *ecclesia* back to the centrality of the cross instead of identifying itself with the marks of the human success – a practice that is very common among the New Apostolic Reformation churches. Apostolic ministry sensitises the community of the importance of formation of new congregations and calls them to establishment to radical renewal. The apostolic preacher stands as a bridge between the old and the new community and so participates in the suffering that always occurs when generations or cultures clash.
- *The recovery of apostolic identity is essential if faith is to become the centre of the ecclesia's reality and life.* Some denominations exist for the sake of companionship or a particular action. Companionship is not an end in the Bible. *Ecclesia* is created by faith response to *euangelion* and *kerygma*. Once the community is formed, fellowship of the community together with the members of the Holy Trinity is to be consummated. Christ's incarnation continually takes place to shape the new



community into *imago Dei* and into Christ's character. This is championed by the apostolic gift within the community – the role as *didache*.

- *The formation of the Pauline corpus and the development of the apostle as a basic part of the canon make clear how important preserving the apostolic voice was to the early church. The canon gives the ecclesia a clarion call to understanding of the contemporary world in it exists. It is within this context that the eschatological community needs to know and understand its own journey towards its intended destiny. The apostolic voice is needed for this clarity and understanding.*
- *There are a number of implications for apostolic ministry itself. Apostles remind community members of the gospel power that resides beyond self and the church's control. The power does not reside in the community's spirituality, but in Christ through the Holy Spirit. Apostles sustain the *paradosis* and are responsible for hermeneutical exegesis of *euangelion* as *dunamis theou estin* that transforms lives. The apostle Paul does this by combining the *paradosis* and contemporary relevance to make sense of the identity of this new community. The apostle lives under the *exousia* of *euangelion*. The ecclesia's integrity is due to the apostles' *kerygmatic* activities. The congregation and the apostle work as a *symbiosis* (grow together) and *loyal Syzygus* (Phil 4:3) for the cause of the gospel. Another implication is the continuing assessment of congregational relation and conformity to its alliance claims with Christ. This implies asserting authority against the congregation when it becomes acculturated or when it fails to align itself with the power that was originally made available to it.*

5.10.1.2. He gave some to be prophets.

A prophet – (*prophetes*) in a New Testament sense signifies a person who spoke for the god and interpreted this god's will, hence a forth-teller. In a biblical sense, a prophet uttered the actual words which God had given to them without altering them. This was built on the Mosaic injunction: "...I will put my words in his mouth, and he will tell them



everything I commanded him” (Deuteronomy 18:18b). God put His words in the mouth of the prophet and the prophet in turn speaks these words precisely as commanded (Isa 6). It is logical, then to conclude that prophets are *the occasional organs of inspiration* (Hendriksen 1976:196) - inspired preachers and teachers. He is an organ of special revelations from God, a spokesperson for God. Like the apostles, prophets ended when the canon of the New Testament was completed. “We no longer need direct revelations of truth; the truth is in the Bible. We must never separate the Spirit and the Word. The Spirit speaks to us through the Word, so we should always doubt and query any supposed revelation that is not entirely consistent with the Word of God” (Lloyd-Jones 1984:191).

- Reflections on this View.

The *logia* that the *canon* brought the prophets and their role to conclusion is highly debatable. The continuous revelation of God to humanity and the world as whole conflicts with this conclusion. All our *dogma* regarding God is *eschatological*. Ruthven (1993:125) is right that

Most relevant for our study is Paul’s point that the charismata are *eschatological*. Spiritual gifts express the contemporary presence of the future kingdom of God. But exciting and powerful as these experiences might be, the Corinthians have not yet arrived; there is much more to come. The abundance of the charismata serves usefully to promote maturity in believers throughout the present age, but these gifts will be overwhelmed and replaced by the consummation of the age, the end, the kingdom in its fullness, that is, the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ in the day of his glory.

God is busy making Himself known to humanity and the universe as a whole is still in the process of being created. The revealed Word needs to be interpreted and made known to God’s people. This is the role of the prophet: making God’s will known to His people for times such as these.



This is the service that is accompanied by revelation. It is the gift that thrusts the community towards their vision, and activates their spiritual gifts. The prophetic audible voice calls members of the community to holiness and righteousness. The *kerygmatic* voice has the creative power to change lives, to edify, to comfort, and to exhort. The Old Testament shows a prophet as an intercessor, empowerer, and the imparter of gifts for the ministry.

In retrospect, it is noted that the theological nuance of prophets departs slightly from the Charismatic teaching. In this research, the explanation of the New Testament prophecy, concurs with Wehrli (1992:35) that

the prophets were persons called to see through a revelation given to them by the power of the Spirit what God is doing in the present in order that people might discern the new times and authority in the presence of the old and so live by hope in the new age that God is inaugurating. Prophets make the reign of God, hidden in the present, manifest so that people might live in a new order

- *Prophecy is related to community.* It is a gift bestowed on individual members of *ecclesia*, and like all other gifts, is to be used for the common good (1 Cor 12:7). It is one of the prominent gifts listed in 1 Cor 14 and is characteristic of the local church and its life. It is desirable, not because it is more spiritual, because it builds up the church (1 Cor 14:3, 4, 12). “But everyone who prophesies speaks to men for their strengthening, encouragement and comfort.” The three key words here; *oikodome*, *paraklesis*, *paramuthia* (1 Cor 14:3): build up (strengthening), encourage, or exhort reveal the purpose of prophecy. The apostolic appeal to the Corinthians is the desire for the strengthening or building up of the local church through their prophetic gift (14:12, 26). Central to the prophetic activity in the Spirit is the creation or building up of a new community. Wehrli (1992:46) drives the point home that “Prophecy is understood as a mark of the Spirit and a sign of the new age in the church.”



- *Prophecy is more specific in function.* It does not build in general, but it builds up the local community, specifically by encouragement and consolation (1 Cor 14:3). It is the sign to the members that God is with and among them. For the outsiders, prophecy is a conviction, a call to new accountability, discerning the secrets of one's heart, and repentant worship, declaring, "God is really among you" (1 Cor 14:25).
- *Prophecy is primarily part of the public worship of the local church.* This is reiterated by Paul as evidenced in this chapter regarding prophecy:
 - "Follow the way of love and eagerly desire spiritual gifts, especially the gift of prophecy" (14:1)
 - "I would like every one of you to speak in tongues, but I would rather have you prophesy..." (14:5)
 - "Therefore, my brothers, be eager to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues" (14:39).

Paul does not expect all Christians to be prophets and to prophesy but exhorts all those with charisma of the Spirit for inspired speech to prophesy rather than speak in tongues. Prophecy is love in action in the local congregation. It is a gift from God, and not a claim upon God.

- *Prophecy gives revelation.* This is made clear in 1 Cor 14:6. Revelation comes from prophecy, knowledge from teaching. Prophecy is exercised for the purpose of *manthano* and *parakaleo* (learning and encouragement) as reflected on 14:29-31. The local church is the setting in which God gives authoritative revelation. Prophecy reveals the mystery. This is confirmed by other Pauline passages, as Wehrli (1992:39) further asserts:

according to the revelation of the mystery that was kept secret for long ages but is now disclosed, and through the prophetic writings is made known to all the Gentiles, according to the



command of the eternal God” (Rom. 16:25-26; cf. 1 Cor. 15:51; Rom. 11:25f; Eph. 3:3-5; Matt.10:26; Luk. 12:2). While the mystery that prophecy discloses is primarily in the present, Paul also uses revelation in an eschatological context (Rom.6:18)

The authority of revelation rests on the Spirit of God. The prophets’ words are not to be despised (1 Thes 5:19-20). In public worship, any Christian may become an agent of the Spirit and prophesy (1 Cor 14:24-25, 30-32). The prophetic leaders’ speech is authenticated by the recognition of the inspiration by God and the expression of His will. The Spirit is the builder of the community, and He does so by the prophetic utterances within the community. The prophet speaks with authority within the congregation. Prophecy is a communal function and a sign of the new age (Acts 13:1-3). The prophet reveals the hidden will of God. Theirs is to interpret the current events including the difficult understanding of the cross (Luk 24:25-27). They reveal the reality of God’s new age and fundamentally are called to clarify and discern (*diakrinos*) the gift to which another is called. They discern the gifts of the Spirit and call community members to respond to them. It is therefore theologically legitimate to conclude in the words of Wehrli (1992:47):

Prophecy is God’s gift to the church, and this gift is the indication that the new age of the Spirit with its own gifts has already begun. As apostles deal primarily with the faith in the remembered acts of God in the Christ event, prophets *look to the new age* and are *agents of hope*

Apostles create the new community; prophets maintain the vision by which it can live.

5.10.1.3. He gave some to be evangelists

The word *euangelistes* appears thrice in the New Testament (Ephesians 4:11; Acts 21:8; 2 Timothy 4:5). It is derived from the term, “*euangelizo*”, to evangelise, which means to



proclaim good news. The evangelist was the preacher of the gospel. Albert Barnes (1979:79) explains the evangelist as someone “whose main business was *preaching*, and who was not particularly engaged in the *government* of the church”. Hendriksen (1976:196) sees evangelists as *travelling missionaries*. The evangelists were of lower rank than the apostles and the prophets. They were the messengers of the good news. An evangelist was the minister of the gospel who was not bound by geographical restriction, but travelled as a missionary to preach the gospel, and to establish churches.

- Reflections on this View.

It is unpalatable to consider some leaders as those lower in a rank than others. It is esteemed that the evangelists are of less importance in a functioning of the church. To consider them as outside the church government debases their role and according to the text (Ephesians 4:11), they are given the same accord as of all other offices. The panoramic view of 1 and 2 Timothy, makes one to realise that Timothy, the evangelist’s (2 Timothy 4:5) mandate was to remain (*hupomeno*) at Ephesus (1 Timothy 1:3). It is within the church that he does the work of an evangelist. That means he did not have to travel, but to hang in there in order to bring order in the church. The word “evangelist” has no bearing on “travelling missionary”. It shows a leader in a local church proclaiming good news to unbelievers, and bringing reproof within a believing community (Romans 1:15; 1 Corinthians 9:14; 2 Corinthians 11:7; Galatians 2:14; Philippians 1:27). An evangelist is a *kerygmatic* preacher, though in the church, but a *verbum externum*, the external word that moulds and shapes the life of the church for impacting the world.

Evangelists are the preachers of the gospel with full authority and power (Acts 8:4, 12-14). To evangelise is associated with the description of the function of the apostles as preachers of the gospel. Luke, who limited the title apostle by applying it mainly to the Twelve, calls Philip an evangelist (Acts 21:8). Earlier the same Philip had been preaching the good news of Jesus Christ (8:26-40), reaching out as an itinerant to the Ethiopian eunuch. In the pastoral epistle, Timothy is enjoined: “Do the work of an evangelist” (2 Tim 4:5). They are regarded not only as missionaries but also as leaders of already



established churches. The manifestations of God's *dunamis* and presence come by *kerygmatic* endeavours that help people to understand and to respond to the *soteriological* appeals that will finally incorporate them into the *ecclesiastical* membership, the *communitas fidelium* where *discens* and *docens* will be experienced and exercised. These are the forgiveness of sins, baptism, evangelism, and the desire for worship. This was significant in the early church, as confirmed by Ridderbos (1975:454):

Certainly the evangelists will not have confined themselves to the proclamation of the gospel, but also have baptized and given directions for the establishment of the organization of the church (cf. 1 Tim. 2:2; Tit. 1:5; Acts 8:12). Yet their proper work, so far as we are able to conclude from the few examples, apparently lay not so much in the government of the church as in the continuing proclamation of the gospel. In the first period they frequently formed the link between the apostles and the leading figures in the church. With the dying out of the apostles the evangelists disappear as well.

The evangelistic proclamation leads to some form of response. The hearers of the word responded by asking the obvious questions:

- *What does this mean? (Acts 2:12).*
- *Brothers, what shall we do? (Acts 2:37).*
- *How can I... unless someone explain it to me? (Acts 8:31).*
- *Who are you Lord? (Acts 9:5)*
- *Sirs, what must I do to be saved? (Acts 16:30)*

When the evangelistic message is proclaimed, there was evidence that the proclaimer had been given certain abilities. He knew the facts, the truth of the gospel, and could present them in a clear manner and with unction and authority and power from the Holy Spirit.



5.10.1.4. He gave some to be pastors

The Greek word, *poimenas* is rendered “shepherd” with the fundamental meaning of protection.

It is applied to the Lord Jesus as the great *shepherd* of the flock – the church. It is rendered *pastors* only in the place before us. The word is given to ministers of the gospel with obvious propriety, and with great beauty. They are to exercise the same watchfulness and care over the people of their charge which a shepherd does over his flock (Barnes 1979: 79).

The primary emphasis suggests guiding, feeding, protecting, and caring for the sheep. They are designated “*ministers of local congregation, teaching elders (or overseers)*” (Hendriksen 1976:197). The pastors are concerned about the government, the instruction, and the rule of the church. They are the officers in the settled church. To highlight the notion of Lloyd-Jones (1984:193): “He is the guardian, the custodian, the protector, the organizer, the director, the ruler of the flock.”

- Reflections on this View.

The original Greek rendering of *poimenas kai didaskalous*, many Reformed scholars are convinced that the pastors and teachers are to be one office. The pastor is expected to be able to teach, and the teacher cares and feeds God’s flock with God’s Word.

This is the leadership image that stems from the Old Testament. An example is that of the shepherd boy, David who was chosen by God to rule (1 Sam 16:11-13). David the shepherd, not the warrior, delivered Israel from the taunting and militantly powerful Goliath. This is the Old Testament precedence or analogy of the ruler and the shepherd. It is the analogy deeply rooted in the image of God as the one who shepherds. This means as a shepherd, He feeds, leads, protects, and cares for God’s flock (*ecclesia*).



The Old Testament prophets likened the rulers as shepherds:

- Jeremiah addressed the negligence of the shepherds (23:1-4)
- Ezekiel addressed the greediness, carelessness and brutality of the shepherds in leading the flock. (34)
- Zechariah revealed the judgement awaiting the uncaring shepherds and how to be without a shepherd equals death (10:3; 13:7; 11:4).

Since the human shepherds fail the flock, God takes upon Himself to take care of the flock. This is illustrated by some Old Testament references that:-

- God will gather and feed the sheep (Ezek 34:7-16)
- God will be the true Davidic shepherd (Isa 40:11; Jer 50:19; Mic 7:14)
- God will appoint better shepherds (Jer 3:15)

The shepherd's role in this sense is to gather the scattered sheep into a community and to feed them. The shepherds are the care givers and the leaders who build the community.

The New Testament concept of shepherd is explicit as in the Old Testament. The Lukan writings lack direct reference to shepherds in the context of charismata in the settled pneumatic community.

The Synoptics: The direct reference to *poimen* in the Synoptics is basically in Matthew and Mark where crowds (*ochlos*) are seen as sheep without a shepherd (Mark 6:34; Matt 9:36). The crowds are shepherdless sheep, harassed, helpless, and fainting with hunger. In both biblical instances, Jesus pre-incarnates the shepherd who responds to people's needs with compassion, first by exercising pastoral leadership by teaching. He gathers and feeds the shapeless, scattered people who are without identity. He allowed the disciples to learn by doing when they became agents of the divine action by distributing bread to people. These disciples were taught that they were to be feeders. By ordering the



crowd to sit on the grass, Jesus the shepherd brought order in the midst of the chaotic crowd.

The Johannine references. The well-known passage on *poimen* is John 10:1-18 where the noun “shepherd” is used five times and “flock” once. This makes this passage unique since it reflects a general lifestyle of *ecclesia* under *poimen*. The recurrent *ginosko* in Johannine writing speaks of the intimacy between the sheep and the shepherd. There is a relationship between the sheep and the shepherd. Bromiley (1985:122) calls for wisdom that:

ginoskein plays a bigger role in John and 1 John. It denotes personal fellowship with God or Christ. The relation between Father and Son is a knowing, and so is that between Jesus and his disciples (Jhn. 10:14-15, 27). Knowing God also means being determined by love (1 Jhn. 4:7-8). Love governs the relation between both Father and Son (Jhn. 3:35 etc) and Jesus and his disciples (13:1 etc).

In the Johannine apocalypse, he describes the Lamb as a shepherd who nourishes people to life (Rev 7:17). Christ is the true shepherd ruler – the good model shepherd. He is the good Shepherd who rules with authority. Those who reject His shepherding, He will shepherd with a rod of iron (Rev 2:27; 12:5; 19:15). The *poimen* of *ecclesia* is a figure of *exousia* with definite functions. The caring function of the *poimen* limits and clarifies the nature of *exousia*.

The Pauline corpus. Pastors in Ephesians 4:11 are mentioned together with the teachers with the same definite article, which implies a close relationship between the two. The apostle associates *poimen* with *presbuteros* and *episkopos* (Phil 1:1; 1 Tim 3:4; 1 Tim 5:17). The Pauline references to *poimen* are widely associated with leadership responsibility in the local community of believers.

The other epistles. Peter brings forth the function of Christ as that of a shepherd:



- He is the shepherd and guardian (*episkopos*) of your souls (1 Pet 2:25)
- He is the chief shepherd (*archipoimen*) who is to appear (1 Pet 5:4)

This epistle (2:22-24) reflects Jesus the Shepherd's ministry as that of suffering servant of Isa 53. Shepherding is suffering servanthood (Wehrli 1992:88).

Poimena are leaders in the local church: The image of pastoral leadership is reflected throughout the later New Testament and this justifies its appearance in the fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4:11 – the time when the church was settled as a *pneumatic* community under the leadership of pastors (*poimena*) and elders (*presbuteroi*). Earlier, long before the writing of this epistle, Paul admonished *tous presbuterous tes ekklesias* (the elders of the church) that they keep their integrity and supervise the flock of God. They are the overseers (*episkopoi*) – supervisors of the church. “True pastoral rule involves nurturing and feeding those who have lost their way. It is giving meaning to the disoriented crowd. Its goal is to gather persons together into community... The pastor is the gatherer” (Wehrli 1992:90). The shepherd gathers the chaotic fragments of society into *ecclesia*, supervises it, discerns its character, and applies discipline to disruptive members who threaten *ecclesia*. This means discerning and opposing false teachers.

The pastor assures the community the safety, security, and acceptance. He is a leader with the ability to draw people together for a common cause. He deepens their faith and establishes them into the oracles of God. The pastoral task is emotional since it involves some emotional participation into the affairs of the people. He feeds and leads people towards God's purposes and growth. The pastor engages in shepherding (*poimano*), overseeing (*episkopeo*), and protecting (*proistemi*) by nurturing faith by teaching.



5.10.1.5. He gave some to be teachers

Didaskalous is rendered “teacher” like in a case of Nicodemus in John 3. The main function of this office is to teach or give instruction in the religious doctrine. This is the “teaching elder” who expound the Word for the church’s establishment in faith.

Shepherding and teaching are different functions yet the same people could exercise both from time to time. Leadership involves truth, i.e. correct teaching, for the leader has to say in what direction he wishes to lead, and teaching involves leadership for the teacher must be seen to be leading others in the way he or she advocates, teachers are more than academics providing information (Best 1997:168).

- Reflections on this View.

It is worthy of notice that the pastor must be able to teach. The teacher can be itinerant to strengthen the churches in different *locales*. The pastor is the shepherd, specifically responsible for the flock under his care.

The role of the teacher and what is to be taught (*didache*) dominates the Pastoral Epistles. Bromiley (1985: 165) enlightens us that:

In 1 Cor. 12:28-29, Eph. 4:11, and Acts. 13:1 *didaskaloi* are mentioned after or with (apostles and) prophets. Again they are expositors who edify by their clearer understanding. The order is material, not hierarchical. The apostles are giving way to pastors and the evangelists to teachers. Similarly in 1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11 the work of teaching constitutes a part of Paul’s apostleship which the teachers will continue.



Teaching in Pauline *corpus* occurs as a *charisma* that manifests itself freely in the church. Like apostles and prophets, teachers are a delimited group of people with the definite quality (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11). Ridderbos (1975:452-3) reminds us:

We do not read of a distinct office of teacher, that is to say, appointment as teacher in and by the church. It is required of the leading figures in the church, for example, of the overseers, that they be *didaktikos*, apt to teach (1 Tim. 3:2; cf. 2 Tim. 2:24; Tit. 1:9) and of the elders those are to be held in highest honor who are charged especially with preaching and instruction (1 Tim.5:17; cf 1 Thes. 5:12; 2 Tim. 2:2)

The *didaskalos*' primary function is impartation of instruction and the transmission of apostolic *paradosis* - with special highlight on its redemptive-historical content and the *paraenesis* arising out of it. This calls for competence to instruct others in the Christian tradition and precepts (1 Cor 4:17; 2 Tim 2:2) This function is not only restricted to the *paraenesis*, but it extends to the whole content of *kerygma*.

The uniqueness of the *didaskaloi* lies in the fact that during the time when oral tradition was the only source for knowledge of the Christian faith, they provided an important ministry for the propagation of that tradition. Ridderbos (1975:453) notes it correctly;

The labour of these teachers will have been of particular significance for the *catechuminate* and the instruction of those who wished to be baptized. On the other hand, as appears from the close conjunction of 'pastors and teachers' in Eph 4:11, their teaching activity had a broader scope as well. While the modality of prophets and teachers was different, therefore, the former representing more the current, the latter the traditional aspect of the preaching of the gospel, the function of both lay in upbuilding, comforting, and giving spiritual direction to the church.



From this, it can be deduced that *didaskalos* maintains accuracy in handling God's Word, and enables the community to understand God's truth. Through God's revelation, the teacher sets people free from deception and heresy. He engrosses the community into practical lifestyle that fits with sound doctrine. The teacher's pivotal role is to help the church realise that the Christian life is based on facts, not feelings.

5.10.2. PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC APPROACH

The classical Pentecostal exposition of this passage is intertwined with that of other passages that relate to the subject of *charismata* (1 Corinthians 12-14; Romans 12:3-8; 1 Peter 4:10-11). The bottom-line of this passage is that spiritual offices in the Church were to be accepted as gifts from Christ to His body, the Church leaders are the gift of God to the Church; they are called into the office by God, and equipped with the corresponding gifts in order to function in that office. The latest Pentecostal and Charismatic research (Wagner, Hamon, and Cannistraci) agrees that there is a sharp distinction between the ministry gifts (*charismata*) and the gifts of the Spirit (*pneumatika*). The New Apostolic Reformation promotes the fivefold ministry as the authentic structure that will restore God's kingdom and bring order out of chaos.

- The Problem of Cessationists Theology

The Pentecostal/ Charismatic theology is critical to the *cessationist theology* embraced by some Protestant teachers, especially those from the dispensational and fundamentalist background. This school of thought is convinced that some *charismata* were designed for foundational establishment of the church, hence are no necessary since foundations are laid and the *canon* is complete. Cessationists are inclined to use 1 Corinthians 1:4-8; 13:8-10; Ephesians 4:7-13; and John 16:13 to authenticate the view that the *charismatic* gifts described in the Epistles and Acts ceased to function in the first century and were replaced by the completion of the *canon* of the New Testament Scripture. This view is repugnant with Biblical Theology of the Holy Spirit and the Kingdom of God. It is inimical with the revelation of God and Jesus Christ as the *eschaton*. The notion that



charismata belonged only to the apostolic, or pre-canonical age is a foreign concept to Paul. The *charismata* are all temporary enough in Paul's view.

The Charismatic ecclesiology is insistent that all the gifts are operational and are genuine for the restoration of the church's vitality and *missional* mandate in the world. There can be no apostle's doctrine without the apostles. "They were theologians bringing the foundational **Christian Doctrine** that was to serve the church to this present time. **We are in the Apostles' age**. Their gospel was Christ's gospel to be heralded until His second return to the earth" (Payne 2004:92). An apostle is closely related to the one who sent him i.e. Christ. As Christ was sent by the Father from heaven to accomplish His divine plan, the Pentecostal and Charismatic leaders, like the Reformed theologians, believe that Jesus sends His apostles to complete mission Dei in His world. However, for the emerging apostolic churches, the apostles in the present church government represent the head leadership of the corporate church. It is however, theologically correct, to assume that the one and only chief apostle above all apostles is the Lord Jesus Christ. Payne (2004:96) continues to elaborate that, "The five governmental ministries must recognize the apostle in relationship to them as the father of ministry. The apostle is a father. He admonishes, nurture, cherish, develop, and train. He has a heart of a father." The apostle is a foundation-laying ministry (Ephesians 2:20) with the purpose of establishing new churches and to correct errors by establishing proper order and structure. Furthermore, the apostle act as oversight ministry that fathers other ministries (1 Corinthians 4:15; 2 Cor 11:28)

5.10.2.1. The Apostles

- The Meaning

The root word *apostolos* from which the words *apostle* and *apostolic* are derived, means *messenger* or *one who is sent*. The prominent pentecostal systematic theologians, Duffield and van Cleave (1987:348) assert:



The basic idea expressed by the word ‘apostle’ is that of one sent as a representative of another and who derives his authority from the sender. In the classical Greek, *apostolos* also meant ‘a fleet of ships, an expedition’. From the latter, the meaning is extended to “one commissioned and sent to another country,” thus “a missionary.

The verb *apostello* means to “send from or away” In the footsteps of traditional and contemporary understanding of the apostle, the Charismatic ecclesialogists agree with the classical Protestant contextualisation of this office:

The Latin equivalent, *missio*, provides the etymological root from which we get the English words *mission* and missionary. So at a basic, semantic level, to be apostolic means to simply function as a missionary in planting churches. And we know from both the Bible and Church history, this is precisely what the first apostles did. From John in Asia Minor to Peter in Samaria to Paul (and later Peter) in Rome, the early Church saw a flurry of apostolic activity once the fire of Pentecost – and later persecution – kicked the Church into gear (Broocks 2002:176).

- The Etymological Analysis

The etymological analysis of *apostolos* creates problem due to the historical usage of the word. The historical definition is too general. The entire ministry should in a sense be sent forth. In the analysis of a prominent member of the Apostolic Leadership Team for Ministers Fellowship International, Bill Scheidler (1980:88):

It was used to refer to an emissary or ambassador, to a fleet of ships or an expedition sent with a specific objective, to the admiral who commanded the fleet or to the colony which was founded by



the admiral. If a fleet of ships left Rome with the purpose of establishing a new colony somewhere, all of these were called apostles – the fleet, the admiral, the new found colony.

It is clear then, that these emissaries, the fleet, the admiral, the new colony, were expected to be faithful in transmitting the intentions of the sender.

- The Apostle's Role

Wagner (1999:105) summarises the charismatic understanding of the apostle: “The gift of apostle is the special ability that God gives to certain members of the Body of Christ to assume and exercise general leadership over a number of churches with an extraordinary authority in spiritual matters that is spontaneously recognized and appreciated by those churches”. This is the same definition that he also iterated in another book, *Your Spiritual Gifts Can Help Your Church Grow* (1979), revised in 1994, p.127. It can be deduced from this definition that apostles are called by Christ and have a great authority over their spheres of influence. They are the local church's primary leaders who cast the vision of the church. Their mandate is to plant new churches and establish the foundational government structure of the church. In some critical studies of Charismatic leaders and authors in the New Apostolic Reformation, such as Payne, Wagner, Cannistraci, and Scheidler, one concludes that the Apostolic Movement understands a present day apostle as a man who has the leadership capacity to raise up some new works in territorial ministries. He establishes “sound doctrines” or doctrinal exactness in the church. He brings church polity in line by applying discipline to the detractors from the fundamental truth. As the administrative and ecclesiastical head of the church, the apostle is expected to be a great teacher with a pastoral heart.



5.10.2.2. The Prophets

- Their Background

The prophet is not only expected to exercise the gift of prophecy, but occupies a place of leadership ministry along with the apostles and teachers. Prophets and prophecy are not alien to the New Testament.

In the Early Church, there were two classifications of prophets. Any member of the general body of believers who ministered edification, exhortation and comfort through the gift of prophecy was called a prophet (1 Cor 14:24, 31). Another group, consisting of such men as Barnabas, Silas, Judas, Agabus and others mentioned in Acts 13:1, were spiritual leaders of the church (Acts 21:22), they are referred to by Paul in Ephesians 4:11 as among the ministry gifts to the Church. Those of the latter group, although they exercised the same gift of prophecy, possessed an additional *charisma* of leadership (Duffield & van Cleave 1987:350).

- The Meaning

The root meaning of *propheteuo* is to “say or speak forth or fore.” The apostolic movement regards prophecy as forth *telling*, which means speaking forth a message from God (Hebrews 1:1). Their prophecy also has the aspect of *foretelling* aspect to imply declaring beforehand something that will surely happen (Jeremiah 28:9; Ezekiel 33:32-33). There is a higher element of prediction in prophecy, hence is sometimes called *predictive prophecy*. However, caution must be exercised as Scheidler (1980:93) remarks: “All prediction is prophecy but not all prophecy is prediction.” The prophets are the spokespersons for God. They are God’s mouthpiece to humanity. The prophet’s ministry involves revelation, exhortation, warning, impartation of vision, and inspiration. Cindy Jacobs concludes her chapter in Green’s book (2005:47) that “Prophets are God’s



voice used to expose, shift, and bring transition to nations.” The prophet has the gifted ability to perceive and speak the specific mind of Christ to individuals, churches, businesses, or nations.

- Their Role

The prophets speak to nations in order to encourage God’s people to respond to His Word. The prophet’s word normally stirs God’s people to rise up in faith and believe God for mighty things to transpire. Jacobs (2005:47) regarding the fivefold ministry exhorts: “The prophetic word is transformational when God’s people believe it”. From the Latter Rain Movement to the present, the Pentecostals and Charismatics have viewed prophecy as personal and that it should be restored to the church. It is no longer restricted to general words of exhortation, but would include personal detailed revelations for guidance and instruction (Moriarty 1992:46/61). There is a tremendous personalisation of prophecy in the emerging apostolic movement of the day. However, one has to bear in mind that prophecy is a separate entity from the church life. As Quebedeaux (1983:134) critiques

The use of prophecy in pentecostal worship is natural, non-systematic, and usually in the form of an assurance of God’s presence with the group, or a summons by God for the group to prepare itself for worship or for the reception of some manifestation of the miraculous. In other words, the prophecies are part of worship, not additional revelation in the form of doctrine or new theological knowledge.

Prophecy or prophets are the essential part of the ecclesiastical structure, and they function alongside the apostles for the building up and the blessing of the church. The emerging apostolic movement sees prophets as a pointer finger on the hand of God. They point the direction the church should take by sharing the heart of God with the church. The church is guided and protected through the prophet.



5.10.2.3. The Evangelists

- The Meaning

The Greek word “*euangelistes*” carries the meaning of a career, a messenger, or in this context, a preacher of good news. Apart from Ephesians 4:11, the word is not mentioned elsewhere in the Pauline corpus except in 2 Timothy 4:5 where Timothy is instructed to do the work of an evangelist. The only other New Testament occurrence of the noun is in Acts 21:8, where Philip is called the evangelist. The evangelist is the bearer of the gospel, which is the message of salvation.

- The Biblical Example

The *gift is* clearly demonstrated in the story of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8. The Pentecostal/ Charismatics take the *locus* of evangelist from this story. Duffield and van Cleave (1983:353) survey the characteristics of Philip’s ministry that forms a pattern of New Testament evangelist as follows:

- a) Philip preached the Word of God, especially declaring the heart of the gospel, which is Christ the Saviour. “He preached Christ unto them” (8:4,5,35)
- b) There were many who believed and were baptized (8:6,12)
- c) Mighty miracles of healing followed his preaching and many were delivered from spirits (8:6, 7). The healing miracles gave greater effectiveness to Philip’s ministry (8:6, 8).
- d) Philip was ready to witness about Christ as the Saviour to whole cities, or to one individual. Leaving Samaria, he was directed to the chariot of the treasurer of Ethiopia (8:26), whom he led to Christ (8:35-38). The true soul winner has a passion for souls that makes him adaptable to mass evangelism or personal evangelism.
- e) Philip’s evangelistic ministry took him from city to city (8:40).



- The Role:

Drawing conclusion out of these patterns, the Charismatic ecclesiology sees the evangelist of the New Testament and post-apostolic period as the one who preaches the gospel message of salvation in different geographical locations – either in different churches or different cities. This is confirmed by Duffield and van Cleave’s (1983:353) direct quotation of Eusebius that:

And they scattered the saving seeds of the kingdom of heaven far and near throughout the whole world... The starting out on long journeys they performed the office of evangelists, being filled with the desire to preach Christ to those who had not yet heard the word of faith.

The research on the evangelist concludes that of the fivefold ministries in the New Testament, the evangelist has the least recorded about him and apart from Christ we only have one good Bible example of an evangelist i.e. Philip. There are three Greek root words from which we get our English word ‘evangelist’:

- a) *Euangelizo*: It literally means “to announce good news”. The word is descriptive of the *ministry* of an evangelist (Scheidler 1980:97). The word is extensively used to refer to the ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ (Matthew 11:5; Acts 13:32; Romans 10:15; 2 Corinthians 10:16; Galatians 1:18; Ephesians 3:8; Hebrews 4:2)
- b) *Euangelion*: This means “the gospel of a good message”. The emphasis of this word is the message rather than a person. It is the gospel message of God’s grace made possible in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Matthew 24:14; Acts 20:24; Romans 1:16; 1 Corinthians 4:15; Ephesians 1:13).
- c) *Euangelistes*: It means “a preacher or messenger of good news.” This is an evangelist.



The ministry of the evangelist is the *doma* to the Body of Christ, the *ecclesiastical* community. In the context of Ephesians 4:11 passage, the evangelist is also a governmental ministry. Scheidler (1980:100) agrees that,

The public ministry of the evangelist, then, involves mainly two areas. He is first of all given as a travelling ministry to the unevangelized, working as a kind of ground-breaker to prepare the way for other following ministries. Beyond this, the evangelist is given to the local expression of the body of Christ for the perfection of the saints (*Eph 4:12*).

In a nutshell, the evangelist reaches the lost outside the church; he is the carrier of the good news, he plants new churches, and as part of the local church forms part of the local church government. Wagner, a contemporary scholar in the Apostolic Movement, in his commentary on the Book of Acts accentuate that “The gift of evangelist is the special ability that God gives to certain members of the Body of Christ to share the gospel with unbelievers in such a way that men and women become Jesus’ disciples and responsible members of the body of Christ” (1994:210).

The modern day apostolic movement is longing for the restoration of the evangelistic ministry patterned after that one of Philip in Acts 8 where the gospel is preached to the lost (8:5), miracles performed to confirm God’s Word (8:6), people delivered from demonic powers (8:7), angelic visitations (8:26), revelation knowledge (8:29), supernatural translation from one geographical area to the other (8:26, 40).

5.10.2.4. The Pastor

- The Meaning

The King James Version uses the word “pastor” only once in Eph 4:11, though the word *poimen* meaning “shepherd” occurs eighteen times in the New Testament. The



grammatical structure of Ephesians 4:11 have the word “teacher” without a definite article. This suggests that “teacher” is to be taken together with “pastor”, though this does not legitimate the interchangeable usage of the terms. Duffield and van Cleave (1983:354), who seem to be of this school of thought impress:

There may be teachers who are not pastors, but there cannot be pastors who are not teachers (Acts 20:28-30). In churches where there were several elders, some might have had a ministry of leadership who were not teachers (1 Timothy 5:17), but the real pastor was a teacher, Especially those whose work is preaching and teaching” (1 Timothy 5:17b, NIV). One of the necessary qualifications for a bishop (pastor, elder) was that he be “apt to teach” (1 Timothy 3:2, 2 Timothy 2:24). A true pastor, then, will have the charisma of teaching (Romans 12:7; 1 Corinthians 12:28).

The pastor is the spiritual leader, the under-shepherd, serving under the Chief Shepherd (Hebrews 13:20).

- The Role

The shepherd is expected to feed, tend, and protect the flock. The position of the shepherd was that of *authority* and *service*. The position of authority implies rulership and government, while the position of service implies accountability.

The verb form of this word (*poimaino*) also supports this two-fold usage. At times it seems to be referring to the governmental aspect of the function of a shepherd (Matthew 2:6). In this connection those who shepherd are given power and authority to rule (Rev 2:26-27; 12:5; 19:15). At other times it seems to emphasize the caring and feeding aspect of this ministry (Scheidler 1980:102).



The pastor is therefore, in the position of authority and service. In the position of service, he practises accountability. He supplies the necessary resources for the well being of the souls of his people. He is in rulership and servitude in the governmental ministry of the church. His ministry is to gather the scattered people, to establish a governmental order, and to care for the flock (church).

5.10.2.5. The Teacher

- The Meaning

The root word “*didasko*” sometime translated “*doctor*” or “*master*” is commonly used for a teacher. It simply means “*to instruct*”. It has a connotation of holding a discourse with others for the purpose of instruction. It refers to the process of explaining, expounding, and applying the Scripture. It involves the instilling and the reiteration of apostolic injunctions into others. The teacher’s ministry is vital to foundational laying, growth, and development for the maturity of the church. He is concerned with the church doctrine and the faith of the people.

- The Role

O’Brien (1999:300-301) reinforces this Charismatic stance that

In the Pastoral Epistles, teaching appears to be an authoritative function concerned with the faithful transmission of apostolic doctrine or tradition and committed to men specially chosen (e.g. 2 Tim 1:13-14; 2:1-2; 1 Tim 3:2; 5:17; Titus 1:9). Timothy is urged not only to pursue a teaching ministry himself but also to entrust what he has learned to faithful men who will be able to teach others also (1 Tim 4:13,16; 2 Tim 2:2). Teachers did not simply impart information or open up new ways of thought. They also urged their hearers to live by what they taught (Eph 4:20-21). So



important is this ministry for building the body of Christ that provision is made for its continuity for succeeding generations.

The Apostolic teacher is not only expected to teach the word, but also to minister with divine life and Holy Spirit anointing (2 Corinthians 3:6). He exhibits keen spiritual discernment and divine insight into the Word of God and its personal application to believers.

5.11. THEOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS: THE NEW APOSTOLIC REFORMATION

Authority does not exist in a vacuum. All forms of authority find their *raison d'être* in the context of a particular community and in relation to the specific goals of that community. The historical overview of the fivefold ministry shows that the New Apostolic Movement holds to the fact that the structure of the church is controlled through *potestas sacra*, holy power, balanced with authority by the apostolic figures. There are two *sympiotic* terms related to Charismatic leadership of the church. These are **power** (*dunamis*) and **authority** (*exousia*). There is also another term, *influence*. *Dunamis* occurs about 118 times in the New Testament (Kraft 2000:67). The apostle Paul uses the word frequently, as do the Gospels writers. It is the normal word for power, might, strength or force, and is often used in the plural to refer to miracles (wonders) in the phrase “*miracles and wonders*” (Acts 2:22; 2 Corinthians 12:12; Hebrews 2:4). It is also encountered in reference to supernatural beings (Romans 8:38; 1 Corinthians 15:24; Ephesians 1:21; 1 Peter 3:22). The power of God is ordinarily referred to as *dunamis*, as is the power Jesus gives to disciples (Luke 9:1). The earthly power attached to rulers, armies or weather, was also labelled *dunamis*.

Exousia is the classical New Testament Greek term referring to the ability to perform an action to the extent that there are no obstacles in the way. It focuses on the right to use power rather than on the power itself. It is the right to do something granted by a higher authority. The word is found 108 times in the New Testament (Kraft 2000:67), and



always used in relation to people. “It is a personal right, either because of status or by delegation, to assert power, whether in legal, political, social, or moral ways in the human world or in the spiritual realm” (Kraft 2000:67). In the Greek Old Testament (LXX), *exousia* means right, authority, or permission, the legal or political freedom to act. Paul Avis (1992:19) expresses New Testament usage of *exousia*: “When applied to Jesus Christ it denotes his divinely given dominion and status (Matt 28:18: ‘All *exousia* in heaven and on earth has been given to me’). *Exousia* is ultimately divine authority (Mark 2:10: ‘the Son of man has *exousia* on earth to forgive sins’). *Exousia* is the right that lies behind the exercise of power (*dynamis*), though the two terms are sometimes used almost synonymously”. *Exousia* legitimates *dunamis*.

It is on this basis that the emerging Apostolic Movement leaders claim the authority that they should exercise on their subjects. Though the “authority” concept seems to be theologically sound, it can be abused and displaced from its biblical intentions. Kraft (2000:67) warns sternly:

In the New Testament, both power (*dunamis*) and authority (*exousia*) flow from the work of Christ, first as He employed them and then as He empowers His followers to do His works... Thus, the authority we participate in is that modelled by Jesus Himself and grounded, as it was with Jesus, in the same power of the Holy Spirit. It is the God-given right to receive and use God’s power that flows from the indwelling Holy Spirit.

In researching the New Apostolic Reformation, one realises that power is the influence which involves people’s emotions, cognitions, motivations, and behaviours. This power divides people into rulers and subjects. It creates *social stratification* that gives some people authority over others. This authority is the influence that is acceptable by the people in question. Van der Ven (1996: 297) has it right that “In *Charismatic authority* leadership is acknowledged on the basis of exceptional or even extranatural or



supernatural gifts attributed to it.” It is legitimately acceptable to conclude that the Charismatic authority is personal authority.

The theological understanding of *authority* that the apostolic movement must comprehend is that the government of Christ’s church must commence with the Lord Himself and His kingdom *authority*. He is the Head of the church; His rule is unique and incomparable. The church reflects the *organic life* of Christ’s body made up of members who are dependent on one another in the exercise of the life they receive from Christ. It lives as an organism, not just as an organisation. The church is organised for service, not dominion. All government in the church is stewardship. Its leaders are servant-managers, who employ their authority for the purpose of advancing the interests of those they represent and serve. This is captured by the Reformed theologian, Clowney (1995:202):

Christ exercises his absolute authority on behalf of his body, the church. His rule over the church differs from his rule over the universe, for it his saving rule: he frees his people from the power of the devil (Col.1:13-14). All authority in the church belongs to Christ. From his place of authority at God’s right hand, Christ gives the keys to his kingdom; he validates in heaven what is done in his name on earth. Church government cannot modify his Word by deletion or addition (Rev. 22:18-20; Gal.1:8, 12). Because its power is declarative, not legislative, it may not invent new doctrines or require practices that have no scriptural foundation.

The New Apostolic Reformation, intentionally or out of theological apathy has the tendency to perpetrate the modern abuse of ecclesiastical powers. Spiritual power can be more effective like physical abuse. The bottom line is that the church government should represent the authority (*exousia*) of Christ, the *Kurios* of the *kosmos*. There is organic mutuality that requires the joint exercise of church authority.



Although the New Apostolic Reformation ecclesiological governments claim to be decentralised, the historical evidence is abundant that hierarchy and figurative persons had always accompanied its historical *consortia*. The Shepherding Movement of the seventies and Bishop J L Payne's Christ Churches of God in Christ, USA International are good examples of this assertion. However, this is not always accompanied by *successio apostolica* as in the Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox traditions. Most of the modern day apostles and prophets claim to be the *pneumatikoi*, the special bearers of the Spirit. This is evident among those who practise *glossolalia* and *prophecy*, hence resorting to *routinisation of charismata*. The fivefold ministers are warned that the authority should not be subjectively possessed, should not breed pride, but instead create a sense of accountability and humility. The biblically sound authority is a delegated authority, where leaders see themselves as ambassadors of Christ.

The church does not create its own leaders. Christ does. The gifts are not gifts made to people but gifts of people who have a particular role to play in the ecclesiastical life. The *domata* activities of Ephesians 4:11 are service to the body of Christ. They are the diverse manifestations of the Spirit in the community. These *domata* do not monopolise the Church's ministry. Their purpose is *pros ton katartismos* (adjustment or equipment) and *eis oikodomein* - the perfecting and the building up of the body. This means house furnishing, mending or repairing of the saints. The *doma*'s function is to help and direct the community so that members can perform their several ministries for the good of the whole. Although the particular *domata* refer to those who are in charge of guiding Christian community after the apostle's death, the passage assumes that all Christians are part of the building process. The focus of *domata* in this passage is the creation of new humanity created in Christ, guided towards maturity under Christ-appointed leadership.

The appreciation one can attach to the new emerging apostolic movement is the worldview of the church's polity as that of simplicity and spontaneity. It is noteworthy to realise that the various types of Apostolic Churches have different types of authority occurring exclusively within their various church communities. This is the *collegium*, a free society, an association of equals who meet regularly in the *oikos* of one of its



members. This was well demonstrated by the Shepherding Movement. On the other hand, “the spontaneous structure is primarily based on the experiences, feelings, and attitudes that originate in the extraordinary charismata” (Van der Ven 1996:303). In this structure, embraced by the emerging apostolic church there is no what Weber (in Van der Ven) calls *routinisation of charisma* where *charisma* is institutionalised. The communion of the saints is a *collegium* where the priesthood of all believers is realised. The *ecclesia vera* is a *Lebensform* where there is *hierarchia veritatum* – the true church is living together in a hierarchy of truth.

The fivefold ministry as *capsulated* in Ephesians 4 passage is open to debate. Is it a precursor for church structure and government, or is it a reflection of the pneumatic community in action? The next chapter answers these questions. However, the wisdom of Kreitzer (1997:129) is called upon for the hypotheses that the fivefold ministry is not a theologically legitimate church government to be applied to the twenty-first century church:

It is unwise to view the five categories of people here listed as evidence of the prevailing ecclesiastical structures of the time, or to take them as an indication of the situation of the church to which the Writer directs his letter. Likewise, it is not at all clear that what is intended here is a hard and fast distinction between the clergy and laity, as the insertion of a comma between the phrases ‘to equip the saints’ and ‘for work in his service’ in some translations of verse 12 suggests. One must look elsewhere, such as the Pastoral Epistles, to substantiate a theology of the two-fold office of Christian ministers, since ecclesiastical legitimization of the forms of an ordained ministry is not the writer’s focus here.

The Lord shows how His love and grace must be administered in His Church. The missional church that He leaves behind is endowed with gifts in order to strengthen and



expand itself. The passage points to the existence in the church of those whose task is to specifically move the church towards the goal of maturity in Christ.

These are the gifts that are sovereignly distributed to the members of the body, which is the church – an instrument for carrying out God’s purposes in the *cosmos*. In Ephesians 4:11, these are the gifts of ascended Christ to the church. These gifts are the persons themselves not the abilities or the energies as is found in the *charismata* of 1 Corinthians 12:4-11. These gifts are released for the church to function as it should. The gifts are deliberately released for the edification of the body (4:12), for the avoidance of false teaching (4:14). They are Christ’s ministries that reflect His victory by which He endows the church.

5.12. ARGUMENTS AGAINST FIVEFOLD MINISTRY FOR CHURCH GOVERNMENT

5.12.1. The timing of the letter of Ephesians

The time of Paul’s ministry in Ephesus ranges within 52-56 AD. The apostle Paul spent almost three years in Ephesus where he was heavily involved with interactions and confrontations:

- He encountered twelve disciples of John the Baptist (Acts 19:1-7)
- He engaged the Jews into debates in the synagogue for three months, demonstrating that Jesus is indeed the Messiah (Acts 19:8-10)
- Withdrawing from the synagogue he entered the lecture hall belonging to a man called Tyrannus where many Ephesians got converted (Acts 19:8-10)
- He performed many miracles as a means of persuading people about the gospel (Acts 19:11-17)
- There arose some commotion about him, instigated by a certain Demetrius (Acts 19:23-41)



All these events happened before the confirmation of elders in the Ephesians Church, long before the writing of the epistle, which were around 62 AD. At the time of the writing of the epistle to the Ephesians, church structure was already in place – the elders were already in charge of the church. The logic is evident that the church government under the elders were already functional by the time Paul mentioned the fivefold ministry in his epistle. The epistle was written to the pneumatic community that was already settled with full governance under the elders.

5.12.2. The wording of the Ephesians 4:11-13 passage

The intention of *domata* in this passage is not for government, but for empowerment of the community. The apostolic intention is the preparation of God's people for works of service that will lead the community towards unity and maturity. Barth (1974:478) captures this fact:

Eph 4:11-13 is a *locus classicus* pointing out the coherence of the church's origin, order, and destiny. Certain ministries are given by Christ (vs. 11) in order that the church fulfils her present task (vs. 12), and, at the end, reach the goal set for her (vs. 13)... In following the teleological accent set by vs.13, the treatment of the purpose described in vs.12 will precede the description of the means mentioned in vs.11.

The statement: "to prepare God's people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up..." (v. 12) have three elements. These three elements usher in the triple definition of the one purpose that determines the gift of the ministries mentioned in v.7, 8, and 11:

5.12.2.1. The equipment of the saints: The ministry here is *katartismos*, which according to Bromiley (1985:80); "denotes equipment for the work of the ministry, while *katartisis* is the inner strength of the organic relationship of the community, or of the character of the members (2 Cor 13:9)." The fundamental meaning here is that the *domata* of this



passage is intended to restore to the original shape or position, to put in order, to realign, or to complete. The fivefold ministers are tasked to arrange or put into order everything in the church. They minister in order to reform or repair the weaknesses of the church. The wisdom of Lloyd-Jones (1984:199) reinforces this point:

Essentially this word means that we have to be made fit to serve the end and object aimed at. The picture is that something which we desire to use is not yet perfect, so we have to do certain things to it in order to fit it for that end and object for which we desire to use it. This means the supplying of certain deficiencies or the mending or adjusting of certain parts that are wrong.

It is all about community empowerment. It is the community development that involves the community itself in its own development – a notion that is reinforced further by Lloyd-Jones (1984:198) that

the ultimate purpose of all these offices and divisions of labour in the church is the perfecting of the saints; and the way in which the saints are to be perfected is through the gift of the ministry, the function of which is to edify the body of Christ. There is an ultimate objective, and there are more immediate objectives.

5.12.2.2. The servant work: The “grace gifts” given to community members are the same ministerial gifts given to Paul: *But to each one of us, grace has been given as Christ apportioned it.* This fact is reiterated by the apostolic juncture that; *Surely you have heard about the administration of God’s grace that was given to me for you... I became a servant of this gospel by the gift of God’s grace given me through the working of his power (Ephesians 3:2, 7).* This grace, given to each community member, makes him an active servant. It does not come in vain, but makes a member of Christ’s body work (1 Cor 15:10). It is clear that Ephesians 4:7 and 12 connect “charismata” with servant work. The hermeneutical insight concludes that Ephesians 4:7’s “each” refers to all the



members of the body of Christ as the recipients of “charismata”, not only apostles, prophets, evangelists pastors, or teachers. The same notion is carried on in 4:13 by “we all”, and is emphasised further by 4:16’s “each part”. This demonstrates the apostolic intention of the mutual contact of all members, not a specific group – in this case, the fivefold ministers.

The comparison of 1 Cor 12 and Eph 4 passages regarding “grace gifts” shows that the Corinthians letter focuses on the unity of the community and the diversity of the functions within the community. On the other hand, the Ephesians letter stresses the building up of the body. The balance between the two passages indicates that the gifts are liberally distributed to each community member for service, not for governance as the fivefold ministry promoters claim. Service and leadership are intertwined, though sometimes distinguished by those who garner for power to control instead of serving. Barth (1974:480) is correct:

Neither in 1 Corinthians nor in Ephesians are higher and lower, official and non-official, active and primarily receptive (or passive) church members distinguished as different ranks. On the contrary, in 1 Cor 12:22-23 the weakest members of the church are declared the most important.

5.12.2.3. The construction of the body of Christ: This function dismisses the parochial intentions in the community. All is done by Christ and for Him only. Bromiley (1985:39) alludes to the fact that the fivefold ministry’s primary function is *aletheia* – the true teaching or the revelation of authentic divine reality. They have something to say. They are engaged in the construction, the building of the body of Christ by speaking. They are men and women with diverse services to the internal edification of the community and the external expansion of the community. Their focus is the local and universal expansion of the ideals of the body of Christ. The construction of the body of Christ is not the job of the chosen few officers, it is the *kaleo* – divine calling of the entire community to strengthen and stretch itself.



5.12.3. The nature of the church at Ephesus

Ephesians is closer to Romans, which is the crown and climax of Paul's Christology. It is the distilled essence, the obvious authoritative and the most consummate compendium of the Christian faith. This letter was written in 62 AD after the establishment of many New Testament churches. This was the time when Paul had an opportunity to contemplate the meaning of the new phenomenon that had come into being. The reference to "*ecclesia*" in its diverse forms connotes the church universal rather than the local community. In its universal form, the *ecclesia* includes all who have believed in Christ since the inception of the community, and includes all who will yet believe before the realisation of the *eschaton*.

5.12.3.1. *The **ecclesia** is a **mysterion**. - the mystery that has its meaning and essence hidden in Christ, though it is present where its members are found.* The church as a mystery is prevalent in post - Vatican II ecclesiological commentaries. For instance, in the introductory statement, Avery Dulles (1987:9), in one of his famous books, *Models of the Church* states;

I wish to indicate my conviction that the Church, like other theological realities, is a mystery. Mysteries are realities of which we cannot speak directly. If we wish to talk about them at all we must draw on analogies afforded by our experience of the world. These analogies provide models. By attending to the analogies and utilizing them as models, we can indirectly grow in our understanding of the Church.

The Church is a mystery that cannot be articulated in categorical terminology. It is mysterious because of the Christological and ecclesiological language employed in referring to it (Ephesians 5:32). This is confirmed by the exemplification given by Clowney (1995:108) that;



The Bible certainly speaks of the church in heavenly terms. Chosen to holiness in Christ before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4-5), it is not to be likened to the kingdoms of this world (Eph. 1:23; 5:23, 32; Col. 1:18; Jn. 18:36). It is the dwelling of God, built of living stones on Christ as the chief cornerstone (Eph. 2:20; 1 Pet. 2:5). Only the Lord knows infallibly those who are his, and they are joined to him by the secret working of his Holy Spirit (2 Tim. 2:19; Jn.3:8).

Since the church is the mystery, it needs *domata* such as the fivefold ministry in order to be energised towards the maturity.

5.12.3.2. *The ecclesia is an **organism and organisation***, with Christ as the Head. That it is an organism is confirmed by the twentieth century New Testament scholar, Robertson (1931:515); “Ephesians chief stress is placed upon the Dignity of the Church as the Body of Christ the Head.” The church is permeated throughout all its parts with one common life. It has the same life for each member. Each member has not only been baptised into one Body, but has been made to drink into one Spirit (1 Cor 12:13). This implies that the church is something that is alive in the world and is organisationally constituted of all those in Christ universally. The Ephesians Church that received the epistle was organisationally rationalised, but still in its journey to be an organism. As an organisation, it was already under the leadership of elders, but as an organism, it still needed the fivefold ministry, not to govern but to strengthen towards unity and maturity. Kuiper (1998:115) echoes this sentiment that

It was the practice of the apostles to form an ecclesiastical organization wherever there was a group of believers. For instance, when Paul and Barnabas, on their way homeward from their first missionary journey, visited the various places where they had recently preached the gospel, they ‘ordained them elders in every church’ (Acts 14:23).



The Ephesians received an epistle at the time when they were an organisation already, and organism in process. This made it imperative for them to learn about who they are in Christ, life of purity and unity, importance of striving towards the ideal of organisational unity on congregational and universal levels.

5.12.3.3. *The Ephesians church received the **apostolic paradosis** – the tradition that had to be transmitted **as catechesis** for ages and generations to come.* The canonical function of the letter is to affirm the community members in their faith regardless of their ethnical or cultural background. The *ecclesia* is gifted to operate in diversity and the Ephesians are settled to operate in the like manner. They are the *pneumatic* community that is settled and is *eschatological* by nature. On its way towards maturity, they need to be strengthened for the journey and the task. The fivefold ministry is provided by Christ for this purpose of equipping the saints for this *eschatological* journey. It is the community living under the *ecclesiastical* governance of elders (Acts 20:13-38). They have passed the pioneering stage and are now settled, hence the need to maintain unity and grow towards maturity. Their *missional* task is dependent on their internal strength. Their apostolic and evangelistic endeavours depend on their prophetic, pastoral and didactic tasks.

5.12.3.4. *The Ephesians Church needed to be a charismatic fellowship.* The internal dialogue of the epistle lacks the eschatological expectations. The eschatological terminology such as *parousia*, second advent, resurrection etc is scantily evident in the letter. This indicates that the Ephesians community was settled and was over the turbulence of the last days expectations. They were a fellowship that needed some energy to incarnate their faith in idolatrous environment in which they lived. They were expected to be the real *communio sanctorum* or *congregatio sanctorum* – the Christian people who live in mutual concern for one another and mutual self-giving in the spirit of love. This notion was attested by the third article of the Barmen Theological Declaration and commented on by Moltmann (1989:315-316) that:



A community of brethren lives in the spirit of brotherliness, showing its fellowship with God's Son, 'the first-born among many brethren' (Rom. 8.29), through a brotherly common life. ...The 'community of brethren' means the new, visible way of life... In the community of the brethren the greed for possessions and the claim to personal property come to an end... In the community of brethren social, cultural, racial and sexual privileges lose their validity...The community of brethren proclaims the kingdom of God through its way of life, which provides an alternative to the life of the world surrounding it.

This commentary carries weight that it speaks of the rebirth of fellowship of Christians that is intertwined with friendship with Christ. Ephesians are exhorted to maintain the apostolic *paradosis* of the early years of the apostolic church, where Christians lived for each other and were sacrificing their possessions for each other. The communal lifestyle where *charismata* played a role in building up of the church was called into action. The essence of fellowship was and is expected to revolve around the grace gifts given to the community for the purpose of becoming more like Christ, the Head of the Church. The missional task is effective through charismatic lifestyle.

5.12.3.5. The Ephesians Church was expected to be a self-developing community. The *ecclesia* is made up of the human beings who are in communion with the Trinitarian God. This composition rules out the idea of *homo sans tete* (human without mind). These members are creative individuals who attribute significance and survival in a temporal context. Their behaviour is not determined solely by external factors, but also by individuals' values, opinions, intentions and expectations. Ephesians 4:11-16 elaborates that the fivefold gifts are for the *katartismos* (equipping) of the saints for the work of the ministry. Each member is expected to be a *martyrios* – an active witness of the salvific acts of Christ here on earth. However each member needs to be trained for the witnessing service (Ephesians 4:11-12) by the gifted members in the community. In a nutshell, the expected outcome is that training for witnessing service is to be decentralised to the



community rather than to the professors at the institutions of higher learning. This kind of training has its place and respect, but the maturity of the church should be from within by the members who share their gifts among themselves for the purpose of growth in all aspects.

The gift of apostleship along with other ministries thus serve to plant and water the seed of the Word so that it can bear fruit among the gifted congregation as all grow up to speak the Word to one another... The apostles belonged to the church as gifts to inspire and guide them as they grew to take their place as mature bearers of the Spirit and the Word themselves” (Macchia 2006:236).

When ‘grace gifts’ operate in *ecclesia*, the energy is released and this becomes a resource for the local community to assert and strengthen itself. This confirms the sociological thesis that resources are all those elements in people’s mental framework and total environment on which they depend for their existence and survival (Miller 1992:9). The resources are found to be within the people themselves. *Charismata* creatively unlock the vital energy, strength, talent, skills, knowledge and insight of a group or an individual. The revival fires would be set burning and spiritual energies released with spiritual vitality and soul-winning passion when the gifted members mould the character of those in their fellowship. This does not discredit the worthy scholarship as the emerging apostolic movement always retorts. Scholarship and spiritual passion can exist together within one person.

The purpose of *domata* in Ephesians 4 passage is to accomplish a specific task in a prescribed time: “... until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ” (Ephesians 4:13). This refers to the completion of the Body of Christ by adding to it all who are His elect people in this age. When the *ecclesia* is not self-developing, it stands vulnerable to the danger that is cautioned in the next verse: “Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there by every wind of



teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of men in their deceitful scheming” (Eph 4:14). The *ecclesia*, like the human body, is self-developing. Each member is expected to exercise gifts of grace spontaneously for the mutual building of the Body. In discussing the gift of prophecy which is part of the fivefold ministry, Wehrli (1992:51-52) emphasising the self-developing concept of the church that is already settled, speaks of prophecy as

God’s gift to the church for its own life and leadership, and the gift of prophecy is one indication that the new age of the Spirit with its gifts (*charismata*) has already begun. These prophetic utterances in the community, which pointed to him for this special task, sustain Timothy in the face of hostility and persecution – that by them he might ‘fight the good fight’ (1 Tim. 6:12).

5.13. CONCLUSION

Ephesians 4:1-16 is an ecclesiastical exhortation. The first part of the passage is the description of the church’s existence and order. The passage does not expound any self-contained and boisterous church or doctrine of the church. There is an urgent advice in Ephesians 4:1-3 for the members of *ecclesia* to be humble, united, and strong in mutual love. **The** members are reminded of the creed of the church (Ephesians 4:4-6) that confesses the oneness which exerts a unifying force beyond the community of the saints. The confession is still called out and the one body (church) is still on the *eschatological* journey towards maturity. The one baptism is still a declaration that distinguishes the members from their former life. Ephesians 4:7-10 introduces the reader to the distribution of various gifts by the exalted Christ as a proof that Christ reigns supreme above all. The ministers given to the church in Ephesians 4:11 are charged to train fellow members for the ministry, and to prepare them for meeting the Lord, and protect them from immature and naïve behaviour (Ephesians 4:12-14). As ministers of Christ, they are mandated to ensure the growth of the church as attested by Forestell (1991:89), “the continued



existence and effectiveness of the church, like that of any other social group, requires the presence and activity of leaders, regardless of how these leaders may emerge from the group or of how they are installed and called to account by the group.” The accent is set upon the growth of the church towards the head, Christ Himself (Ephesians 4:15-16).

Since the epistle was destined for the settled pneumatic community, the ministers of Ephesians 4:11 were not intended for church governance, but for the empowerment of the community. The fivefold ministers are called to serve in a flat structured community where the priesthood of believers is displayed, not to create the hierarchy of leadership. Boff (1985:155) highlights the tone of the Ephesians church to be portraying the church as

the encounter of the community of the faithful, an encounter prompted by Christ and the Spirit to celebrate, deepen faith, and to discuss the questions of the community in the light of the Gospel. Church... is more an event that may take place beneath an oak tree, in the house of some coordinator, or within a church building, rather than an institution with all of its goods, services, laws, doctrines, ministries, and historical continuity.

The *ecclesia* as the people of God maintains its cohesiveness and organised continuity of the faithful by allowing everyone to have a sense of belonging, and equality as a citizen of the kingdom. The mission of the church is not seen as a task entrusted to the selected few, but given to all though few are variably enabled to perform some extraordinary tasks. The Ephesians *ecclesia* is the organised people. Their organisation is only authentic if it has or allows some maximum benefit for all the members. As a community, the *ecclesia* displays equality whereby all members are baptised in the *pneumatic* Christ and anointed by the Holy Spirit. It is a democratic principle wherein the *ecclesial* power is derived from the sharing in the power of the Spirit and the ascended Christ active in the community. The Pauline notion is that there must not be a hierarchy in the settled community that will prevent the operation of *charismata* for its advancement. Christ



released His *domata* to the church in order that she may strengthen herself towards her Head, Christ Himself. These gifts (*domata*) enhance the unity of the church and engross the sense of belonging since there is a maximum participation in the livelihood of the church.



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 ecclesologically 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.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

All Africa Conference of Churches 1993 *Problems and Promises of Africa: Towards and Beyond the Year 2000 (A Summary of the Proceedings of the Symposium Convened by the AACC in Mombasa in November, 1991)*.

Nairobi: Africa Church Information Service.

Alston Jr, W M 2002. *The Church of the Living God: A Reformed Perspective*.
Louisville/London: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Akin, D et al 2004. *Perspectives on Church Government*.
Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Anderson, A. 1994. *The Holy Spirit in an African Context*.
Pretoria: Unisa.

_____ 2004. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ 2007. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*.

Avis, P 1992. *Authority, Leadership and Conflict in the Church*.
Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.

Banks, R 1980. *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting*.

Exeter: Paternoster Press.

Barclay, W 1962. *The Letter to the Romans*.
Edinburgh: The Scrint Andrew Press.

Barnes, A 1979. *Barnes's Notes on the Old and New Testament: 1 Corinthians*.
Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

_____ 1979. *Barnes's Notes on the Old Testament and New Testament: Ephesians – Colossians*.

Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Barth, M 1974. *Ephesians 4-6: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*.
New York: Doubleday.

Barth, K 1956. *Church Dogmatics*. Volume IV.
Edinburgh: Clark.

Bartlet, J V 2003. *Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity*.
New York: Kessinger Publishing.



Berg, M & Pretiz, P 1996. *Spontaneous Combustion: Grass-roots Christianity, Latin American Style*.

Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Berkhof, L 1941. *Systematic Theology*.

London: The Banner of Truth Trust.

Best, E 1997. *Essays on Ephesians*.

Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Beyerhaus P 1975. "Lausanne zwischen Berlin und Genf" In: *Reich Gottes oder Weltgemeinschaft? Die Berliner Okumene – Erklärung zur utopischen Vision des Weltkirchenrates*.

Bad Libenzell – Germany: Verlager der Liebenzerler Mission.

Bloesch, D G 1978. *Essentials of Evangelical Theology. 2 Vols.*

San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Bockmuehl, M & Thompson, M B 1997. *A Vision for the Church: Studies in Early Christian Ecclesiology*.

Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Boff, L 1985. *Church: Charism and Power. Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*.

New York: Crossroads.

Boice, J M 1979. *The Foundation of Biblical Authority*.

Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Bradshaw, T 1992. *The Olive Branch: An Evangelical Anglican Doctrine of the Church*.

Oxford: Latimer House, / Paternoster Press.

Brand C & Norman D 2004. *Perspectives on Church Government: Five Views of Church Polity*.

Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Brenman, C M 1996. *The Association of Evangelicals in Africa: Its History, Organisation, Members, Projects, External Relations and Message*.

Zoetemeer: Uitgeverij Boekencentrum.

Brent, A 1999. *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity Before the Age of Cyprian*.

Leiden: Brill.



Bromiley, G W 1985. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. (Abridged in One Volume).*

Grand Rapids: W B Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Broocks, R 2002. *Every Nation in Our Generation: Recovering the Apostolic Mandate.*
Lake Mary: Creation House Press.

Bruce, F F 1961. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: A Verse-By-Verse Exposition.*
London, Pickering & Inglis.

Bruner, F D 1971. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness.*
London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Burtchaell, J T 1992. *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities.*
New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cairns, E E 1978. *Christianity Through the Centuries.*
Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Calver C & Warner R 1996. *Together we Stand: Evangelical Convictions, Unity and Vision.*
London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Cannistraci, D 1996. *Apostles and the Emerging Apostolic Movement: A Biblical Look at Apostleship and How God is Using it to Bless His Church Today.*
Ventura: Renew Books.

Chafer, L S 1978. *Systematic Theology.*
Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press.

Clinton, B 1975. *Spiritual Gifts: Church Philosophy Series.*
Coral Gables: West Indies Mission.

Clowney, E P 1995. *The Church: Contours of Christian Theology.*
Downs Grove, Ill: Intervarsity.

Haggard, T. Evangelicals in a Secular Society. *Christianity Today, Vol 49* (November 2005).

Christian Research Institute. *The Fivefold Ministry* Journal, Vol 22 (Number 1, 1999).

Coleman L & Neander A 1844. *Apostolic and Primitive Church: Popular in its Government and Simple in its Worship.*
Provo: Kessinger.



-
- Dayton, D W 2004. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism (5th Printing)*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- De Haan, M R 1974. *Studies in First Corinthians: Messages on Practical Living*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Diodati, G 1607. *La Bibbia cioe, I libri del vecchio e del nuovo testamento*. Geneva: de Tournes.
- Dowley, T (Ed) 1977. *A Lion Handbook: The History of Christianity*. Herts: Lion Publishing.
- Doyle, D M 2000. *Communion Ecclesiology*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Duffield, G P & Van Cleave N M 1983. *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*. San Dimas: LIFE Bible College.
- Dulles, 1987. *Models of the Church (Expanded Edition)*. New York: Doubleday.
- Duminy, P A et al 1992. *Education for the Student Teacher 3*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Du Plessis, D 1970. *The Spirit Bade Me Go*. Plainfield: Logos International.
- Du Plooy, A 1997. *Historiae ecclesiasticae Vol XXVI, No 1 & 2: The Foundation and Relevance of Reformed Church Polity as a Theological Science*. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.
- Durnbaugh, Donald F 1968. *The Believers' Church: The History and Character of Protestantism*. London: The McMillan Company.
- Ekman, U 1996. *The Apostolic Ministry: Can the Church Live Without It?* Sweden: Word of Life.
- Engle, P E & Cowan, S B 2004. *Who Runs the Church: 4 Views on Church Government?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing.
- Erickson, Millard J 1993. *The Evangelical Mind and Heart: Perspectives on Theological and Practical Issues*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Eusebius, Pamphilus 1962. *Ecclesiastical History*.



Forestell, J T 1991. *As Ministers of Christ: The Christological Dimension of Ministry in the New Testament*.
New York: Paulist Press.

Flynn, G 2004. *Yves Congar's Vision of the Church in the World of Unbelief*.
Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Gaybba, B 1987. *The Spirit of Love: Theology of the Holy Spirit*.
London: Geoffrey Chapman/ Cassel Publishers.

Gillquist, P E 1974. *Let's Quit Fighting About the Holy Spirit*.
London: Lakeland.

Gordon, T D 1994. The Equipping Ministry of Ephesians 4. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*.

Graham, B 1980. *The Holy Spirit: Activating God's Power in Your Life*.
Glasgow: William Collins Sons.

Green, M 1975. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*.
Kent: Hodder & Stoughton.

Green, M D 2005. *Understanding the Fivefold Ministry*.
Lake Mary: Charisma House.

Grenz, S J 1990. *Reason for Hope: The Systematic Theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg*.
New York: Oxford University Press.

Grudem, W A 1988. *The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament and Today*.
Westchester: Crossway Books.

Haggard, T 2005. Who are the Evangelicals? *Christianity Today, November Issue*.

Hamon, B 1999. *Prophets and the Prophetic Movement: God's Prophetic Move Today*.
Santa Rosha Beach: Destiny Image Publishers.

_____ B 2002. *Apostles Prophets and the Coming Moves of God: God's End-Time Plans for His Church and Planet Earth*.
Shippensburg: Destiny Image.

Harrison, E F 1960. *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*.
Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Hayford, JW & Moore, SD 2006. *The Charismatic Century: The Enduring Impact of the Azusa Street Revival*.
New York: Warner Faith.



Hebert, AG 1963. *Apostle and Bishop: A Study of the Gospel, the Ministry, and the Church-Community*.

London: Faber & Faber.

Hendriksen, W 1976. *Ephesians*.

Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Hesselgrave, D 1971. *Theology and Mission: Papers Given at Trinity Consultation No 1*.

Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Heyns, J A 1980. *The Church*.

Pretoria: N.G Kerkboekhandel.

Hoehner, H W 2003. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*.

Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Holdcraft, L T 1979. *The Holy Spirit: A Pentecostal Interpretation*.

Springfield: Gospel Publishing House.

Holmberg, B 1978. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*.

Lund: Libert Laromedel/Gleerup.

Hooker, T 1972. *A Survey of Summe of Church Discipline*.

New York: Arno Press.

Hunter III, G G 1996. *Leadership Network Forum*.

Husbands M & Treier D J (Eds) 2005. *The Community of the Word: Toward an Evangelical Ecclesiology*.

Downers Grove/Leicester: Intervarsity Press/ Apollos.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti 2002. *An Introduction to Ecclesiology: Ecumenical, Historical, & Global Perspectives*.

Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.

_____ 2002. *Toward a Pneumatological Theology: Pentecostal and Ecumenical Perspectives on Ecclesiology, Soteriology, and Theology of Mission*.

Lanham: University Press of America.

_____ 2002. *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective*.

Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Kasper, W 1985. *Jesus the Christ*.

Kent: Burns & Oates.



_____ 2004. *That They May All Be One: The Call to Unity Today*.
London: Burns & Oates.

Keeler, J B 1906. *Lesser Priesthood and Notes on Church Government*.
Provo: Kessinger.

König, A 1982. *Here Am I: A Christian Reflection on God*.
Grand Rapids/London: WM. B. Eerdmans/Marshall Morgan & Scott.

Kraft, C H 2000. *I Give You Authority*.
London: Monarch Books.

Kreitzer, L 1997. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*.
Peterborough: Epworth Press.

Kritzinger, J J et al 1994. *On Being Witnesses*.
Halfway House: Orion Publishers.

Kuen, A 1971. *I will Build My Church*.
Chicago: Moody Press.

Küng, H 1986. *The Church*.
Kent: Search Press.

Kuiper R B 1998. *The Glorious Body of Christ*.
Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust.

Larbi, E K 2004. African Pentecostalism in the Context of Global Pentecostal
Ecumenical Fraternity: Challenges and Opportunities, *Africa Journal of Pentecostal
Studies Vol 2 Dec*.
Rynfield: Hebron Theological College.

Lawler M G & Shanahan J 1995. *Church: A Spirited Communion*.
Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Lloyd-Jones, M 1984. *Christian Unity: An Exposition of Ephesians 4:1 to 16*.
Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Long, Edward Leroy 2001. *Patterns of Polity: Varieties of Church Governance*.
Cleveland: Pilgrim Press.

Lull, T F 1983. *The New Church Debate: Issues Facing American Lutheranism*.
Philadelphia, Fortress Press.

MacArthur, J 2003. *Think Biblically: Recovering a Christian Worldview*.
Wheaton: Crossway Books.



- Macchia, F D 2006. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*.
Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- McGrath, A 1995. *Evangelicalism & the Future of Christianity*.
Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.
- McKee, E A 1988. *Elders and the Plural Ministry: The Role of Exegetical History in Illuminating John Calvin's Theology*.
Genève: Librairie Droz S.A.
- McKenzie, J L 1966. *Authority in the Church*.
New York: Seed & Word.
- Macquarrie, J 1971. *Principles of Christian Theology (Study Edition)*.
London: SCM Press.
- _____ 1990. *Jesus Christ in Modern Thought*.
London: SCM Press.
- Miller, D 1997. *Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the New Millennium*.
Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Miller, G T 1992. *Living in the Environment: An Introduction to Environmental Science (7 Edition)*.
Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Milner Jr, B C 1970. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Church*.
Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Moltmann, J 1977. *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*.
London: SCM Press.
- Moore, S D 2003. *The Shepherding Movement: Controversy and Charismatic Ecclesiology*.
New York: T & T Clark.
- Moriarty, M G 1992. *The New Charismatic's*.
Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Mother, Richard 1972. *Church-Government and Church-covenant Discussed*.
New York: Arno Press.
- Mwamwenda, T S 1996. *Educational Psychology: An African Perspective (2nd Ed)*.
Isando: Heinemann.



Myer, R 2006. *Fivefold Ministry Made Practical: How to Release Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers to Equip Today's Church*.
Lititz: House to House Publications.

Newlands G M 1984. *The Church of God*.
Marshall Morgan & Scott.

Noll M A & Wells D F 1988. *Christian Faith and Practice in the Modern World: Theology from an evangelical Point of View*.
Grand Rapids: W.B.Eerdmans.

O'Brien, P T 199. *The Letter to the Ephesians*.
Grand Rapids: W B Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Ogden, S M 1996. *Doing Theology Today*.
Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

Pannenberg, W 1998. *Systematic Theology, Vol 3*.
Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____, 1981. *The Church*.
Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Paul, R S 1972. *The Church in Search of Itself*.
Grand Rapids: W.B.Eerdmans.

Payne, J L 2004. *The Five Ministries: A New Testament Church's Study on the 5-Fold Ministry*.
Jackson: Church House Publisher.

Pazmiño, R W 1997. *Foundational Issues in Christian Education: An Introduction in Evangelical Perspective*.
Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Perkins, P 1982. *Ministering in the Pauline Churches*.
New York: Paulist Press.

Peters, T 2000. *God – The World's Future: Systematic Theology for a New Era (2 Ed)*.
Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Phillips, R D et al 2004. *The Church: One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic*.
Phillipsburg: P & R Publishing.

Phiri, I & Maxwell, J. Gospel Riches: Africa's rapid embrace of prosperity
Pentecostalism provokes concern – and hope. *Christianity Today, Vol 51* (July 2007).



Quebedeaux, R 1983. *The New Charismatics: How a Christian Renewal Movement Became Part of the American Religious Mainstream.*
San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Radmacher, E D 1978. *What the Church is all About.*
Chicago: Moody Press.

Ridderbos, H 1975. *Paul: An Outline of his Theology.*
Grand Rapids: W B Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Ruthven, J 1969. *The Cessation of the Charismata.*
“Paraclete” Vol 3. No 2.

Ryrie, C C 1980. *The Holy Spirit*
Chicago: Moody Press.

Sauter, G 2003. *Gateways to Dogmatics: Reasoning Theologically for the Life of the Church.*
Grand Rapids: W B Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Scheidler, B 1980. *The New Testament Church and its Ministries: A Study of the Importance, Function and Ministries of the Local Church.*
Portland: City Bible Publishing.

Simpson, D 1996. *Why Not Call It Neo-denominationalism, Ministry Advantage.*
Unpublished Track.

Stackhouse, M L et al 2000. *The Local Church in a Global Era: Reflections for a New Century.*
Grand Rapids: W B Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Stackhouse Jr, J G 2003. *Evangelical Ecclesiology; Reality or Illusion.*
Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Stackhouse, I 2004. *The Gospel-Driven Church: Retrieving Classical Ministry for Contemporary Revivalism.*
Bletchley: Paternoster Press.

Stone, D 1999. *Gifts From the Ascended Christ: Restoring the Place of the 5-Fold Ministry.*
Shippensburg: Treasure House/Destiny Image & Publishers.

Stott, J R W 1979. *Baptism and Fullness: The Work of the Holy Spirit Today.*
Leicester: Intervarsity Press.



_____ 1979. *The Message of Ephesians*
Leicester, Intervarsity Press.

_____ 1999. *Evangelical Truth: A Personal Plea for Unity, Integrity & Faithfulness.*
Downers Grove: Inter- Varsity Press.

Strauch, A 1995. *Biblical Eldership: An Urgent Call to Restore Biblical Church Leadership (Revised and Expanded).*
Colorado Springs: Lewis & Roth Publishers.

Sullivan, F A 1982. *Charisma and Charismatic Renewal: A Biblical and Theological Study.*
Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

Thiessen, H C 1979. *Lectures in Systematic Theology (Revised Edition).*
Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Towns, E L 1996. *Ministry Advantage: Understanding the Cycles of Church Renewal,*
July-August.

Trueheart, C 1996. *The Next Church, Atlantic Monthly.*

Tucker, W L 1983. *Studies in Ephesians.*
Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.

Tunji, J D 2005. *The Principles of Leadership and Structure of the Local Church.*
Bloomington: Authorhouse.

Van der Meer, F G L 1966. *The Faith of the Church.*
London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Van der Ven, J 1996. *Ecclesiology in Context.*
Grand Rapids: W.B.Eerdmans.

Van Dyk, P J 1987. *How to Analyse the Bible: Discovering the Context of Scripture by Using the Historical-Critical Method.*
Pretoria: J L van Schaik.

Van Gemeren, W A 1990. *Interpreting the Prophetic Word: An Introduction to the Prophetic Literature of the Old Testament.*
Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Vidler, A R 1974. *The Church in an age of Revolution: 1979 to the Present Day.*
London: Penguin Books.



Vine, W E 1952. *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words: With the Precise Meanings for English Readers.*
Iowa Falls: Riverside Book and Bible House.

Volf, M 1998. *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity.*
Grand Rapids: W.B.Eerdmans.

Wagner, C Peter 1994. *Spreading the Fire, Book 1 Acts 1-8.*
Ventura: Regal Books.

_____ 1994 / 2005. *Your Spiritual Gifts can Help Your Church Grow.*
Ventura: Regal Books.

_____ 1998. *The New Apostolic Churches.*
Ventura: Regal Books.

_____ 1999. *Churchquake!*
Ventura: Regal Books.

_____ 2004. *Changing Church.*
Ventura: Regal Books.

_____ 2006. *Apostles Today.*
Ventura: Regal Books.

Webster, J 2001. *Word and Church: Essays in Christian Dogmatics.*
Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Wehrli, E S 1992. *Gifted by their Spirit: Leadership Roles in the New Testament.*
Cleveland: Pilgrim Press.

Williams, D H 1999. *Retrieving the Tradition and Renewing Evangelicalism: A Primer for Suspicious Protestants.*
Grand Rapids: W.B.Eerdmans.

Wilson, G. B. 1976. *Romans: A Digest of Reformed Commentary.*
Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust.

Winter, R D & Hawthorne, S C 1981. *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader.*
Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Woodridge J D, & McComiskey T E 1991. *Doing Theology in Today's World: Essays in Honor of Kenneth S Kantzer.*
Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.



Zanchius J 1889. *Commentarius in Epistolam Sancti Pauli ad Ephesios – Pars Altera* (Ed H H de Hartog).
Amstelodami: Joannem Adamum Wormser.

Zizioulas, J 1985. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*.
Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press.

INTERNET REFERENCES

All for His glory. *Fivefold Ministers/Ministries*
<http://www.allforhisglory.net/ofhoc/terms.html> 4/6/2005

Bracy D. *Fivefold Ministry Concepts*
http://www.members.tripod.com/metropolis_5/fivefold.html 18/8/ 2006

Christian Research Institute. New Watch Article: DF400. *Fivefold Ministry Makes a Comeback*
<http://www.equip.org> 22/11/2006

Dove Christian Fellowship. *Fivefold Ministry Seminars*
http://www.dcfi.org/Fivefold_Sem.htm 4/6/2005

Fedor J. *The Fivefold Ministry: The Hand of God*
<http://www.trumpetsoftruth.net/new/excerpt/lecture-20.html> 4/6.2005

Global Accrediting Commission for the Fivefold Ministry (G.A.C.F.M)
<http://www.fivefold-ministry.com> 4/6/2005

Global Ministry Resources International Training College
<http://gmr-itc.gmr-i.com/degrees.php> 27/2/2008

Hamon B. *Restoring the Fivefold Ministry*
http://www.cbn.com/700club/guests/bios/bill_hamon_042304.aspx 22/11/2006

Kang A. *What You Should Know About Fivefold Ministry*
<http://www.praise.com/ministries/pastorkang> 22/11/2006

Kilpatrick G. *The Hand Illustration of Fivefold Ministry*
<http://www.newfoundationspubl.org/mercy.htm> 4/6/2005

Lambert S *The Ministry of the Prophet*
<http://www.slm.org/prophetic/articles/prophet.html> 4/6/2005

Leavenworth P *Organizational Life-Cycles and the Fivefold Ministry*
http://www.openbible.org/message/sept_oct_04/Leavenworth.html 22/11/2006



Martinez R D *The Fivefold Ministry And Spiritual Abuse: Part 2 of 4*
<http://www.spiritwatch.org/fivespab1.htm> 4/6/2005

River of Glory. *Fivefold Ministry Church, Fivefold Ministry Overview*
<http://www.riverofglory.org/five-fold-ministry.asp> 22/11/2006

The Fig Tree
www.thefigtree.org 27/2/2008

Viola F. 2005. *Re-Thinking the Fivefold Ministry*
<http://www.ptmin.org/revolution/htm> 12/1/2006