

10-1-1999

A Critique of David Cannistraci's Understanding of the Gift of Apostle and the Emerging Apostolic Movement

John A. Crabtree Jr.
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalarchives.apu.edu/jascg>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Missions and World Christianity Commons](#), [Practical Theology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Crabtree, J. A. (1999). A Critique of David Cannistraci's Understanding of the Gift of Apostle and the Emerging Apostolic Movement. *Journal of the American Society for Church Growth*, 10(3), 41-82. Retrieved from <https://digitalarchives.apu.edu/jascg/vol10/iss3/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by APU Digital Archives. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of the American Society for Church Growth* by an authorized editor of APU Digital Archives. For more information, please contact mpacino@apu.edu.

**A Critique of David Cannistraci's Understanding
of the Gift of Apostle and the Emerging Apostolic Movement**

John A. Crabtree, Jr.

The purpose of this article is to challenge the concept of apostolic succession in the form of a contemporary apostolic movement led by those with the gift of apostle. David Cannistraci's¹ assertion that there is a contemporary apostolic movement is a hideous assault against the authority and sufficiency of Scripture, resulting in a heretical² stance that cannot, and must not, go unchallenged.

I will accomplish this stated purpose by dividing the article into three major sections. First, I will discuss Cannistraci's understanding of the gift of apostle and the apostolic movement. The second section will contain a discussion of the bibliohistorical understanding of the gift of apostle and apostolic succession. Thirdly, I will provide a biblical critique of Cannistraci's understanding of the gift of apostle and the apostolic movement.

Cannistraci's Understanding of the Gift of Apostle and the Apostolic Movement

Cannistraci argues for apostolic succession, demonstrated by contemporary apostles and the apostolic movement. The propositions used to support the argument include evangelistic priority, ecclesiastical maturity, etymological utility, eschatological reality, and extra-biblical authority.

Evangelistic Priority and Apostolic Purpose

According to Cannistraci's trickle-down apostolic theory, world evangelization is dependent on the body of Christ becom-

Journal of the American Society for Church Growth, Fall 1999

ing apostolic. After outlining the seven scriptural aspects of the apostolic call,³ Cannistraci says,

To summarize, God the Father has given an apostolic calling to His Son, Jesus Christ. Christ has generously demonstrated and distributed the calling to specific individuals who become apostles. God then imparts an Apostolic Spirit and calling through these apostles to the entire Body of Christ as a reflection of His Spirit within them. This process is what we shall see increase in these last days as a part of the apostolic movement's influence. As the needs of a lost world touch the heart of the Father, the Son will gift more and more apostles, who will in turn perfect an apostolic people to reach the world.⁴

There is no doubt in Cannistraci's mind that completion of the Great Commission will be fulfilled in proportion to the restoration of the gift of apostleship today. The ultimate result of this trickle-down theory will be churches, "whose primary concern is reaching all people with Christ. They have a passion to see entire cultures embrace Jesus in his saving, healing and delivering power."⁵

What is it about these churches that make them unique and able to accomplish such a worthy objective? What is the primary characteristic of these churches? Cannistraci has an answer, and that answer is found in the next section of the article. It is to this section that we now turn for an explanation.

Ecclesiastical Maturity and the Apostolic Paradigm

The key to the fulfillment of the Great Commission is Christian unity, and the key to this unity is ecclesiastical maturity based on the apostolic paradigm (Eph. 4:11). Cannistraci is clear when he says,

Today we are all concerned about the important issue of church unity . . . Restoration of the ministry of apostles is intrinsic to church unity. Apostles, along with the other ministry gifts, were given by Christ to edify the Church and to bring it to the *unity of the faith* (see Eph. 4:11-13). If the office of the apostle is not restored, how can we hope for unity? The apostle is part of the fivefold cord God has created to tie the Body of Christ together in unity.⁶

Cannistraci's logic is as follows: unity (Eph. 4:13) is based on

maturity (Eph. 4:13), and the apostle (Eph. 4:11) is necessary for maturity. "The apostle," says Cannistraci, "is a central part of the manifold wisdom of God; not only to raise the church to maturity, but to defeat the enemy and his plan to control the earth."⁷ The church, therefore, cannot become mature until the apostle is restored.

The apostolic paradigm becomes the common ground for all sectors of the church. Cannistraci is convinced that the apostolic movement can flourish in all segments of the church regardless of the specific church tradition, because the apostolic paradigm is not just a pentecostal or charismatic paradigm. Today the great need is to, "allow the Lord to stretch us and pull us together around the patterns of His Word," remembering that the apostolic paradigm is, "a biblical pattern that the whole Body of Christ can, and must, utilize."⁸

Although Cannistraci often speaks in terms of the total body of Christ, the key to the apostolic movement is the local churches, particularly the restoration of the local church to its New Testament pattern. The movement, therefore, is definitely ecclesio-centric. Cannistraci pronounces,

In the coming apostolic movement, the Church will be the vehicle God uses to accomplish His will. The New Testament reveals that the Church is God's instrument and the apple of His eye . . . The energized local church will play an indispensable role in the coming apostolic movement.⁹

The complete New Testament pattern of the local church includes the apostle (Eph. 4:11).

Cannistraci intends to begin a conversation with all sectors of the church "that can bring us all together around the apostolic paradigm found in the New Testament. I believe that what God wants to do involves all of us, whether we are from charismatic, fundamental or other backgrounds."¹⁰

The problem with such a conversation is that the word "apostle" means many things to many people. It is, therefore, necessary for Cannistraci to help people understand what he means by the word "apostle." It is to this understanding that we now turn.

Etymological Utility and Apostolic Progression

Cannistraci's historico-contemporary usage of the word "apostle" justifies his insistence on apostolic succession. To avoid confusion, Cannistraci distinguishes, "modern apostleship," from, "unique apostleship."¹¹ Those who assume that the ministry of the apostles has ceased fail to, "differentiate between the original apostolic function represented in 'The Twelve' and the perennial apostolic function."¹² The point is that by examining the Bible,

It is evident that the twelve apostles hold a unique and authoritative position in the Kingdom. The existence of apostles beyond the number of the twelve in the New Testament is equally clear . . . The confusion between the twelve apostles (who are unique and whose function is complete) and the other apostles in the New Testament (whose function is assumed by some to be complete, but is not) has fueled the error of believing that the office has ceased.¹³

Historically, the term "apostle" has been understood in both a narrow and a broad sense.¹⁴ When Cannistraci's focus is on the apostle's work and character, his emphasis is on the sending and oversight functions of the apostle.¹⁵ But, "Above all," says Cannistraci, "we must keep in mind the picture that is painted of apostles in Ephesians 4, where they are seen as equippers given by Christ to the Body to perfect and mature it."¹⁶

Cannistraci's contemporary definition of an apostle is,

one who is called and sent by Christ to have the spiritual authority, character, gifts and abilities to successfully reach and establish people in Kingdom truth and order, especially through the founding and overseeing of local churches.¹⁷

As a primary member (1 Cor. 12:28-30; Eph. 4:11) and a foundational structure (Eph. 2:20) of the Church, apostles are, "distinct from the other ministry gifts mentioned in Scripture and appear to possess a unique place, function and importance in God's plan."¹⁸ Again, the church cannot be built without the apostle.¹⁹

The most compelling reason for the duration of the present day apostolic function is the Bible, specifically Ephesians 4:13.²⁰ Cannistraci never separates the office from the function of the

apostle, therefore, both the office and the function of apostle continues.

There must be a reason that Cannistraci is pushing this concept of an emerging apostolic movement now. The next section considers one such reason, and it is to this section that we now turn.

Eschatological Reality and the Apostolic Product

The end time global harvest is the apostolic product, which is based on the eschatological reality of the outpouring of God's Spirit (Joel 2:28; cf. James 5:17,18). This "latter rain" of God's Spirit that will usher in the harvest will, "reactivate true apostolic ministry for the harvest."²¹

Cannistraci bases his understanding of the final harvest on Mark 4:26-29. We are at the blade stage today, looking forward to the full harvest. This harvest is guaranteed because,

For two thousand years, spiritual seed has been sown by the Church, the gospel has been preached and martyrs have offered their lives as the ultimate seed. Jesus said these precious seeds would spring up in the earth suddenly and without explanation, and their appearance would manifest in discernable phases: 'First the blade, then the head, after that the full grain in the head' (v. 28).²²

The point is that Cannistraci sees that the time is ripe for the emergence of the apostolic movement. Much is happening throughout the world, indicating that God's Spirit is being poured out.²³ Modern day apostles and the emergence of an apostolic movement are a necessary consequence of such a movement of God's Spirit.

The power to accomplish such a feat is certainly not the inherent natural power of humanity. Something more is needed, and that something must be supernatural. This supernatural power will be discussed in the next section of the article.

Extra-biblical Authority and Apostolic Power

Cannistraci is unapologetic when he declares that, "The demonstration of true supernatural power is one of the most exciting aspects of the ministry of the apostle and the entire apostolic movement."²⁴ The frequency, magnitude, and demonstration of God's power through the lives of the early apostles is not

confined to the first century. For true apostolic ministry cannot be separated from the supernatural power of God.²⁵

Although having a miraculous ministry is not proof of one being an apostle, a true apostle can have nothing short of a miraculous ministry demonstrated by patience, signs, wonders and mighty deeds, which are the authenticating marks of apostleship (2 Cor. 12:12). Cannistraci locates signs and wonders ministry in the heart of God as an expression of His love for people. "What is the Bible," says Cannistraci, "if it is not the record of God's supernatural power flowing through His people to demonstrate His nature of love and compassion?"²⁶

There are seven manifestations of supernatural apostolic power.²⁷ Cannistraci contends that apostles receive extra-biblical revelation through the Spirit of revelation. This revelatory information comes through visions (Acts 10:9-22; 18:9, 10; 2 Cor. 12:1), words of knowledge (Acts 5:3; 10:19,20), and the supernatural prophetic gifts (1 Tim. 1:18; 2 Tim. 1:6). One thing is clear,

The apostles in the Bible moved in supernatural revelation from the Holy Spirit, and depended upon it for success in ministry. Although the canon of Scripture is unchangeable and complete and today's apostles are not authorized to write their revelations in the form of Scripture, as did their counterparts the prophets, they are nonetheless authorized by pattern and example of the first-century apostles to receive supernatural revelations if they are consistent with Scripture.²⁸

The point is that contemporary apostles have the ability to receive supernatural, extra-biblical revelation from the Spirit of God.

A Summary of Cannistraci's Understanding of the Gift of Apostle and the Apostolic Movement

There is a direct relationship between the full and final world harvest of souls, and the gift of apostle conjoined with the apostolic movement. The rate of the gathering in of the harvest is directly proportional to the restoration of apostles in the contemporary Church.

The restoration of the apostle in the contemporary Church, initiated by the outpouring of God's Spirit, completes the New Testament pattern (Eph. 4:11). Such restoration commences the

emergence of a worldwide apostolic movement that is driven by mature and unified local churches. All churches, regardless of tradition, must adopt this apostolic paradigm of unity and maturity (Eph. 4:13).

Thus a mature church is a supernatural church, because of the supernatural power and authority of the apostles. Because of their ability to receive direct revelation from God, these apostles can use such revelation to guide the church, and to provide instruction to the people. This extra-biblical revelation that is received directly by the apostles becomes an additional source of divine authority for the church.

Is Cannistraci's understanding of the gift of apostle and the apostolic movement correct? I will show that his understanding is not only incorrect, but harmful to God's church.

A Biblio-historical Understanding of the Gift of Apostle and the Apostolic Movement

This section of the article is concerned with the biblio-historical understanding of the gift of apostle and the apostolic movement. I will divide this section into four subsections which are a biblical analysis, an exegetical/hermeneutical analysis, a theological analysis, and an ecclesiological analysis.

A Biblical Analysis

The word "apostle"²⁹ is used in the New Testament in a primordial, foundational, general, and classical sense. First, the writer of Hebrews calls Jesus an apostle (Heb. 3:1). In addition, the twelve disciples whom Jesus calls to be apostles become the foundation of the church (Eph. 2:20). Further, others beside the twelve are called apostles (Acts 14:4, 14; Rom. 16:7; 2 Cor. 8:23; Phil 2:25; 1 Thes. 2:6). Finally, Paul is the classical example of an apostle. Such an analysis indicates that the word "apostle" was used in the New Testament in both a narrow and a broad way.

The biblical evidence substantiates the claim that the role of the apostles, used in the narrow sense, was non-repeatable and irreplaceable. Thus the Twelve represent a significant initiative pushed forward by Jesus. These apostles formed the foundation of the church (Eph. 2:20). Having been both personally chosen by Jesus Christ (Matt. 10:1-4; Luke 6:12-16) and an eyewitness to his resurrection (Acts 1:21-22; 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:7-8), these men became the absolute authoritative revelatory agents of God (Jude 17) who were authenticated by miraculous signs (2 Cor. 12:12). Cor-

responding to the Twelve Patriarchs, these apostles were the representatives of the New Israel, and they would be forever honored by having their names on the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:14).

Paul was the last person to whom the risen Lord appeared (1 Cor. 15:8). Thus, having met this qualification to be an apostle, he was called to be an apostle (Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 1:1) to the Gentiles by the will of God (2 Tim. 1:1). Paul, therefore, is considered to be a primary conduit through which the Gospel passed into the Gentile world.

The wider use of the word "apostle" opens the door for questions to arise concerning apostolic succession, the gift of apostle, the office of apostle, and the relationship between apostles and the church. In two of Paul's letters he discusses the apostle in the context of the church (1 Cor. 12:28-29; Eph. 4:11). The next subsection addresses the exegetical and hermeneutical analyses of these two passages.

An Exegetical Analysis

The primary task in this section is to examine these two passages that refer to the possibility of a gift of apostle (1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11). The purpose of this exercise is to be able to arrive at a sound theological basis for such a gift. To bring specific theological categorizations or presuppositions to the exegetical task is to place the theological cart before the biblical horse. These specific interests must not become the critical hermeneutical factor, thus subordinating what the Bible says to a secondary significance.

The Corinthian problem³⁰ yielded a corrective, not an instructional, response from Paul. Because the problem was an abuse of the gift of tongues, Paul was concerned with putting tongues into a broader context--the context of edification of the body of Christ. Paul's pneumatology, therefore, is Christocentric evidenced by his discussion in the first three verses.

The text (1 Cor. 12:1) allows for the translation of *pneumatikon*: concerning spiritual men; however, the context supports the view of spiritual gifts.³¹ Certainly it is true that spiritual persons are those who have spiritual gifts; however, the content, not the manner, of one's speech is the gauge of the veracity of personal spirituality (12:3).

Paul argues for diversity within unity in the remainder of this chapter. His point is that diversity, not uniformity, is necessary for a healthy church. This diversity shows up in the very

character of God (12:4-11), the nature of the church (12:12-26), and the variety of persons in the church (12:27 ff.).³²

What is clear is that apostles stand at the top of Paul's list in this last section (12:27 ff.). The issue is whether Paul had in mind an office, gift, or function when he constructed this list. The word "and" (12:28) indicates a change of subject, whereby Paul begins to speak about the diversity of offices and gifts in the body of Christ.³³ The word *etheto* ("placed for his own use") expresses the notion that these various functions depend on the sovereign will of God.³⁴ In keeping with Paul's concern for the edification of the body that he has hinted at already (12:7), and that he will stress later (1 Cor. 14), the use of the word "apostle" is primarily functional in this list.³⁵

In sum, apostles are mentioned first (12:28), but there is no conclusive evidence that the word "apostle" meant gift or office in this specific context. The biblical evidence does not warrant such a conclusion. In fact, to make such an assertion either way is mere speculation. The most that can be said from this context is that Paul acknowledged that apostles functioned in the body of Christ and that they were first in priority over prophets and teachers.

The theme of unity is pervasive in the fourth chapter of Ephesians.³⁶ The proviso for unity is God's grace. The one church of Jesus Christ arising out of both Jews and Gentiles, becomes a reality because of God's grace. This chapter concerns itself with a vision of corporate life necessary to achieve such a unity of purpose. A note of diversity is introduced in the distribution of grace by Christ to each individual member of the church (Eph. 4:7-16). The purpose of individual diversity is for the increase of corporate unity as evidenced by the flow of thought from verses seven through eleven.

It has been suggested that verse seven is the hermeneutical key to this passage.³⁷ The argument is centered on the need to interpret the word "gift," along with the term "grace" in the same verse (4:7).³⁸ Paul uses the word "grace" (*charis*) in other places in his writing to refer to the gifts to the church (Rom. 12:3 ff.; 1 Cor. 12:4 ff.). The point is that all Christians have a part to play in the body life of the church, and each member has been endowed with some gift by the grace of God.³⁹ The grace of God, therefore, is the basis for all ministry based upon Paul's projection of the doctrine of justification into his ecclesiology.⁴⁰

This interpretation is significant for a proper understanding

of Paul's discussion in verse eleven. It is apparent that corporate unity and church growth is absolutely dependent on the ministry of the Word (4:11-13). Here the gifts that the exalted Christ gave to the church were persons, specifically, ministers of the Word whose responsibility it was to equip the members of the body for the work of the ministry and the building up of the body (4:12).

The situation addressed in verse eleven is noteworthy because Paul calls the apostles gifts to the church, given by Jesus Christ himself.⁴¹ Since the normative word for gift (*charisma*) is not used in this chapter, the question arises as to whether the apostles have the corresponding spiritual gift. There is no explicit evidence to argue for the gift of apostle. What can be said for certain is that God gave apostles to the church for a specific purpose.

Is there any evidence that this passage advocates an office of apostle, relating to a specific ecclesiastical structure? The likelihood that this passage refers to a developing ecclesiastical structure⁴² is strong; therefore, the church was moving from a ministry of function (1 Cor. 12), with charismatic leadership, to a ministry of semi-structure here, with ecclesiastical officials.⁴³ Although there is no hint here of ordination to office, or of any legitimization of office like that found in the Pastorals, the exercise of such ministries would have required acceptance and recognition by their churches. Textually, it is apparent that Paul sees the apostle's significance in the past tense, meaning that in the postapostolic period it is the evangelists who continue to carry out the activities of the apostles.

Why does the exalted Christ give these gifts to the church? Exegetically, verse twelve can accommodate two different interpretations.⁴⁴ The first option insists that the ministers are to equip God's people to do the work of ministry, thereby fulfilling their work of ministry by building up the body. The second option places the responsibility of building up the body on the apostolic ministry of these leaders (v. 11).⁴⁵ Taking a position against popular opinion, it is likely that the second option is the most probable interpretation.⁴⁶ The focus, therefore, is on the apostolic ministry preparing God's people, and in so doing it is the apostolic ministry that is building up the body.

The conjunction "until" (4:13) conveys the "already--not yet" tension that exists with the whole body of Christ in terms of maturity.⁴⁷ These ministers (v. 11) are needed for this period of the

“not yet” to help the church progress toward the eschatological goals of unity and maturity. The object of this unity is the Word of God; therefore, it is the task of these ministers of the Word to, “ensure that there is a progressive movement toward the goal of full appropriation of the one faith and of the one knowledge of Christ.⁴⁸ The ministry of the Word is essential to bring the body to maturity, “which is a fully completed church embodying all his fullness.”⁴⁹

The point is that the apostles were recognized as essential components of the first century church. The question is whether or not they continued to be a part of the church following the first century. To answer such a question we must examine the apostle’s function in the first century church.

In the narrow sense, the apostles had a foundational function (Eph. 2:20). Their qualifications were such that no one could be an apostle who was not with Jesus from the time of John’s baptism, or who did not see the risen Christ (Acts 1:21-22). The conclusion is obvious that these apostles had a temporary ministry even though their influence was enduring.

What are the theological ramifications of this conclusion? Is there a relationship between this conclusion and doctrinal orthodoxy in general, and biblical authority specifically? The next section deals with such considerations.

A Theological Analysis

Theologically there are really only two positions concerning the issue in question.⁵⁰ A Scripture-only principle supports a cessationist viewpoint concerning apostles, while a Scripture-plus principle supports the continuation of apostles past the first century. Only the Scripture-only principle necessitates a closed canon. The Scripture-plus principle belies scriptural authority and undermines scriptural sufficiency.⁵¹

The cessationist position is the only one that provides a biblically-satisfactory and consistent answer to the question of apostolicity. Richard Gaffin⁵² argues for a christological, ecclesiological-missiological understanding of Pentecost, rather than an anthropological-experiential one.⁵³ Pentecost, therefore, belongs to the history of salvation, not the order of salvation.⁵⁴ Such an interpretation provides a reasonable biblical base for understanding how apostles can be the foundation of the church (Eph. 2:20). In response to Christ’s finished work, the apostles are, “Christ’s authorized witnesses, appointed by the resurrected Christ him-

self to bear authoritative testimony to his resurrection and its implications (Acts 1:2, 8, 21-26; 1 Cor. 9:1; 15:1-4, 8-11; Gal. 1:1, 15-16). The apostles are the foundation of the church because of their witness--their inspired revelatory witness (Eph. 3:5).⁵⁵ The point is that to the once-for-all work of Christ is joined the once-for-all witness to that work. Gaffin explains,

Here is the matrix for the New Testament canon, for the emergence of a new body of revelation to stand alongside what eventually becomes the Old Testament. So apostolicity, though not strictly a criterion of canonicity (several New Testament documents were not written by apostles), is undeniably the medium or matrix of canonicity. With this foundational revelation completed, and so too their foundational role as witnesses, the apostles pass from the life of the church.⁵⁶

Apostolic succession, therefore, is a contradiction in terms.

Robert Saucy (open-but-cautious) is in reality more cautious than he is open to the miraculous gifts today. He is correct that, "The New Testament does not explicitly teach the cessation of certain gifts at a particular point in the experience of the church."⁵⁷ His cessationist tendency is revealed when he argues that, "there are several lines of evidence that demonstrate that the miraculous phenomena experienced in the early biblical church are not standard for the life of the church throughout all time."⁵⁸

C. Samuel Storms (third wave) qualifies apostleship as an office, not a gift. He argues that if apostleship were a gift, it would be the only one in which a person would have to meet certain qualifications.⁵⁹ The third wave position is sure that all the gifts are operative today, and their distinctive feature is that the church must expect God to use such gifts.

Douglas Oss (pentecostal/charismatic) agrees that, "those appointed to be apostles of Christ, to govern the early church, and to produce the infallible body of doctrine that came to be the New Testament canon, functioned in a unique, unrepeatable, foundational role in the building of the church (Eph. 2:19-22)."⁶⁰ Oss does want to hold to the inconsistent idea that somehow the notion of the cessation of the apostles can exist alongside the continuation of revelatory word gifts (tongues/interpretation, prophecy).

Apostolic succession in any form, therefore, is a contradic-

tion in terms. At issue is the unique once-for-all status of the apostolate. There is a non-continuing presence of apostles in the life of the church. This complete foundational witness is preserved in the New Testament. To maintain a continuation of revelatory word gifts today is to stand in opposition to the canonicity of the New Testament in closed form.

Historically the Church has wavered on this point. Some branches have adhered to the biblical view of cessation, while others have adopted the continuationist view. An ecclesiological analysis will provide an historical understanding of apostolicity.

An Ecclesiological Analysis

For theology to do its work adequately there is a need for familiarity with the history of the church.⁶¹ Church history⁶² is organic, meaning that every generation has its antecedents; therefore, we are influenced by both our predecessors and our peers.

Two competing systems of thought, each one based on a different standard of authority, exist in the history of the church. Generally the restorationists, with their experiential authority, view history anachronistically, while the conservationists, with their biblical authority, take a progressive outlook. In other words the millennial fervor of the charismatics creates a myopic perspective, yielding a desire to return to the primitive era of Christianity. In contrast the confessionalists' purview of history, located in the context of God's sovereign purpose, results in a desire for biblical fidelity and cultural engagement.

Interestingly extra-biblical authority is a common feature of both the charismatic and Roman Catholic traditions. Apostolic succession proceeds through the bishop of Rome in the Catholic church; therefore, extra-biblical authority here is institutional in nature because the Pope speaks for the church. Apostolic succession, therefore, is linked to an ecclesial office, not a spiritual gift. In the charismatic tradition extra-biblical authority is more personal, meaning that extra-biblical revelation comes to certain persons with certain gifts, and they in turn speak for God.

The apostolic church was characterized by spiritual vitality and apostolic authority. Certainly first century Christianity was charismatic in the sense that these Christians used their spiritual gifts to build up the churches. These churches were not uniform in structure; however, deacons, elders, and bishops were emerging as common organizational features.⁶³ The church was apos-

toloc because it was built on the apostolic foundation.⁶⁴

Organizational development and intellectual formulation characterized the ancient church.⁶⁵ During this time the church grew from a small band of committed believers (Acts 2:42) to large congregations made up of nominal Christians.⁶⁶ There were two major challenges to the church in regard to revelation: the Marcionites and the Montanists, or, the minimalists and the maximists respectively. Standing on the shoulders of some serious brokers of Gnosticism, Montanus tried to reform the church by emphasizing the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷ The authoritative canon was the major contribution of the ancient church in terms of authority.⁶⁸

The medieval period of church history was marked by the development of papal supremacy.⁶⁹ Traditional Roman Catholicism, however, failed to develop an adequate theology of spiritual gifts.⁷⁰ This period was a time of rebirth for the heresies of Gnosticism and Marcionite dualism. The dualism in the West was fanatical, charismatic, and wildly enthusiastic. The concept of extended authority was emerging at this time, which eventually gave rise to a dual source of revelation and authority: Scripture and tradition.⁷¹

The Reformation church was the result of a political, social, and cultural upheaval occurring in Western Europe during the sixteenth century, which resulted in the shift from the medieval world to the modern world. It has been said that, "the Reformers rediscovered the Augustinian principle of the invisible church but not without a concern for the visible church."⁷² John Calvin introduced a second form of church government known as the government by the presbytery. Consequently, Presbyterian and Reformed churches recognize only two offices in the church—elders and deacons.⁷³

Lutheran and Reformed theologians seldom mentioned spiritual gifts. Both Calvin and Luther identified gifts with material blessings or talents, while Calvin was sure that the miraculous gifts had ceased with the death of the last apostle.⁷⁴ The Anabaptists believed that the gifts were being restored as a sign of the end of the world. The point is that, "Luther, Calvin, and Beza stood in succession to earlier writers such as Chrysostom, Augustine, Basil, Theodoret, and others in their opposition to the charismatics of their day."⁷⁵

Luther was against the principle of extended authority. Calvin was against the view that the church conferred authority on

Scripture, arguing that the authority of Scripture is intrinsic. The Anabaptists were literalists and looked for the plain meaning of Scripture. Arminius relied on an evidential approach to Scripture. It was Wesley's hermeneutic that opened the way for a dynamic view of Scripture.⁷⁶

The modern church was characterized by the breakdown of biblical authority. The Enlightenment shifted the focus of authority away from the Scripture and the church to reason. The orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century responded to Descartes' Cartesian methodology by emphasizing the doctrine of inerrancy, which became the guarantee of biblical authority. Biblical criticism was a direct result of the age of reason, and as such, became a way of destroying biblical authority by reducing the Bible to a human book.⁷⁷

The holiness movement⁷⁸ of the late nineteenth century spawned the pentecostal movement that began at the turn of the twentieth century.⁷⁹ Curiously the pentecostals emphasized mainly the gifts of tongues and healing. Neo-pentecostalism, or the charismatic movement, began with the formation of prayer groups within Protestant and Catholic churches.⁸⁰ The charismatic renewal movement spun off the "signs and wonders" movement (Wimber, 1970s-1980s), the prayer movement (1980s-1990s), and the apostolic movement (1990s-2000).

The "signs and wonders" movement focuses on healing and power evangelism, while the prayer movement focuses on intercessory prayer and exorcism. The apostolic movement focuses on the gift of apostle. The question remains, "Is there such a thing as a gift of apostle?"

In our discussion thus far we have ascertained several important facts. First, the word "apostle" is used in Scripture in both a narrow and a broad way. To be certain, the role of the apostles, used in the narrow sense, was non-repeatable and irreplaceable. These men formed the foundation of the church. Second, there is no explicit exegetical or hermeneutical evidence that the word "apostle" meant gift in either the Corinthian or Ephesian passages we studied. Third, only a Scripture-only principle necessitates a closed canon, thus obviating the continuation of the presence of apostles in the church today. Fourth, there has always been a charismatic impulse in the church. The restorationists, with their experiential authority, view history anachronistically; therefore, their millennial fervor creates a myopic perspective, yielding a desire to return to primitive Christianity.

Journal of the American Society for Church Growth, Fall 1999

Now we must address the issue of the broad use of the word "apostle," considering whether or not this usage substantiates the claim for a gift of apostle. One explanation for the use of the word "apostle" is in the context of missionary activity.⁸¹ The name is applied to the first Christian missionaries, and to the itinerant missionaries in the second century.⁸² The Greek word, "*apostole*," means simply, "mission," or, "being sent." It has been suggested that the recent usage of this word in the sense of mission is because the term "mission" no longer carries the sense of the church sent out into the world that does not know Christ.⁸³

An ardent spokesman for the "missionary gift" does not make an exact equivalent between "apostle" and the "missionary gift."⁸⁴ Wagner's argument for the continuation of the gift of apostle is based solely on the fact that there were others in the Bible called apostles.⁸⁵

Who were these others who were called apostles? These persons include Barnabas (Acts 14:4, 14), Silas and Timothy (1 Thes. 1:1; 2:6-7), and Andronicus and Junias (Rom. 16:7). Barnabas was sent by the Jerusalem church to help the growing work in Antioch, and was commissioned with Paul to preach beyond the boundaries of Antioch. It seems apparent that Barnabas was one whom Paul referred to as, "an apostle of the church" (2 Cor. 8:23).⁸⁶ Silas was a prophet (Acts 15:32) and missionary on Paul's second missionary journey (Acts 15: 36-41). It has been suggested that he co-authored the epistles to the Thessalonians (1 Thes. 1:1; 2:6-7; cf. 3:2,6) and was a scribe who worked with Peter (1 Pet. 5:12). Such activity placed him under the direct authority of an apostle.⁸⁷

Timothy was a disciple of Paul, a missionary with Paul, and the pastor of the church in Ephesus. Paul poured his life into Timothy and authorized him to appoint elders and establish order in the Ephesian church.⁸⁸

Andronicus and Junias are referred to as "of note among the apostles" (Rom. 16:7). This phrase may be interpreted either as designating the "high esteem in which they were held by the Twelve, or as reckoning them in the number of apostles. The latter is the sense, if "apostle" be understood here in the more general meaning."⁸⁹

It is clear that each of these individuals were under the direct supervision or authority of Paul, and in the case of Andronicus and Junias, it is not altogether clear that they are even referred to as apostles. To make the case that the gift of apostle continues

because these persons were called apostles is tenuous to say the least.

In addition, let us be clear about what is meant by spiritual gifts. Two concepts are involved in reference to spiritual gifts: 1) "a spiritual gift to an individual is God's enablement for personal spiritual service," 2) "a spiritual gift to the church is a person uniquely equipped for the church's edification and maturation."⁹⁰ The sign gifts that were "signs of an apostle" (2 Cor. 12:12) include tongues (1 Cor. 14:22), exorcisms (Matt. 10:8), raising the dead (Matt. 10:8), and healing every disease and sickness (Matt. 10:1). It must be recognized that apostles were gifts to the church who were able to do extraordinary things by the grace of God.

Standing in the first century and looking to the future of the church, the Bible projects a church that is organized around bishops, elders, presbyters, pastors, and deacons. Looking back at the church, apostles did not continue to operate past the first century.⁹¹

The biblical, exegetical/hermeneutical, theological, and historical evidence suggests that there is no gift of apostle. Apostles, in the narrow sense, were gifts given to the church. These men exercised miraculous sign gifts and were part of the foundation of the church. In the broad sense, these people acted as missionaries and associates to an apostle. Since there is no gift, it cannot continue. Likewise, because of the nature of the apostolic office, it cannot continue either.

A Critique of Cannistraci's Understanding of the Gift of Apostle and the Apostolic Movement

The purpose of this section of the article is to provide a critique of Cannistraci's understanding of the gift of apostle and the apostolic movement. The main method I will use is an examination of each of the subsections of the first major division of this article. The strategy will include both a positive and a negative assessment of this paradigm.

The first two subsections must be taken together. Positively, Cannistraci emphasizes world evangelization through church planting. Correctly, he views this evangelistic mandate ecclesio-centrally.

Negatively, Cannistraci misunderstands the apostolicity of the church. Apostolicity is not just one of the four marks of the church, rather it is the master mark that shapes the others: the

gospel creates the church.⁹² The message of the gospel--Jesus Christ and him crucified--is primordial in character, because this message is more basic than the apostles and prophets who make up the foundation of the church. As such, "evangelicals do not define apostolicity in terms of a literal, linear succession of duly ordained bishops," in the Roman Catholic sense.⁹³ Nor, I might add, should evangelicals define apostolicity in terms of a revival of the gift of apostle. Thus Cannistraci's misunderstanding of apostolicity is an affront to the self-authenticating nature of the Word of God.

In the second subsection, Cannistraci is guilty of eisegesis when he bases ecclesial maturity on the apostolic paradigm.⁹⁴ To indicate that the apostle completes the New Testament pattern for the contemporary church is to say something that the Bible does not say in Ephesians 4:11. Contrary to Cannistraci's claim to a five-fold ministry, the biblical text sets the pastors and teachers apart from the other three categories.⁹⁵

The third subsection includes a discussion concerning Cannistraci's understanding of the word "apostle." He is correct in distinguishing between the twelve and others who are called apostles in the Bible. Confusion results when Cannistraci argues for a restoration of modern apostles based on Ephesians 4:13. Again, there is no exegesis of that passage to determine what is meant; rather, there is just a statement of alleged fact based on the immature status of the contemporary church.

Cannistraci is confusing at this point because he wants to attribute the foundational function of the foundational apostles to the contemporary apostles. Although he suggests a perennial function, he insists that these apostles receive revelatory information. He cannot have it both ways; therefore, because the other apostles were eventually called missionaries and evangelists, let us call them what they are and stop the confusion.⁹⁶

The fourth subsection explains Cannistraci's millennial fervor and overrealized eschatology.⁹⁷ The outpouring of God's Spirit ("latter rain") is that which is supposed to activate the true gift of apostle, leading to the apostolic movement; therefore, an apostolic movement is necessary in order to realize the harvest. Cannistraci is guilty of convoluted argumentation and textual disconnection. The term "latter rain" is the charismatic reference to the last days spoken of by Peter on the day of Pentecost. Cannistraci fails to demonstrate textually the connection between the final harvest and the restoration of the gift of apostle in combina-

tion with the apostolic movement.

The fifth subsection deals with the most critical issue of this whole system: the authority and sufficiency of Scripture. Cannistraci's claims of extra-biblical revelation and "signs and wonders" of these new apostles necessitates an investigation into the nature and essence of this movement. I will show that Cannistraci's claims are non-evangelical, heretical, and cultic in nature.

Cannistraci is a self-proclaimed charismatic, and as such reveals a certain philosophical, theological, and epistemological concept of truth.⁹⁸ Juxtaposed to an evangelical understanding of these components,⁹⁹ it is evident that there are significant charismatic divergences that are worth noting. Specifically, other sources of knowledge, such as experience, are not denied by evangelicals; but the ultimate epistemic base is God, and thus God's knowledge is revealed in Scripture.

The charismatic concept of extra-biblical revelation is an immense divergence in thought from historic evangelical thought. The problem with extra-biblical revelation is that eventually this revelation supplants the authority of the Bible.¹⁰⁰ Not that biblical authority is totally rejected by the charismatics, at least in the verbal sense; rather, the fact is that biblical authority is undermined by dialectical conclusions.

An example is seen with the concept of the word of knowledge, or revelation knowledge.¹⁰¹ The charismatic movement has a tendency toward a heightened dualism, which gives an imbalanced profile to ideas such as satanic/demonic activity and spiritual warfare. McConnell expresses the sentiments of evangelicals when he says, "The main cause for these chronic doctrinal tangents is: from its inception to the present, the independent charismatic movement has had a defective doctrine of revelation."¹⁰²

Does God speak today apart from the Bible? As long as God does not contradict his Word, what difference does it make if he does or does not? For some, to say that God speaks today is simply a way of describing God's guidance and direction of his people by the application of his Word through promptings, impressions, and insights. For others, to say that God speaks means that God gives them words through the same media that he used in the past.¹⁰³ The problem with this second usage, as two scholars admit, is that the words God speaks today are not at the same level as the words God spoke in the past.¹⁰⁴ A question that Cannistraci must answer is, "How can these words that God speaks today to his children, be so necessary and strategic to

God's highest purpose for their lives when their Father does nothing to ensure that they will ever actually hear those words?" The problem is that these new words from God are diverting attention away from the Scriptures, thus quenching the Spirit who speaks therein.¹⁰⁵

A deficient view of God relates to an inadequate understanding of Scripture. Cannistraci's theological heritage is in the Arminian tradition, which has a human-centered focus. Omniscience, omnipotence, and transcendent sovereignty are primary characteristics that are lacking in the Arminian understanding of God.¹⁰⁶ The charismatic tendency toward a heightened supernaturalism places a premium on the work of the Holy Spirit in personal experience. A problem arises when this activity is disengaged from Scripture, because, "[t]he Spirit does not speak in ways that are independent of Scripture."¹⁰⁷ In other words, God's revelational Word is tethered to his Word; therefore, God's Word, not experience, is the test of truth. Thus Scripture is, "wholly sufficient to meet every need of the human soul."¹⁰⁸

Historically, evangelicals have practiced a complementarity of Word and Spirit. An imbalance of one or the other will result in rationalism or subjectivism respectively. The point is that the Spirit does not bring a new revelation, but illumines the meaning of the text for today, and in so doing fulfills the original meaning.

To level a charge of heresy against any movement is serious. The most dangerous heresies lie in the gray areas, those places of light and darkness; therefore, their threat to the church is directly proportional to the degree in which they appear orthodox. Cannistraci's doctrine of revelation is heretical because it cuts the heart out of the full and final authority and sufficiency of Scripture. While adhering to a fully authoritative Word, in and of itself, Cannistraci really undermines such authority by denying its full sufficiency. To admit that the Bible is not fully sufficient for faith and practice is reductionistic in thinking. This charge does not mean that every participant in this movement is heretical, because some may not realize the nature of the problem.

In addition, there are twelve specific areas in which a thoroughgoing critique is needed.¹⁰⁹ I will identify the area and point out the problem.

1. An imbalance between the transcendent and immanent nature of God can lead to a sharp transcendentalism, resulting in an either/or approach to life situations. An example would be

where one must rely either upon medicine or God, but not both at the same time.

2. Cannistraci's epistemological presupposition that Christians have direct access to God tends to place the emphasis on the subjective element called illumination; however, he misunderstands illumination to mean the communication of new information. This new information includes more than the cognitive dimension based on an objective element of authority; God also reveals new information about people, their needs and problems, as well as their sins.

3. Cannistraci's non-dialogical understanding of history means that all that is needed is a replay of the biblical events and people will believe. This back to the future approach is a serious misunderstanding of how God works in the historical context.

4. An overrealized eschatology attributes benefits assigned to the eschaton to the present. Overcoming physical illness, restraining spiritual evil, and raising the dead are three such phenomena. In other words Cannistraci's movement is an attempt to experience the millennium now.

5. A considerable separation between personal piety and social righteousness is the result of a privatistic and individualistic concept of the Christian life. In this way, Cannistraci resembles fundamentalism more than evangelicalism.

6. A macro-hermeneutical assumption means that all of Scripture applies to all periods of time, which is a stance that is diametrically opposed to dispensationalism. There is no need to distinguish between meaning and significance in interpretation, because the meaning then is the meaning now, and there is no difference in application.

7. The emphasis on the humanity of Christ, rather than the difference between him and us, means that Christians today are called to continue his actions and ministry. We must do what Jesus did literally.

8. There seems to be a strange anthropological naivete about the movement. The presence of signs and wonders can be found in other religions in the world. It is not a matter of whether the signs and wonders within Christianity are more effective than are those of other religions, but rather it is a question of whether the signs and wonders are genuine and not spurious. By ignoring this issue this movement is both anthropologically and theologically naive.

9. A third world supernaturalism is prevalent, yet what is ac-

tually being promoted is a prescientific or premodern world-view. What is happening, is that in the interest of advancing the faith, the movement may be recommending superstition and animism instead of supernaturalism. What is needed is a philosophical critique of the presuppositions of their anthropological method.

10. The temptation is to buy into the narcissistic assumption that health is the highest of all goods, thus elevating secondary factors into primary roles. The tendency is to value power for power itself. An overemphasis on the unusual means that there is a virtual denial that God works in less spectacular ways, thus neglecting the biblical witness to the immanent nature of God. By emphasizing the spectacular, the movement overlooks the less subtle ways that satan works.

11. Selective authority is something for which Cannistraci needs to respond. Such things as walking on water and feeding 5000 people with no apparent food in sight are not feats that are duplicated today. If these are not being repeated, then why not, if we are to carry on the same ministry as Jesus?

12. The heavy emphasis on the kingdom of God fuels the power encounters. The power of the kingdom of God does not only belong to Jesus, but to all the church down through the ages.

Cannistraci's desire to reach a lost world without Christ is commendable, but is this apostolic paradigm another pragmatically-driven method? He must answer the question, "Is it proper to jettison the full and final authority and sufficiency of Scripture in order to reach a lost world for Christ?" Is Cannistraci willing to examine critically the apostolic paradigm and ask, "Is pragmatism driving the subjectivistic hermeneutic of this system?"

An Overall Summary

The first major section of the article revealed a logical, but highly misinformed attempt to argue for a direct relationship between world evangelization and the restoration of the gift of apostle. I found three major concerns with the argument. First, there is no direct and explicit biblical evidence to support either a direct, or indirect, proportional relationship between world evangelization and the restoration of the gift of apostle and an emerging apostolic movement. Second, there is no direct and explicit biblical evidence that supports the notion that the restoration of apostles will complete the New Testament pattern for

the contemporary church. Third, there is no direct and explicit biblical evidence that suggests that a supernatural church today is dependent upon the supernatural power and authority of apostles.

The biblical analysis revealed that the word "apostle" is used in both a narrow and broad sense. The word "apostles," used in the narrow sense, formed the foundation of the church, thus their foundational function is non-repeatable and irreplaceable. Apostles, in the broad sense, were missionaries, preaching the gospel to those who had never heard it before.

Exegetically, the word "apostle" in the first Corinthian passage was used in a functional sense, while its official sense was determined in the Ephesians passage. In neither of these passages was there direct and explicit biblical evidence to suggest that the word was used to recognize a gift of apostle.

Theologically, a Scripture-only principle of revelation supports a closed canon, thus recognizing the absolute, full and final authority and sufficiency of Scripture. A Scripture-plus principle of revelation belies scriptural authority and undermines its sufficiency. Apostolicity, therefore, is the medium or matrix of canonicity, because the foundational revelation is complete. Thus apostolic succession is a contradiction in terms.

Ecclesiologically, the restorationists, with their experiential authority, view history anachronistically. The charismatic millennial fervor creates a myopic perspective, yielding a desire for primitivistic Christianity. On the other hand, the conservationists, with their biblical authority, take a progressive outlook. A confessionalist purview of history located in the context of God's sovereign purposes, results in a desire for biblical fidelity and cultural engagement.

Consequently, there is no direct or explicit biblical evidence for a gift of apostle, therefore, there can be no such thing as an emerging apostolic movement. Such teaching is non-evangelical, heretical, and cultic.

Conclusion

Cannistraci's egregious assault on the authority and sufficiency of Scripture is evidenced by his heretical proposition for the renewal of the gift of apostle and the emergence of an apostolic movement. Such tinder ought to ignite the biblical and theological fires of those who are committed to historical evangelicalism.

Journal of the American Society for Church Growth, Fall 1999

Evangelicals who are committed to historic orthodox Protestantism must challenge this wave of revelational reductionism and hermeneutical subjectivism. These theological minimalists have influenced greatly a host of people using a post-modern method: deconstructionism and the new hermeneutic.

God's Word deserves a better treatment than it is being given by modern day Montanists and Gnostics. There is no reason to fall biblically or theologically toward an imbalance in either a rationalistic or subjectivistic direction. We must keep the heart and head in balance, protecting ourselves from either a disengagement of the mind, resulting in an enthusiastic spirituality without substance, or a disingenuous attitude toward the Spirit, yielding a docile commitment to a set of propositional statements in the context of a frigid form of Christianity.

Reviewer

Crabtree, John. Address: 416 Apple Tree Dr., Fishers, IN 46038. John earned a B.S. from Indiana-Purdue University, a B.S. from the University of Louisville, and both the M.Div. and Th.M. from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, KY. He will receive his Ph.D. in May 2000 from SBTS also. John is presently a senior consultant with the American Association of Church Consultants. He has pastored for fifteen years.

NOTES

1. C. Peter Wagner states, "David Cannistraci, a key figure in the Postdenominational Movement, is a person of giftedness, wisdom and experience beyond his years. He is one of those rare people who is seen simultaneously as a scholar and a practitioner. Not only does Dr. Cannistraci develop theories, but he also makes sure his theories have gone through hands-on experimentation before he advocates them." David Cannistraci, *Apostles and the Emerging Apostolic Movement* (Ventura: Renew Books, 1996), 12. This book is the main resource that I will use to explain Cannistraci's understanding of apostles and the apostolic movement.

2. Harold O. J. Brown states, "The word 'heresy,' as we have noted, is the English version of the Greek noun *hairesis*, originally meaning nothing more insidious than 'party.' It is used in this neutral sense in Acts 5:17, 15:5, and 26:5. Early in the history of the first Christians, however, 'heresy' came to be used to mean a separation or split resulting from a false faith (1 Cor. 11:19; Gal. 5:20). It designated either a doctrine or the party holding the doctrine, a doctrine that was sufficiently intol-

erable to destroy the unity of the Christian church. In the early church, heresy did not refer to simply any doctrinal disagreement, but to something that seemed to undercut the very basis for Christian existence." Harold O. J. Brown, *Heresies*, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1984), 2. It is my contention that an assault on the authority and sufficiency of God's Word is not just a doctrinal disagreement, but something that undercuts the basis for Christian existence. It is for this reason, therefore, that Cannistraci's proposal for an apostolic movement is heretical.

3. The seven scriptural aspects of the apostolic call are: 1) the apostolic call originates from deep within the Father's heart; 2) the apostolic call, which comes from the Father, has its eternal residence in Christ, the Apostle; 3) Christ imparts his apostleship to people; 4) the calling of an apostle is personal and specific; 5) the apostolic call is a command from God in Christ; 6) the apostolic call touches and transforms; and, 7) the apostolic call results in the formation of an apostolic people. Cannistraci, 50.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*, 176.

6. *Ibid.*, 196.

7. *Ibid.*, 48.

8. *Ibid.*, 36–37.

9. *Ibid.*, 175.

10. *Ibid.*, 19.

11. "Unique apostleship" includes those men who, "wrote much of the New Testament and whose functions will never be duplicated by another." *Ibid.*, 20. (*italics original*)

12. *Ibid.*, 80. (*italics original*)

13. *Ibid.*, 80–81.

14. Cannistraci states, "In the evangelical Protestant tradition, influenced by cessationist theology, apostleship is usually restricted to these twelve with perhaps a few exceptions The term 'apostle' has also been used to refer to the leaders of the first Christian missions to a country, such as Saint Patrick of Ireland or Saint Cyril of the Slavs In the Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and Episcopal traditions, the term 'apostle' is usually associated with *apostolic succession* Various other fairly common uses of the word 'apostle' or 'apostolic' are as follows: Since the seventeenth century the first generation of church leaders after the New Testament have been labeled 'the Apostolic Fathers'; the most widely accepted affirmation of faith among Christians is the 'Apostles' Creed'; one of the most popular orders of worship in Eastern orthodox churches and the Roman Catholic church is the 'Apostolic tradition'; and many Protestants interpret the gift of *apostle as missionary*." *Ibid.*, 28–29.

15. "The term 'apostolos' itself may be translated 'messenger,' or,

'one that is sent with orders.' Apostles are delegates on a clear mission for an authority figure. They go forth as representatives of their commanders, sent to carry out their orders. The word 'apostle' is prominent in the New Testament, occurring in every kind of New Testament writing: Gospels (10 times), Acts (28 times), Epistles (38 times), and the book of Revelation (3 times), for a total of 79 occurrences. A related term we have already discussed is *apostello*, which means *sent*. Apostles are simply 'sent ones' Another related term is *pempo*, translated as 'sent,' but it is used only in John's writings." *Ibid.*, 85–86.

16. *Ibid.*, 86.

17. *Ibid.*, 29.

18. *Ibid.*, 82.

19. "Apostles are first in the ministry of the Church (see 1 Cor. 12:28). Apostles are an essential part of the team God has formed so the Church can be built up (see Eph. 4:11–17). Apostles are the wise master builders God has given so the Church can be properly built (see 1 Cor. 3:10). Without the apostle, the team is incomplete, and the Church cannot be properly built." *Ibid.*, 29.

20. Cannistraci provides three additional reasons for apostolic existence today. First, the church needs them. Second, there is no verse in the Bible that explicitly states that the office of apostle would cease. Third, their perennial function is biblically based (Eph. 4:13). Cannistraci states, "That word 'until' is important. Clearly the Church has not yet arrived at that place of perfection and maturity. The apostle must remain an enduring function, office and call as an essential part of the Body of Christ until that objective is accomplished." *Ibid.*, 81.

21. *Ibid.*, 26.

22. *Ibid.*, 27.

23. "As evidence consider the facts. The rate at which the Church is growing in this century is explosive . . . It is common knowledge that the destruction of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. caused the gospel to pour freely into Russia and the former Soviet states. What looked hopeless in subsaharan Africa during the rise of Islam has now reversed itself as Christianity has become the dominant spiritual force there. The icy resistance to Christ that has been real in England is melting under the fire of widespread renewal.

Reports from behind the Bamboo curtain in China and in other parts of Asia state that multiplied thousands of believers are added to the Church daily. Latin America is presently experiencing an explosive and seemingly perpetual revival. In Korea, Buddha is bowing to the lordship of Jesus Christ as Christianity steadily grows to become the most pervasive spiritual power

The church growth data for the last decade [sic] is equally encouraging. About 275 million committed and active Christians were reported worldwide in 1980. Since that time, reliable estimates point to a

wave of conversions worldwide totaling some 80,000 souls coming to Christ every day, and a minimum of 20,000 of them are converting daily behind the Bamboo Curtain of Communist China

For the first time in history, missiologists are of the mind that we have the necessary resources—spiritual, financial, and human—to fulfill the Great Commission by the end of this decade!” Ibid., 25–26.

24. Ibid., 159.

25. Ibid., 160.

26. Ibid., 160–161.

27. The seven manifestations of apostolic power include the following: 1) apostles supernaturally attract large audiences, 2) God uses apostles to supernaturally impart through the laying on of hands, 3) apostles possess a supernatural Spirit of revelation, 4) apostles exercise supernatural command over sickness, 5) apostles demonstrate supernatural power over demons, 6) apostles release supernatural judgments against wickedness, and 7) apostles manifest supernatural power to raise the dead. Ibid., 163–171.

28. Ibid., 166–167.

29. *Apostolos* is a masculine noun that means, “messenger,” and is derived from *apostello*, meaning, “send,” “send out,” or, “send away.” *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*, 1971 ed., s.v. *apostolos*” and “*apostello*.” The number of times *apostolos* is said to occur in the New Testament varies from seventy nine to eighty one. Buttrick and Rengstorf use the figure of seventy nine. *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, 1962 ed., s.v. “Apostle,” by George Buttrick; *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol 1, 1964 ed., s.v. “*Apostolos*,” by Rengstorf. Balz and Schneider use the figure of eighty. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 1990 ed., s.v. “*Apostolos*,” by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. Wingram and Winter use the figure of eighty one. George Wingram and Ralph Winter, *The Word Study Concordance* (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1972), 77. Six of the nine occurrences of *apostolos* in the Gospels are found in Luke. Ibid.

30. In a general sense, the problem at Corinth was located in the issue of what it meant to be spiritual. Certainly the phenomenon of ecstatic speech is taken up in Paul’s argument. It is not so much that the Corinthians were divided among themselves on the matter of spiritual gifts. Rather Paul takes exception to their viewpoint on what it means to be spiritual. Gordon Fee states, “Being ‘spiritual’ in the present means to edify the community in worship (1 Cor. 12–14), for the perfect has not yet come (1 Cor. 13:8–13); and when it does come, it will include the resurrection of the body, albeit as a spiritual body (1 Cor. 15).” F.F. Bruce, ed., *The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, by Gordon Fee, 569–70. F. F. Bruce declares that, “The indispensable evidence that one is truly ‘spiritual’ is not glossolalia, but love.” Matthew

Black, ed., *The New Century Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), *I & II Corinthians*, by F. F. Bruce, 117. Specifically, Donald Carson pinpoints the problem as an overrealized eschatology, a divided church, and misconduct in their assemblies. D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12–14*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 16–17.

31. F.F. Bruce, ed., *The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, by F. W. Grosheide, 278. Leon Morris notes that the adjective *pneumatikos* (spiritual) is unusually common in this letter (fifteen times out of twenty four times in Paul; no more than three times in any other letter). Leon Morris, ed., *I Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 163. Hans Conzelmann supports the assertion that spiritual gifts are in mind based on the fact that Paul does not criticize the ecstatic phenomena, rather he corrects the Corinthians by theologically transcending the *pneumatika* with his discussion of *charismata*. George W. MacRae, ed., *Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), *First Corinthians*, by Hans Conzelmann, 204.

32. Fee understands that Paul erected this theological framework to serve as part of the corrective to the Corinthian's understanding of spirituality, manifested by tongues, which had become an end in itself. He states, "The opening paragraph (12:1–3) put the work of the Spirit into a proper christological perspective. This section (12:4–31) puts it into a proper theological perspective." Fee, 583.

33. Paul continues to lay the foundation for his argument concerning tongues. There is one Spirit who gives different *charismata*, and there is one church which, besides having different gifts of the Spirit, also has different members. Grosheide, 297–98. Carson argues that Paul has in mind the narrow scope of apostles here. It is uncertain in what sense these apostles are first; however, the interpretation that they are first in chronological appointment seems likely. "It is clear," says Carson, "that the gift of apostleship that Paul mentions in this text is not transferable to persons living in our day." Carson, 91.

34. Thomas Edwards, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1886), 333.

35. The word "apostle" is both a functional and positional / official term for Paul; therefore, it is no surprise that Paul should list apostles first. Fee, 620.

36. In contrast to the other two major chapters on gifts (1 Cor. 12; Rom. 12), Andrew Lincoln sees the diversity of gifts playing a subordinate role to the major emphasis of unity in Ephesians 4. David Hubbard and Glenn Barker, eds., *Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas: Word, 1990), vol 42, *Ephesians*, by Andrew T. Lincoln, 230.

37. Ralph Martin suggests that, "The grammatically singular word *gift* in v. 7 is the key to this difficult passage. It needs to be interpreted

along with the term *grace* in the same verse. *Grace* is not an illusion to 2:6,8 but rather to those other places in Pauline writing where the same Greek expression (*charis*) refers to the Spirit's gifts to the church (Rom. 12:3 ff.; 1 Cor. 12:4 ff.). What Paul has in mind here is the part which all Christians are to play in the life of the body of Christ. There are no exceptions, for all in the church are the members of his body and as such endowed with some gift-by-grace (*charisma*). Clifton J. Allen, ed. *The Broadman Bible Commentary* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1971), vol 11, *Ephesians*, by Ralph Martin, 155. Kenneth Wuest declares that, "in the general unity, the individual is not overlooked, and unity is consistent with the variety of gifts and offices." Kenneth Wuest, *Ephesians and Colossians in the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), 97. A. T. Robertson comments that, "each gets the gift that Christ has to bestow for his special case." A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931), vol 4, *Ephesians*, by A. T. Robertson, 536.

38. Lewis Donelson states, "This section begins with a classic Pauline image: 'each of us was given grace according to the measure of Christ's gift.'" Lewis Donelson, *Colossians, Ephesians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 86. Ralph Martin is convinced that, "the verb 'was given' in the (punctiliar) aorist tense looks back to a particular occasion and to that time when the gift was made. The latter is best taken to refer to Pentecost, when the exalted Lord gave his gift (singular) to the church. This gift is the Holy Spirit." James Luther Mays, ed., *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1991), *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon*, by Ralph Martin, 49.

39. Martin points out that, "All agree that 'grace' (*charis*) here does not mean what it does in 2: 6, 8, but it is the author's equivalent of Paul's word *charisma* in Romans 12: 3-12 and 1 Corinthians 12: 4-11." Martin, 49.

40. Siegfried Schatzman, *A Pauline Theology of Charismata* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987), 85.

41. "The word 'edoken' is not a Hebraism for 'etheto' (1 Cor. 12:28). It is chosen because of *edoken domata* in the quotation, as if the apostle had said, 'the gifts He gave,' etc. It is not merely the fact of the institution of the offices that he wishes to bring into view, but the fact that they were gifts to the church. Christ gave the persons; the Church appointed to the office (Acts 13: 2; 14: 23)." Samuel R. Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles A. Briggs, eds., *The International Critical Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), *Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, by T. K. Abbott, 117. "Paul repeats the *edoken* (gave) of the citation (Ps 38), and explains that the 'gifts' there mentioned are the various ministries—some apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; . . . While in 4:11 he appeared to put forward the truly

Pauline conception that spiritual endowments are bestowed upon every Christian to fit him for his own particular function in the organic life of the church, he now defines the gifts of Christ as the ministers whom he gives to the church to foster its corporate life." George A. Buttrick, *The Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1954), vol 10, *Ephesians*, by Francis W. Beare, 690. "In 1 Corinthians 12:28 Paul uses *etheto* (more common verb, appointed), but here repeats *edoken* (first aorist active indicative of *didomai*) from the quote in verse 8." Robertson, 537.

42. "The fact that neither bishops or elders are mentioned is an indication that we are still some distance removed from the developed organization that we find around the turn of the first century." Beare, 691. "That bishops and deacons are not mentioned here illustrates the variety of structures in the early church and the difficulty of obtaining a clear and overall picture . . . Drawing conclusions about the historical conditions of the churches during this time based on the writers theological reflection can be hazardous. So whether there were still [apostles] and prophets operating in the churches to which he writes cannot be ascertained with any certainty." Lincoln, 249.

43. "The apostles and prophets were the honored leaders of the first generation who constitute the foundation of the church (Eph. 2:20), and were the original recipients of the revelation (Eph. 3:5). By their very nature these offices could not belong to the permanent structure of the church . . . Evidently the church has gone a long way toward the development of a ministry of established office in place of the ministry of function . . ." Beare, 690. "In these earlier references [Eph. 2:20; 3:5] the apostles as divinely commissioned missionaries and planters of churches . . . were viewed as norms from the past . . . In the postapostolic period it is the evangelists who continue to carry out many of the activities of the apostles . . . Because of the special foundational place given by this writer to the apostles and prophets, in effect a new triad of ministers, in comparison with the triad in 1 Corinthians 12:28, emerges as active in the churches of his time—evangelists, pastors and teachers." Lincoln, 249–51.

44. "This exegesis has not been universally accepted by scholars and there is an issue surrounding the intended relationship of the three prepositional phrases and, therefore, the punctuation of any translation." Lincoln, 253. "The tangle of the Greek in these verses permits at least two options." Martin, 52.

45. The second option, "accept[s] that the drift of Paul's thought is rather that it is the apostolic ministry which prepares God's people and in so doing it edifies the whole body. This makes the apostolic work a necessary part of the church's ongoing life and would accord with a more developed structure of organizational pattern of church and ministry which is found in subapostolic writers like I Clement and Ignatius." Martin, 157.

46. The argument for the first option is stated as such, "The three phrases of verse 12 are not parallel—as the thrice repeated *for* of our versions would suggest; in Greek there is a change of preposition (*pros*, *eis*, *eis*). It seems best to take the first two phrases together—"in order to fit his people for the work of service." Beare, 691. "The view has become popular that the second prepositional phrase is not to be seen as distinct from the first and that the two taken together contain one idea, namely that the ministers have been given to equip the saints to carry out their service [thus building the body, which is the force of the third prepositional phrase] In support of this view, appeal is made to the change in prepositions from *pros* to *eis* between the first and second phrases, as a sign that the phrases are not coordinate, to verse seven with its notion that all have received grace for service, and to verse sixteen with its emphasis that building up the body is the work of all believers." Lincoln, 253. The evidence against such a position is: 1) the change in prepositions cannot bear the weight of such an argument, 2) the primary context in verse twelve is the function and role of the ministers, 3) the stringing together of a number of prepositional phrases, all dependent on the main verb and coordinate with each other, is a characteristic feature of the writer. In addition, a Protestant American tendency would be to avoid clericalism and to support a democratic model of the church; thus, the first option would appeal to an Americanized version of Christianity. *Ibid.*

47. "'Till we all attain' (*mechri katantesomen hoi pantes*). Temporal clause with purpose idea with *mechri* and the first aorist active subjunctive of *katantao*, late verb, to come down to the goal (Phil 3: 11)." Robertson, 537. "*mechri* is without *an* because the result is not uncertain." Abbott, 121. "*mechri* has both a prospective and a final force. The ministers are to carry out their task both until the whole church reaches this goal and in order that it might reach this goal." Lincoln, 255. "The conjunction here has virtually a final force, but conveys the additional thought (not given by *ina*) that time is needed for the attainment of the end. 'We all'—the use of the article (*hoi pantes*) makes the expression collective: not all of us, individually, but all of us in the fellowship of our common life." Beare, 692.

48. "As in v 5, *pistis*, 'faith,' used here in the context of an emphasis on the teaching ministry and the mention of false teaching, is likely to have an objective connotation. In other words, it is not primarily believers' exercise of faith that is in view but rather the content of that faith." Lincoln, 255. "Christian faith requires right belief, and even right, not wrong, intellectual formulations of the gospel. Heresy was and is, as our epistle will shortly tell us (v. 14), a constant danger to the church." Beare, 692.

49. Martin, 157. Martin cites Schneider who states, "The church's 'perfect form is achieved when all who are appointed to it by the divine

plan of salvation belong to the church." Ibid.

50. Wayne Grudem's book, *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, presents four views concerning the miraculous spiritual gifts: cessationist, open-but-cautious, third wave, and pentecostal/charismatic. An examination of these views reveal that there are two major views with various nuances of each view. For instance, the cessationist view includes the reformed (Westminster Seminary), dispensationalist (Dallas Seminary, Master's Seminary), and Lutheran (Missouri Synod) nuances. The continuationist view includes the open-but-cautious, third wave, and pentecostal/charismatic nuances. Wayne Grudem, ed., *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996).

51. The formal principle of the Reformation—*Sola Scriptura*—is the real issue of this discussion, because *sola Scriptura* and *sola fide* stand at the center of evangelical theology. In addition to the Catholic tradition, which was the antagonist of this principle in the sixteenth century (and still is), there are new authorities, including extra-biblical revelations. *Sola Scriptura* means that Scripture is necessary, authoritative, sufficient, and perspicuous (clear and plain). These components stand and fall together; thus to accept authority and deny sufficiency is to reject the whole. This mistake is precisely what the continuationists insist on doing when they treat experience as authority. John Armstrong, "Introduction: Two Vital Truths," in *The Coming Evangelical Crisis*, ed. John Armstrong (Chicago: Moody Press, 1996), 19–22.

52. Gaffin declares that his position is not: 1) "an anti-supernatural hermeneutic," 2) "in captivity to 'common sense' realism," 3) "an intellectual quasi-deism," and 4) "bound up with the Enlightenment and [has not] adopted their brand of rationalism." Richard Gaffin, "A Cessationist View," in *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, ed. Wayne Grudem (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 26. Gaffin states that he does not hold that all gifts have ceased, that the church is devoid of all such gifts, or that miracles have ceased. He does question whether the gifts of healing and of working miracles are given today. Also, his main concern is with the revelatory or word gifts. Ibid., 41–42. His criticism of the charismatic view is that their spirituality involves a worldview that has affinities with postmodernism. What he describes as a philosophical movement, the charismatic contingency, "seeks to recover a sense of the whole and the interrelatedness of knowledge and experience." Ibid., 27.

53. Ibid., 37.

54. Gaffin agrees with Carson who recognizes the salvation-historical structure of the book of Acts. The history of salvation (*historia salutis*) is distinct from the order of salvation (*ordo salutis*). The *historia salutis*, in theological terms, "refers to events that are part of Christ's once-for-all accomplishment of his work of earning our salvation. The events in the history of salvation (Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension) are finished, non-repeatable events, that have importance for

all of God's people for all of time." Ibid., 30. The *ordo salutis*, "refers to events in the continuing application of Christ's work to individual lives throughout history, events such as saving faith, justification, sanctification. When individual believers appropriate Christ's work in their own lives, those experiences are part of the 'order of salvation.'" Ibid. The point is that, "resurrection—ascension—pentecost, though distinct in time, constitute a unified complex of events, a once-for-all, salvation-historical unity. Pentecost, then, is no more capable of being a repeatable paradigm event than are the other events . . . Pentecost completes Christ's finished work for our salvation." Ibid., 32.

55. Ibid., 43.

56. Ibid., 44.

57. Robert Saucy, "An Open but Cautious View," in *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, ed. Wayne Grudem (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 100. Saucy states, "It is impossible to say, on the basis of biblical teaching, that certain gifts cannot occur at any given time according to God's sovereign purpose." Ibid.

58. Ibid. These lines of evidence include: 1) the uniqueness of the apostolic era, 2) the unevenness of the miracles in Bible history, 3) the witness of church history regarding miracles, 4) the possibility of the continuation of spiritual gifts in the church, and 5) the issue of specific teaching on the cessation of certain spiritual gifts. Ibid., 101–23.

59. C. Samuel Storms, "A Third Wave Response to Robert Saucy," in *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, ed. Wayne Grudem (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 156–57. Storms states, "Virtually everyone acknowledges that to qualify as an apostle one must be both 'an eye-and-ear witness to the resurrection of Christ' and receive a personal commission from Jesus himself (Acts 1:22–26; 1 Cor. 9:1–2; 15:7–9; cf. also Rom. 1:1,5; 1 Cor. 1:1; 2 Cor. 1:1; Gal. 1:1). Ibid., 157.

60. Douglas Oss, "A Pentecostal/Charismatic View," in *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, ed. Wayne Grudem (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 279. Oss declares, "Moreover, their teaching embodied in the New Testament, continues to be the only authoritative, infallible rule for faith and practice." Ibid.

61. J. Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 25.

62. The reigning paradigm of church history is the history of Christian thought. James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 24. Church history includes the practice of the church as well as the thought of the church. Historical theology and the history of Christian thought are subsets of church history. Historical theology includes both the history of doctrines and the history of dogma. The history of Christian thought includes the entire range of Christian thought; therefore, "as the broadest category, the history of Christian

thought presses on the limits of what is 'Christian' or 'orthodox': the history of Christian thought would also include thinkers who were only marginally related to the church, and subsequently may have actually been disenfranchised by the church . . ." Ibid., 9. The history of spirituality fits this category, including the discussion of the character of Christian life and piety, as well as philosophical topics and the relation of Christian thought to the culture. Consequently, "the history of Christian thought functions as the basic discipline of historical theology, without which neither the history of doctrine nor the history of dogma can really function, because the doctrines themselves can only be understood in their fundamental religious context and in relation to the way Christians were living, thinking, and acting in society, that is, in relation to a broad Christian history of ideas." Ibid., 8-9.

63. Kenneth S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), 115. "Before the first century of its existence was out, the church began to display certain organizational features which, developed, have persisted, with modification, into the twentieth century In at least several of the local churches there was more than one bishop and the evidence seems to support the view that at the outset in some and perhaps all of the churches the designations "elder" and "bishop" were used interchangeably for the same office. Ibid., 116.

64. "The function of the apostles was unique and unrepeatable. They received the revelation that is the meaning and message of the church To compromise the authority of Scripture is to destroy the apostolic foundation of the church the compromise comes by adding to Scripture as well as by subtracting from it." Edmund P. Clowney, *The Church* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1995), 74-75.

65. The battle to preserve orthodoxy and suppress heresy was a necessary Christian task. Simply put, it was the task of the church to preserve the faith once delivered to the saints (Jude 3). Brown states, "Orthodoxy is supposed to be the traditional, timeless faith of the whole church, while heresy is the error of the faction." Brown, 9.

66. Alan Johnson and Robert Webber reference some important themes during this ancient period of church history. First, the apostolic age (A.D. 100-150), in which the three functions of ministry in the Pastorals (oversight, teaching, and service) become the office of ministry early in the second century. Second, the formation of a monarchical bishop is evidenced in the writings of Ignatius (A.D. 110). Third, the teaching of apostolic succession, based on the view of the bishop being the center of orthodoxy, emerged in Irenaeus's writings (A.D. 130-200). Fourth, the rise of the Roman bishop in the West to a position of ascendancy occurred in the fourth and fifth centuries. Fifth, by the end of the fourth century the church in the West was well defined; "it functioned according to the threefold ministry of bishops, priest, and deacon; it was unified around the bishops, with the bishop at Rome enjoying a position

of the first among equals; its liturgy, architecture, lectionary, and music were showing signs of maturity." Alan E. Johnson and Robert E. Weber, *What Christians Believe* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 351–55.

67. Gnosticism became the seedbed for one of the three strains of religious life among the early Christians: the charismatic tendencies. Extra-biblical revelations appealed to this faction of the church. Montanus added, as equally authoritative, his own prophecies to the body of divine revelation. Montanus was a 'charismatic,' who maintained that he received direct revelation from the Holy Spirit. Brown, 74, 66.

68. Between A. D. 30 and 50 the apostolic interpretations of the Christ event became fixed into the kerygma (e.g., Acts 3:11–26), hymns (e.g., John 1:1–14; Phil 2:1–111), creeds (e.g., 1 Cor. 15:1–3; 1 Tim. 3:16), baptismal formulae (e.g. Matt. 28: 19–20), traditions regarding the Lord's Supper (e.g., 1 Cor. 11:17–34), doxologies (Rom. 11:36), benedictions (2 Cor. 13:14), catechetical material (e.g., Col 3:5–10). "These sources, which carried the weight of apostolic authority, may be regarded as the earliest authoritative oral and written interpretations of the Christ event in the church." In A. D. 397, at the Council of Carthage, "the books that now comprise Scripture, both Old and New Testaments, were prescribed as the limits of the canon." *Ibid.*, 36–40.

69. "In the eleventh century, as the church approached the zenith of its power, Pope Gregory VII (1073–85), set forth the case for papal supremacy in twenty-seven notes contained in his work *Dictatus Papae* (the Dictations of the Pope) It [the pope's argument] implies that the church has converted the structures of society and rules over them in the name of Christ According to the doctrine of papal supremacy, Christ rules the world through the pope and the church." *Ibid.*, 356–57.

70. Thomas Aquinas was the representative theologian of the medieval Roman Catholic Church. He defined *charismata* as "gratuitous graces," and equated spiritual gifts with inner virtues such as love and hope. His views became standard for most Roman Catholics. Kenneth C. Kinghorn, *Gifts of the Spirit* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 15.

71. The point was that even though the canon was closed the limits of authority were still fluid; thus, some writings outside the canon shared the same authoritative power as the Scripture itself. The question during the fourteenth century was, "Does the Scripture derive its authority from the church, or must the church be subservient to the Scripture?" Four positions emerged: 1) Scripture over the church, 2) church over the Scripture, 3) traditions of the church alongside Scripture, 4) papacy over the church and Scripture. The dilemma of the fifteenth century was to sort out where authority was actually found. The Pope claimed that he was acting in the place of God. The conciliarists argued for the need for an authoritative interpretation of Scripture, which was represented in the councils. The nominalists insisted on the

principle that Scripture alone is a sufficient rule of faith. *Ibid.*, 40–43.

72. *Ibid.*, 358–59.

73. “Other communions such as the Baptists and Congregationalists who derive from the Reformed tradition differ from the presbyterial form of government and argue for a congregational approach to church governance. The Congregational, presbyterial, and episcopal forms of government—rule by local church, rule by local presbytery, and rule by bishop—constitute the three basic forms of church government practiced throughout the history of the church.” *Ibid.*, 360–61.

74. *Ibid.*

75. Victor Budgen, *The Charismatics and the Word of God* (Durham: Evangelical Press, 1989), 131.

76. Wesley’s dynamic view of Scripture did not lead to a repudiation of tradition or reason as seen in his Wesleyan quadrilateral: the insistence that an understanding of theology must be based on Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience. “What he [Wesley] taught was a view of the Bible that continually inspired a person to live by its spirit.” Johnson and Webber, 43–46.

77. “Although the concept of an inerrant Scripture was presupposed by the ancient Fathers, the medieval scholars, and the Reformers, the difference in the seventeenth century is the apologetic use of inerrancy in contradistinction to its methodology of the radical doubt espoused by Descartes.” The development of a mechanistic cosmology (scientific revolution) and the principle of progress (historical revolution) became the fuel for the rise of biblical criticism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. *Ibid.*, 47–49.

78. The holiness movement began as a reforming movement with the Methodists after the Civil War. The three basic beliefs of the movement include: 1) the Bible must be interpreted literally, 2) each person must strive for moral perfection, and 3) each person must experience conversion and the second blessing. Cecil D. Bradfield, *Neopentecostalism: A Sociological Movement* (Washington, D.C.: University of America, 1979), 2.

Vinson Synan suggests that the Wesleyan reformation is looked upon by those in the holiness churches as a second reform of the church. Wesley’s Methodist societies emphasized sanctification as a second blessing following justification, calling for a life of holiness and separation from the world. Phoebe Palmer and her husband joined with her sister Sarah Lamkford in promoting the “Tuesday meetings for the promotion of holiness” in 1839 (Finney’s great revivals in New York occurred in 1830s). After the Civil War, the holiness movement spread beyond the Methodist church under the banner of the National Holiness Association (founded in 1867). The height of the holiness revival was from 1867 to 1894, and the *sine qua non* of the movement was entire sanctification as a second work of grace. This insistence on instant holi-

ness led to the rejection of the holiness movement by Methodist churches; however, the emphasis of this instantaneous, or, "crisis," aspect of the second blessing led to a climate receptive to Pentecostalism. Vinson Synan, "Theological Boundaries: The Arminian Tradition," in *The Evangelicals*, eds. David F. Wells and John Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), 39–45.

79. The Pentecostal movement began in Topeka, Kansas at the beginning of the twentieth century. The three basic beliefs of the Pentecostals are: 1) speaking in tongues is evidence of the baptism of the Spirit, 2) tongues is the only experience necessary to obtain a full Christian life, and 3) those who speak in tongues enter into the "charismatic life." Bradfield, 3. Pentecostalism fell into the same pattern of subjectivism that characterized Montanism in the second century. The schismatic nature of Pentecostalism resulted from their leaders using proof texts, building their teaching on oral traditions, personal experiences, and a strong desire to see supernatural manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Kinghorn, 18.

The father of Pentecostalism, Charles Parham (a former Methodist), found students in his "Bethel Healing School" speaking in tongues (1901). Based on a comparative analysis between this experience and biblical references to glossolalia, Parham concluded that the "one and only biblical evidence for receiving the baptism with the Spirit was speaking in other tongues. Here was an experience with clear biblical antecedents, easily confirmed and repeatable." Synan, 47. William Seymour became the catalyst for the worldwide popularization of Pentecostalism through his Azusa Street mission in Los Angeles. His goal of trying to convince the Christian world that the *charisma* were available today was met by the dispensational resistance of the fundamentalists. Curiously, even though it was diametrically opposed to the pentecostal claim about the *charimata*, the Pentecostals adopted the dispensational program. The mainstream American evangelicals never really considered the Pentecostals to be evangelicals, despite their claim to be evangelicals. With the support of Harold Okenga, the NAE chose the Pentecostals over the militant fundamentalism of Carl McIntyre's American Council of Christian Churches. Since that time, Pentecostals have been considered to be under the evangelical tent. Synan, 47–48.

80. Neo-pentecostalism, or the charismatic movement, came out of the closet in 1960 when Dennis Bennett (Rector of St. Mark's Episcopal Parish in Van Nuys, California) testified publically to tongues speaking. Catholic charismatics emerged from Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, 1966); Notre Dame University (South Bend, 1967); and the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, 1967). By 1976, not only were there charismatic fellowships within Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, and Mennonite denominations, but it was respectable for one to speak in tongues in American society. Synan, 50–52. There was an intentional distancing of

these charismatics from their forebears, the pentecostals. Although they did not lack in any of the spiritual gifts, they changed their name from neo-pentecostals to charismatics, they were reluctant to adopt the Pentecostal doctrine of initial evidence, and they emphasized glossolalia as a prayer language and a means of singing in the Spirit. Ibid.

81. "However, if the term 'apostle' is used in the wider sense of one commissioned of the Lord to open new mission fields, whose ministry is accompanied by signs and wonders, it would not be inappropriate to use the word." Guy P. Doffield, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1983), 475.

82. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 1964 ed., s. v. "Apostle." *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 1988 ed., s. v. "Apostolic Age." *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1997 ed., s. v. "Apostle."

83. *Concise Dictionary of the Christian World Mission*, 1971 ed., s. v. "Apostolate, Apostle." "The Greek words *apostolos* and *apostello* are the bases for a number of significant English words which are vital to the vocabulary of mission: apostle, apostolic, apostolate, apostleship, and apostolicity In terms of usage, three English words have emerged to express the fundamental missional concept: the word *mission* itself of Latin origin, the word *apostolate* of Greek origin, and the word *sending* of Anglo-Saxon origin. The Latin cognates have been the most widespread in usage. The words *mission*, *missions*, and *missionary* have had the longest traditional use The Greek cognates have also had a widespread use. However, traditionally the words *apostle*, *apostolic*, *apostleship*, and *apostolicity* have referred almost exclusively to the twelve (eleven) or Paul. Only in recent years have we come to use *apostle* in the sense of missionary, and this has often been a kind of editorial or poetic use." Francis M. DuBoise, *God Who Sends* (Nashville: Broadman, 1983), 35.

84. "Especially in Roman Catholic missiology, as well as in the *Living New Testament* and other Protestant writings, a tendency to make an exact equivalent between the gift of "apostle" and the "missionary gift" is evident. Etymologically there is a close relationship, and in ministry there might be such similarity also. But it does seem that the concept of apostleship in the New Testament involves both more and less than the missionary gift implies. An apostle is more than a missionary because he has a certain God-given authority among a particular group of churches which some missionaries who are not apostles might lack." C. Peter Wagner, *Frontiers in Mission Strategy* (Chicago: Moody, 1971), 79–80. The point is that Wagner associates the missionary gift with an ability to minister effectively in a cross-cultural setting.

85. C. Peter Wagner, *Your Spiritual Gifts Can Help Your Church Grow* (Ventura: Regal, 1994), 181.

86. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, 1979 ed., s. v. "Barnabas"; *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 1988 ed., s. v. "Barnabas."

87. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, 1988 ed., s. v. "Si-

las"; *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 1988 ed., s. v. "Silas."

88. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, 1988 ed., s. v.

"Timothy"; *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 1988 ed., s. v. "Timothy."

89. The more general meaning was used, "in Acts 14:4 of Barnabas, in 2 Cor. 8:23 of Titus, in Phil 2:25 of Epaphroditus, and in the Didache of "the traveling evangelists or missionaries who preached the gospel from place to place." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, 1988 ed., s. v. "Andronicus"; *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 1988 ed., s. v. "Andronicus."

90. Paul Enns, *The Moody Handbook of Theology* (Chicago: Moody, 1989), 270.

91. "When the Pastoral Epistles talk about the future of the church and how the church should be organized, they speak about bishops and presbyters, elders and pastors, deacons and deaconesses. The Pastoral Epistles never talk about apostles." John MacArthur, *The Charismatics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 82.

92. Mark Shaw understands the four marks of the church (one, holy, catholic, apostolic) to be descriptive of the four different ways of loving God and others (holy—loving God's person, one—loving God's people, catholic—loving God's mission, apostolic—loving God's truth). In this sense, loving God's truth involves believing, professing and proclaiming that Christ is Lord over sin, death and redemption. Mark Shaw, *Ten Great Ideas from Church History* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1997), 218–19.

It should be noted that these four marks are not independent of one another. "What the apostles did, that is, their life and work as witnesses to God's good news in Jesus Christ the Lord, defines and shapes the very nature of the church. The apostolicity of the church is expressed by its witness to the gospel, its obedience to the mandate to go out as Christ's ambassadors." Darrell I. Guder, ed., *Missional Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 256.

93. Timothy George, "What I'd Like to Tell the Pope about the Church," *Christianity Today* (June 15, 1998): 43. George aptly states, "As the authorized representatives of Jesus Christ, the apostles have faithfully and accurately transmitted their authoritative witness to their Lord in the divinely inspired writings of Holy Scripture. The teaching authority of the apostles, evangelicals believe, thus resides in the Old and New Testaments, the self-authenticating Word of God . . . For evangelicals, public preaching of the Word of God is a sign of apostolicity." *Ibid.*, 43–44.

94. Gerald Bray notes, "Even the most careful scholars are liable to draw conclusions which are not warranted by the evidence, usually because they have an agenda which led them to study a particular aspect of the Bible in the first place. This tendency, which amounts to decorating our own opinions with biblical texts in order to buttress our

authority, is one of the greatest dangers of preaching." Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996), 41.

95. Beare, 690. "The pastors and teachers are mentioned in a way that sets them apart from the former three categories; the form of the phrase might be taken to mean that these are dual titles for a single office—reflecting the twofold task of the settled ministry—with its duties of pastoral care and instruction. Or it may simply mark them out as representatives of two different office, linked together as sharing the care of established congregations, in distinction from the three former classes who bring new congregations into being." *Ibid.* "What is clear is that 'pastors and teachers' differ from the preceding classes in being attached to particular churches." Driver, 118. Robertson sees four groups—*tous men, tous de* three times, as the direct object of *edoken*—where these titles are in the predicate accusative (*apostolous, prophetas, poimenas kai didaskalous*). Robertson, 537.

96. Edmund Clowney states, "The New Testament recognizes special gifts for the proclamation of the Word. Paul was an apostolic missionary, driven to preach Christ where he had not been named (Rom. 15:20). Others shared this missionary calling, and are called apostles (as sent ones: Acts 14:14; Rom. 16:7, 2; 2 Cor. 8:23), or evangelists (as preachers of the evangel: Eph. 4:11; 2 Tim. 4:5). Still others are called pastors or teachers (Acts 13:1; Eph. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28; James 3:1) . . . We have seen that the apostles, in the narrow sense of 'the twelve', were the foundation stones of the church, providing through the Spirit the revelation of the person and work of Christ, and the 'pattern of sound words' that established the church in truth (Eph. 2:20; 3:3–5; Gal. 2:8). As recipients of revelation, they were joined by New Testament prophets. When their task was completed, and the final revelation of Christ, the Son of God, had been given, the calling of the apostles in the broader sense (missionaries) and evangelists continued to carry the gospel to those who had not heard." Clowney, 210–11.

97. We have seen that overrealized eschatology was a problem with the Corinthians (Carson). The Pentecostals were guilty of this same problem at the turn of this century. "As people who regarded themselves as signs of an endtimes revival, early pentecostals set out to make their presence known in a burst of intense, focused evangelistic activity." Edith Blumhofer, "Transatlantic Currents in North Atlantic Pentecostalism," in *Evangelicalism*, eds. Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 352.

98. John MacArthur identifies ten charismatic issues that the evangelical church must confront. The first four are relevant to this study: 1) revelation, 2) interpretation, 3) authority, and 4) apostolic uniqueness. MacArthur, 199.

99. "The philosophical category involves an underlying philosophical assumption of the correspondence theory of truth with an alle-

giance to the law of non-contradiction. The theological method of Evangelical theology is largely presuppositional in orientation. Finally, there is an embrace of the epistemological priority of special revelation as found in the Bible, which is construed as having a propositional element in its form and being inerrant in its nature. Together these form the basis of the concept of truth in contemporary American Evangelical theology as evidenced by the leading theologians who have been surveyed in this work." James Emery White, *What is Truth?* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 165.

100. David Wells states, "[G]ranting the status of revelation to anything other than the Word of God inevitably has the effect of removing that status from the Word of God. What may start out as an additional authority alongside the Word of God will eventually supplant its authority altogether." David Wells, *God in the Wasteland* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 109. John MacArthur proclaims, "Once we see Scripture as less than the final, infallible authority for faith and practice, we have opened the doors to theological chaos. To abandon the uniqueness of Scripture—its normative nature as the only Word of God—is to invite a spiritual free-for-all." MacArthur, 22.

101. Revelation knowledge is the progeny of the faith movement, which D. R. McConnell suggests was fathered by E. W. Kenyon, whom Kenneth Hagin plagiarized. The most popular modern day leader of this movement is Kenneth Copeland. Kenyon was the first to coin the term "Revelation Knowledge." Revelation knowledge is transcendent, supra-sensory knowledge that reveals the reality of the spiritual realm. This knowledge is the epistemology of the faith theology. Dualism, the belief that all of reality is reducible to just two opposite principles—spirit and matter—with nothing in between, is one result of this epistemological construct. Another result is fideism, the belief that religious truth is based solely on faith rather than reasoning or sensory evidence. Both dualism and fideism are characteristics of metaphysical cults. McConnell identifies five parallels between Kenyon's epistemology and that of metaphysical cults: 1) radical dualism; 2) to possess one type of knowledge demands denial of the other; 3) perfect knowledge is attainable in this life; 4) a way of knowing that will enable one to transcend physical limitations; 5) a way of knowing that creates specific classes of people. The point is that the major epistemological error is that of gnosticism. The Bible does not justify a dualistic view of revelation, because biblical revelation and salvation are physical as well as spiritual (John 1:14; Col 2:9; Col 1: 20–22). In addition, because the human mind is just as necessary in knowing God as the human spirit, then human reason cannot be the enemy of faith and God is not an irrational being. D. R. McConnell, *A Different Gospel* (Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1988), xvi, 104.

102. McConnell, 189.

103. R. Fowler White, "Does God Speak Today Apart from the Bible?" in *The Coming Evangelical Crisis* ed. John H. Armstrong (Chicago: Moody, 1996), 79.

104. Both Jack Deere and Wayne Grudem admit that these revelatory words spoken today are not the same as those words spoken by God in the past. *Ibid.*, 83.

105. *Ibid.*, 87.

106. R. Albert Mohler, "'Evangelical': What's in a Name?" in *The Coming Evangelical Crisis*, ed. John H. Armstrong (Chicago: Moody, 1996), 34.

107. James M. Boice and Benjamin Sasse, eds., *Here We Stand* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 15.

108. John MacArthur, "How Shall We Then Worship?" in *The Coming Evangelical Crisis*, ed. John H. Armstrong (Chicago: Moody, 1996), 177. MacArthur states, "The point of that passage [Ps 19:7-10] is . . . that *all essential spiritual truth* is contained in the Word of God." *Ibid.* (italics not mine)

109. These twelve areas are a synthesis of Erickson's concerns regarding the signs and wonders movement. Millard Erickson, *Evangelical Mind and Heart* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993); *Where is Theology Going?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994).