

<p>UTGIVER REFLEKS-Publishing</p> <p>REDAKTØR Geir Lie</p> <p>ADRESSE Ravnkroken 60G 1254 Oslo</p> <p>TELEFON 97019629</p> <p>EPOST kontakt@refleks- publishing.com</p> <p>HJEMMESIDE www.refleks- publishing.com</p> <p>TRYKK Graforad, Zenica (Bosnia og Herzegovina)</p> <p>LØSSALGSPRIS NOK 120,- / SEK 150,- / DKK 115,- pr. nummer</p> <p>BANKGIRO 0539 11 57539 (N) 8431-9 53001 932-2 (S) 4563 74 1045 (DK)</p> <p>ISSN: 1502-9700</p>	<p>Innhold</p> <p>Forord 1</p> <p>Plymouthbrødrene 2 Geir Lie</p> <p>Ekklesiologi på avveie 7 Geir Lie</p> <p>Poul Madsen og Kristent Fælles- skab-bevegelsen 35 Geir Lie</p> <p>Charles F. Schmitt – a brief intro- duction 57 Geir Lie</p> <p>The New Apostolic Movement 60 Paul L. King</p> <p>The Convergence Movement 74 William DeArteaga</p> <p>Persecuted for Christ 89 Roscoe Barnes III</p> <p>Spirit, soul, and body 98 William Atkinson</p>
<p>MANUS: Redaktør vil bistå med ferdig dokumentmal i Word format. Manus leveres på diskett. Noter skrives som fotnoter.</p> <p>Signerte artikler gir ikke nødvendigvis uttrykk for redaksjonens syn.</p>	

Forord

Røtter er viktige for mange av oss. Pinsekristendommens historiske og læremessige forankring i 1800-tallets hellighetsbevegelse er blitt berørt i tidligere numre av *Refleks*. Arven fra plymouthbrødrene er imidlertid for mange ikke like åpenbar, dette til tross for at de fleste karismatikeres eskjatalogi er sterkt farget av John Nelson Darbys pretribulasjonale premillennisme. Jeg har lenge ønsket å vie større deler av et tidsskriftnummer til en belysning av plymouthbrødrenes betydning som blant annet premissleverandør for mange pinsevenner og karismatikertroende (og dette til tross for at de fleste plymouthbrødre avviser berettigelsen av karismatiske åndserfaringer i vår tid).

Innledningsartikkelen gir en kortfattet oversikt over plymouthbrødrenes historikk i Storbritannia. Denne etterfølges av en presentasjon av kineserne Watchman Nee og Witness Lee, samt av disses Local Church bevegelse. Felles for Nee og Lee var blant annet at de søkte en læremessig syntese av hellighetsbevegelsens (Keswicktradisjonens) antropologi og plymouthbrødrenes ekklesiologi. Det samme gjorde i utgangspunktet Poul Madsen fra Danmark. Hans Kristent Fællesskapsbevegelse er gjenstand for mine betraktninger i artikkel nummer 3. Artikkelen deretter, en biografisk portrettskildring av amerikaneren Charles F. Schmitt, avslutter sekvensen vedrørende plymouthbrødrene og arven derfra.

Paul L. King redegjør så for den 'apostolske bevegelse', mens William DeArtega presenterer Convergence-bevegelsen. Og Roscoe Barnes er tilbake med nye betraktninger rundt den amerikanske helbredelsespredikanten F.F. Bosworth. William Atkinson avrunder så det hele med en teologisk analyse av trichotom antropologi slik denne kommer til uttrykk hos forkynnerne E.W. Kenyon, Kenneth E. Hagin, og Kenneth Copeland.

God lesning!

Gress hie

Plymouthbrødrene - en kortfattet presentasjon

Geir Lie er lektorutdannet med kristendomskunnskap hovedfag fra Det teologiske Menighetsfakultet i Oslo.



Plymouthbrødrene har knapt blitt objektivt berørt i norsk litteratur, om vi ser bort fra to bøker forfattet av Kjell Dahlene, *Plymouth Brethrens innflytelse i norsk kristenliv* (1983) og *Adolf Bjerkreim* (1987). I begge disse dokumenteres 'brødrenes' nedslagsfelt i Norge fra 1860-årene av. De gryende venneflokkene ble snart, etter mønster fra Storbritannia, utskilt som 'lukkede' og 'åpne' brødre.

I tillegg påviser Dahlene 'brødrenes' påvirkning, ikke bare i forhold til baptistene, pinsebevegelsen, Misjonsforbundet (Den frie Misjon), De Frie Evangeliske Forsamlinger og Kristi Menighet, men også vis-à-vis alliansegrupper (som Kristiania-komiteen [ledet av Otto Treider, Johannes Jørgensen og Hans Guldberg], ulike 'frie grupper' sentrert rundt Marius Giverholt, Harald Hjelm-Larsens Norske Bibelkursus pr. Korrespondanse og kretsen rundt Albert Lunde og dennes Evangeliske Forsamling), samt i forhold til det Vestlandske Indremisjonsforbundet og Kinamisjonsforbundet (senere Misjonssambandet). I tillegg til 'brødrenes' egne publikasjoner, ble de innvilget spalteplass i en rekke norske oppbyggelsesblader, som *Evangelisten* (startet i Kristiansand i 1911), *Heimemisjon* (Sunnmøre Indremisjons organ), *Indremissionæren* (utgitt av det Østlandske Indremisjonsforbund) og *Karmel*.

I Storbritannia oppstod plymouthbrødre-bevegelsen i 1820-årene. Dahlene problematiserer en bombastisk tidsfastsettelse rundt 1825, tilsvarende en del engelskspråklige skrifter har gjort. Han skriver:

Både sosialt og politisk gjærte det i England ved begynnelsen av det nittende århundre. Nye tanker og ideer presset på. Det er ringvirkninger av den franske revolusjon. Også på det religiøse område gjorde det seg gjeldende sterke brytninger. Det oppstod bevegelser som spente fra det ytterste høykirkelige til det ekstremt lavkirkelige. Noen brøt med den engelske statskirke, andre valgte å bli stående i kirken og påvirke kirken innenfra.¹

Dahlene har for øvrig rett når han skriver at plymouthbrødrene – som bevegelse – ikke *har* noen påvisbar begynnelse, men at det snarere "oppstod en del gruppe-

¹ Kjell Dahlene, *Plymouth Brethrens innflytelse i norsk kristenliv* (Mandal: Eget forlag, 1983) s. 9.

ringer som var nokså ensartet, uavhengig av hverandre og som først senere fant sammen i kontaktfellesskap.”²

Like fullt tid- og stedfestes bevegelsens begynnelse gjerne til 1825 i Dublin, Irland. Tannlegestudent Edward Cronin flyttet dit i begynnelsen av 1820-årene og oppsøkte flere protestantiske menigheter. Til å begynne med ble han innvilget nattverdsdeltakelse “as a visitor”, men ettersom Dublin-oppholdet fikk et mer permanent preg over seg, ble han oppfordret til å finne seg fast menighet. Opplevelsen har åpenbart vært skjellsettende, for senere bibelgranskninger synes eksklusivt å ha bekreftet hans gryende skepsis til tradisjonelle trosamfunns berettigelse:

Membership of denominations, as such, he could not find in Scripture, though he did see that there were local churches, made up of the members of the one body of Christ gathered together for fellowship, for instruction, for the breaking of bread and for prayer in local companies, but apparently one on the ground of the body, receiving one another as such and not as subscribing to special tests or forming minor organizations within the one great organism.³

Cronin opplevde det også problematisk at en prest eller menighetsforstander innehadde en særskilt autoritetsfunksjon og stod nærmest eneansvarlig for forkynnelsen:

He also found growing up within himself a feeling of repugnance to a one-man ministry, for it seemed to him that there was no place for this in the New Testament church, but that gifted men exercised their ministry as led by the Spirit in dependence on the Lord, and the idea of one minister set over a church was foreign to Scripture. He did not mean by this to deny that in many places the responsibility for preaching or teaching the Word might be largely restricted to some one gifted individual, but he thought he saw a different order for worship meetings, where the Spirit of God might use whom He would to the edification of all, if believers were subject to His guidance.⁴

Sammen med Edward Wilson møttes han i 1825 for å feire nattverd og ha bønnfellesskap. Gruppen vokste, og to år senere ble John Nelson Darby og John Gifford Bellett identifisert med samlingene.

Plymouthbrødrene i generell forstand, og Darby spesifikt, identifiseres gjerne med en eskjatalogisk tilretteleggelse – pretribulasjonal premillennisme. Vi skal

² Dahlene, *ibid.*

³ Harry A. Ironside, *A historical sketch of the Brethren movement* (Neptune, New Jersey: Loizeaux Brothers, 1995) s. 11.

⁴ Ironside, *ibid.*

imidlertid merke oss at eskjatologien først ble aktualisert i 1830. I utgangspunktet var det *ekkesiologien* som opptok dem:

What particularly marked them from the beginning was their belief that there is no Biblical warrant for the idea that the Lord's Supper was ever intended to be the badge or exclusive possession of a sect or party; that no ordained clergyman needed to preside in order to render the remembrance of Christ in this way valid, but that any two or three gathered together in the name of Jesus, whether for prayer, worship, or to take the feast of love, were guaranteed His presence in the[ir] midst. They did not see in Scripture any evidence of a clerical system in the early church at all, but recognized that the Word taught the priesthood of all true believers having access into the holiest by the blood of Christ.⁵

I 1827 publiserte Darby sitt første ekklesiologiske skrift, "The Nature and Unity of the Church of Christ". Dette igjen resulterte i kontakt med tilsvarende smågrupper, både i Irland og Storbritannia. Kjente navn i plymouthbrødre-sammenheng er George Müller og Henry Craig som stod som ledere for en uavhengig menighet i Bristol. Etter hvert som disses læremessige sympatier gikk i 'plymouth-retning' ble menigheten omformet til en plymouth-forsamling. Et hovedsenter for bevegelsen ble snart byen Plymouth, hvor Benjamin Wills Newton var den markante lederen. Forsamlingen bestod av 1200 troende i 1840.

Open versus Exclusive Brethren

I 1845 dukket Darby opp i Plymouth og fant, som han nok allerede var blitt forespeilet, at Newton hadde omformet plymouth-forsamlingen til en nærmest tradisjonell menighet hvor han selv, sammen med kollega James Lampden Harris, stod for forkynnelsen (som tidsmessig dominerte møtene) og hvor nattverds-feiringen fungerte som sekundærstørrelse. Darby ble værende flere måneder i Plymouth, og i desember samme år tok han opp konkurrerende virksomhet.

To år senere ble Newton konfrontert med at han forkynte feil om Kristus, som angivelig var besmittet – på ulikt vis – av Adams fall. Under et større møte i Bath i mai 1848 ble Newton og Plymouth-menigheten identifisert utenfor 'brødre'-fellesskapet. Et større skisma var imidlertid underveis og ble aktualisert idet noen fra Newtons forsamling kom til Bristol og søkte fellesskap med Bethesda-forsamlingen (plymouthbrødre-forsamlingen ledet av George Müller og Henry Craik). En minoritet i Bethesda protesterete – mottok man representanter fra Newtons forsamling, annullerte man samtidig Bath-vedtaket, hevdet de. De ledende i menigheten mente imidlertid at de tilflyttede ikke delte Newtons avvikende kristologi og derfor kunne innlemmes i fellesskapet. Minoriteten, derimot,

⁵ Ironside, *ibid.*, s. 16-17.

med George Alexander i spissen, initierte en omfattende korrespondanse med Darby. Det endelige utfallet ble at også Bethesda-forsamlingen ble satt utenfor nettverket, ikke fordi de ikke hadde tatt avstand fra Newtons kristologi, men fordi de ikke *automatisk* avskrev mennesker med utgangspunkt i hans forsamling. En rekke menigheter støttet Bethesda, mens andre allierte seg med Darbys posisjon. Utfra dette første skismaet oppstod distinksjonen mellom de 'åpne' og 'lukkede' brødre. Ironside skriver i den anledning:

Stripped of all unnecessary details it simply simmers down to this: What would be the attitude of Scripturally-gathered assemblies of saints, to persons themselves properly under sentence of excommunication, or to those associated with them? Bethesda and those of like mind practically said, 'Examine them individually and receive such as have not imbibed the teaching or willfully endorsed the evil.' These were called 'Neutral' or 'Open' brethren by the others, who maintained that inasmuch as it is written 'a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,' an assembly tolerating known evil is like a lepruous house and any intercommunion with it, receiving from or commending to it, is but to spread the defilement. Therefore they would refuse all fellowship with any church or assembly tolerating moral or doctrinal evil.

Ironside konkretiserer:

They [The Exclusives] maintained also that if one were excommunicated for Scriptural reasons by any company of Christians, he was by that act properly excluded from every assembly of saints on earth until by repentance and confession he was re-instated. These were known as 'Exclusives'. Thus it will be seen that terms 'open' and 'exclusive' have no reference to the Brethren's attitude toward Christians not regularly meeting with them or holding denominational membership, but they relate solely to these matters of internal discipline.⁶

Til tross for at Bethesda-forsamlingen aldri bifalt Newtons kristologi, skulle skismaet danne presedens hva angår de 'lukkede' rigide håndtering av fremtidig meningsbrytning. Iøynefallende ved de 'lukkede' historikk er nettopp de mange skismaer relatert til sterke lederskikkelser.

Skismaet til tross, både de 'åpne' og 'lukkede' hadde fremgang hver på sine felt. Mens de 'åpne' først og fremst var involvert i evangelisasjons- og misjonsarbeid, utmerket mange av de 'lukkede' seg som fremragende bibellærere. Deres innflytelse nådde langt utenfor egne rekker. William Kelly, for eksempel, stod som utgiver av tidsskriftet *Bible Treasury*, J.B. Stoney utgav *A Voice to the Faithful* og *Food for the Flock*, mens Andrew Miller sammen med C.H. Mackintosh stod ansvarlig for *Things New and Old*. Sistnevntes allegorisk-oppbyggende bibel-

⁶ Ironside, *ibid.*, s. 66-67.

kommentarer (for eksempel *Notes on the Pentateuch*) appellerte vel så mye til ledere innen hellighetsbevegelsen som til plymouthbrødrene selv.⁷



⁷ Følgende sitat illustrerer dette forhold: “The teaching of the [Plymouth Brethren] thru J.N. Darby, C.H.M. [Charles H. Mackintosh], and others is the real foundation of all advanced Bible study. They unfolded the Grace of God, Sonship and Righteousness, in a new way to the searcher. These men loved the Word.” E.W. Kenyon, “The Decadence of Faith.” *Bethel Trumpet* vol. 3 no. 6 (Oct. 1902) s. 133. Et interessant forskningsspørsmål er selvfølgelig i hvilken grad vi kan påvise en evt. *gjensidig* interaksjon mellom plymouthbrødre og representanter for hellighetsbevegelsen. Kenyon selv antyder dette spørsmålet i formuleringen “I do not know just how far the Plymouth Brethren fellowshipped this movement” og refererer da til den britiske Keswicktradisjonen. (E.W. Kenyon, “The new birth,” upublisert prekennotat, 17. juni 1928.) En person som trakk veksler på begge tradisjonene, var Harry A. Ironside, først aktiv innen Frelsesarméen, senere innen Grant-fraksjonen blant de ‘lukkede’ brødre og siden pastor i Moody Church i Chicago. I boken *Holiness the false and the true* (London: Pickering & Inglis, [u.å.]), hvorav første del er selvbiografisk og andre del er læremessig, søker han i antropologien og hellighetslæren å formidle mellom plymouthbrødrene, den metodistisk-orienterte fløy innen hellighetsbevegelsen og den såkalte ‘Higher Christian Life’ (den Keswick-inspirerte del av hellighetsbevegelsen).

Ekklesiologi på avveie - fra Watchman Nee til Witness Lee

Geir Lie er lektorutdannet med kristendomskunnskap hovedfag fra Det teologiske Menighetsfakultet i Oslo.



Tidligere artikler i dette tidsskriftet har blant annet beskjeftiget seg med (1) amerikansk og britisk hellighetsbevegelse (inkludert den britiske Keswicktradisjonen), (2) plymouthbrødrene (jfr. forutgående artikkel i inneværende nummer) og (3) den britiske hellighetsforkynneren T. Austin-Sparks. En venn av sistnevnte, som for øvrig kombinerte tankegods fra bl.a. Keswicktradisjonens antropologi og plymouthbrødrenes ekklesiologi, var kineseren Nee Shu-tsu (1903-72). Etter sin kristne omvendelse som 17-åring tok han navnet Nee To-sheng (倪柝聲) eller *Watchman Nee*, som han heretter vil bli referert til som.¹ Nees bibelundervisning har hatt stor innflytelse blant både pinsevenner og karismatikere og tjener i denne sammenheng som legitimering av fokuset på hans person og virke.

Nee ble født i Swatow, men vokste opp i Foochow i provinsen Fukien.² Etter omvendelsen, i forlengelse av den kvinnelige evangelisten *Dora Yus* (Yu Tzi-tu)³ vekkelsesmøter i en lokal metodistkirke,⁴ begynte han sammen med et par klassekamerater⁵ å avholde bønnemøter på skolen.⁶ Etterhvert som flere av ungdom-

¹ Witness Lee, *Watchman Nee. A Seer of the Divine Revelation in the Present Age* (Anaheim, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1991).

² Angus Kinnear, *Against the Tide* (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 1978) s. 19-21.

³ "Miss Dora Yu - was to study medicine in England before she became an evangelist. When approaching her destination on board a ship, she was moved by the Holy Spirit and inspired by the love of the Lord; She answered His call. Then she asked the captain to let her go home to testify of God. Whereupon she returned to China from Marseilles. She stayed in Shanghai at first; and from there she went to different places to preach the gospel. The Lord used her in a tremendous way, and many people were saved." (James Chen, *Meet Brother Nee* [Hong Kong: The Christian Publishers, n.d.] s. 3.) Se også Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 29-30, 46.

⁴ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 50.

⁵ Disse var Wilson Wang, Simon Meek, Faithful Luke og K.H. Weigh.

⁶ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 56. Watchman var nylig uteksaminert fra anglikanernes (Church Missionary Society) kinesisk-språklige realskole i Foochow og hadde begynt ved den engelsk-språklige High School of St. Mark's. (Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 42, 45.)

mene tilkjennegav en kristen omvendelse, begynte man å gå ut på gatene for å bringe ut evangeliet gjennom traktater og personlige vitnesbyrd:

Their invitation to passers-by was simple and effective. Each of them carried a white cloth hanging on both sides of their bodies. In the front it was written, "You are going to die"; at the back, "Believe in Jesus and you will be saved."⁷

Gjennom Dora Yu ble Nee oppmuntret til å ta kontakt med en forhenværende anglikansk misjonær, *Margaret E. Barber* (1878-1930), som nå virket "independently."⁸ Barber var oppvokst i Peasenhall, Suffolk og hadde meldt seg til misjonens tjeneste i 1899 hvor hun de neste sju år var engasjert som lærer ved Church Mission Society's realskole for piker i Foochow. I løpet av en hvileperiode i England i 1909 lot hun seg døpe med troende dåp av pastor D.M. Panton,⁹ som betjente Surrey Chapel i Norwich. Til tross for at biskopen i brev form frarådet henne å reise tilbake til Fukien provinsen, allierte hun seg i 1920 med forbønnen fra sine trosfeller i Surrey Chapel og påbegynte et arbeid blant kinesiske kvinner,

⁷ Tung Siu Kwan, "The Waves of the 'Local Church.'" *Bridge* (Hong Kong), No. 56, Nov.-Dec. 1992 s. 5.

⁸ "In 1909 while on furlough from her missionary post at the Nan-t'ai girls' middle school, she began to seriously question the church's position on infant baptism. To the dismay of her bishop she began attending the services at the independent Surrey Chapel, Norwich. Under the teaching of Rev. David M. Panton, she adjudged baptism to be actually a baptism into the Lord's death." (Dana Roberts, *Understanding Watchman Nee* [Plainfield, New Jersey: Logos International, 1980] s. 13.)

⁹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 78. David Morrieson Panton ble født på Jamaica i 1870 og hadde anglikansk geistlig familiebakgrunn. Faren var 'archdeacon' og onkelen 'Archbishop of the West Indies'. I 1885 kom unge Panton til England hvor han først studerte to år ved Old Hall, Wellington, deretter to år ved St. Lawrence's, Ramsgate. Deretter bar det til Cambridge University, "entering Caius College to read law in preparation for a legal career." Sammen med flere av studentene kom han under innflytelse av ex-anglikaneren Robert Govetts undervisning. Som førstnevnte ble også Panton 'ledet ut' av Church of England, blant annet på grunn av et avvikende dåpssyn. Etter en kort periode på Jamaica kom han igjen tilbake til England hvor han ble "appointed Resident Warden at the Ipswich Social Settlement." Etter 4 år mottok han så kall til forstandergjeringen i Govetts menighet, Surrey Chapel. Denne tjente han som fulltidspastor i perioden 1901-41. Mange av menighetens medlemmer opplevde kall til misjonsgjeringen, men som under Govetts periode, vokste fremdeles menigheten i antall. Også Panton ble kjent på grunn av sine mange bøker og pamfletter, samt artikler i tidsskriftet *The Dawn*, som han utgav fra og med april 1924. (*Surrey Chapel Norwich (Undenominational) Centenary 1854-1954* s. 21-27.)

ledsaget av frøken M.L.S. Ballord og kineseren Li Ai-ming i Pagoda Anchorage like utenfor byen Foochow:¹⁰

The two ladies at first engaged in country evangelism, but in the stormy post-World War I years, the conviction grew in their hearts that the future of the Chinese Church depended on the emergence of young Chinese leadership.¹¹

Barber ble den som vekket Nees interesse for opplysende kristen litteratur. En biografi om den franske mystikeren Madame Guyón (1648-1717) gjorde et uutsløttelig inntrykk. Interessen for eskjatologiske spørsmål ble vakt gjennom bøker av G.H. Pember,¹² Robert Govett¹³ og Panton. Nee etterlyste dessuten litteratur

¹⁰ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 57-58.

¹¹ Leslie Lyall, *Three of China's mighty men* (Sevenoaks, Kent: Hodder and Stoughton and the Overseas Missionary Fellowship, 2. utg., 1980) s. 54.

¹² George Hawkins Pember (1836-1910) vokste opp i Hereford. Han studerte siden ved Cambridge University (Caius College) hvor han tok sin B.A. i 1860 og M.A. i 1863. (John Venn, *Biographical history of Gonville and Caius College, 1349-1897* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1898] s. 331. Se også J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953] s. 80.) Pembers bachelorgrad omfattet gresk og latin språk og litteratur. (J.R. Tanner (ed.:) *The historical register of the University of Cambridge* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917] s. 621.) I perioden 1861-63 var Pember også ansatt som 'assistant master' ved Rossal School i Lancashire. (L.R. Furneaux, *Rossal School Register, 1844-1923*. 6 utg. Oxford, 1924 s. 7.)

¹³ Govett ble født 14. feb. 1813 i Staines, Middlesex. Gjerne på grunn av familiens geistlige bakgrunn, syntes unge Govetts fremtidige yrkeskarriere forutbestemt. Etter å ha blitt uteksaminert fra Oxford University (Worcester College) begynte hans anglikanske prestekarriere i Bexley, Kent i 1837. I 1841 flyttet han til Norwich hvor han betjente St. Stephen's Church. Han fikk imidlertid teologiske problemer med barnedåp og ble kort tid deretter døpt som troende av forstander William Brock i St. Mary's Baptist Chapel. Govett brøt med den anglikanske kirke i 1845, og mange av medlemmene fulgte med til Victoria Hall i St. Andrew's Street hvor han leide lokale i 9 år framover. I 1854 kjøpte menigheten eget lokale i Surrey Road, 'Ebenezer Chapel', senere kalt 'Surrey Chapel'. Kirken var en av Norwichs største med 1500 sitteplasser, og var ofte fylt til randen av møtebesøkende.

(footnote continued)

“on the subject of the cross in Christian experience,” men Barber, til tross for at hun hadde to bøker om emnet, ville vente med å introdusere bøkene til hun opplevde ham moden nok til å lese dem:

“I could not understand the reason for this,” he says, “and I wanted those two books very much, so I obtained them by guile. I enquired from her the titles and author without her realizing what I was doing, and I wrote to Mrs. [Jessie] Penn-Lewis, who sent them to me as a gift and wrote me a nice letter as well! One was *The Word of the Cross* and the other *The Cross of Calvary and Its Message*.”¹⁴

Nee ble også fascinert av å lese om George Müller¹⁵ og Hudson Taylor,¹⁶ som begge hver på sin kant opplevde at Gud dekket deres økonomiske behov uten at de appellerte til hjelp fra andre troende. Et levende eksempel nærmere for hånden

Govett praktiserte troende dåp, og i løpet av de første fire år etter bruddet med Church of England døpte han mellom 300 og 400 anglikanere. Flere selvstendige menigheter ble etablert utenfor Norwich, eksempelvis i Stoke Holy Cross, Bramerton, Great Moulton, Swardeston og Saxlingham Nethergate. Govetts forfatterskap inkluderer først og fremst teologiske bibelkommentarer. 26 år gammel, mens han fremdeles betjente St. Stephen’s Church, skrev han *Isaiah Unfulfilled*. Ifølge ham selv var hans beste bok *Acocalypse Expounded By Scripture*, et fire binds mammutverk. Govett betjente menigheten fram til sin død 20. feb. 1901. (*Surrey Chapel Norwich* s. 3-15.)

¹⁴ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 76. Sistnevnte bok av Penn-Lewis ble siden bundet sammen med en annen av hennes bøker, *The Logos of the Cross*. Fellestittelen på den ‘nye’ boken ble *The Centrality of the Cross*.

Barber kjente Penn-Lewis personlig og stod oppført som forkynner under en av Penn-Lewis’ ‘Overcomer Conventions’. Hun deltok på flere ‘Workers Conventions’ arrangert av Penn-Lewis og besøkte dessuten sistnevnte i Leicester. Også Panton må Penn-Lewis ha vært fortrolig med i og med at han fikk publisert en rekke artikler i den walisiske kvinnens tidsskrift *The Overcomer* i løpet av 1913-14. (Brynmor Jones, brev datert 30.09.1996 og 27.05.1996.)

¹⁵ Watchman Nee, *Spiritual Knowledge* (New York: Christian Fellowship Publishers, Inc., 1973) s. 40-42.

¹⁶ Watchman Nee, *The normal Christian Church Life* (Anaheim, California: Living Stream Ministry, 4th. ed., 1991) s. 182-83.

var dessuten Margaret Barber personlig, som hadde forlatt England uten å ha noen garanti om økonomisk underhold fra noen utsendermenighet:¹⁷

Often, Watchman knew, she had been down to her last dollar, but God had never yet failed her. In 1923 she had spoken to the brothers of her prayer for a ten-room hostel for expansion of her work at Customs Point, with no idea whatever of how this might be provided. Watchman was astounded when a little later a neighboring industrial school ceased operation and God caused its twenty rooms to become available to her at a paltry rental.¹⁸

Nees forhold til hellighetsbevegelsen

Nee var også, som fastslått innledningsvis, fascinert av forrige generasjons hellighetsforkynnere, og hans egen undervisning bar preg av dette:

He was finding now much personal help from the writings of Andrew Murray and F.B. Meyer on the practical life of holiness and deliverance from sin. He read, too, all he could of Charles G. Finney, and of Evan Roberts and the Welsh spiritual awakening of 1904-5; and he delved into Otto Stockmayer and Jessie Penn-Lewis on the questions of soul and spirit and of triumph over Satanic power.¹⁹

Allerede i 1923 hadde Nee laget utkast til et par kapitler om det troende menneske som ånd, sjel og legeme. Etter lengre tids avbrudd tok han etter tre år igjen fatt på bokprosjektet, og i juni 1928 var *The Spiritual Man*, et omfattende verk i 3 bind, klar for trykking. Dette ble faktisk eneste boken Nee forfattet, alle øvrige er nedskrevet av andre fra hans muntlige forkynnelse.²⁰

¹⁷ “When Miss M.E. Barber thought of coming to China to serve the Lord, she foresaw the difficulties of a woman setting out on her own for a foreign country, so she asked advice of Mr. Wilkinson of the Mildmay Mission to the Jews, who said, ‘A foreign country, no promise of support, no backing of any society - all these present no problem. The question is here: Are you going on your own initiative, or are you being sent by God?’ ‘God is sending me,’ she replied. ‘Then no more questions are necessary,’ he said, ‘For if God sends you, He must be responsible.’” (Nee, *The Normal Christian Church Life* s. 171.)

¹⁸ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 83.

¹⁹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 105.

²⁰ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 126.

Nees forhold til plymouthbrødrene

I løpet av 1927 hadde Nee begynt å samles sammen med tre venner i Shanghai for å “worship God together in the breaking of bread.”²¹ Tidlig i 1928 fikk man så leie møtelokaler på Wen Teh Li, en liten gate som strakte seg østover fra Har-doon Road, og innen et år var forsamlingen kjent under navnet *Den lille flokk* (Hsiao Chun).²²

Margaret Barber hadde noe nølende introdusert Nee for plymouthbrødre-forfattere som J.N. Darby og C.A. Coates. Disse appellerte til Nee, som kontaktet en forlegger i London for å få fatt i ytterligere beslektet litteratur. På denne måten kom han i forbindelse med George Ware, som tilhørte de ‘lukkede brødre’ (Exclusive Brethren) i London. Nees personlige

search for a more primitive pattern of Christian worship, free of the accumulated debris of tradition, had, he now discovered, led him to follow lines rather similar to theirs. The central act of every Sunday’s worship was the evening meeting around the Lord’s Table at which anyone present was free to express spontaneous adoration and thanksgiving to God, before all partook together of the bread and wine.²³

I samsvar med plymouthbrødrene forfektet Nee et kvinnesyn som ikke bare forhindret dem i å ta ordet i offentlige sammenkomster hvor menn var tilstede, de måtte endog tildekke hodet i menighetssamlinger, dette til tross for at tradisjonell kinesisk kultur ikke tilsa at kvinner bar verken slør eller hatt. Da slike ting måtte lages, ble det heklet en svart lue som var lik for alle. Og som om ikke dette skulle

²¹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 125-26. Disse var *Peace Wang* (Wang Pei-chen) [i hvis hjem de først kom sammen], *Ruth Lee* (Li Yuen-ju) og *Charles H. Judd*. Sistnevnte var kanadisk misjonær og jobbet i regnskapsavdelingen for China Inland Mission i Shanghai. Peace Wang hadde virket som evangelist etter å ha blitt uteksaminert fra Nanking Seminary, mens Ruth Lee hadde stiftet bekjentskap med Watchman Nee allerede i 1922 da hun ble invitert til Foochow som evangelist. (Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 66-67.)

²² Nee hadde oversatt til kinesisk salmer av Margaret Barber, samt flere av de britiske plymouthbrødrenes sanger fra *deres* salmebok *Hymns for the Little Flock*. Tittelen på Nees sangbok ble identisk, og dette er gjerne årsaken til at utenforstående identifiserte Nees forsamling som ‘The Little Flock’: “As Watchman’s work spread across China, all associated local groups of believers were thereafter dubbed by observers with a name their members deplored and never themselves used: ‘the Little Flock Churches.’” (Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 143.)

²³ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 128.

være nok, måtte også kvinnene sitte adskilt fra mennene, med takstøttene som skille.²⁴

Om mennene i teorien anså sitt eget kjønn eksklusivt som verdig til å undervise fra Bibelen, ble ærbødigheten for 'Guds Ord' likefullt satt på kraftig prøve når det kom til praksis. Det var nemlig slett ikke bare kvinnene som verdsatte undervisningen til f. eks. Ruth Lee og Peace Wang. Etter nøye 'teologiske overveielser' løste et par av mennene problemet ved å dele lokalet ved hjelp av et stort hvitt laken når Lee og Wang forkynte. Mennene plasserte seg bak forhenget for på den måten å unngå sin tilstedeværelse og fikk slik nytte godt av kvinnes forkyngergave uten å komme i konflikt med angivelig paulinsk forbud mot kvinnelige lærere!²⁵

Til tross for at Nees åndelige utvikling hittil på mange måter var en frukt av kvinnelige forkynnere som Margaret Barber og Jessie Penn-Lewis, gav han nå førstnevnte en overhaling for at hun, angivelig stikk i strid med Bibelens anvisninger, gav bibelundervisning til det motsatte kjønn. Istedet for å tilrettevise den unge kineseren, viste hun ham et par bøker av T. Austin-Sparks, "whose messages on the cross of Christ, owing something to Jessie Penn-Lewis, had in the past year or so brought blessing to her."²⁶ Dette ble også siste gang Nee traff Miss Barber, som døde i mai 1930 og ble pleiet av den norske sykepleieren Serene Løland.²⁷

I desember 1930 stiftet så Nee bekjentskap med *Charles Barlow*, som representerte et britisk ingeniørfirma i Shanghai.²⁸ Barlow selv kom fra Petersburg og

²⁴ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 129, 133.

²⁵ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 222.

²⁶ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 129. Kjennskapet til Austin-Sparks er ikke unaturlig, all den stund Barber hadde deltatt - endog som forkynner - ved flere av Penn-Lewis konferanser, hvor også Austin-Sparks var aktiv.

²⁷ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 138. Lølands historie, gjenfortalt av Aril Edvardsen, er beskrevet i boken *Gud i China* (Kvinesdal: Logos Forlag, 1973).

²⁸ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 140-41.

hadde tilknytning til Raven-Taylor fraksjonen²⁹ blant 'de lukkede brødre' i London. Han fant at Nees menighetsbyggende virksomhet syntes å gjenspeile "principles which [the Plymouth Brethren] had inherited from their own beginnings a century before."³⁰ Etter å ha forlatt Shanghai delte Barlow sin begeistring med de menigheter han hadde tilknytning til i den engelsktalende verden, og man ble enige om å sende en delegasjon til Shanghai for å gjøre seg nærmere kjent med Nees arbeid.³¹ Nees medarbeider Stephen Kaung hevder i ettertid at 'brødrenes' intensjon var å ta over Nees menighetsbyggende arbeid i Kina. I løpet av korrespondansen mellom Kina og England forut for delegasjonens ankomst i oktober hadde kineserne eksplisitt gjort oppmerksom på at delegasjonen kun var velkommen som "individual believers," ikke i kraft av at de representerte en fraksjon blant de 'lukkede brødre'.³² Delegasjonen bestod av åtte personer fra henholdsvis England, USA og Australia. Disse ankom Kina i oktober 1932 og ble raskt forvisset om at ingenting burde være til hinder for at man kunne 'bryte brødet' sammen og dele det åndelige felleskapet:

The first week the visitors asked to be excused from breaking bread with the Chinese on the Lord's Day, while they prayed and debated, weighing carefully what they had seen and learned in conversations, lest there should be a flaw. How could they associate their friends at home with something God might not approve? But there was so much to reassure them: the attitude of worship, and of obedience to the Scriptures, the prayers, the evident authority of the brothers, the meekness and silence of their women - and their seemly headcovering.³³

På våren året etter fikk så Nee invitasjon til å besøke 'menighetene' i England, USA og Canada. I løpet av perioden i England var han en rask tur innom Austin-Sparks menighet på Honor Oak Road i London, dog uten å informere noen av

²⁹ F.E. Raven var 'disippel' av J.B. Stoney. I 1888 ble han anklaget for å forkynne galt, både vedrørende den troendes delaktighet i evig liv og mhp. hvordan guddoms- og menneskenaturen innbyrdes forholdt seg til hverandre i Jesu egen person. Ravens kristologi har blitt identifisert med den læreposisjon som i oldkirken blant annet ble forfektet av Laodikea-biskop *Apollinaris*, som synes å ha ment at Kristus ikke var sant menneske siden den skapte, men preeksistente Logos (av samme vesen som Faderen) gjennom inkarnasjonen hadde tatt Jesu menneskelige sjels plass. Ved Ravens død i 1905 utpekte amerikaneren James Taylor sr. seg som gruppens leder. Han ble siden etterfulgt av sønnen James Taylor jr.

³⁰ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 146.

³¹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 147.

³² Stephen Kaung, "The Life of Watchman Nee." Kassett nr. 2 i en udatert serie på 3.

³³ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 147.

sine venner blant de 'lukkede brødre'.³⁴ To uker senere gikk kursen videre til USA, og Nee ble ledsaget av lederen for Raven-Taylor fraksjonen blant de 'lukkede brødre', James Taylor sr., som hadde besøkt England et par uker. I mellomtiden hadde 'brødrene' i England ad tilfeldigheter fått nyss om Nees besøk og - enda verre - hans nattverdsdeltakelse i Honor Oak-menigheten. Det ble umiddelbart telegrafert til Taylor i Brooklyn, New York, men Nee var allerede i New Haven. Nees hovedhensikt for reisen til USA hadde vært å besøke legemisjonær Thornton Stearns som var hjemme på hvileperiode.³⁵ Her brøt igjen Nee ut av 'brødrenes' lukkede krets i og med at han tok del i nattverden sammen med ekteparet Stearns, som han tidligere hadde gjort det også i Kina.³⁶ En av Nees etterfølgere, kineseren *James Chen* (Chen Tseh-hsin),³⁷ hevdet med rette at de 'lukkede brødre' trodde at kun de utgjorde menigheten og at de alene "stood on the right church ground":

Their fellowship extended only to their own members, and those who had fellowship with them were not allowed to enter into fellowship with other Christians. In their opinion, the fact that brother Nee broke bread with brother Sparks was a violation of the greatest church principle, and they announced officially his expulsion.³⁸

³⁴ "[Austin-Sparks], whom he had greatly hoped to see, was away in the north; but George Paterson and others welcomed him warmly and he enjoyed the fellowship and ministry of the Word, and received with gladness the bread and wine." (Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 152.)

³⁵ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 152-54.

³⁶ James Taylor, A.F. Moore og John Smith, brev "To the saints who gather unto the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ at Shanghai," datert 14.10.1933.

³⁷ James Chen opplevde en kristen omvendelse i 1926 da Nee besøkte hans hjemsted i Changchou. Nee sendte i 1949 Chen til Hong Kong for å styrke menigheten der. (Chen, *Meet Brother Nee* s. 26, 76.) Gjennom Chen ble det reist opp en livskraftig menighet "numbering in the thousands." (James Chen, *The Passing of the Torch*, [Auburn, Maine: Christian Books Publishing House, 1988], introduksjon [som mangler sidenummerering.] Perioden 1950-57 karakteriseres som "the golden age of the church." Fra 1957 til 1961 avtok veksten og man "remained on a horizontal level." Deretter opplevde man regelrett stagnasjon og til sist en traumatisk splittelse. Splittelsen gjaldt imidlertid ikke bare menigheten i Hong Kong, men var bare en av mange i rekken etter den første i Manila, Filippinene i 1961. (Chen, *The Passing of the Torch* s. 16-17)

³⁸ Chen, *Meet Brother Nee* s. 40. Som det går fram like i forveien (note 34), var ikke Austin-Sparks tilstede da Nee besøkte menigheten. Det medfører dermed ikke riktighet at Nee 'brøt brødet' sammen med engelskmannen som Chen her påstår.

Nå fulgte en to års periode med utstrakt korrespondanse mellom 'brødrene' i Vesten og Shanghai-menigheten. I tillegg til at Nee gjennom nattverdsdeltakelse angivelig hadde gått god for legitimiteten av den kirketilhørighet som var representert gjennom de øvrige nattverdsdeltakerne – "thus he [Nee] is associated with sectarianism, clericalism and other evils of which we need not speak"³⁹ - hadde Nee også "denied the symbolical teaching of the book of Revelation." Nærmere konkretisert innebar dette blant annet at Nee i bokstavelig stand så for seg et himmelsk Jerusalem med gater av gull. I tillegg hadde han forfektet den såkalte 'partial rapture' teorien som hevder at kun et utvalg av de troende vil bli opprykket ved Jesu annet komme.⁴⁰ Menigheten i Shanghai gav i sin respons uttrykkelig beskjed om at man aldri hadde hatt noen visjon om en organisatorisk enhet med de 'lukkede brødre' i Vesten. Delegasjonen som besøkte Kina i 1932 var blitt mottatt som brødre i troen uten referanse til hva de måtte representere organisatorisk sett. Med referanse til de vennskapsbånd som hadde utviklet seg mellom Shanghai-menigheten og brødrene i Vesten, ble det forøvrig presisert:

By our coming together into fellowship it does not mean that two fellowships merge. We are nothing and we hope to continue to be nothing. We come together as brothers and only as such, not as the 'Brethren.'⁴¹

Selv om den læremessige disputten endte med et formelt skisma i 1935,⁴² var Nee fremdeles positivt innstilt til mye av plymouthbrødrenes litteratur. Spesielt verdsette han deres syn "that a town or village should have one church, not several."⁴³

Nees innflytelse i Kina vokste på den ene side sett i kraft av utbredelsen av hans bøker, som fylte et stort behov for undervisning - dessuten gjennom menighetsmedlemmenes "spontaneous use of believers' homes":

³⁹ James Taylor, A.F. Moore og John Smith, brev "To the saints who gather unto the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ at Shanghai," datert 14.10.1933.

⁴⁰ James Taylor, A.F. Moore og John Smith, brev "To the saints who gather unto the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ at Shanghai," datert 27.01.1934.

⁴¹ D.C. Du, Y.A. Wu og K.Y. Chang, brev "To the saints gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ at London," datert 20.03.1934.

⁴² Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 170.

⁴³ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 158.

A prayer group would spring up where a believer moved by transfer of business or official service; and at once this would become a fresh center of Christian witness, drawing people, some out of paganism but not a few from various mission connections, into a primitive church fellowship.⁴⁴

Etter som gruppen vokste, ble det utnevnt *eldste* (chang-lao) i samsvar med deres nytestamentlige forståelse. Bevegelsen hadde også *apostler* (shi-tu), fulltidsarbeidere som virket blant de unødde, pionerte menigheter og bygget opp de troende. I Nees ekklesiologi skilte han mellom 'menigheten' og 'arbeidet'. Førstnevnte var økonomisk selvhjulpen, autonom og ble ansett som et lokalt uttrykk for Guds rike innenfor et gitt geografisk område. 'Arbeidet', derimot, ble ansett som "loosely coordinated by regions, with Watchman and a few others acting as advisers to the apostles in their areas, training them and feeling themselves responsible before God for the flow of financial support."⁴⁵ En 'apostel' ville dermed underordne seg de eldste i en lokal menighet når han jobbet inn i deres sammenheng, men ikke når han var engasjert i pionervirke og menighetsplanting. I 1938 skal man ha hatt 128 fulltidsansatte 'apostler' i virksomhet.

En av Nees medarbeidere, *Simon Meek* (Miao Shou-hsun), hadde virket på Filippinene siden 1931,⁴⁶ og etter et besøk i Manila i 1937 hvor Nee virket i en fire ukers periode, vendte han tilbake til Kina akkurat idet den japanske invasjonen startet opp. I byen Hankow samlet Nee sammen så mange som mulig av heltidsarbeiderne og søkte med primært bakgrunn i korintierbrevene å "crystallize and codify the practical principles derived from Scripture that together they had worked out and used in living situations in the conduct of the work and the formation of local churches."⁴⁷ Denne undervisningen, samt Nees forkynnelse fra en tidligere konferanse i Shanghai

⁴⁴ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 177.

⁴⁵ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 178.

⁴⁶ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 181.

⁴⁷ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 182.

i januar, dannet bakgrunn for boken *Kung-tso Ti Tsai-ssu* (Rethinking the Work) som utkom i mars 1938.⁴⁸

Flere av Nees venner blant misjonærene øvde et påtrykk om at boken måtte oversettes til engelsk, og ansvaret falt primært på Elizabeth Fischbacher, som sammen med to øvrige 'China Inland missionary ladies' fulgte med Nee til England samme år. Nee hadde hatt en viss korrespondanse med T. Austin-Sparks og hadde med stort utbytte lest dennes tidskrift *A Witness and a Testimony*, men de hadde hittil ikke møtt hverandre. Sammen overvar de den årlige 'Convention for the Deepening of Spiritual Life' i Keswick før de begav seg til Austin-Sparks Honor Oak-menighet i London som Nee gjorde til sitt midlertidige hovedkvarter.⁴⁹

I oktober fikk Nee invitasjon fra pastor J. Fjord Christensen til Danmark. Ved den internasjonale folkehøgskolen i Helsingør holdt Nee ti prekenes over Romerbrevets kapitler 5-8 med hovedtemaet 'Det normale kristenliv'. Disse prekenene, supplert med noen flere over samme tema, dannet bakgrunn for Nees klassiker med samme tittel. I Odense tok Nee utgangspunkt i Efeserbrevets oppbygning og prekte over verbene 'sitte', 'vandre', 'stå' - som også ble utgangspunkt for en liten bok med identisk tittel.⁵⁰

Nee var også en tur innom Norge i løpet av 1938 hvor han talte i Albert Lundes menighet, Den Evangeliske Forsamling, i Møllergata 20 i Oslo. På spørsmål om Kinas virkelige behov, undersøkte han ikke behovet for misjonærenes innsats:

⁴⁸ Leslie Lyall skriver: "The book, published in Chinese and later in English, was a bombshell! It was immediately recognized as an open attack, a declaration of war, both on denominational foreign missions and also on interdenominational missions. New separatist local churches were set up in many of the larger cities claiming to be the only ones with Biblical justification. It would be untrue to say that this separatist movement did not cause intense resentment on the part of many of the older churches and not a little bitterness on the part of those who saw the fruit of their life-work being taken over by another organization. On the positive side, many old denominational churches were aroused from their sleep by Nee's challenge to realize how useless in themselves were the traditional customs and forms of worship practiced in many congregations. However, the one 'locality' principle so firmly held, led to a denial of all other churches as not real churches at all and the required total breaking of fellowship with them was divisive." (*Three of China's mighty men* s. 66.)

⁴⁹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 183-85.

⁵⁰ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 188.

Send ut lærere, folk som kjenner Gud på en særlig måte og som har kjennskap til Guds Ord, og som kan lede de kristne frem, og la så kineserne gjøre mer av alt evangelisk arbeide. Jeg tror dette er det største behov. Og så eders bønner og finansielle hjelp.⁵¹

I løpet av perioden i England gikk Elizabeth Fischbacher igang med oversettelsen av den kinesiske *Kung-tso Ti Tsai-ssu* som Nee forkortet og endret forordet på. Oversettelsen ble utgitt i London i mai 1939 under tittelen *Concerning Our Missions*.⁵²

Nee slår uttrykkelig fast i boken at 'arbeiderne' ikke har krav på noe økonomisk underhold fra de lokale menighetene. I praksis tok Nee selv ansvaret for omlag 40 av heltidsmedarbeiderne. I 1942 etablerte han 'China Biological and Chemical Laboratories' som var knyttet til produksjon av syntetiske legemidler. Broren George var nemlig kjemiker og hadde tidligere grunnlagt en farmasøytisk bedrift med produksjons- og distribusjonsledd under navnet 'Nee Brothers' hvorav noen av aksjene var fordelt på familiemedlemmene. Broren manglede imidlertid forretningsansats, og det ble Watchman som til å begynne med overvåket denne siden ved prosjektet. En av hensiktene med firmaet var delvis å sysselsette mange av Nees heltidsmedarbeidere for dermed å sikre dem det økonomiske underhold som var nødvendig for at de kunne fortsette det evangelistiske arbeidet.

Menigheten i Shanghai hadde imidlertid liten forståelse for at Nee engasjerte seg i sekulær 'business' istedetfor å vie seg helt og fullt for 'Guds rike'. Han fikk derfor ikke anledning til å forkynne lenger i menigheten på Wen Teh Li.⁵³ Menigheten som sådan opplevde også stagnasjon under krigsårene. De offentlige møtene ble innstilt og man kom kun sammen til private husmøter.⁵⁴ I 1946 skrev så Nee til sin tidligere medarbeider *Witness Lee* (Li Shang-chou - 李常受) i Chefoo og uttrykte bekymring for Shanghai-menighetens tilstand. Resultatet ble at Lee flyttet til Nanking for å bygge opp menigheten der og i Shanghai.

Lees organisasjonstalent viste seg umiddelbart. To dager i uken samlet man seg på Wen Teh Li som 'menigheten i Shanghai', mens man tre ganger i uken kom sammen som *familier* (chias) på femten ulike steder i byen. Da menighetens medlemmer viste en tendens til å favorisere først *en* distriktssamling, siden en

⁵¹ L.F., "En kineser om China idag." *Kinamisjonæren*, des. 1938 s. 1, 5-6.

⁵² Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 189-90. I USA er boken publisert under tittelen *The Normal Christian Church Life*.

⁵³ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 211-14.

⁵⁴ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 218.

annen, ble man etter ett år *tildelt* sitt faste distrikt og måtte formelt søke om tillatelse om man ønsket overgang til et annet distrikt. Til tross for den mer autoritære linjen, vokste menigheten i antall, og ‘familiesamlingene’, som kunne telle fra 40 til omlag 200 troende, ble inndelt i grupper på omlag 15 personer. Disse utgjorde gjerne de troende i en enkelt gate, og to personer ble tildelt ansvaret å ha oppsyn med de øvrige frammøte og åndelige tilstand:

A clock-in system was soon to be introduced at meetings which, together with a full index of believers’ addresses, employment, family, etc., meant that your failure of attendance could be quickly followed up.⁵⁵

Den økumeniske holdningen med åpent nattverdsbord, som blant annet hadde forårsaket bruddet med de ‘lukkede brødre’ i Vesten, ble nå forlatt og man måtte formelt introduseres for menigheten og få tildelt navneskilt for å ta del i nattverdsfeiringen. Ett av kriteriene var imidlertid at man hadde brutt med øvrige kristne sammenhenger og var overgitt til Nees bevegelse.⁵⁶

Alt fra begynnelsen av konfronterte Lee lederne i Shanghai med deres utstøtelse av Nee fra menigheten. Det skulle likevel gå to hele år før gjensidig tillit var gjenopprettet og Nees forkynnergave igjen fikk komme til uttrykk i menigheten.⁵⁷ Dette var imidlertid like før kommunistenes maktovertakelse i 1949, og bare tre år senere ble Nee arrestert anklaget blant annet for “imperialist intrigue and espionage, counterrevolutionary activities hostile to government policy, financial irregularity, and gross licentiousness.”⁵⁸ I januar 1970 - etter atten år i fengsel i Shanghai - synes Nee å ha blitt flyttet til en åpen anstalt eller arbeidsleir. 1. juni 1972 døde han uten at sikre opplysninger foreligger vedrørende dødsårsak.⁵⁹

Nees forhold til pinsebevegelsen

Som vi har sett, integrerte Nee elementer av ulike kristendomstradisjoner innenfor sitt eget system. Det er imidlertid uklart hvordan han stilte seg til pinsebevegelsen og dens teologiske anliggende. Nee var inne i en åndelig ‘tørkeperiode’ da han møtte Elisabeth Fischbacher i 1935 og lot seg fascinere av hennes bibelundervisning. “I have met the Lord,” telegraferte han til ‘brødrene’ i Shanghai.

⁵⁵ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 223.

⁵⁶ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 223-24.

⁵⁷ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 227, 233-34.

⁵⁸ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 271.

⁵⁹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 309.

Medarbeiderne Witness Lee og Stephen Kaung hevder likefullt at Nee aldri talte i tunger.⁶⁰ Nee hevdet dessuten selv at tungemålgaven ikke var tilgjengelig for enhver troende.⁶¹ Stikk i strid med Nees nære medarbeidere, påstår likevel den norske kinamisjonæren Serene Løland at både Watchman Nee og hans kone Charity var 'åndsdøpte'.⁶² Både i og utenfor Shanghai hevder Løland at hun fikk være til hjelp for troende som tilhørte 'The Little Flock'.⁶³ Mange syke påstås å være blitt helbredet, og en rekke å ha mottatt tungemålgaven som et resultat av den norske kvinnens forbønn. Løland hevder imidlertid å ha vært noe tilbakeholdende med å legge hendene på mannlige troende innen Nees bevegelse, "fordi hans menighet og alle andre menigheter innen 'Den lille hjord' var imot at en søster la hendene på en bror."⁶⁴ Nees svigerinne Faith Bao var etter sigende Lølands med-

⁶⁰ Witness Lee, *The History of the Church and the Local Churches* (Anaheim, California: Living Stream Ministries, 1991) s. 46.

⁶¹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 170-73.

⁶² Løland, *ibid.* s. 99-100. Løland ble i utgangspunktet utsendt fra Metodistkirken til Foochow i Fukien provinsen for å arbeide ved Wiley General Hospital hvor hun senere ble øverste leder. Løland ankom Kina og Foochow i 1921 og stiftet samme år bekjentskap med Watchman Nee og hans foreldre (*ibid.* s. 27-28, 99). En tid etter at Løland sa opp sin stilling ved hospitalet i 1937 for å leve "i tro" og "bare stole på Herren for [økonomisk] underhold" (s. 35-39), flyttet hun til Shanghai (s. 45). Hun fikk bo hos Faith Bao, søster av Watchman Nees kone, og hevder at huset snart ble et senter folk strømmet til fra alle kanter for å få personlig forbønn. Løland befant seg angivelig snart "midt oppe i en karismatisk vekkelse i Shanghai," og dette lenge før den egentlige karismatiske fornyelse fra 60-tallet gjorde sitt inntog: "En mektig Åndsutgydelse begynte over kristne fra alle samfunn, og særlig blant den kristne overklasse i Shanghai" (s. 52). Løland konkretiserer:

"Masser av studenter kom til mitt hus for hjelp og forbønn og de ble døpt i den Hellige Ånd. De kom fra alle tre universitetene i Shanghai og vekkelsen spredte seg mer og mer. Fra St. Johns Universitet, fra Chuo Tung Universitet og fra Shanghai Universitet kom stadig studenter og ble døpt i den Hellige Ånd. Likeså ble en del lærere og professorer ved disse tre universiteter åndsdøpt. Ved den Presbyteriansk Teologiske skole i Shanghai ble presidenten Chia Yu Ming åndsdøpt og mer enn 50 av de teologiske studenter og flere av lærerne.

Slik fortsatte Åndsutgytelsen hele tiden mens jeg var i Shanghai. Fra alle kirker kom folk for å bli døpt i den Hellige Ånd. Metodister, episkopalere, lutheranere, presbyterianere og baptister ble døpt i den Hellige Ånd og talte i nye tunger og deres liv ble forvandlet. Den Hellige Ånd falt alle steder" (s. 52-53).

⁶³ Løland, *ibid.*, s. 39, 59-60, 96-97, 111- 112.

⁶⁴ Løland, *ibid.*, s. 70.

arbeider,⁶⁵ og til tross for sistnevntes fokus på 'åndsdåp' og tungetale, fikk hun medlemsbevis til Nees forsamling i Shanghai slik at hun kunne delta i menighetens nattverdsmøter.⁶⁶ Det har pr. idag falt utenfor min interesse å sjekke sannhetsgehalten i Lølands biografiske skildringer.

Witness Lee og The Local Church

Nees medarbeider Witness Lee (1905-97) er delvis berørt i denne artikkelen allerede. Han vokste opp i byen Chefoo i den nordlige delen av Kina,⁶⁷ opplevde en kristen omvendelse gjennom Peace Wang i 1925⁶⁸ og gikk raskt inn i en lokal (plymouth-)brødre-forsamling (Benjamin Newton-fraksjonen). Samme år⁶⁹ ble han introdusert for Nees arbeid, blant annet gjennom sistnevntes blad *The Present Testimony*.⁷⁰ I 1933 gikk han inn i arbeidet som Nees medarbeider.⁷¹ Like forut for kommunistenes maktovertakelse i 1950 hadde man omlag 1000 menigheter i Kina som Nees arbeidet inn i.⁷² I 1949 ble Lee sendt til Taiwan, hvor det hadde blitt startet et menighetsbyggende arbeid to år tidligere. Dog var det kun et par hundre mennesker på hele øya som identifiserte seg med Nees virksomhet. I løpet av få måneder økte

⁶⁵ Løland, *ibid.*, s. 82, 94, 100, 111.

⁶⁶ Løland, *ibid.*, s. 99.

⁶⁷ Witness Lee, *History of the Church and the Local Churches* (Anaheim, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1991) s. 59.

⁶⁸ Lee, *History* s. 113; Witness Lee, *Watchman Nee. A Seer of the Divine Revelation in the Present Age* s. 284.

⁶⁹ Kinnear hevder feilaktig at Lee først kom over Nees tidsskrift to år senere - i 1927. (Kinnear, *ibid.*, s. 144.)

⁷⁰ Dette var Nees første tidsskrift og utkom første gang i 1923. Bladet ble erstattet av *The Christian* som utkom månedlig fra og med 1925. Etter 2 år opphørte dette og *The Present Testimony* utkom på nytt i en 7 års periode. Deretter (fra 1934) utkom begge bladene. Sammen med disse to utkom også bladet *The News of the Churches*. (Lee, *History* s. 61, 101-102, 136.)

⁷¹ Lee, *History* s. 35.

⁷² James Chen, *The Passing of the Torch* (Auburn, Maine: Christian Books Publishing House, 1988) s. 4.

imidlertid medlemsmassen til omlag 800 personer.⁷³ Da Lee vendte tilbake til Taiwan etter en fire måneders reise i Sørøst Asia i mars 1953, hadde arbeidet vokst ytterligere.⁷⁴ Han hevder selv at man i perioden 1949-55 vokste fra fem hundre personer til omlag tjue tusen.⁷⁵ En kritisk artikkelserie fra Hong Kong påstår imidlertid at medlemsmassen på Taiwan var så høy som femti tusen i 1955.⁷⁶ Ifølge samme kilde begynte man i 1952 å trene opp potensielle medarbeidere og antallet økte samme år fra to personer til omlag hundre. Menighetene opplevde adskillig vekst over hele

⁷³ Vi skal imidlertid være klare over at minst 500 av disse var flyktinger fra fastlandet som allerede identifiserte seg med Nees menighetsbyggende arbeid. (Norman Howard Cliff, "The Life and Theology of Watchman Nee." M.Phil. thesis, Open University, 1983 s. 102.)

⁷⁴ Tung Siu Kwan, "The Waves of the 'Local Church'," *Bridge* (Hong Kong), No. 57, Jan.-Feb. 1993 s. 2. Det er grunn til å anta at mye av rekrutteringen skjedde blant mennesker som allerede var troende: "Following the Chinese Communist occupation of mainland China, a large number of the Chinese Christians came to Taiwan to live. Upon their first arrival, they found most of the churches on the island using Taiwanese. They were unable to understand what the preachers were saying. However there was a small number of the church which used Mandarin. The Church Assembly Hall (Nee's group), the True Jesus Church, and the chapel in the Y.M.C.A. which used Mandarin, filled the gap. They were able to meet the religious requirements of many mainland Christians who at one time were literally a lost flock. On the mainland there were many denominational churches which they could attend, but when they came to Taiwan, their missionary friends were unable to catch up with their movement and supply their spiritual needs." (Hallington K. Tong, *Christianity in Taiwan. A History*. [Taipei, Taiwan: China Post, 1961] s. 110.)

⁷⁵ Lee, *History* s. 59. Jack Sparks skriver i sin bok *The Mind Benders* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2nd. ed., 1979), s. 221: "Between 1949 and 1955 it appears that the size of the Little Flock grew from 500 to 23.000 on the island." Utsagnet bekreftes av Hallington K. Tong, som skriver: "[...] 52 churches of the Church Assembly Hall located in various places on the island, with a combined attendance of more than 20,000" (*Christianity in Taiwan* s. 113.). Se også Allen J. Swanson, *Taiwan: Mainline versus Independent Church Growth. A Study in Contrasts* (South Pasadena, California: William Carey Library, 1970) s. 190 ff.

⁷⁶ Kwan, "The Waves of The 'Local Church'," s. 2.

Sørøst Asia, men i tillegg til Taiwan særskilt på Filippinene hvor man i 1968 regnet med seks tusen medlemmer.⁷⁷

Vi har imidlertid sett at Lee ikke var den første medarbeideren som ble sendt ut fra fastlands Kina. Simon Meek, tidligere nevnt i artikkelen, hadde altså virket på Filippinene siden 1931. Og *Stephen Kaung* (Chiang Sheo-tao - 江守道), som hadde blitt introdusert for Nees møter i Shanghai i løpet av gymnasårene og “joined the work” i 1935,⁷⁸ virket en kort periode i Singapore⁷⁹ før han med nød og neppe kom seg tilbake til Kina via India idet japanerne invaderte Singapore. Mens Japan var i krig med Kina, virket Kaung i byen Chunking⁸⁰ mens han i 1949 ble utsendt til Filippinene⁸¹ hvor han forble i 3 år.

I 1952 kom Kaung på besøk til USA, nærmere bestemt til et menighetsfelleskap i Hollis (New York City), opprinnelig influert av Austin-Sparks forkynnelse.⁸² En Lind, med skandinavisk avstamning, som tidligere hadde stått som pastor for en svensk menighet i Minnesota, hadde etablert menighetsfelleskapet i Hollis. Uvisst på hvilket tidspunkt fikk Lind kontakt med Austin-Sparks og besøkte flere ganger Honor Oak-felleskapet i London. Da misjonærekteparet Thornton og Carol Stearns vendte tilbake til USA fra Kina, ble de oppmuntret av Austin-Sparks

⁷⁷ Sparks, *ibid.* s. 222. Heller ikke arbeidet i Hong Kong bør neglisjeres. Dette ble påbegynt av K.H. Weigh og Faithful Luke i 1937. De tok umiddelbart fatt med “open air meetings and cottage meetings” da de skjønte at alle protestantiske kirkesamfunn stilte seg avvisende til deres virksomhet. Luke dro etterhvert videre til Singapore for å pionere et nytt arbeid, men Weigh fikk forsterkninger fra Kina i kraft av medarbeideren James Chen. Veksten fikk et betydelig oppsving i forlengelsen av et besøk av Nee og Lee i 1949, samt av Nee igjen året etter. I 1956 ble antall troende estimert til omlag 2.500 personer. (Cliff, *ibid.* s. 100-101.)

⁷⁸ Stephen Kaung, “Life of Watchman Nee,” kassett nr 2, B-siden.

⁷⁹ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 205. Daniel Tan synes å ha vært den første medarbeideren som ble sendt til Singapore, sannsynligvis allerede på 30-tallet (Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 181.).

⁸⁰ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 217.

⁸¹ Etter å ha utsendt Meek i 1931 og selv stanset opp en hel måned i Manila på vei til England via Singapore i 1937, sendte Nee året etter Lucas Wu til Filippinene for å bistå Meek i arbeidet. Etter at Witness Lee besøkte Manila rundt 1950, tiltok rekrutteringen av nye medlemmer. Ved Angus Kinnears besøk i 1955, anslo sistnevnte medlemsmassen i Manila alene til omlag 1.200 troende. (Cliff, *ibid.* s. 98-99.)

⁸² For nærmere presentasjon av Austin-Sparks, se Geir Lie, “T. Austin-Sparks – a brief introduction.” *Refleks* 3-1 (2004) s. 48-52.

til å ta kontakt med Lind. De fant seg godt tilrette og ble en del av felleskapet.⁸³ Thornton, som var “Professor of Orthopedics in the Medical School” og som hadde virket ut fra presbyterianernes misjonsfelt i Tsinan i Shantung provinsen,⁸⁴ og deretter i Shanghai,⁸⁵ - etterhvert også som menighetseldste⁸⁶ - medvirket til at ‘Austin-Sparks felleskapet’ fikk mer ‘Watchman Nee-preg.’ Inderen Bakht Singh besøkte felleskapet i 1960 og forkynte et beslektet budskap.⁸⁷

Også Stephen Kaung kjente godt ekteparet Stearns, og i 1952 kom han altså på besøk til USA og felleskapet - som på dette tidspunkt talte 30-40 personer. Lind var død, og Stearns stod sentralt i ledelsen. Kaungs besøk fikk et noe permanent preg over seg idet han ble i New York og menigheten der fram til 1970.

Om Kaung flyttet til USA så tidlig som 1952, hevder like fullt Witness Lee at det første genuine ‘church life’ i USA oppstod i San Fransisco i 1958. Her ble det nemlig etablert en kinesisk-talende ‘Local Church’ forsamling med forbindelseslinjer til Lees virksomhet på Taiwan. Samme år besøkte Lee USA for første gang og var innom New York, Los Angeles⁸⁸ og, naturlig nok, menigheten i San Fransisco. Lee vendte tilbake til USA i 1960 og fikk forkynnerinnngang i ulike sammenhenger hvor Watchman Nees engelskspråklige litteratur var kjent, blant annet hos Navigatørene i Glen Erie, Colorado.⁸⁹

⁸³ Stephen Kaung, uformell telefonsamtale datert 15.04.1996.

⁸⁴ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 145.

⁸⁵ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 167.

⁸⁶ Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 200-201.

⁸⁷ For nærmere presentasjon av Singh, se Daniel Smith, *A Prophet of God: Bakht Singh of India* (Washington D.C.: International Students, Inc., 1959) og Bakht Singh, *The Skill of His Loving Hands* (Bombay: Gospel Literature Service, n.d.).

⁸⁸ Kaung anbefalte gjerne menigheten Westmoreland Chapel i Los Angeles til kinesere som kom til USA og ville bosette seg på Vestkysten. Det var i så måte naturlig at Witness Lee oppsøkte Los Angeles.

⁸⁹ Sparks, *ibid.* s. 223.

Westmoreland Chapel

Før Lees første USA-besøk i 1958 hadde en svoger av Watchman Nee flyttet til Los Angeles og gått inn i menigheten Westmoreland Chapel.⁹⁰ Medlemmene hadde fått kontakt med Austin-Sparks allerede mens James R. Graham, menighetens første pastor, virket der for han flyttet til Taiwan i 1951 og hvor han etablerte to kristne 'colleges'. Midt på 50-tallet, under et besøk av Austin-Sparks, ble denne spurt om han hadde noen i Honor Oak-felleskapet som kunne lede Los Angeles-menigheten videre.⁹¹ Austin-Sparks sendte da Charles John Bacon Harrison (1901-67),⁹² en tidligere anglikansk prest. Denne forlot London i 1957 og tok ansvar i Westmoreland Chapel sammen med menighetens øvrige lederskap.⁹³ Flere kinesiske familier søkte til menigheten i perioden 1957-62, men "they never fully merged into the identity of Westmorland [sic] Chapel."⁹⁴ Lee forlot Taiwan permanent og flyttet til Los Angeles i 1962.⁹⁵ Også han tok kontakt med menigheten, men da han insisterte på at Harrison skulle erklære menigheten som 'The Church in Los Angeles' og på den måten tilkjenne at han ikke kunne anerkjenne øvrige troendes legitime virke i byen, kom det til et brudd. Kort tid deretter forlot en rekke av menighetens medlemmer - ikke

⁹⁰ På begynnelsen av 40-tallet brøt omlag 100 personer med "a certain large church in Los Angeles" på grunn av spørsmålet skilsmisse-gjengifte. Den nye menigheten tok kontakt med Dr. James R. Graham, en "come outer" som nettopp hadde brutt med sitt eget kirkesamfunn, og bad ham om å ta pastoransvar i den nye menigheten. ("Westmoreland Chapel," upublisert manuskript.)

⁹¹ "Westmoreland Chapel."

⁹² Harrison ble født og vokste opp i India som misjonærbarn. Etter å ha blitt uteksaminert fra Cambridge University med en M.A. grad i 1928, ordinert innen den anglikanske kirke to år tidligere for etter noen år å ha virket som prest i Christ Church, Bromley, Kent, brøt han forbindelsen med den anglikanske kirke i 1935 og ble en del av Austin-Sparks menighetsfelleskap i Honor Oak, London. (Josephine Taylor, "A Brief History," upublisert manuskript, august 1996.)

⁹³ Taylor, *ibid.*

⁹⁴ Sparks, *ibid.* s. 223. James Reetzke skriver forøvrig i "The Lord's Recovery of Experiencing Christ and Practicing the Church Life in Oneness" at Samuel Chang i 1959 "moved from the church in Hong Kong to Los Angeles. He began to meet with our group and to share with us concerning the ground of the church." (<http://www.lordsrecovery.org/history/iv.html>) Den teologiske grunnen var med andre ord forholdsvis godt forberedt da Lee vendte permanent tilbake til Los Angeles i 1962.

⁹⁵ Witness Lee, *The Practical Expression of the Church* (Anaheim, California: The Stream Publishers, 1974) s. 184.

bare kineserne - Westmoreland Chapel og dannet 'The Church in Los Angeles'.⁹⁶ En kritiker av Lee, Jack Sparks, skriver:

An issue came up over Witness Lee himself. The Chinese faction sided with Lee, while others from Westmorland [sic] opposed this faction. As a result, the group split and in 1962 the divisive element from Westmorland [sic] Chapel, under Lee's not-too-well-disguised leadership, "claimed the ground" in Los Angeles. The movement was now fully underway in the United States.⁹⁷

Allerede i 1963 arrangerte man den første av en rekke årlige 'trainings' – det vil si flere ukers intensiv bibelundervisning. Flere kom langveisfra og bestemte seg deretter for å flytte til Los Angeles og være en del av Lees menighet. Bare i løpet av september-oktober 1969 opplevde man et tilsig på 200 personer som gjorde menigheten til sin egen. Man hadde også tre små menigheter i Lubbock, Waco og Denton – alle disse i Texas. Samme år valgte de fleste av medlemmene i alle disse å flytte til Houston hvor de etablerte seg som 'menigheten' i byen. To år senere brøt noen opp for å etablere seg som 'menigheten i Dallas' mens 'menigheten i Austin' så dagens lys i 1973.

Menighetsplantingen i Houston bevirket for øvrig at en rekke troende fra den nordøstlige delen av USA bestemte seg for å flytte til Akron, Ohio. Omtrent samtidig flyttet om lag førti personer fra Los Angeles-menigheten til Atlanta, Georgia og tilsvarende mange til Chicago.

Witness Lee versus Stephen Kaung

Lee og Kaung hadde samarbeidet i det fjerne Østen. Båndene mellom dem var fremdeles intakte fram til omlag 1970 hvor veiene skiltes. Selv om Kaung bifaller Watchman Nees ekklesiologi slik denne kommer til uttrykk blant annet i boken

⁹⁶ Taylor, *ibid.* 27. mai 1962 møttes omlag 20 troende hjemme hos Samuel Chang som 'menigheten i Los Angeles.' Lee var ikke tilstede under samlingen, men befant seg i Seattle. Han hadde imidlertid tett kontakt med gruppen og kom fra tid til annen ned for å undervise dem. 30. november flyttet han permanent til Los Angeles. (James Reetzke, *ibid.*)

⁹⁷ Sparks, *ibid.* s. 223.

The Normal Christian Church Life, opplevde han etter hvert Lee som altfor ekstrem og eksklusiv.⁹⁸

Kaung hadde kontakt med kristne felleskapsgrupper rundt omkring i USA, og cirka 1970 flyttet han fra New York City til Washington D.C. hvor han fram til 1976 ledet en fremdeles eksisterende menighet. Uenigheten med Lee var dog iferd med å komme til overflaten, og Lee hadde i 1973 sendt 16 personer, med Bill Mallon i

⁹⁸ En av Lees tidligere 'våpendragere', William T. Freeman, forfattet i 1981 et polemisk forsvar for Lees 'Local Church' bevegelse, *In Defense of Truth (A Reply of the Local Churches to the Book "The God-Men")* [Seattle, Washington: Northwest Christian Publications, Inc., 1981]. Den polemiske ansatsen var rettet mot Neil T. Duddy og The Spiritual Counterfeits Projects bok *The God-Men, An Inquiry into Witness Lee & the Local Church* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1981). Freeman har siden trukket seg fra Lees bevegelse på grunn av uenighet med "some of the present attitudes, emphases, and practices of the local churches and the Living Stream Ministry." (Freeman, brev til artikkelforfatteren datert 14.03.1996.) Han bifaller dog fremdeles sitt tidligere forsvar av Lee, som ifølge ham selv ble "grossly misrepresented by various cult writers." (I praksis dreide det seg kun om ovennevnte bok av Neil Duddy, samt Jack Sparks, *The Mind Benders*. Sistnevnte bok ble forøvrig imøtegått av Gene Ford, *Who Is the Real Mindbender. Witness Lee ? Jack Sparks* (Anaheim, California: Gene Ford, 1977), Ron Kangas, *Mind Bending or Mind Renewing?* (Anaheim, California: Gene Ford, 1977) og J. Gordon Melton, *An Open Letter Concerning the Local Church, Witness Lee and the God-Men Controversy* (Santa Barbara, California: Institute for the Study of American Religion, 1985). Lee trakk imidlertid både Neil Duddy og Jack Sparks for retten. Resultatet ble at utgiverne trakk *The Mind Benders* tilbake mens forfatter og utgiver av *The God-Men* ble dømt til å betale i underkant av 12 millioner amerikanske dollars. Etter Freemans brudd med the 'local Church' brøt han opp fra Seattle og flyttet til Scottsdale, Arizona. Han har siden flyttet til Spokane, Washington.

(http://www.whitworth.edu/whitworthian/spring2005/0222/news/freeman_index.htm)

spissen, til New York City for å bosette seg der.⁹⁹ Det tidligere ‘Austin-Sparks-fellesskapet’ ble nå knyttet opp mot Witness Lees menighetsnettverk. Noen flyttet også til Washington D.C., men forsøket på å overta menigheten der lyktes ikke. Der finner man derfor to separate grupperinger, en gruppe med lojalitet til Kaung og en annen, hvis stamme er tilflyttede Lee-patrioter, som er lojal overfor sistnevntes virksomhet. I 1976 flyttet Kaung til Richmond, Virginia, som han fremdeles bruker som base for sin reisevirksomhet. Kaung leder dessuten ‘Christian Fellowship Publishers’ som oversetter og utgir Watchman Nees litteratur på engelsk.¹⁰⁰ Også Witness Lees virksomhet gir ut engelskspråklige oversettelser av Nees bøker.

Bevegelse med frynsete renommé

‘Local Church’-bevegelsens¹⁰¹ status som suspekt har tiltatt med årene. Cal Beisner, Robert og Gretchen Passantino skriver i den forbindelse:

⁹⁹ Allerede på 40-tallet hadde Witness Lee tilrettelagt evangelisk virksomhet på nye felter i Kina ved å flytte et representativt utvalg av Chefoo-menighetens medlemmer: “Groups of families, selected as to personnel and representing a suitable cross section of trades and professions - gardeners, shoemakers, teachers, nurses, barbers - were chosen and carefully prepared for their venture. [...] All these gave themselves to the church, who supplied their travel expenses and three months' living costs at their destination. At the end of that period they were expected to support themselves in the new setting.” (Kinnear, *ibid.* s. 230-31.) Under en samling Watchman Nee hadde med flere av medarbeiderne i 1948 ble det besluttet å bygge videre på Lees erfaringer fra tidligere på 40-tallet. Man ble enige om å “concentrate fellow workers for ministry in regional centers until local churches [were] fully established.” (s. 232.) Når menigheten så var et faktum, var det på tide å sende ut “whole communities” for å plante nye menigheter på unådde steder. At den nye praksis syntes å komme i konflikt med det tidligere rådende syn at den lokale menighet og dens eldste ikke var underlagt de tjenestegavene som var engasjert i ‘arbeidet’, kommer knapt til uttrykk.

¹⁰⁰ Kaung, uformell telefonsamtale, 15.04.1996.

¹⁰¹ Betegnelsen ‘Local Church’ anerkjennes ikke av menighetens medlemmer som egenavn.

Problems between the Local Church and other Christians were slight and scattered until 1974. In 1974, the churches following Lee began to proselytize much more openly than before, and to make their disdain of “organized Christianity” [Catholicism and Protestantism] much more plain. Church members in the Southern California area began to disrupt other church’s services, and to call other Christians members of “Babylon”. These practices soon spread to the other Local Churches.¹⁰²

Vi tar også med et direkte sitat fra Witness Lee:

Judaism is Satanic, Catholicism is demonic, and Protestantism is without Christ. They teach Christ’s name, but He is not there. Do you really believe that today the living Lord Jesus is in the Protestant churches? Whether you believe it or not, the Lord says that He is outside the door.¹⁰³

Teologisk kritikk mot bevegelsen har blant annet gått på deres forståelse av tre-enighetslæren. Den lutherske skribenten Robert Passantino har identifisert denne med både sabellianisme (‘monarchianistic modalism’) og triteisme. Passantino har imidlertid blitt søkt imøtegått av Lee-tilhenger Gene Ford:

We believe that God is three and has been eternally so. We also believe that God is one. How this can be we make no attempt to explain. We simply believe it because it is the clear teaching of the Word of God.¹⁰⁴

Passantino har parert Fords imøtegåelse og hevder, mot sistnevnte, at ‘Local Church’-bevegelsen til tider forkynner en *logisk* modalisme (“[that] claim[s] that God cannot be both Father and Son and Holy Spirit at the same time and [...] therefore say[s] that God was first the Father, became the Son, and then became the Holy Spirit”) og til tider en *ikke-logisk* modalisme (“[that] recognize[s] that often the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are spoken of at the same time. These modalists try to say that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit somehow exist at the same time and yet are each other”). Den ikke-logiske varianten identifiseres av Passantino med såkalt ‘Patripassianism’:

¹⁰² Walter Martin, ed., *The New Cults* (Santa Ana, California: Vision Book Publisher, 1980) s. 381. Tung Siu-kwan skriver i artikkelen “The Waves of the ‘Local Church’” s. 4: “Parading in the streets of Southern California, [Lee’s] group often printed “God hates Christianity” on their T-shirts; they also burned banners with the word “religion” on them. On the other side, they raised high “Jesus Christ is Lord!” banners and had their big drums imprinted with “Jesus is Lord.” It is clear that they considered all other churches had degenerated into “religion” and only they themselves “walked on the right path.”

¹⁰³ *The Stream Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 4 (November 1976) s. 12. Sitert etter *The New Cults* s. 384.

¹⁰⁴ Gene Ford, *A Reply to the Tract Against Witness Lee and the Local Church* (Anaheim, California: Living Stream Ministry, 1976) s. 16.

Few Patripassians of the third and fourth centuries said much about the Holy Spirit; one who did, Marcellus of Ancyra, taught the personal identity of the Spirit with the Father and Son, just as [Witness] Lee does.¹⁰⁵

Kritikk mot bevegelsen har dog ikke eksklusivt vært relatert til heterodoks teologi. I 1988 ble det utgitt en 20-siders pamflett, *Reconsideration of the Vision*, som sirkulerte innen mange av bevegelsens lokalmenigheter og hvor Lee (identifisert som 'Mr. X') ble beskyldt for økonomiske misligheter. De anonyme utgiverne av pamfletten anklaget videre Lee for ikke bare å ha avveket fra Bibelen (og Watchman Nees lære), men for å ha hevdet at

every age is only allowed to have one spiritual leader – with himself being that leader for today. [They] also question [Lee's] behavior in several areas, accusing him of being "puffed up," of not disciplining his seriously erring "second son" (identified by former church members as Phillip Lee), of improperly insulting coworkers and elders, and of seeking to replace older and more spiritually mature leaders who might call him to accountability with "arrogant" but loyal younger followers."¹⁰⁶

Mange av bevegelsens tilhengere forøvrig anklaget Lee for hans "longterm failure to deal with the 'sinful' behavior of his son Phillip. It is contended that 'gross immorality' and other sins were committed by Phillip over a ten-year period, with Witness Lee's knowledge, and that Lee and his co-workers tolerated and covered up this behavior."¹⁰⁷ Utfallet av den stadig økende misnøyen ble et massivt exodus av tidligere medlemmer, samt at også enkeltmenigheter (ikke minst i Europa) brøt med Lee og hans virksomhet. Kineseren John So (født og oppvokst på Filip-pinene), bosatt i Tyskland, sammenlignet ved en anledning Lee med den japanske hær som under 2. verdenskrig okkuperte Filippinene (mens Lee – ifølge So – "invaded the ecclesia in Anaheim, seized and occupied it, and turned it into an 'ecclesia of [Witness Lee]'"¹⁰⁸) So sammenlignet videre Lee med Jesabel, "the prophetess who killed all of God's prophets to make herself the only one to speak for God."¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Walter Martin, ed., *The New Cults* s. 396.

¹⁰⁶ Elliot Miller og William M. Alnor, "Turmoil in the 'Local Church'." *Christian Research Journal* (Fall 1988) s. 5.

¹⁰⁷ Miller og Alnor, *ibid.* s. 6.

¹⁰⁸ Witness Lee og hans Living Stream Ministry flyttet fra Los Angeles til Anaheim i 1974.

¹⁰⁹ Tung Siu-kwan, "The Waves of the 'Local Church'" s. 7

The 'Local Church' i Danmark

Witness Lee besøkte Danmark i 1957 som taler ved Poul Madsens årlige stevne på Nyborg Strand. Et annet tilknytningspunkt var de to ghaneserne Thomas Quai og Ransford Ackah,¹¹⁰ som søkte å profilere Lees bevegelse etter å ha møtt den i USA. Også den amerikanske misjonæren Paul Gullans reiste rundt i Danmark og talte om Guds 'ene menighet'. Et ytterligere tilknytningspunkt var en gruppe troende i København som søkte å virkeliggjøre Watchman Nees menighetsvisjon slik denne kom til uttrykk gjennom boken *The Normal Christian Church Life* (oversatt til dansk under tittelen *Bibelske menigheder*).¹¹¹

I 1970 ble John So invitert av tidligere Kina-misjonær Kjestine Jepsen til Danmark for å holde møter. Han fikk også kontakt med gruppen i København. I 1977 ble det dessuten etablert forbindelse med noen unge familier på Jylland som hadde brutt med 'Indre Mission' og latt seg troende døpe blant pinsevenner. Disse organiserte seg snart som 'menigheden i Give'. På grunn av kontakten med John So ble det imidlertid et brudd mellom disse og Witness Lee på slutten av 80-tallet.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Ackah skriver i Gene Ford, *Who is the real mindbender* s. 68: "In 1969 I was the head of evangelism in all the Assembly of God churches in Ghana. [...] In 1970, I was invited as the guest speaker to an international conference, the Odenwald in West Germany. In that same year, I had a lot of invitations to visit and speak in several assemblies and groups in Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, England, France, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and Germany. [...] In some of the places in Europe, especially in Germany and Norway, I was nick-named the 'African Billy Graham'. [...] In 1971, by His grace and sovereignty, I came in touch with the church."

¹¹¹ Eva Johansen skriver i et brev til artikkelforfatteren datert 27.01.1998: "[Jeg har] personlig vært involvert – først og fremmest fordi jeg i 1959-61 på invitasjon af Witness Lee var deltager i et 7-måneders treningsprogram for de lokale menigheder i Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, Phillipinerne m.fl. i Taipei og derefter var med i et storstilet evangelisationsprogram i Østen. Tilbake i København ble jeg gift med Marius Johansen, som hadde vært en eldste i [Kristent Fælleskab] i en årrække, men som sammen med andre følte, at de skulle udgive 2. udgave af [Watchman Nees] bog "Det normale Kristne Menighedsliv", - og gå ind for et større eftertryk på, at menigheden må udtrykkes lokalt. Det var den lille gruppe i København i 1970."

¹¹² Eva Johansen og Bjarne Lindberg, brev til artikkelforfatteren datert 16.12.1997. Brudet mellom So og Lee har ikke vært uproblematisk all den stund Sos kone er søster av Lees svigersønn Albert Lim.

The 'Local Church' i Norge

Dansken Finn Østergaard ble introdusert for Witness Lees forkynnelse i Give og flyttet til Norge i 1983 hvor han først slo seg ned på Sollihøgda hvor han etter hvert samlet mennesker til private husmøter. I begynnelsen stod han også en del på Karl Johans gate i Oslo og delte ut brosjyrer vedrørende Lees undervisning om 'menigheten'. Arbeidet har aldri tatt av i Norge, og husmøtene er for lengst avviklet. Østergaard mener selv dette dels har sammenheng med at splittelsen mellom flere av menighetene i Tyskland og Los Angeles fikk ringvirkninger i Skandinavia.¹¹³

I Oslo har også Pilegrimsfolket, med Jan Egil Hafsahl i spissen, vist en viss interesse for Lees menighetsbyggende litteratur uten at det har ført til noen formell tilknytning til 'Local Church'-bevegelsen.¹¹⁴ Et norsk ektepar, som møtte bevegelsen i USA, lyktes heller ikke i å rekruttere tilhengere etter at de flyttet tilbake til hjemlandet.

The 'Local Church' i Sverige

I Sverige fikk bevegelsen feste i kretsen rundt Hans Erik Svensk, tidligere baptist fra Karlskrona og senere aktiv blant de 'åpne' (plymouth)brødre. Etter å ha flyttet til Klippan i Skåne, ble Svensk introdusert for bevegelsen gjennom Paul Gullans i 1971. Gullans hadde selv møtt bevegelsen gjennom sønnene Mark og Steve.

Gjennom Steve Gullans ble det etablert kontakt med John So, som hadde avbrutt medisinstudiene i Tyskland og flyttet til Los Angeles i 1967-68 for å være en del av Witness Lees menighetsfelleskap. Venner fra Tyskland besøkte ham i 1970 og vendte deretter tilbake til hjemlandet for å etablere 'menigheten i Freiburg'.

¹¹³ "The Standing of the Church in Anaheim." Taped transcript of a Christian meeting, Aug. 28 1988. En av deltakerne, Albert Koch, sa: "But, I must say that as I listened to the fellowship in the localities in Europe, I heard just about the same things. They are asking: 'Are we really the local church, with a general standing, open to every Christian in Oslo, Norway? Or are we a sect?' They, like us, are concerned, because through their practices over the past few years—and they were trying to follow what they considered the 'up-to-date, present moving of the Lord'—they found out that more and more they were becoming a very special kind of 'church', not a local church (ie., in their meetings they read only certain materials, etc.)."

¹¹⁴ Finn Østergaard, telefonsamtale datert 21.11.1997.

REFLEKS 5-1 2006

So flyttet tilbake til Tyskland i 1971. I 1973 brøt menigheten opp fra Freiburg og flyttet til Frankfurt,¹¹⁵ og tre år senere til Stuttgart.¹¹⁶

Hans Erik Svensk hadde en gruppe som kom sammen til møter i hans hjem en gang om uken. Sammen med om lag 25 personer deltok han på en konferanse i Stuttgart. Svensk forble fascinert, men de fleste av hans tidligere tilhengere mistet interessen da kvinnene ble oppfordret til å tildekke hodet under samlingene.

Svensks familie flyttet i 1980 til Stockholm hvor man i dag samler om lag 30 troende. Svensks svigersønn Sonny Youngs er den mest markante lederen. I mange år hadde man regelmessig kontakt med trosfellene i Tyskland og Danmark. I motsetning til disse har gruppen i Sverige valgt å bevare tilknytningen til Lee-nettverket i USA.¹¹⁷



¹¹⁵ “Die ‘Gemeinde’ in Frankfurt besteht noch nicht lang. Ein Teil der jetzigen Mitglieder kommt aus Freiburg, wo sich seit durch 1970 durch den Einfluß eines Chinesen eine kleine Gruppe zusammengefunden hatte. Um an einem zentralen Ort ein weiteres Betätigungsfeld zu haben, zogen die etwa 40 Mitglieder seit Herbst 1973 alle nach Frankfurt.” (Ingrid Reimer, “Die ‘Ortsgemeinde’ nach Watchman Nee.” *Materialdienst Aus der Evangelischen Zentralstelle für Weltanschauungsfragen der EKD* 1975, s. 153.)

¹¹⁶ Ingrid Reimer, “Die Gemeinde (Kirche) in Stuttgart.” *Materialdienst Aus der Evangelischen Zentralstelle für Weltanschauungsfragen der EKD* 1976, s. 243.

¹¹⁷ Sonny Youngs, telefonsamtale datert 11.06.1998.

Poul Madsen og Kristent Fællesskab-bevegelsen i Danmark

Geir Lie er lektorutdannet med kristendomskunnskap hovedfag fra Det teologiske Menighetsfakultet i Oslo.



Flere av mine siste artikler i dette tidsskriftet har beskjeftiget seg med enkeltpersoner som røper en læremessig affinitet til den britiske Keswicktradisjonens helighetsforståelse samtidig som deres ekklesiologi reflekterer en viss arv fra plymouthbrødrene. Jeg vil her presentere den danske Kristent Fællesskab-bevegelsen, hvis grunnlegger Poul Madsen, naturlig nok, også vil vies forholdsvis stor plass.

Madsen er utdannet cand.jur. fra 1940 og jobbet de ti første årene i Centraladministrationen i København.¹ I 1938 ble han gjort oppmerksom på J. Fjord Christensens møter i Teknologisk Institut, hvor han så begynte å gå regelmessig til bibelundervisning.² Før vi går videre inn på Madsens liv og virke er det naturlig med en kortfattet introduksjon av to personer som har fått betydning for hans videre utvikling.

Jesper Fjord Christensen (1868-1956)

J. Fjord Christensen jobbet de første årene etter fullført teologisk utdanning som lærer, “idet han ike anså sig for egnet til at beklæde et præsteembede.”³ Senere lot han seg imidlertid overtale og valgte da det lille stedet Askø, med sine rundt 200 innbyggere. Først i 1905 - åtte år etter at han kom til Askø - opplevde presten en kristen omvendelse. Forkynnelsen tok en ny dreining, og Christensen fikk etterhvert rykte på seg som en ualminnelig dyktig bibellærer. I 1916 fikk han dog medias oppmerksomhet rettet mot seg da han “efter megen bøn” følte at han ikke skulle tilkalle lege da datteren fikk kokende vann helt over seg. Christensen var overbevist om at Gud ville gripe inn med helbredelse. Barnevernet var imidlertid

¹ Madsen var “fuldmægtig” i Indenrigsministeriet og var iferd med å avansere til kontorsjef i det nye Arbejdsministerium da han opplevde seg kalt til heltids forkynnervirksomhet.

² Poul Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994. Se også Poul Madsen, “Nogle beslutninger af afgørende betydning for mit liv og virke.” *Mod Målet*, jan.-feb. 2006 s. 5.

³ Poul Madsen, “J. Fjord Christensen.” *Mod Målet*, des. 1956 s. 1.

av en annen mening og “fjernede barnet fra hjemmet og lod det indlægge til behandling.”⁴

Christensen opplevde etterhvert at hans virke ikke skulle være begrenset til folkekirken og søkte avskjed som prest i 1922. I mange år reiste han rundt i sommerhalvåret, mens han resten av året holdt møter i Teknologisk Institut i København. I denne perioden hadde han en opplevelse av at Gud kom til ham med ordene fra Johannes Åpenbaring 1:11 – “Hvad du ser, skriv det i en bog.” Christensen begynte etter dette å skrive ned prekenene ord for ord. I mange år var Christensens nedskrevne prekener fast innslag i Madsens månedstidskrift *Mod Målet*.⁵

En av grunnene til at Christensen forlot folkekirken, var at han var blitt overbevist om gyldigheten av troende dåp. Selv om møtene i Teknologisk Institut ikke var identifisert med noen lokal menighet, ble man likevel kritisert for å dra troende mennesker ut av den danske folkekirken og inn i de ulike frikirkene. Den karismatiske misjonsforbundsforkynneren Erik Larsson, som hørte Christensen første gang i 1930 og senere selv ble innbudt dit som forkynner, opplevde i ettertid kritikken som delvis berettiget.⁶

Sofie Jørgensen (1886-1987)

I 1936-37 vendte 50 år gamle Anna Sofie Marie Jørgensen hjem til Danmark etter etter å ha virket innen Hudson Taylors China Inland Mission fra og med 1910.⁷ Under oppholdet i Kina hadde hun hadde stått Watchman Nee forholdsvis nær. Mens hun var i Kina, opplevde hun at Gud viste henne hvordan de troende i Danmark var “adskilte fra hinanden, idet alle de forskjellige kirkeretninger havde høje mure, som forhindrede dem i at være det ene Legeme for Herren.”⁸ Mens hun fremdeles var i bønn, opplevde hun å høre Herrens tiltale om å vende hjem til Danmark for primært å be om “at alle disse mure måtte blive brudt ned.”⁹ Jørgensen underrettet China Inland Missions ledelse om beslutningen om å bli løst

⁴ *Ibid.*, s. 2.

⁵ Poul Madsen, “Mod Målet.” *Mod Målet*, januar 1961, omslag s. 2.

⁶ Erik Larsson, intervju datert 12.12.1994.

⁷ Daphne Deen (Oversees Missionary Fellowship, UK), brev til artikkelforfatteren datert 20.02.1996. Se forøvrig i underkant av 30 brev fra Jørgensen i perioden 1915-37 i *Meddelelser*, utgitt av Lærernes Missionsforening.

⁸ Eva Johansen (Give, Danmark), brev til artikkelforfatteren datert 02.03.1996.

⁹ *Ibid.*

fra tjenesten. Istedet ble hun bevilget permisjon “idet man regnede med, at det umuligt kunne være Guds vilje, og at hun blod måtte være stille for Gud en tid.”¹⁰ Sammen med en britisk CIM-misjonær, Elisabeth Fischbacher, som også stod Watchman Nee nær, tilbrakte hun ett års tid i bønn inntil det ble klart for dem begge at hun “måtte reise hjem til Danmark og være dette bønnens redskap for Gud der.”¹¹ Hun fikk kontakt med Christensen, som var meget interessert i hva Jørgensen kunne formidle av Nees undervisning. I 1938 utgav Christensen første utgave av den danske oversettelsen *Bibelske menigheder*, som senere kom ut på engelsk under de to titlene *Concerning our Missions* og *The normal Christian Church Life* (sistnevnte tittel i USA). Boken består av en del av Nees taler til sine yngre medarbeidere i Kina og var i utgangspunktet ikke bestemt for offentliggjøring. Christensen skriver imidlertid i det danske forordet:

Naar vi har bestemt oss til at lade [Bogen] udkomme paa Dansk, er Grunden den, at den er et ærligt Forsøg paa at løse det vanskelige Menighedsspørgsmaal og fjerne Partivæsenets Forbandelse fra Herrens Menighed. Der er egentlig intet andet at sige til Forsvar for Bogen, end at den i eet og alt stemmer med Skriften. Den, der ikke vil lade Herrens Ord være øverste Norm og Rettesnor i alle Ting, har Bogen intet Budskap til, men den, for hvem et “Saa siger Herren” afgør alle Spørgsmaal, vil være taknemmelig for denne Haandsrækning til at finde ut af Virvaret.¹²

Høyst sannsynlig var det også gjennom Jørgensen at Christensen i 1939 fikk rede på at Nee befant seg i Europa. Kineseren ble invitert til Danmark hvor man hadde møter på den internasjonale høyskolen i Helsingør. Nees undervisning derfra ble siden gitt ut i bokform under tittelen *The Normal Christian Life*. Boken hevdes å være en av de mest solgte og utbredte kristne bøker på 50-tallet og hadde i 1972 blitt oversatt til 18 ulike språk.¹³

I 1942 ble Madsen overbevist om nødvendigheten av troende dåp og lot seg døpe av Christensen, som halvt spøkefullt bemerket: “Nå er det viktig at ditt hode kommer dypt under vann. Du tenker for mye.”¹⁴

Gjennom Christensen og Jørgensen fikk Madsen siden høre om både Nee og den britiske forkynneren T. Austin-Sparks.¹⁵ Madsens bror, John, som oppholdt seg fire

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Watchman Nee, *Bibelske Menigheder. Tilbakeblik over Arbejdet*. Forkortet Oversættelse fra Kinesisk. (København: Fjord Christensen og Sofie Jørgensen, 1938) s. 3-4.

¹³ Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, sept. 1972 s. 16.

¹⁴ Poul Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

REFLEKS 5-1 2006

år ved London Bible College fra 1946 til 1950,¹⁶ dro ofte til Austin-Sparks menighet på 39 Honor Oak Road og opplevde møtene som usedvanlig givende. Madsen selv besøkte England i 1948, 1949 og 1955¹⁷ og møtte der mange av Nees venner, deriblant Austin-Sparks og dennes svigersønn Angus Kinnear. Madsen skriver:

På grund av sit [Austin-Sparks] usædvanlige blik for det væsentlige i den bibelske åpenbaring kom han uden selv at vide det til at spille en stor rolle i mit liv. Før jeg var begyndt Bibelundervisningen i København i 1949, hørte jeg ham ved et dagligstuemøde i Skotland, hvor vi vel var omkring 10 til stede. Medens jeg lyttede til ham, fik jeg "en ny Bibel" og fornemmede da, hvad bibelsk forkyndelse er. Uden denne hjælp havde jeg næppe kunnet gå i gang med en gennemgang af hele Skriften.¹⁸

Madsens arbeid, som først fikk navnet Hvide Marker,¹⁹ oppstod i København i 1947 i forlengelse av to misjonærers utreise til henholdsvis India og Kina:

En lille kreds av deres venner følte trang til at følge dem med deres forbøn og besluttete sig derfor til at samles regelmessigt en gang om måneden til bøn. Kredsen voksende hurtig, der kom andre kredse til i forskjellige provinsbyer, og i løbet af de ca. 3 år, der er gået, siden den første bedekreds samledes for første gang, er antallet af forbedere for disse missionærer vokset til over 600.²⁰

Etter en tid meldte behovet seg for systematisk bibelundervisning, og i februar 1949 ble denne igangsatt, "bestående i en gjennomgang af hele Bibelen i hovedtræk."²¹ Man startet opp i et privat hjem, men det stadig voksende deltakerantallet gjorde det raskt nødvendig å leie mer egnede lokaler. Den nye virksomheten synes imidlertid å ha blitt møtt med en viss skepsis - iallfall til å begynne med:

¹⁵ For nærmere opplysninger om Austin-Sparks, se Geir Lie, "T. Austin-Sparks – a brief introduction." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004) s. 48-52.

¹⁶ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, juni 1969 s. 15.

¹⁷ Poul Madsen, "Hendes husband synger hendes lov." *Mod Målet*, august 1960 s. 3.

¹⁸ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, juli 1971 s. 16.

¹⁹ Navnet er hentet fra Jesu ord i Joh. 4:35: "Opløft jeres øjne, og se at markene er hvide til høst." (Poul Madsen, "Nytårsbrev." *Mod Målet*, januar 1955, omslag s. 2.)

²⁰ Poul Madsen, "Hvide Marker. En kort redegørelse for arbejdet og dets mål." *Mod Målet*, juni 1950, u.s.

²¹ *Ibid.*, u.s.

Lukkede døre blev åbnet som svar på bøn. Året efter at vi var lukket ude af K.F.U.M. og der var blevet advaret offentligt imod os i Kristeligt Dagblad og sendt skrivelser ud om, at dørene burde lukkes for mig, åbnede Gud samtlige Københavns kirker for os og sluttede med at give os domkirken fem aftener i træk, alt som svar på bøn. Hundredevis af mennesker søgte da frelse, uden at vi havde sat nogen pressekampagne i gang, uden at vi betalte så meget som en krone til annoncering eller til mødelokaler - alt blev os givet fra oven som svar på bøn.²²

Kontorsjef Niels Sørensen, som ledet møtene i Teknologisk Institut fram til sin død i 1946, hadde startet månedstidskriftet *Det salige håb* i 1939. Siden den finsk-svenske forkynneren Frank Mangs hadde holdt møter sammen med J. Fjord Christensen og flere ganger hadde uttrykt ønske om å ha et organ i Danmark, spurte Sørensens enke om Mangs kunne tenke seg å ta over tidskriftet. Mangs hadde imidlertid ikke kapasitet til dette, og i 1947 tok dermed 30 år gamle Poul Madsen ansvaret for tidskriftet som så fikk navnet *Mod Målet*.²³ Madsen skriver:

En nat sagde Herren imidlertid ganske tydeligt til [Sørensens enke], at hun skulle tilbyde mig forlaget, og da hun henvendte sig til mig, forstod jeg, at det var et kald fra Herren.²⁴

Allerede i februar 1950 begynte Madsen dessuten med tilsvarende undervisning i Odense. Det var til å begynne med ikke aktuelt å arrangere søndagsmøter/gudstjenester i og med at slike møteformer ble regnet som “et typisk kirke- og menighedsanliggende - og Hvide Marker er netop ikke nogen kirke eller menighet.”²⁵ Tvert imot ble det hevdet å ligge “ganske utenfor Hvide Markers oppgave at danne menighet.”²⁶

Fra og med 1. januar 1955 falt betegnelsen “Hvide Marker” bort og man tok navnet Kristent Fælleskab, inspirert blant annet av versene i Filemon 6²⁷ og Fil. 1:5.²⁸ Man var fremdeles bevisst på at menigheten som sådan var “dannet af Helligånden” og

²² Poul Madsen, “Et tilbageblik.” *Mod Målet*, sept. 1971 s. 3.

²³ Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

²⁴ Poul Madsen, “Et vidnesbyrd.” *Mod Målet*, jan. 1963, omslag s. 2.

²⁵ Poul Madsen, “Hvide Marker (2). En kort redegørelse for arbeidet og dets mål.” *Mod Målet*, juli 1950 s. 13.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ “Sammen med dem eier du troen, og det er min bønn at den må være virksom og gi deg større innsikt i det gode vi skal gjøre for Kristus.”

²⁸ “For fra første dag og helt til nå har dere vært med i arbeidet for evangeliet.”

bestod "af alle de troende i København." Man kunne ikke melde seg inn i Kristent Fælleskab, og ingen ville kunne innskrives i noen menighetsprotokoll.²⁹ Madsens økumeniske holdning kom også til uttrykk gjennom forsikringen om at møtedeltakere som følte at de skulle "stå sammen med trossøskende andre steder i vor store by," skulle slippe å frykte "at der fra vor side skal blive gjort noget forsøg på at 'kabre' ham eller hende." Madsen påla forøvrig disse ikke å støtte "bibelundervisningen økonomisk ved at lægge gaver i bøsseerne, hvis det sker på bekostning af den forsamling, de har deres åndelige hjem i."³⁰ Madsens månedstidskrift refererer forøvrig også til fellestmøter med både Indremisjonen, Misjonsforbundet, Baptistsamfunnet og Den apostolske Kirke.³¹ "Vi har erfaret, at det, der forener os, er sterkere end det, der adskiller os," skriver han ved en annen anledning. Madsen kunne også komme med følgende selvkritikk av egen virksomhet: "Der finnes blandt mange lutherske venner en stille hellighed, en ukunstlet beskedenhed, en bæven for Gud, som man nok kan savne, hvor man er blevet dus-kammerat med Gud og ikke viger tilbake for at vidne om, at man ejer 'det fulde evangelium'."³²

Interaksjon med britiske trosfeller

Madsen opplevde tidlig at kristenfolket i England hadde en langt bedre bibelforståelse enn dets trosfeller i Danmark. De troende i England syntes forøvrig langt mer systematisk i sin bibellesning. Sannsynligvis allerede i 1948 hadde Madsen blitt venn med Charles J. B. Harrison, som forøvrig også var influert av Austin-Sparks.³³ Harrison gjennomgikk hele Bibelen i løpet av 1 uke ved hjelp av 'store overskrifter'.³⁴ Inspirert av "min kære broder C.J.B. Harrison, der besøgte os i København i efteråret 1951 og holdt en række møder sammen med os," utarbeidet Madsen en skjematisk oversikt over de ulike bøkene i Bibelen. Disse ble i løpet av en periode

²⁹ Poul Madsen, "Nytårsbrev." *Mod Målet*, jan. 1955, omslag s. 2.

³⁰ Poul Madsen, "Redegørelse for bibelundervisningen." *Mod Målet*, sept. 1959 s. 13.

³¹ Kristent Fælleskab har et baptistisk dåpssyn, men hevder likevel at "de, der af hjertet kan hvile i deres barnedåb, påtvinges bestemt ingen dåb." Dermed skal ikke dåpen "skille Guds børn fra hinanden." (Dorthe Vestergaard, "Ordet og bønnen er noget fundamentalt i Kristent Fælleskab." *Udfordringen*, 11. januar 1990 s. 8.)

³² Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, april 1972 s. 15.

³³ Se forøvrig Harrysons artikler i Austin-Sparks tidskrift *A Witness and A Testimony*, eksempelvis "God's Final Movement," juli 1955 s. 84-89; *idem*, "The Significance of the Holy Spirit's Coming and Presence," nov. 1957 s. 135-139.

³⁴ Poul Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

på 5½ år presentert i *Mod Målet*.³⁵ I 1955 kom for øvrig materialet også ut i bokform under tittelen *Bibeloversigterne. En skematisk oversigt over og kort analyse af hver bog i Bibelen*.³⁶

Om ikke Madsen kan peke på noen konkret frelsesopplevelse,³⁷ er han likevel bevisst en religiøs oppvåkning i gymnasårene. Litt etter litt “vågnede en længsel efter god opbyggelig litteratur, der kunne hjælpe mig i mit trosliv.” På dette tidspunkt visste han ikke “at kristendom kunne være andet end den evangelisk-lutherske gode gamle danske folkekirke, hvor jeg havde lært så meget - den gang levede kæmperne nemlig endnu i folkekirken.” Gjennom forbindelser utenfor folkekirken kom imidlertid Madsen snart i kontakt med Kirkeklokkens forlag,³⁸ som tross forankringen i folkekirken – “så det som en oppgave at udgive opbyggelige bøger af ikke-luthersk observans, især angelsaksisk Keswick-præget opbyggelseslitteratur.”³⁹ Madsen kastet seg så over biografiske fremstillinger av 1800-tallets hellighetsforkynnere som Johann Blumhardt, Charles Finney, R.A. Torrey, D.L. Moody og Andrew Murray. I *Mod Målet* finner vi dessuten artikler av A.J. Gordon,⁴⁰ A.B. Simpson,⁴¹ E.M. Bounds⁴² og Jessie Penn-Lewis.⁴³ En rekke kjen-

³⁵ Poul Madsen, “Nogle ord om bibelskemaerne.” *Mod Målet*, august 1955, s. 12.

³⁶ Madsen, 1955. Se også Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, des. 1968 s. 16: “En finsk oversættelse af Bibeloversigten er nu udkommet. Bibeloversigten anvendes i adskillige bibelskoler og af teologiske studenter rundt om i Skandinavien.” Se også Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, jan. 1969 s. 17: “En lærerskole i Bergen bestilte for nylig 76 eksemplarer av Bibeloversigten.”

³⁷ Poul Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

³⁸ “Bladet Kirkeklokken udkom første gang i 1888 som et udslag af, at en kreds af kristne i København, domineret af præster i folkekirken, ønskede at gøre noget nyt. Man ville kalde folk til kirke, men man ville også bl.a. afhjælpe et socialt behov blandt byens børn.” Smørgrosserer Thorvald Plum var med i initiativgruppen, og da de øvrige etterhvert falt fra, ble det han som tok initiativet til *forlaget Kirkeklokken* som begynte å utgi de første bøkene på slutten av forrige århundre. “KMIs årsmøde.” *Godt Budskab*, juni 1994 s. 2. Se også Christian Svendsen, “100 år.” *Godt Budskab*, 7. okt. 1988 s. 1-2, 7, 10.

³⁹ Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, mai 1973 s. 15.

⁴⁰ Adoniram Judson Gordon, “Sædekorn.” *Mod Målet*, mai 1959, u.s.

⁴¹ Albert Benjamin Simpson, “Snævre passager.” *Mod Målet*, april 1968 s. 5-8, 13-14; *idem*, “De medarbejdere vi ønsker.” *Mod Målet*, feb. 1969 s. 14.

⁴² E.M. Bounds, “Gud søger mænd.” *Mod Målet*, aug. 1966 s. 3-4.

te kristne lederskikkelser har deltatt ved flere av Madsens årlige sommerstevner på Nyborg Strand fra og med 1951, derav forkynnere som dr. Martin Lloyd-Jones,⁴⁴ Francis Schaeffer,⁴⁵ T. Austin-Sparks,⁴⁶ Bakht Singh,⁴⁷ Stephen Kaung og Witness Lee.⁴⁸ Flere av disse hadde forøvrig stadig artikler i Madsens månedstidskrift. Også Madsens artikler ble trykt i utenlandske tidskrifter, som Harry Fosters *Toward the Mark*, hvilket etterfulgte Austin-Sparks *A Witness and A Testimony*⁴⁹ ved sistnevntes bortgang i 1971.⁵⁰ I sine yngre dager ble Madsen influert av Austin-Sparks betoning av korsets subjektive virkning i den troendes liv. Han bifalt dessuten sistnevntes forståelse av menigheten som et åndelig felle-skap. Felle-skapet mellom de troende er primært en organisme, ingen organisa-sjon:

De første kristne var en stor åndelig familie, ukomplicerede og enkle. Familien omfattede alle dem, der var "født på ny" og derfor ejede Guds Ånd, hverken flere eller færre. Den familie kunne man ikke indmelde seg i. Enten var man født medlem, eller også var intet medlemskab muligt.⁵¹

⁴³ Jessie Penn-Lewis, "Hvor dybt skal korset gå?" *Mod Målet*, juli 1950 s. 9-12; *idem*, "Sønderbrudt." *Mod Målet*, jan. 1953 s. 8-10; *idem*, "Højt over alle." *Mod Målet*, feb. 1955 s. 12. For nærmere informasjon om Penn-Lewis, se Geir Lie, "Jessie Penn-Lewis – en kortfattet introduksjon." *Refleks 2-1* (2003) s. 31-40.

⁴⁴ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, sept. 1966 s. 18.

⁴⁵ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, jan. 1969 s. 16.

⁴⁶ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, juni 1969 s. 18.

⁴⁷ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, nov. 1969 s. 15.

⁴⁸ Poul Madsen, "Witness Lee's og Stephen Kaungs besøg." *Mod Målet*, april 1958 s. 13.

⁴⁹ Austin-Sparks gav ut tidsskriftet i perioden 1927-71.

⁵⁰ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, okt. 1980 s. 8. *Toward the Mark* ble utgitt i perioden 1972-89. Madsens regelmessige bidrag følger tidsskriftet fra begynnelse til slutt. Hans første bidrag var "What can we do," mars-april 1972 s. 27-29 mens siste artikkel gjaldt "The Spirit of Truth" sept.-okt. 1989 s. 91-94. Sporadiske artikler av Madsen kunne også forekomme i *A Witness and A Testimony*, som "The Spirit of Faith," jan.-feb. 1971 s. 6-8; "The Characteristics of the Word of Faith," mars-april 1971 s. 32-35; "The Reality of the Word of Faith," mai-juni 1971 s. 55-56 og juli-aug. 1971 s. 79-81.

⁵¹ Poul Madsen, *Kristent Felle-skap. En redegørelse* (København: Forlaget Mod Målet, 1967) s. 4-5.

Om Madsen i sin tidlige ungdom var influert av mange av lederne innenfor den såkalte Keswick-bevegelsen, opplever han i ettertid undervisningen om å “regne seg som død for synden” som for skjematiserende. Livet med Gud består ikke primært av teknikker som kan tillæres. Vi må søke Gud personlig, mener han idag.⁵²

Madsen var, som allerede nevnt, personlig venn av Austin-Sparks svigersønn Angus Kinnear. Begge britene besøkte Danmark etter at Madsen hadde begynt med søndagsmøter i København.⁵³ Austin-Sparks hadde vært en tur på Taiwan og i Hong Kong og var veldig grepet av det han hadde sett av menighetsbyggende arbeid inspirert i forlengelse av Watchman Nees tidligere virksomhet i Kina.⁵⁴ Austin-Sparks oppmuntret Madsen til selv å dra til Østen for å la seg inspirere. Madsen kjente allerede til både Watchman Nees menighetsbyggende arbeid i Kina og Bakht Singhs tilsvarende gjerning i India. Allerede i 1947 da bønnegruppen startet opp i København

blev vennerne i Den lille Flok hurtigvis nogle av dem, vi særlig følte ansvar for. Vi havde en følelse af, at Herren brugte dem ud over det sædvanlige, og det var en forret at stå med dem i trofast og ansvarsbevidst forbøn. Senere hørte vi også om Bakht Singh's arbejde i Indien, og den samme fornemmelse af, at vi havde et åndelig medansvar for hans gerning, greb mange af os.⁵⁵

Poul Madsen versus Witness Lee

Etter innbydelse fra Taiwan og India dro Madsen og hustru sammen med Austin-Sparks i begynnelsen av 1957. I ettertid karakteriserer Madsen besøket som en skuffelse.⁵⁶ På Taiwan møtte han blant annet Witness Lee, som hadde gigantiske

⁵² Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Austin-Sparks benyttet en hel preken under Madsens sommerstevne på Nyborg Strand i 1956 til å dele erfaringene fra Taiwan. (Austin-Sparks, “Guds gerning på Formosa,” i: *Højt i det himmelske. Kristent Fælleskabs sommerstævne 1956* [København: Forlaget Mod Målet, 1956] s. 35-37.) Se også diverse artikler av Witness Lee i Austin-Sparks tidskrift *A Witness and A Testimony*, eksempelvis “A God Who Hides Himself,” nov. 1956 s. 129-132; “Spiritual Experience,” mars 1957 s. 35-40.

⁵⁵ Poul Madsen, “Rejsebrev nr. 1.” *Mod Målet*, mars 1957, omslagets s. 2. .

⁵⁶ Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994. Skuffelsen over at forventningene ikke ble innfridd på Taiwan innebar også en skuffelse over Austin-Sparks. Det er derfor ingen tilfældighet at sistnevnte, til tross for sin deltakelse på Madsens sommerstevne både i 1954 og 1956, ikke ble invitert tilbake før 1969. (Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, juni 1969 s. 18.)

møter som samlet 5000 mennesker til nattverd. Madsen ble møtt av 1000 kinesere som sang for ham og hans hustru. I løpet av de 6 ukene de tilbrakte på Taiwan ble de mer og mer både forundret og urolige. Under en sammenkomst henvendte plutselig Lee seg til Madsen med spørsmålet: “What is the local church?” Madsen svarte at den lokale menighet er summen av alle gjenfødte kristne innenfor et gitt geografisk område. Lee ‘korrigerte’ ham så offentlig ved å ramse opp 10 punkter som måtte være tilstede før en lokal menighet kunne ansees å være konstituert, deriblant at man måtte ha rettelig innsatte eldste. Madsen grep imidlertid ordet på nytt og utbrøt “I totally disagree!” Madsen opplevde mer og mer at Lee istedetfor å lede en kristen menighet hadde etablert en organisasjon preget av jernstyre og eksklusivitet.

Når vi ser bort fra det karakteristiske kultursjokket som møter de fleste førstegangsreisende i den såkalt tredje verden,⁵⁷ var tonen i reisebrevene likevel overveiende positiv: “Men overalt er vi blevet modtaget med rørende hjertelighed.”⁵⁸ Selv Madsens observasjon av den “åndelige opdragelse” i menigheten hvor de nyomvendtes “personlige ønsker og tilbøjeligheder og særmeneringer må lægges til side for det langt større at tjene helheden, d.v.s. tjene Kristus i hans legeme,”⁵⁹ synes positivt referert. Først på et langt senere tidspunkt kommer Madsens uro til overflaten:

⁵⁷ “Her er en mængde cyklerickshaw’er. Jeg fik en tur forleden dag i en af de, men jeg håber ikke, at jeg fik for mange lopper fra den.” (Poul Madsen, “Rejsebrev nr. 6.” *Mod Målet*, april 1957, u.s.) “Vi er blevet inkvarteret på byens fineste hotel. Vi bor i et dejligt værelse, hvor der ikke er gjort rent de sidste måneder. Heldigvis kan vi regne med, at der blev skiftet sengetøj ved det kinesiske nytår for ca. en måned siden, så mere end 30 kinesere har der ikke ligget [sic] i dette sengetøj før os. Vi overvejer at gå i seng med regnfrakker på!!” (Poul Madsen, “Rejsebrev. nr. 7.” *Mod Målet*, april 1957, omslagets s. 2.)

⁵⁸ Poul Madsen, “Rejsebrev nr. 8.” *Mod Målet*, april 1957 s. 13.

⁵⁹ Poul Madsen, “Rejsebrev nr. 9.” *Mod Målet*, april 1957 s. 13. Flere indisier på at Madsen neppe kan ha opplevd bare “skuffelse” i Østen, er at Witness Lee deltok på sommerstevnet på Nyborg Strand i 1958. (“Åbent hus.” *Mod Målet*, okt. 1958.) Lees prekener ble forøvrig samlet og gitt ut under tittelen *Livets træ*. (“Bestilling af bøger.” *Mod Målet*, des. 1958 s. 11.)

Som tidligere omtalt er mange af forsamlingerne på Formosa blevet splittet. De har været gennem smertefulde kampe, og der foregår fortsat meget, som volder sorg og bedrøvelse. Det gælder i det hele taget det store arbejde, som er knyttet til Watchman Nees og Witness Lees navne. Overalt i Det fjerne Østen er disse forsamlinger i store interne vanskeligheder.⁶⁰

Noe senere gør så Madsen oppmærksom på at Witness Lee har forlatt Taiwan og flyttet til USA:

Denne rigt udrustede mand følger nu en ny linie for arbejdet, som mange har svært ved at acceptere. Han behøver megen forbøn, at hans rige udrustning og vældige energi må blive anvendt på allerbedste måde for den Herre, som han af hjertet vil tjene. Watchman Nees navn knyttes nu til en del, som mange mener, han ikke selv ville godkende, om han var fri og kendte det.⁶¹

Til trods for en fremdeles ærbødig omtale av de kinesiske lederne, konkretiseres Madsens uro for hver gang de samme personer omtales i *Mod Målet*:

Witness Lee og Stephan [sic] Kaung har fået amerikansk statsborgerret. De arbejder med vældig energi og samler hundredvis af mennesker. Jeg føler en dyb bekymring, når jeg tænker på deres arbejde, idet det for mig ser ud, som om de er kommet ind i noget skæbnesvangert eksklusivt og sekterisk, deres rige udrustning til trods. Vi må ikke glemme dem i vore bønner.⁶²

⁶⁰ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, nov. 1968 s. 18. Allerede i oktobernummeret av *Mod Målet* i 1961 møter vi imidlertid de første forsigtige hentydninger om at alt kanskje ikke var som det skulle på Taiwan. I artikkelen "Hvad ser du?" skriver Madsen: "Man møder i dag her og der mennesker, som gør Watchman Nee's ord til normen for, hvorledes der bør arbejdes i Guds rige. De misforstår ham komplet. Han vil lige så nødigt som alle andre Åndens mænd skabe et nyt læresystem, et nyt bogstavsystem, hvorefter alle sig haver at rette. Dette gælder også hans uden tvivl bibelske lære om den lokale menighed. Man møder mennesker, der er alt for beherskede af, hvad de mener at have lært af Watchman Nee. Menigheden opbygges aldrig, hvor bogstaven - end ikke den rette bogstav - er herre, men kun hvor Ånden er Herre - og Ånden sprænger alle systemer, også de aller-rigtigste, og fører os fram ad *livets* forunderlige vej - hvilket netop er, hvad også Watchman Nee selv ønsker. Læs derfor alle hans bøger med skønsomhed og inddrik ikke bogstaven, men Ånden!"

⁶¹ Poul Madsen, "Hva ser du?" *Mod Målet*, mai 1970 s. 18. Se også Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, sept. 1972 s. 16: "Det bør måske tilføjes, at der ud over de oven-nævnte bøger af Watchman Nee er udsendt adskillige andre i hans navn i U.S.A. Han tages nu til indtægt for sekteriske og ekstreme synspunkter, som han aldrig selv ville have godkendt, og hans navn benyttes på en uåndelig og uforsvarlig måde."

⁶² Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, aug. 1973 s. 18.

Etter å ha lest Nees bok *The normal Christian Church life*⁶³ mener Madsen i et-tertidd å kunne se en kime til den eksklusivitet han ble vitne til rundt Witness Lees arbeid på Taiwan. Etter at Lee siden flyttet til USA og ble enda mer ytterliggående, undrer Madsen på om også *denne* utviklingen er et direkte resultat av at Lee følger prinsippene slik de utlegges i ovennevnte bok av Watchman Nee.⁶⁴ Madsen opplever at det av Nees undervisning som samler seg om korsets budskap og dets betydning for den enkelte troende, har hatt positiv innflytelse mange steder, men han ser også en fare i en overbetoning av det subjektive. De menighetsrelaterte bøkene, hvor menigheten blir forkynnelseens gjenstand, har imidlertid hatt skadelige virkninger.⁶⁵

Bakht Singh

På vei hjem fra Taiwan møtte Madsen Bakht Singh i India. Singh hadde på det tidspunkt grunnlagt flere hundre menigheter. Disse var enkle, "primitive forsam-

⁶³ Boken er også kjent under tittelen *Concerning our Missions* og ble oversatt til dansk under J. Fjord Christensen som *Bibelske menigheder*.

⁶⁴ "På det tidspunkt [Watchman Nee besøkte Danmark i 1939] havde han utgivet et vidnesbyrd om sit arbejde under titlen 'Concerning our Missions' (angående vort kald og vor gerning). Det var - således som det udtrykkelig fremgår af titlen - et *vidnesbyrd* om, hvorledes Gud havde ledet ham i arbejdet med at opbygge lokale forsamlinger, men det var ikke hans mening, at bogen skulle opfattes som en *lærebog* i nytestamentlig menighedsliv. Desværre blev den af mange opfattet således (på dansk blev den derfor utgivet under titlen 'Bibelske menigheder'), hvilket har medført en del forvirring adskillige steder, især hvor man helt bogstaveligt og slavisk har fulgt bogens anvisninger." (Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, sept. 1972 s. 15.)

"Her er et andet vigtigt område, hvor mange har læst alt for mange bøger og derfor ikke hørt, hvad Herren personligt ville sige dem. De vidste jo fra bøgerne, hvad han burde sige! Nogle har i bøgerne [Nees bøker om menigheten] læst en mengde om, at uden ældste er der ingen menighed. Andre har læst, at hvis man ikke har bopæl i samme kommune, hører man ikke til i samme menighed. Andre igen har læst noget tredje." (Poul Madsen, "De mange misforståelser." *Mod Målet*, april 1970 s. 4.) Sannsynligvis alluderer Madsens kritikk her vel så mye til danske *Witness Lee-tilhengere*, som f.eks. Marius Johansen (med opprinnelig bakgrunn fra henholdsvis Teknologisk Institut og Kristent Fællesskab) og Ellenhardt Lak (med opprinnelig bakgrunn fra henholdsvis Apostolsk Kirke og Kristent Fællesskab). Blant annet disse to tok initiativ til en ny utgave av Watchman Nees bok *Bibelske menigheder*, som nå fikk tittelen *Det normale Kristne Menighedsliv*.

⁶⁵ Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

linger” hvor både evangelisasjon og nattverdsfelleskapet ble poengtert. Om oppholdet på Taiwan hadde blitt positivt omtalt i *Mod Målet*, syntes møtet med Singh å ha vært enda mer oppløftende:

Bakht Singh er en af de største personligheder, vi har truffet, den mest interessante på denne rejse. [...] Han er fuldstændig upåvirket og uimponeret af Vesten, men helt åben og fri. Arbejdet her synes umiddelbart at have endnu større udviklingsmuligheder end det på Formosa, idet det dels er mere originalt, dels mindre organiseret. Forsamlingerne, af hvilke der er hundrevis, er ikke ensartede eller ensrettede. I hver enkelt by har Gud ledet dem på en speciel måde.⁶⁶

Bakht Singh vokste opp i en tradisjonell sikh familie. Til tross for at han betegner seg som bitter fiende av all kristendom helt fra barndommen av, gikk han 5 år på en misjonsskole i Punjab. Etter avlagt eksamen i 1926 bar det så til England hvor Singh “begyndte at læse på den polytekniske læreanstalt i London.”⁶⁷ Etter et kort opphold i Canada i 1928 dro han så tilbake året etter for å “avslutte en bestemt uddannelse.”⁶⁸ Av en venn fikk han låne et nytestamente hvis budskap straks grep ham. 16 desember 1929 betegner han så som sin personlige frelsesopplevelse.⁶⁹ 3 år senere ble han døpt i Vancouver og reiste deretter “fra sted til sted og aflagde mit vidnesbyrd.”

Etter 7 års fravær vendte han så tilbake til India i 1933 som utdannet ingeniør. Singh var innstilt på å leve et behagelig liv, men etter en lengre “kamp med Gud” ble han villig til å gi Gud “alle mine penge” bare han fikk jobbe som ingeniør. Han opplevde imidlertid Herrens gjensvar: “Jeg vil ikke have dine penge, jeg vil have dig!” Det hele endte med at Singh kapitulerte, knelte og overgav seg til Guds kall: forkynneroppgaven.⁷⁰ Gud hadde imidlertid på forhånd gitt ham følgende tre direktiver: “Giv først afkald på alle dine krav på ejendom i Punjab og tal aldrig med noget menneske om, hvad du behøver. For det andet: Slut dig aldrig til nogen kirke, noget missions-selskab eller nogen forsamling. Og for det tredje: Læg aldrig dit eget program!”⁷¹ Singh begynte med å dele ut kristne traktater i Karachi i det nåværende Pakistan. De første årene holdt han hovedsaklig friluftsmøter og hjalp angivelig hundrevis av mennesker til å ta en beslutning for Kristus. Det viste seg at de tradisjonelle kirke-

⁶⁶ Poul Madsen, “Rejsebrev nr. 13.” *Mod Målet*, mai 1957 s. 13.

⁶⁷ Bakht Singh, “Uudsigelig glæde.” *Mod Målet*, januar 1955 s. 5.

⁶⁸ Bakht Singh, “Uudsigelig glæde.” *Mod Målet*, jan. 1955 s. 9.

⁶⁹ Bakht Singh, “Hans kærlighed og omsorg.” *Mod Målet*, juni 1955 s. 2-3.

⁷⁰ Bakht Singh, “Uudsigelig glæde.” *Mod Målet*, feb. 1955 s. 3-4.

⁷¹ Bakht Singh, “Hans kærlighed og omsorg (2).” *Mod Målet*, juli 1955 s. 13.

REFLEKS 5-1 2006

samfunn var ute av stand til å ta hånd om de nyomvendte, og Singh så seg nødt til å samle de troende “i lokale forsamlinger etter Det nye Testaments mønster.”⁷² Singh har grunnlagt omlag 400 menigheter i India, og alle er økonomisk selvhjulpne. Madsen refererer:

Det er et stort vidnesbyrd, at disse forsamlinger, der gjennomgående består af fattige, aldrig beder mennesker om økonomisk hjælp. Ja, de går så vidt, at de ikke tillader venligtsindede mennesker, der ikke er født på ny, at give gaver til arbejdet.⁷³

Singh besøkte Danmark og forkynte sammen med Madsen blant annet i 1957, 1965 og 1969.⁷⁴ Inderens suksess i hjemlandet synes imidlertid å ha avtatt etter hvert på grunn av den “sentraliserte autoritetsutøvelsen”. Han var selv juridisk eier av alle menighetsbygningene, noe som har skapt problemer.⁷⁵

Poul Madsen – anti-karismatisk?

Madsen har blitt beskyldt for å være “anti-karismatisk,”⁷⁶ og det hevdes at Kristent Fælleskab har opplevd en forholdsvis stor avgang både til pinsebevegelsen⁷⁷ og den karismatiske fornyelse som sådan. Den britiske legen Michael Harry møtte Madsen i Austin-Sparks menighet på Honor Oak Road i London. I 1961 flyttet han til Danmark hvor han blant annet hadde forkynneransvar i Kristent Fælleskab fram til

⁷² Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, okt. 1965 s. 16.

⁷³ Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, juli 1966 s. 16.

⁷⁴ Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, jan. 1970 s. 18

⁷⁵ Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

⁷⁶ Hans Kristian Neerskov, intervju datert 12.12.1994. Neerskov begynte sammen med andre unge fra Emdrup Kirke (folkekirken) å gå på Madsens ungdomsmøter – ‘Hvide Marker’ i 1951. Neerskov identifiserte seg med Kristent Fællesskab fram til 1959. Han har siden virket som pinseforstander både på Jylland og i København og var siden fulltidsengasjert innenfor Dansk Europamisjon.

⁷⁷ Allerede i 1956 ble Madsens bok *Helligåndens væsen og virke* (København: Forlaget Mod Målet) utgitt. Innledningsvis i boken (s. 7.) polemiserer Madsen mot kristne [pinsevenner] som med utgangspunkt i Acta 1:8 nærmest behandler Guds Ånd som om han ikke var “en guddommelig person, evig, uskabt, som Faderen og Sønnen.” Ifølge Madsen mener de “at kunne slutte, at Helligånden [kun] er en kraft, som kommer fra Gud, en velsignelse, som han skænker sine.”

1965.⁷⁸ I august samme år deltok Harry på Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship Internationals første samling i Europa, i Martin Lloyd-Jones menighet Westminster Chapel i London.⁷⁹ Etter prekenen gikk Harry fram til forbønn og mottok Den Hellige Ånd "i tro". Tungemålgaven opplevde han imidlertid ikke i funksjon før han var tilbake i København igjen. Det ble raskt et brudd mellom ham og Madsen, og Harry valgte å melde seg inn i den danske folkekirken.⁸⁰

"Anti-karismatisk" er dog svært negativt ladet. Om Madsen utvilsomt er en person med sterke meninger, har han likefullt mot til å ta offentlige oppgjør ikke bare med andre, men også med seg selv:

Nogle venner i Norge, hvis ord har vægt for mig, har ladet mig forstå, at de blev bedrøvet over, at jeg for nogle måneder siden i disse spalter rejste spørgsmål om værdien af alt, der ikke direkte havde med den lokale menighed at gøre. Jeg har læst mine bemærkninger igennem igen og kan godt fornemme, hvad mine norske venner siger. Mine udtalelser var alt for kategoriske og kunne derfor virke provokerende, som om jeg ville kassere alt andet. Dette var selvfølgelig ikke min mening, og jeg er bedrøvet over at have udtalt mig så klodset, at det på tryk tager sig ud som en ukærlig dom over andre. Tilgiv mig dette!⁸¹

Madsen hevder forøvrig at han "har været meget iblandt pinsevennerne og vennerne fra Apostolsk Kirke." Sigurd og Anna Bjørner var personlige venner, som ofte besøkte Madsens møter.⁸² Dessuten deltok de norske forkynnerne Lyder Engh, Thoralf Gilbrandt og Martin Ski på Madsens sommerstevne i 1967.⁸³ Likefullt finner Madsen alvorlige *teologiske* betenkeligheter med både pinsebevegel-

⁷⁸ Se forøvrig Harrys artikler i *Mod Målet*, eksempelvis "Kristi legeme" (des. 1962 s. 2-4) og "Den gode hyrde" (jan. 1962 s. 11-13).

⁷⁹ Michael Harry, *Åndelig fornyelse* (København: Forlaget Scandinavia, 1982) s. 40-41.

⁸⁰ Michael Harry, intervju datert 10.12.1994.

⁸¹ Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, mai 1969 s. 16. Se også Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, mai 1967 s. 15: "Når gode venner føler noget sådant, er der grund for mig til at ransage mig selv, thi jeg vil ikke være med til at såre og bedrøve Guds børn, men søge at være sandheden tro i kærlighed. Jeg har derfor gennemgået mine artikler på ny, og jeg må erkende, at jeg har anvendt udtryk, der har kunnet opfattes som kolde, ukærlige nålestik. Det vil jeg af hjertet bede om tilgivelse for. Jeg føler mig dømt af 1. Kor. 13:1-2. Mit syn på den økumeniske bevægelse er uforandret, men jeg vil ikke, at mine ord skal virke hårde og ubroderlige."

⁸² Poul Madsen, "Helligåndens virke." *Mod Målet*, mars 1972 s. 6.

⁸³ "Nyborg Strand." *Mod Målet*, aug. 1968 s. 7.

sen og den karismatiske fornyelse.⁸⁴ Han avviser uttrykket “Åndens dåp” som ubibelsk. Bibelen taler nemlig verken om at Ånden skal døpes eller at han døper: “Det gjør derimod vor Herre Jesus. Han døber med Helligånd og ild.”⁸⁵ Dette bibelske uttrykk forstås av Madsen som en referanse til menigheten:

Både dåb i vand og dåb i Ånden forudsætter altså, at der er et *legeme*, der kan nedsænkes. Hvad dåb i vand angår, må jeg komme med mit fysiske legeme og lade dette nedsænke i vandet. Hvad dåb i Ånden angår, har jeg ikke selv noget åndeligt legeme, jeg kan komme med; men der findes eet, og kun eet åndeligt legeme, der er blevet nedsænket og altså døbt i Guds Ånd, og det er Kristi åndelige legeme, hans menighed. I samme grad som jeg er et lem på dette legeme og lever som et lem på legemet, har jeg delagtighed i Åndens dåb.⁸⁶

Med utgangspunkt i de tre skriftstedene Matt. 3:11, Mrk. 1:8 og Acta 1:5, som alle “peger frem mod samme begivenhed, nemlig pinsen,” og 1. Kor. 12:13⁸⁷ - som peker tilbake til den samme begivenhet, slutter Madsen at ‘åndsdåpen’ omfatter alle troende og at den objektivt sett ble gjort tilgjengelig på pinsedag.⁸⁸ Dermed blir ‘gjenfødelse’ og ‘åndsdåp’ for Madsen nærmest synonyme begreper, om de dog har ulikt anvendelsesområde:

⁸⁴ Se blant annet Madsens polemikk mot overdreven fokus på troshelbredelse i *Helligåndens væsen og virke* s. 51: “Bibelen taler om gaver til at helbrede, men den taler ikke om helbredelsesprædikanter eller helbredelsesevangelister. Og Bibelen taler aldrig om helbredelse på en sådan måte, at redskabet kommer i forgrunden. Ej heller ser vi noget sted i Bibelen, at den, der blev brugt til helbredelse, selv skapte sensation om sit navn eller sit arbejde. I vore dage er der meget farlige strømninger i gang på dette område. Visse evangelister har på en uåndelig, ofte usmagelig måde bragt helbredelsen af syge frem i et lys, som slet ikke tilkommer denne side af evangeliet, og har herigennem voldt stor skade og ført mange ud i svære skuffelser.”

⁸⁵ Poul Madsen, “Helligåndens virke.” *Mod Målet*, mars 1972 s. 3.

⁸⁶ Poul Madsen, “Døbt med Ånden.” *Mod Målet*, sept. 1963, omslagets s. 2-3. Madsen skriver videre: “Åndens dåb er *altid* knyttet til Kristi legeme, og kun i samme grad vi lever som et legeme, lever vi i Åndens kraft. Den, der løsriver sig og sin virksomhet fra Kristi legeme, løsriver sig fra Åndens dåb og kraft.”

⁸⁷ “For med én Ånd ble vi alle døpt til å være ett legeme, enten vi er jøder eller grekere, slaver eller frie, og vi fikk alle én Ånd å drikke.”

⁸⁸ Poul Madsen, *Helligåndens væsen og virke* s. 35.

Når vi taler om at blive født av Ånden, tænker vi på det nye liv, den troende da *selv* får. Når vi taler om at være døbt med Ånden, tænker vi på det nye liv, som den troende får *sammen* med alle de andre troende. [...] Den nye fødsel peger altså på det *personlige*, Åndens dåb peger på det, vi har *sammen* med alle de hellige, vort *fælles* liv som lemmer på samme legeme.⁸⁹

Madsen polemiserer ikke kun mot det teoretiske grundlaget for pinsevennernes 'åndsdåplære'. Som sjelesørger peger han på det utilbørlige press læren nødvendigvis må legge "over alle dem, der går ind under denne lære, og som ikke selv har talt i tunger." Da de angivelig mangler "kraften fra det høye" og i tillegg opplever seg mindreverdige vis-à-vis de 'åndsdøpte', blir konsekvensen ifølge Madsen "at de giver sig til at søge en [illegitim] oplevelse med tungetale af al deres magt."⁹⁰

Madsen avviser likevel ikke all tungetale som sådan,⁹¹ men hevder tvert imot at denne Åndens gave har sin berettigede funksjon i menighetssamlingen:

Tungetalen har sin plads i Guds forsamling, men ikke nogen fremskudt plads og slet ikke pladsen som beviset på, at man er døbt med Ånden eller "brudt igennem til den åndelige verden," som nogle siger. La os med Paulus søge at give den dens rette plads.⁹²

Madsen sier videre: "Med dette syn arbejder vi for tiden sammen med brødre, der har et divergerende syn. Kan det virkelig gå? Hidtil har det gået - ikke problem-løst, men alligevel velsignet og til ære for Herrens navn."⁹³

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, s. 36-37.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, s. 41.

⁹¹ "Der er flere, der hævder, at denne gave ikke er i brug i dag i sin ægte form. De henviser til alt det hysteriske og opstømte, der kaldes for tungetale, og mener, at den sande tungetale var forbeholdt den første tid i menighedens historie. Det er sandt, at der er en mængde falsk og uægte tungetale, men denne sørgelige kendsgerning bør ikke forlede os til også at forkaste den ægte tungetale. Den ønsker Gud også at skænke sin menighed i dag. Hvor den findes, virker den opbyggende og berigende." (Madsen, *Helligåndens væsen og virke* s. 56.)

⁹² Poul Madsen, "Helligåndens virke." *Mod Målet*, mars 1972 s. 8. Se også Madsen, *Helligåndens væsen og virke* s. 55: "Den ægte tungetale er skøn, himmelsk, harmonisk, ren. Den leder opmærksomheden hos de kristne, der er til stede, hen på Herren. Den bryder aldrig den Ånd, Gud giver i mødet. Den skurrer ikke. Den uægte, sjælelige tungetale er 'elektrisk', citrende, støjende, højrøstet, ofte skrigende og hysterisk. Den bortleder opmærksomheden fra Herren og bryder Ånden."

⁹³ Madsen, *ibid* s. 14.

Samarbeidet Madsen alluderte til, refererte høyst sannsynlig til Operasjon Joshua, et evangelisasjonsinitiativ fra Rino Lange (som tilhørte Kristent Fællesskab i København), modellert etter George Verwers Operasjon Mobilisering, men hvor man drev evangelisering eksklusivt i Danmark. Arbeidet startet opp i 1970 og var et samarbeid med organisasjonen Unge Kristne, ledet av blant annet Johannes Facius (som hadde vært med i Kristent Fællesskab fra 1955 til begynnelsen av 1960-tallet) og Johnny Noer. Samarbeidet innebar at det årlige sommerstevnet på Nyborg Strand ikke ble holdt i 1970, men at Kristent Fællesskab og Unge Kristne arrangerte en felles konferanse som ble avholdt ved Den Apostolske Kirkes hovedkvarter i Kolding. Madsen og menigheten i København følte imidlertid etter hvert på at Operasjon Joshua ble for karismatisk, rent teologisk kunne man heller ikke innestå for Facius 'åndsdåplære' som reflekterte tradisjonell pinseteologi. Det ble derfor et definitivt brudd i 1975.

Brudd mellom Madsen og Kristent Fællesskab

Kristent Fællesskab-bevegelsen har aldri vært numerisk stor, og man har i dag menighet i København, Odense og Hillerød. Samlet teller man i dag om lag 400 troende (barna er her ikke medregnet). I 1990 ble det et brudd mellom Madsen og de tre menighetene. Dette skyldtes primært at Madsen ønsket større beslutningsmyndighet enn menighetene var rede til å innvilge. De så imidlertid gjerne at han, som tidligere, bistod med forkynnelse, samt fungerte som 'mentor' og medeldste. Resultatet av bruddet ble at Madsen etablerte en egen Kristent Fællesskab-menighet i København som i dag teller 60-70 troende (barna er heller ikke her medregnet).

Madsen gir på eget initiativ fortsatt ut tidsskriftet *Mod Målet*. De tre Kristent Fællesskab menighetene som ikke lenger samarbeider med Madsen, derimot, publiserer hver sine menighetsblad. I tillegg samarbeider menigheten i København og Odense om utgivelsen av tidsskriftet *Kristent Perspektiv*.⁹⁴

Madsens innflytelse i Norge

Madsens første kone, Thyra Fenger, døde i 1960 og Madsen feiret jul hos Angus Kinneer i England. Gjennom Kinneer ble han introdusert for den britiske forkynneren Lance Lambert, som nok var inspirert både av Nee og Austin-Sparks. Lambert

⁹⁴ Michael Bramming, intervju datert 07.02.2005.

kom heretter ofte til Danmark, ifølge Madsen på eget initiativ.⁹⁵ Det ble imidlertid etterhvert uoverenstemmelser mellom de to,⁹⁶ og Lambert sluttet å komme til Nyborg Strand.⁹⁷

Madsen fikk også tidlig kontakt med Norge. Erling Ramstad, som var formann i eldsterådet for misjonsmenigheten Betlehem i Oslo hadde hørt Madsen i Danmark i perioden 1952-53. Madsen ble så invitert til Betlehem i 1953. I løpet av disse møtene fikk Madsen kontakt med Gilbert Horntvedt, som var medlem i misjonsmenigheten. Horntvedt dro så i årskiftet 1954-55 på et nyttårstevne i Jönköping hvor Madsen sammen med Wilhelm Bergling var hovedtalere. Horntvedt var fascinert over den dyptpløyende bibelundervisningen og den kontinuerlige forbønnen for stevnet. Vel tilbake i Oslo ble Horntvedt sammen med en annen norsk deltaker, Arthur Jørgensen, enige om å komme sammen til bønn for på den måten bedre å ta vare på det de hadde mottatt gjennom Madsens forkynnelse. Flere kom til, og man begynte med regelmessige bønnemøter i private hjem.⁹⁸ Lyder Engh hadde sporadisk holdt søndagsmøter med 'brødsbrytelse' i Horntvedts gruppe. Fra januar 1969 ble det imidlertid bestemt at man skulle begynne fast med søndagsmøter. Man ønsket ikke å gjøre seg avhengig av forkynnere utenfor 'felleskapet' - man kunne samles "om Herren" selv om man ikke hadde noen spesiell taler tilstede. 'Felleskapet' fikk navnet Kristent Fellesskap i 1969, inspirert både av Madsens Kristent Fællesskab i Danmark og Lamberts Christian Fellowship in Halford House på Halford Road i Richmond, London.⁹⁹ Madsen besøkte det norske felleskapet flere ganger om året og ble gjerne fulgt av utenlandske forkynnere som Lambert eller Bergling.¹⁰⁰ Også Stephen Kaung har vært innom. 'Felleskapet' ble lagt ned i 1981 og samlet 50-60 mennesker på det

⁹⁵ Se forøvrig Lamberts artikkelserie "Vor fælles tjeneste" i *Mod Målet*, august 1963 s. 1-4, 9; sept. 1963 s. 4, 9-10; okt. 1963 s. 3-4, 9-10.

⁹⁶ Roar Haldorsen, intervju datert 13.12.1994.

⁹⁷ Siste referanse til Lambert som jeg personlig har kommet over i *Mod Målet*, refererer seg til Madsens artikkel "Hvad ser du?" i aug. 1967 s. 16: "[...] vore gamle venner fra England, Harry Foster og Lance Lambert, vil underrette os om, hvad Herren gør iblandt dem."

⁹⁸ Gilbert Horntvedt, intervju datert 23.05.1995.

⁹⁹ Horntvedt hevder at navnet Kristent Fellesskap ble valgt nettopp fordi man allerede var et kristent fellesskap. Siden Madsens arbeid i Danmark hadde identisk navn, rådspurte man seg likevel med Madsen om han hadde innsigelser, hvilket han ikke hadde.

¹⁰⁰ Se eksempelvis Poul Madsen, "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, des. 1969 s. 15 og "Hvad ser du?" *Mod Målet*, des. 1975 s. 16.

REFLEKS 5-1 2006

meste.¹⁰¹ Bønnegruppene fortsatte, og fortsetter med noen av de samme menneskene, men man tilhører nå ulike menigheter. Omtrent samtidig med at 'felleskapet' ble lagt ned, ble det en splittelse i Den Evangeliske Forsamling. Flere fra 'felleskapet' gikk inn i denne menigheten mens andre valgte utbrytergruppen Menigheten i Nordregt.¹⁰²

Det synes å råde ulike oppfatninger innen 'felleskapet' om hvorvidt man var en lokal menighet eller ikke. En av lederne, Roar Haldorsen Strat, hevder at menigheten ble "formelt etablert i 1969 og fikk navnet Kristent Fellesskap."¹⁰³ Horntvedt, derimot, så ikke 'felleskapet' som noen egen selvstendig menighet. Man var kun opp tatt av å dele det hellige samfunn som svarte til det bilde man hadde mottatt gjennom sin subjektive Bibelforståelse.¹⁰⁴ Ulikt Watchman Nee, som syntes å 'forkynne menighet' ut fra en forutforståelse av menighetens 'natur',¹⁰⁵ synes Horntvedts (og

¹⁰¹ Etter sommerstevnet på Nyborg Strand i 1965 kom flere av de unge fra 'felleskapet' i Oslo sammen for å drøfte hvordan *de* kunne bevare den forkynnelse de hadde fått del i. De begynte så en separat bønnegruppe i tillegg til at en del fortsatte å gå i Horntvedts gruppe. Etter 2 års bønn ble de tent for aktiv gateevangelisering. De trykte egne traktater og begynte å gå ut på gata på lørdagskveldene. Traktatene ble undertegnet 'Unge Kristne', som de heretter refererte til seg selv som. En del av de omlag 20 ungdommene hadde tidligere hatt kontakt med Operasjon Mobilisering, deriblant Jostein Stokkeland, som var første norske OM'er i 1967. Flere av de unge opplevde siden kall til misjonstjeneste, og flere dro ut med Wycliffe Bibeloversettere til Papua New Guinea, Nepal og Filippinene. Andre startet 'Unge Kristnes Boksenter', som senere ble 'Telos Litteraturtjeneste'. Colombianeren Gonzalo Roa Reyes, fikk siden kontakt med Telos. Gjennom ham opplevde så flere latinamerikanere en kristen omvendelse. Dette ble starten på Salemkirkens (pinsemenighet) arbeid blant spansktalende i Oslo. (Haldorsen, intervju datert 13.12.1994.)

¹⁰² Menigheten ble avviklet for 3 år siden.

¹⁰³ Haldorsen, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ Horntvedt, intervju datert 23.05.1995.

¹⁰⁵ I *Mod Målet* for okt. 1963 reflekteres likefullt Watchman Nees menighetssyn i Lance Lamberts artikkelserie "Vor fælles tjeneste," s. 8-9: "Der fandtes aldrig to menigheder i den samme by. [...] Denne enkle geografiske deling er den eneste form for deling, der ikke skader Guds folk, men i virkeligheden fremmer deres eenhed. [...] Du vil sikkert forstå, at i en storby som København med mange kristne må vi have to slags møder, nemlig 1) store centrale møder for alle Guds børn inden for storbyens område og 2) mindre møder i de forskellige dele af byen. [...] Da der kun er een menighed, har såvel de store centrale møder som de små lokale møder samme mål - at opbygge Kristi legeme. Derfor er det nødvendigt, at de i harmoni og fællesskab supplerer hverandre."

Madsens?) motivasjon mye mer praktisk orientert. ‘Felleskapet’ hadde en funksjonalistisk intensjon i og med at mange av hovedstadens øvrige menigheter ikke syntes å ivareta nødvendige åndelige behov.

Om Madsens første og viktigste ‘Norgeskontakt’ var og er Horntvedts bønnegruppe, hadde han likefullt mange venner rundt omkring i Statskirken såvel som i frimenighetene, og på et tidspunkt leste flere hundre nordmenn *Mod Målet*.¹⁰⁶ Viktige impulser er blitt formidlet også til Bergen hvor Bernhard Dahl og Sverre Lundhaug, som besøkte Nyborg Strand første gang i 1963, hadde sin bønnegruppe.¹⁰⁷ Madsen selv besøkte Bergen første gang i mars 1966.¹⁰⁸ Et senere besøk året etter fikk en viss mediedekning da den forholdsvis ukjente kretsen rundt Dahl leide et stort møtelokale og innbød til stevne: “To gange kom journalister fra de stedlige aviser for at få at vide, hvordan det kunne være, der kom så mange mennesker, når - som de sagde - ingen stod bag møderne.”¹⁰⁹ I enda større grad enn Madsen øvde imidlertid Lance Lambert en betydelig innflytelse. Selv kjente han på misjonskall til Kina og hadde allerede lært seg kinesisk¹¹⁰ da han første gang ankom Bergen flere år tidligere for å

¹⁰⁶ Madsen, intervju datert 19.11.1994.

¹⁰⁷ Arne Dahl, intervju datert 03.04.1995. Bernhard Dahl var en nær venn av kinamisjonær Marie Monsen. På begynnelsen av 60-tallet opplevde han en noe vanskelig periode og følte behov for en ‘åndelig fornyelse’. Sammen med sin kone fikk han kontakt med en frk. Hana, som muligens hadde tilknytning til De Frie Evangeliske Forsamlinger. Gjennom henne fikk de kontakt med flere mennesker som tidligere hadde vært sammen med Marie Monsen i en privat bønnegruppe, deriblant familien Lundhaug, Anna Margrethe Hansen og Aslaug Bull. Gjennom frk. Hana fikk de også høre om Poul Madsen i Danmark. Dette var foranledningen til at de oppsøkte Madsens sommerstevne på Nyborg Strand, Fyn i 1963 og kom beriket tilbake.

Dahls sønn, Arne, som studerte teologi ved Menighetsfakultetet i perioden 1966-71, ble av Lance Lambert oppmuntret til å gå i Horntvedts bønnegruppe. Han følte seg imidlertid aldri helt hjemme der. Det er i ettertid likevel vanskelig å peke på ulikheter mellom de to gruppene i henholdsvis Oslo og Bergen. Det eneste måtte i så tilfelle være at mens han aldri kan huske å ha hørt tungetale i Oslo, hendte det at Aslaug Bull i Bergen kunne fremføre budskap i tunger. Dette ble anerkjent som “genuint fra Gud.”

¹⁰⁸ Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, mars 1966 s. 18.

¹⁰⁹ Poul Madsen, “Hvad ser du?” *Mod Målet*, april 1967 s. 17.

¹¹⁰ Som forberedelse til Lamberts planlagte opphold i Kina ble han tatt opp ved “the School of African and Oriental Studies” ved London University. Her studerte han “Classical Chinese, Mandarin, Oriental Philosophy and Far Eastern history.” (“Bible Teaching Cassettes by Lance Lambert.” Kent: Anchor Recordings Ltd, n.d.)

besøke den norske kinamisjonæren Marie Monsen.¹¹¹ Lambert opplevde igjen “at Gud hadde lagt Bergen på hans hjerte” og spurte om han kunne få besøke Dahls bønnegruppe.¹¹²

Familien Dahl dro heretter regelmessig ned til Madsens sommerstevner på Nyborg Strand i mange år. Etterhvert som vennskapet med Lambert vokste seg sterkere, ble identifikasjonen med engelskmannen og hans menighet i London toneangivende vis-à-vis Madsen og Danmark. Lambert besøkte Bergen flere ganger om året til rundt på 80-tallet og bodde da alltid hos familien Dahl. Dahls bønnegruppe bestod hovedsaklig av eldre mennesker, men en del unge møtte trofast opp når Lambert kom på besøk.¹¹³ En av de unge i bønnegruppen, Jan Otto Nesse dro over til Halford House rundt 1963 og tilbrakte ett års tid i Lamberts menighet. Dahls sønn, Arne, besøkte menigheten i løpet av sommeren 1964. En rekke andre har også vært innom menigheten for kortere perioder.



¹¹¹ Lambert ble visstnok introdusert for Marie Monsen via Hilmar Kjær, som var utsendt fra De Frie Evangeliske Forsamlinger i Bergen som misjonær til Swaziland. (Noralv Askeland, intervju datert 31.08.1994.)

¹¹² Arne Dahl, intervju datert 03.04.1995. Hele familien Dahl var lutheranere. Bønnegruppen samlet imidlertid flere med et baptistisk dåpssyn. Sakramentenes betydning ble dog nedtonet. Man møttes på tvers av teologiske skillelinjer på grunn av en felles forventning om at Gud hører bønn. Mange hadde lært Marie Monsen å kjenne, og hennes bøker ble flittig lest. Det er nok også riktig å si at man møttes gjennom en felles forståelse av ‘menigheten’ som ‘Kristi legeme’, slik denne undervisningen hadde blitt formidlet via Madsen og Lambert. Selv om Lambert nok var sterkt influert av Watchman Nees undervisning om den lokale menighet - og nok også avdekket sitt radikale menighetssyn i hjemmemenigheten Halford House i London, gikk han åpenbart langsommere fram i Bergen. Lambert var forøvrig også influert av den britiske forkynneren T. Austin-Sparks, og forkynnelsen i Bergen var gjerne mer i tråd med Austin-Sparks undervisning om Guds ‘universelle’ menighet som ‘Kristi legeme’. Likevel var det nok mange som sanset at Lambert ønsket noe mer. På samme måte som at flere i bønnegruppen i Bergen etterhvert tok troende dåp - selv om dåp i seg selv aldri ble forkynt - og man opplevde at Lambert bifalt beslutningene, ble man også vitne til at flere av ungdommene etterhvert sluttet å komme på bønnemøtene, men istedet etablerte sin egen bønnegruppe. Sistnevnte moment vil vi imidlertid vende tilbake til i en senere artikkel.

¹¹³ Noralv Askeland, intervju datert 31.08.1994.

Charles F. Schmitt - a brief introduction

Geir Lie holds a Master of Christian Religion from the Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology in Oslo.



Schmitt (1937-)¹ was born and grew up in Brooklyn. He had a ‘born again’ experience in 1950, was water baptized a year later in an independent Pentecostal church his aunt attended and was ‘Spirit filled’ in 1952 (subsequent to having read a Keswick-inspired book on *The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*).

He had been ‘saved’ through the work of the Fellowship Deaconry which was carried out by German Deaconess Sisters in New Jersey, and since several of his mentors had attended Prairie Bible Institute in Canada, Schmitt also decided to attend in 1955. Here he was introduced to and greatly influenced by the publications of Watchman Nee. About at the same time he began to gather with a Plymouth Brethren group which met outside of campus.

One year later (1956) Schmitt became aware of an assembly in Jamaica, New York, where Stephen Kaung, a former co-laborer of Watchman Nee, ministered. Later, he was introduced to Herb Fader, who actually proofread the translation of the Nee manuscripts which Kaung had brought with him to the U.S. from China.

From Prairie Bible Institute, Schmitt went to Bethany Fellowship in Minneapolis in 1958. Here he was exposed to charismatic phenomena such as tongues, interpretation and prophecy. He was receptive and soon received his own ‘Pentecost’.²

Schmitt then went to Roseau, Minnesota with a small group of young Christians where they all were further introduced to charismatic faith and practices. As they were ‘released’ from this independent charismatic church in Roseau, Schmitt decided – together with Morris Watson from Grand Rapids, to meet on a regular basis with a small group of believers in that city. The Fellowship of Believers in Grand Rapids was founded in 1962 as an expression of the restoration of New Testament church life such as Schmitt had seen portrayed in Nee’s ecclesiological writings. The Grand Rapids fellowship grew to 180 believers (children included). In addition Schmitt ministered among many small groups scattered throughout a number of states (Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin,

¹ This article is based on a conversation with Schmitt, dated July 7, 2000.

² Schmitt obviously distinguishes between his Spirit-filled experience in 1952 and his Pentecost-experience six years later.

Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky and Missouri). These groups, taken together, contained thousands of believers, Schmitt claims.

Although it was primarily the Nee writings which influenced Schmitt's ecclesiology, he developed further contact with Christians of yet other persuasions, including some Latter Rain/Manifest Sonship contacts, such as Bill Britton, Sam Fife, John Robert Stevens (initiator of The Walk) and Stevens' father. He also met Gene Edwards, Lance Lambert, Bob Ewing (son of Glenn Ewing),³ and DeVern Fromke, in addition to Stephen Kaung. Schmitt also knew several of the British Restorationist leaders. While living in Grand Rapids, he had invited Gerald Coates to preach. He later visited the UK where he met John Noble and Maurice Smith, among others.

In 1979, Schmitt (with his family) moved to Wheaton, Maryland to be a part of a fellowship led by Larry Tomczak and C.J. Mahaney: Gathering of Believers. After two years, a painful separation took place between these men. Schmitt, in the process, became convinced that they had become exclusive and sectarian. In time, he found that this concern would equally apply to himself and to many fellowships he had previously ministered in. He recalls reading Witness Lee's book, *The All-inclusive Christ*, and suddenly realizing that although Lee's words in the book were *inclusive*, the author's followers nonetheless displayed an *exclusive* attitude towards others who were not connected with their local churches. This had also been true of himself and many he labored with. (In 1998 Schmitt was reconciled to most of the leaders from the Gathering of Believers fellowship; among these were Larry Tomczak, Jim Golden, Che Ahn, and others.) Interestingly, Tomczak has since also severed his ties with Mahaney and the Gathering of Believers movement (which has gone through various name changes, first People of Destiny, and later Sovereign Grace Ministries). The division between Tomczak and Mahaney, although not referred to explicitly in his book *What do you believe about how people get saved?* (1998), which seeks to counter the Calvinistic view of the way to salvation, nonetheless is hinted at.

After the division with the Gathering of Believers in 1981, several key local pastors in the Washington D.C. area gathered around Schmitt and his wife (Dorothy). As close friends, they encouraged the couple to begin to build a local church. In the fall of 1983 a small group came together in the Schmitt's family

³ Glenn Ewing has unfortunately never been the object of scholarly research. In a letter to this author, dated May 7, 1997, Charles V. Simpson writes: "[Glenn Ewing] is a little known patriarch...represent[ing] the earliest combination that I know of reformed theology, charismatic truth, the five-fold ministry, and spirit, soul, and body teaching."

home to pray. However, they quickly outgrew their location and moved to a local Seventh Day Adventist fellowship hall. By 1984 they had grown to over 100 believers and relocated to E. Brooke Lee Middle School in Wheaton, Maryland. In early 1989, the church purchased property at 16819 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Springs, Maryland where they relocated. More than 3,500 believers now consider Immanuel's Church their home church.

Immanuel's Church is an interdenominational 'Spirit-filled' church with ever-increasing relational connections to a wide spectrum of evangelical-charismatic-revival churches and ministries. One of the current thrusts in Immanuel's is home cell groups. The church also has a Bible school and college, and undergirds a growing network of so-called 'apostolic' missions. Immanuel's currently supports scores of missionary families worldwide.



The New Apostolic Movement in Historical Context

Paul L. King, D. Min., Th.D. is a professor at Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Oklahoma.



The New Apostolic Revolution of the late 20th and early 21st centuries has resurrected the concept of apostles as governmental leaders in the Church, and has become an ongoing and controversial movement, proposing alternative structures to traditional denominational leadership. It has been hailed as “changing the shape of Protestant Christianity around the world.”¹ In order to understand this movement, we need first to survey the history of apostolic movements and concepts.

After the last of the original New Testament apostles died, apostles were replaced with bishops and the concept of apostolic succession. In the New Testament era, the term bishop (Greek, *episcopos*—overseer) was synonymous with elder and pastor (Acts 20:17, 28; 1 Peter 5:1-2). However, with Ignatius, shortly after the dawn of the second century, the term bishop became elevated to one who held authority over a group of churches or pastors or a region, and the term apostle appears to have been abandoned. Ignatius stated that the council of elders had the authority of apostles, but he did not call them apostles.² Ignatius referred to himself as a magisterial bishop, but avowed he did not command with the authority of the apostles.³

The *Didache*, or the *Teaching of the Twelve*, usually dated about 120 A.D., does speak of the continuing role of apostles and prophets: “But concerning the apostles and prophets, according to the decree of the Gospel, thus do. Let every apostle that cometh to you be received as the Lord. But he shall not remain except one day; but if there be need, also the next; but if he remains three days, he is a

¹ C. Peter Wagner, “New Apostolic Revolution,” *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements (NIDPCM)*, ed. Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard M. Van Der Maas (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 930.

² Ignatius, “Epistle to the Trallians,” Chapter 2, *Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF)* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), 1:66; Ignatius, “Epistle to the Magnesians,” Chapter 6, *ANF*, 1:61.

³ Ignatius, “Epistle to the Magnesians,” Chapter 6, *ANF*, 61; Ignatius, “Epistle to the Romans,” Chapter 4 *ANF*, 1:103; Ignatius, “Epistle to the Antiochans,” Chapter 11, *ANF*, 1:112.

false prophet. And when the apostle goeth away, let him take nothing but bread until he lodgeth; but if he ask money, he is a false prophet.”⁴

After this time, however, the term was seldom ever used of post-New Testament church leaders. Rather, the concept of apostolic succession became the norm. Irenaeus and Tertullian asserted that those who had not seen the New Testament apostles, even if they claimed to have new revelation, are not apostles.⁵ By the fourth century, church historian Eusebius claimed that evangelists “held the first rank in apostolic succession” and performed the apostolic function of “laying the foundation of the faith.”⁶ Garrett notes of Eusebius:

It is significant that in his account of the early church, Eusebius clearly distinguished between apostles (those labeled as “apostle” in the New Testament) and church leaders who succeeded them. According to Eusebius, the successors of the apostles did not bear the label “apostle.” Evangelists, as itinerant preachers of the Gospel, were considered to be those who succeeded the apostles in their trans-local ministry. The senior (most aged) overseer in a region became the arbiter of apostolic doctrine. Thus, after the death of John (95-99 AD), according to Eusebius’ record, no one was called an “apostle” in the early Church.⁷

After thorough computerized research of the term apostle throughout the literature of Church Fathers, Garrett found: “In these documents, with few exceptions, the term, *apostle*, was used only for those who in the New Testament were labeled *apostle*. Most of these exceptions are New Testament figures who did apostolic work, but were not labeled *apostles* in the New Testament. Those who claimed the title *apostle* after the death of John were, for the most part, labeled false apostles.”⁸ The reasons for this appear to be respect for the apostles as the unique founders of the church, concern to maintain the purity and authority of

⁴ “The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” 11:3-6, *ANF*, 7:380.

⁵ Irenaeus, “Against Heresies,” Book 2, Chapter 2-1-22, *ANF*, 1:389-392; Tertullian, “Prescriptions Against Heretics,” Section One, Chapter 30, Chapter 32, *ANF*, 3:257-258.

⁶ Eusebius Pamphilis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 3, Chapter 37, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), Series 2, 1:169.

⁷ James W. Garrett, “Translocal Ministry in the New Testament Church,” a paper delivered at the New Testament Church Conclave, May 2005, 22. See website: <http://www.doulospress.org/pprs.php>

⁸ Garrett, “Translocal Ministry,” 23.

apostolic doctrine, as well as unity of the church through apostolic succession.⁹ Vinson Synan notes of the Reformation time:

In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Calvin wrote “The Lord now and again revives them [apostles, prophets and evangelists] as the need of the times demands.” These offices, however, have no place in “duly constituted churches,” he added. In a similar vein, Luther believed “the apostolic message rather than the office” would remain in the church.¹⁰

Occasionally throughout church history missionaries have been considered apostles in a generic sense, such as William Carey and Hudson Taylor being considered as apostles of missions. Also those who have pioneered new paths in Christian ministry and growth or new movements have sometimes been considered as apostles, such as George Müller and Smith Wigglesworth called apostles of faith. A. B. Simpson was considered an apostle for his pioneering work of missionary outreach through the para-church organization he founded, The Christian and Missionary Alliance (C&MA).

19th and 20th Century Restorationism

With the revivals and renewals of the 1800s came a sense of restoring the apostolic church. The American Campbell/Stone (Thomas and Alexander and Barton Stone) Restoration Movement endeavored to recover New Testament practices and emphases, though not focusing on apostles. From this movement emerged the Disciples of Christ, independent Christian Churches, and the Church of Christ. The first apparent “apostolic movement” emerged through the teachings of Edward Irving, who believed in the restoration of the gifts, ministries and offices of the New Testament Church, and founded the Catholic Apostolic Church, in which apostles were appointed. The last of those apostles died in 1901, with no provision for future apostles, so the denomination became almost extinct.¹¹

In the late 1800s, some in the Higher Life and Keswick holiness movements were emphasizing renewal of the New Testament church. The idea of a “Latter Rain” restoration was taught in many holiness circles. For instance, C&MA leader W. C. Stevens wrote as early as 1891 that recovery of the healing ministry would open the door for all the other supernatural manifestations, and that restoration of

⁹ Garrett, “Translocal Ministry,” 24.

¹⁰ Vinson Synan, “Apostolic Practice,” *He Gave Apostles: Apostolic Ministry in the 21st Century*, Edgar R. Lee, ed., (Springfield, MO: Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, 2005), 17.

¹¹ D. W. Dorries, “Catholic Apostolic Church,” *NIDPCM*, 459.

the rest of the gifts would be revived in the logical order of listing in 1 Corinthians 12.¹² Stevens and C&MA theologians were teaching on the Latter Rain long before the Azusa Street Pentecostal Revival. In 1901 John Alexander Dowie, a faith healer who founded the Christian Church, claimed he was the prophetic fulfillment of Elijah, the Restorer. By 1904 he expected “full restoration of apostolic Christianity and revealed that he had been divinely commissioned to be the first apostle of a renewed end-times church.”¹³ His health failed and he was embroiled in scandal and controversy, dying in 1907.

With the Azusa Street Pentecostal movement there emerged what was called “apostolic faith,” recovery of the beliefs and practices of the apostolic church.¹⁴ At the same time, the movement did not, by and large, believe in the office of apostle.¹⁵ In the 1930s Chinese minister Watchman Nee, influenced by Keswick, Pentecostalism and the Brethren churches, taught on the reality and roles of apostles, distinguishing them as universally preaching the gospel, but not exercising authority over local churches, which is the role of prophets, teachers, and elders.¹⁶

In the late 1940s a new Latter Rain Movement sprung up with emphasis on restoring apostles and prophets and the importance of the role of laying on of hands.¹⁷ The Assemblies of God branded the movement as heretical and dismissed the idea of the office of apostle for today. Donald Gee likewise severely criticized the office of apostle in the Apostolic Church and the Apostolic Faith Church in Great Britain, remarking, “To bestow New Testament titles of offices upon men and women and then consider that by doing so we are creating apos-

¹² William C. Stevens, “Jesus Our Healer,” *CAMW*, Mar. 20, 1891, 183.

¹³ E. L. Blumhofer, “Dowie, John Alexander,” *NIDPCM*, 587; Nico Horn, “Apostolic Leadership: Renewal of the Church or Pentecostal Heresy?,” Paper presented at the 21st Annual Conference of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Lakeland, Florida, November, 1991, 13.

¹⁴ J. R. Goff, Jr., “Apostolic Faith,” *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements (DPCM)*, ed. Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988), 16-18; E. L. Blumhofer, “Apostolic Faith Movement,” *DPCM*, 19-20; S. L. Ware, “Restorationism in Classical Pentecostalism,” *NIDPCM*, 1019-1021.

¹⁵ Horn, 2-3.

¹⁶ Watchman Nee, *The Normal Christian Church Life* (Anaheim, CA: Living Stream Ministry, 1980).

¹⁷ R. M. Riss, “Latter Rain Movement,” *DPCM*, 532-534.

toloc assemblies parallel to those of the primitive church is very much like children playing at churches.”¹⁸ One of the products of the Latter Rain Movement was John Robert Stevens, a former Assemblies of God minister who founded an independent work called Living Word Ministries (also informally called “The Walk”).¹⁹ Declared to be an apostle, some of his followers believed he was a reincarnation of Elijah, and various legends grew about his spiritual superiority and authority.²⁰

Apostolic Conceptions in the Charismatic Movement

With the emergence of the charismatic movement in the 1960s came the renewal of belief in restoration of all the gifts and ministries of the Spirit. The “Ft. Lauderdale Five” who launched the shepherding movement (sometimes also called a Covenant movement) taught a form of restorationism, relating to the Latter Rain conception. They included Ern Baxter (who had contacts with the Latter Rain movement), Don Basham, Charles Simpson, Bob Mumford, and Derek Prince.²¹ John Poole, whose father was active in the Latter Rain Movement, circulated with this group of leaders for a time.²² Trying to bring order and discipline to the excesses in the charismatic movement, they endeavored to provide authority, counsel and structure. Although they did not call themselves apostles, they began to fashion, in embryonic form, the idea of an apostolic council of church government or “trans-local authority.”²³ Because of accusations of authoritarianism and legalism, the shepherding movement lost favor and eventually disbanded.

A similar covenant movement developed in the United Kingdom, particularly through Bryn Jones, teaching restoration of the five-fold ministry of Ephesians 4.

¹⁸ Cited in Horn, 4-5.

¹⁹ See the Living Word Ministries website at: www.thelivingword.org.

²⁰ Horn, 14-16. Stevens, along with Bill Britton and Sam Fife, represented a stream of the Latter Rain Movement that taught the “manifest sons of God” concept, that a group of elite believers would be manifested as a fully mature, overcoming army in the end times.

²¹ Mumford had been associated with Elim Bible Institute, which was influential in carrying Latter Rain teachings into the charismatic movement. Riss, 534.

²² Riss, “Latter Rain Movement,” 534.

²³ Derek Prince, “Discipleship, Shepherding and Authority,” *New Wine*, Feb. 1976, 11.

Jones was designated an apostle in that movement.²⁴ In South Africa during the early 1990s leaders such as Derek Morphew and Ray McCauley (Rhema Bible Church) recognized the ministry and office of apostle, but shunned the term to describe their ministries even though they appeared to operate in an apostolic capacity.²⁵ Other apostolic-like movements that arose during the 1970s and 1980s included the People of Destiny, now known as the Sovereign Grace Movement, led by C. J. Mahaney and formerly Larry Tomczak, and Maranatha Ministries, a college campus church-planting ministry founded by Bob Weiner. Accused of authoritarianism similar to the shepherding movement, it disbanded in 1989. The International Communion of Charismatic Churches was formed in 1982 with Earl Paulk as archbishop.

Apostolic Conceptions in the Third Wave Movement

Apostolic conceptualization re-emerged through the Third Wave movement beginning in the 1980s. Bill Hamon, significantly influenced by the Latter Rain Movement, as presented in his 1981 book *The Eternal Church*,²⁶ launched his emphasis on restoration of apostles and prophets in 1988. His teaching consummated in his 1996 book *Apostles, Prophets and the Coming Moves of God*,²⁷ endorsed by Oral Roberts, among others.²⁸ David Cannistraci's books *The Gift of Apostle* and *Apostles and the Emerging Apostolic Movement* followed in 1996 and 1998.²⁹ A diversity of charismatics and Pentecostals like David Yonggi Cho, Ted Haggard, Freda Lindsay, Cindy Jacobs, and even a non-charismatic like Bill Bright, founder of Campus Crusade, endorsed his books. Ken Sumrall founded the Church Foundational Network in 1995, providing apostolic oversight

²⁴ Horn, 18-19.

²⁵ Horn, 8.

²⁶ Bill Hamon, *The Eternal Church* (Phoenix, AZ: Christian International, 1981).

²⁷ Bill Hamon, *Apostles, Prophets and the Coming Moves of God* (Santa Rosa Beach, FL: Christian Intl., 1997).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, xv.

²⁹ David Cannistraci, *Apostles and the Emerging Apostolic Movement* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1996, 1998).

for a variety of churches, cells, and pastors,³⁰ and related to it the Apostolic Family Ministries.³¹

Following on their heels in 1998, C. Peter Wagner's book *The New Apostolic Churches* describes the New Apostolic Revolution (NAR).³² He recognizes a pattern of divine blessing through church movements that have been especially blessed by God through enormous church growth as being "new apostolic churches." The leaders of these church movements are then the new apostles, people who have had a large "amount of spiritual authority delegated to individuals."³³ He includes a diversity of American church leaders and movements such as Billy Joe Daugherty's Victory Fellowship of Ministries, Dick Iverson's Ministers Fellowship International, Larry Krieder's Dove Christian Fellowship International, Bill Hybel's Willow Creek Association, and Wellington Boone's Fellowship of International Churches, as well as worldwide, such as Lawrence Khong in Singapore, William Kuymuyi of Deeper Life Ministry in Nigeria, Paul Daniel's His People Christian Ministries in South Africa, Eddie Villanueva of Jesus Is Lord Church in the Philippines, and Joseph Wongsak's Hope of Bangkok Church in Thailand.

This new apostolic revolution is characterized by new authority structures unlike denominations with loosely structured apostolic networks, new homegrown leadership development and releasing people to ministry in the local church, new ministry focus that is vision driven, new worship styles and prayer forms, new attitudes toward financing, fresh approaches to aggressive outreach, and a new supernatural power orientation (even in non-charismatic churches). His book had the endorsement of no less than the non-charismatic fundamentalist church leader Elmer Towns from Liberty University, who wrote the foreword to his book.³⁴ While the influence of Bill Hamon and the Latter Rain movement is strongly evident, Wagner also sees roots of the new apostolic movement in the African independent church movement beginning about 1900, the charismatic movement,

³⁰ See website at: www.churchfoundationalnetwork.com.

³¹ See website at: www.apostolicfamilyministries.org.

³² C. Peter Wagner, *The New Apostolic Churches* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1998).

³³ Wagner, *The New Apostolic Churches*, 19-20.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 7-9.

the Chinese house church movement, and the Latin American grassroots church movements, all from the 1970s.³⁵

In 2004 *Ministries Today* emphasized the five-fold ministries of Ephesians 4, devoting an entire issue to apostles. They identified other apostles and apostolic ministries such as Samuel Lee and his network of churches in Europe and worldwide, Cesar Castellanos and the G-12 (“Government of Twelve”) cell movement, Mosey Madugba’s Spiritual Life Outreach missions ministry in Africa, Zhang Rongliang’s Chinese for Christ movement, and Kayy Gordon’s church planting Glad Tidings Arctic Mission.³⁶ Larry Keefauver names other international apostolic leaders such as Pam Seward in Nepal, Raymond Mooi and Li Ming in Malaysia, Timothy and Fifi in Bali, Petrus and Tina in Indonesia, Kong Hee and Sun in Singapore, Suri and Mari Kerulo in Fiji, Gary Haynes in Brazil, Bob and Annie Christian in Serbia, among many others.³⁷

In 2004 Wagner announced that he believes the church has entered a “second apostolic age.”³⁸ Many other apostolic networks have developed throughout the United States and worldwide, such as through Jim Hodges, the apostle of the Federation of Ministers and Churches. The Apostolic Council for Educational Accountability (ACEA) was formed as an alternative to traditional educational accreditation.³⁹ Che Ahn, pastor of Harvest Rock Church in Pasadena, California, is the presiding apostle of the apostolic team of Harvest International Ministries.⁴⁰ The Council of International Charismatic Bishops, with a global network in more than 100 countries, have regional leaders that make up an Apostolic Leadership Council.⁴¹ The largest and most influential apostolic movement appears to be the International Coalition of Apostles (ICA) including such leaders

³⁵ Wagner, *The New Apostolic Churches*, 17; C. Peter Wagner, *Changing Church* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 2004), 10-11.

³⁶ *Ministries Today*, Nov./Dec. 2004, 25-28, 30-31.

³⁷ Larry Keefauver, “Acts of the Apostles,” *Ministries Today*, Nov./Dec. 2004, 84.

³⁸ Wagner, *Changing Church*, 12-13.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁴⁰ Wagner and Bill Greig, President of Gospel Light Publications, serve on the Board of Directors of HIM. See website at: www.harvestim.org

⁴¹ See website at www.cicbconference.org

as Chuck Pierce, John Eckhart, John Kelly, with Wagner as the presiding apostle.⁴² Over 350 leaders of the Apostolic Reformation are recognized as apostles.⁴³

Responses and Controversies

In 2004 Doug Beachem of the International Pentecostal Holiness Church published *Rediscovering the Role of Apostles and Prophets*, endeavoring to provide a balance to the emerging apostolic movements and responding to Wagner's books.⁴⁴ While recognizing the insights of the New Apostolic Revolution, he envisions more hope for renewing and restructuring denominational structures and leadership than Wagner. The Assemblies of God responded to the New Apostolic Revolution with a book of essays in 2005 entitled *He Gave Apostles: Apostolic Ministry in the 21st Century*, based on lectures from the AG Theological Seminary Symposium "Apostolic Ministry in the Pentecostal-Charismatic Tradition."⁴⁵ The Assemblies of God have reiterated their opposition to the conception of the authoritative apostolic office today, while leaving the door open for the possibility of apostles in a more general and limited sense.⁴⁶ One notable exception is the book by David Cartledge, *The Apostolic Revolution: The Restoration of Apostles and Prophets in the Assemblies of God in Australia*.⁴⁷ Some of the ongoing controversial issues regarding the New Apostolic Revolution include:

1. *Interpretations of Roles of Apostles.* Current scholarship presents three views of the phrase "foundation of the apostles and prophets in Ephesians 2:18-22: (a) genitive of apposition—the foundation which is the apostles and prophets, (b) genitive of possession—"the Apostles' foundation"—"that on which they built or that on which they were built," (c) genitive of originating cause—the foundation

⁴² Wagner, *Changing Church*, 37, 111, 112

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁴⁴ Doug Beachem, "The Leadership Shift," *Ministries Today*, Nov./Dec. 2004, 33ff.

⁴⁵ Edgar R. Lee, ed., *He Gave Apostles: Apostolic Ministry in the 21st Century* (Springfield, MO: Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, 2005).

⁴⁶ As cited in Orrel Steinkamp, "Assessing Current Teachings, Issues, and Events with Scripture," accessed online 5/3/99 at http://www.net.pci.com/~ssimpson/second_pentecost.html.

⁴⁷ David Cartledge, *The Apostolic Revolution: The Restoration of Apostles and Prophets in the Assemblies of God in Australia* (Paraclete Institute, 2000).

laid by the apostles and prophets.⁴⁸ Which interpretation is valid continues to be debated.

Third Wave theologian Wayne Grudem insists that in the strict biblical sense there are no apostles today, and the term should not be used as a title.⁴⁹ Cannistraci mentions Grudem briefly, but does not engage his interpretation of the exegetical issues.⁵⁰ Tan distinguishes between the pre-Pentecostal commission of “The Twelve” apostles, and the post-Pentecostal “ascension” apostles of Ephesians 4:11.⁵¹ There are also questions over the authority of apostles today. Wagner’s ICA is setting up a sophisticated business-like structure. However, according to Garrett, the role of the apostle in the New Testament (beyond the 12) is more one of church-planting, not a governmental role.⁵²

2. *Resurrection of an old heresy.* Steinkamp considers the entire “Latter Rain” concept as an illegitimate allegorical interpretation of Scripture, therefore the idea of present day apostles illegitimate.⁵³ To G. Raymond Carlson, former General Superintendent of the Assemblies of God, the New Apostolic Movement is a resurrection of an old heresy: “I saw it in the New Order of the Latter Rain in the late 40s and early 50s. Before that it made its presence felt in the early days of

⁴⁸ Garrett, “Translocal Ministry,” 14; see also James W. Garrett, *New Testament Church Leadership* (Tulsa, OK: Doulos Press, 1996). For discussion of various scholarly exegetical views, see Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994), 904-911; Jon Ruthven, “Ephesians 2:20 and the ‘Foundational Gifts,’” accessed online at <http://home.regent.edu/ruthven/220.htm>.

⁴⁹ Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 904-911. For a response to Grudem, see Jon Ruthven, “Ephesians 2:20 and the ‘Foundational Gifts,’” accessed online at <http://home.regent.edu/ruthven/220.htm>.

⁵⁰ Cannistraci, *Apostles and the Emerging Apostolic Movement*, 78.

⁵¹ Simon G. H. Tan, “Apostles Then and Now,” *Journal of Asian Missions*, 5:2 (2003), 225-227.

⁵² Garrett, “Translocal Ministry,” 26-27.

⁵³ As cited in Orrel Steinkamp, “Assessing Current Teachings, Issues, and Events with Scripture,” accessed online 5/3/99 at http://www.net.pci.com/~ssimpson/second_pentecost.html.

the century among early Pentecostals.”⁵⁴ As early as 1991, Nico Horn addressed the issue at the Society for Pentecostal Studies Conference with his paper “Apostolic Leadership: Renewal of the Church or Pentecostal Heresy?”, saying that present day apostolic movements are less extreme than earlier attempts to reintroduce the apostolic office.”⁵⁵

3. *Who is to say who is an apostle?* Cannistraci deftly sidestepped the question, saying it is not his place to say.⁵⁶ However, Wagner in his book *The New Apostolic Churches*, included specific individuals who he believes have an apostolic anointing. Most of these are charismatic in orientation, although he includes Bill Hybels.

4. Related to this, *can women be apostles?* Cannistraci briefly discusses this, but does not come to a firm conclusion.⁵⁷ The exegetical evidence does not appear to be clear enough to make a definitive determination either way. Even if the interpretation is accepted that Junia(s) in Romans 16:15 is a woman apostle, Cannistraci notes that it was not a common phenomenon for a woman to fulfill that role.⁵⁸ Some new apostolic networks provide liberty for women to serve and be ordained in ministry, but not in governmental positions.⁵⁹

5. *Authoritarianism and the new hierarchy.* As Horn observed in 1990, “The ego mania of Dowie, the extravagant claims of the apostles of the New Apostolic Church and the developments around John Robert Stevens is a clear indication that the office of the apostle can lead to manipulation and the misuse of power.”⁶⁰ Hayford warns, “some approaches to contemporary ‘apostle-ing’ manifestly re-

⁵⁴ As cited in Orrel Steinkamp, “Assessing Current Teachings, Issues, and Events with Scripture,” accessed online 5/3/99 at http://www.net.pci.com/~ssimpson/second_pentecost.html.

⁵⁵ Nico Horn, “Apostolic Leadership: Renewal of the Church or Pentecostal Heresy?”, 21st Annual Conference of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Lakeland, Florida, November, 1991.

⁵⁶ Cannistraci, *Apostles and the Emerging Apostolic Movement*, 92-93.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 86-90.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁵⁹ Wagner, *The New Apostolic Churches*, 39-41.

⁶⁰ Horn, 22.

vert to oppressive hierarchical structures.”⁶¹ The creation of apostolic teams or networks with mutual accountability is designed to decrease such manipulation and abuse of power, but is not failsafe. What if the network of apostles is in mutual agreement about a theological issue or a practice, but their position is not sound?

Horn posits, “As long as the independence of the local church remains a pillar in the restoration movement, the churches (and even individual members) are even less vulnerable to the abuse of power than a church in a centralized Pentecostal denomination. This local independence makes any apostolic movement very vulnerable for schisms. . . . However, if this principle is deviated from in any way, the nondenominational movement will not only become a real denomination, it will also make the apostles almost untouchable.”⁶² There is also the concern of “breakup of covenant relationships between apostles, the moving apostles from one team to another and the often open enmity between apostolic teams.”⁶³

The shepherding movement had tried to establish a kind of apostolic hierarchy, but due to the authoritarianism it was rejected and eventually dissolved. There seems to be a new hierarchy emerging with Wagner’s concepts of horizontal and vertical apostles.

Though he claims to be a horizontal apostle, as the presiding apostle of ICA he appears to be a vertical apostle. Some see the ICA as a rehashing of the shepherding movement. Hyatt notes that “according to Matt. 20:25-26, apostles are not rulers over God’s people, but servants to God’s people.”⁶⁴

6. *Coupling strategic level spiritual warfare with apostolic leadership.* Wagner claims that strategic level spiritual warfare (SLSW) is a part of the new apostles’ calling, and those who do not accept the exegesis and practice SLSW are “anti-war,” or “spiritual pacifists.”⁶⁵ He claims that the new apostles are the “generals” of SLSW. That would appear to mean that if someone does not fully accept the theology and practices of SLSW, that person can not function as a new apostle. Therefore, for example, someone like Kenneth Hagin, considered an apostle of

⁶¹ Jack Hayford, “The Apostolic ‘Right Stuff,’” *Ministries Today*, Nov./Dec. 2004, 98.

⁶² Horn, 25.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ Eddie L. Hyatt, “Thinking Biblically About Apostolic Ministry: 5 Popular Misconceptions in the Church Today,” article excerpted from www.revivalandreformation.org

⁶⁵ Wagner, *Changing Church*, 114-118.

the word of faith movement, could not function as an apostle in this movement because of his opposition to some aspects of SLSW.⁶⁶

7. Related to this, *concerns about elitism*. Making belief in SLSW a characteristic or condition of apostleship obviously raises the concern of exclusivity. Further, membership in ICA is only by official invitation from ICA leadership.⁶⁷ Wagner claims it is not exclusive because other apostolic groups are arising too. This may be true, but the selectiveness of ICA could make it a country club of apostles, leaving out others who may have an apostolic anointing but not view things the same way.

8. *Lack of biblical basis for terminology and structure of the new apostolic movement*. Acknowledging that he is using a phenomenological approach, Wagner posits a methodology and terminology of ecclesiastical apostles, functional apostles, horizontal and vertical apostles, convening, ambassadorial, mobilizing, territorial, and marketplace apostles.⁶⁸ Borne out of a pragmatic managerial point of view, it is difficult to find clear biblical basis for such a scheme. Peter, Paul, James and the other apostles do not seem to have instituted anything nearly as structured as what Wagner has proposed.

9. *Concerns about a "lighter doctrinal load."* Wagner proposes in the New Apostolic Revolution moving "from a heavy doctrinal load to a lighter doctrinal load,"⁶⁹ allowing for broader toleration of a variety of interpretations of Scripture without compromising the essentials of the faith. While he encourages toleration of the various camps of eschatology and such issues as Calvinism vs. Arminianism, he also includes controversial doctrinal variations such as openness theology and non-Trinitarian oneness Pentecostalism, downplaying the role of systematic theology and hermeneutics. On the other hand, Garrett observes that New Testament apostles such as Peter, Paul and John were quite concerned about correcting doctrinal error, cautioning that apostles "must be good exegetes, but also possess discernment."⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Triumphant Church: Dominion Over All the Powers of Darkness* (Tulsa, OK: Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 1993), 201-222.

⁶⁷ See Global Harvest website at <http://www.globalharvestministries.org/home.qry?ID=72&cat=5>

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ Wagner, *Changing Churches*, 143ff.

⁷⁰ Garrett, 29.

Conclusions

Though there is no clear consensus, there is a general acceptance that apostles can exist in some form today, though not with the distinctiveness and extent of authority as the original twelve appointed by Jesus. Beacham concludes, “While Pentecostal denominations accept the reality of contemporary ‘apostolic and prophetic’ ministries, not all accept the NAR premise that there are contemporary ‘offices’ of apostles and prophets. Nonetheless, denominations need to find ways to identify, encourage and recognize the ‘apostolic’ leaders in their midst—even if we remain uncomfortable with calling someone an ‘apostle.’”⁷¹

It would seem that the concept of modern-day apostles in some form is here to stay, hence, Horn concludes:

For those Pentecostals and charismatic who are discontented with democratically elected church leadership without grassroots recognition of ministry, discontented with ecclesiastical structures and searching for a structure based on trust and voluntary fellowship, apostolic ministry can at least be an alternative. The errors of the past does (sic) not give us too much hope for the future. However, modern-day apostolic teams have learned to avoid many of the traps of the past. Apostolic leadership is not without potential dangers—so is denominational Pentecostalism. But Pentecostals can no longer ignore this growing alternative.⁷²

The posture of Hayford is perhaps the wisest approach: “So, I have no particular opposition to people who feel it is important to use the title, but I confess—I don’t believe the title is that important. What is important is that each apostle Jesus raises up (even if he doesn’t think he is one) function in the spirit that Jesus demonstrated by His apostleship. That’s “the right stuff.” And where that happens, His church will have stronger foundations . . . built upon Him, of course.”⁷³



⁷¹ Beacham, “The Leadershift,” *Ministries Today*, Nov./Dec. 2004, 35.

⁷² Horn, 28-29.

⁷³ Jack Hayford, “The Apostolic ‘Right Stuff,’” *Ministries Today*, Nov./Dec. 2004, 97.

The Wesleyan Revival as Model for the Convergence Movement

William L. DeArteaga is a priest of the Communion of Evangelical Episcopal Churches.



Since the decade of the 1990s a new form of Christian congregation has emerged - churches that follow the precepts of the Convergence Movement (CM). This is the attempt to unite three, normally separate, "styles" of Christendom, the Evangelical, the Pentecostal and the sacramental-liturgical. Numerous books and articles have come out on the CM.¹ Unfortunately none of the pioneers or writers on the CM seem to be aware that an earlier, and perhaps superior, form on the CM occurred two centuries ago – the Wesleyan Revival. The contemporary CM has several self-limiting faults which have limited its influence and expansion. On the other hand the Wesleyan Revival was arguably the most successful and influential revival of the Church Age – birthing not only Methodism, but the later Holiness Movement and eventually Pentecostalism.

Two entirely new denominations, the Charismatic Episcopal Church (CEC) and the Communion of Evangelical Episcopal Churches (CEEC), have been formed to live out the CM vision of Christian life.² But the influence of the CM extends beyond its specific denominations. Robert E. Webber, influential worship theologian, director and founder of The Institute for Worship Studies, has spread the

¹Among the most important items are: Wayne Booshda and Randy Sly, "The Convergence Movement" in: Robert E. Webber, ed. *The Complete Library of Christian Worship* (rest of citation), and Robert Webber, *Sign of Wonder: The Phenomenon of Convergence in Modern Liturgical and Charismatic Churches* (Nashville: Star Song Publishing, 1992). Available on the web at <http://www.theceec.org/11convergence.html>. Webber is the most prolific of the convergence writers. His most recent CM title is *Ancient-Future Faith* (Baker: 1999). Randall Balmer's article, "Why the Bishops Went to Valdosta," *Christianity Today* (Sept. 24, 1990), 19-24, was an important CM document, especially for the large circulation it received.

² Web site for the CEC is www.iccec.org, and the CEEC is www.theceec.org.

gospel of convergence through his prolific writings and well attended seminars.³ Many independent congregations have also accepted the CM basic goals.⁴

The first and largest of the new CM denominations, the CEC, was founded by the Rev. Randolph Adler - pastor of an independent charismatic fellowship in San Clemente, California. He had been influenced by the charismatic "Shepherding Movement" which stressed intense discipling. In 1988 he and his congregation cooperated with other churches in a local anti-abortion protest in which he and many of the participants were arrested and jailed. While in jail Adler noticed that the Christian demeanor and ability to withstand the discomforts of jail was superior among the Catholic charismatics.⁵

Pastor Adler discovered that these Catholics worshiped liturgically and partook of the Eucharist frequently as normal devout Catholics, but as charismatics were also Evangelical in the broad sense of the word - believing in the scriptures as the Word of God, and in Jesus as Savior. Additionally they were empowered by the gifts of the Spirit as fully as any Pentecostal or charismatic believer. In other words they were *convergence* believers.

After his release from prison Pastor Adler read the available works of the CM. These included the books of Thomas Howard and Peter Gillquist and their journeys from Evangelical to sacramental Christianity, and also the writings of Robert Webber on liturgy.⁶ Adler began to lead his congregation to a more liturgical and sacramental way of worship and life. He was delighted to find that several other Pentecostal and charismatic congregations were on the same CM path as he.

In 1992, after much research, prayer and experimentation, pastor Adler together with two other pastors were ordained into Apostolic succession through the

³ Webber's web site is: <http://www.ancientfutureworship.com/>

⁴ See for example the web site of the important Episcopal split off, the Anglican Mission in America (AMiA) http://64.118.70.157/amia/meetamia_sub.cfm?id=4

⁵ Archbishop Adler's imprisonment is described in several of his tapes. I have relied for this account on the description given me in a telephone conversation by Archdeacon Daniel Sharp (April 20, 1998) who was with Adler in prison and has been his long-time assistant. For a brief history of Abp. Adler's journey into convergence see: Phillip Johnson, "Twenty-five Years of Ministry with the Patriarch of the ICCEC," *Sursum Corda*, 6, #1 [Mar. 1999], 1, 9-11

⁶ The Thomas Howard's work which particularly inspired Pastor Adler was: *Evangelicalism Is Not Enough: Worshipping God in Liturgy and Sacrament* (Ignatius Press, 1988).

American Old Catholic Church, and Adler became Bishop of the new denomination, the CEC. Episcopal *Book of Common Prayer* (1979) became its normative liturgy. The CEC form of CM Anglicanism stressed classic theological orthodoxy - what the Methodist theologian Thomas Oden first humorously called "paleo-orthodoxy" - as well as a reverence for classical liturgy.

Adler had hoped for ten new churches in ten years. Providentially, the November/December edition of *Ministries Today* ran a cover story, "Ancient Altars, Pentecostal Fires."⁷ This article covered the growing convergence movement and gave positive attention to the new CEC. The article was read, Xeroxed and faxed around the country. Many charismatic and Pentecostal pastors who were thinking similar convergence thoughts were amazed that they were not alone, and the CEC office became deluged by quires from pastors and priests. Within a year the CEC had 100 affiliated churches, and by 2000 the number was almost 600, not counting the huge number of churches in their international outreach in Africa and in Asia.

Surprisingly, the basic theology of the modern CM was developed half a century earlier, and came as a result of a desperate missionary necessity in British India. There, the denominational divisions among the Protestants made witnessing to the love and reconciling power of Christ seem hypocritical to unbelievers. Negotiations to unify the Protestant churches in South India had gone on among church leaders from the 1930s. By 1947 Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Anglicans, the major Protestant denominations in South India, had finally agreed to a union. Individual congregations were to keep their order of service and clergy, but an overall episcopal structure was created to coordinate the churches in advancing the great commission to the millions of Hindus and Moslems of the Subcontinent.

One of the nine pastors chosen to serve as a new bishop for the united Church of South India was an experienced English missionary, Lesslie Newbigin, ordained through the Scottish Presbyterian Church.⁸ Pastor Newbigin enthusiastically supported the on-going negotiations, and in 1944 he took on the assignment, with

⁷ Paul Thigpen, "Ancient Altars, Pentecostal Fire," *Ministries Today* (Nov./Dec. 1992), 43-51.

⁸ The biographical information on Lesslie Newbigin comes from his autobiography, *Unfinished Agenda: An Autobiography*, (Geneva; WCC publications, 1985). His theological pilgrimage is summarized in an article by Bernard G. Thorogood, "Apostolic Faith - An Appreciation of Lesslie Newbigin," *International Review of Missions* 79 (January 1990) 66-85).

two others, of drawing up a liturgy for the possible joint ordination service of the bishops of the new united denomination. That inauguration and ordination service for the new Church of South India finally took place on September 27, 1948, at the Cathedral of St. George's in Madras. It was a service that had no precedent, but went on flawlessly and with the felt presence of the Holy Spirit. Newbigin wrote back to England:

What struck me over and over again in it was that the two notes which are so often opposed - Catholic and Evangelical - were constantly and completely blended throughout. It is something we have so often talked about as an ideal, and yet here it was really happening, and they fitted as if they had always been made for each other - as indeed they had...It made one so utterly sure that what we are doing is not patching things together, but being led by the Holy Spirit back to the fullness and simplicity of Gospel truth.⁹

Newbigin became one of the most outstanding bishops of the Church of South India. He discovered that the greatest tool for healing old denominational divisions and caste frictions were joint eucharistic services that were focused on reconciliation. He received a call to deliver the prestigious Kerr lectures in Glasgow, Scotland, for 1952. Newbigin's lectures, published as *The Household of God*, became the theological foundation of the CM. In this work he argued that the healthy church should have "three streams," the Catholic (liturgical), the Protestant (Evangelical), and the Pentecostal (Spirit empowered). It is an understanding that refers not only to the church as a whole, but to individuals. When Newbigin explained how a person becomes a mature Christian he wrote:

The first answer is, briefly, that we are incorporated in Christ by hearing and believing the Gospel. The second is that we are incorporated by sacramental participation in the life of the historically continuous Church. The third is that we are incorporated by receiving and abiding in the Holy Spirit."¹⁰

At the time Newbigin understood "Pentecostal" to mean those "enthusiastic" leaders and Christian sects, such as George Fox and the Quakers. Newbigin assumed that although these individuals and sects often experienced a strong initial unction of the Holy Spirit, they most often fell into error and extremism. Newbigin had no contact with the Pentecostal churches already in India, and like most Christians, had a conscious disdain for Pentecostals as extremists. He was not to change that opinion until his later work in the WCC when he actually met

⁹ Newbigin, *Unfinished*, 96.

¹⁰ Lesslie Newbigin, *The Household of God: Lectures on the Nature of the Church*. (London, SCM Press, 1953), 30.

Pentecostal pastors.¹¹ In spite of Newbigin's conventional and *negative* view of the Pentecostals, he came to what must now be recognized as a prophetic understanding of where the future of Church unity lay:

In recent discussions of the Catholic-Protestant issue, and of the deadlock in which these discussion seem to have become immobilized, it is often suggested that the way forward may be found in a new understanding of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But of course the illumination which is needed will never come as a result of purely academic theological study. May it not be that the great Churches of the Catholic and Protestant traditions will have to be humble enough to receive in fellowship the brethren of the various groups of the Pentecostal type with whom at present they have scarcely any Christian fellowship at all?¹²

The Household of God was a prophetic work that could not be fully understood by the Church at large. His theological insights and image of three "streams" were recovered when the need arose to give theological definition to what some churches were doing, especially in America.

By the end of the 1990s the CM had through Newbigin, Webber and others, a mature theological base, and through the CEC, CEEC, and other convergence groups hundreds of new congregations. Yet all is not well with the CM, especially in North America.

To illustrate its core problem let me start with a description of a CEC church I helped birth.¹³ The church grew out of a home church co-led with a friend at St. Jude's Episcopal Church in Marietta, Georgia, an orthodox and partially charismatic congregation. My friend had attended one year of seminary and felt a call to the priesthood. However, he was rejected for ordination by our local Bishop for the incredulous reason that he was "male, white and too orthodox." Several months after this blow I handed him a copy of Thigpen's "Ancient Altars, Pentecostal Fire." Less than a year later he was ordained a CEC priest. He left St. Jude's and founded a CEC church, taking with him five of St. Jude's most enthusiastically charismatic families.

I had obligations with St. Jude's and could not join the new church. At the time I believed this church would explode into one of the major churches of the Atlanta area. Everything seemed right, a great theological base in the riches of the ortho-

¹¹ Newbigin, *Unfinished*, 137.

¹² Newbigin, *Household*, 109-110.

¹³ The reader will note my reluctance to use proper names. This paper is a critical evaluation of what has gone wrong with the CM, but many of the persons involved are my friends, faithful and excellent pastors.

dox Anglican tradition, all of the faith and spiritual gifts of Pentecostalism, a pastor who was charismatic and experienced in effective prayer, and a potential congregation of the many orthodox Episcopalians leaving their churches in our area.

Yet after almost a decade the CEC church has grown very little. It still has a core of highly dedicated and orthodox believers. But its Sunday attendance averages less than 40 persons – chapel size. Ironically, its services are *less* charismatic than St. Jude’s. Instead, the new church became small “high church” Anglican congregation, orthodox in its theology and scrupulous in its observance of the rites and rituals of the Anglican tradition. There is rarely any charismatic manifestation during the liturgical services – the Pentecostal segment of convergence is reserved for home group prayer. It is a congregation made of wonderful Christians who are trying to protect their families from the corrosive paganism of our contemporary America. However there is no effective outreach to the lost and unchurched, as is so common in Vineyard and other charismatic churches. I have observed this in a dozen other CEC and CEEC churches. I know personally two ex-Vineyard pastors who left that denomination to form CM churches. They left vibrant churches of one thousand members or more, and are now pastoring churches of less than two hundred.

Bishop Malcolm Smith, one of the most respected bishops of the CEC, and a nationally known Bible teacher, has admitted that small, close-knit, but *weekly evangelical* churches are “not uncommon” in the CEC.¹⁴ In fact though not in theory, CM churches are often little more than chapels of high church worship.

Significantly, a similar problem has plagued the mother church of convergence, the Church of South India (CSI). In September of 1997 that denomination celebrated its 50th anniversary with gala festivities. It was now the largest and most respected Protestant denomination in India with about 2.8 million members. Yet some of the participants felt uneasy that the convergence promise of the early days had never been realized. One observer noted:

¹⁴ See: Bishop Malcolm Smith, “Evangelism: Doing What the Father Does,” Tape #55.03, (Olathe, KS: Canterbury Center, March 7, 1998).

What began as a genuine union of different churches in 1947 has become over the intervening fifty years an Anglican church. There is little of Methodism, Presbyterianism, or Congregationalism left in the CSI, except in memory, whereas Anglicanism is very evident at the levels both of symbolism and of church politics. Clergy dress and the place of the bishop in the ceremonial life of the church are the most obvious symbols of this transformation. The same is true of the Book of Common Worship, which is used in urban congregations, while “free worship” tends to prevail in rural congregations, where the literacy level is low.¹⁵

More importantly, true evangelical outreach has declined, and most of the church growth has been due to biological increase, not new converts. This is partially due to the hostility towards public evangelization by the majority Hindus of India, but only partially. In comparison, Pentecostal denominations in India are rapidly expanding, so that the ultimate responsibility for the CSI’s mediocre growth must be a real decline in evangelical effort and effectiveness.

What went wrong? Why are CM congregations mostly high church *chapels* rather than power houses of evangelization, or shining example of Pentecostal power and revival?

It is my belief that the CM has failed to meet its God-ordained potential because of what might be termed the “traditionalist temptation.” It is a *spirituality dominated by nostalgia*, and “based on the delusion that a former age, usually the age of primitive Christianity, was far superior to all subsequent ones, perhaps most especially the one now experienced.”¹⁶ The traditionalist temptation is the exaggeration of a proper respect for former Christian communities and liturgies that incarnated the Gospel in past - and from which we can still learn. It has taken a destructive and self defeating form in the CM in America specifically through justifying an exaggerated sacerdotalism, and of the inappropriate model of Eastern Orthodoxy.

Specifically the CEC and CEEC have both opted for the models of the medieval Church (Celtic, Orthodox or Roman Catholic) with their view on the role of the ordained clergy in doing all sacramental functions. Unintentionally or not, the understandings that Reformers recovered, and Pentecostals expanded, into the priesthood of all believes and the authority of every Christian, are *functionally diminished*. This is particularly noticeable in CEC churches where the model

¹⁵ [John C. B. Webster] “The Church of South India golden jubilee,” at: <http://www.csichurch.org/article/jubilee.html>.

¹⁶ Robin Darling Young, “Texts Have Consequences,” *First Things* (March 1999), 41. This review article is especially good on the futility of Christian nostalgia as it pertains to the Patristic period.

seems to be of the pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic Church. Women can not have any ordained ministry. The bishop rules the priest, and the priest rules the parish. Unlike the Episcopal Church, there is no vestry of laypersons at the parish level with real authority - rather a powerless “advisory council.” Several years ago the lead article of *Sursum Corda*, the CEC newsletter, described a meeting of the CEC House of Bishops. Phillip Johnson, the CEC reporter writes:

The central service of this House of bishops was the consecration of the Holy Chrism and the bishops’ reaffirmation of their vows to the Patriarch. Both of these actions are key to the maintenance of unity in the Church....The reaffirmation of vows demonstrated that the bishops are in total submission to the Patriarch which is uncharacteristic for Christian leaders in an autonomous world.¹⁷

In fairness it must be noted that there is much that is valuable in both the CEC and the CEEC. A few CEC churches are large and thriving, as in the Church of the Messiah in Jacksonville, Florida, which is led by Bishop Dale Howard. He led his congregation out of the Episcopal Church and into the CEC where it maintains its vitality and evangelistic outreach. Also, the CEEC, though much smaller than the CEC (only about forty congregations in North America), has avoided most of the authoritarian and sacerdotal extremes common to the CM. Its main problem is the consistently small size of its congregations.

A strong liturgical and sacramental emphasis was very attractive to the founders of the American CM who were raised in Evangelical households. For them, the Evangelical pattern of music-preaching-music had become boring, a reaction that many Evangelicals have experienced.¹⁸ But this said, it is also true that converting to high church liturgy, though ministering the founder’s needs and likes, does not create a liturgy form that is attractive or understandable to many contemporary Americans. We now have many new converts who are several generations separated from any church involvement and know nothing of Church traditions. High church liturgy will initially attract *some* followers, (the ex-Catholics, ex-Episcopalians, ex-Orthodox, etc.) but this should not be confused by the CM pastor as a sign that every new Christian will, or should, develop a desire for high liturgy and sacramental life.

The attention on high churchmanship also has negative unintended consequences. Pastors and laypersons both have only limited disposable time for church work -

¹⁷ Phillip Johnson, “Recalling the Revelation,” *Sursum Corda*, 5 #2 [1998], 1.

¹⁸ See the cover story of *Christianity Today* for Oct. 6, 1997, Gary M. Burgess’ “Are Evangelicals Missing God at Church?” available at: <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/7tb/7tb20a.html>.

time they are not spending at work or with family. If the concentration of a new CM congregation is on planting a high church, with its many needs of traditional altar vestments, candles, crosses, etc., then inevitably both time and money are spent in lieu of other priorities, such as youth evangelization.

The traditionalist temptation, via liturgical vestments, seems to have become a problem with many CM churches. When my wife and I attended the Jacksonville CEC convocation in 1987 we saw the bishops process in with elaborately carved shepherd's crocks, decorated miters and vestments the likes of which we had never seen in our many years as Episcopalians. I whispered, "too much." She nodded agreement. Later a wise Episcopal priest and charismatic leader who had decided against joining the CEC told me, "They are like a bunch of kids who broke into grandma's attic trunk and have gone wild playing "dress-up." Perhaps an overstatement, but it had a point.

On a theological level, American CM leadership has been deeply influenced by the model of Eastern Orthodoxy through the writings of Evangelical-to-Orthodox converts such as Peter Gillquist and Frank Schaeffer. This is most unfortunate in view of the fact that the Orthodox Church has an entirely negative history of permitting the use of the gifts of the Spirit to its laypersons. The Orthodox Churches have strenuously opposed the charismatic movement (1/3 of the CM). Fr. Peter Hocken, the noted historian of the Charismatic renewal summarized the opposition of the Eastern Orthodox Churches:

Opposition to [the] C[harismatic] R[enewal] has been fiercest and most sustained among the leaders of the Orthodox church, whose bishops and theologians view the movement as intrinsically Protestant. ...Almost all of the Orthodox priests renewed in the Spirit in the last twenty years have withdrawn under pressure.¹⁹

Further, the Orthodox Churches have a singularly poor record of evangelical outreach. Frank Schaeffer, son of the great Evangelical apologists, and one of the more famous Evangelical-to-Orthodox converts, wrote a scathingly frank article on the problem in his Orthodox journal, *The Christian Activist*. The thrust of his Jeremiad is that the Orthodox Churches in America have wonderful, biblically based, worship but they are principally *ethnic enclaves* that are woefully negligent of any real evangelical outreach. His solution (typical of a traditionalist) is that the Orthodox churches go back to their real heritage of heroic evangelism of

¹⁹ Peter Hocken, "The Charismatic Movement," *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, 141. See also the chapter by Andrew Walker, "The Orthodox Church and the Charismatic Movement," in: David Martin and Peter Mullen. *Strange Gifts? A Guide to Charismatic Renewal* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1984). This chapter contains an interesting critique of the Charismatic Renewal from the Orthodox perspective.

the 4th and 5th Centuries. However, he provided no precise examples or suggestions as to doing modern evangelism – perhaps they might have appeared too Protestant to his readers.²⁰

It is clear that the Orthodox Churches are really *missing 2/3 of the CM triad*, and they are the highest of the high church congregations. Why then have its apologists been so attractive to the CM leadership? The main part must be in similarity of origins. Gillquist, and the others of the Evangelical-to-Orthodox group share a specific common heritage, theology and worship memories with the original Evangelical and charismatic leaders of the CM. The Orthodox churches with their high liturgical/sacramental content *seem* to be closer to the CM ideal than pure evangelicalism.

Further, the Evangelical-to-Orthodox literature is extremely well written and theologically sophisticated. All this obscures that it is *anti-convergence*. Yet this literature is still found on the recommended reading list of CM web sites and taught in CM seminaries. In contrast, there are simultaneously a huge number of people who have shifted from liturgical/sacramental churches to Evangelical or charismatic churches. Their numbers are in the millions, but their literature tends to be unsophisticated and more of a “witness” type, or even more unattractive, as in the fundamentalist “Catholic bashing” genera.²¹

There is a profound issue here. The New Testament makes clear that the chief criteria for things spiritual is not conformity to *tradition*, nor even theological sophistication, but by spiritual *fruits*. At the beginning of the gospel account we see John the Baptist warning the Pharisees, the traditionalists of their day, that they must produce good fruit and not rely on their spiritual pedigrees for God’s favor:

²⁰ Schaeffer, “Seduction of Orthodoxy,” cited from *The Christian Activist* web site, now defunct, no page numbers given. On the problem of ethnic enclaves, we have all seen this in the wonderful movie, “My Big Fat Greek Wedding.” In fairness, one Orthodox church, the Antiochian Evangelical Orthodox Church has attempted some evangelical outreach. See: Shelly Houston, “Orthodox Rekindle Evangelistic Heritage,” *Christianity Today* (October 27, 1997).

²¹ On the Catholic flight to Evangelical and charismatic churches see: Donald E. Miller, *Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the New Millennium* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), and Dean R. Hoge, Kenneth McGuire, Bernard F. Stratman, Alvin A Illig, *Converts, Dropouts, Returnees: A Study of Religious Change Among Catholics* (New York: the Pilgrim Press, 1981).

But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to where he was baptizing, he said to them: “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the coming wrath? Produce fruit in keeping with repentance. And do not think you can say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father.’ I tell you that out of these stones God can raise up children for Abraham. The ax is already at the root of the trees, and every tree that does not produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.” (Matt 3:7-10)

Similarly Jesus made the fruit criteria as the central spiritual “litmus test.” (Matt, 3:8-10 and Matt 7:16-20). During Jesus’ ministry it was the Pharisees who were “liturgically correct” and concerned with “right tradition.” They evaluated Jesus and his disciples as sorcerers because, although they did miracles, they violated Rabbinical traditions. In effect, they missed what the Spirit was doing in their generation because it conflicted with their cherished traditions.²²

As a priest and member of a CM denomination it is painful to point out that the CM has shown relatively little evangelical fruit in its decade long history. It has become an enclave for the orthodox and the pious, but new membership does not come from among the unchurched multitudes that now populate every part of America. Vineyard, World Harvest and many independent charismatic churches do *much better* at evangelization in spite of their unsophisticated theologies.²³ Nor have CM churches been distinguished as part of the present revivals that have flared in Pensacola, Toronto or other parts of North America.

Saying all of this is not to write an obituary for the CM. Not yet. I believe there is a way to revitalize the CM and bring it to its original promise. Obviously the leadership of the CM must reject the traditionalist temptation, and especially the model of Eastern Orthodoxy – those roads lead only to further high church chapels, not great or effective churches.

Let me suggest that there is a far better model for the CM, one that strengthens and encourages every stream of the CM triad - the original Wesleyan Revival of the 18th Century. The Wesleyan Revival must be considered the most effective revival of modern times – it bore immensely bountiful “good fruit.” Looking at it from the perspective of the CM it can be thought of as the first and greatest of the CM revivals.

Now immediately we must admit that the Wesleyan Revival was not quite Pentecostal. In fact, when several of John Wesley’s preachers began to practice heal-

²² I dealt at length with the fruit vs. tradition criteria in my book, *Quenching the Spirit* (Lake Mary: Creation House, 1996), especially chapter 1.

²³ Miller. *Reinventing*, passim.

ing prayer they were stopped by him, as he was anxious to protect his movement from the charge of “Enthusiasm”.²⁴ Properly speaking, the Wesleyan revival was pneumatological rather than Pentecostal. The Wesley brothers understood and even welcomed the intrusive moves of the Holy Spirit among its congregations. This is in contrast to other Evangelical groups of the times, such as in the Calvinist Evangelicals. The Wesleyan Revival had more in common with the Toronto and Pensacola revivals, where there are many “manifestations,” than with the Charismatic Renewal which stressed healing and the word gifts of the Spirit.

Methodist scholars of the 19th and 20th Century tended to downplay the role of both manifestations and the continuing revival outbreaks throughout the history of the Wesleyan Revival, and believed the manifestations as belonging to an “immature” stage of the movement. The historical record shows that this is untrue, and that revival and outbreaks of such things as holy laughter and massive fallings continued sporadically all through its first century.²⁵

On the “Evangelical” aspect of the CM triad little needs to be said. The Methodists were, in fact, the premier component of the great 18th and 19th Century Evangelical revival. However, the sacramental/liturgical triad of the Wesleyan Revival needs some clarification. There has been much (unintentional) distortion by Evangelical Methodist historians who have failed to recognize the deeply sacramental aspect of the Wesleyan Revival.²⁶ The “Holy Club” at Oxford was originally called “the Sacramentarians” in derisive recognition that the fellowship received holy communion weekly – far more frequently than the custom at the time. The Wesley brothers’ initial understanding and commitment to the Eucharist and sacramental worship never changed or flagged. This is most plain in John Wesley’s sermon, “Duty of Constant Communion,” (Sermon #101), and in the

²⁴ A Methodist friend asked if I thought John Wesley “quenched the Spirit” by stopping the Methodists healers. My opinion is that Wesley acted providentially, that his movement was already so far ahead of the rest of Christendom that one more advance could not have been sustainable (Mt 11:14) and would have made it seem totally cultish.

²⁵ Ronald A Knox’s classic work *Enthusiasm: A chapter in the history of religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961).

²⁶ See: Bowmer, *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, ix. In this regard the recent issue of *Christian History* which highlighted the Wesley brothers is especially disappointing, it mentioned nothing about their sacramental theology or devotion. *Christian History* 10 (#3)

glorious eucharistic hymnal produced by the brothers, *Hymns on the Lord's Supper* (1745), perhaps the greatest work of its genera ever produced.²⁷

The question naturally arises, why was the Wesleyan CM so much more fruitful than the contemporary CM? It seems that two major factors distinguish the Wesley brothers from most of the leaders of the current CM. First, the Wesley brothers were loyal churchmen who cherished the Anglican tradition,²⁸ yet they were never beguiled by the "traditionalist temptation." Second, they were observant and obedient to the prompting of the Holy Spirit to the extent they went against some of the strongest of church traditions when there was biblical warrant and obvious good fruit.²⁹

John Wesley, in particular, loved the Patristic Fathers and read from Christian writers of all ages including the Catholic mystics. Yet he was critically appreciative of these sources, not bound by them. For example, he formulated his controversial concept of Christian perfection ("perfect love") from the biblical witness and Christian mystical sources, yet was critical of the excesses of mysticism.

In contrast to much of the contemporary CM leadership, there was little if any sacerdotalism in the Wesleyan Revival. To the contrary, Methodism expanded the role of laymen and women well past the boundaries of church tradition. As early as the missionary attempt in Georgia, John Wesley set women to work in the visitation ministry and called them "deaconesses" – something that would have been impossible and scandalous in England. Later, and this time against Anglican *canon law*, he allowed his "exhorters" to become lay preachers and expound the word of God among his societies.

²⁷ I have stressed the sacramental aspects of the Wesleyan revival in my most recent book *Forgotten Power: The significance of the Lord's Supper in Revival* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), it was by no means a pioneer insight, but based on solid scholarship including: John C. Bowmer's, *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism* (London: Dacre Press, 1951), and the magnificent piece by Steven T. Hoskins, "Eucharist and Eschatology in the Writings of the Wesleys," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 29 (Spring/Fall, 1994).

²⁸ Frank Baker, in his *John Wesley and the Church of England* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970).

²⁹ Richard Steele, "John Wesley's Synthesis of the Revival Practices of Jonathan Edwards, George Whitefield and Nicholas Zinzendorf," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 30 #1 (Spring 95).

We need to draw attention to the Wesleyan sacramental/liturgical CM component. Here are demonstrated both John Wesley's adoptability and sense of the Holy Spirit's leading, and a major difference in accent from the contemporary CM. As we mentioned, the Wesleyan Revival was deeply sacramental, yet even in its sacramental piety it was innovative, Holy Spirit sensitive, and *non-traditionalist*. Take for example, the Methodist love-feast. This is mentioned in the Bible, but fell out of practice in the early Middle Ages. The Moravians had reintroduced it, and John Wesley first observed it celebrated in Georgia. He later partook of several love-feasts at the Fretter Lane society where the Spirit fell on those occasions with great power. In spite of the fact that the love-feast had no warrant in Anglicanism or other major Christian denomination, he mandated it for his societies. He did not fight a great theological war about it, nor claim it was a major sacrament on par with Baptism or the Lord's Supper. He merely *did it*, and set his preachers to do the same. This time it was something they could do without violating Anglican canon law - since there was no recognition of the love-feast as sacrament in Anglicanism, and therefore no sacerdotal restrictions on who could celebrate.³⁰

The Wesleyan Revival was the most sacramental revival in Church history, but paradoxically it was *not a liturgical revival*. That is because the Wesley brothers had relatively little concern for precise liturgical forms. Whereas the present CM writers have great interest in investigating the history of Medieval liturgies, vestments and their symbolic meaning, etc., none of these things were of critical importance to the Wesley brothers. In fact, the Wesleyan revival was one of *increasing sacramental expression*, and *descending liturgical concerns*. For instance, John Wesley allowed the Scottish Methodists to celebrate the Lord's Supper in the Presbyterian way, a Reformed liturgy, not a Medieval one. John Wesley also knew that the frontier situation of the American Methodists demanded simplicity in liturgy. He prepared for the American Methodists an edited and reduced version of the *Book of Common Prayer* - in it everything was simplified. Even the Sunday service was cut down to allow more time for preaching and extemporaneous prayers.³¹ The Wesleys understood that liturgy was necessary to corporate worship, but the search for "right" liturgy or the "best" liturgy was not their concern - they had a different focus.³²

³⁰ William Parkes, "Watchnight, Covenant Service, and the Love Feast in Early British Methodism," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 32 (Fall 1997), 35-58.

³¹ Frank Baker, in his *John Wesley and the Church of England* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), calls the Wesley's edited *Book of Common Prayer*, "low church," 251.

³² Baker, *Wesley and the Church of England*, chapters 14-16.

Could the Wesleyan form of CM work in the contemporary world? Could it revitalize the CM and bring it to its fulfillment?

We can only speculate as to the answer to the second question. The first is answered in the affirmative by observing Bishop Dan Williams' Christ the Redeemer Church in Ponte Verde Beach, Florida. Dan Williams was, like most of the leaders of the CM a successful charismatic pastor and church planter who came to realize the need for deeper sacramental worship and Episcopal oversight of churches than is common among independent charismatic churches.

When Bishop Williams looked at the CM model as practiced in America he sensed that its traditionalist drift was a wrong model for him to follow. His form of CM includes the Lord's Supper at every Sunday service, but liturgical vestments only on high holy days. The church has a gloriously effective youth ministry which includes a snack and games "café," and a Saturday evening service with smoke and modified rock music – but also always with a Eucharist. Space does not permit further details, but only to say that at Dan Williams' Christ the Redeemer the contemporary CM has fulfilled the Wesleyan pattern and it is successful, the Sunday attendance numbers are reaching one thousand.³³ Hopefully the success at Christ the Redeemer will remind the rest of the CM leadership that they will not meet the fullness of the CM vision without refocusing their model and theology.



³³ For a more detailed description of this CM church see chapter 15 of my work, *Forgotten Power*, "Word, Sacrament and Presence at Christ the Redeemer." The website for Christ the Redeemer Church is: www.christredeemer.com.

Persecuted for Christ

A Defining Moment in the Life of F.F. Bosworth

Roscoe Barnes III, M.A.R., B.S., is a well known author, copywriter, journalist and ghostwriter.



“Every work of God, as every individual, has to have its period of testing,” said C.T. Studd, the great missionary pioneer. “For only by this means can the dross be purged away, weaknesses and unbelief exposed and eradicated, and the instrument be fitted for effective use.”¹ These words by C.T. Studd provide a summary of the spiritual truths that F.F. Bosworth would discover during his early work in Texas.

Fred Francis Bosworth (1877-1958) was a Pentecostal pioneer, famous healing evangelist, musician and author who reportedly led more than a million people to Christ through his ministry. Born on a farm near Utica, Neb., he was considered, by scholars and ministers alike, to be one of the most successful healing evangelists of the 20th century. He received more than 225,000 written testimonies of healing and his book, *Christ the Healer*, is a classic that has been in print since 1924. Though he spent most of his life as a member of the Christian & Missionary Alliance, he was well respected among Pentecostals and holiness groups.

Back in 1911 while engaging in church planting in Dallas, Texas, Bosworth found he would learn a few things in ways that he never imagined. He would learn what it really means to suffer for Christ, to be persecuted in His name and to be willing to lay down his life. Like Job, he would encounter pain, danger, and even loneliness. At the same time he would discover what it means to be tried by fire. All of this happened on a Saturday night in August 1911 after he reached out to people of another race.

It began with an invitation to share the “full gospel” with a crowd of white people in Hearne, Texas, where a black Pentecostal campmeeting was being held in a tent. The Spirit was moving and great things were happening in the black service. So much so, that the meeting caught the attention of the white community. As a result, crowds of white people began to gather around the tent. They watched in amazement as the blacks conducted service and worshipped God in this new way.

¹ Norman Grubb, *C.T. Studd: Cricketer & Pioneer* (Fort Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1978), 212.

They were moved by the preaching and the testimonies that were shared about God's Spirit.

Despite their intense level of interest, however, the whites would not enter the tent. The reason was likely due to the charged racial climate in the South and the long-established rules about mixing with other races at that time.

Therefore, to accommodate this curious crowd, the blacks erected a brush arbor near the tent. That way, the whites could learn about the Pentecostal experience at a distance without actually sitting with the blacks. But the crowd continued to grow and spilled out around both the tent and the brush arbor.

"Many of the white citizens became deeply interested in the teaching," wrote Bosworth. "And not wanting to seek the baptism at a colored altar, the white people urged the colored leaders to send for some white Pentecostal teacher to come and help them into the baptism."²

Since Bosworth, now 34, was a white preacher and had experienced what the blacks were preaching about, he was the perfect candidate for the mission. He received the invitation to address the crowd on Saturday night, August 5.³ Though his initial understanding was that he would speak to the whites -- and not necessarily the blacks -- it was no doubt clear that the two groups of people were together in one place. There were risks, to be sure, but Bosworth had spent a lifetime taking risks.

Furthermore, he was not unfamiliar with black worship or with associating with black leaders. In June 1907, he had the privilege of meeting with the black Pentecostal pioneer, William J. Seymour of Azusa Street. In fact, he had a picture

² F.F. Bosworth to his mother and family, 21 August 1911, typewritten letter, 1, Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center, Springfield, MO.

³ Bosworth was not always precise or exact in his use of dates. Sometimes, when sharing his testimony, he omitted dates all together. In a letter to his brother, Burton (September 1912), he says the beating occurred "last September." But in another letter (August 2, 1911), he says the incident occurred on a Saturday night of August 1911. Interestingly enough, a poem by Fred Graves entitled, "In Commemoration of Aug. 6, 1911," suggests the persecution occurred on a Sunday. Since Bosworth specifically stated "Saturday" in his letter of Aug. 21, 1911, the date for the incident was most likely Saturday, Aug. 5, 1911.

taken with Seymour and other Pentecostal pioneers.⁴ So being with people of another race was not an issue with him.

However, the seriousness of the invitation becomes amplified when one considers that the early 20th century was a turbulent time for the United States in general, and Texas in particular. Race relations were anything but cordial. “Lynchings were all too common in the early 20th century,” according to a report by Ohio State University. “And they had a history much deeper and darker than any numbers can convey.”⁵ Between 1882 and 1962, more than 4,000 lynchings occurred in the United States. More than 3,000 of the victims -- about 72.2 percent -- were black. With a total of 493 lynchings, Texas was listed as third among states with the highest number. Mississippi was first with 581 and Georgia was second, with 531.⁶

At the time of Bosworth’s ministry, Texas had had a number of lynchings. Victims included: Anderson Ellis, Rockwall, March 7, 1909; Matthew Chase and “Mose” Creole, Marshall, April 30, 1909; Holland Brooks, Dallas, March 3, 1910; Leonard Johnson, Rusk, June 26, 1910; Five members of the Cassaway family, San Antonio, April 1911.⁷

Within this context, it becomes clear that reaching out to people of a different race in Texas was no small matter. Still, Bosworth wanted to do what was right. He wanted to do what he was called to do. Since he was not one to back down from an opportunity to share what he considered “the full gospel,” he agreed to go to Hearne to see what was happening and to be a blessing, if he could.

⁴ Gordon P. Gardiner, *Out of Zion Into All the World* (Shippensburg, PA: Companion Press, 1990), 40, 41.

⁵ “Lynching,” Ohio State, [article on-line]; available from <http://1912.history.ohio-state.edu/race/race1.htm>

⁶ “Lynching Statistics,” Classroom: The Charles Chestnut Digital bArchive [article on-line]; available from <http://www.berea.edu/faculty/browners/chesnutt/classroom/lynchingstat.html>.

⁷ The Lynching Century: Names of African Americans Who Died in Racial Violence in the United States, 1865-1965 [document on-line]; available from <http://www.geocities.com/Colosseum/Base/8507/NLNames1.htm>.

Hearne was a small town located in Robertson County, about 100 miles south of Bosworth's home in Dallas. Known as the "crossroads of Texas," it was situated in the middle of the state in a triangle formed by Houston, Dallas/Fort Worth and San Antonio. It had two major highways and two rail lines.⁸ The quaint rural town was established in 1868 and soon became known for its cotton and rail center. By 1910, it had a population of 2,353.⁹

On his visit to Hearne, Bosworth wanted to first learn about the needs and questions he was invited to address. He didn't intend to preach on the first visit. Yet, he was open to whatever God had in store. When he arrived at the campgrounds, he saw huge crowds under the tent and spilling out of the brush arbor. There were cars and carriages and people standing all around the area. Not sure of his location, he stopped and asked where his meeting was being held. He quickly learned he was at the right place. When people within the white audience recognized him, they urged him to preach. So he positioned himself on a platform between the two crowds with the blacks on one side and the whites on the other. In his usual manner, he opened his bible and began to teach the Word calmly, but with conviction and authority. He wrote:

God gave me unusual liberty and blessing in teaching and explaining the truths for which this movement stands, both audiences receiving the truth with great enthusiasm. I was tired and thought I wouldn't preach that night but the people wanted me to and then God anointed me for it.¹⁰

After the service, one of the white men in attendance invited him to his home for the night, which he accepted. While they were walking along, a small group of white men -- "white ruffians, extreme nigger-haters" -- stopped them. The men cursed Bosworth and accused him of being a trouble-maker.¹¹

⁸ "About Hearne," *Hearne: The Crossroads of Texas* [article on-line]; available from <http://rtis.com/reg/hearne/HearneAbout.htm> .

⁹ Norman Lowell McCarver Sr. and Norman Lowell McCarver Jr. "It Happened in Hearne," *Hearne on the Brazos* (San Antonio, TX: Century Press of Texas, 1958. accessed 27 August 2004) [book on-line]; available from <http://www.rootsweb.com/~txrober2/HOT-ItHappenedInHearne.htm> .

¹⁰ Letter, 1, 2.

¹¹ *Ibid*, 2, 3; F.F. Bosworth, *Bosworth's Life Story: The Life Story of Evangelist F.F. Bosworth, As Told by Himself in the Alliance Tabernacle*, Toronto (Toronto, Ont.: Alliance Book Room), 12, 13. Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center; Eunice M. Perkins, *Joybringer Bosworth: His Life Story* (Dayton, OH: John J. Scruby, Distributor, 1921), 97-99.

“You come here to put us on a level with the damn niggers,” they said, staring menacingly at Bosworth and his friend. There was no doubt that the men wanted to shoot them. But God granted Bosworth boldness, wisdom and perfect coolness.

“I was doing God’s will the very best I knew how,” he said. “I am ready to die and will offer no resistance to anything God permit you to do.” Bosworth paused for a moment and said, “If you have no objections I would like to speak a few words of explanation before you shoot us.”

The men seemed reluctant to listen but they gave in. Bosworth then explained that he came to the meeting with no intention of putting the blacks on a level with whites. Rather, it was the white people who invited him to come. “I did the very best I knew and I’m willing to take anything God permits,” he said.

The men backed off, choosing to let Bosworth and his friend live. But they insisted that the preacher take the next train out. Bosworth and his friend turned and headed for the depot. He bought a ticket to Dallas and his friend went to a room for his suitcase. While his friend was inside, an angry mob of 25 men approached Bosworth who was standing outside. The men lunged at him with clubs made from the oars of a boat. They struck him repeatedly as they cursed and spat. “You’ll never preach again when we get through with you!” they said.

Bosworth, a slim figure, dropped in a bloody heap under the impact of the blows. One by one, the men pounded him as he tried to cover himself. He offered no resistance and as the blows struck his flesh, causing searing pain, he committed himself to God. He prayed that God would not allow them to break his spine. But with all the racial hatred they could muster, the men wield the clubs against the preacher’s back with all their might. For a moment, the men stopped. “Get up!” they ordered.

Bosworth tried to get up, but the men knocked him back down and slammed the lethal wood against his head and arms until he could hardly move. They told him again to get up. Nearly unconscious, Bosworth tried once again to stand. This time the men began pounding him with their fists. He crumbled to the ground, in the cinders of the tracks, trusting God to keep him alive.

After a while, the men tired. They permitted him to stand but would not allow him to take the train. Bosworth picked up his luggage that contained his cornet and important papers and began to walk the nine miles to Calvert, Texas. He felt a sharp pain in his left wrist: It was broken. His flesh had been mashed to the bone on his back all the way down to his knees. “Lord, help me,” he prayed. “Give me strength.”

Using his good arm, he grabbed his luggage and started walking. Along the way, he asked a section-man about a side-track where he could flag the train. He am-

bled to the location and “touched a lighted match to his bundle of papers when he saw the train coming, but the wind blew the light out before the engineer had seen it and the train whizzed past.”¹² There was nothing to do now but to continue walking. As he did, he prayed for the men who had threatened and beaten him. “The suffering during this period was terrible but as soon as it was over I looked away from wounds and bruises to God and He took away all suffering and put His power and strength upon me so that I carried a heavy suitcase with my right arm over nine miles.”¹³

Bosworth held “not the slightest anger towards the criminals and the walk to Calvert in the dark with moon light was the most heavenly experience of my life and the Lord gave me wonderful intercession for those men that He should forgive them and prepare them for his coming.”¹⁴ After walking all night, Bosworth finally reached home on Sunday evening. By that time, he felt joy in his soul and he could actually thank God for the experience. Like Christ and Stephen in Scripture, he found he could pray even more for his enemies.

Although Bosworth felt a sense of relief and jubilation, his family and friends felt otherwise, thinking his situation was far worse than it appeared. They were nervous and some of them broke down and cried when they saw his wounds. It would be a month before Bosworth could lie comfortably on his back. In all honesty, he was “lucky to get out alive,” according to John Melvin, current publisher of *The Hearne Democrat*, a weekly established in 1889. In those days, he said, “they’d kill you.”¹⁵

The local newspaper ignored the beating, which was no surprise considering the fact that very few of the papers ever reported on activities involving blacks at that time, noted Melvin. At any rate, a paper in Zion City reported on the incident but it did so with exaggerations, something that seemed to bother Bosworth. “The paper just came from Zion City telling about my beating,” he wrote. “Not much

¹² Perkins, 98. Blomgren Jr., Oscar. “Man of God: Fred F. Bosworth, Part IV: Bosworth Begins His Work,” *Herald of Faith*, Jan. 1964, 16-17.

¹³ Letter, 3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ John N. Melvin, publisher of the *Hearne Democrat*, interview by Roscoe Barnes III, Thursday, 24 June 2004. Phone interview. Baltimore, MD.

like the facts. My face was not scratched but my head was bruised in several places. No marks left on my face.”¹⁶

As news spread about the beating, Bosworth’s mother began to inquire. She, like others, was very concerned about his health and recovery. In a letter to her dated, Aug. 21, 1911, Bosworth talked at length about the beating he’d suffered. But he weighed his words carefully so as not to upset her. He, understandably, did not want his mother to worry. So he assured her that everything was going to be all right.

Just a short time after the assault, Bosworth discovered some surprising news about the two mobs: The leader of the first mob was killed when he was run over by a train and the leader of the second mob broke his neck and died when he was thrown from a car. The two incidents happened only a few weeks after they accosted and assaulted the young preacher. However, “the victim of their cruelties still lives to the praise, honor and glory of God,” Bosworth wrote.¹⁷

The brave Pentecostal pioneer had stood his ground in what he believed -- and that without compromise. But it’s worth noting that he was in no way a social activist to improve race relations. Yes, he was bold about ministering to all people and was willing to pay the price for doing so, yet, he viewed such a mission as something that must be arranged by God. For without God, any ministry of this type that involved the crossing of racial lines in the South would be futile and only lead to disaster.

In the letter to his mother, he made it clear that he was no longer ministering to blacks and would not do so unless God leads him. “You need not worry one bit,” he wrote. “We are not now preaching to colored people and will not unless God clearly leads as he did when he led us to Queen City and other parts of Dallas. He put his seal upon this by saving many, healing many and baptizing over 225 with

¹⁶ Letter, 4. Although Bosworth mentioned that a newspaper in Zion had reported the incident, the report was not found in *The Leaves of Healing*, housed at Zion Benton Public Library. It also was not found in the *Zion-Benton News*.

¹⁷ The deaths of the two men were reported to Bosworth by a woman from Hearne, Texas, who visited his home in Sept. 1912. However, the deaths were not reported in the Hearne newspaper, something that seems strange for the current newspaper publisher. The publisher believes that such news would have certainly been published in the local newspaper, or at least in the regional papers.

the Holy Ghost. The deepest and quickest work I have known of. We do not lay our own plans but wait for him.”¹⁸

Stirred by this conviction and his love for all people, Bosworth would later minister with the Cleveland Coloured Gospel Quartette. The Quartette represented the finest in black gospel music. Each of its five members was saved through the Christian & Missionary Alliance. Bosworth and his brother, Burt, would invite the group to sing in large campaigns in Toronto, Pittsburgh, Toledo, Chicago and elsewhere.¹⁹

Yet, in spite of the suffering and the months of pain and recuperation, Bosworth and his family were happy and in the will of God. The experience, not surprisingly, would leave an indelible impression on him as a man of God. If he could look death in the face and endure a vicious beating and then walk nine miles with a broken arm, he could face anything in his future. Also, he could talk about the experience without fear or regret. He would recall the experience years later in an address before the Alliance Tabernacle in Toronto: “Now let me go back and relate an incident that I don’t like to tell, and my only reason for mentioning it is that God may be glorified.”²⁰

However, as Bosworth lay recovering from his wounds, he reflected on the persecution, and acknowledged his willingness to carry the cross and to be in God’s will no matter the cost. The experience made him feel he was “several notches higher” in his Christian walk. It deepened his devotion to Christ and strengthened his faith. At the same time, it allowed him to see how God can not only comfort him in a crisis, but also use the crisis as a means to bless others. Even more, he came to realize that suffering in this life can only lead to rewards in the life to come. He rejoiced as he remembered explicit promises in Scripture about suffering. The writings of the Apostle Paul were of great importance, particularly the passage in 2 Cor. 4:17-18: “For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things that are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.”

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 3, 4.

¹⁹ Robert L. Niklaus, John S. Sawn and Samuel J. Stoesz, *All for Jesus: God at Work in the Christian and Missionary Alliance Over One Hundred Years* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications Inc., 1986), 152, 168.

²⁰ *Bosworth’s Life Story*, 12.

According to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., “unearned suffering is redemptive.”²¹ If this is true, then Bosworth was not unreasonable to expect grace, spiritual growth and fortitude following his ordeal. He wrote:

[God] has been so precious to me. Since that I have thanked Him many times for being privileged to know something of the ‘fellowship of his suffering.’ If this was the result of some unwise thing I had done or for speaking anything but His own sweet message, I would be very sorry, but since it came for plain obedience in preaching His gospel to every creature, it has given me great joy to experience this which was so common among the early Christians in the first centuries of the church.²²

Like the saints throughout the Scriptures, Bosworth considered it a blessing and an honor to suffer for the cause of Christ. He told his mother: “I would much prefer to be faithful and have some little tribulation now than to fail to overcome and have to pass through the great tribulation soon to come. Praise God I am determined to have God’s plan for my life carried out.”²³

✍

²¹ Coretta Scott King, ed., *The Words of Martin Luther King Jr.* (New York: Newmarket Press, 1967), 52.

²² Letter, 3.

²³ *Ibid.*, 4.

Spirit, Soul and Body**The Trichotomy of Kenyon, Hagin and Copeland**

William Atkinson lectures at Regents Theological College, Nantwich, England, in New Testament studies and Ministry studies.

*Introduction*

“Man is a spirit, has a soul, and lives in a body.” This claim might be heard in any number of Pentecostal and charismatic churches, but it is most particularly to be associated with, and originates from, the Word-Faith movement (WFM).¹ It is striking, not so much for its rigid trichotomy, which is not uncommon among charismatic Christians, but more for its uncompromising prioritisation and centralisation of the human spirit as the essential person, and its concomitant relegation of soul, and more particularly body, to the peripheries of human being. While it is becoming an increasingly common formulation, is it an acceptable one? Several of the movement’s critics have answered in the negative. Dan McConnell likens WFM’s anthropology to gnostic dualism.² Robert Bowman notes its similarities to Platonism, and believes that it leads to a harmful anti-intellectualism.³ Andrew Perriman too sees it preventing rational discussion

¹ ‘Word-Faith’ is the preferred term of Robert M. Bowman, Jr., *The Word-Faith Controversy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2001), *passim*; cf. ‘Word of Faith’, the term employed by Andrew Perriman, *Faith, Health & Prosperity* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003), *passim*. Members of the movement, if they label themselves at all, prefer the simpler epithet, ‘Faith’ teacher (e.g. Kenneth Hagin Ministries’ publishing arm is named ‘Faith Library Publications’). D. McConnell follows this nomenclature, referring to the ‘Faith movement’ (*The Promise of Health and Wealth* [London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1990], *passim*). The movement is also known as the ‘Positive Confession’ movement (e.g. by D. Hunt & T. A. McMahon, *The Seduction of Christianity* [Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1985]), and less formally as ‘Prosperity theology’, as the ‘Health and Wealth’ movement, and even simply as ‘name it and claim it’. Its massive growth and pervasive influence are well documented by Milmon F. Harrison, *Righteous Riches: The Word of Faith Movement in Contemporary African American Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

² McConnell, *Promise*, pp.110, 123.

³ Bowman, *Controversy*, p.103.

about the strengths and weaknesses of the movement's beliefs.⁴ This article considers WFM's anthropological trichotomy in order to determine its possible sources within the Bible, historic Christianity, and certain nineteenth century non-Christian ideas that WFM is alleged to have drawn from.⁵ It concludes that it cannot claim strong biblical support, but that several of its features are to be found within traditional Christianity, and not least among its closest orthodox predecessors.

The views of three exemplary authors will be considered. One of these is widely recognised to provide the conceptual basis for much of WFM's teaching, even though he predated the movement as such. He is E. W. Kenyon (1867-1948).⁶ Another is the 'father' of WFM, the late Kenneth E. Hagin (1917-2003). The third is the leading living proponent of WFM, Kenneth Copeland (1937-). Both their statements and their reasoning will be studied. This will then be compared with the results of further scriptural study, and with the teaching of foremost writers on Christian anthropology. Also, the teaching of Kenyon's possible immediate sources will be studied, for signs of likely influence upon him.

The Anthropology of Kenyon, Hagin, and Copeland

In his repeated affirmations that the spiritual is more important than the material, and particularly that 'revelation knowledge' surpasses 'sense knowledge', Kenyon went so far as to envisage a world controlled by God-given *spiritual* forces and laws, that took precedence over for instance physical ones.⁷ As commentators have noted,⁸ Hagin and Copeland teach likewise.⁹

⁴ Perriman, *Faith*, p.32.

⁵ McConnell, *Promise*, ch.2.

⁶ For Kenyon's connection to WFM see especially McConnell, *Promise*, ch.1.

⁷ E.g. "Love and hate, hope and faith are spiritual forces. These forces are the forces that govern the world." (E. W. Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Knowledge* [Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 21st printing, 1998 (1938)], p.32; cf. *The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption* [Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 3rd printing, 1969 (posthumously edited and compiled by Ruth Kenyon Housworth)], p.15).

⁸ Bowman, *Controversy*, p.106; Perriman, *Faith*, p.33.

While Kenyon's cosmology centralised spirit, his anthropology, if anything, did so even more. He held to a rigidly trichotomous view in which human nature comprises spirit, soul and body.¹⁰ This trichotomous formulation involved such dualistic disjunction between the parts that he insisted that of these three the spirit alone was the true 'I' to the exclusion of the others.¹¹ Hagin's anthropology was essentially the same. While, rarely, he could write in dichotomous terms,¹² his generally pervasive trichotomy led to WFM's well known formula: "Man *is* a spirit, *has* a soul, and *lives* in a body."¹³ Hagin consistently followed Kenyon in subjugating the body to the soul, and that in turn to the spirit.¹⁴ Copeland also offers a clearly pneumocentric trichotomy.¹⁵ This characterisation of humanity has moral repercussions. Hagin and Copeland agree that obedience to God re-

⁹ Kenneth E. Hagin, *In Him*, (Tulsa, OK: Faith Library Publications [FLP], 1975), part I; Kenneth Copeland, *The Force of Righteousness* (Fort Worth, TX: Kenneth Copeland Publications/ Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1984), p.11 ("You see, the world of the spirit controls the world of the natural. A Spirit created all matter" [italics original]); K. Copeland, 'Don't Hang the Curtains... Hang the Rod!', pp.2-5, *Believer's Voice Of Victory* 33.6 (June 2005), p.3 ("Spiritual law governs all of life").

¹⁰ No effort is made to define these three terms.

¹¹ E.g. "The spirit is the real man, created in the image of God... Your body is not you. Your mind is not you. You have a mind which you use. You possess a body which you use. Your mind and body are merely the instruments of your spirit, the real YOU." (Kenyon, *Bible*, pp.17-18, emphasis original).

¹² "Man's nature is two-fold. There is an inward man and outward man. The inward man is the spirit. The outward man is the body." (Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Real Faith* [Tulsa, OK: FLP, 1970], p.13).

¹³ See, e.g., Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Human Spirit* (Tulsa, OK: FLP, 6th printing 1980), p.8.

¹⁴ "Your body is not the real you, it is just the house you live in." (Hagin, *Real Faith*, p.14). "The real man is the spirit. The spirit operates through the soul: the intellect, sensibilities, and will. And the soul operates through the body." (Kenneth E. Hagin, *Redeemed from Poverty, Sickness and Spiritual Death* [Tulsa, OK: FLP, 2nd edn, 1983 (1966)], p.56).

¹⁵ Kenneth Copeland, *The Force of Faith* (Fort Worth, TX: Kenneth Copeland Publications, 1983), pp.6, 8; 'To Know the Glory', *Believer's Voice Of Victory* 24.11 (December 1996), p.6.

quires a state in which spirit dominates soul and, in turn, body in making moral decisions, while in contrast immorality results when body or soul dominates.¹⁶

The reasoning for this position commences with the biblical statement that humans are made in God's image (Gen.1:26). Since God is spirit (Jn 4:24), then humans must essentially be spirit as well.¹⁷ In fact, Kenyon and Hagin went so far as to say that humans were made 'in God's class',¹⁸ and were thereby 'gods'.¹⁹ A full discussion of 'the image of God' lies beyond the limits of this article.²⁰ Suffice it to say that the logic applied by the authors under study could equally be applied the other way round: since humanity is made in God's image, and that humanity is self-evidently physical in nature, then this must imply some physi-

¹⁶ Hagin, *Zoe: The God-Kind of Life* (Tulsa, OK: FLP, 1981), p.7: "If your mind is not renewed with the Word of God, it will side with your flesh and dominate your spirit. But if you get your mind renewed, your spirit, through your mind, will dominate your body." (emphases original); Copeland, *Force of Faith*, p.6: "To be a powerful Christian, your spirit, trained in the Word, must be in command of your mind and body. The chain of command is spirit (heart), soul (mind), body (flesh)."

¹⁷ Kenyon, *Bible*, pp.17-18; *The Two Kinds of Faith* (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 16th printing, 1998), p.46; cf. *Two Kinds of Knowledge*, p.32.

¹⁸ E. W. Kenyon, *The Father and His Family* (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 32nd printing, 1998 [1916, 1937]), p.34; *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne*, (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 13th printing, 1969 [1945]), p.62.

¹⁹ Kenneth E. Hagin, *New Thresholds of Faith*, (Tulsa, OK: FLP, 2nd edn, 1985 [1972]), p.56.

²⁰ Similar difficulties with dualistic thinking about the divine image have been traced by Gunton from Irenaeus to Descartes. Gunton concluded that, because in these traditional formulations the image was classically seen in terms of reason, and the likeness of soul rather than body to God, "one implication is that our embodiedness cannot be the place where the image, and hence our true humanity, is found" (Colin E. Gunton, 'Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology: Towards a Renewal of the Doctrine of the Imago Dei', pp.47-61 in Christoph Schwöbel and Colin E. Gunton, *Persons, Divine and Human* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991], p.49).

cality in God's being.²¹ John 4:24 would not of itself preclude this possibility: the statement that God is spirit might in context be best understood in functional rather than ontological terms.²² Of course, and more importantly, the concept of 'image' need not preclude ontological differences between divine spirituality and human nature.

WFM's anthropology is further supported by references to 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Hebrews 4:12. Kenyon and Hagin clearly regarded 1 Thessalonians 5:23 as self-explanatory, both using it as a 'proof-text' for their trichotomy without elaboration.²³ In holding this view, they have almost every serious commentator on 1 Thessalonians against them,²⁴ and rightly so. Paul's clear emphasis is on God's preservation of the whole person, and he 'piles up' words to express this emphasis. There is no more need to see trichotomy here than there is to see 'tetrachotomy' in the 'greatest command' as recorded at Mark 12:30.²⁵ Copeland makes somewhat more considered use of the verse. For him, the word order

²¹ David Cairns, *The Image of God in Man* (London: Collins, rev. ed. 1973 [1953]) pp.30-31, considers the idea, with reference to the Gilgamesh epic and the work of von Rad, that Genesis 1:26 might imply some physicality in God. He does not rule out the possibility. Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *The True Image* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989) p.12, on the other hand, wisely does.

²² So George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (Milton Keynes: Word [UK], 1991 [1987]), p.62, contra Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, Revised (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), p.240.

²³ Kenyon, *Bible*, p.17; Kenneth E. Hagin, *The New Birth* (Tulsa, OK: FLP, 1975), pp.6-7.

²⁴ E.g. Gene L. Green, *The Letters to the Thessalonians* (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), p.269; Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. ed. 1991 [1959]), p.182; Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), p.207; John A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (London: SCM, 1952), p.27; A. A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1986), p.208; Charles Sherlock, *The Doctrine of Humanity* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1996), p.218; James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998) p.57. I. Howard Marshall, in contrast, believes the triadic wording is "a description of human nature as consisting of three parts." However, the "distinctions are loose, and do not suggest three 'parts' of man which can be sharply separated, but rather three aspects of his being" (*1 and 2 Thessalonians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983] pp.162-163).

²⁵ Morris, *Epistles*, p.182; Hoekema, *Image*, pp.208-209.

(spirit, soul, body) supports the prioritisation of the spirit.²⁶ However, mere word order does not inform about the location of the essential self. In similar vein, Copeland refers to Hebrews 4:12 in his explication of his trichotomous view, with no further comment beyond the observation that “only the Word can put the spirit, soul and body of a man in proper order.”²⁷ Hebrews 4:12, however, can no more be used to argue that spirit and soul are separate parts of a three-fold structure than to argue that joints and marrow are. The emphasis of the verse is clearly on the penetrability of God’s word to the deepest recesses of the human being.²⁸

The third way in which these authors’ trichotomy is supported involves Kenyon and Copeland both justifying the claim that one’s spirit should rule one’s mind and body with reference to the writings of the apostle Paul, in which the latter famously contrasts ‘the flesh’ with ‘the spirit’, portraying spirit and flesh as at

²⁶ Copeland, *Force of Faith*, p.6: “It does not say, ‘body, soul and spirit.’ The Bible never speaks of the reborn man in this order.”

²⁷ Copeland, *Force of Faith*, p.7.

²⁸ “It would indeed be precarious to draw any conclusions from these words about our author’s psychology.” (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. ed. 1990 (1963)], p.113; cf. Hoekema, *Image*, p.208; Sherlock, *Doctrine*, p.218).

war (e.g. Gal.5:16-17; Rom.8:4-7).²⁹ Commentators, however, widely agree that in such passages, the distinction Paul typically draws between spirit and flesh is not anthropological (in terms of distinguishable parts of the human make-up) but ethical and eschatological.³⁰

In conclusion, it is clear that arguments from the divine image, from ‘proof texts’ and from Paul’s flesh/spirit contrast do not successfully support a trichotomy, let alone one which promotes spirit as central and essential. However, points made thus far in this article have merely indicated that the reasoning offered has been faulty. They have not thereby negated Kenyon’s, Hagin’s and Copeland’s conclusions, nor, if necessary, offered an alternative. Further consideration is thus worthwhile.

²⁹ E.g. Kenyon, *Father*, p.156: “Satan’s appeal always comes through the physical senses; so Man’s only hope is to live in the spirit. I don’t mean the Holy Spirit, but in his own spirit realm; instead of dreaming of gratifying physical passions or desires, he is to live in the realm of the spiritual, his own spirit fellowship with the Spirit of God. This is the only way to overcome the influence of his physical body upon himself. So Paul says here, “If we walk by the spirit,” more literally, if we walk in the realm of the spirit, “ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh,” for the members of your body are combating against your spirit, and your spirit is contending against your flesh or the members of your body.” E.g. Copeland, *Force of Faith*, pp.6-7 (italics original): Paul, by the Holy Spirit, is saying that the flesh lusteth or drives against the spirit (the human spirit, the reborn spirit of a man) and the spirit against the man’s flesh. The spirit of the man is demanding that the flesh obey him, and the flesh is reluctant to give up its control. Before a man is born again, his flesh (body) completely dominates his life and will continue to do so unless his mind is renewed by God’s Word... Paul said, *With my spirit I serve God*. He is talking of the spirit on the inside of him who is doing his best to please God. His flesh is trying to continue to live unrestrained and unregulated as it has had the freedom to do for years. When a man’s mind is not renewed to [sic] the New Testament, his spirit is trying to go one way at the leadership of the Holy Spirit and his body and his mind are attempting to live as they have always lived, following after the world’s order of things. He is being pulled in two different directions at once. When the man is born again, his spirit became a new creature in Christ Jesus, but his mind and body were unchanged. Now his spirit is right with God but *his mind and body must be trained*.

³⁰ Broad agreement is found from the classic Pauline study of Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* Volume 1 (ET London: SCM Press, 1952), pp.234-241 to more recent conservative contributions to Pauline anthropology such as Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), pp.816-822.

Anthropological material / immaterial dualism

WFM's trichotomy stands, with dichotomous anthropologies, in opposition to a monistic anthropology. Before any further consideration can be given to trichotomy as such, with its clear distinction between spirit and soul, consideration must be given to whether Christian anthropology is dualistic at all, or whether in fact a more reasonable and realistic way to understand human nature is to dispense with any dualism between matter and an immaterial 'nature' entirely.

The traditional position until the twentieth century has been dualistic: a distinction can be drawn between soul and body. The biblical and philosophical basis for this dualism, and its ethical consequences, have been strongly criticised in recent decades, being replaced by monistic anthropologies that have enjoyed widespread support among biblical theologians,³¹ systematicians³² and philosophers.³³ Monists, building largely on Old Testament Hebrew and New Testament Pauline anthropology, claim that for Paul, 'I am a body' is at least as true, if not truer, than 'I have a body', and certainly truer than 'I am a soul living in a body'.³⁴ The strongest argument in favour of this position is that Paul's eschatological hope was not for an eternal life of a disembodied soul, but for a resurrection of his body. It has thus been claimed by such critics of dualism there is no such thing as a soul distinct from a body. Human life is and only can be embodied. 'Soul' is a way of speaking of the life that this body enjoys.

However, this monism, in turn, is not without its problems. First, holistic views of the human person easily undergo reductionist collapse into a materialism that conforms to modernist views of humanity. One suspects, therefore, that the monism allegedly found in Christian scriptures may not have been drawn from that

³¹ Influentially, Bultmann, *Theology*; also influentially (despite using word studies in a way discredited since James Barr's *The Semantics of Biblical Language* [Oxford: OUP, 1961], e.g. p.35), Robinson, *Body*, ch.I; more recently, Murray J. Harris, *Raised Immortal* (London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1983), e.g. p.140; at a popular level, Samuele Bacchiocchi, *Immortality or Resurrection?* (Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1997).

³² E.g. George Carey, *I Believe in Man* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1977); Clarke H. Pinnock, 'Foreword', p.13 in Bacchiocchi, *Immortality?*

³³ E.g. Nancey Murphy, *Beyond Liberalism & Fundamentalism* (Valley Forge, Pen: Trinity Press International, 1996), ch. 6: "nonreductive physicalism" (e.g. p.149).

³⁴ E.g. Bultmann, *Theology*, p.194.

witness, but imposed upon it.³⁵ Also, in terms of interaction with scripture, support for anthropological monism is complicated by the fact that, while some believe they draw their monism from its pages, others see a dualism there of which they are critical.³⁶ Furthermore, moderate dualistic anthropologies offer a more satisfactory explanation of the occasional references in scripture to the intermediate state, in which the continuing existence of a disembodied soul is implied (e.g. 2 Cor.5:3³⁷) and to at least the conceivability of out-of-body experiences in this life (2 Cor.12:2³⁸).

For these reasons, an anthropology based on scripture, while celebrating the normal functional holism of human life on this earth and in the resurrection life to come, needs also to hold alongside this an awareness of at least some dualistic features in human being and becoming. This moderate dualism holds that the true person is the combination of body and soul, such that neither without the other

³⁵ So James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (London: SCM, 1992), p.98.

³⁶ E.g. John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999 [1998]), pp.xxiii-xxix, is critical of what he sees as Paul's vacillation in 1 Corinthians 15 between 'Judaism' and 'Hellenism', the former of which Crossan prefers. Paul's "moderate Platonic dualism" (p.xxv) is a "Platonic compromise" (p.xxix); cf. Bultmann, *Theology*, pp.201-202; Pheme Perkins, *Gnosticism and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), pp.33-34, building on the work of Schmithals.

³⁷ Robinson's useful translation was: "If, indeed, it is as clothed (i.e., still alive), and not naked, that we shall be found (*sc.*, at the *Parousia*)" (*Body*, p.77). He continued, "The depression from which even Paul himself suffers derives from the fact that we cannot be *sure* that this very fragile house of flesh will in fact last us until the *Parousia*, and that we shall not be required to face a temporary disembodiment" (p.77, italics original). It is surprising, given Robinson's earlier strong avowal of Paul's Hebraic monism, to find him admitting that Paul conceived of a temporary disembodiment.

³⁸ Bultmann, while insisting that Paul's anthropology was essentially monistic (*Theology*, pp.192-209), nevertheless indicated that at 2 Corinthians 12:2-4 "he is clearly reckoning with the possibility that the self can separate from the soma even in this present life, and this soma can only be the physical body" (p.202). This is one of a few examples that indicated to Bultmann that Paul was occasionally influenced by Hellenistic and even gnostic dualism away from his more characteristic monism.

can be regarded as 'I', or the full person.³⁹ The disembodied soul of the intermediate state, of which scripture states so little, only needs on this basis to involve sufficient personal identity to guarantee that the 'I' which experiences full bodily existence in the life to come is the same 'I' as has been alive on this earth, at least insofar as a plant need be regarded as the same individual as the seed from which it came (1 Cor.15:37).⁴⁰ While allowing that, it does not claim that this intermediate bodiless existence is in any sense full. It thus gives weight to the eschatological hope of the final resurrection. In line with such reasoning, a significant number of commentators continue to advocate forms of dualism. Examples can be found among biblical scholars,⁴¹ theologians,⁴² philosophers⁴³ and psychologists.⁴⁴

In conclusion to this section, forms of anthropological dualism are not without merit and continue to be found among current Christian formulations. That the anthropology of Kenyon, Hagin and Copeland is dualistic need not in itself be regarded with suspicion.

³⁹ E.g. Stephen T. Davis, *Risen Indeed* (London: SPCK, 1993), p.86. Bernard Williams (*Problems of the Self* [Cambridge: CUP, 1973], ch.5) argues persuasively that the claim that a disembodied soul is fully personal leads inexorably to Cartesianism (which view is not regarded as an exposition of any biblical anthropology by serious commentators today).

⁴⁰ A brief philosophical defence of this idea is offered, building on Aquinas, by Peter Geach, *God and the Soul* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), ch.2.

⁴¹ George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974); Barr, *Garden*.

⁴² Hoekema, *Image*, ch.11: "psychosomatic unity" (e.g. p.217. This term is used by some holists, e.g. Carey, *Man*, p.29, but Hoekema's commitment to a form of dualism is indicated in his discussion of the intermediate state, pp.218-222); John W. Cooper, *Body, Soul and Life Everlasting* (Leicester: Apollos, 2nd edn 2000 [1989]): "holistic dualism" (e.g. p.164).

⁴³ Davis, *Risen*, ch.5: 'General Resurrection and Dualism': "temporary disembodiment" (e.g. p.87).

⁴⁴ Jeffrey H. Boyd, 'A History of the Concept of the Soul during the 20th Century', *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 26.1 (1998), pp.66-82: "holistic dualism", with reference to Cooper, *Body* (e.g. p.70).

Promotion of the immaterial

Drawing a conceptual distinction, however, between body and soul is quite a different matter from declaring that the essential self resides within one to the exclusion of the other, and that one should control the other. Such is clearly the case in WFM. It is now necessary to consider whether there is any wisdom in such a promotion of the immaterial.

If biblical justification is sought for these ideas, beyond banal observations such as the word order in 1 Thessalonians 5:23, appeal might be made to Paul's sense of necessity, for instance, that "I remain *in* the body" (Phil.1:24). This statement might suggest the belief that the real "I" is an entity other than the body. Scholars are virtually unanimous, however, in observing that for Paul full personal existence involves bodily existence. Insofar as the soul can be distinguished from the body at all, its disembodied existence is 'naked', and this existence is something to be avoided (2 Cor.5:2-4). There seems to be no biblical reason to site the 'I' in one 'part' of the human make-up rather than the whole, or to argue that one 'part' controls, or ought to control, the other(s). Therefore, a Christian anthropological dualism need not postulate that the 'real person' is immaterial; still less that it should control the material. The whole person can be seen, with Barth, as 'bodily soul' or 'besouled body'.⁴⁵ On this basis, WFM's prioritisation of the spirit as the real 'you' is less than satisfactory.

Accepting that the Bible does not offer a sound basis for prioritising the immaterial over the material in human nature, it is necessary to concede that until the twentieth century, Christian writers not only distinguished between body and soul but frequently promoted the latter over the former. Augustine, working with a Platonist framework, clearly prioritised the soul over the body. This is evident throughout his treatise on the origin of the soul, where it is evident that the soul dominates the body, which is its home.⁴⁶ It is also evident from his treatise on the

⁴⁵ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* Vol.III Pt.2 (ET Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960 [1948]), p.350. It is not necessary thereby to agree with Barth that "soul would not be soul, if it were not bodily" (p.350).

⁴⁶ Augustine, 'On the Soul and its Origin' (*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* Vol.V [Philip Schaff, ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975 (1887)]) e.g. IV.4: the soul "moves the body" (p.355); cf. Augustine's references to "a rational soul, using a mortal and earthly body" and a soul's being "suited to the task of ruling the body." (quoted in Cooper, *Body*, p.10).

Trinity that the mind, to the exclusion of the body, is the true self.⁴⁷ Aquinas, more Aristotelian in outlook, took more care to highlight the essential unity of soul and body. However, insofar as he distinguished between the two, the soul was still prioritised as “the primary principle of life.”⁴⁸

Luther too relegated the body: “the spirit may live without the body, but the body has no life apart from the spirit.” Furthermore, the work of the body “is only to carry out and apply that which the soul knows and the spirit believes.”⁴⁹ Calvin perhaps most overtly prioritised the soul/spirit over the body, in words even reminiscent of Plato and Nag Hammadi:

Moreover, there can be no question that man consists of a body and a soul; meaning by soul, an immortal though created essence, which is his *nobler part*. Sometimes he is called a spirit... Christ, in commending his spirit to the Father, and Stephen his to Christ, simply mean, that when the *soul is freed from the prison-house of the body*, God becomes its perpetual keeper.

* * * * *

[Biblical] passages which everywhere occur, not only clearly distinguish the soul from the body, but by giving it the name of man, intimate that it is his *principal part*.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Augustine, ‘On the Trinity’ XI.1 (Schaff, *Fathers*, Vol.III [1976]), p.144: “we ourselves, i.e. our minds, are not sensible things, that is bodies.”

⁴⁸ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1a.75,1 (Timothy Sutor, ed., Westminster: Blackfriars, 1970), p.7.

⁴⁹ Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works* vol. 21 (Jaroslav Pelikan, ed., Saint Louis: Concordia: 1956), pp.303-304.

⁵⁰ J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* I/XV, 2 (ET London: James Clarke & Co., 1962), pp.160-161, italics added; cf. Plato, *The Republic* XI 1:611 (ET London: Penguin, 2nd edn 1974 [1955]), p.382; ‘Nag Hammadi’, *The Treatise on the Resurrection* 45:40-46:2; 46:22-47:24; 47:37-48:3; *A Valentinian Exposition* 35:28-37; *On Baptism B throughout* (James M. Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* [ET New York: HarperCollins, rev. ed. 1990 (1978)] pp.55-56, 486, 488; cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* I:XXI:4,5 (Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson, eds, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975 (1867)], pp.346-347). Larry Hurtado is, however, wisely cautious about the extent to which the Nag Hammadi texts may be taken to reflect the earlier varieties of gnosticism that Irenaeus criticised (*Lord Jesus Christ* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003], pp.533-538). Calvin’s reliance on Platonism is noted by Hughes, *Image*, p.399.

Even today, some Christian dualists, while keen to label their version of dualism as ‘holistic’, actually depart from the moderate form of dualism they claim to espouse: they demote the body from its full contribution to personhood. The soul is the real ‘I’, so that, however much they may protest against it, the body seems to emerge in their thinking as just a house.⁵¹

Given historic Christianity’s readiness to promote the immaterial over the material in these ways, Kenyon’s so doing does not immediately suggest any great departure from Christian tradition. However, McConnell claims that Kenyon learnt his form of dualism between spirit and matter from ‘metaphysical cults’ such as New Thought and Christian Science (NT/CS).⁵² His claim that Kenyon drew conceptually from these wells has, however, proved controversial. Geir Lie, Dale Simmons and Joe McIntyre, in their different ways, have shown that Kenyon was as likely to have been influenced by certain orthodox Christian teachers in movements known as Higher Life and Faith Cure (HL/FC) as by NT/CS.⁵³ Research into the beliefs of teachers in HL/FC on one hand and NT/CS on the other, specifically to discover whether they prioritised the immaterial over the material, may therefore provide a guide as to where Kenyon gained this aspect of his anthropology from. HL/FC authors to be reviewed will be A. J. Gordon (1836-1895), A. T. Pierson (1837-1911), G. D. Watson (1845-1923), Andrew Murray (1828-1917) and A. B. Simpson (1843-1919).⁵⁴ NT/CS authors reviewed

⁵¹ E.g. Cooper, *Body*, p.162, despite his criticism of ‘axiological dualism’ (p.185).

⁵² McConnell, *Promise*, p.110.

⁵³ G. Lie, ‘E. W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister?’, *The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* vol.16 (1996), pp.71-86; ‘The Theology of E. W. Kenyon: Plain Heresy or Within the Boundaries of Pentecostal-Charismatic “Orthodoxy?”’, *Pneuma*, 22.1 (Spring 2000), pp.85-114; D. H. Simmons, *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1997), e.g. p.305; Joe McIntyre, *E. W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story* (Orlando, FL: Creation House, 1997), e.g. pp.21-22.

⁵⁴ In each case, McIntyre (*Kenyon*) offers clear evidence that Kenyon was a recipient of their teaching, and in many cases he presents equally clear evidence that Kenyon was a positive admirer.

will be Phineas P. Quimby (1802-1866), Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882), Mary Baker Eddy (1821-1910), and Ralph Waldo Trine (1866-1958).⁵⁵

Among HL/FC authors, A. J. Gordon's dualism seemed particularly moderate. He did not believe that the soul was the real or whole person, but humanity's "complete condition" required "body and soul united".⁵⁶ A. T. Pierson could appear to prioritise the spiritual. In calling his hearers to view modern missionary activities as in some way paralleling the initial missionary expansion depicted in the Acts of the Apostles, he wrote: "Only a spiritual eye can read them: only a spiritual mind interpret them." However, it is clear from the context that Pierson simply meant by these terms the eye and the mind guided by the Holy Spirit.⁵⁷ In similar vein, the following words by G. D. Watson seem initially to foreshadow Kenyon's favouring of 'revelation knowledge' over 'sense knowledge': "There are two hemispheres of knowledge; first, the hemisphere of what we learn through our senses; secondly, the hemisphere of knowledge revealed intuitively by the Spirit." However, Watson was actually valuing sensory knowledge as well as intuitive knowledge, with respect to 2 Peter 1:16-19.⁵⁸

Andrew Murray did more clearly promote the immaterial over the material: he regarded the soul as the true self, and wrote, "the spirit, as linking him with the Divine, was the highest [part]; the body, connecting him with the sensible and the animal, the lowest".⁵⁹ He could thus write, "Sin entered in, and appeared to thwart the Divine plan: the material obtained a fearful supremacy over the spiritual."⁶⁰ Sin altered what had previously been a perfect harmony between spirit

⁵⁵ Quimby is widely regarded as the founder of New Thought. The other three authors are all claimed by McConnell to have had association with and possible impact on Kenyon (*Promise*, pp.25-26, 41).

⁵⁶ A. J. Gordon, *Behold He Cometh* (London: Thynne & Co. Ltd., 1934 [1896 as *Ecce Venit*]), p.202.

⁵⁷ A. T. Pierson, *The New Acts of the Apostles* (London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited, 1901), p.10.

⁵⁸ G. D. Watson, *Coals of Fire: Being Expositions of Scripture on the Doctrine, Experience, and Practice of Christian Holiness* (n.pl.: n.pub., 1886), pp.119-120, quotation from p.120.

⁵⁹ Andrew Murray *The Spirit of Christ* (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1888), p.333.

⁶⁰ Andrew Murray, *Abide in Christ* (Philadelphia: Henry Altemus, ET 1895 [1864]), p.83.

and matter: “Man was to be the highest specimen of Divine art: the combination in one being, of matter and spirit in perfect harmony, as type of the most perfect union between God and His own creation.”⁶¹ A. B. Simpson’s writing also contained a prioritisation of the immaterial over the material: “the soul is superior to the body,”⁶² and physical healing must be sought through “spiritual channels.”⁶³ Nevertheless, Simpson held a holistic view of humanity’s spirituality and physicality: “Man has a twofold nature. He is both a material and spiritual being.”⁶⁴ In summary, HL/FC authors offered various forms of dualism, some more moderate and balanced than others. The seeds of Kenyon’s ideas may have lain in the teaching of those, like Andrew Murray and A. B. Simpson, who most explicitly promoted the immaterial.

Turning now to NT/CS, Quimby wrote of soul and matter in typically esoteric and puzzling terms:

Everyone will admit that all the qualities of ‘soul’ which I have mentioned will apply to man’s intelligence, and that ‘mind’ according to every definition can change; also admit that Wisdom cannot change, that it is the same today and forever. Now can anyone tell me what there is that is not matter that can be changed? ... what is it that is not Wisdom, God, or spirit, and not matter and yet can be changed? It is matter held in solution called mind, which the power of Wisdom can condense into a solid so dense as to become the substance called ‘matter’. Assume this theory and then you can see how man can become sick and get well by a change of mind.⁶⁵

While, according to this ontology, soul, or mind, seems to be derivative of matter, being matter ‘held in solution’, nevertheless mind, by the operation of ‘Wisdom’, dictates the behaviour of matter, such as the sickness or health of a human body.

⁶¹ Murray, *Abide*, p.83.

⁶² A. B. Simpson, *The Holy Spirit or Power from On High* (New York: The Christian Alliance Publishing Co., 1895), p.42.

⁶³ A. B. Simpson, *The Gospel of Healing* (London: Morgan & Scott Ltd., new ed. 1915 [1888]), p.28.

⁶⁴ Simpson, *Gospel*, p.5.

⁶⁵ P. P. Quimby, ‘The World of the Senses’, 1860-1865, ch.15 in Horatio W. Dresser, ed., *The Quimby Manuscripts* (Electronic Edition: Cornerstone Books, 2000 [1921]), accessed 15.9.05 from <http://cornerstone.wwwhubs.com/framepage.htm>.

Emerson, similarly, building on the works of Plato and Platonists,⁶⁶ taught that “the mind had to rule the body.”⁶⁷ He also drew on Hindu ideas to teach that sensory perception of matter could be an illusion trapping an individual in a state of less than full actualisation.⁶⁸ Eddy’s view was yet more negative about matter: “my system of metaphysics... rests on God as One and All, and denies the actual existence of both matter and evil.”⁶⁹ And:

I learned these truths in divine Science: that all real being is in God, the divine Mind, and that Life, Truth, and Love are all-powerful and ever-present; that the opposite of Truth, - called error, sin, sickness, disease, death, - is the false testimony of false material sense, of mind in matter; that this false sense evolves, in belief, a subjective state of mortal mind which this same so-called mind names *matter*, thereby shutting out the true sense of Spirit. My discovery, that erring, mortal, misnamed *mind* produces all the organism and action of the mortal body, set my thoughts to work in new channels, and led up to my demonstration of the proposition that Mind is All and matter is naught as the leading factor in Mind-science. Christian Science reveals incontrovertibly that Mind is All-in-all, that the only realities are the divine Mind and idea.⁷⁰

Trine, though using the three-fold terminology of soul, mind and body, rather than spirit, soul and body, wrote material to which Kenyon’s ideas came closest. He advised his readers to realise their oneness with the Infinite Life and Power in quiet receptivity:

⁶⁶ Richard Geldard, *The Spiritual Teachings of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Great Barrington, MA: Lindisfarne Books, 2001), pp.22-27.

⁶⁷ Geldard, *Teachings*, p.24. Emerson used the word ‘soul’ pantheistically (Emerson, ‘Divinity School Address’, 1838, accessed 15.9.05 from <http://cornerstone.www.hubs.com/framepage.htm>).

⁶⁸ Geldard, *Teachings*, pp.118-119.

⁶⁹ Mary Baker Eddy, *No and Yes* (Boston, MA: The First Church of Christ, Scientist, 1887), p.29. Eddy’s denial of the existence of matter, however, seems to be contradicted by her belief in physical healing: “Become conscious for a single moment that Life and intelligence are purely spiritual, - neither in nor of matter, - and the body will then utter no complaints. If suffering from a belief in sickness, you will find yourself suddenly well” (*Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* [Boston, MA: The First Church of Christ, Scientist, rev. edn 1891 (1875)], p.14).

⁷⁰ Eddy, *Science*, pp.108-109, italics original, paragraph breaks removed.

Calmly, quietly, and expectantly desire that this realization break in upon and take possession of your soul. As it breaks in upon and takes possession of the soul, it will manifest itself to your mind, and from this you will feel its manifestations in every part of your body.⁷¹

It is clear from these brief quotations that Kenyon's prioritisation of spirit and soul over body did not reflect the extreme anti-materialism of Eddy. The positions of Quimby, Emerson and Trine, however mysteriously expressed, have more in common with Kenyon, all indicating that soul, or mind, is the originating force that affects physical outcomes in the body. That stated, the conclusion cannot be reached that Kenyon was necessarily dependent on these sources for his form of dualistic anthropology. The fact, already indicated, that similar prioritisation of the soul is to be found scattered throughout traditional Christianity, including in HL/FC, makes it difficult to be certain whether Kenyon drew this idea from orthodox or heterodox sources. Given that Kenyon consistently disparaged NT/CS,⁷² and given that the nearest terminological similarity is in A. B. Simpson's work, the benefit of this doubt must be given to the possibility that Kenyon drew his inspiration from orthodoxy.

Spirit and soul

Discussion can now move on to consider that which characterises trichotomy among dualistic anthropologies: drawing an ontological distinction between spirit and soul, or, as Kenyon often did, between spirit and mind or intellect. It is first worth noting that those who do so are, in the eyes of mediaeval Christianity, in error, for trichotomism was condemned at the fourth Council of Constantinople.⁷³ Nevertheless, Hoekema traces the existence of trichotomy from Irenaeus in the second century to Watchman Nee, for instance, in the twentieth.⁷⁴ Conceiving of differences between spirit and soul is not as easy as doing so with respect to soul

⁷¹ R. W. Trine, *In Tune With The Infinite* (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1952 [1897]), p.192.

⁷² Kenyon, *Two Kinds of Faith*, p.17; *Jesus the Healer* (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 29th printing, 2000 [1943]), p.77; cf. *The Wonderful Name of Jesus* (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 30th printing, 1998 [1927, 1935]), pp.69-70.

⁷³ 869-870 C.E.

⁷⁴ Hoekema, *Image*, p.205.

and body. Theologians have tackled the difficulty, and the relevant biblical material, in a number of ways, not all of them trichotomous.

One way, beloved of anthropological monists, is to understand all biblical references to spirit to refer to divine spirit, so that 'spirit' does not denote a constituent aspect of human nature.⁷⁵ However, this narrowly theological understanding of spirit had already been cast into doubt by H. Wheeler Robinson.⁷⁶ Niebuhr was thus right to demur: Paul could speak of the "spirit of man".⁷⁷ While, occasionally, Niebuhr used 'soul' and 'spirit' in apparently interchangeable ways,⁷⁸ he was encouraged by the biblical data to make a conceptual distinction between the two: soul is "the life principle in man", while spirit is "man's organ of relation to God."⁷⁹ This coheres with what he regarded as Christianity's definition of spirit: it is suprarational, and is associated with freedom, transcendence, and the search for the ultimate "ground of existence."⁸⁰

Niebuhr's understanding of the biblical term was, however, questionable. Others are adamant that spirit and soul are used interchangeably throughout scripture,⁸¹ and it is certainly difficult to see how Niebuhr's assertion that the spirit rather than the soul is the 'organ of relation' to God fits with such scriptural proclamations as "my soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God" (Luke 1:46-

⁷⁵ E.g. Barth, *Dogmatics* III.2, p.354; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective* (ET Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985), pp.519, 522, 529-530.

⁷⁶ *The Doctrine of Man* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), p.110.

⁷⁷ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* Vol.I (London: Nisbet & Co., 1941), p.163 and n.1; cf. Bultmann, *Theology*, pp.205-208. More recently, Fee has equivocated, referring to S/spirit, and using this deliberately ambivalent term to demonstrate "Paul's apparent conviction that the believer's spirit is the place where, by means of God's own Spirit, the human and the divine interface in the believer's life" (*Presence*, p.25).

⁷⁸ Niebuhr, *Nature*, p.13.

⁷⁹ Niebuhr, *Nature*, p.162; cf. p.163. Biblical distinctions between spirit and soul are not "too sharp" (p.163). More recently, Dunn, writing about Pauline anthropology, has reached a similar conclusion. While for him the Pauline soul is "the whole person" (*Theology*, p.76), he writes that the spirit in Paul is "evidently that dimension of the human person by means of which the person relates most directly to God" (p.77).

⁸⁰ Niebuhr, *Nature*, pp.14-15, quotation from p.15.

⁸¹ E.g. Hoekema, *Image*, pp.206-207.

47). Similarly, “I will pray with my spirit, but I will also pray with my mind” (1 Cor.14:15) does not suggest that the spirit is an ‘organ’ that relates any more obviously to God than does the mind. Those who follow Niebuhr in positing any distinction between spirit and soul must either create their own definitions to suit, or must be highly tentative in the undertaking.⁸² Nothing is lost to theological discussion by following the biblical lead and using the terms interchangeably. Both strictly monist and trichotomous readings of ‘spirit’ are suspect, and the Bible certainly does not set a precedent in offering an ontological distinction between spirit and soul.

It seems likely, then, that Kenyon and WFM do not gain their distinction between spirit and soul from a close reading of scripture but from Christian tradition, which view is then reinforced by their unsophisticated reading of scripture. However, as already stated, Kenyon Hagin and Copeland go further: they state that ‘man is a spirit’ but only ‘has a soul’, or mind. Kenyon’s promotion of spirit over mind sometimes had a strong moral tone: “In the beginning, man’s spirit was the dominant force in the world; when he sinned, his mind became dominant – sin dethroned the spirit and crowned the intellect; but grace is restoring the spirit to its place of dominion” and “One of the greatest mistakes that has been made in our intellectual culture has been the ignoring of the spirit. Knowledge of our intellects has taken the throne, and our spirits have been locked away in prison.”⁸³

Such statements have led to the charge of anti-intellectualism. However, it would be wrong to think that Kenyon was anti-intellectual as regards human affairs in general. He could happily write: “Man’s education should cover the whole being. To train only the physical is to make a prize fighter. To train only the mental is to make an intellectual anarchist. To train only the spiritual is to make a fanatic.”⁸⁴ If Kenyon was anti-intellectual, it was only as regards knowing God: the intellect certainly had a legitimate place in human affairs, but it could not receive direct revelation from God.⁸⁵ Also, it would be more accurate to describe his position

⁸² E.g. Sherlock, *Doctrine*, p.220.

⁸³ Kenyon, *Wonderful Name*, p.25; *Two Kinds of Faith*, p.48

⁸⁴ Kenyon, *Wonderful Name*, p.68.

⁸⁵ Even this idea was maintained rather ambivalently by Kenyon: “Sense Knowledge can see the handiwork of God, can see the design in Creation, but it cannot find the Designer” (*Two Kinds of Knowledge*, p.12), but “Creation shows the Designer’s Master Hand.” (*Father*, p.19).

not as anti-intellectualism, but as anti-physicalism: his distrust of 'sense-knowledge' was not so much a rejection of the mind as a means to know God, but of the physical senses.

Charges of anti-intellectualism apart, the question arises as to the source from which Kenyon gained his prioritisation of spirit over soul. To address this question, it is necessary to divide Kenyon's prioritisation into two aspects: the spirit is the true self; and the spirit should control the soul. With regard to the second aspect, it is likely that Kenyon heard such ideas preached in HL/FC circles. A. B. Simpson, a trichotomist, held that "the soul represents the intellectual and emotional elements that constitute man. The spirit represents the higher and the Divine life which links us directly to God, and enables us to know and to come into relationship with Divine things."⁸⁶ This belief that God communicates directly with only the human spirit, held also by Kenyon, led Simpson to conclude that "our higher spiritual nature should control the soul. Just as the soul is superior to the body, so the spirit should be predominant to the soul. The fatal defect of natural life is that the soul is predominant, and the natural mind controls spirit and body."⁸⁷ Similarly, Jessie Penn-Lewis taught that the soul should be a 'handmaid' of the spirit.⁸⁸

With respect, on the other hand, to the first aspect (the spirit is the true self, as opposed to the soul), a source is sought in vain. There is no such statement in historic Christianity that Kenyon seemed to be echoing. Even historic trichotomism, while distinguishing between spirit and soul, did not declare that spirit was the true self, while soul was, in contrast, an appendage. Advancing the scrutiny to Kenyon's immediate historic predecessors and possible influencers, neither HL/FC⁸⁹ nor NT/CS⁹⁰ offered a precedent. It seems that this idea may have been a *novum* in Kenyon's mind.

⁸⁶ Simpson, *Spirit*, p.36.

⁸⁷ Simpson, *Spirit*, p.42.

⁸⁸ Jessie Penn-Lewis, *Soul and Spirit* (Leicester: Overcomer Book Room, 3rd edn, n.d.), p.8. McIntyre (*Kenyon*, p.116) and Lie (personal communication, 16.9.05) both consider Kenyon to have read her work favourably.

⁸⁹ Anthropological formulations among these authors varied between dichotomous and trichotomous ones. Those which distinguished between spirit and soul did not limit selfhood to the spirit. If anything, Murray (*Spirit*, p.333) and Penn-Lewis (*Soul*, p.7) regarded the soul, not the spirit, as the self.

Summary conclusions

In conclusion, Kenyon's, Hagin's and Copeland's statements that 'I am a spirit, I have a soul, and I live in a body' betray an anthropology that does not have a strong biblical basis. Its prioritisation of the immaterial over the physical body cannot be justified scripturally. Furthermore, its distinction between spirit and soul, let alone its promotion of one over the other as controlling self, cannot claim scriptural support.

That stated, three points may be made that ameliorate the weaknesses of their view. The first is that scripture does support a moderate material-immaterial dualism that recognises a disembodied intermediate state, and thereby allows some distinction to be validly drawn between body and soul. The second ameliorating factor is that, while scripture itself does not support a prioritisation of spirit or soul over body in terms of either personal identity or functional control, nevertheless Christian tradition has been replete with voices that have done precisely this. The suspicion thus emerges that Kenyon, Hagin and Copeland, while thinking that they gained their relegation of the body from scripture, actually gained it from Christian tradition. This is despite the observation that approximately similar relegation of the physical can also be found in NT/CS writing. Thirdly, trichotomism as such continues to be found within the tradition. Even Kenyon's and WFM's particular form of trichotomy, in which the spirit is not only distinguished from the soul but should control the soul, can find precedent in the HL/FC movements. The only aspect which has emerged as a clear departure from the Christian tradition is the statement that the spirit as opposed to the soul is the true self. There is no evidence to suggest that Kenyon gained this most distinctive aspect from NT/CS. He may well have developed it himself.



⁹⁰ For Eddy, 'spirit', 'soul' and 'mind' were synonymous (*No and Yes*, pp.20, 32). Trine's advice, already referred to, that realisation of oneness with Infinite Life should reach soul first, then mind, and then body (*Tune*, p.192) does resemble Kenyon's spirit-soul-body prioritisation, but does not view the soul exclusively as the true self.