

<p>UTGIVER REFLEKS-Publishing</p> <p>REDAKTØR Geir Lie</p> <p>ADRESSE Ravnkroken 60G 1254 Oslo</p> <p>TELEFON 97019629</p> <p>EPOST geir_lie9@live.no</p> <p>TRYKK E-dit</p> <p>LØSSALGSPRIS NOK 150,- / SEK 180,- / DKK 140,- 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>Theological Influences on the Teaching and Practices of John Alexander Dowie 2 David William Faupel</p> <p>The Inner Healing Movement in Historical Context 30 Paul L. King</p> <p>Christian Psychics and Shamans. A Response to Morton Kelsey, Agnes Sanford and DeArteaga's Defense and Acceptance of Psychic Phenomena 48 Paul L. King</p> <p>Fra pinsevern eller karismatiker til pinsekarismatiker: Norsk pinsekristendom og karismatisk fornyelse fra 1980-årene og fram til idag 64 Geir Lie</p> <p>Weakness That Divine Power Perfects (2 Cor. 12.9-10) 91 Mark E. Roberts</p> <p>Index over alle artikler og bokanmeldelser publisert i Refleks, samt bokutgivelser på Refleks-Publishing og Akademia forlag</p>
---	---

Forord

Det er utvilsomt en merkelig følelse jeg kjenner på i forbindelse med at tidsskriftet *Refleks* nå legges ned etter ni år. Det har vært både morsomt og givende å drive amatørforlag, fra tidsskriftets første nummer (som mest av alt lignet et sirkulær fra et hvilket som helst borettslagsstyre) til det siste nummeret i 2009, som har en layout og estetisk form jeg fullt ut kan innestå for. En stor takk til Lars Flikkeid for dette!

Bladet, ja, forlaget som sådan, legges herved ned, delvis fordi tiden ikke strekker til, og delvis fordi jeg føler at jeg har fått sagt mye av det jeg ønsket å si – både gjennom egne og andres artikler. Takk til alle dere som har fulgt meg gjennom disse ni årene. Jeg håper mange av dere ikke bare har abonnert på tidsskriftet, men faktisk også har lest artiklene.

Som for de aller fleste av tidsskriftets numre, har vi også her et såkalt åpent nummer, med artikler som spriker i de forskjelligste retninger. Den første av disse, skrevet av David William Faupel, presenterer og kontekstplasserer John Alexander Dowie, en viktig forløper for amerikansk pinsebevegelses tilblivelse. De to neste artiklene, begge av Paul L. King, presenterer henholdsvis den amerikanske 'Inner Healing'-bevegelsen og evaluerer deler av det tankegods som har blitt promotert gjennom denne. Deretter følger mitt eget forsøk på å skape logisk mening ut av noe av det som har skjedd innen norsk pinsebevegelse og karismatiske miljøer fra midt på 1980-tallet og fram til i dag. Den siste artikkelen, forfattet av Mark E. Roberts, gir en teologisk tilretteleggelse av skriftavsnittet i 2 Kor 12:9-10 i lys av de to korintierbrevene.

God lesning!

Gress hie

Theological Influences on the Teaching and Practices of John Alexander Dowie

David William Faupel, Ph.D., *is Professor of the History of Christianity at Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C.*

Abstract

John Alexander Dowie has long been known as a theological forebear of the Pentecostal Movement. What has been less known is the extent to which he was influenced by the theology and practices of the Mormon tradition. This article seeks to identify these influences and place them in the historical/theological context of Dowie's life and ministry. The article goes on to show that Dowie operated within the broad theological context of the Calvinistic wing of 19th Century Perfectionism known as the Keswick Movement. His theological understanding was modified by insights drawn from Edward Irving and the Catholic Apostolic Church. Within this theological framework his utopian vision, evangelistic strategy, and ecclesiastical structures, all paralleling Mormon understanding was placed.

Introduction

John Alexander Dowie was one of the most colorful religious figures to emerge on the North American scene at the close of the nineteenth century. Newspapers had a field day when he declared himself to be Elijah, the Old Testament prophet, announcing pending judgment on the religious establishment and political order that would come about with Christ's imminent return.

The almost daily publicity these diatribes generated served Dowie's purposes well. People came to hear him from far and near. Hundreds claimed healing in his meetings. Many came to jeer, but left committed to his cause. His following spanned the social spectrum from the lowly drunkard and prostitute to religious leaders such as Catherine and Arthur Booth-Clibborn, the daughter and son-in-law of the founder of the Salvation Army. By the time of his death in 1907 over 250,000 persons had joined his ranks.

Although he denounced Pentecostalism just before his death, thousands of his followers and hundreds in leadership roles would leave his organization to join this emerging movement. Today, many Pentecostal churches in North America,

Europe, New Zealand, Australia and especially South Africa trace their origins to this enigmatic man.¹

Although Dowie has figured prominently in Pentecostal historiography, comparably little work has been done to trace the origins of his theological ideas. Indeed, once he had declared himself to be Elijah, all subsequent pronouncements have tended to be dismissed as the mad ravings of a lunatic. While this paper is not intended to prove Dowie's sanity, it will seek to demonstrate that his message contained a logical theological development consistent with his worldview. Furthermore, I shall seek to show that he was able to take all of his ideas from other theological traditions he encountered and place them within his own theological spectrum.

I shall first introduce Dowie by briefly describing the highlights of his life and ministry. I shall next focus attention on the unfolding theological development of his thought. I shall then seek to place his ministry in its broader historical/theological context by noting parallels to contemporary theological traditions.

Dowie's Life

Dowie has been described as "a man born to command and incapable of following."² At the height of his power, his physical appearance was unimposing. At age fifty, he was a small, overweight, balding man with bowed legs and a flowing beard. But the force of his personality was such that few could escape the power in his presence. In private he was a perfect gentleman. He radiated confidence, sincerity, trust and understanding. Seeker and skeptic alike were captivated by his warm smile, penetrating gaze and listening ear. On the other hand, in the pulpit, dressed in long flowing liturgical robes, he would rail against the evils of

* The author wishes to acknowledge that funding for the research of this article was granted by the National Endowment of the Humanities. Any views, findings, or conclusions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of NEH.

* This article was originally published in *Pneuma* 29 (2007), 226-253 and is published with explicit permission from both the author and the original publisher.

¹ E. L. Blumhofer, "A Pentecostal Branch Grows in Dowie's Zion," *Assemblies of God Heritage* (Fall, 1986), 3-5; W. J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Press, 1972), 65, 120-1.

² J.M. Buckley, "Dowie Analyzed and Classified," *The Century Magazine*, LXIV (October, 1902), 928. Another investigative reporter concluded that Dowie could "no more follow than a fish can walk." J. Swain, "John Alexander Dowie: The Prophet and His Profits," *The Century Magazine*, LXIV (October, 1902), 936.

his day and denounce a spineless Christianity for its failure to stand up to the forces of Satan. So compelling was his power, that his followers gladly sold their material possessions, joyously gave him their wealth, unquestioned loyalty, and total devotion.³

Dowie was born in Edinburgh, Scotland in 1847. He migrated with his parents to Australia at age fourteen. For seven years he worked as an apprentice for various firms. Feeling the call of God to the ministry, he went back to Edinburgh at age twenty-one, spending three years at New College. He returned to Australia in 1872 to become a Congregational minister. Holding a succession of pastorates, Dowie quickly climbed the ecclesiastical ladder. Within four years of his ordination, he was called to the prestigious Collegiate Church in Newton, a suburb of Sydney. During the course of his ministry, the church experienced a seventy percent growth. However, with his future secure, Dowie abruptly resigned in 1878, announcing that he was leaving his denomination to devote himself to independent evangelistic work.⁴

The next few years were trying times for Dowie. Although he often preached to large crowds, finances were not sufficient to meet expenses. Gradually he had to sell off all of his assets to meet his bills. His former colleagues denounced him. His in-laws turned against him feeling that he was not taking adequate care of their daughter. The bitterest moment came in 1882 when his little daughter, Jeanie, died.⁵

Dowie's fortune turned in 1883. He determined to make Divine Healing the central focus of his ministry. The change resulted in instant success. Crowds came in droves to hear his new message. Testimonies of miraculous healing were received daily. Finances to fund an expanding operation began to flow. He established the Free Christian Church in Melbourne. From this base, he conducted healing crusades throughout Australia and New Zealand. To sustain the fruit of these campaigns, he founded the Divine Healing Association.⁶

Flushed with newfound success, Dowie began to think in terms of worldwide ministry. He determined to visit England where he had many contacts. With

³ For an exhaustive analysis of Dowie's personality see R. Harlan, "Characterization," *John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Apostolic Church in Zion*, 40-69.

⁴ G. Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie* (Shreveport, LA: Voice of Healing Publishing Company, 1951), 11-26; and Swain, "John Alexander Dowie," 934.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 64-71.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 72-5; and Swain, "John Alexander Dowie," 936.

London as a center, he reasoned that he would be able to develop a following throughout the British Empire.⁷ To this end he set sail in March, 1888, determining to go by way of the United States.

Dowie received such a tremendous response to his ministry in North America that he never left. For two years he traveled up and down the Pacific Coast holding crusades before moving east across the continent. Wherever he went, he established branches of his Association, which had by this time been reorganized as the International Divine Healing Association. He continued his crusades until 1895, organizing branches in virtually every major American city.⁸

In 1890, Dowie decided to make Chicago, the second largest city in the United States, his headquarters. Centrally located, he was better able to keep a handle on his growing empire. The World's Fair, which opened in Chicago in 1893, provided Dowie with further opportunity. Always a strategic planner, he set up a tabernacle just outside the fairground's entrance, hoping to attract people from throughout the world. His strategy paid off handsomely. Ever increasing crowds attended, forcing him to locate in a succession of larger meeting places.⁹

The period following the World's Fair has been described by one biographer as his "Golden Years."¹⁰ They were filled with controversy, decisive action and

⁷ Swain, "John Alexander Dowie," 936. William E. Boardman may well have stimulated Dowie's thoughts. He received an invitation from Boardman, then President of the British Divine Healing Association, to attend an International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness to be held in London in 1886. Dowie desired to attend, but the timing was wrong. He felt he could not leave his evangelistic activities in Australia at that point. In declining the invitation, he stated that he hoped to visit England within three years. Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 85.

⁸ Swain, "John Alexander Dowie," 937; Harlan, *John Alexander Dowie*, 34; and Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 90, 93-4.

⁹ Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 104-5; Swain, "John Alexander Dowie," 937; and Harlan, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 34.

¹⁰ Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 161.

¹¹ Harlan, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 34-7. Dowie claimed to have spent 120 days in court in 1895. Over one hundred warrants for his arrest were issued that year. He was charged with practicing medicine without a license. Although the establishment was legitimately upset about some of his healing practices, their real concern was his critique of their city. They were enraged by his attacks of alleged corruption of several of Chicago's elite groups. He singled out the medical profession for particular verbal abuse. Convinced that all drugs were poison and enslaving, he went so far as to declare that

(footnote continued)



huge success. Dowie's flamboyant style and pointed tongue soon alienated him from Chicago's power structure. The press, medical community, clergy and politicians all sought to put him out of business. Dowie was able to turn this free publicity to his advantage. The more headlines that denounced him, the larger his following grew. Though many would come out of curiosity or to heckle, they would often stay to pray. By this time Dowie had recognized that he had completely alienated the religious established. He therefore, disbanded his interdenominational Divine Healing Association in November 1895, announcing that no longer would his followers be able to retain membership in their old denominations. Instead they must join the Christian Catholic Church (renamed the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion, in 1904), which he formally established in February, 1896.¹¹

Events moved with dizzying speed following the creation of his new denomination. On New Year's Eve 1899, Dowie announced plans to build Zion, a utopian community, forty miles north of Chicago. Zion soon became a bustling city of 8,000 residents with plans to grow to 200,000. Building was going on everywhere. Homes were erected. Stores for many businesses were constructed. A large hotel was built for persons coming from great distances to attend the healing meetings. An educational system from elementary school through college was established. A huge tabernacle holding 5,200 people was placed in the heart of Zion with plans to build a temple with a seating capacity of 25,000 on an adjacent block. Zion was the first and largest of several communities that he planned to establish around the world. A large farming development, planned for Mexico, was next on the agenda.¹²

In October, 1903 Dowie launched a world tour beginning with a three-week crusade at Madison Square Garden in New York City. Three thousand of his "Restoration Host" came with him for this first meeting. During the day, they fanned

"Doctors, as a profession, are directly inspired by the Devil." J.A. Dowie, "Doctors, Drugs and Devils, or, the Foes of Christ the Healer," *Physical Culture* (April, 1895), 81.

¹² P.L. Cook, *Zion City, Illinois: Twentieth Century Utopia* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1996), 31-32, 55, 61-67; 71-77; 169.

out across the city passing out tracts, knocking on doors, inviting people to the evening meetings. Not surprisingly, the Garden was packed with over 5,000 people turned away nightly. From there, Mrs. Dowie with a smaller party, went on to London, several cities on the European continent, South Africa, New Zealand and Australia. Dowie left for San Francisco, joining his wife in Australia and returning via India, Africa and Europe. Everywhere he went he held large rallies in the major cities, and then spoke privately to the community of followers he had in that part of the world. Returning to Chicago in September, 1904 he began plans to launch his Western campaign in 1905 when he planned to “invade” St. Louis, Salt Lake City and San Francisco, with 5,000 of his “Restoration Host”.

Dowie’s expanding empire was paralleled by the elevation of his status. He had named himself General Overseer of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church upon its formation in 1896. In 1899, he proclaimed that he was the “Messenger of the Covenant” prophesied by the prophet Malachi. He declared himself to be Elijah, who was to be “The Restorer of All Things” in June, 1901. In September, 1904, he consecrated himself First Apostle of a new apostolic order. His psychological development caused at least one writer to speculate that had Dowie lived on, he would have claimed to be the reincarnation of the Messiah.¹³

Dowie’s Message

Dowie, summed up his message by stating: “Zion stands for Salvation, Healing and Holy Living,” which he referred to as the “Full Gospel.”¹⁴ Included in this summation is the understanding that Christ’s atonement had a three-fold dimension: Jesus as Savior, Sanctifier, and Healer.¹⁵ In seeking to fully understand his message, attention shall first be directed to an analysis of this three-fold theme. This “Full Gospel” will then be set against the backdrop of Dowie’s world-view.

¹³ Harlan, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 36-39.

¹⁴ Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 177-214.

The Full Gospel

Dowie found Scriptural support for his three-fold emphasis in Isaiah 35:

Be strong and fear not. See your God come. . . He comes to save you. Then shall blind men's eyes be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap like a deer, and the tongue of the dumb shout aloud. . . And there shall be a causeway there, which shall be called the way of Holiness and the unclean shall not pass along it, it shall be the pilgrim's way. . . By it those he has ransomed shall return and the Lord's redeemed come home. They shall enter Zion with shouts of triumph.

This three-fold gospel is evident in much of Dowie's teaching. Even where it is not explicit, it is often just below the surface.

Of the three emphases, Dowie gave least attention to the first, justification. One possible reason for this as his critics were quick to point out, is that most of his adherents came from other denominations rather than as new converts to the Christian faith.¹⁶ Still, through his preaching and writing he had ample occasion to address the un-churched. Many came to hear him in hope of experiencing healing of the body. Others came out of curiosity. In both cases, those in attendance would often hear a sermon calling them to repentance.

Despite this, however, the message of justification by faith in Christ, clearly was not Dowie's central concern. Like most Evangelical leaders today, Dowie thought his understanding of the doctrine was identical to that of the Reformers, namely that salvation saved one from the guilt of past committed sins. In his view, this was a good but insufficient beginning. The Christian still needed to be freed from the power of sin. Thus his thrust moved him to the concern for Holy Living. Rather than connecting this to an all-embracing doctrine of salvation, he followed a two-fold model.

Like his doctrine of salvation, Dowie's understanding of divine healing is grounded in the atoning work of Christ. Healing is obtained through faith. Just as Christ breaks the power of sin, he breaks the power of disease. Using the ministry of the historical Jesus as his model, Dowie taught that healing was the third order of things. First Jesus taught, then He preached, finally He healed. Dowie

¹⁵ E. L. Blumhofer, "Christian Catholic Church and the Apostolic Faith: A Study in the 1906 Pentecostal Revival", in *Charismatic Experiences in History*, ed. C. M. Robeck, Jr; (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985), 134.

¹⁶ Harlan, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 162.

interpreted this to mean that the candidate for healing must receive correct teaching and hear correct preaching before expecting to be healed.

The reason sickness had such a grip on the Church, Dowie maintained, stemmed from the incorrect teaching that the source of disease was God--either as Divine judgment for sin, or as an instrument for perfecting the human spirit. This was a lie from Satan to keep the Church in bondage. The work of Satan is to destroy. The will of Christ is to restore. In Christ's resurrection, God demonstrated his power over sickness and death; this must now be apprehended by faith.

Preaching preceded healing, in Dowie's view, so that the power of the Gospel could convict of sin and elicit faith. Healing would not come to an impure heart. Indeed sickness, in the life of a Christian, was evidence that there was "sin in the camp."¹⁷

The Healing Home was provided so that persons from outside the community might have a place to stay while they heard the Word proclaimed and prepared their hearts for God's healing touch on their lives. Medicine in any form was viewed as Satan's counterfeit to keep people in bondage. Use of such remedies also demonstrated a lack of faith in God's provision for Divine health.¹⁸

Dowie's teaching and practice of Divine Healing were so close to the heart of his thinking that he could hardly speak of any subject without at least an allusion to this doctrine. The reason for this is grounded in an experience that happened to him in 1875. At that time he was still the pastor of the prestigious Congregation Church in Newton, Australia. The country was in the midst of a plague. Thirty persons had died in Dowie's parish within a few weeks. Exhausted from lack of sleep, Dowie wrestled with the reality of death about him. How could a loving God allow this to happen? He was called upon to pray for a young lady of his parish who lay on her deathbed wracked with pain. White foam mixed with blood was oozing from her mouth. Seeing her thus, Dowie reached a breaking

¹⁷ Dowie was adamant on this issue. Sickness among his adherents resulted in much soul searching and some finger pointing as believers sought the source of the disease. If it was clear that the individual had not sinned, then perhaps it was caused by a lapse in the immediate household, or by some member in the Zion community. Dowie taught that sickness in such circumstances was not a judgment from God. Rather the sin resulted in Zion's defenses being let down, allowing one of Satan's demonic attacks to succeed. Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 214-19.

¹⁸ Dowie, He Is Just The Same today, 8-11. See also his testimony reprinted in G. Lindsay, ed., "How God gave Dowie the Ministry of Healing." *The Sermons of John Alexander Dowie: Champion of the Faith* (Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, 1982), 22-28.

point. The doctor attending the girl said, helplessly, “Sir, are not God’s ways mysterious.” With sudden insight Dowie exploded in anger:

God’s ways? . . . How dare you call that God’s way of bringing His children home to Heaven? No sir that is the devil’s work and it is time we called on Him who came to destroy the work of the devil No will of God sends such cruelty, and I shall never say God’s will be done to Satan’s works which God’s own Son came to destroy.¹⁹

With this outburst, he prayed for the girl. Instantly the fever broke and she fell asleep. When she awoke she was completely well. Following this incident, the scourge did not touch any others in the Newton Parish. Although he did not publicly proclaim his healing message for six years, the event changed the course of Dowie’s life. A new world-view, a new perspective by which he read and understood the Bible was fermenting within his being. Once he publicly launched his message of healing, he would never retreat. Again and again he would make reference to this moment as the event that shaped his future course of ministry.²⁰

Despite the fact that Dowie is most well known for his healing ministry, his adherents claimed that his emphasis on Holy Living, the final component of his three-fold gospel, was the most significant part of his message.²¹ For him, holiness was not a goal to be achieved but a way of life to be lived. Dowie was convinced that salvation brought not only pardon for the guilt of sin, but deliverance from its power as well. Correct teaching on this biblical concept was essential to bring correct thinking to people who had been nurtured on a weakened half-truth gospel. Persuasive preaching was needed to bring conviction and encouragement. These two tools in the hands of the leadership were essential provisions that God had given to assist the pilgrim on this spiritual journey. Visitors to Zion would often remark with surprise, the practical nature of Dowie’s messages to the community, helping them to find ways of dealing with problems arising within family and communal life.²²

¹⁹ Cook, “Zion City, Illinois,” 116.

²⁰ Cook, “Zion City, Illinois,” 55, 115-125.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 128, citing *The Coming City*, (September 19, 1900).

²² W. M. Hundley, “The Flag of the Salvation Army Eclipsed by the Standard of Zion City,” *Physical Culture*, (January 1901), 276.

²³ *Ibid.*, 91-97.

Dowie's concern for Holy Living included both personal and social dimensions. His lists of guidelines to regulate individual behavior were endless. But he recognized that such behavior modification could best take place in a social context. This was the major reason for establishing the city of Zion. All life within the city was structured in ways to encourage the desired behavior. Land, leased to family for 1,100 years, could be revoked if a member of the family was caught violating one of the more serious codes. The city was divided into small sections for the purpose of weekly cottage prayer meetings. These occasions included not only a time for exhortation and prayer, but also a time for sharing personal struggles and victories.²³

Dowie's hope to lead his flock in the way of perfection was especially manifested in Zion's educational system. Adherents recognized that their own spiritual progress had been hindered by worldly influences and their association with apostate denominationalism. In their children, they saw the possibility for greater advancement in the way of holiness. Everything possible was provided to insure their prodigy would be a royal generation.

Dowie's concern for Holy Living took on a social dimension as well. He tried to instill in every convert the conviction that God is the Father of all and that all humankind are our brothers and sisters. Mutual respect for all was taught. Policies were formed to discourage a multi-class society. Concern for Jews and for Blacks was stressed. One Negro visitor observing the conditions of his fellow Blacks stated that Dr. Dowie must be the most courageous man in the nation. Miscegenation was defended as a means to regain the purity and strength of the human race. Respect for fellow men brought Dowie to advocate a pacifist position. Because nation states created jealousy, he defended the concept of world government. A welfare system was devised to provide for the needs of the less fortunate. A home for orphans, a hospice for fallen women, and a retirement home were all centerpieces of the city.²⁴ Thus, the implications of Dowie's doctrine of Holy Living reached far beyond his sub-culture and became part of his evangelistic thrust. Zion was to become a model community to whom others could look, finding there a higher, better way for living. Such communities were to be established throughout the world. In a cooperative rather than coercive way, Dowie believed that his movement would eventually transform society. It would ultimately prepare the way for the return of Christ to rule as head of theo-

²⁴ Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 208-9.

²⁵ J.A. Dowie, *Satan, The Defiler: A Sermon* (Chicago, IL: Zion Publishing House, 1899), 8-9.

cratic government. For him, the way of holiness was truly through the gates of Zion.²⁵

The Restoration of All Things

Although he believed Christ's return was imminent, Dowie did not include this as a fourth point in his "Full Gospel". Rather it became the backdrop of all his activity and preaching. On one occasion he stated: "That is all my message, I have no other." However, despite the fact that most of his adherents were drawn from the premillennialist camp, Harlan correctly observed that Dowie offered "no official program of the future of an apocalyptic nature." Instead of looking to external events to show evidence of Christ's soon return, Dowie was content to incarnate the end-time events into his own person and movement. At its theological center, Dowie's message was eschatological, declaring "the restoration of all things."²⁶ Gordon Lindsay, his most sympathetic biographer, summed up his conviction:

He utterly believed that as a fulfillment of prophecy, God raised him up to bring about a restoration of worldwide extent, of all things spoken by the prophets. This if true actually involved and anticipated nothing more nor less than a dispensational change in God's dealings with the human race. John Alexander Dowie so regarded it. He believed that the ministry of his office and the ministry of his Restoration Host would affect world changes prophetically incident to the ushering in of the Millennium and the Return of Christ.²⁷

To grasp this coherent center of Dowie's message and to gain insight into how he came to understand his own role in this scheme of things, it is necessary first to place his "Full Gospel" in the context of his world-view and to interpret his self-pronouncements in the light of the events of his ministry.

Dowie first articulated his world-view in a sermon entitled: "Satan, the Defiler." In this sermon, he stated his conviction that Satan and his demonic hosts had once inhabited the earth as a pre-adamic race. As a judgment for disobedience,

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 12.

²⁷ This was his understanding of what happened to Methodism, for example. He believed that Wesley had responded to God's call. "If I had been born in his time, I would have been a Methodist." He further declared, "If John Wesley were alive today, he would have been the leader in the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion." The primary villain that caused Methodism to go astray in his opinion was the infiltration of that denomination by the Masonic order. J.A. Dowie, *Zion's Conflict with Methodist Apostasy, Especially in Connection with Freemasonry* (Chicago, IL: Zion Publishing House, 1900), 25-30; 123, 128-9.

God cast them into hell where they were to continue existence for eternity in the form of disembodied spirits. Refusing to accept this penalty, they determined to repossess the earth for themselves. They seduced the angelic hosts who were sent to keep watch over the earth, penetrated God's defenses. As a result, they deceived God's new creation. Satan, therefore, became the author of human-kind's destruction, the cause of their sickness, death and judgment.²⁸

The purpose of Christ's first coming, as Dowie understood it, was to declare war on Satan and his legions. The decisive battle was waged at Calvary. Victorious in death, and vindicated by resurrection, the risen Lord returned to heaven to await the final triumph of God. The Church was called into existence to bear witness to Christ's victory and was empowered by the Holy Spirit to establish and extend Christ's Kingdom over all the earth. But like Israel before it, the Church failed in its mission. Even in the Apostolic era, unbelief and apostasy hampered the mission and rendered the Church powerless.²⁹ Many had since responded to the call of God, but they failed to grasp the Full Gospel. The truth they were able to receive fell into further desolation in the generations that followed.³⁰

However, the victory Christ had achieved at Calvary was "without repentance." The benefits he had won were not changed "by the unbelief of men." They were "a permanent possession." They simply had lain dormant. If unbelief was replaced with faith, and apostasy transplanted by obedience, the Church would be restored and once again empowered to accomplish God's will on earth. The culmination of the present age would come when a person or a movement stepped forward in perfect obedience to say "Yes" to God's call. Dowie determined to be that man.³¹

²⁸ J.A. Dowie, *Talks with Ministers on Divine Healing* (Chicago, IL: Zion Publishing House, 1897), 19.

²⁹ J.A. Dowie, *Our Second Year Harvest: Being a Brief Record of a Year in Divine Healing Missions on the Pacific Coast of America* (Chicago, IL: International Divine Healing Association, 1891), 168.

³⁰ Dowie, *Talks with Ministers on Divine Healing*, 15.

³¹ Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 214-19. Dowie's critics were confident that this tragedy would break his hold upon his following. This did not happen. As one commentator noted: "In that moment Dowie was supreme. His people in all lands sent messages of condolence and of renewed love to him and reverently accepted Esther's message. And Dowie, with tears streaming from his eyes, and with a heart almost broken,

(footnote continued)



It is in this context that the healing, which took place at Newton, Australia, must be understood. Dowie believed that Satan's hand had been stayed. In that dark hour, God had vindicated His Word. The girl's recovery convinced him that he understood God's purposes and through this situation was calling him to step forward in faith. No matter how dark the outward circumstances would become, Dowie had no thought of turning back. He had discovered that God could be trusted. He was locked into an airtight world-view. To doubt or question this discovery would be to cut himself off from his only source of hope. There was only one way to go--Forward. All of Dowie's subsequent actions must be understood in light of this event and the interpretation he placed upon it.

Stepping forward into the healing ministry, he claimed, with conviction, that in every city and country where he proclaimed his message, God had confirmed the Word with "signs following."³² Evidence to the contrary was swept aside as "lack of faith" or "unrepentant sin." When addressing the delegates at the First General Convention of the Divine Healing Association in San Francisco on June 10, 1890, he declared:

Supposing there was no healing in the city, it would not alter the fact that Christ is the Healer. Now I ask you as ministers, suppose there was not one man saved in the city, would it alter the fact that Christ is Savior? No; it would simply show that there was no faith in San Francisco. That Christ is the Healer does not rest upon any human testimony, it rests upon the Word of God.³³

Even his daughter's death failed to shake his belief or his flock's faith in him. Esther was a student at the University of Chicago when she met her death. Failing to follow her father's injunction not to use alcohol in any form, she had purchased an alcohol lamp. It overturned; she caught fire and burned to death. For Dowie, this was not simply a tragic accident. Rather it demonstrated to Dowie how Satan could penetrate when one let down one's guard the slightest bit.³⁴

stood beside her body and prayed, not that God would help him persuade his people that there was a rational excuse for failure to cure the young woman, but that He would forgive Esther, who had sinned against Him. The death caused great grief in Zion but the failure to cure caused not a ripple of questioning."

³² Swain, "John Alexander Dowie," 943.

³³ Dowie, *Talks with Ministers on Divine Healing*, 15.

³⁴ Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 84-9.

From the outset, Dowie understood his healing ministry in eschatological terms. The outline of his vision was clear by the time he founded the International Divine Healing Association and set out on his world tour in 1888. Through the confirming sign of healing, he felt men and women would be awakened to the claims of primitive Christianity. Organized in branches of his Association, they would help spread the message throughout the world, preparing the way for Christ's return.³⁵

Although Dowie maintained that the Association was not the first step in founding a denomination, the formation of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion was the logical outgrowth. Even then, he refused to acknowledge that he was starting a new denomination. There was but one Church and that was founded by Jesus Christ. The existing denominations had all departed from the New Testament model of Church Order and had in effect, become apostate. In establishing the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion, Dowie declared that he was merely recognizing the original Church order, allowing it to find expression in the contemporary scene. God would honor this recognition by fully restoring the nine-fold spiritual gifts as well as the prophetic and the apostolic office.³⁶

The establishment of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church like so many other events in Dowie's life was at once the culmination of all that went before, and a foreshadowing of what was yet to come. In his opening sermon, following its formation, he spelled out his understanding for the purpose of the Church:

That the Church of God shall be the Divine agency in the building up of the family, the home, the city, the state, the world, the Church of God, until God's work is completed.³⁷

This was not just "a mere question of Chicago." Branches would be established in Joliet, Rockford, Ohio, Iowa, Canada, England, Ireland, Scotland and Australia. Implicitly veiled was his vision for a worldwide network of theocratic communities seeking to extend the Kingdom of God on earth. More explicit in the sermon was his own role in this work. The major thrust of his address sought to

³⁵ Lindsay, *ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 172. Despite Dowie's claim to the contrary, Lindsay is probably right when insisting that the organizing of a church on "apostolic principles" was the fulfillment of a long held dream, 151-3.

³⁷ J.A. Dowie, "The Ministry of an Apostle--Is it for Today?", *Champion of the Faith*, 113-125.

demonstrate that God had intended the apostolic office to be perpetual and that it was the Almighty's desire to restore this office to the Church today. His point was not missed. Later in the day one of his followers declared him to be chief of the modern apostles. Dowie intuitively recognized that this was not yet the time for such public speculation. The man was sternly rebuked. But the seed had been sown.³⁸

For the next several years, his sermons and editorials were filled with intimations about the nature of his own mission. Dowie believed that he had a prophetic as well as an apostolic role. He searched the scriptures to discover what they would reveal about his end-time ministry. Three figures emerged: The Messenger of the Covenant, the prophet foretold by Moses, and Elijah the Restorer. Dowie came to believe that his prophetic office embraced all three. He made this claim explicit in his "Elijah Declaration" which he announced in Chicago on June 2, 1901.³⁹

Dowie took the next logical step on September 18, 1904, by consecrating himself First Apostle of a restored apostolic college. He intended to add others to the Apostolate in July, 1906, but his stroke and subsequent fall from grace, prevented this action from taking place.⁴⁰

Sources of Dowie's Ministry and Message

Having outlined Dowie's life and teachings, it is now possible to attempt to determine the sources of his thought. Despite the vast amount of literature written

³⁸ *Ibid.* Dowie stated with conviction that he had not reached the depth of humility and self-effacement to be entrusted with the Apostolic Office. *Ibid.*, 155-6. Lindsay suggested that something happened to Dowie between 1896 when he organized the Church and 1901, when he made the Elijah declaration. He felt that Dowie underwent a metamorphosis from deep humility to exalted pride. He attributes this to overwork and lack of adequate time for prayer. Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 187, 191-8, 234. While it is undoubtedly true that Dowie was extremely busy in the years that followed and that he did not seek the council of his elders, there is nothing to suggest that this was a new pattern. Cook is closer to the truth when he suggests that Dowie had already worked out his own conclusions and gradually allowed his following to ratify them. Cook, "Zion City, Illinois," 106-7.

³⁹ Cook, "Zion City, Illinois," 170-174.

⁴⁰ Harlan, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 38.

about Dowie and his Movement, to date very little effort has been made to place his message in the context of a broader theological spectrum.

Parallels with the Keswick Movement

An early commentator noted that he was essentially a Scottish Calvinist, though exhibiting many aberrations.⁴¹ A more recent investigator has correctly placed him within the emerging Keswick tradition.⁴² Although he would ultimately disassociate himself from Keswick leaders, Dowie's roots were clearly in the same soil with those Evangelicals who shared his Reformed theological heritage and who focused on the praxis of Christian living. Repeatedly, critic and advocate alike, mention that Dowie's message was characterized by a deep concern for the "Higher Christian Life."⁴³ What set Dowie apart from the other Keswick leaders of his time, was the radical extent to which he was willing to apply the implications of their message.⁴⁴

Dowie gave the "Full Gospel" motif of the Keswick Movement its most radical eschatological expression.⁴⁵ Rather than waiting for God's time clock of history to tick off sovereignly, the end-time events, Dowie sought to understand fully God's eternal purposes, and work creatively with Him. He took the Keswick doctrine of sanctification and applied it on a cosmic scale. He reasoned that if the individual could cooperate with God to achieve personal holiness, so too,

⁴¹ Buckley, "Dowie Analyzed and Classified," 928.

⁴² E.L. Blumhofer, "The Christian Catholic Church," 8. See Appendix A.

⁴³ Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie*, 257; W.M. Hundley, "The Flag of the Salvation Army," 274. Dowie himself wrote to Keswick leader, William Boardman expressing regret that he was unable to attend the first International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness. *Record of the International Conference on Divine Healing and True Holiness held at the Agricultural Hall, London, June 1 to 5, 1885* (London: J. Snow, 1885), 171-5.

⁴⁴ Blumhofer, "The Christian Catholic Church," 9.

⁴⁵ Both Keswick and Wesleyan leaders used the term "Full Gospel" to refer to the atoning work of Christ on the cross. For both, this included Jesus as Savior, Sanctifier and Healer. They also included a fourth dimension, Jesus as Coming King. Wesleyans who became Pentecostal added a fifth element, Jesus as Baptizer in the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals coming from the Keswick tradition retained a four-fold work, substituting Baptizer for Sanctifier. The best historical and theological analysis the significance of the "Full Gospel" in the formation and development of Pentecostalism is D. W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987).

could a person or a movement align with God's eternal plan in order to bring it about. All of Dowie's actions were geared toward that end. In moving in this direction, Dowie's doctrinal development aligned him with the theology of Edward Irving and the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church.⁴⁶

Parallels with the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church

Like many Pentecostal leaders who would follow him, Dowie was reticent to attribute any of his theological ideas to anyone. Rather he maintained that his theology had come as a direct revelation from God. As noted earlier Dowie was born in Edinburgh near the home of Edward Irving. When he returned from Australia to read theology at New College the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church was at the height of its popularity and influence. Dowie's awareness of the Irvingite movement is clearly evident in an interview he gave to reporter in Havana, Cuba, on February 17, 1905, en route to Mexico. In the course of the interview Dowie had explained his understanding of what God was doing in the world and the role his movement was to play in it. The reporter then asked him: "Do you think, Mr. Dowie, that God ever put this movement upon earth before your time? Did anybody ever start it ahead of you?" Dowie replied:

I think Edward Irving, one of the founders of what is known as the Holy Catholic Church, was a mighty man of God, and might have been intended to do this work, but it all failed because his brethren were jealous of him. It broke his heart and he died. He left no successor. The church lapsed into a dead sacramentarianism. Its last Apostle recently died. It also is practically dead. But there are many good people in it.⁴⁷

In my forthcoming biography on Dowie, I plan to spell out in detail the influence this church had on him.⁴⁸ Here is sufficient to note the two movements shared the following characteristics in common.

1. Both Irving and Dowie viewed their movement to be the forerunner, preparing the way for the return of Christ.

⁴⁶ See Appendix B.

⁴⁷ "Interview with John Alexander, First Apostle of the Lord Jesus, the Christ, in the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion," *Leaves of Healing*, Vol. XVI, No. 16 (March 4, 1905), 642-643.

⁴⁸ The most complete account of the history and doctrine of the Catholic Apostolic Church to date is C. G. Flegg, "*Gathered Under Apostles*": A Study of the Catholic Apostolic Church (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

2. Both saw their movement as having a two-fold mission: to serve as a witness to the nations, from which a remnant would be gathered;⁴⁹ and to warn of pending judgment.⁵⁰
3. Irving's Movement became the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church; Dowie's the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church.
4. Both Movements understood that theirs was the restored true church brought into being through the prophetic office, and that the Ascension Gift Ministries (Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists and Pastor/teachers [Ephesians 4:8-13]) had been restored to the church.
5. Both agreed that under the supervision and authority of the Ascension Gift Offices, the nine-fold gifts of the Spirit mentioned in I Corinthians 12 should be exercised in the church.
6. Both churches saw their mission embodied in the spirit of Elijah as prophesied in Malachi 4:5 as the "Elijah Ministry."⁵¹
7. Both movements saw a vital role for the Ministry of the Seventy, the Redemption Host.
8. The name Zion was prominent to both.

Parallels with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints

While still in Australia he met and was impressed by Mormon missionaries. Sometime early in 1890 he spent considerable time in Salt Lake City meeting with the leadership of the Mormon Community. Reflecting on his visit on a Sunday afternoon service on January 1, 1899, Dowie stated that that Church of Jesus

⁴⁹ This commission was taken from Matthew 24:14: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be proclaimed to the nations as a witness and then shall the end come."

⁵⁰ The second dimension of their mission was taken from Revelation 14:6-7: "And I saw another angel flying through the heavens, carrying the Everlasting Gospel to preach to those on earth—to every nation, tribe, language and people. 'Fear God,' he shouted, 'and extol His greatness for the time has come when He shall sit as Judge!'"

⁵¹ For a full explication of the Irvingite understanding of the nature and work of the Elijah Ministry see C.W. Boase, *The Elijah Ministry: The Tokens of Its Mission to the Christian Church Decead from the Ministry of John the Baptist to the Jews* (Edinburgh, Scotland: Privately Printed, 1868). While Dowie embraced the view that the restored church carried on this ministry, by his Elijah declaration he also understood that he embodied the spirit of Elijah himself in a special sense in that it was through him that the church was called into existence.

Christ of Latter Day Saints “is the best organized and most clearly scripturally organized of all churches....the Mormons have kept closely to the Apostolic model” He continued:

I studied that church. . . I saw that by their industry and frugality they had made the land around Salt Lake a wonderful garden. . . . When I visited Salt Lake, they treated me as if I had been a prince of the church, and I was enabled to learn a great many things concerning the internal organization.⁵²

There is oral evidence to suggest that Dowie visited Salt Lake City with the intention of joining the Mormon community.⁵³ Learning that he would not be brought into this church as an Apostle, he left to establish his own organization.⁵⁴

Just what did Dowie borrow from the Mormons? With the exception of the similarity of the church name, everything Dowie shared with the Irvingite tradition he shared with the Mormons.⁵⁵ In addition:

1. The Prophet Isaiah was the biblical and theological foundation for both movements.
2. Both movements called their headquarters city, Zion.
3. Zion, Illinois was organized on the same basis as Nauvoo, Illinois.
4. Both headquarters cities were to serve as model communities for others that would be established throughout the world.

⁵² “Opening of Zion’s Hall of Seventies,” *Leaves of Healing*, Vol: V, No. 14 (January 28, 1899), 255.

⁵³ See Appendix C.

⁵⁴ Dowie’s consideration to join the Mormons, if this indeed was the case was plan C. Initially, he planned to establish his organization with headquarters in London, England. Upon his arrival in American, he reconsidered, thinking to establish his headquarters in San Francisco, California. While holding healing crusades up and down the West Coast for two years, his primary goal was to persuade Holiness and Keswick leaders to join with him in one united “end-time” organization. It was only when this effort failed to materialize that he turned to Salt Lake City, finally deciding to establish his own organization with headquarters in Chicago. J. Swain, “John Alexander Dowie: The Prophet and Profit,” *The Century Magazine*, 64 (October, 1902), 936; Gordon Lindsay, *The Life of John Alexander Dowie* (Shreveport, LA: Voice of Healing Publishing Company, 1951), 85; “The Dowie Controversy,” *Salt Lake City Herald*, July 29, 1906 in *Journal History Project*, July 28, 1906, 2; and *Journal History Project*, March 9, 1907, 9.

⁵⁵ See Appendix D.

5. These communities in their life and practice were to model as closely as possible what life would be like in the coming millennium.
6. From these communities the ministry of the seventy would be sent forth to evangelize the surrounding countryside.
7. The temple stood in the center of Zion as well as the center of liturgical life and theological system.
8. Both Joseph Smith and Alexander Dowie claimed for themselves the office of Prophet, First Apostle and High Priest, as well as chief officer governing the temporal affairs of the community.
9. Both expected (and in the case of Smith found) the recovery of ancient texts that would be regarded as scripture on a par with the Old and New Testaments.⁵⁶
10. Both held that God continued to give revelation that was consistent with, further explained, and fulfilled earlier prophecies contained in the Old and New Testaments.
Both held that God was once man and that humanity will be come gods.⁵⁷

What else Dowie may have intended to introduce into his movement from Mormonism will never be known, though it is certain that he planned to reveal some startling new revelations. In the same address that he declared that God the Father had the body parts and passions of a man, he went on to say:

I have only begun the task of reconstructing our theology. I have in mind about fifty 'pet heresies' that are still being cherished, in due time you will hear of them. You could not bare the truth now.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Dowie believed that the apocryphal book, Enoch, gave an accurate account of Satan's physical preexistence, but contended that the text had become so corrupted through transmission that it could no longer be considered reliable. He predicted that an original copy, written by Enoch himself, would be discovered and accepted as the oldest book of the Bible. This would be one of several new Biblical texts that had been preserved by God, which would now come to light as the power of the British Empire was extended into the Middle East in this "time of the restoration of all things." J.A. Dowie, *Satan, The Defiler: A Sermon* (Chicago, IL: Zion Publishing House, 1899), 10-1.

⁵⁷ There are countless quotations to this effect in the *Leaves of Healing*. Two will suffice. "The Father is a father, and we know of no form which the Father assumes except the one like our own. . . He is then a great and glorious Primitive Man." *Leaves of Healing*, December 31, 1904, 346; and "God has the parts and passions of a man." *Leaves of Healing*, December 14, 1904, 306.

⁵⁸ *Leaves of Healing*, December 31, 1904, 344.

(footnote continued)



Had he lived, Dowie would almost certainly have introduced into the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion a practice that Mormonism had since repudiated. Dowie never forgot nor forgave a slight. The fact that he had been rejected by the Mormon leadership caused him to want to get back at them. On September 2, 1903, Dowie announced his intention. The Chicago Record-Herald announced that he planned “to come to Utah with an immense following in order to convert the ‘Mormons.’” It quoted one of Dowie’s deacons as stating:

The restoration hosts will assuredly crusade to Utah in 1904. From Chicago and the neighboring states we will move 3,000 or 4,000 strong. In the West Zion has many followers and they will be expected to join the army....No secret has been made by Dr. Dowie of his longing to contrive a conversion of the Mormons, and the deeds that they hope to do in the Utah stronghold are constantly being discussed by the citizens of Zion.⁵⁹

The Mormon leadership responded “come on”.

The Chicago ‘doctor’ may count on full houses for a couple of performances or more. He may even secure a few converts. Nearly everything that comes along, from Christian Science to the most palpable humbug, obtains a following among people who are grouping in the dark and unable to judge for themselves about truth and error. But he will not make any inroad upon the members of the Church. Much of what is good in Dowieism is clearly borrowed from the doctrines of the Church. It is clearly plagiarism. The distinctive Dowie features are almost repulsive. Such a system can make no lasting impression upon a people that lives in the light of truth.⁶⁰

But Dowie had something up his sleeve which the Mormons had not anticipated. First, however he had other agenda on his plate, the New York Crusade, his world tour, and his inspection trip to Mexico where he planned to purchase 2 million acres of prime land. In February, 1904 Dowie announced his Salt Lake City Crusade would be delayed until 1905. He sent three representatives to Salt Lake City to begin preparations just as he was leaving on his world missionary

⁵⁹ “Dowie is Coming,” *The Chicago Record-Herald* in *The Journal History Project*, September 2, 1903, 2.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

tour.⁶¹ The trump card Dowie expected to play when he finally arrived for his Salt Lake City Crusade was a new revelation. As with Joseph Smith before him, he planned to declare God had shown him that the reinstatement of plural marriage was part of God's end time program of preparing for Christ's return and ushering the millennium. He planned to invite all Mormon converts to join him as he initiated the practice in Mexico.⁶²

Conclusion

Dowie never made his return trip to Salt Lake City. As he left for his Mexico inspection tour, he suffered a slight stroke. The cause of his stroke undoubtedly was due in part by the strenuous schedule he had imposed upon himself, building the city of Zion, the New York Crusade, undertaking his world missionary tour and preparing for his adventures in Mexico. Equally important, however, was the growing conflict he was having with the leadership in Zion City.

Dowie's vision kept expanding faster than the monetary resources came in to actualize it. The cost of his New York City Crusade and World Tour had far exceeded funds he had raised for those purposes. With Zion City only starting to become self-sustaining, he was contemplating the purchase of 2 million acres in Mexico and was calling for his following from around the world to migrate there rather than to Illinois. This planned initiative was highly controversial within the Illinois community and many of the Zion leadership were openly opposed. Dowie felt he could not fully trust them to run things in his absence. He therefore sent for Wilbur Glenn Voliva, his Overseer for Australia and New Zealand to return to Zion as Deputy General Overseer and gave him power of attorney. Voliva soon joined the existing leadership in a revolt. Claiming Dowie with mismanagement of funds they also charged him with immorality. They claimed

⁶¹ "Dowites to Invade Utah," *Salt Lake City Herald*, February 10, 1904 in *Journal History Project*, February 10, 1904, 2. For an analysis of Dowie's World Missionary Tour, see my paper "The Missionary Strategy of John Alexander Dowie," presented at the Wesley Theological Society in Kansas City, MO, on March 4, 2006 and which will be published in a forthcoming issue of the *Wesleyan Theological Journal*.

⁶² For a full analysis of the Mexico project see my paper "The Place of Mexico in the Eschatological Vision of John Alexander Dowie," presented at Fuller Theological Seminary on February 11, 2006.

in private conversations, Dowie had spoken in favor of plural marriage and planned to start a polygamous colony in Mexico.⁶³

There would be one last association with the Mormons. Upon learning of the revolt, Dowie returned to Zion City in an effort to regain control. While en route rumor spread throughout the United States that he had sold Zion City to the Mormons to keep it out of the hands of the rebels.⁶⁴ The rumor soon proved to be unfounded. In the battle which ensued Dowie was discredited and died two months before his 60th birthday. Voliva gained control of Zion City and the Christian Catholic Church. However the vast legacy Dowie left would pass on to the Pentecostals.⁶⁵

Appendix A - Keswick

Keswick is named for a small village in the Lake District in Northern England, which was the site of an annual convention focusing on teaching the “Higher Christian Life” beginning in 1875. James Orr correctly traces the roots of Keswick to the 1857-58 revival that arrived in England in 1859. (J.E. Orr, *The Fervent Prayer: The World-Wide Impact of the Great Awakening of 1858* [Chicago: Moody Press, 1974], 142.) Phoebe and Walter Palmer, leaders of the American Holiness Movement spent the years of the American Civil War in England teaching the Wesleyan version of perfection claiming thousands of converts. (For an account of their claims, see W. Palmer, *Four Years in the Old World, 1860-64* [New York: Palmer Press, 1865]). However, it was with the arrival of another husband and wife team, Robert and Hannah Pearsall Smith, in 1873 that the Holiness movement really blossomed in Britain. (J. Kent, *Holding the Fort: Studies in Victorian Revivalism* [London: Epworth Press, 1978], 2780. the Smiths, from Presbyterian and Quaker backgrounds respectively, had been swept into the Holiness movement during the 1857-58 revival. They later became good friends with the Palmers and were fully indoctrinated into the teachings of the movement by the leaders of the National Camp Meeting Association. After active work in the movement for many years on the American scene, they went to England for rest and recuperation. Soon they introduced a circle of new friends to the Holiness teachings. Lord and Lay Mount Temple offered their Broadland estate for a conference in July 1874. Approximately 100 guests attended. The meeting was so

⁶³ Cook, *Zion City, Illinois*, 191-200.

⁶⁴ “Dowie and the Mormons,” *Deseret News*, April 13, 1906, in *The Journal History Project*, April, 13, 1906, 1.

successful that a second larger meeting was planned to be held at Oxford the following month. Over 1,000 pastors and church leaders responded to the call including several from the Continent. At the conclusion of the Oxford meeting, plans were laid to hold a larger convention at Brighton in May 1875. Smith in the meantime travelled through the continent where he enjoyed huge success. He returned to Brighton a conquering hero to address crowds of over 8,000. Charles Finney and Asa Mahan from Oberlin were also main speakers. Canon Hartford-Battersby offered Keswick as the site for the next convention, which met later that autumn. It has met at this site annually ever since.

Wesleyan theology as taught by the Palmers, understood that through Christian conversion, one was forgiven from personal sins; but that one's sinful nature inherited from Adam and Eve's fall remained. A second work, entire sanctification, was provided by Christ's atoning work on the cross that would remove this nature, freeing one to be able "not to sin". As this "Higher Christian Life" penetrated Reformed circles, the substantive language of "sinful nature" was replaced by relational categories. Keswick theology taught that by "yielding" to the Holy Spirit and "abiding" in Christ a person could live an "overcoming" life freed from the power of sin. The best articulation of Keswick's history and theology remains Steven Barabas, *So Great Salvation: the History and Message of the Keswick Convention* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1952).

Appendix B – The Irvingite Movement

The Irvingite Movement is named for Edwar Irving, a Scottish divine who came to London in 1822 to pastor a small Presbyterian Chapel. A brilliant orator, Irving soon had to build a larger church to hold the crowds as the elite of London came to hear him preach. In 1826 Irving became part of the Albury Conference for the Study of Prophecy, which was held at the estate of Henry Drummond, a Member of Parliament. The conference was held annually during Advent for the next five years.

Those who gathered were the leading clergy and laity from across Great Britain who had seen the French Revolution as the Rosetta Stone of Biblical Prophecy marking the beginning of end-time events that had occurred in their parishes earlier that year. Several dramatic healings had taken place. In addition, there were visions, prophecies, speaking in tongues, and interpretation of tongues. Without exception, the messages of the various phenomena were the same, "The Lord is coming soon, get ready to meet him." Observers were sent to investigate. The Conference reconvened in October when the investigators pronounced the phenomena genuine. The news were received with great joy. They believed the Holy Spirit was being outpoured, restoring His gifts to the church for its end-time mission. The same manifestations began to occur in Irving's church early the follow-

ing year. The outbursts caused great controversy leading to the expulsion of Irving from the Kirk in 1833.

Later that year, the Catholic Apostolic Church was called into being. Over the next two years twelve apostles were called forth by prophecy and commission through the laying on of hands. In addition to the apostolic ministry, the offices of prophet, evangelists and pastor/teachers were restored to the church. This four-fold ministry were known as the “Elias Ministry” foretold in Malachi 4:5 to be realized, not in a single person but in a restoration of apostolic ministries. The nine gifts of the Spirit articulated in 1 Corinthians 12 were recognized and exercised in the services. The new church quickly spread throughout Great Britain and the European Continent. Missionaries were sent to Africa, Asia and the Americas.

Because the church saw its mission as preparing Christ’s bride for His return and warning the world of pending judgment, no provision was made for apostolic succession. When the last Apostle died in 1901, the church decided that whatever mission God had for it had been completed and that they were to go into silence. They had been the ministry of the twelve. At some later point God would raise up the ministry of the seventy. Larry Christenson, a Lutheran minister, has argued that the Pentecostal/Charismatic Movements emergin in the twentieth century has fulfilled this prophecy. L. Christenson, “Pentecostalism’s Forgotten Forerunner,” in V. Synan, *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1975), 35.

Appendix C – Visiting Salt Lake City

David Paulsen, Interview with D. William Faupel, June 22, 2005. Paulsen, currently Professor of Philosophy at Brigham Young University, spent his missionary years at Zion, Illinois, in 1957-58. While in Zion several members of the Catholic Apostolic Church told Paulsen that Dowie was deeply impressed by what he had learned from Mormon missionaries while he was still in Australia. Shortly after arriving in the United States he spent six months in Salt Lake City observing the community and talking with the Church’s leadership. Dowie seriously considered becoming a member of the Church promising to encourage his growing following to come with him. After learning that he would not be named to the Quorum of the Twelve, however, he decided not to join.

Paulsen aske if I had ever heard this story and said he always wondered if it were true. It was this conversation that stimulated my renewed interest in Dowie this past summer. I discovered in the Mormon *Journal History Project*, clippings from the Salt Lake City newspapers, some 136 references to Dowie. All of these I photocopied. Much of what Paulsen reported was stated in these sources. Since then I have gone through all the *Leaves of Healing* and found that Dowie himself

acknowledged his visit to Salt Lake City where he met with the officials of the Church. At the present time, the archivist of the Church is checking the minutes of the Quorum of the Twelve to see if there is a record of the substance of that meeting.

Dowie's public comments of the Mormon begin in a rather positive vein acknowledging that he has gained much from them, but also stating that he felt they had fallen into error at several points. In later public references he becomes increasingly hostile toward them, but he never denied his visit nor his indebtedness to them. The Salt Lake papers, on the other hand had nothing positive to say about Dowie until they reported a rather lengthy obituary at the time of his death. They nonetheless monitored his work closely, reporting his work at the world's fair in Chicago, the establishment of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church, the establishment of Zion, his New York Crusade, his world evangelistic tour, his plans for a major colony in Mexico and his battles with the Chicago press. They complained bitterly of all the ideas he plagiarized from the Mormons, but concluded that in the end Dowie got it all wrong.

The doctrines, the Church organization, the ordinances, the gifts of the Spirit, the orders of Priesthood, the methods, the services, the missionary work, the entire system as as different from Dowie's concern ... as the mighty Rockies in their mountain grandeur are from the mole hills thrown up by the moles of the plains.

Deseret News, November 7, 1903, found in the *Journal History Project*, November 7, 1903, 1.

Appendix D – Parallels with Mormon Teaching

The newly formed Catholic Apostolic Church learned of the Mormons and sent one of their ministers, John Hewett, to Kirtland in June 1835 to investigate the movement and determine whether an alliance or merger might be appropriate. A letter of introduction which Hewett brought with him stated in part: "The Lord hath seen our joy and gladness to hear that He was raising up a people for Himself in that part of the New World, as well as here... O, may our faith increase that He may have Evangelists, Apostles, and Prophets, filled with the power of the Spirit, and performing His will in destroying the workds of darkness." Hewett met with Joseph Smith but left after a few days. Nothing further came from the talks.

Richard Bushman, who has brought this incident to light in his biography of Joseph Smith, notes the following parallels between the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints and the Catholic Apostolic Church.

1. Both called themselves the "Saints".

2. Both shared the sense of an imminent Second Coming for which the world must prepare.
3. Both thought the Christian churches were irreparably dysfunctional.
4. Both believed the Jews would return to their own land and be converted.
5. Both believed in the restoration of the Apostolic Office and the gifts of the Spirit.
6. In addition, the Catholic Apostolic Church supported the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, which was founded by Joseph S.C.F. Frey, a converted Jew who believed the ten lost tribes dwelt among the American Indians.

R. Bushman, "Visitors," *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knoff, 2005), 270-78.

The fact that Edward Irving and Dowie would have interest in the Mormons should not be surprising given Joseph Smith's initial statement of faith that was added to the canon of Mormon Scripture in 1880 was as follows:

1. We believe in Go the Eternal Father, and in his son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.
2. We believe that men will be punished for their own sins and not for Adam's transgression.
3. We believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.
4. We believe that these ordinances are: 1st, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; 2nd, Repentance; 3rd, Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; 4th, Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.
5. We believe that a man must be called of God to "prophecy, and by laying on of hands" by those who are in authority to preach the gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.
6. We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive church, viz: apostles, prophetss, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.
7. We believe in the gift of tongues, prophesy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.
8. We believe the bible to be thw word of God as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God.

9. We believe all that God has revealed, all that he does now reveal, and we believe that he will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the kingdom of God.
10. We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes. That Zion will be built upon this continent. That Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisaic glory.
11. We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience, and allow all men the same privilege let them worship how, where or what they may.
12. We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honouring and sustaining the law.
13. We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men; Indeed we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul: "We believe all things, we hope all things, we have endured many things and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is any thing virtuous, lovely, or of good report or praise worthy we seek after these things.

Jessee, Dean C. ed. *The Papers of Joseph Smith*, Vol. 1 (Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book Company, 1969), 436-437.



The Inner Healing Movement in Historical Perspective

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

Inner healing is the healing of the inner person, the psyche, which involves healing of damaged emotions, healing of memories, healing of trauma, inner wounds, rejection, bitter experiences, and release from past bondages, in the contemporary movement especially through healing prayer techniques. This article surveys the history and development of the inner healing movement and the issues and controversies surrounding the concepts and practice.

Inner Healing Concepts in Earlier Church History

Historically, recognition of need for emotional healing began early in the Church Fathers. Origen records, "By these [the names of God and Jesus] we also have seen many delivered from serious ailments, and from mental distractions and madness, and countless other diseases, which neither men nor demons had cured."¹ Not only were people healed physically and delivered from demons, but also they were delivered from apparent confusion of mind and insanity.

Fourth century writers such as Nemesius and Augustine referred to the work of ministry by the Latin term *cura animarum*, the "cure or care of souls."² Chrysostom recognized cure for sickness of soul as well as body, writing: "If we stand with them [martyrs] with faith, whether our sickness be of the body or the soul, we will not leave their tombs without the healing of which we stood in need. . . . it is enough that we bring a loyal faith, that we shed warm tears, and have a sober soul, for us to find forthwith a cure for our soul and healing for our body."³ Gregory of Nazianzus indicates that it takes "great skill" to treat the wide variety of needs of the soul and gives extensive counsel on treating different kinds of cases.⁴

¹ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 3.24 (trans. Henry Chadwick; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 142, cited in Ronald A.N. Kydd, *Healing through the Centuries* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), 21.

² Cited in Thomas C. Oden, *Pastoral Theology: Essentials of Ministry* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1983), 186.

³ Morton T. Kelsey, *Healing and Christianity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), 176-177.

⁴ Cited in Oden, 196-108.

Serapion, an early bishop, considered Holy Communion as “specific medicine for our souls.”⁵ The medieval *Penitential* manual credited to Columbanus advises that just as physicians treat certain illnesses in different ways, “so also should spiritual doctors treat with diverse kinds of cures the wounds of souls.”⁶ Twelfth-century Benedictine Hildegard taught that some issues were not dealt with by exorcism. The inner person needs healing. She began to establish some rudimentary principles of psychology, based on seeing metaphysical causes behind health and sickness.⁷

Later mystics such as Guyon and Fenelon were concerned for the health and healing of the mind and emotions as well. Guyon emphasized, “Melancholy contracts and withers the heart, and renders it unfit to receive the impressions of grace. It magnifies and gives a false coloring to objects, and thus renders your burdens too heavy to bear.”⁸ Likewise, Fenelon advised, “The strivings of the human mind not only impair the health of your body, but also bring dryness to the soul. You can actually consume yourself by too much inner striving. And to no purpose at all! Your peace and inner sweetness can be destroyed by a restless mind.”⁹

Cure and care of the soul was a theme in pastoral theology, especially in Reformation and post-Reformation times. Pastoral theologian Thomas Oden notes, “In the English tradition it was said that when a minister was sent to a parish, the pastor was given a ‘cure’ or curacy or ‘care for souls’ (*cura animarum*) in that local area.”¹⁰

19th Century Inner Healing Developments

Psychological theories began to arise with Sigmund Freud, William James, and others as they began to investigate the psychology of religious experience. “Mental philosophy” became the forerunner concept of modern psychology.

⁵ Cited in Mark Pearson, *Christian Healing* (Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2004), 96.

⁶ Quoted in Amanda Porterfield, *Healing in the History of Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 83.

⁷ Porterfield, 73-75, 86-87.

⁸ Cited in Mrs. Charles Cowman, *Streams in the Desert* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1972), 1:165.

⁹ Francois Fenelon, *Let Go* (Springdale, Penn.: Whitaker, 1973), 9.

¹⁰ Oden, 194.

Thomas Upham, for instance, was a professor of mental philosophy at Bowdoin College in the nineteenth century. He had ties with Phoebe Palmer and Methodism, and integrated philosophy and nascent concepts of psychology with Christian faith and the mystical thought of Guyon and others. Other movements involving the health and use of the mind and emotions began to emerge, including New Thought metaphysics, Christian Science, Theosophy and the Mind Sciences. In a more evangelical context, the Faith Cure movement arose with R. Kelso Carter, homeopathic physician Charles Cullis, and others.

Deliverance from mental bondages began to be practiced by Pietist Johannes Blumhardt in Germany and Ethan O. Allen, with Brethren and Methodist ties in America, using a combination of techniques including counseling, prayer therapy, faith confessions, truth encounters, and confronting demonic powers. George Peck, a leader in the Methodist and early Christian and Missionary Alliance (C&MA) movements himself suffered an attack of insanity that he attributed to demons. C&MA friend and colleague C. W. Morehouse prayed for his healing and cast out the demons.¹¹ As a result, they launched into a greater ministry, devoting most of their time to healing and deliverance.¹²

Late nineteenth century Higher Life and Keswick movement leaders such as C&MA founder A.B. Simpson and Dutch Reformed pastor Andrew Murray began to broaden the idea of a whole person concept in what they called the “gospel of full salvation.” Andrew Murray related outer health to inner health, seeing a connection between healing and sanctification, or renewal of the mind. “Health of the soul” and “the presence of Jesus in the soul,” Murray wrote, has “a blessed influence on the health of the body.”¹³ They viewed holiness as wholeness of spirit, soul and body (1 Thess. 5:23).

Though primarily an early strong advocate of physical healing, Simpson also hinted at the need for healing the whole person and inner healing—the interrelatedness of inner wounds.¹⁴ Commenting on Mark 2:5 where Jesus addresses the adult paralytic as “child,” Simpson recognized in this story the need for a deeper

¹¹ “Substance of Dr. Peck’s Account of His Healing of Acute Mania,” *Christian Alliance and Missionary Weekly*, Mar. 21-28, 1890, 192ff.

¹² George B. Peck, “In His Name,” *Christian Alliance and Missionary Weekly*, Aug. 14, 1895, 102.

¹³ Andrew Murray, *Divine Healing* (Spingdale, PA: Whitaker House, 1982), 115.

¹⁴ See A.B. Simpson, *Christ in the Bible* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1993), 2: 122.

inner healing, writing, “In dealing with the sick, we must realize the deeper causes of their physical conditions.”¹⁵ He also connected healing with the casting out of demons, saying, “The subject [of deliverance] fits right alongside of Divine healing and stands or falls along with it.”¹⁶ He demonstrated development of thinking on the concept of generational curses, when he referred to the descendants of Reuben as being under a “hereditary cloud” due to the sin of Reuben.¹⁷

Early Twentieth Century Inner Healing Developments

Combining, Medical, Psychological, and Divine Healing Insights

Psychological and psychosomatic theories abounded in the earlier twentieth century. Some Christians looked at such theories with skepticism or fear that it would water down the gospel. Others combined medical, scientific, psychological, and spiritual insights together. One of these was Dr. S.A. Richmond, a Christian medical doctor, who in 1904 wrote *Divine Healing: Mind and Faith Cure: The Science of Health and Happiness: Divine Science Applied to Moral, Mental and Physical Harmony*.¹⁸ As a harbinger of the later inner healing movement, he stressed seeking the root causes of distress and disease, emphasizing that the Word of God (and particularly the words of Jesus and the gospel), “strikes at the root of all diseases” and “creates a fountain of health.”¹⁹ “The leaves of the gospel tree,” as he puts it, “when taken as a medicine, penetrate the veins and search the heart. Their searching operations divide between the joint and the marrow, and discern the thoughts and intents of the heart. A wondrous medicine this. It searches the soul through and through.”²⁰

¹⁵ A.B. Simpson, *Christ in the Bible* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1993), 4:200.

¹⁶ A. B. Simpson, “The Casting Out of Devils,” *Christian Alliance and Missionary Weekly*, Nov. 13, 1895, 311.

¹⁷ Simpson, *Christ in the Bible*, 1:371.

¹⁸ Dr. S.A. Richmond, *Divine Healing: Mind and Faith Cure: The Science of Health and Happiness: Divine Science Applied to Moral, Mental and Physical Harmony* (San Francisco, n.p., 1904). He is not referring to the religious movement known as “Divine Science,” which is considered by some as a metaphysical cult.

¹⁹ Richmond, 76.

²⁰ Richmond, 76.

The Emmanuel Movement

About 1904-1906 Rev. Elwood Worcester, Rector of the Emmanuel Church in Boston, along with another minister, Dr. Samuel McComb, introduced a popular and controversial technique of individual and group psychotherapy free of charge to the public. Beginning as a fellowship group combining medical, spiritual, and psychological insights for tuberculous patients, a special "Class for the Treatment of Mental Disorders" was established with the help of psychiatrist Dr. Isador H. Coriat. This idea of group treatment was the first to be used in psychotherapy and was applied to the treatment of alcoholics. In 1908 Worcester and his colleagues published *Religion and Medicine: The Moral Control of Nervous Disorders*.²¹ The movement continued about a decade after Worcester's retirement in 1929, but the idea of group therapy has carried on.²²

John MacMillan on Generational Vulnerabilities

Although not couching his teaching in psychological terminology, John MacMillan, a C&MA missionary and professor who was a pioneer in spiritual warfare, used sound cognitive psychological principles along with spiritual warfare in discerning and treating a person's inner needs. Although he engaged in binding spirits or exorcism if discerned necessary, he also used methods to bring healing to the mind and emotions or "inward attitudes" deceived by believing lies ingrained in a person by Satan or other people or through a traumatic event. "He appeared to use a two-pronged approach in counseling such persons. First he would seek to bring a fresh illumination of who God is and what He is like, correcting bad theology. Then he would guide the troubled soul to a self-revelation of who he or she is in Christ, helping the person to understand the privileges, inheritance and authority of the believer."²³ The later 20th century inner healing approach known as "truth encounter," pioneered by Biola University professor Neil Anderson was influenced by MacMillan's teachings and practices.

²¹ Elwood Worcester, et al., *Religion and Medicine: The Moral Control of Nervous Disorders* (New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1908).

²² For more on this movement, see Sanford Gifford, *The Emmanuel Movement: The Origins of Group Treatment and the Assault on Lay Psychotherapy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).

²³ Paul L. King, *A Believer with Authority: The Life and Message of John A. MacMillan* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 2001), 166-167.

Further, predating modern teaching on “generational sin” and “generational curses” by decades, MacMillan warned, on the basis of Exodus 20:5, of the consequences of sin being visited upon succeeding generations. He called it “an inexorable law of return and of increase,” explaining with a poetic flair, “Nor does it end with himself; the drunkard transmits a poisoned frame to his offspring; the loose woman has a daughter who is hurrying in the ways of shame. Our sins do not die with ourselves; they scatter themselves over the society about us like the winged seeds of the thistle and the dandelion, impossible to catch, settling down in choice places to reproduce their kind.”²⁴ He adds that such a “principle of heredity” can result in “sometimes a weakened body, always a tendency to worldliness and departure from God.” However, he notes, “Grace is shown in that the curse runs out in the third and fourth generation, unless persisted in.”²⁵

Father-Daughter Forerunners of Contemporary Inner Healing—White and Sanford

Rev. Hugh W. White, a Presbyterian missionary to China in the early twentieth-century, was confronted with the reality and results of exorcism. He studied demon possession and exorcism extensively, as well as practicing exorcism, and in 1922 published *Demonism Verified and Analyzed*.²⁶ DeArteaga notes, “White believed that possession was a form of violent disassociation. The possessing force was not a spiritually independent entity; it was more like a psychic force or idea. Yet the exorcism itself was “real in the sense that it was a form of rapid psychotherapy.”²⁷

His daughter Agnes, who married an Episcopal priest named Sanford, took her father’s ideas and adapted and blended psychological theories together with Christian healing and deliverance ministries. She found that not all deliverance was effective to cure, and deliverance was not considered appropriate in all circumstances. Sanford was perhaps the first to develop fully on inner healing con-

²⁴ King, 169-170.

²⁵ King, 170.

²⁶ Hugh W. White, *Demonism Verified and Analyzed* (Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1922).

²⁷ William L. Da Arteaga, “Agnes Sanford: Apostle of Healing, and First Theologian of the Charismatic Renewal,” *Refleks*, June 1, 2007, 72.

cepts, with an increasing awareness that not all is solved by exorcism, on one hand, or through secular psychological counseling, on the other.²⁸

In her book *The Healing Light*, she included chapters on “The Healing of Emotions” and “The Healing Power of Forgiveness,” writing that she had stumbled upon the ancient rite of the Confessional as a “healing treatment” for the soul.²⁹ According to DeArteaga, her book “might be termed the crowning work of Christian New Thought. That is, Mrs. Sanford appropriated many of the motifs, vocabulary and insights from New Thought writes, but using her biblical knowledge as filter, eliminated the unbiblical aspects of New Thought, such as its drift into radical idealism (evil is unreal, as in Christian Science) and its sub-orthodox Christology.”³⁰ Most controversial, however, was her advocacy of the use of guided imagery and visualization.

Later Twentieth Century Inner Healing Developments

Christian Medical Community Recognizes Need for Inner Healing

The latter half of the twentieth century brought to the forefront an emphasis on inner healing. Christian psychiatrist W. Hugh Missildine wrote a groundbreaking book in 1963 entitled *Your Inner Child of the Past*.³¹ Finding Freudian psychology inadequate, he adapted his own blend of psychological and biblical principles, based in part on the Apostle’ Paul’s statement on thinking like a child in 1 Corinthians 13:11. Missildine’s book has become a classic, still being published and used more than 40 years later.

Another Christian medical doctor, S. I. McMillen, 1963 wrote *None of These Diseases*, in which he connected emotional distresses with physical illnesses. Using descriptive chapter titles like “Upset Minds—Upset Bodies” and “It’s Not What You Eat, But What Eats You,” he writes of needs to heal the emotions, wounds, fears, and bitter memories of the past to live healthy. In one chapter he

²⁸ For a review of the life, ministry and teachings of Sanford, see William L. DeArteaga, “Agnes Sanford: Apostle of Healing, and First Theologian of the Charismatic Renewal,” *Refleks*, June 1, 2007, 69-88.

²⁹ See Agnes Sanford, *The Healing Light* (St. Paul: Macalester Park Publishing Co., 1947), 120-136.

³⁰ DeArteaga, 77-78.

³¹ W. Hugh Missildine, *Your Inner Child of the Past* (New York: Pocket Books/Simon and Schuster, 1963).

describes the experience of a man who contracted arthritis after a traumatic childhood scare from a panther.³²

Inner Healing in the Charismatic Movements

Catholic charismatic leaders were among the earliest to emerge with inner healing ministries. Michael Scanlan appeared with his book *Inner Healing* in 1974.³³ He makes reference to Morton Kelsey's connection between spiritual, emotional and physical healing, Paul Tillich's concept of self-surrender as an act of faith resulting in healing of mental and bodily diseases, and to Henri Nouwen's concept of being a "wounded healer," and Paul Tournier on the power of faith in psychoanalysis.³⁴ Other Catholic charismatic leaders, Matthew and Dennis Linn and Sheila Fabricant, published *Healing of Memories* (1974) and *Healing the Eight Stages of Life* (1988), an inner healing approach based on social psychologist Erickson's eight developmental stages.³⁵ The latter was endorsed by noted psychiatrist M. Scott Peck.

Francis MacNutt, a former Roman Catholic priest and Ph.D. scholar teamed up with other teachers on physical and inner healing such as Agnes Sanford, Tommy Tyson (a Methodist evangelist who was the first chaplain of Oral Roberts University), David Seamands, and others. Then he married Judith, a psychotherapist who saw inner healing prayer accomplish what long-term counseling could not, and they launched a ministry of physical and inner healing. His book *Healing* has become a classic, and promotes four areas of healing: spiritual (forgiveness), emotional/inner healing, physical, and deliverance from demons.

John and Paula Sandford founded Elijah House Ministries in the 1980s and have written the most extensively on inner healing. Their two volume series included *Transformation of the Inner Man* (1982) and *Healing the Wounded Spirit*

³² S. I. McMillen, *None of These Diseases* (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1963), 92ff.

³³ Michael Scanlan, *Inner Healing* (New York: Paulist Press, 1974).

³⁴ Scanlan, 8-10, 30, 41-42, 81.

³⁵ Dennis Linn, and Matthew Linn, *Healing of Memories* (New York: Paulist Press, 1974); Matthew Linn, Sheila Fabricant, and Dennis Linn, *Healing the Eight Stages of Life* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988).

(1985).³⁶ Agnes Sanford was a mentor to them in the inner healing ministry. They also used Plato's and Jung's terminology of "archetypes," but put a different meaning to the concept. The Sandfords and MacNutt both were strongly influenced by Agnes Sanford.

In his popular book *Power Healing*, John Wimber also taught a fourfold healing ministry, similar to MacNutt including "healing the effects of past hurts."³⁷ He makes reference to Seamands, Scanlan, and charismatic Episcopal priest Dennis Bennett.

Evangelical Inner Healing Advocates

Noted Presbyterian pastor Lloyd John Ogilvie wrote on inner healing in his 1985 book *Why Not? Accept Christ's Healing and Wholeness*. A chapter from the book on "How to Heal Your Memories" was published as in the little tract magazine *Plus: The Magazine of Positive Thinking*.³⁸

Highly respected evangelical Methodist minister and professor of pastoral ministries at Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky, David Seamands, wrote a trilogy of books on inner healing in the 1980s entitled *Healing of Memories, Healing Damaged Emotions, Putting Away Childish Things*.³⁹ He makes use of neurological and psychiatric studies, and references Missildine, as well as providing biblical foundations from 1 Cor. 13:11 and other Scripture passages. His son, Stephen Seamands, a professor at Asbury Theological Seminary, has also taught on inner healing and spiritual warfare. David Seamands popularized the concept of inner healing outside of the charismatic movement and was endorsed by popular Christian psychologists James Dobson and Larry Collins.

³⁶ John and Paula Sandford, *Transformation of the Inner Man* (Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Publishing, 1982); John and Paula Sandford, *Healing the Wounded Spirit* (Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Publishing, 1985).

³⁷ John Wimber and Kevin Springer, *Power Healing* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987), 61, 77-96.

³⁸ Lloyd John Ogilvie, *Why Not? Accept Christ's Healing and Wholeness*. (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1985); Lloyd John Ogilvie, "How to Heal Your Memories," *Plus: The Magazine of Positive Thinking*, February 1986.

³⁹ David Seamands, *Healing of Damaged Emotions* (Wheaton, IL: Victor, 1981); David Seamands, *Healing of Memories* (Wheaton, IL: Victor, 1985); David Seamands, *Putting Away Childish Things* (Wheaton, IL: Victor, 1982).

Ruth Carter Stapleton, the sister of United States President Jimmy Carter, developed a healing ministry in the late 1960s, popularized with her 1976 book *The Gift of Inner Healing*.⁴⁰ It was endorsed by prominent Christian leaders like Keith Miller and Lloyd John Oglivie, although by her own admission, some ministers regarded her as a witch, a heretic or Satan disguised as an angel of light.

She had experienced healing of memories over several months in 1967 through the ministry of Rev. Cliff Custer, a Presbyterian minister in the charismatic renewal.⁴¹ Custer was influenced by Sanford, Missildine, Frederick Perls, Carl Gustav Jung, Dr. Ann Faraday, and others, including a booklet entitled, "Guided Affective Imagery" written by French psychiatrist, Robert Desoilles.⁴² Stapleton also makes reference to the teaching of Francis MacNutt on distinguishing inner healing from exorcism.⁴³

In 1981 Leanne Payne, a C.S. Lewis scholar and research fellow at Yale Divinity School, wrote *The Broken Image* on the need for inner healing for homosexuals, asserting that homosexual inclinations evolve out of dysfunctional relationships with parents.⁴⁴ Acknowledging the influence of Agnes Sanford, she applied the techniques of inner healing prayer to freeing people from homosexual bondage. At the same time, her book was endorsed by a wide spectrum of people in Christian leadership, including evangelicals like Elizabeth Elliott and Karen Mains, writers like Madeleine L'Engle and Thomas Howard, Catholic inner healing leader Barbara Schlemmon, and Episcopalian bishop William Frey. More recently, *Leadership Journal*, a publication of *Christianity Today*, has recommended her books *The Healing Presence* and *Restoring the Christian Soul*.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Ruth Carter Stapleton, *The Gift of Inner Healing* (Waco, TX: Word, 1976).

⁴¹ Cited in <http://clcpres.com/inner%20healing/The%20Inner%20Healing%20Sayings.htm>

⁴² "Using imagery, the language of the subconscious, Desoilles found that he could quickly discern the nature of a person's emotional problem and communicate corrective healing images directly into their deep mind." Cited from <http://cliffcuster.com/personal.htm>

⁴³ Stapleton, 84.

⁴⁴ Leanne Payne, *The Broken Image: Restoring Personal Wholeness Through Healing Prayer* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1981).

⁴⁵ Leanne Payne, *The Healing Presence: Curing the Soul through Union with Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1995) and Leanne Payne, *Restoring the Christian Soul: Overcoming Barriers to Completion in Christ through Healing Prayer* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), cited in *Leadership*, Spring 2007, 67.

More Recent Varieties of Inner Healing

Inner healing has taken a place in the mainstream of evangelical and charismatic Christianity with varying degrees of acceptance and different types of practice. Varying philosophies, techniques, and methodologies of inner healing have arisen.

Neil Anderson and Truth Encounter

Based on John 8:32, Dr. Neil T. Anderson, a former professor at Biola University, emphasizes “the power of believing the truth.”⁴⁶ Anderson identifies seven areas of our life in which we need to have an encounter of truth: counterfeit vs. real, deception vs. truth, bitterness vs. forgiveness, rebellion vs. submission, pride vs. humility, bondage (sexual, homosexual, abortion, suicidal, self-abuse such as eating disorders, cutting, substance abuse), vs. freedom, acquiescence (generational bondage) vs. renunciation. He has written several books on the subject, including *The Bondage Breaker*, *Living Free in Christ*, and *Helping Other Find Freedom in Christ*.⁴⁷

Jack Winter and Day Star Centers

Jack Winter, founded Daystar Ministries in 1964, which expanded to a staff of more than 700 people in many locations, including ministering in more than 40 countries. He is best known for his message “The Father’s Love,” in which he “taught that experiencing the unconditional love of God as your Father gives the power to forgive the unforgivable and to be made whole.” He also taught on the power of giving a blessing, especially in the family.

Ed Smith and Theophostic

A more recent development in the inner healing movement is “Theophostic,” initiated by Baptist minister Ed Smith, who holds a doctorate in pastoral ministry from Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Kansas City, Missouri. Theophostic means “light of God.” The concept is that while praying for a need God

⁴⁶ Neil T. Anderson, *Victory Over the Darkness* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1990), 107.

⁴⁷ Neil T. Anderson, *The Bondage Breaker* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1990, 1993); Neil T. Anderson, *Living Free in Christ* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1993); Neil T. Anderson, *Helping Other Find Freedom in Christ* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1995).

gives light or revelation upon a person's past painful experience.⁴⁸ "Adherents believe that people's current distress is rooted in past painful experiences that exposed them to accepting lies from Satan or his demons. Smith teaches that when a person's body, soul, and spirit can be freed by Jesus' truth from those lies, the distress found in the memory will go away as well."⁴⁹ Some conventional Christian therapists such as Paul Meier and Mark Verkler of New Life Clinic in Dallas make use of Theophostic techniques. Neil Anderson's book *Christ-Centered Therapy* mentions theophostic as a part of a "Counseling Assistance Tool Kit."⁵⁰

Inner Health

Not only is there an emphasis on inner healing, but also on inner health. In 1996 Dr. William Backus, a clinical psychologist and ordained Lutheran minister, published *The Healing Power of a Healthy Mind: How Truth Strengthens Your Immune System*.⁵¹ While drawing on psychological principles, he focuses on how inner health can contribute to physical health, saying that a healthier inner life will restore life and health from within.⁵² He includes such prescriptions as healthy, positive thoughts, avoidance of "spiritual junk food," the power of knowing and speaking the truth, managing stress, dealing with resentments, among many others.

Interaction Between Inner Healing and Deliverance Techniques

Several ministries do not focus only one techniques such as inner healing or deliverance, but use a combination of techniques depending on discernment of the situation. We have already mentioned MacNutt and Wimber, who emphasized whole person healing of spirit, soul, and body. John Loren and Mark Sandford

⁴⁸ For more on theophostic, see www.theophostic.com; Elizabeth Moll Stalcup, "Hope for the Wounded Soul," *Charisma*, November 2007, 70ff.

⁴⁹ "Deliverance Debate," *Christianity Today*, Feb. 5, 2001, 18.

⁵⁰ Neil T. Anderson, Terry E. Zuehlke, and Julianne S. Zuehlke, *Christ Centered Therapy: The Practical Integration of Theology and Psychology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000).

⁵¹ William Backus, *The Healing Power of a Healthy Mind: How Truth Strengthens Your Immune System* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1996).

⁵² Backus, 21.

have also written *A Comprehensive Guide to Deliverance and Inner Healing*, broadening their focus to include deliverance ministry and providing guidelines for how to distinguish and blend the two and when neither is appropriate.⁵³

Professional counselors Larry Crabb and Dan Allender distinguish the various sources and causes of emotional distress and the need to handle each type differently:

- Spiritual Warfare—The cause is demonic.
- Dysfunctional Background—The cause is psychological.
- Personal Sin—The cause is moral.
- Biochemical Disorder—The cause is medical.
- Undisciplined Living—The cause is weakness.
- Deficient Spirituality—The cause is distance from God.⁵⁴

They recommend dynamic therapies for recovering and healing the past, recovery and twelve-step movements for release from shame and addictive behaviors, and spiritual intervention when demonic forces bring harassment.⁵⁵

Jack Hayford has hosted Neil Anderson's Freedom in Christ seminars at his church, Church on the Way in Van Nuys, California, and adapted his techniques of truth encounter. One of his staff members, Chris Hayward, developed a retreat ministry called Cleansing Stream Ministries, utilizing a combination of discipleship, truth encounter, and deliverance.⁵⁶

Dr. John Ellenberger, former professor at Alliance Theological Seminary, Nyack, New York, and his wife Helen, both missionaries with The Christian and Missionary Alliance in Indonesia have been extensively involved in truth encounter and power encounter ministries. They use a combination of theophostic, truth encounter, and exorcism (as necessary). They recommend the following process of the three "R"s of truth encounter:

- *Remember:* Write down past happenings or issues that Satan might have used as a gateway, foothold or "grounds" for activity in your life. Pray for God to bring to your mind other occurrences or issues: Traumatic

⁵³ John Loren Sandford and Mark Sandford. *A Comprehensive Guide to Deliverance and Inner Healing*. Grand Rapids: Chosen Books, 1992.

⁵⁴ Larry Crabb and Dan B. Allender, *Hope When You're Hurting* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 47.

⁵⁵ Crabb and Allender, 87-88.

⁵⁶ See Chris Hayward, *God's Cleansing Stream* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 2003).

events, sins or questionable activities, past or present that keep coming back to haunt, any involvement with the occult, anything that seems generational, negative attitudes or emotions that control you

- *Renounce*: With each item on the list, resist the devil (James 4:7), binding, claiming the authority of the believer, commanding Satan to depart, affirm and confess the truths of the Word of God, making faith confessions.
- *Reclaim*: by submitting to God (James 4:7-8), and surrendering all to Him.⁵⁷

Additional Biblical Basis for Inner Healing

In addition to the Scriptures already mentioned above, there is extensive biblical basis for inner healing cited by its advocates. Limitations of this article permits only brief mention of a few examples. Paul writes of the need for renewal of the mind (Rom. 12:2). He further writes of need for renewal of childhood mind (1 Cor. 13:11). Much of Jesus' healing, counseling and deliverance ministry involved children or adults with problems from childhood (Matt. 15:22-28; 19:13-15, 16-22; Mark 5:23; Luke 7:12-15; 13:11; 17:15-17; John 4:46-53; 5:5; 9:1-3)

The Scriptures demonstrate the reality of "en utero" encounters, indicating that prenatal influences of an emotional or spiritual nature may occur within the womb. Jacob and Esau struggled in Rebekah's womb, indicative of their future conflict in life (Gen. 25:22-23). Jabez appears to have had fetal distress connected with his mother's abnormal pain, which left psychological marks healed only by prayer in adulthood (1 Chron. 4:9-10). John the Baptist leaped in his mother's womb at the recognition of Mary's becoming pregnant with the Messiah (Luke 1:41, 44). These "en utero" encounters demonstrate that human activity of a psychological nature does take place in the womb, contrary to those who say life begins at birth.

The Bible also seems to place great importance on the first few years of life following birth. The preschool years in the Bible are a crucial developmental period. Jesus warns against causing a child to be scandalized: Whoever receives one such child in My name receives Me; but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in Me to stumble [Gr.—*skandalion*], it is better for him that a heavy millstone be hung around his neck, and that he be drowned in the depth of the sea (Matt. 18:5-6 NASB). Understanding the nature of a child's development,

⁵⁷ Adapted from brochure Dr. John and Helen Ellenberger. "The Three R's: Remember, Renounce, Reclaim."

He warns against harmful nurturing influences especially in the preschool years (*paidion*, diminutive of *pais*). Therefore, painful childhood memories, feelings of rejection, and traumas can have long-lasting impact upon the inner being of a person into their adult years.

Jabez, for example, had painful memories and feelings of rejection from his childhood. In fact, because of her extremely painful childbirth, his mother gave him the name “Jabez,” which means “pain.” Every time his name was called, he was reminded of pain. His prayer, made popular by Bruce Wilkinson in his book *The Prayer of Jabez*, was really a prayer for inner healing: “Oh that You would bless me indeed and enlarge my border, and that Your hand might be with me, and that You would keep me from harm that it may not pain me” (1 Chron. 4:9-10, NASB).

An example of preschool trauma causing abnormal development is found in Mark 9:17-29. An epileptic boy was afflicted with a deaf and dumb spirit. Jesus pointedly asked the father, “*How long has this been happening to him?*” and he replied, “*From childhood* [Gr., *paidiothen*—literally “infancy”]” (Mark 9:21 NASB). Here was a crucial early childhood trauma in which a demon attacked him at the preverbal stage in his infancy, causing trauma and preventing the child from hearing properly, learning to speak, and gaining sensorimotor control.

In Mark 2:5, Jesus addresses the adult paralytic, saying, “Son [literally, “child”], your sins are forgiven,” indicating that the man’s paralysis occurred in connection with some childhood trauma in which he needed forgiveness. Similarly, in Matthew 9:20-22, Jesus addresses an adult woman suffering from a hemorrhage, saying, “Daughter, take courage, your faith has made you well,” indicating that her illness probably began in her teenage years, possibly from the onset of menses.

Additionally, emotional distress in adult experiences may need inner healing as well. Paul writes of unhealthy soul ties from illicit sexual relationships (1 Cor. 6:15-20; 2 Cor. 6:16). Jesus warns of torment that results from bitterness and unforgiveness (Matt. 18:21-35; see also Heb. 12:15).

By a charcoal fire, Jesus took Peter through a three-fold inner healing process due to his lingering guilt for denying Jesus three times by a charcoal fire. The fire apparently triggered in Peter deep remorse, and Jesus gave him a three-fold opportunity to reaffirm both his love for Jesus and reaffirmation from Jesus of his call to feed Jesus’ sheep (compare John 15:15-18, 22-27 with John 21:9, 15-17).

Responses, Controversies and Concerns

Although the concept and ministry is becoming more accepted in both evangelical and charismatic circles, some criticisms or concerns about inner healing still arise. Some of them include the following:

- *Inner Healing Is Unprofessional and Unprepared.* Professional counselors and therapists are concerned that a lay person who does not know what he or she is doing can actually inflict more emotional damage than any help that is derived.⁵⁸
- *Inner Healing May Involve False Memories.* Sometimes in trying to bring up the past, pseudo-memories through the power of suggestion may be dredged up. Sometimes people have had false memories of sexual abuse, Satanic ritual abuse, or other imagined experiences. Such false memories can occur in psychotherapy as well, but an untrained minister of inner healing may not recognize them.⁵⁹
- *Inner Healing Is Not Really Needed.* Some people believe that there is no need for inner healing, that healing of the mind, emotions and memories is provided in salvation. The true believer is covered under the blood of Jesus, so they don't need healing, they just need to realize that they have been healed.
- *Inner Healing Emphasis May Foster "Victimization."* Some people may claim they are victims of their past, rather than take responsibility for their actions.⁶⁰
- *The "Inner Child" Is Not to be Trusted.* Inner healing advocate Leanne Payne nonetheless cautions, "In counseling it is important to realize that the way of the wounded 'inner child' is so often the way of the foolish child."⁶¹
- *Inner Healing Involves Occult Practices.* Some Christian leaders such as Dave Hunt think that there is an emphasis Jungian psychological theory and

⁵⁸ "Pitfalls of Prayer Ministry," *Charisma*, November 2007, 72.

⁵⁹ "Pitfalls of Prayer Ministry," *Charisma*, November 2007, 72. See also Pearson, 103-105, for a discussion of this caution.

⁶⁰ See Pearson, 102-103, for a discussion of this caution.

⁶¹ Cited in Pearson, 106.

involvement in the occult, especially with visualization and imagery.⁶² More recent advocates have distanced themselves from psychic or New Age practices, but Agnes Sanford did not. Richard Foster asserts that some form of guided imagination has been used throughout church history, but he distinguishes it from New Age guided imagery, and advises the use of “sanctified imagination.”⁶³

- *There Are Problems with the Use of Theophostic*—There is need for discernment, concern for false memories. Some believe theophostic is based on unorthodox Christian theology or puts too much emphasis on role of demons.⁶⁴
- *Continued Emphasis on Inner Healing May Create Dependency Patterns*—As in psychotherapy, some people may become co-dependent on those who are ministering to them, continually dredging up more, and never really getting healed.

Conclusions

Biblical theology and anthropology presents humankind as a unity. Thus, one dimension of a person’s being affects the others. Physical illness often has emotional and emotional components and roots. Inner healing does have a biblical basis and is a part of the sanctification process for the renewal of the mind. While there are dangers and excesses in inner healing movements, especially for those who are not trained, I believe that the ministry is biblically and theologically valid, and I have experienced the positive effects of inner healing myself as well as in those to whom I have ministered.

⁶² Dave Hunt and T.A. McMahon, *The Seduction of Christianity* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1985), 149-188; Dave Hunt, *Beyond Seduction* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1987), 190-240. For responses and refutations of Hunt’s claims, see Thomas Reid, Mark Virkler, James A. Lane, and Alan Langstaff, *Seduction? A Biblical Response* (New Wilmington, PA: Sunrise Publications, 1986); Bob and Gretchen Passantino, *Witchhunt* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1990).

⁶³ Richard J. Foster, *Prayer: Finding the Heart’s True Home* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1992), 147-148, 264n17; Richard J. Foster, *Celebration of Discipline* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1978, 1988), 25-26, 29-30, 41-42. See also A.W. Tozer, “The Value of a Sanctified Imagination,” *Born After Midnight* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Publications, 1959), 92-95.

⁶⁴ “Deliverance Debate,” *Christianity Today*, Feb. 5, 2001, 18; “Pitfalls of Prayer Ministry,” *Charisma*, November 2007, 72.

At the same time, I have seen the excesses and caution those who would seek inner healing to be sure that those who are ministering healing prayer are Spirit-led and competent. Those who pursue inner healing ministry should be careful to root their theology and praxis in sound biblical principles and avoid suspect practices and beliefs.

The roots of the contemporary inner healing movements appear to come mainly from Missildine, Sanford, and psychological theories, though there are other sources as well. Not all healing movements make use of all of Sanford's methodology or endorse all of her theology. At the same time, so long as discernment is exercised, some of Sanford's principles do have sound biblical basis and can be utilized for inner healing ministry, while others should be avoided. My related article, "Christian Psychics and Shamans: A Response to Morton Kelsey, Agnes Sanford, and DeArteaga's Defense and Acceptance of Psychic Phenomena," deals with some of the issues of discerning wheat from chaff.

5

Christian Psychics and Shamans

A Response to Morton Kelsey, Agnes Sanford and DeArteaga's Defense and Acceptance of Psychic Phenomena

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

Psi powers or parapsychology, powers of the soul (from the Greek *psyche* for soul), are para-normal powers that involve extrasensory perception (ESP) and related phenomena. According to Mark Albrecht and Brooks Alexander in the *Journal of the Academy of Religion and Psychical Research*, there are at least four theories of possible sources of psi phenomena:

- *Residue Theory*—Humanity was created with para-normal powers in the image of God, but they were corrupted, restrained, or short-circuited by the Fall (proposed by George Pember, Watchman Nee)¹
- *Lapsogenic Theory* (originating in the Fall)—Psi powers were created or released by the Fall (Gen. 3:22—“The eyes of both were opened. . . . the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil.”)
- *Spiritistic Theory*—linkage between the human mind and the consciousness of an extra-dimensional entity (a spirit being)—1 John 4:1
- *Neutral Naturalistic Theory*—an intrinsically neutral natural phenomenon of the human psyche that can be used for good or evil—Morton Kelsey, Agnes Sanford.²

¹ George H. Pember, *Earth's Earliest Ages and Their Connection with Modern Spiritualism and Theosophy* (Toronto, Ontario, Canada: A. Sims, Publisher, n.d.) 253; Watchman Nee, *The Latent Power of the Soul* (New York, NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers, Inc., 1972), 9ff. Pember was a nineteenth century British scholar. Nee's teaching in this matter is based on Pember's conclusions.

² Mark Albrecht and Brooks Alexander, “Separating Wheat and Chaff: Biblical Discernment and Parapsychology,” *Journal of the Academy of Religion and Psychical Research*, Vol. 3, No. 3, July 1980, 200-204. See also Richard Balge, “An Analysis Of Some Of The Cults Which Are Likely To Disturb Our People,” Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary April, 1983, 28, accessed online at <http://www.wlsessays.net/files/BalgeAnalysis.pdf>

This article will particularly address briefly the fourth theory, that psychic phenomena are God-given natural powers that can be used for good or evil.

Defense of the Neutral Naturalistic Theory

Agnes Sanford

Agnes Sanford was the daughter of Presbyterian missionaries who married an Episcopalian priest and began a ministry of healing, and was a pioneer of the inner healing movement. DeArteaga considers her the first theologian of the charismatic movement.³ Observing the similarity between charismatic giftings in the Bible and psychic powers, Sanford explained psychic powers in this way:

The Holy Spirit does not do violence to our natures, but only increases and develops in us gifts that are already potential to our natures. Some people have natural-born spiritual sensitivity, and if they use them only in the realm of meditation and spiritual living, avoiding séances, Ouija boards and automatic writing, the gift can be greatly used in God's service.⁴

According to DeArteaga, Sanford believed this explanation was more scriptural to view these manifestations as a continuum. He explains that to Sanford's notion, "godly spiritual healing," as well as God-given powers of positive thinking and visualization and spiritual powers of the soul (*psyche*) can be manifest on three levels, which she linked with the Trinity:

- Level I—God the Father—Any one who believes in God, even if not a Christian, can have some healing power (such as Christian Science and the Metaphysical Movements), some degree of God-given visualization, and some genuine supernatural power from God in the soul (psychic abilities, or what some call "spiritual sensitives")
- Level II—God the Son—Those who believe in the divinity of Jesus and make Him Lord have double the healing power of Level I, as well as increased powers of the soul, positive thinking, and visualization through the name of Jesus.
- Level III—God the Holy Spirit—Those who have experienced the baptism in the Spirit have the highest healing power and the gift of healing,

³ For more on Agnes Sanford, see William L. DeArteaga, "Agnes Sanford: Apostle of Healing, and First Theologian of the Charismatic Renewal," *Refleks*, 6-1-2007, 82.

⁴ Cited in DeArteaga, 83.

as well as the highest powers of positive thinking, visualization, and spiritual gifting.⁵

DeArteaga defends her position, describing her beliefs as “a modern version of the traditional Catholic doctrine that ‘grace perfects nature.’ It was used by later Catholic theologians of the renewal to explain to fellow Catholics the gifts of the Spirit.”⁶ This theology he contrasts with the residue theory popularized by Watchman Nee, in which “the human soul was so ruined by original sin that anything ‘psychic’ is sinful” according to the Calvinist doctrine of total depravity. He claims that this position “does not make biblical sense,” citing the prophetic dream of Pilate’s wife is an example of biblically-sanctioned psychic phenomena from God.⁷

Morton Kelsey

Episcopal scholar Morton Kelsey, known for his comprehensive work on the history of healing entitled *Healing and Christianity*, has also written on *The Christian and the Supernatural* and *Transcend: A Guide to the Spiritual Quest*, relating supernatural manifestations in the Bible to psi powers, that is, extrasensory perception (ESP) and related phenomena. Kelsey was influenced by the thought of Agnes Sanford, but went beyond her conceptions.

Kesley defines a shaman as “one in whom the power of God is concentrated and can thus flow out to others,” claiming that Jesus was “greater than all shamans,” and practiced clairvoyance by exercising psi power. He believed that the supernatural manifestations of the apostles in the books of Acts are parapsychological experiences, asserting, “This is the same kind of psi power that Jesus himself had. . . . It appears that almost all Christians who were true disciples were something like shamans in the style of their master, sharing various gifts of power.”⁸ In fact, he avows, “Cut out the ESP elements from the book of Acts and the accounts become meaningless.”⁹

⁵ William L. DeArteaga, “Agnes Sanford: Apostle of Healing, and First Theologian of the Charismatic Renewal,” *Refleks*, 6-1-2007, 82.

⁶ DeArteaga, 83.

⁷ DeArteaga, 83.

⁸ Morton T. Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976), 93-95.

⁹ Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 96-97.

Further, he contends that “psi experiences themselves are not something from beyond; they are simply natural experiences of the human psyche which mankind shares with other living things and which can sometimes be developed.”¹⁰ To Kelsey, “There is nothing “intrinsicly evil . . . about psi power or its use . . . When people have deep and abiding experiences of God, ESP (extra-sensory perception) experiences often occur.”¹¹ Clairvoyance, telepathy, precognition, psychokinesis, and healing are all the same kind of power that Jesus and the disciples used.¹²

Like Sanford, Kelsey believes that such psi phenomena are neutral and can be used for good or evil: “Extra sensory perception, then opens up a whole new view of spiritual reality and the soul. If it is isolated from our religion and our central values and used for doubtful motives, it becomes demonic and an instrument of Evil like any other valuable human capacity. But psi ability may also become a powerful aid in eliminating the evil that is so much a part of our lives. It may be used to know God and to serve him.”¹³

In his sequel, *Transcend: A Guide to the Spiritual Quest*, Kelsey adapts and expands upon his thought, advancing support for psi phenomena and Christian shamanism by developing “psi theology” even further: “Christ was and is the ultimate shaman. He was the god/man who restores to human beings their connection to the divine . . . and the Christian shaman needs to have an understanding of psychic phenomena and of his and her own unconscious depths. In a real sense, every Christian who allows the Spirit to move in him or her is a shaman.”¹⁴

Kim Clement

As an example of more recent advocate, I mention Prophet Kim Clement, a popular and influential leader in the contemporary charismatic prophetic movement. Whether he is influenced by Sanford or Kelsey is unknown, but he takes a similar viewpoint. In an interview on the web he was asked, “Do you believe that psychics are all of the devil and they all got their gifting from the devil? Or do you

¹⁰ Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 109.

¹¹ Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 113.

¹² Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 142.

¹³ Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 123.

¹⁴ Morton Kelsey, *Transcend: A Guide to the Spiritual Quest* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 31.

believe some of them got their gifting from God?” Clement responded: “It is not a gift from the devil. The devil doesn’t give gifts. I believe everything is of God. It’s misappropriated; it’s misused. It’s taken and used . . . incorrectly. They have a gift. . . . God is sending psychics to prophets so they can clean them up and fill them with the Holy Spirit, and then get them used.”¹⁵

The Evidence of Scripture Regarding Psychic Power

The theories of Sanford, Kelsey, and Clement are intriguing to be sure. The real question here is, “Is the neutral naturalistic theory of psi phenomena biblical as Sanford, DeArteaga, Kelsey, and Clement claim?” The nature-to-grace theory as applied to psi phenomena by Sanford and DeArteaga is only valid if it has clear biblical support. Addressing Nee’s residue theory is not the focus of the paper, but one does not have to be a five-point Calvinist or agree to a hyper-Calvinist view of total depravity to acknowledge the possibility of Nee’s explanation.¹⁶ Nor does one have to buy into Nee’s theory to refute the neutral naturalistic theory. Defenders of the neutral naturalistic theory may seem to have biblical support on the surface, but when the Scripture is studied more in depth exegetically, hermeneutically and theologically, the biblical evidence shows differently and we actually find that such support is scant and contradictory.

The Problem of Hermeneutical Presuppositions

First of all, in citing Old Testament figures who did not profess faith in Christ as examples of non-Christian theists who exercised psi powers, Sanford and DeArteaga fail to take into account that those Old Testament figures were in covenant relationship with Yahweh. They were pre-Incarnation believers in the Father of the Son of God, not just people who in some generic sense believe in a Supreme Being.

Secondly, regarding the dream of Pilate’s wife, DeArteaga (and Sanford) fail to distinguish between illumination from God and inherent natural ability of spiritual sensitivity. The dream of Pilate’s wife was not psychic sensitivity but revelation from God through His prevenient grace. It is vital and foundational hermeneutically to recognize the difference.

¹⁵ Kim Clement interview #3, accessed online at <http://www.prophetic.tv/clement3>

¹⁶ Actually, Nee’s teaching was more specifically Keswick, rather than distinctly Calvinist, although Keswick believers tended to be moderately Calvinistic.

Old Testament Examples of Psi Power Not From God

Kelsey cites many Old Testament examples of para-normal powers such as voices and visions, Balaam's prophecy, Joseph's ability to interpret dreams, Daniel as a prophet and seer who headed a guild of soothsayers, the prophetic powers of Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, and other prophets, etc.¹⁷ Space does not permit full response to each of these, but we will respond to a few and mention other significant examples.

Balaam. Balaam was not attuned to some psychic force from within him, even though he was familiar with such forces. Rather, Yahweh "put a word in Balaam's mouth" (Num. 22:28; 23:5, 12, 16). He had revelations from God in spite of his psychic powers, not because of them. In fact, he was intending to use his psi powers of divination, and had been paid for it (Num. 22:7), but he was stopped by the angel of Yahweh, "because your way was contrary [lit. "reckless"] to me" (Num. 22:32). The angel of the Lord revealed to Balaam that the psychic way was contrary to God's way. His eyes were opened to true visions of the heavenly *only* when he ceased "seeking [lit., "encountering"] omens," and the Spirit of the Lord came upon him (Num. 24:2-4). Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he acknowledged that his own psi power was not effective on Israel (Num. 23:7-8, 23).

Samuel. Samuel's powers as a "seer" were not due to tapping into a psychic power or some natural sensitivity to the spirit realm, but rather "the Lord revealed this to Samuel" (lit., "uncovered his ear") (1 Sam. 9:15). Samuel was indeed a "spiritual sensitive," but he was not a spiritual sensitive to the para-normal. Rather he was a spiritual sensitive to the Holy Spirit.

Saul. Saul was initially spiritually sensitive to Yahweh when the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he was changed into another man and prophesied (1 Sam. 10:6-12), but when he did not obey Yahweh fully, he lost that sensitivity (1 Sam. 15:19, 22-23), so that "when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord did not answer him, either by dreams or by Urim or by prophets" (1 Sam. 27:6). So he sought out other para-normal means which were forbidden by Yahweh. In fact, Samuel calls such para-normal powers apart from Yahweh as "rebellion" and "the sin of divination" (1 Sam. 15:23). His original prophetic powers did not come from a naturally-developed psychic force within him, but the Holy Spirit coming upon him.

¹⁷ Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 87-92.

The Medium of Endor. The medium of Endor was accustomed to receiving psychic communication, but was surprised at seeing Samuel (1 Sam. 28:7-14). She was not, in this case, attuned to or tapping into a psychic power within her, but rather a power external to her manifested itself. She had a revelation from God in spite of her psychic powers, not because of them.

Joseph. Regarding the source of *Joseph's power to interpret dreams*, Joseph answers the neutral naturalistic theory by his own words, making it clear that he is not tapping into some psychic force:

- “Interpretations belong to God”—Gen. 40:8
- “I cannot do it [“It is not in me”—KJV], but God will give Pharaoh the answer.”—Gen. 41:16
- “God has revealed. . . . God has shown. . .”—Gen. 41:25, 28

Even Pharaoh himself recognized that the power was not in Joseph innately, but Joseph is “one in whom is the Spirit of God” (Gen. 41:38).

Elijah and Elisha. The Scripture does not attribute the para-normal powers of Elijah and Elisha to an inner force or innate power residing in them. Rather, “the hand of the Lord” was on them (1 Kings 18:46) or “the word of the Lord came to” them (1 Kings 17:2, 8; 18:1; 2 Kings 3:12). The mediumistic psi powers of the prophets of Baal were no match for the supernatural power of Yahweh.

Micaiah and the Supposed Prophets of Yahweh. Scripture demonstrates that not all who claim psi powers from God are really from God. Zedekiah and numerous other prophets were prophesying in the name of Yahweh, but only Micaiah truly represented Yahweh (1 Kings 22:5-25). The others were branded as inspired by deceiving spirits. Applying Sanford’s standards, their gift could “be greatly used in God’s service,” since they were “avoiding séances, Ouija boards and automatic writing.” Contrary to Kelsey, their powers were not “isolated from their religion.” The standards of Sanford and Kelsey fall far short of Yahweh’s standards for true prophetic power.

Zechariah. Zechariah’s prophetic powers did not come from within himself or from being sensitive to some psi force. Rather, Scripture records that his para-normal insight was “through the vision (or, “fear”) of God” (2 Chron. 26:5). The visions that Zechariah experienced were not from being attuned to an innate inner power, but from “a word of the Lord” and an angel of Yahweh (Zech. 1:7-9).

Daniel. Some might point out that Daniel and the magi could have been good or evil. Daniel was indeed classed by King Nebuchadnezzar as one of the magi, one of the magicians who possessed psi powers to be able to identify and interpret dreams (Dan. 1:20). He even made him chief of the magicians (Dan. 2:9). However, Daniel made it clear that his powers did not come from himself or tapping into any psychic power or energy field:

- “No wise man, enchanter, magician or diviner can explain. . .”—Dan. 2:27 (sets himself and God apart from these sources)
- “God is the revealer of mysteries . . .”—Dan. 2:28-29 (not his inner power)
- “*not . . . any wisdom residing in me* more than in another other living man”—Dan. 2:30
- Did not accept money for his power—Dan. 4:17

Nebuchadnezzar himself recognized that there was a huge difference between Daniel and the other magi, saying, “a spirit of the holy gods is in him” (Dan. 4:8, 9, 18; see also 5:11, 14). He acknowledged, “Your God . . . is the revealer of mysteries . . .” (Dan. 2:47). He declared Daniel and his Jewish friends, who were under covenant with Yahweh, as “ten times better than all the magicians and conjurers” (Dan. 1:20). King Belshazzar’s wife, the queen of Babylon, as well as King Darius the Mede, also recognized that Daniel had an “extraordinary spirit” (Dan. 5:12; 6:3, NASB), not just more attuned or advanced as a “spiritual sensitive.” They distinguished Daniel as different from and superior to all other diviners, possessing a divine spirit that none of the other diviners had.

There are clear differences between Yahweh covenantal-sanctioned prophetic seers and seers who receive their revelations and powers from other sources. Yahweh Himself makes it clear that the visions, dreams, oracles, powers, and insights of the prophets did not come from themselves, but from Yahweh alone: “‘Not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit,’ says the Lord [Yahweh] of hosts” (Zechariah 4:6).

New Testament Examples of Psi Power Not From God

Jesus the Psychic Shaman? There is no biblical evidence that Jesus was tapping into some psychic force. He was not a shaman. This is rather a theoretical pre-supposition on Kelsey’s part. Rather, Jesus makes it clear that His powers come from God, not Himself. It was not the exercise of His own will, but the will of His Father (John 6:38). He was not attuned more to the psychic powers within him than most psychics and shamans, but rather attuned perfectly to the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit had conceived Him, dwelt within Him, filled Him, baptized Him. So also we do not tune into some psychic force. It is only in covenant relationship with God through Jesus Christ with the Holy Spirit indwelling us that we have that ability.

Simon the Magician (Sorcerer) and Elymas the Magician (Acts 13). The word for sorcerer or magician is μαγῶδ (or μαγεία, the activity or work of a μαγῶδ), generally meaning “the possessor and use of supernatural knowledge and ability,” which can include ability to predict the future, interpreting dreams, possessor of

secret wisdom,¹⁸ in other words, psi phenomena. There is a clear distinction between the supernatural powers that Simon and Elymas possessed and those that are from the Spirit of God. “The influence of Simon could not be traced to the possession of the genuine πνεῦμα Θεοῦ but only to the use of extradivine powers. The efficacy of these powers is not denied. In fact, Ac. 8 admits the dangerous and influential force of the work of Simon.”¹⁹ The story of Elymas “is designed to show the sharp contrast between Christianity and magic.”²⁰ They may claim to have paranormal powers from God, but they are not from the Holy Spirit.

The Woman with the Spirit of Divination (pneuma pythona—“python spirit”) (Acts 16:16). The python spirit was related to the Delphic oracle. She clearly believed in God (or gods) and demonstrated true clairvoyant psychic powers. However, Paul did not regard her as a “spiritual sensitive” who had perception from God, but rather cast a demon out of her. According to DeArteaga’s understanding of Sanford, she would consider theists as having genuine healing or psychic power from God. If we apply this definition consistently over to New Testament experience, then this woman, a theist from whom Paul cast out a demon, really had her power from God.

Psychic and Occult Materials Burnt at Ephesus (Acts 19:18-19). The word for magic arts here is *perierga*, having “the specific sense of interfering with other people through magical arts, . . . primarily concerned with the realm of the psychic and the occult.”²¹ The believers got rid of anything associated with psi powers.

Sorcery or Witchcraft (Gr., *pharmakeia*). Sorcery can indeed begin with natural experiences in the human psyche as Kelsey suggests, for Paul calls it a work of the flesh or nature (Gal. 5:20). However, Paul does not suggest that people channel and develop that natural power with God’s help, but rather, in strong contrast, asserts that people who use such powers will not inherit the kingdom of God (v. 21).

¹⁸ Gerhard Kittel, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 4:357.

¹⁹ Kittel, 4:358, 359.

²⁰ Kittel, 4:359.

²¹ Colin Brown, ed., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 2:557.

Bewitched Christians. Further, Paul contends that such works of the flesh are contrary to oppose and the Holy Spirit (v. 17). He even indicates that Christians can become bewitched (Gal. 3:1). The Greek word here is *baskaino*, meaning to charm, deceive, or cast a spell. So the Scripture clearly leads people away from any psi activity that could be tied to occult involvement.

Works of Power—From Nature or Spirit? Paul goes on in the same chapter to berate the Galatians as being foolish to think that if they had begun by the Spirit, that they would become perfected by the flesh (some translations render it “nature” or “sinful nature”). (verse 3). Then he writes that God provides the Spirit who works miracles (lit., “works of power”). Para-normal powers in the New Testament church did not come from some tapping into a natural psychic force on a higher level, but from a totally different source—the Spirit of God.

Distinguishing Psychic from the Spirit

Three different New Testament writers, Jude, James and Paul, are all in accord in distinguishing that which is from the Spirit and that which is psychic, or from the soul:

- 1 Corinthians 2:14—“But a natural [Greek, *psychikos*] man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually appraised.” (NASB)
- James 3:15—“This wisdom is not that which comes down from above, but is earthly, natural [*psychikos*], demonic.” (NASB)
- Jude 19—“These are the ones who cause divisions, worldly-minded [*psychikos*], devoid of the Spirit.” (NASB)

For all three of these New Testament writers, that which is *psychikos*—soulish, psychic—is not of the Spirit of God. That which is *psychikos* is to be distinguished from that which is *pneumatikos*, that is, of the Spirit. Jude writes that that which is *psychikos* is devoid of the Spirit. James goes so far as to link *psychikos* with that which is demonic.

Some point to Ephesians 3:20, “according to the power that works within us,” as indicative of psi power within everyone. However, that power is not our own, but the power of the Holy Spirit, and that power does not reside in everyone, but only in believers. Contrary to New Age psychic belief that the divine dwells within every human being, the Apostle Peter indicates that it is only believers in Christ who are “partakers of the divine nature” (2 Peter 1:4).

Spiritual gifts, or gifts of the Spirit, are just that—gifts from the Holy Spirit who indwells the believer in Christ (1 Corinthians 12:7, 11). A person who does not

have the Holy Spirit cannot receive the gifts of the Spirit. Jesus made it clear that the world cannot receive the Holy Spirit (John 14:17). Only a believer in Jesus Christ can receive the Holy Spirit; therefore, only a believer can receive the gifts of the Spirit.

The Evidence of Experience Regarding Psychic Powers

From a Former New Age Psychic

Contrary to the claims of Kelsey, Sanford, DeArtega, and Clement, Sandra Clifton, a Doctor of Ministry graduate of Oral Roberts University and a former TV psychic who was considered a “spiritual sensitive,” explains from her own experience that ESP and psychic powers are not a gift and are not from God. God made it clear to her through Scripture and personal revelation that this was not acceptable to God:

When I was lost, I truly believed that what I did was for the good of mankind. I did not see my professional practices—such as TV appearances and psychic consultations—as sin. Years after I came to the Lord, I reminded Him in prayer that I hadn’t used tarot cards or crystal balls. In other words, I was saying to God, “My style of ‘psychic’ was a cut above the others.” To which He replied in that still, small voice, “Daughter, there is no such thing as gourmet sin.”²²

Again, from her authority of experience and Scripture, she writes of people who have been involved in psychic phenomena, the occult and New Age practices: “They have needed to learn what is acceptable to God and what isn’t, especially if they have been used to activities of the mind that have gone against God, such as mind-reading, fortune-telling, consulting discarnate spirits, and doing incantations. All converts who have been in the occult/New Age or who have been influenced by it in any way need to know that they will need to walk away from their old ways and adapt new ways of living that please Christ and are in Christ.”²³

From a Former Spiritualist

Raphael Gasson, in his book *The Challenging Counterfeit*, tells of his conversion from spiritualism to Christ and identifying such psychic phenomena as counterfeits of the gifts and manifestations of the Spirit, by his own account having ex-

²² Sandra Clifton, *From New Age to New Life* (Lake Mary, FL: Creation House, 2007), 65.

²³ Clifton, 63.

perienced both. Refuting the claim of a former Methodist pastor turned “Christian Spiritualist” that the phenomena of tongues and prophecy on the day of Pentecost and in the Welsh and Pentecostal revivals are examples of psychic power, Gasson avows from his own personal testimony, “the gifts given by the Holy Spirit are wonderfully different from those given by demons—having experienced both!”²⁴

Gasson goes on to say, “Spiritualists claim that the gift of clairvoyance and clairaudience . . . is a natural one that exists in everyone and it only requires developing and instruction to be properly exercised. We consider the exercise of it to be the result of demon control and inspiration, its *modus operandi* to be entirely different from the Divine gift of revelation which leaves the mental faculties untouched and undisturbed.”²⁵

Likewise, regarding psychic healing power Gasson relates, “A few moments of silence will reign throughout the whole congregation who will operate by concentrating on the patient and sending out healing ‘thought rays’ and ‘love rays’ to assist the medium in his task.”²⁶ The spiritualist beliefs and practices sound virtually identical to Sanford’s claim that the Holy Spirit “only increases and develops in us gifts that are already potential to our natures. Some people have natural-born spiritual sensitivity. . . .” Significantly, having been involved deeply in psi phenomena, Gasson is able to discern a clear difference of type and source, whereas Sanford unwittingly sees it only as a matter of degree.

From Contact with Navajo and Korean Shamans

Kelsey cites a Navajo shaman turning away a tornado as a “modern-day example much like Jesus calming of the storm.”²⁷ However, I have personally talked with a Navajo Christian pastor who knows from experience that a Navajo shaman’s power is not from God. The shaman put a curse on him, making him severely sick, but the pastor rebuked it in Jesus’ name. The curse came back on the shaman and he died.

Shamanism is also quite popular in South Korea. I teach South Koreans in doctoral classes at Oral Roberts University. These Koreans who believe in the su-

²⁴ Raphael Gasson, *The Challenging Counterfeit* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1966), 90.

²⁵ Gasson, 92-93.

²⁶ Gasson, p. 61.

²⁷ Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 133.

pernatural power of the Spirit, whether Presbyterian, Methodist, Anglican, Baptist, or Pentecostal, are also especially sensitive to the difference between shamanism and the life of the Spirit, and by no means want to be identified with shamanism.

From Personal Experience

Sanford seems to think that all healing is from God, including metaphysical healing. However, some holistic practices and treatments involve New Age practices and thought, which Sanford and Kelsey seem to condone. Some New Age practices can indeed bring a measure of seemingly health and healing, but at a cost. People can unwittingly succumb to occult or psychic powers by engaging in certain practices, and thus cause more disease and distress in their lives. They may get rid of one problem and find a host of others to take its place.

After a serious surgery I had a couple of years ago, I had unrelenting problems with hiccups. With every hiccup, it felt like someone was stabbing me in the abdomen in the locations of the incisions. I could not get rid of them for hours and could not sleep. I prayed and rebuked the hiccups, but they persisted. The nurses recommended some techniques, but those did not work either.

After nearly three days of this, I prayed, "Lord, I cannot stand this any longer." One nurse asked if I was willing to try some alternative methods. In a kind of stupor from the sedatives, my mind was not clear, and not knowing what she meant, I said in exasperation, "Sure, whatever it takes to get rid of this." So she began to hum and pass her hands over my body without touching me. Even though I could not think clearly, I had enough spiritual awareness to think to myself, "This does not seem right." I prayed silently, even while continuing to hiccup painfully, "Lord, if this is not of You, do not let it affect me," and also prayed in tongues. After several minutes, she said, "I don't understand. This usually works. I don't know why it is not working on your body. It should get rid of your hiccups." I thought to myself, praise God it did not! Eventually, the surgeon gave me a special medicine and the hiccups finally soon subsided.

I had read sometime earlier about the medical community experimenting with therapeutic touch, auras, energy fields, and the like, and the spiritual dangers of this kind of thing.²⁸ The Lord brought that back to my mind even when my mind

²⁸ See Paul C. Reisser, M.D., Dale Mabe, D.O., and Robert Velarde, *Examining Alternative Medicine: An Inside Look at the Benefits and Risks* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 221-233.

could not concentrate, and protected me from what could have been a type of mediumistic psychic transference. It is vital to use only means that are not forbidden in Scriptures. Psychic healing is real, but its source is not God.

Conclusions

The neutral naturalistic theory does not hold up to sound biblical interpretation. Again and again in Scripture, the para-normal powers of those in covenant relationship with God (whether the Old Covenant or New Covenant) are clearly distinguished from other para-normal powers, and do not come from within the person's own nature, but only from the Holy Spirit. Scripture would therefore seem to support one or more (or a combination of) the first three theories mentioned at the beginning of the article: Residue Theory—Humanity was created with para-normal powers in the image of God, but were corrupted, restrained, or short-circuited by the Fall; Lapsogenic Theory (originating in the Fall)—Psi powers were created or released by the Fall; Spiritistic Theory—linkage between the human mind and the consciousness of an extra-dimensional entity (a spirit being)

Regardless of whether one believes that psi powers were natural human abilities corrupted by the Fall of man or abilities released by the Fall or a blend of both, they are made use of by demonic entities, and are not merely neutral powers, therefore are not to be trusted. I would agree with the conclusion of Albrecht and Alexander: "Scripture acknowledges the reality of occult phenomena and parapsychological manifestations, but it does not condone their pursuit and cultivation as a means of knowing God; on the contrary, much of the Biblical testimony emphasizes the futility and the danger of such questionable spiritual activities. . . . The Biblical revelation does not associate occultism and parapsychological occurrences with victory, joy, or absolute truth; instead it identifies the whole syndrome for the most part with humankind's cosmic and temporal dilemma."²⁹

But What about Déjà Vu?

Some cite déjà vu as an example of psi phenomena that most people experience. I personally have had numerous déjà vu experiences, and sought the Lord for an answer about them. God impressed upon me that those déjà vu experiences are not merely tapping into my intra-psychic self; but rather that He was trying to show me something either as a caution or as a confirmation or affirmation. I do not make any more of the experiences than that. To try to pursue their meaning

²⁹ Albrecht Alexander, "Separating Wheat and Chaff," 200-204.

more fully apart from prayer and biblical meditation would be venturing into dangerous territory.

True Spiritual Sensitives

“Spiritual-sensitive” in the Christian sense does not mean having an innate ability, but it means being close to God, being attuned to the Spirit of God, and being obedient to God. Therefore, supernatural gifts and manifestations of the Holy Spirit are not just other terms or another advanced form of psi phenomena. They are to be clearly distinguished from psychic powers.

Lack of Discernment

Sanford has much good, sound teaching on healing and the gifts of the Spirit. However, she fails to discern and heed John’s caution, “Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God; because many false prophets have gone out into the world” (1 John 4:1, NASB). In the schema of Sanford, Kelsey, and Clement, there would seem to be few false prophets, just mostly those who need to be cleaned up, come to a higher level, or use their powers more carefully.

Kelsey does give cautions about the potential for using psi power in inappropriate ways or motive and “less natural methods,” acknowledging, “Experiences of ESP that come through dreams, religious rituals, and meditation have far less dangers than those forced by the use of drugs, trances, or hypnosis.” However, rather than steering people away from psi experiences altogether as do the Apostles Paul and John, he counsels, “If one has become open to psi by these methods [drugs, trances, hypnosis], it is wise to have the guidance of established religious rituals in using the abilities.”³⁰ Ignoring many warnings in Scripture, he even accepts mediumship as a legitimate Christian means, claiming that the noted psychic Edgar Cayce was “a dedicated Christian and authentic medium” who “had the ability to psychically contact a person in poor health, diagnose the malady, and accurately prescribe remedies.”³¹

Kelsey lacks discernment regarding this, for the Apostle John in Revelation 21:9 uses the same term *pharmakeia* as Paul used in Galatians 5:20, indicating that such practices of magical arts need to be repented of, not guided by religious

³⁰ Kelsey, *The Christian and the Supernatural*, 118-119.

³¹ Kelsey, *Transcend*, 31.

rituals. Kelsey fails to counsel repentance of involvement in these matters, thus unwittingly exposing people to the possible demonic bondage.

The chart at the end of this article distinguishes the characteristics of psychic power vs. supernatural power of the Spirit.³² This is only a sampling of distinguishing between psychic powers and para-normal powers of the Spirit. Space limitations of this article do not permit going into detail in these matters. I do hope to write a book some day on discerning true manifestations and gifts from God from psychic, fleshly, and demonic counterfeits.

Characteristics of Psychic Power

1. Appeals to developing mental powers apart from the Holy Spirit.
2. Must be *developed* by concentration, self discipline, exertion of one's self.
3. Causes person to seek within himself.
4. Glorifies man.
5. Often uses a medium or non-scriptural means.
6. Emphasis is upon control of self or others.
7. Can be manifested by a person who has not been born anew by the Holy Spirit.
8. May demonstrate secular good works or attitudes without influence of God.
9. Effects may be temporary and/or partial.

Characteristics of Power of the Spirit

1. Transforms by *renewing* the mind.
2. Is *appropriated* by faith and obedience to *God*.
3. Causes person to seek God.
4. Glorifies God.
5. Is initiated by the Holy Spirit and uses means prescribed solely by Scripture.
6. Emphasis is upon control by God alone.
7. Can be manifested only by a believer in Jesus Christ who has the Holy Spirit dwelling within him.
8. Demonstrates genuine fruit of the Spirit.
9. Effects are transforming spiritually.



³² Adapted from my lecture notes in courses I teach on Divine Healing and Spiritual Warfare in the Doctor of Ministry program at Oral Roberts University.

Fra pinsevern eller karismatiker til pinsekarismatiker

Norsk pinsekristendom og karismatisk fornyelse fra 1980-årene og fram til idag

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

La meg innlede med å si at mye av det jeg har fått med meg fra karismatikkens verden siden 1990-tallet er observert i sidespeilet og at denne artikkelen derfor ideelt sett burde ha vært skrevet av en person 15-20 år yngre enn meg selv. Dette er for øvrig ingen objektiv fagartikkel, og i flere passasjer forlater jeg bevisst rollen som distansert betrakter og henvender meg som karismatisk kristen til medkarismatiske lesere. Uansett, vi er nok flere som kan slutte oss til den norske teologen Lars Råmunddals innrømmelse, nemlig at de mange pinserelevante og karismatisk inspirerte miljøer, ikke minst på verdensbasis, representerer “en teologisk og erfaringsmessig verden som kan virke uoversiktlig og rotete.”¹ Mangel på oversikt blir på ingen måte bedre gjennom statistiker David B. Barretts skjelling mellom kategoriene ‘pentecostal’, ‘charismatic’ og ‘neo-charismatic’. I et etter mitt skjønn klønete forsøk på å gjøre dette kristensegmentet mer sofistikert enn hva berettiget er, opererer han i enkelte sammenhenger med omlag 100 ulike kategoriseringer, deriblant ‘hidden Buddhist neocharismatics’.² Hans unødvendige forvanskninger til tross, det i fenomenologisk forstand karismatiske kristensegmentet, i Norge som i mange andre land forøvrig, synes i utgangspunktet

¹ Lars Råmunddal, “Tidsskriftet Refleks.” <http://www.refleks-publishing.com/no/tidsskrift/index.htm>. Nedlastet 25. april 2009.

² Jfr. *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Zondervan) s. 289. Tilsvarende opererer han med ‘Hidden Hindu neocharismatics’, ‘Hidden Muslim neocharismatics’, ‘Hidden Jewish neocharismatics’ og ‘Hidden other-religionist neocharismatics’ (som Barrett, ‘hidden’ til tross, likefullt hevder å ha kartlagt det numeriske omfanget av). Jeg antar at alle disse er konkretiseringer av kategori 59 (‘Hidden non-Christian believers in Christ’), hvilket i så fall må bety at flere av hans kategoriseringer delvis overlapper hverandre. Ifølge Barrett var det i 2002 70 742 pinsevenner, 1 031 297 karismatikere og 146, 961 såkalt ‘neo-karismatikere’ i Norge, totalt sett i underkant av 1,2 millioner. Et riktigere anslag ville vel være rundt 50 000. Idet Barrett adderte tilsvarende oppblåste tall for verdens øvrige nasjoner kom han fram til et tall i overkant av en halv milliard på verdensbasis. Dette anslaget er selvfølgelig like upålitelig som hans tallmateriale for Norge.

problematisk å komme til rette med rent begrepsmessig. Mange nåværende pinsevenner hevder for eksempel om seg selv at de er 'karismatikere' eller eventuelt 'pinsekarismatikere'. Hva har skjedd blant norske pinsevenner og karismatikere i løpet av de siste 20-30 år som gjør at den tradisjonelle skjelningen mellom 'pinsevenn' og 'karismatiker' ikke lenger synes hensiktsmessig? Dette er ett av spørsmålene jeg ønsker å gi mitt bidrag til å få belyst gjennom denne artikkelen.³

Tradisjonelt sett har den karismatiske, eller neo-pentekostale, fornyelsesbevegelsen blitt identifisert som en i fenomenologisk forstand 'pinsebevegelse' utenfor de tradisjonelle pinesamfunn, det vil si de trossamfunn og gruppesegmenter som står i et historisk kontinuitetsforhold til amerikansk pinsebevegelses tilblivelse i Topeka, Kansas i 1901.⁴ Til tross for at en rekke enkeltpersoner utenfor tradisjonell amerikansk pinesammenheng fikk del i pinsevennenes fromhetsytringer på 1940- og 50-tallet, identifiseres den karismatiske fornyelses tilblivelse til kretsen rundt episkopalforkynner Dennis Bennett i Van Nuys, California i 1959-60. Fornyelsesbevegelsen berørte snart ikke bare de toneangivende protestantiske kirkesamfunn, men fra og med 1967 den romersk-katolske kirke og tidlig på 1970-tallet også den ortodokse kirke.⁵

Parallelt med den karismatiske fornyelses vekst innen de historiske kirkesamfunn, ble man på slutten av 1970- og begynnelsen av 1980-tallet også vitne til en konfesjonell nydannelse, nemlig lokalmenigheter og nettverk av lokalmenigheter som i fenomenologisk forstand var karismatiske, men ikke lot seg innlemme verken i et organisert pinesamfunn eller et allerede-eksisterende ikke-pentekostalt trossamfunn. Mens det tidligere hadde vært vanlig å skjelne mellom pinsevenner og karismatikere ved å si at sistnevnte representerte en 'pinsebevegelse' innenfor de ikke-pentekostale trossamfunn, ble 'pentecostal' og 'charismatic' av mange mer og mer ansett som synonyme benevelser. Over 300 lokalmenigheter dannet i 1979 the National Leadership Conference på forkynner Ken Sumralls initiativ. Tre år senere dannet Larry Tomczak og C.J. Mahaney People of Destiny International. Denne sammenslutningen hadde nær forbindelse med 'Bob' Weiners Maranatha Campus Ministries, International. Felles for alle tre sammenslutningene

³ Pinsebevegelsen som sådan er her kun interessant gjennom og på grunn av sin kontakt og interaksjon med karismatiske ledere. Denne artikkelen søker ikke å skrive pinsebevegelsens historikk de siste 20-30 år. Heller ikke har jeg ambisjoner om å favne alle miljøsegmenter som har gjort seg gjeldende innen en norsk karismatisk kontekst.

⁴ For en nærmere presentasjon av amerikansk pinsebevegelsens historikk, se Geir Lie, "Pinsebevegelsen i USA fram til omlag 1920 – et historisk riss." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004) s. 2-18.

⁵ Geir Lie, "Den karismatiske bevegelse i USA – et historisk riss." *Refleks* 4-1 (2005) s. 2-11.

var at de så for seg en gjenopprettelse av det nytestamentlige menighetsideal hvor spesielt apostel- og profetutrustningen igjen ville komme til sin rett. En beslektet tenkning fant man i Fellowship of Covenant Ministries and Conferences, grunnlagt av Charles V. Simpson. På 1980-tallet ble også the International Communion of Charismatic Churches etablert med John Meares og Earl Paulk som biskoper i USA. Omtrent samtidig (1986) tok helbredelsesforkynner Oral Roberts initiativ til opprettelsen av Charismatic Bible Ministries. Også Vineyardbevegelsen fikk et kraftig oppsving i 1980-årene.

Mens den karismatiske bevegelse til å begynne med fikk stor medieoppmerksomhet i USA fordi den representerte noe helt nytt (idet pinsebevegelsen, som til å begynne med representerte en sosio-økonomisk underklasse, opererte i stor grad av religiøs isolasjon til andre konfesjonsdannelser), var dette ikke tilfelle i Norge. Både Det norske Misjonsforbund og Det norske Baptistsamfunn stilte seg i utgangspunktet positive til pinsebevegelsens erfaringsmessige anliggende, idet pinsegrunnlegger T.B. Barratt vendte tilbake til Norge i desember 1906. I begge trossamfunn har man alltid hatt mennesker som i møtesammenheng frembar både tungetale, tydning og profetisk tale. I flere menigheter preget dette virksomheten i sterk grad. Den karismatiske bevegelse representerte i så måte lite nytt. Annerledes stilte det seg for både Frelsesarméen og Metodistkirken. Organisatorisk sett var det likefullt primært innen Den norske Kirke at man på begynnelsen av 1970-tallet ble vitne til en synlig karismatisk *bevegelse*. Hans-Jacob Frøen var direkte ansvarlig for en av disse (Agape) og indirekte involvert i etableringen av en annen (Ungdom i Oppdrag), mens Hans Christian Liers karismatiske engasjement etter hvert munnet ut i organisasjonen Oase.⁶

Pinsevenners syn på karismatikere

Pinsevenner flest synes i liten grad å ha merket seg – og langt mindre mottatt impulser fra - den karismatiske fornyelse.⁷ Selvsagt fantes det individuelle unntak. Pinseforkynner Oddvar Nilsen, for eksempel, oversatte i 1970 Michael Harpers bok *As at the beginning* og i 1972 Dennis Bennetts bok *Nine o' clock in the*

⁶ Geir Lie, "Norsk karismatisk fornyelse – en kortfattet historikk." *Refleks 7-1* (2008) s. 63-77.

⁷ Dette til tross, under pinsebevegelsens predikantkonferanse i 1971 tok forkynner Oddvar Nilsen opp den karismatiske bevegelse som eget emne, "og i samtalen etterpå ble det slått fast at pinsevennene i Norge hilser denne vekkelsen velkommen, for 'ingen har monopol på Åndens gaver.' Dette ble slått fast, samtidig som det ble advart mot fremmede spor." (Terje Hegertun, "Den karismatiske vekkelsen." *Korsets Seier* 4. juni 1983 s. 11.)

morning til norsk.⁸ Nilsen bad forøvrig med metodistpastor Harald Dysjeland til 'åndsdåp' i sistnevntes stue i forbindelse med fellesmøtene i Larvik på vinteren 1971.⁹ En annen pinseforkynner, David Østby, som var forstander i Sarpsborg, introduserte i 1969 byens metodistforstander Harald Wessel Nørberg for John Sherrills bok om den karismatiske fornyelsen i USA, *De taler med andre tunger*. Også denne oversettelsen var utgitt på pinsevennernes Filadelfiaforlaget. Boken skapte en lengsel etter en dypere erfaring av Guds nærvær og kraft til tjeneste, og Østby betydde mye for Nørberg i denne perioden. Sistnevntes 'åndsdåpsopplevelse' skjedde likevel i enerom 15. oktober 1970.

Om enkelte pinseforkynnere til å begynne med stilte seg åpen overfor den karismatiske fornyelsesbevegelsen, reagerte flere av de mer sindige bibellærerne raskt på bevegelsens angivelige lærelikegyldighet. Det ble dessuten uttrykt frykt for at kontakt med katolsk-karismatikere ville kunne føre til negativ læreutvikling.¹⁰ Også protestantiske karismatikertroende kunne man, til tider, iallfall, trekke på smilebåndet av fordi de i enfoldig naivitet knapt evnet å skjelne mellom Åndens manifestasjoner og menneskelig føleri. Ikke minst reagerte man på enkelte karismatikeres iver hvor de endog skulle "hjelp Gud og å lære mennesker å tale i tunger."¹¹

Karismatikeres syn på pinsevenner

Om norske pinsevenner hadde et ambivalent forhold til den gryende karismatiske bevegelse, skal det heller ikke underslås at norske karismatikere kunne styre sin begeistring overfor pinsevennene igjen. Sogneprest Thor Hesselberg (f. 1947), som hadde opplevd en karismatisk fornyelse rundt 1970, det vil si tre år etter at han påbegynte teologistudiet ved Menighetsfakultetet i Oslo, var også i etterkant av sin karismatiske erfaring reservert i forhold til pinsevennernes åndsdåpsforkynnelse. Selv opplevde han denne som lovisk. Vektleggingen av at

⁸ Geir Lie, *Plymouthbrødrene, hellighetsbevegelsen, pinsebevegelsen og moderne karismatik: En bibliografisk introduksjon* (Oslo: REFLEKS-Publishing, 2005) s. 10, 40. Året etter oversatte Oddvar Tegnander enda en bok av Harper, mens Nilsen oversatte en ytterligere av samme forfatter i 1973.

⁹ Harald Dysjeland, intervju, datert 13. februar 1998.

¹⁰ Thoralf Gilbrant, *Pinsebevegelsens svar til Aril Edvardsen* (Oslo: Eget forlag [1977]) s. 126ff. Ifølge Ivar Gulbrandsens referat fra formiddagssesjonen under norske pinsevenners predikantkonferanse 3. februar 1971 hevdet for øvrig Oddvar Nilsen at "Noen [karismatikere] går til svært tvilsomme ytterpunkter og heller til spiritisme."

¹¹ Ivar Gulbrandsen, referat av Oddvar Nilsens innledning om Den karismatiske vekkelse under norske pinsevenners predikantmøte 3. februar 1971 (formiddagssesjonen).

kynnelse. Selv opplevde han denne som lovisk. Vektleggingen av at man 'skulle' bli døpt med Den Hellige Ånd og få en bevisst erfaring av Ånden som resulterte i at man talte i tunger, førte gjerne til at man begynte å søke en *opplevelse* som angivelig gav seg tilkjenne på en spesiell måte. Så lenge tilhøreren ikke hadde del i denne erfaringen (tungetale), ble det gjerne noe man ikke strakk til overfor.¹² Også Jan Gossner, som ble introdusert for den karismatiske fornyelsen litt senere enn Hesselberg, karakteriserer seg selv som i utgangspunktet "skeptisk" til pinsebevegelsen.¹³ Tilsvarende gjaldt for Oddvar Søvik. Tidlig i løpet av teologistudiene ved Menighetsfakultetet (som på dette tidspunkt var lokalisert i St. Olavs gate i Oslo sentrum) hadde han nærmest forvillet seg inn på et møte med Aage Samuelsen i Turnhallen. Dette ble en skrekkopplevelse hvor folk talte høyt i tunger i munnen på hverandre. Da han så 18. februar 1970 kom over *Morgenpostens* oppslag om to statskirkeprester som 'talte i tunger', var hans første tanke: "Skal vi nå få det samme uvesenet inn i Den norske Kirke? Dette må gjerne pinsevevnenne få ha for seg selv!"¹⁴ Også Jens-Petter Jørgensen, formann i den luthersk-karismatiske Oasekomiteén i perioden 1980-85, var seg umiddelbart bevisst en skarp disassosiering til pinsevevnenne. Idet han talte i tunger for første gang slo det ham at han "ikke vil[le] bruke denne tungemålgaven til å skrike ut et eller annet på møter i fremtiden." Han hadde nemlig hatt "noen vonde opplevelser fra pinsevevnmøter med meget høyt lydnivå." "De opplevelsene," fortsatte han, "kunne ha vaksinert meg mot nådegaver og tungetale for livstid."¹⁵

Kristen-norge er imidlertid et lite 'land', og fordommer blir mindre når troende møtes på tvers av konfesjonsgrensene. Jens-Petter Jørgensen uttalte i 1987: "Jeg vet at flere Oase-ledere har hatt kontakt med pinseforstandere på det personlige plan, og noen av dem har også talt i pinsemenigheter. Jan Gossner er en av dem som i det stille har vært åpen for en slik kontakt."¹⁶ Motsatt sett deltok pinsevevnen Frank Matre med forkynnelse under Oase-dager for prester og predikanter i Den norske Kirke, som ble avholdt på Stovner (Oslo) i 1986. En av møtedeltakerne, Jan-Aage Torp (daværende pinseforstander i Salem, Oslo), hevdet i den anledning: "Her på Oase opplever jeg at de har en langt videre horisont – på et trygt,

¹² Thor Hesselberg, intervju, datert 25. februar 1998.

¹³ Jan Gossner, intervju, datert 13. august 1998.

¹⁴ Oddvar Søvik, intervju, 13. august 1998.

¹⁵ Jens-Petter Jørgensen, *Forandring* (Oslo: Nye Luther Forlag, 1989) s. 46-47.

¹⁶ Rolf Erik Janøy, "Da barnebarna kom på besøk." *Hvetekornet*, februar 1987 s. 22.

bibelsk grunnlag – enn det jeg opplever i den bevegelsen jeg tilhører.”¹⁷ Og under en helg i desember 1986 innbød pinsemenigheten Filadelfia, Oslo Oaseledere til forelesningssamlinger og paneldebatt. Invitasjonen var delvis foranlediget av norsk pinsebevegelses 80-års jubileum, norsk karismatisk bevegelses 25-års jubileum og Oasebevegelsens 10-års jubileum.¹⁸ Tidligere samme året, under pinsevennernes predikantkonferanse, hadde den 32-år gamle pinseforkynneren Egil Svartdahl foreslått at man burde invitere daværende Oaseleder Kjell Petter Dahl til neste års konferanse. Det ble endog nedfelt en erklæring om at man “hilser Oasebevegelsen og andre positive, åndelige strømninger innen de forskjellige trossamfunn Guds velsignelse.” Både Kjell Petter Dahl og Jens-Petter Jørgensen møtte under predikantkonferansen i 1987, og i sin forkynnelse slo Dahl fast at “Vi er barn av pinsebevegelsen” og “Luthersk fornyelsesbevegelse og Pinsebevegelsen har mye å lære av hverandre og inspirere hverandre med.”

Ny fase innen norsk karismatisk bevegelse med fokus på menighetsbygging

I 1980-årene ble man i Norge vitne til en konfesjonell nydannelse, idet en rekke selvstendige trosmenigheter raskt dukket opp. Til tross for fravær av organisatorisk overbygning var det åpenbart at mange av menighetsmedlemmene i de ulike menighetene anså seg selv i identifikasjonsfellesskap med hverandre og med lignende lokalmenigheter rundt omkring.¹⁹

I forkant av de første norske trosmenighetenes etablering i 1985, søkte det amerikanske pinsesamfunnet International Church of the Foursquare Gospel å slå rot i Europa, og man tok mål av seg om å etablere minst én Foursquare-menighet i alle

¹⁷ “Levende tjenere levende menigheter.” *Hvetekornet*, mars 1986 s. 61.

¹⁸ Magne Vågnes, “Lik erfaring, ulik lære.” *Hvetekornet*, februar 1987 s. 20.

¹⁹ Geir Lie, “Trosbevegelsen i Norge – en historisk gjennomgang.” *Refleks* 7-1 (2008) s. 111-151. Parallelt med oppblomstringen av norske trosmenigheter dukket det også opp en rekke kritiske bøker. Blant disse kan nevnes Anders Bergem, *Himmelen på forskudd?* (1987); Tormod Engelsviken og Kjell Olav Sannes, *Min hjelp kommer fra Herren* (1990); Geir Harald Johannesen, *Vekkelse eller villfarelse?* (1991); Ingrid Vad Nilsen, Olav Fykse Tveit og Einar Tjelle, *Kristent fellesskap?* (1995); Sven Reichmann, *Det er ikke fra Gud alt som glimrer* (1990); Torbjørn Swartling, *Tankekontroll: trosbevegelsen slik jeg opplevde den* (1993); Helga Aarnes og Kristin Fosheim, *Stener for brød* (1993). En rekke studenter ved Menighetsfakultetet valgte dessuten å skrive spesialavhandling, eventuelt hovedfagsoppgave, om trosbevegelsen. De fleste av titlene er opplistet i Geir Lie, *Plymouthbrødrene, hellighetsbevegelsen, pinsebevegelsen og moderne karismatikk. En bibliografisk introduksjon* (Oslo: Refleks-Publishing, 2005) s. 123-130.

vesteuropiske land innen 1990. Amerikaneren Greg Bretz ble i 1982 utsendt fra Jack Hayfords Foursquare-menighet i Van Nuys, California for å plante menighet i Norge. Sammen med sin norske kone slo han seg ned i Stathelle hvor Foursquare-menigheten Livets Vann snart så dagens lys. Steve og Leslie Ranck, også disse utsendt fra Hayfords menighet i Van Nuys, etablerte dessuten menigheten Stavanger Foursquare Ministries. Også i Kragerø og Grimstad ble det startet virksomhet, selv om Foursquare i dag ikke lenger er representert verken i disse to byene eller i Stavanger. Heller ikke Foursquares menighetsbyggende arbeid i Stjørdal skulle bære langvarig frukt. I dag er Foursquare representert i Norge med menighet i Stathelle, Kristiansand og Asker. Flere av de toneangivende forkynnerne i Norge har karismatisk bakgrunn, selv om trossamfunnet som sådan med rette defineres som et pinesamfunn.²⁰

Også Vineyardbevegelsen, som etablerte seg med norske menigheter fra 1992 av, søkte å få et brohode inn i Norge med Kenn Gulliksen allerede i 1982. Og i 1986 inviterte Ungdom i Oppdrag den amerikanske Vineyardforkynneren Bob McGee til Norge, og like deretter kollegene Andy Park og Jeff Kirby.²¹

Tradisjonell norsk pinsebevegelse, derimot, var lite opptatt av menighetsplanting. Tvert imot opplevde man Foursquarebevegelsens initiativ i Norge som en trussel og tilskrev bevegelsens hovedkvarter i Los Angeles hvor man (tilsvarende Det norske Misjonsforbund) stilte seg spørrende til berettigelsen av et nytt pinesamfunn i Norge. Allerede i 1970 hadde for øvrig Aril Edvardsen tatt et til dels skarpt oppgjør med pinsevennenes motstand mot "berettigelsen av flere (pinse-) menigheter i en by."²² Vi har imidlertid sett at pinse- og karismatikkforkynnere i løpet av 1980-årene hadde begynt å møtes, både på lokalplan og i større samlinger tilsvarende pinsevennenes predikantkonferanse eller Oasestevner. Især fra 1990-

²⁰ Geir Lie, "Foursquare på norsk. En historisk og teologisk kontekstplassering." *Baptist* nr. 1 1999 s. 3-18.

²¹ Geir Lie, "Vineyardbevegelsen i USA og Norge – en kortfattet historikk." *Fast Grunn* nr 1 1999 s. 45-52.

²² Aril Edvardsen, *Pionervirke og menighetsplanting* (Kvinesdal: Logos, 1970) s. 12. Edvardsen skriver dessuten på s. 14 i samme bok: "Den største hindring for å nå de mange drabantbyer og nybyggerstrøk, er pinsevennenes forunderlige syn på sentralisering. Dette med å bygge menigheter rundt om i byene, strategisk fordelt, har ennå ikke blitt oppdaget av pinsevennene i Norge, selv om det gjøres av pinsevenner over hele verden. Den norske pinsebevegelse sover tungt i denne sak. I de to byer i Norge hvor det idag finnes to eller flere pinsemenigheter, har ikke dette skjedd fordi man hadde syn for menighetsplanting på strategiske steder i byen."

tallet ble det dessuten etablert ytterligere arenaer for kontakt. Dette vil vi i det etterfølgende se nærmere på.

Både pinsevenner og karismatikere hadde ikke minst latt seg fascinere av sørkoreaneren Yonggi Chos Full Gospel Church i Seoul, som allerede i 1975 var verdens største pinsemenighet med over 25 000 medlemmer og som i dag har en medlemsmasse på over 800 000. I 1980 kom Cho for første gang til Sarons Dal og forkynte under et kirkevekstseminar. I etterkant av dette ble både Aril Edvardsen og Hans Bratterud medlemmer av Church Growth International, stiftet på Chos initiativ, men av hans amerikanske medarbeider John Hurston. Stiftelsen hadde 15-20 medlemmer. Hver av disse representerte større eller mindre organisasjoner på sine hjemsteder. Church Growth International arrangerte større konferanser rundt om i verden, blant annet i Oslo i 1983, hvor 15-20 norske forkynnere medvirket.

Bratterud hadde i 1980 etablert den frittstående menigheten Oslo Fullevangeliske Kirke, og medarbeideren Sigfred Rafoss tok etter hvert praktisk ansvar for etableringen av en menighetsbibelskole, som fikk navnet Norsk Kirkevekstinstitutt (utvilsomt inspirert av Chos tanker om menighetsvekst). Bratteruds menighet var den første karismatiske menigheten i Norge, nest etter Oasen, Fyllingsdalen, og selv om førstnevnte ble lagt ned i 1994, ble Bratterud trendsetter, idet han som en av de første i Norge tok et synlig oppgjør med tidligere karismatisk praksis om å forbli innen sitt opprinnelige trossamfunn utfra intensjonen om å formidle karismatisk fornyelse innad. Det faktum at Bratteruds menighet tiltrakk seg både pinsevenner og karismatikere som ikke lenger var fornøyde med punktuelle fornyelseserfaringer på stevner og konferanser, kan ha forberedt både pinse- og karismatikkforkynnere på en ideologisk kursendring hva angår berettigelsen av å etablere frittstående karismatiske menigheter.

Tverrkirkelige kontaktpunkt med fokus på menighetsplantning og vekst

Dawn Norge, en avlegger av Dawn Ministries, er et kristent nettverk av forkynnere som ivrer for menighetsplantning og menighetsvekst. Som viktig arena for interaksjon og kryssfertilisering av ideer (til tross for at få pinsevenner har vært aktive innen Dawn) fortjener virksomheten en kortfattet presentasjon. Forretningsmannen Olav Råmunddal var katalysator for arbeidets etablering i Norge, og daværende leder innen Ungdom i Oppdrag, Alv Magnus, ble leder for den nasjonale Dawn-komiteén, idet denne ble dannet i oktober 1993.

Dawn er ikke et spesifikt karismatisk nettverk, selv om en rekke av medlemmene representerer karismatiske menigheter og fløyer. I styret sitter blant andre Terje Dahle (Kristent Fellesskap / Kristent Nettverk), Andreas Norlid (Ungdom i Oppdrag) og Øystein Gjermø (Pinsebevegelsen). Den første nasjonale Dawn-konferansen ble avholdt i 1996 og fikk bred medieoppmærksomhet, idet davæ-

rende biskop Bjørn Bue og trosforkynneren Åge Åleskjær var blant dem som stod som innbydere. Trosbevegelsen var hittil blitt fremstilt i kristen media i lite flatterende vendinger. I denne sammenheng bør kanskje Ingrid Vad Nilsen, Olav Fykse Tveit og Einar Tjelles bok, *Kristent fellesskap?* med undertittelen *Hvordan menigheter i Den norske kirke kan møte “kristen senter” og “trosbevegelsen” – en økumenisk utfordring* trekkes fram. Boken ble nemlig utgitt av Mellomkirkelig Råd i 1995. Åleskjærs deltakelse på Dawnkonferansen i 1996 representerte på mange måter et gjennombrudd for ham selv innen det bredere norske kirkeliv. Han fikk nå mer aksept i økumeniske fora, og menigheten Oslo Kristne Senter gikk inn i Norges Frikirkeråd i mars 2000. Menigheten ble raskt etterfulgt av trosmenighetene Oppdal Kristne Senter og Karisma Senter (Stavanger). Det vil neppe være feil å si at Dawn Norge har fungert som en viktig møteplass mellom blant andre norske trosforkynnere og andre karismatikere.²³

Den amerikanske baptistforstanderen og grunnleggeren av menigheten *Saddleback Valley Community Church* i Orange County, California, Richard Duane Warren (f. 1954), har riktignok ikke inspirert til konkrete menighetsnettverk i Norge, selv om det midt på 1990-tallet var etablert minst 25 dattermenigheter av Saddleback.²⁴ Sannsynligvis er de fleste av disse lokalisert i USA. Saddlebackmenigheten forklarer sin numeriske suksess med en møte- og gudstjenesteform som er spesielt tilrettelagt for kirkefremmede. Warrens bok *The Purpose-Driven Church* (1995), utgitt på norsk i 1997 under tittelen *Målrettet menighet*, omtales i begeistrede ordelag på baksidcoveret av pinsevennene Aril og Egil Svartdahl, trosforkynner Åge Åleskjær og av karismatikernes Martin Cave og Olav Garcia dePresno. Egil Svartdahl skriver blant annet at dette “er den desidert beste boken jeg har lest om menighetsbygging.”

²³ I intervju med Marie Helene Grønneng (“Bygger ikke sitt eget byggverk, men Guds rike”) i bladet *Mot Målet* (nr. 2 2009 s. 6-9) sier tidligere Ungdom i Oppdrag-leder Alv Magnus: “Gjennom [Dawn-konferansen] ble det stuerent å starte nye fellesskap. De som før hadde prøvd å starte nye menigheter, var blitt møtt med mye skepsis. [...] Konferansen fikk et anerkjennende stempel ved at mange sentrale aktører innenfor norsk kirkeliv var samlet på samme arena; fra statskirkelige biskoper på den ene siden til karismatiske pastorer på den andre. Det var et stort øyeblikk da biskop Bjørn Bue rakte Åge Åleskjær hånden.” Allerede i 1995 ble dog Oslo Kristne Senter, Karisma Senter i Stavanger og Troens Liv i Skien antatt som medlemmer i Frikirkelig Studieforbund. (Linda Helén Haukland, “Trosmenigheter inn i Frikirkelig Studieforbund.” *Nyhets Magazinet*, april 1995 s. 10. Samme året talte endog Åge Åleskjær på baptistenes predikantkonferanse.

²⁴ Rick Warren, *Målrettet menighet. Vekst uten å gå på akkord med budskap og oppdrag* (Skjetten: Rex, 1997) s. 55. Den norske tittelen er oversatt fra originalutgaven *The Purpose-Driven Church* (Zondervan, 1995).

Vi ser altså at det, især fra 1990-tallet av, er blitt etablert ulike arenaer hvor blant andre pinsevenner og karismatikere har stiftet nærmere bekjentskap med hverandre.²⁵ I 1998 ble det endog arrangert en Skandinavisk Vekkelseskonferanse i Oslo Kristne Senters lokaler hvor predikantene Aril Edvardsen, Thoralf Gilbrandt, Åge Åleskjær, Enevald Flåten og Ulf Ekman stod på samme talerstol.²⁶ Det er vanskelig å forklare forsoningen mellom norsk pinsebevegelse og Aril Edvardsen i Sarons Dal, samt mellom norsk pinsebevegelse og trosbevegelsen løsevret fra konferansen i 1998. Også Ulf Ekmans senere nedslagsfelt innen norsk pinsebevegelse må sees i sammenheng med vekkelseskonferansen i 1998. Denne, som de ulike fellesarenaer navngitt tidligere i denne artikkelen, synes delvis foranlediget av en felles uro over liberaliseringstendensene innen etablert norsk kirkeliv, hvilket innenfor denne bibelkonservative fløyen kan ha virket økumenisk sett konsoliderende. Man synes også å ha møttes i en felles anerkjennelse av fravær av tallmessig framgang, samt i en felles 'nød' for vekkelse og numerisk tilvekst.

²⁵ Willow Creek Norge er ifølge virksomhetens hjemmeside et annet eksempel på et "tverrkirkelig ressurscenter som ønsker å hjelpe norske menigheter og forsamlinger til å nå nye mennesker med evangeliet." Mye av inspirasjonen har de hentet fra Bill Hybels Willow Creek Community Church i Chicago som, tilsvarende Richard Warrens Saddleback-nettverk, ivrer for en kristen møtekultur tilrettelagt for kirkefremmede. Deres varemerke er 'seeker sensitivity'-møter. Hybels har besøkt Norge ved flere anledninger, og både pinse- og karismatikkforkynnere har latt seg inspirere av ham og har deltatt på Willow Creek Norges konferanser, samt nyttiggjort seg av deres ressursmateriell. I denne sammenheng bør også tyskeren Christian Schwarz, som leder Naturlig Menighetsutvikling på verdensbasis (om lag 70 land), nevnes. I 1998 kontaktet han den norske religionssosiologen Ommund Rolfsen med forespørsel om denne ville bli nasjonal partner for stiftelsen K-vekst. Sistnevnte er et firma som gir tilbud om menighetsundersøkelse, bøker og veiledning. Siden 1999 har en rekke norske pinsemenigheter søkt veiledning gjennom K-vekst. Det synes rimelig å hevde at det var i etterkant av K-veksts etablering i 1998 at norske pinsevenner begynte å vise synlig interesse for menighetsplanting. Rolfsen var for øvrig med i ledelsen av Dawn Norge og illustrerer i så måte fravær av vannrette skott mellom de ulike menighetsplantingsnettverkene. Rolfsen har endog sittet i styret for Norsk Kirkevekstforum, en stiftelse som riktignok ikke synes å hatt nevneverdig innflytelse på verken pinsevenner eller karismatikere (selv om også den karismatiske forkynneren Reidar Paulsen var med her).

²⁶ Anne Gustavsen, "Isbryter," Korsets Seier, 21. november 1998. http://k-s.no/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=155394&Itemid=74, nedlastet 10. mai 2009.

Fokus på lederskap

Den opprinnelige karismatiske bevegelse var en grasrotbevegelse innen de historiske kirkesamfunn. Den karismatiske erfaring som sådan stod i fokus, og skrift-avsnittet i Joel 3:1-2 syntes å legitimere en *demokratisering av Ånden* (jfr. skrift-avsnittets referanse til Åndsutgydelse “over alt kjød”, inklusiv “træller” og “trællkvinner”) hvor skillet mellom predikant og forsamling ble nedtonet. Omreisende forkynnere underviste ikke først og fremst, men vitnet om sin egen karismatiske erfaring, og eventuelt om ‘det Gud gjorde’ innenfor deres egen konfesjonelle sammenheng. Daværende (1984) Oaseleder Jens-Petter Jørgensen skrev i den anledning med referanse primært til den karismatiske bevegelse i Storbritannia:

Selv om man helt fra begynnelsen av kom sammen i grupper til bønn og oppbygelse, stod den personlige fornyelsen i fokus for forkynnelse og praksis i sekstiårene. Først i 1970-årene begynte man å beskjefte seg med spørsmålet hvordan den karismatiske fornyelsen en selv hadde fått del i skulle få gjennomslag i ens egen lokalmenighet.²⁷

Også *pinsebevegelsen*, iallfall i Norge, har hatt et forholdsvis egalitært preg, selv om både Barratt og flere av hans etterfølgere nok identifiserte seg med en slags borgerklasse, i motsetning til menigheten for øvrig som så å si eksklusivt ble rekruttert fra de laverestående sosiale lag. Gjennom ‘frie vitnesbyrd’ har like fullt arbeiderklassemedlemmene hatt medinnflytelse i møtene. Tilsvarende har tungetale, tydning og profeti fungert som hierarkisk utjevning mellom predikant og menighet for øvrig. Tor Edvin Dahl og John-Willy Rudolph konkretiserer:

Under prekenen kan det skje ting som kanskje virker overraskende på den utenforstående. Predikanten blir stanset midt i en setning. [...] Den som avbryter er helt vanlig medlem av menigheten. Vaktmesteren ved stedets folkeskole, eller en av arbeiderne på saga. Han begynner å tale i tunger. Etter tre-fire minutter tar han en pause. Nå reiser en eldre kvinne seg. Kanskje er hun enslig, livnærer seg ved å stå opp klokka fire og gå rundt med avisene, og ekspedere et par timer i kolonialen, hvis det er ekstra mye å gjøre. Til daglig er hun sky og beskjeden. Nå roper hun ut over forsamlingen med voldsom intensitet og glød: - Så sier Herren! Jeg sendte min egen sønn til jorden for at dere skulle finne fred. Jeg elsket dere så høyt at jeg ofret ham på korsets tre for å sone deres synder. Om ikke lenge kommer han for å hente alle som har tatt tilflukt i troen på Jesus Kristus, men ute i verden vansmekter millioner uten håp og uten Gud. Dere er mine vitner, dere er min munn, mine hender, mine ben, mine ører må bringe det glade budskap om den frelse jeg har tilveiebragt. Se, markene er hvite til høst, sier Herren. Hvem vil gå for meg?

²⁷ Jens-Petter Jørgensen, “Organisasjonene og Oase – spenninger og utfordringer.” Notat utarbeidet av Jens-Petter Jørgensen på vegne av lederskapet i OASE. Organisasjonenes Fellesråds Årsmøte Geilo, 3. – 6. januar 1984.

Så tier hun, og mannen som begynte å tale i tunger, fortsetter. Dette er en profeti og en tydning. Et budskap direkte fra Gud. Taleren står stille på talerstolen. Hodet er bøyd, øynene lukket. Når vekslingen mellom profeti og tydning er avsluttet, fortsetter han kanskje talen, eller han ber menigheten bøye kne og be. På denne måten blir den likhet som eksisterer på tvers av de mange "stillingene" både innenfor menigheten og innenfor bevegelsen, markert. Det profetiske budskap kan komme til hvem som helst. Guds nådegaver blir gitt til alle, *uten* persons anseelse. Pinsevennes gudstjenesteform er noe av det mest antiautoritære og egalitære i norsk kristenliv.²⁸

Synlige autoritære trekk ved den karismatiske bevegelse i USA oppstod i og med den skismatiske Discipleship- eller Shepherdingbevegelsen som holdt på å kløve den karismatiske bevegelsen i to midt på 1970-tallet.²⁹ Bevegelsen oppstod imidlertid ikke i noe ideologisk vakuum, idet det selvbestaltede lederskapet trakk veksler på en rekke premissleverandører. En av disse var kineseren Watchman Nee, hvis bok *Spiritual Authority* ble oversatt til norsk under tittelen *Åndelig autoritet* og utgitt på Logos forlag i Sarons Dal i 1979. I denne synes underordning under menighetens lederskap viktigere enn å leve i samsvar med Guds moralske vilje: "We should not be occupied with right or wrong, good or evil; rather should we know who is the authority above us."³⁰ En annen viktig premissleverandør var argentineren Juan Carlos Ortiz, som flere av lederne møtte i 1973. Også i Norge utøvde Ortiz en viss innflytelse gjennom deltakelse på sommerstevner i Sarons Dal. To av hans bøker ble oversatt til norsk, og jeg tar med et lite sitat fra den ene norske oversettelsen for å illustrere hvor radikal Ortiz var i sin underordningsagitasjon:

Når vi får besøk i menigheten vår, behøver vi ikke å be og tryggle noen om overnatting for gjestene. Isteden sier vi ganske enkelt til en eller annen: "Du broder, du tar med deg disse vennene hjem til ditt hus og sørger for dem." Vi spør ikke, vi gir en ordre. Fordi huset allerede tilhører Herren. Og folk takker Herren fordi de får lov til å bo i Hans hus. Det er en uvanlig måte å gå frem på. Men vi forstår at det er riktig når vi tenker på at vi i grunnen bare er treller i Guds rike.³¹

Den amerikanske trosbevegelsen syntes i utgangspunktet å stå i grell kontrast til Shepherdingbevegelsens hierarkiske autoritetsstruktur. Trosbevegelsen var nemlig mye mer individualistisk orientert, med et fokus på at den enkelttroende selv var istand til å høre Guds stemme, selv var istand til å be troens bønn for syke og

²⁸ Tor Edvin Dahl og John-Willy Rudolph, *Fra seier til nederlag. Pinsebevegelsen i Norge* (Oslo: Land og Kirke / Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1978) s. 99-100.

²⁹ Geir Lie, "Shepherdingbevegelsen – en kortfattet historikk." *Baptist* nr. 2 / 2001 s. 33-43.

³⁰ Watchman Nee, *Spiritual authority* (New York: Christian Fellowship Publishers, 1972) s. 23.

³¹ Juan Carlos Ortiz, *Følg meg* (Oslo: Ansgar forlag, 1977) s. 38.

lidende, selv var betrodd den samme autoritet som Jesus innehadde under sitt jordeliv. Amerikaneren Daniel Ray McConnell har utvilsomt rett når han skriver at trosbevegelsen knapt gjorde seg synlig bemerket innen det pinserelaterte landskapet i USA mens Shepherdingbevegelsen seilte i medvind. Med referanse til trosbevegelsens grunnlegger Kenneth E. Hagin, skriver McConnell:

Although Hagin had been in ministry for years and had participated heavily in the post-war Pentecostal healing movement of the 1950s, his ministry did not begin to blossom until after 1967. As late as 1973, while the Shepherding-Discipleship teaching was still in vogue, his association employed only 19 full-time workers. By the time the Shepherding-Discipleship controversy was over, Hagin's staff had tripled to close to 60. Like some sort of overnight adolescent craze, suddenly authority and discipleship were "out" in the charismatic movement and faith and prosperity were "in".³²

Trosbevegelsens individualistiske laissez-faire orientering tok imidlertid en ny dreining tidlig på 1980-tallet. Jeg gikk selv på bibelskolen Victory Christian Center i Tulsa, Oklahoma i 1983 hvor Bob Lemons bok *God's people & church government*³³ ble promotert og hvor forfatteren agiterte for berettigelsen av pastorstyrte menigheter (i motsetning til blant annet en kongregasjonalistisk menighetsstruktur). Allerede i 1981 hadde dessuten Hagin utgitt *The Ministry Gifts*, hvor han med utgangspunkt i Ef. 4:11-12 argumenterte for at Gud på en særskilt måte ville lede menigheten gjennom apostel-, profet-, evangelist-, hyrde- og lærergaven. Nå bifalt aldri Hagin Shepherdingbevegelsens autoritetshierarki, men det er like fullt et faktum at 1980-årenes trosbevegelse og dennes forkynnelse av embetsgavene i Ef. 4:11-12 på avgjørende punkter brøt med den opprinnelige karismatiske bevegelses betoning av 'det almenne prestedømme'.

Også i norske trosmenigheter ble man raskt vitne til et embetshierarki. Pastorer, som kort tid i forveien hadde gått i slitte dongeribukser, gikk til anskaffelse av gjennomslittige plexiglasslignende talerstoler, og man slapp ikke til på møteplattformen uten dressjakke og slips. Herigjennom synliggjordes forskjellen mellom ordinære møtedeltakere og menn og kvinner som hadde en særskilt 'tjeneste' (ministry). Snart kopierte imidlertid mange av møtedeltakerne den nye kleskodexen. Synliggjøringen av en forskjell ble dog ytterligere forsterket ved at de fremste stolradene ofte var reservert forkynnere og andre i 'tjeneste'. At betydningsinnholdet av ordet 'tjeneste' ble radikalt endret fra det å være en *tjener* til at man fikk en *maktposisjon* (jfr. apostel- eller profettjeneste), ble knapt reflektert over. Både i tradisjonelle trosmenigheter og i mer outrerte karismatiske menighe-

³² Daniel Ray McConnell, *A Different Gospel. A Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988) s. 78.

³³ Boken ble utgitt i 1983 på Kenneth E. Hagins svigersønns Harrison House bokforlag.

ter ble det begått stygge overtramp overfor enkeltpersoner. Det kunne dreie seg om verbale krenkelser, men også at man ble fratatt voksenstatus og fikk konkrete direktiver om hvordan man skulle handle i privatlivet.

Selv om ikke alle gikk like langt i illegitim maktutøvelse, representerte lederskapsbetoningen et markant brudd med den karismatiske fornyelsesbevegelsen.³⁴ Ofte kunne - og kan - det være flytende overganger hva angår lederskap i betydningen å lede en menighetsaktivitet og å lede mennesker. Det kan umulig være lett å orientere seg i sunn retning når noen av de samme aktørene promoterer ulike lederskapsbetoningener, altså ikke tydeliggjør om de ser på seg selv som leder, eventuelt snakker om lederskap, i betydningen (1) aktivitetsleder eller i betydningen (2) at man angivelig har en Gud-gitt gave som leder av mennesker. Ett tilfeldig eksempel på vilkårlighet hva angår synet på lederskap reflekteres gjennom det karismatiske bokforlaget Hermon, som utgir lederskapsbøker av både

³⁴ Andre karismatiske menigheter har hentet inspirasjon om ledelse fra forfatteren Ralph Neighbour. Ytterligere andre igjen har tatt et visst utgangspunkt i bolivianeren César Castellanos G12 cellegruppekonsept og etter hvert forsøkt å tilpasse dette norske forhold.

John C. Maxwell og John Bevere.³⁵ Så vidt jeg kan bedømme, er Maxwells leder-skapsbetoning i all hovedsak relatert til aktivitetsledelse, mens Bevere åpenbart ser på seg selv som leder av mennesker og derfor henvender seg til (1) mennesker med identisk selvforståelse (for at disse skal lære å lede på samme måte som

³⁵ Bevere skriver i *Under cover*, norsk oversettelse *Under Guds beskyttelse* (Kjeller: Logos [en underavdeling under Hermon forlag], 2002) at den som ikke følger jordiske autoriteter, vil bli rammet av ulykker, for eksempel en bilkollisjon. Vi synes ikke ansvarlig for egne handlinger dersom disse er beordret oss ovenfra, for eksempel via mannlig ektefelle, pastor eller arbeidsgiver. Er vi ikke lydige mot våre jordiske autoriteter, gjør vi opprør mot Guds ordninger. På s. 155 i den norske oversettelsen forteller Bevere om sin 9 år gamle sønn som har en eksemplarisk oppførsel, men likevel opplever at læreren gir ham skylden for noe han ikke har gjort. Sønnen prøver å forklare at læreren misforstår, at det er noen andre som er skyldige i det han selv anklages for. Idet sønnen kommer hjem og forteller om situasjonen på skolen, svarer Bevere: “Vel, det er der problemet ligger, gutten min. Du rettferdiggjør deg selv overfor den som har autoritet over deg, og når du forsvarer deg selv, vil ikke Gud gjøre det.” Bevere gir sønnen beskjed om å be læreren om tilgivelse fordi han har utfordret dennes angivelig Gud-gitte autoritet. Sønnen underkaster seg farens instruksjoner og opplever dessuten å få lærerens ‘tilgivelse’. Senere, forklarer Bevere, blir sønnen kåret til ukens elev. Bevere bruker historien som et eksempel på at det lønner seg å etterfølge hans underordningsforståelse. Ytterligere sitater fra Beveres norske oversettelse: “Konsekvensene [...] er alvorlige. Det fører ikke bare Guds dom over oss, men det gir demoniske krefter fri adgang. Hvis vi ønsker å forbli lydige mot Gud og velsignet, har vi bare et valg når det gjelder delegert autoritet – underkastelse og lydighet.” (s. 83) “Senere talte Herren til hjertet mitt: “John, hvis jeg mente at enhver troende skulle få all sin informasjon gjennom bønn og kommunikasjon med meg, da ville jeg ikke utpekt myndighetspersoner i kirken. Jeg plasserte myndighetspersoner innen kirken med det forsett at mine barn ikke kunne få alt de trenger gjennom sitt bønneliv. De må i tillegg lære å gjenkjenne og lytte til min stemme gjennom sine ledere.”” Selv føler jeg behov for å spørre: Ser norske predikanter som leser Beveres bøker på seg selv som våre myndighetspersoner? Dessuten, hvor mange norske pinse- og karismatikerforkynnere med utrustning til å lede en menighetsaktivitet innehar reelt sett åndelige kvalifikasjoner som berettiger mer oppmerksomhet fra oss enn den oppmerksomhet som bør tilkomme det gjennomsnittlige menighetsmedlem i benkeraden? Jeg kan ikke skjønne at noen kan falle for det simple argumentet: “Hvorfor skal ikke vi som har fått nådegaver til å lede få lov til å lede?” Jeg fikk selv dette spørsmålet for en tid tilbake, og følte behov for å svare at det umulig kan være tilstrekkelig ledelseskriterium at noen hevder å inneha for eksempel gründerutrustning. Jeg sa videre at jeg ikke kunne se at vedkommende hadde kommet noe lenger i sin kristne vandring enn folk flest og dermed umulig kunne vite hvor veien videre skulle gå, verken i menigheten eller i mitt eget liv. På hvilket grunnlag ville det da være legitimt av meg selv eller andre å overgi oss til hans – og likesinnes – påståtte nådegave. En annen sak er selvsagt at det vil være usunt å overgi seg til en annen person uavhengig av vedkommendes eventuelle gaveutrustning.

han gjør) og (2) mennesker som oppfordres til å underordne seg de mennesker i sin nærkontekst som angivelig har samme Gud-gitte utrustning som han selv mener seg å besitte. Troende som har lest Maxwells bøker med positivt utbytte vil kanskje ikke lese Beveres publikasjoner med nødvendig kritisk distanse fordi begge forfatterne har fanget deres positive interesse gjennom det samme norske kristen-karismatiske miljøet.

En av de sunnere variantene av 'pinsekarismatisk' lederskap reflekteres muligens gjennom Lederskolen, etablert av pinsevenn Aril Svartdahl i 1999. I 1995 stiftet han bekjentskap med australieren Scott Wilson, som hadde plantet to menigheter i Australia (Orbost New Life Assembly [nå Snowy River Regional Church] som han betjente i perioden 1982-85 og Mallacoota Assembly of God som han betjente i perioden 1985-86) og dessuten hadde etablert Harvest Bible College i Melbourne (hvor han fungerte som rektor i perioden 1985-95). Wilson utformet Lederskolens kursinnhold, og i dag er kursmodulene delvis kompetansegivende. Om lag 1500 personer har pr. dags dato fullført en eller flere moduler. Mange av disse er pinsevenner, men også en rekke karismatikere har fullført kursmoduler. Lederskolen representerer i så måte en av de mange fellesarenaene hvor pinsevenner og karismatikere møtes og gjensidig influerer hverandre. Sammen med pinsevennenes Korsets Seier Publikasjoner utgir Lederskolen dessuten bladet *Lederskap*, hvor både pinsevenner og karismatikere sitter i redaksjonsteamet.

Jeg ønsker ikke å legge skjul på min dyptføyte bekymring over hva som foregår også innenfor mindre usunne 'pinsekarismatiske' miljøsegmenter som vektlegger lederskap. Slik jeg fra utsiden opplever å kunne observere, synes mange å dyrke en fascinasjon for lederskap koblet opp mot en sterk selvforståelse som tilhørende det sjiktet som har fått den Gudgitte gaven å lede ordinære møtedeltakere. Det å ha en bevisst eller ubevisst forståelse av seg selv som 'leder' og av de fleste øvrige som de som har kall fra Gud om å bli 'ledet' (av dem selv og/eller av like-sinnede) torpederer etter mitt skjønn både genuint menighetsliv og normal mellommenneskelig interaksjon.

Spiritualitetsimpulser på tvers av konfesjonsgrensene

Den karismatiske bevegelse ble tidlig beskyldt for lærelikegyldighet. Ikke minst luthersk-karismatikere møtte raskt motstand på grunn av uklare grenseopp ganger i forhold til pinsevennenes 'åndsdåpsforståelse'. Daværende bibelskolerektor Even Fougner skrev blant annet med referanse til den på den tid luthersk-karismatiske bevegelsen Ungdom i Oppdrag i Indremisjonsselskapets hovedorgan *For Fattig og Rik* (hvor Fougner dessuten var medredaktør):

Det er uklart hvordan Ungdom i Oppdrag stiller seg til den karismatiske bevegelses åndsdapteologi, som etter vårt syn er i konflikt med den lutherske bekjennelse. Intil bevegelsen som sådan tar klart avstand fra denne teologi, har vi anbefalt våre foreninger til ikke å samarbeide med Ungdom i Oppdrag.³⁶

Ungdom i Oppdrag ble stiftet av Eivind Frøen og Øyvind Hofstad i 1971, i etterkant av at Frøen og Youth With A Mission-grunnlegger Loren Cunningham møttes under en karismatisk konferanse i Guilford, Storbritannia. Til å begynne med var det kun en identifikasjonsmessig, men ingen formell tilknytning mellom de to bevegelsene, idet Ungdom i Oppdrag ønsket en formell forpliktelse på Den norske Kirkes læregrunnlag. Til tross for at de mer teologisk skolerte lederne (Arne Nordahl, Asbjørn Staveness og Reidulf Stige) gjorde høylydt motstand, valgte Ungdom i Oppdrag i 1987 å gi slipp på sin lutherske forankring for å bli fullverdig medlem av Youth With A Mission-familien. Flere av lederne i etterkant av 1987 har dog også vært medlemmer av enten Den norske Kirke eller Den evangelisk lutherske Frikirke, men det er et spørsmål hvor lutherske de i praksis har vært, bortsett fra i sitt bifall av spebarnsdåp (uten nødvendigvis å ha skjelnet mellom luthersk og metodistisk forståelse). En rask gjennomgang av bladet *Mot Målet* viser imidlertid en tiltakende bekymring og sorg over læreutviklingen i Den norske Kirke. Dette tolker jeg blant annet som en identifikasjonsmessig tilknytning til trossamfunnet.

Likevel er det et faktum, som allerede påpekt, at Ungdom i Oppdrag allerede i 1986 aktivt inviterte amerikanske Vineyard-forkynnere til landet. Gjennom en norsk oversettelse, *Innta byene for Gud* (1991) av forfatter John Dawson, har Ungdom i Oppdrag dessuten vært læremessig premissleverandør for en spesifikk demonologi. Flere innen bevegelsen har hevdet at gitte geografiske områder er spesielt behersket, enten av Guds Ånd, eller alternativt, av onde åndsmakter. Dette har gitt seg ulike utslag: valfarter til nærmest 'hellige steder' (Martinsville (Indiana), Toronto (Canada) og Brownsville (Florida)) eller såkalte 'forsoningsmarsjer' med det mål å knuse åndsmaktens dominans ved å reversere disses opprinnelige fotfeste innen et bestemt geografisk område. Åndsmaktens grep forklares med at en alvorlig synd er blitt begått i dette området, sannsynligvis for flere generasjoner siden. Ved å innta rollen som stedfortreder kan man på lovovertræderens vegne be regionens (eventuelt nasjonens) nåværende befolkning om tilgivelse. Dermed, tror man, oppheves den demoniske forbannelsen og vekkelse fra Gud tilgjengeliggjøres. I forbindelse med reversering av åndsmaktens fotfeste, benyttes gjerne uttrykket 'spiritual mapping' (definitivt knesatt av forfatteren George Otis jr.), som henspiller på en åpenbaringsbasert diagnostisering av hvilke

³⁶ Dag Stange, "Indremisjonen ut mot Ungdom i Oppdrag." *Vårt Land* 20. januar 1977 s. 2.

åndskrefter som angivelig dominerer et gitt geografisk område, samt hvordan disse gjennom autoritativ bønn kan detroniseres.

Også Oasebevegelsen, oppstått i forlengelse av et navngitt 'Helligandsseminar' i Oslo i 1977, og dette igjen av en rekke regionale Oasestevner, har definert seg som et luthersk-karismatisk segment. Årlige stevner, som har alternert mellom ulike byer, samler mellom 2000 og 5000 påmeldte deltakere. I tillegg til de årlige stevnene profilerer bevegelsen seg gjennom bladet *Oasen*, samt gjennom egne konferanser som spesifikt retter seg mot kristne ledere (mennesker med definerte ansvarsområder innenfor kirkelige virkegrener). Man har dessuten opprettet et spesifikt nettverk for prester og kirkelig ansatte, Oases Preste- og Ledernetverk. Som for Ungdom i Oppdrag, synes Oasebevegelsen i de senere år å ha hentet sine mest profilerte spiritualitetsimpulser fra ikke-luthersk hold. Bevegelsen ble gjenstand for kritisk mediedekning i forbindelse med at den kanadiske forkynneren Duncan Smith forkynte under bevegelsens tenåringsstevne i 2008. Tilsvarende har bevegelsen møtt kritikk på grunn av sin innledningsvis ukritiske hyllest til kanadiske Todd Bentleys predikantvirksomhet i Lakeland, Florida.³⁷ Det ansees ikke urimelig at Oasebevegelsens opplevelse av læremessige liberaliseringstendenser innen Den norske Kirke er en hovedårsak til at fromhetsytringer og spiritualitetsimpulser primært hentes fra ikke-luthersk hold.

Karismatisk møtekultur

“Den karismatiske vekkelse,” skriver den norske teologen Torleiv Austad, “vokste fram som en reaksjon på en intellektualisering av det kristne budskap.”³⁸ Selv er jeg av den formening at den karismatiske bevegelse på mange måter representerte et sunt korrektiv. Like fullt vil jeg hevde at det innen karismatisk fornyelse alltid har eksistert understrømninger som har betont det subjektive og emosjonelle på bekostning av det objektive og rasjonelle. Fra begynnelsen av ble karismatiske troende anklaget for lærelikegyldighet, idet mange fant hverandre i en felles karismatisk erfaring og knapt var interessert i eller evnet å reflektere kritisk over verken denne eller andre lære- og/eller erfaringssannheter. Etter mitt skjønn et kritisk ankepunkt mot karismatisk forkynnelse og praksis er det ensidige fokus på det som angivelig skjer i offentlige møter hvor karismatiske troende kommer sammen til forkleinselse for det faktum at både karismatikere og ikke-karismatikere tilbringer betraktelig mer tid utenfor enn innenfor møtelokalet. Den

³⁷ <http://www.vl.no/kristenliv/article3736321.ece>. Lastet ned 30. mai 2009.

³⁸ Torleiv Austad, *Gud møter oss. Artikler om bønn og gudsbilde* (Oslo: Akademia forlag, 2008) s. 124.

karismatiske møteliturgien legger i stor grad vekt på at mennesker skal få 'møte Gud', og siden relativt få mennesker foretar kristne omvendelser på møtene, begrenser 'Gudsmøtene' seg gjerne til at karismatikerne har emosjonsbaserte opplevelser. Disse opplevelsene har nok ulike funksjoner: Delvis styrker de karismatikeren i hans/hennes forutgående Gudstro (det vil si holder tvil på avstand) og delvis motiverer de til fortsatt kristent engasjement (at man fortsetter å slutte opp om møtene og fortsetter å gi seg hen til møteliturgien for på den måten å få nye – både identiske og beslektede - emosjonsbaserte opplevelser).

Lovsang

En vesentlig komponent innen karismatisk møteliturgi er såkalt 'lovsang'. Både innenfor Jesusbevegelsen og blant de første karismatikerne sang man enkle lovsangskor. Det relativt nye er imidlertid at mange i dag har en spesifikk 'lovsangsteologi' hvor motivasjonen for å synge disse i fellesskap og hengivelse er at lovsang er et 'våpen' eller et middel for å nedbe Guds spesifikke nærvær i møtet. Dette 'nærværet' tingliggjøres og kvantifiseres så å si idet det identifiseres med en spesifikk 'salvelse', som både kan observeres og til tider overføres fra en person til en annen.

Mens lukkede øyne, utstrakte hender og svaiende overkropper tidligere var et liturgisk uttrykk forbeholdt karismatikertroende, synes dette i våre dager i stadig større grad å bli kristne ungdommers allemannseie. Terje Hegertun refererer til sønnen Andreas, medpastor i pinsemenigheten Filadelfia, Oslo, som hevder at "det plantes en tverrkristen identitet i genene til ungdommer som (gjennom deltakelse på Skjærgårdsfestivalen, som samler 10.000 ungdommer hver sommer til kanskje det mest typiske uttrykket for [en uniformert lovsangsstil og omgangsform, uavhengig av om det er i et ungdomsmøte i Filadelfia, Oslo, i Storsalen, i Frikirken eller en lørdagskveld i en hvilken som helst statskirkemenighet]) på denne måten beveger seg på tvers av konfesjonsgrensene og som finner det meningsfullt."³⁹

Skjærgårdsgospel, Norges største kristne musikkfestival, er for øvrig ytterligere en fellesarena hvor pinsevenner og karismatikere (samt kristne fra øvrige sammenhenger) møtes og har i så måte vært med og bidratt til læremessig og liturgisk uniformering. Man lytter til de samme artistene og synger disses sanger, eventuelt i norsk språkdrakt, på egne ungdomssamlinger. Den moderne 'lov-

³⁹ Terje Hegertun, "Postkonfesjonalisme. utfordringer fra en postkonfesjonell tid." <http://www.hegertunblogg.org/2009/02/postkonfesjonalisme.html>. Nedlastet 1. juni 2009. Opprinnelig foredrag på Frikirkens pastorkonferanse i Stavern, juni 2008.

sangen' har faktisk blitt et globalt fenomen, og blant annet Hillsong-menigheten i Australia, Soul Survivor-miljøet i England og Passion-bevegelsen i USA har vært viktige premissleverandører. Et stadig økende antall tekstforfattere, med blant andre Darlene Zschech, Matt Redman, Don Moen og Noel Richard i spissen, har også sørget for en jevn tilstrømning av nye sanger.⁴⁰

Drømmen om personlig delaktighet i global vekkelse i forkant av Jesu gjenkomst

Den opprinnelige pinsebevegelsen i USA var i utgangspunktet en eskjatologisk, ja, millennisk, bevegelse. Jesu snarlige gjenkomst stod for døren og ville forandres av en verdensomspennende vekkelse. Selv representerte de første pinsevennene selveste endetidsmenigheten ('Kristi brud'), som innestod for alle lære- og erfaringssannheter som den opprinnelige menighet hadde stått for, men som var gått tapt fra 300-tallet e.Kr., men sakte men sikkert var blitt gjenoppdaget fra og med reformasjonen av. Tungetalen, som pinsevennene av mange først og fremst er blitt identifisert med, ble forstått som et reelt jordisk språk, hvorigjennom budskapet om Jesu snarlige komme skulle utbres til alle verdenshjørner før pinsevennene midlertidig skulle borttrykkes for å feire Lammets bryllupsmåltid i himmelen.

De første amerikanske pinsevenners læreforståelse på disse punkt ble videreført av den kanadiske Latter Rain bevegelsen, som oppstod i North Battleford, Saskatchewan i februar 1948.⁴¹ I tillegg til en spesifikk *historieforståelse* (Kirkehistorien fram til reformasjonen av karakteriseres som forfallshistorie, deretter som en restaurasjonshistorie som kulminerer med ens egen bevegelse, som blir redskap for en verdensomspennende vekkelse), *eskjatologi* (Jesus kommer snart for å hente sin 'brud' [det vil si en elitegruppe blant de troende], deretter kommer trengselstid og dom) og *ekklesiologi* (for eksempel at 'endetidsmenigheten' [som en selv representerer] blir betrodd å bære fram de siste tapte lære- og erfaringssannheter), ble det innen Latter Rain bevegelsen vektlagt at Gud var iferd med å gjenreise det nytestamentlige apostel- og profetembedet.

Latter Rain-bevegelsen klarte ikke å infiltrere de eksisterende pinsesamfunnene i Canada og USA, men dens innflytelse gjorde seg like fullt gjeldende gjennom signifikante forkynnere innen ulike karismatiske miljøsegmenter. Tidligere professor ved Fuller Theological Seminary, C. Peter Wagner, vedgår blant annet at

⁴⁰ Geir Lie og David André Østby, "Lovsang og tilbedelse" i: Geir Lie, red., *Norsk pinsekristendom og karismatisk fornyelse. Ettbinds oppslagsverk* (Oslo: Refleks-Publishing, 2. utg. 2008) s. 103-104.

⁴¹ Geir Lie, "Moderne apostler." *Humanist* nr 2 2002 s. 49-59.

en del av forkynnerne innen for hans eget 'apostoliske' nettverk "have roots in the Latter Rain movement."⁴²

I Norge var Aril Edvardsen tidlig ute med amerikansk-inspirert litteratur som forfektet et gjenopprettelsesbudskap hvor Gud gjenreiste både tapte bibelske sannheter og apostel- og profetutrustning. Budskapet ble forankret i en tro på at Jesus snart kommer tilbake for å hente de sanne troende og at dette Jesu komme ville foranlediges av en verdensomspennende vekkelse. Vineyardmenigheten i Oslo ble en av flere eksponenter for et beslektet budskap. Ikke usannsynlig fikk de del i dette gjennom den amerikanske Vineyardbevegelsens kontakt og interaksjon med de såkalte Kansas City profetene.⁴³ Også Rick Joyners bøker synes å ha spilt en ikke uvesentlig rolle.⁴⁴

Vineyardmenigheten var for øvrig en av de første norske nedslagsfelt for den såkalte 'Toronto'-fornyelsen, som oppstod i daværende Toronto Airport Vineyard i 1993. Rent ytre sett kan 'fornyelsen' beskrives ved hjelp av et begrenset antall observerbare fysiske foreteelser som ble tolket, dels som Guds suverene handling i og gjennom den troende, dels som den troendes respons på Åndens gjerning i vedkommende. Tormod Engelsviken fanger inn alle de essensielle foreteelsene, idet han skriver:

Det dreier seg om ukontrollerbar latter og utrøstelig gråt, om sterk skjelvning, risting og andre kroppslige bevegelser, om å falle på gulvet og bli liggende der [...], om å te seg som ruset uten å være det, og om mer bisarre foreteelser som å frembringe bestemte dyrelyder (for eksempel brøling) eller etterlikne enkelte dyrs atferdsmønstre.⁴⁵

Ryktene om at Gud gjorde noe radikalt nytt i den lille Vineyardmenigheten i Toronto spredte seg umiddelbart til opplevelseshungrige karismatikere langt utenfor Canadas grenser. Det aller første norske nedslagsfeltet for 'Toronto' skjedde sannsynligvis på sommeren 1994, idet Vineyardforkynnerne Bill Twyman og

⁴² Charles Peter Wagner, *Churchquake* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1999) s. 41.

⁴³ For en norsk presentasjon av disse, se Geir Lie, "Profetvekkelsen – med fokus på Kansas City." *Fast Grunn* nr. 3 1999 s. 181-189.

⁴⁴ Erling Rimehaug, "Theology is what we do. Is Vineyard really evangelical?," upublisert manuskript datert 15. juni 1999.

⁴⁵ Tormod Engelsviken, "Toronto-bevegelsen – siste nytt på vekkelsesfronten?" *Tidsskrift for Kirke, Religion, Samfunn*, hefte 2 1995 (Årgang 8) s. 248.

David Parker talte på årets Oasestevne i stedet for en sykemeldt John Wimber.⁴⁶ Kun få dager etter sommerstevnets avslutning dro de første norske karismatikerforkynnerne på lederseminar til Torontomenigheten. Sammen med daværende Oaseleder Jens-Petter Jørgensen, pastor Reidar Paulsen (Kristkirken, Bergen) og pastor Kjell Aasmundrud (Oslo Vineyard) representerte Martin Cave (bysekretær i Stavanger Indremisjon) de første norske forkynnerne i Toronto Airport Vineyard Church. Idet disse vendte tilbake til Norge, arrangerte snart både Oslo Vineyard, Kristkirken og Stavanger Indremisjon hver sine konferanser, og det var utvilsomt via disse tre sammenhengene at de eiendommelige fenomenene ble aktualisert på norsk kirkemark. Etter hvert skulle disse få nedslag både blant baptistene, Misjonsforbundet, Den Evangelisk lutherske Frikirke, Kristent Fellesskap og i enkelte trosmenigheter.

I samme periode bestemte pastorene Kjell Aasmundrud (Vineyard), Bernt Torgussen (Asker og Bærum Bibelsenter) og Pål Brenne (Den Evangeliske Forsamling / Misjonskirken, Majorstua) seg for å komme regelmessig sammen til personlig oppbyggelse. Ryktene gikk fort, og innen kort tid samlet pastorgruppa åtte forkynnere som alle hadde opplevd fornyelse gjennom 'Toronto'. Olav Garcia de Presno (Storsalen) og Egil Svartdahl (Filadelfia) kom også raskt inn i gruppa og ble etter hvert hovedledere. Noe av hensikten bak pastorfellesskapet synes innledningsvis å ha vært et ønske om å synliggjøre enhet og åndelig fellesskap, dette utfra en forståelse om at enhet på karismatisk lederplan (forkynnerplan) kan fungere som utløsende årsaksfaktor for vekkelse. Som et synlig uttrykk for denne enheten stod pastorgruppas ulike lokalmenigheter sammen med Oslo Vineyard som innbyder til pinsekonferansen i 1998, selv om Vineyardmenigheten alene håndterte alt praktisk rundt arrangementet. Vineyardbevegelsen i USA hadde på dette tidspunkt for lengst tatt et oppgjør både med Torontofenomenene og lokalmenigheten i Toronto (som signaliserte skismaets organisatoriske faktum gjennom navneendringen til Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship i januar 1996). Pinsekonferansen i Oslo var imidlertid først og fremst preget av de såkalte Kansas City-profetene, som få år i forveien hadde avlevert sterke impulser til Vineyardbevegelsen, men som på dette tidspunkt ikke lenger hadde Vineyardbevegelsens tillit i USA. Flere av de angivelige 'profetene' forfektet, tilsvarende man hadde gjort innen Latter Rain bevegelsen, at Gud ville gjenreise sin menighetsstandard gjennom et karismatisk lederskap. Både på konferansen i Oslo og i tilsvarende møter i Grenlandsområdet ble det fastslått at Norge stod foran en stor vekkelse.

⁴⁶ Vineyardgrunnlegger Wimbers innflytelse innen norsk luthersk-karismatikk i 1980- og 90-årene utgjør en ikke uvesentlig del av bakteppet om man vil forstå både Oase og Ungdom i Oppdrags nåværende åpenhet for spiritualitetsimpulser fra primært ikke-luthersk hold.

Pastorgrappa, hvis tilblivelseshistorie er uløselig knyttet til Torontofenomenene, men som også mottok inntrykk både fra den såkalte ‘Pensacola Revival’⁴⁷ og fra toneangivende ‘profetskikkelser’ i USA, var kort tid i forveien blitt viklet inn i et ytterligere angivelig ‘Åndens vær’. De hadde nemlig også fått kontakt med de såkalte ‘Lysbærerne’, et nyreligiøst miljø i Trondheim som i 1997 opplevde en dreining henimot kristendommen. Under pinsekonferansen i Oslo i 1998 advarte imidlertid flere av de amerikanske forkynnerne Aasmundrud privat, blant annet på grunn av “sensualisme mellom kjønnene,” “[en] ånd av spiritisme” og “profetier i trance”. En av forkynnerne, Paul Cain, var endog i tvil om ‘Lysbærerne’ “[kunne] kalles en kristen vekkelse i det hele tatt.” Svartdahl, Garcia de Presno og Aasmundrud hadde imidlertid takket ja til å ha et privat pastoransvar for ‘Lysbærerbevegelsen’. Aasmundrud så for seg en formidabel vekkelse innen kort tid, og på en pastorsamling 15. august 1998 ble ‘Lysbærerbevegelsen’ karakterisert som “frøet” som skulle initiere endetidsvekkelsen.⁴⁸ Allerede i februar samme året hadde han innlemmet daværende leder for Vineyard Norden, Hans Sundberg, i en angivelig åpenbaring fra Gud, nemlig at Oslo Vineyard, Filadelfia i Oslo og “Inre Missionen” (Storsalen i Oslo) ville opphøre på sommeren, idet vekkelsen ville bringe inn så mange nyfrelste.⁴⁹ Da det ikke ble noe av denne vekkelsen, ble dette årsaksforklart med at en av ‘profetene’ i ‘Lysbærerbevegelsen’ ikke hadde fått den autoritative plass og funksjon som Gud hadde ønsket.⁵⁰

Det foreløpig ferskeste fenomenet innen norsk karismatisk opplevelseskristendom har fått navnet ‘soaking’, og henspeler på en spesifikk avslappings-/meditasjonsteknikk hvor man søker å bli ‘gjennomvøtet’ av Guds Ånd.⁵¹ Allerede i januar 2007 arrangerte Martin Cave (pastor i IMI-kirken, Stavanger) ‘Catch

⁴⁷ ‘Pensacola Revival’, i fenomenologisk forstand beslektet med ‘Toronto’, hadde sitt utspring i menigheten Brownsville Assembly of God i Pensacola, Florida 18. juni 1995.

⁴⁸ Hans Sundberg, “Thoughts regarding the Lightbearers and Kjell Aasmundrud.” Upublisert manuskript.

⁴⁹ For å unngå misforståelse vil jeg her uttrykkelig slå fast at pastorgrappa aldri var noen homogen størrelse, men hadde innbyrdes avvikende syn på blant annet Lysbærerbevegelsen. Det er derfor viktig å få fram at Aasmundruds vyer om verdensvekkelse og Lysbærerbevegelsens unike rolle i dette endetidsdramaet, samt en angivelig oppløsning av Oslo Vineyard, Filadelfia og Storsalen, så langt jeg kan bedømme, aldri ble forfektet av pastorgrappa som sådan.

⁵⁰ Hans Sundberg, “Kyrkoordiningsfrågor angående Ljusbärarna / Kjell Aasmundrud.” Upublisert manuskript, datert 11. september 1998.

⁵¹ For ytterligere opplysninger om soakingfenomenet, se blant annet http://arnehelgeteigen.weblog.no/1223065447_03okt2008.html. Nedlastet 8. juni 2009.

the Fire'-konferanse med 'Torontopastor' John Arnott og hvor 'soaking' stod på programmet. Målet med 'soaking', på linje med 'Toronto-fornyelsen' (1994) og 'Pensacola Revival' (1995) er å gi troende konkrete erfaringer som identifiseres med 'Guds nærvær'. En tilsvarende konferanse i mars 2007 ble arrangert av Cave i samarbeid med Alv Magnus (Ungdom i Oppdrag), Einar Ekerhovd (Oase) og Håkon Fagervik (Nordic Mission). Det ble snart etablert en rekke 'soaking-grupper', blant annet i Misjonskirken i Bodø, Frikirken på Bryne, Oslo Vineyard, og Storsalen (Oslo).⁵²

Noen kritiske kommentarer

Som nevnt innledningsvis i denne artikkelen, opplever jeg selv i stor grad å ha stått på utsiden og kun i sidespeilet å ha kunnet betrakte noe av det som synes å ha skjedd innen karismatiske miljøsegmenter i Norge de siste 15 årene. Jeg identifiserer meg fremdeles som en karismatisk kristen som i mitt personlige bønneliv praktiserer en karismatisk kristendomsform. Samtidig har jeg, til tross for forholdsvis regelmessig møtedeltakelse både i pinsemenigheter og karismatiske sammenhenger, i stadig større grad opplevd meg fremmedgjort i forhold til disse miljøsegmentene.

Allerede under den karismatiske fornyelses tidlige år ble det frembåret legitim kritikk i forhold til lærelikegyldighet, en overfladisk økumenikk basert på felles karismatiske erfaringer, loviskhet og elitisme. Selv opplever jeg at flere av ovennevnte anklagepunkter er gyldige den dag i dag. Samtidig har jeg – og mange med meg – opplevd mye godt og berikende i møte med karismatisk kristendom. Subjektive opplevelser av Guds nærhet, tror jeg, har skapt og intensivert et ønske om å leve i Kristi etterfølgelse. Opplevelsen av Guds nærvær har fremtvunget mer solid refleksjon rundt Guds person og vesen. For meg er det ikke mulig å skjelne mellom Guds konstante allestedsnærværen og Hans angivelige manifestasjon av det samme nærværet. Jeg tror heller ikke nærværet kan kvantifiseres, og slett ikke forøkes gjennom verken 'lovsang' eller andre midler / teknikker. Slik jeg forstår det som kristen, er vi kalt til å ære Gud utfra motivasjonen at Han er denne ære verd, ikke som et nærmest manipulativt - eller eventuelt med Guds Ånd samarbeidende - grep for å nedbe Hans angivelige 'salvelse' gjennom repeterende trestemt 'lovsang'. Selv opplever jeg karismatisk 'lovsang', slik denne ofte kommer til uttrykk på pinsevenn- og karismatiske møter, som selvsentrert og narsissistisk. Jeg var selv lovsangsleder i Guds Lam Kirke på slutten av 1980-tallet og minnes hvordan flere av oss undret oss over at 'salvelsen' var så mye 'sterkere' når vi sang trestemt akkompagnert av mai-9 og moll-6 akkorder. Vi skjønte ikke at det å gi seg hen til musikken frigjorde

⁵² <http://www.soaking.no/index.php?art=11&kat=6&mid=0>. Nedlastet 8. juni 2009.

skjønte ikke at det å gi seg hen til musikken frigjorde kroppens endorfiner. Selvsagt hadde vi samtidig et oppriktig (så oppriktig som det sannsynligvis er mulig, med tanke på at vi var/er falne skapninger) ønske om å 'samarbeide med Guds Ånd i møtet'. Det at pinsevenners og karismatikeres liturgiske uttrykk de senere årene har fått nedslagsfelt også i ikke-karismatiske ungdomsmiljøer, tolker jeg ikke som at sistnevnte miljøer har fått del i den samme Gudshengivenhet som jeg tror mange av oss hadde på 1970- og 1980-tallet. Tvert imot tror jeg de så å si eksklusivt har fått med seg den selvcentrerthet, narsissisme og opplevelsessøken som hele tiden fulgte oss, parallelt med vår Gudshengivenhet.

Nærmest fra begynnelsen av, tror jeg, ble vi ført inn i en måte å leve ut vår karismatikk på som ikke taler sant om livet. Vi hørte forkynnelse som poengterte viktigheten av å 'klappe for Jesus' under møtene, på samme måte som folk flest klappet for fotball-laget man var tilhenger av. Få reflekterte over at analogien mellom Jesus og Vålerenga, for eksempel, neppe var gyldig. De fleste troende, karismatikere som ikke-karismatikere, blir fra tid til annen anført av tvilstanker. Dersom man imidlertid sitter på tribunen og reelt sett anføres av hvorvidt Vålerenga som fotball-lag er illusorisk eller har selvstendig eksistens, trenger man profesjonell hjelp. Det å 'klappe for Jesus' på samme måten som en selv eller andre klapper for Vålerenga, mener jeg, er etisk uærlig fordi man på den måten kommuniserer både overfor seg selv og overfor omgivelsene (innad i menigheten og utad overfor ikke-troende) at man innehar en mer substansiell visshet hva angår Guds eksistens enn hva som er berettiget. Dermed står man i fare for å manipulere ikke-troende til å ta et kristent standpunkt basert på feilaktige, ja, løgnaktige premisser.

Tilsvarende talte vi usant om livet når vi i lovsangsrusen, med en hånd i været, øyne fiksert på ett eller annet punkt i taket og med et henrykt smil rundt munnen, nærmest gav uttrykk for at vi så like inn i himmelen. Nettopp fordi vår lovsangsadferd og vår lovsangsforståelse tok utgangspunkt i at det vi følte var uttrykk for Guds nærvær, og at dette nærvær i stor grad ble oss til del på grunn av vår åndelige hengivenhet, skjønnte vi ikke, og skjønner mange fremdeles ikke, hvor lite åndelig hengivne vi egentlig var og er. Som nygift skjønnte jeg ikke hvorfor jeg plutselig mistet behovet – og evnen – til å tilbringe timer sammenhengende i bønn. Først på et senere tidspunkt forstod jeg at de mange timene jeg tidligere hadde investert i bønn i stor grad skyldtes min ensomhet og behovet for opplevelsen av nærhet. Idet mye av denne nærheten ble dekket da jeg ble gift, forsvant mye av behovet for bønn. På samme måte, tror og frykter jeg, vil de fleste 'lovsangerne' oppleve et vakuum dersom det glomorøse rundt virksomheten tas fra dem: det å være omgitt av i menighetssammenheng dyktige musikanter, samt opplevelsen av å være en 'artist for Herren' som innehar en særskilt 'tjeneste'.

Jeg opplever det som en alvorlig forførelse at mange fra 40/50-års alderen og nedover innenfor pinse- og karismatikkmenigheter aktivt søker en endorfin-

opplevelse mens de selv tror at de primært søker Gud som person. Samarbeidet mellom plattform og forsamling hvor man kollektivt går inn i en mild form for trance har for meg lite og ingenting med sann lovsang å gjøre, som ærer Ham ene og alene fordi han er Konge og Herre.

Tilsvarende tror jeg mye av fascinasjonen for den fremtidige vekkelsen virker forførende. Mange av oss har opplevd å være mer opptatt av vekkelsesfenomenet enn de menneskers ve og vel som vi håpet skulle bli 'vakt'. Ved å fokusere så sterkt på vekkelsen der framme trodde mange av oss at vi levde i samsvar med Guds vilje, mens vi i praksis – i etterhånd – opplevde å være ganske så likegyldige overfor enkeltpersoner i vår nærkontekst. Å leve under en slik forførelse er ikke å tale sant om eget liv.

Selv mener jeg det ligger noe destruktivt i selve kjernen av tradisjonell karismatisk forkynnelse: Vi oppfordres til å tale i tunger for vår egen oppbyggelses skyld (i stedet for at egen oppbygging følger som en bieffekt), vi initierer 'lovsang' for å få noe tilbake (et følbart nærvær av Gud i beste fall; i verste fall en emosjonell rus), og vi oppfordres til å gi oss hen til diverse erfaringer (relatert til 'Toronto', 'Pensacola', 'Lakeland' osv; igjen enten for å få en spesifikk opplevelse som vi identifiserer med Guds nærvær, eller evt. fordi vi bevisst ønsker en følelsesmessig rus). Som regel blir vi enda mer selvcentrerte enn vi var før den nye 'bølgen' nådde oss. I tillegg blir vi fortalt om store vekkelser, eventuelt en siste stor vekkelser, som ligger like foran oss. Det er akkurat som om forkynnere og 'lovsangere' ikke har tro for at verken vi eller de selv vil bevare vårt (sitt) kristne engasjement om vi (de) ikke ansopes av noe attraktivt lenger fremme i horisonten. Hva med å forkynne nødvendigheten av med Guds hjelp å leve et Kristuscentrert liv fordi Han er Herren og fordi dette er Hans plan med oss som enkeltmennesker og som menighet, og dette uavhengig av hva som måtte skje eller ikke skje som en følge av våre valg?

Hvor bør veien ideelt sett gå herfra? En del pinsevenner og karismatikere har, utvilsomt delvis på grunn av personlig fremmedgjøring overfor karismatisk møteliturgi, opplevd en viss fascinasjon for den kristne menighets oldkirkelige røtter. Andre igjen søker å *integre* Kristusmeditasjon og tradisjonell karismatisk lovsangsliturgi, noe som kan tyde på at kristen mystikk, meditasjon og tradisjonell karismatikk har noen erfaringsrelaterte fellesanliggende. Idet jeg selv ble en karismatisk kristen i en forholdsvis egalitær menighetskontekst og opplever at ledelsesfascinasjonen innen karismatiske sammenhenger har båret negative frukter, føler jeg behov for å uttrykke en viss reservasjon også overfor miljøer hvor enkeltpersoner blir bærere eller videreførere av en oldkirkelig tradisjon som inkluderer hierarkisk skjelling mellom embetsbærere og gudstjenestedeltaker, ikke minst siden det blant andre er de selv som innehar rollen som embetsbærere.

REFLEKS 8-1 2009

For egen del opplever jeg behov for å identifisere en farbar vei hvor jeg sammen med venner som vil meg vel kan integrere hverdags- og familieliv med Kristusliv.



Weakness that Divine Power Perfects (2 Cor. 12.9-10)

Mark E. Roberts, Ph.D., is Director of the Holy Spirit Research Center at Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

While Bible students disagree about the specific identity of Paul's thorn in the flesh,¹ multitudes of believers agree that the Lord's word to Paul comforts them—"My grace is sufficient for you, for (my) power is perfected in weakness (2 Cor 12.9)—as does Paul's concluding exclamation: "For when I am weak, then I am strong" (2 Cor 12.10). The key terms, "weak(ness)" and "strong (strength)," are common in the speech of believers of any era, and I believe, with many, that God strengthens believers in any and all senses and circumstances in which they perceive themselves to be weak and to suffer. Yet this study aims to focus more sharply the senses in which this passage intends readers to understand especially "weak(ness)."

While some of today's critics accuse Paul of being overbearing, even abusive,² Paul's earliest critics attack him for being a weak leader.³ Expressions of this criticism cluster around two judgments: (1) Paul is weak in integrity, or charac-

¹ Brian Peterson summarizes these proposals in *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel*, SBLDS 163 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998), 125-126.

² E.g., Graham Shaw, *The Cost of Authority: Manipulation and Freedom in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1983); Elizabeth Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991); and Sandra Hack Polaski *Paul and the Discourse of Power* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Polaski's work shares with Castelli's the criticism that Paul's call to imitate him establishes an impossible goal and simultaneously valorizes sameness in a way that diminishes human freedom.

³ These vv. express or respond variously to the criticism that Paul is weak, in multiple senses of the term: 10.1 (ταπεινός ἐν ὑμῖν), 2 (τοὺς λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας), 10 (ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενῆς); 11.5-7 (v 5: λογίζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν ὑστερηκέαι; v 7: ἐποίησα ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν), 9 (καὶ παρὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑστερηθεῖς), 21a (ὡς ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠσθενήκαμεν); 29 (τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ;); 11.30-12.11 (v 30: Εἰ καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας μου καυχῆσομαι. . . . 12.5: ὑπὲρ δὲ ἑμαυτοῦ οὐ καυχῆσομαι εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ; v 10: διὸ εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις . . . ὅταν γὰρ ἀσθενῶ, τότε δὴ νατός εἰμι); 12.20-21 (v 21: μου ταπεινώσῃ με ὁ θεός μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς); 13.3-4 (v 4: γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ), 9 (χαίρομεν γὰρ ὅταν ἡμεῖς ἀσθενῶμεν, ὑμεῖς δὲ δυνατοὶ ἦτε).

ter;⁴ and (2) Paul performs apostolic ministry weakly.⁵ With this précis of the case against Paul, we examine specific occurrences of the vocabulary of weakness. This examination will show what Christopher Forbes has noted: “The terms δύναμις [*dynamis*] and ἀσθένεια [*astheneia*], and related terms in Paul, never indicate simply psychological states. Popular exegesis might suggest that Paul’s ‘weakness’ is his awareness of his own inadequacy for God. Usage of the term both in a wide cross-section of Hellenistic writers and in Paul himself indicates rather that the terms carry strong social connotations. ‘Weakness’ is the state of those without power or status, and ‘strength’ is the state of those who do have status. ‘Weakness’ connotes humiliation in the eyes of others, rather than inadequacy in one’s own.”⁶ We now look closer at references by Paul to weakness in 1 & 2 Corinthians.

1 Corinthians 1–4: These chapters seek to correct the Corinthian church’s captivity to a sophistic view of Christian life and leadership.⁷ Some Corinthian believers have transferred to Christian leaders the loyalty they were accustomed to giving sophist teachers in their pre-Christian days. This behavior disregards the implications of the cross for Christian life and leadership and produces rivalry among followers of Christian leaders (1.11-12; 3.3-4) like the rivalry documented among disciples of rival sophists. Paul critiques this behavior from the standpoint

⁴ (a) vacillating as a fleshly man in his travel plans (1.15–23); (b) lacking the courage to return to Corinth to conclude a confrontation (likely involving the public charge that he is not a legitimate apostle) from which he had retreated (1.15–2.11); (c) behaving suspiciously regarding money—*not* accepting payment for his teaching, as any good sophist would (2 Cor 11.7–11; 12.13) or as any apostle should (1 Cor 9.14); yet raising funds ostensibly “for the needs of the saints” (7–9; 12.16–18); (d) writing commanding letters while at a safe distance but behaving weakly when in person (10.1–2, 9–11; 11.6)

⁵ (a) lacking eloquence as a speaker (10.10; 11.6); (b) governing the church weakly (10.1; 11.20–21; 12.20–13.10); (c) failing to evince divine, apostolic authority (10.7-8; 11.5, 21b-23; 12.12; 13.3), including failing to manifest charismata sufficiently (12.1–7, 12)

⁶ Christopher Forbes, “Comparison, Self-Praise, & Irony: Paul’s Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 19. See also p. 14, citing Ronald F. Hock’s observation that Paul’s weakness of 1 Cor 2.3 expresses his low status as an artisan *The Social Context of Paul’s Ministry* (Philadelphia, Fortress: 1980) 35ff.

⁷ Bruce W. Winter explains and demonstrates the first-century sophistic hypothesis presumed in this discussion in *Philo and Paul among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002). Pages 180-202 examine 1 Cor 1-4.

of the cross, through which God rejects conventional hierarchies of value.⁸ Sophists exemplify the conventional values; they are among the “wise,” “powerful,” and “well born” (1.26) of the day, members of a social class to which few believers belong. Yet Paul assures these lower-status believers that they need not feel inferior, because they are “enriched in him [Christ] with all speech and knowledge” (1.5), areas in which sophists claimed supremacy.⁹ In this passage, weakness, a reference to Christ’s cross, expresses social connotations, as Forbes asserts.

Paul’s recounting of his initial coming to Corinth in 2.1-5 continues his anti-sophistic critique.¹⁰ Paul does not proclaim his message with rhetorical eloquence (2.1), because such eloquence hardly fits a message limited to “Jesus Christ and him crucified” (2.2). And contrary to the sophist, who projects self-confidence and whose eloquence includes effective delivery through a credible and appealing *persona*, Paul’s performance, his gospel proclamation, purposely lacks the sophist’s art: “I was with you in weakness and in much fear and trembling” (2.3). Because these qualities pertain to Paul’s public ministry, they again express social connotations: Paul would be seen by others as being socially inferior to sophists and performing in a rhetorically inferior way.

4.10 contains the final reference to weakness in this section. Chapter 4 concludes the first major argument of 1 Corinthians, namely, that the cross—not sophistic values—determines the shape of Christian life and leadership; and that Corinthian believers must stop regarding leaders as Christian sophists but regard and follow them as divinely-appointed assistants and stewards¹¹—roles filled by

⁸ “For the foolishness of God [that is, especially as expressed through the saving cross of Christ] is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men. . . . God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong” (1.25, 27).

⁹ Winter, 183-184.

¹⁰ Winter, 143-150. The coming of a sophist to a city was a major social event complete with advance publicity, public welcoming of the sophist as a celebrity, and speech events at which sophists would display their entertaining art, earn handsome fees, and recruit socially elite young men as paying students. Training by a sophist completed education of upper-status young men, preparing them for civic leadership.

¹¹ ὑπηρέτας, οἰκονόμους

slaves (4.1).¹² This chap. also contains the first of Paul's Corinthian hardship catalogs (4.9-13), which begins and concludes with a startling description of apostles' observable humiliation: "God has exhibited us apostles as . . . a spectacle to the world, to angels and to men. . . . We have become, and are now, as the refuse of the world, the offscouring of all things" (4.9, 13). Verses 8-13 continue the contrastive language first appearing in 1.18-29, where terms contrast God's choice of the cross against values of sophisticated culture apart from God. Paul now applies similarly contrastive terms to a more specific iteration of the contrast between God and the world, namely, the contrast between his apostolic team and the erring Corinthian believers: "We are fools for Christ's sake, but you are wise in Christ. We are weak, but you are strong. You are held in honor, but we in disrepute." Sarcastic and ironic, this language, especially in the final pair, exhibits its social connotations.

1 Corinthians 8–10: The language of weakness and strength in these chapters does not refer to Paul as weak (except for 9.22) or to his weaknesses. In them, Paul responds to questions about eating meat consecrated to idols. Yet Gerd Theissen argues that Paul uses "weak" and "strong" in these chapters in a way that coheres with their social connotation in chapters 1–4.¹³ In chapters 8–10, "weak" refers to lower-class believers whose conscience troubles them when they eat meat, which almost always occurs in public ceremony with unmistakably religious (but non-Christian) elements. "Strong," in contrast, refers to wealthier, higher-status believers who eat meat more often, first, because they can afford to buy it, and second, because they are more likely to have public, professional duties that involve occasional to frequent participation in meals with such conse-

¹² To be examined on another occasion: I think 1 Cor. 1—4 addresses rivalry between followers of only, or primarily, two leaders, Paul and Apollos. Apollos, about whom we know little, apparently ministered with rhetorical eloquence (he was an *ἄνθρωπος λόγιος*, Acts 18.24). Critics of Paul preferred Apollos' eloquent ministry and desired him to replace Paul. These persons reasoned that if the civic *ekklesia* deserved socially and rhetorically qualified leaders, why should the *ekklesia* of God be led by less? (See more about first-century civic and church leadership in Andrew D. Clarke, *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000].) Apollos wisely honored Paul's senior apostleship and founding of the church when he turned down Paul's strong urging (presumably in response to the church's request; 1 Cor. 16.12) to return to Corinth while Paul was away.

¹³ "The Strong and the Weak in Corinth: A Sociological Analysis of a Theological Quarrel," John H. Schutz, trans., in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 121–143. I believe this sense of "weak" is expressed in 2 Cor. 11.29 also, for which, see below.

crated meat. These, whether because they eat meat publicly often or for other reasons, do not experience the troubled conscience of their weaker Christian siblings.

1 Corinthians 11—15: Of three occurrences in these chapters, two merit no comment for this discussion (11.30; 15.43). The third, Paul's reference in 12.22—"parts of the body which seem to be weaker are indispensable"—connotes social status.¹⁴ Paul's familiar use of the body metaphor asserts the importance of all members of the church body (as Christ's body). Paul reverses the usual use of the body metaphor in Greco-Roman political discourse. Usually used to urge lower-status members of society to serve the greater, Paul instead urges higher-status members to value lower-status members.

2 Corinthians 10—13: Language of weakness is conspicuously absent in 2 Corinthians 1–9; however, it occurs some fourteen times in these final four chapters. The reason for this high occurrence is not hard to discern: In 10.10 Paul directly quotes the criticism he has received: "For he says (φησίν), 'His letters are impressive and forceful, but his personal presence is weak and his speech contemptible.'" Here Paul's disqualifying weakness is alleged explicitly, perhaps in some kind of report to or from the church. This complaint alleges both that Paul lacks integrity—forceful through letters while at a distance, yet weak in person—and that he lacks the rhetorical skill (specifically, effective delivery) expected of any leader, civic or religious.¹⁵ The language of weakness beginning here occurs frequently in these chapters because this term serves as a lightning rod consolidating all the complaints against Paul. Given the deterioration of his relationship

¹⁴ Dale B. Martin, "Tongues of Angels and Other Status Indicators," *JAAR* 59 (1991) 563–569; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 259.

¹⁵ Critics presume that apostles and other church leaders should meet qualifications similar to those expected of Greco-Roman leaders generally. Greco-Roman society did not separate religion from state, and leaders we would consider primarily civic or imperial and not primarily religious nevertheless routinely fulfilled explicitly religious duties as part of their official duties. See Clarke, *Serve the Community*, 147–48.

with the church, Paul is obliged to respond, and he chooses to use this key term throughout these chapters in his response.¹⁶

In the beginning of Paul's appeal for complete obedience (10.1-2, 6), he refers to himself sarcastically, restating the charge quoted directly in 10.10: (10.1) "I who am 'timid and unimpressive' (*tapeinos*) when face to face with you but 'bold and commanding' when away from you." *Tapeinos*, often translated "humble," functions as a synonym for "weak" (*asthenēs*) in 10.10 and evinces the negative judgment of Paul by his critics, here tied clearly to his performance as apostle in Corinth. While humility is a Jewish and Christian virtue, in secular Greek, *tapeinos* usually refers to "person who is base, ignoble, of low birth, working at a humble occupation, held in low esteem," or who has a low self-estimate;¹⁷ and its occurrence in 10.1 expresses this negative social sense.

¹⁶ A summary of the key actions of chapters 10–13 establishes a context for examining other occurrences of weakness language en route to examining 12.9-10. Chapter 10 begins forcefully with an appeal to believers and a threat of divine war against the disobedient and rivals (10.1–6). It calls the Corinthians to examine the evidence regarding the criticism of Paul, which it rebuts with three claims (10.7–11): (1) Paul can match anyone else's claim to apostleship (v 7); (2) the results of his ministry will not discredit his claim to apostolic authority (v 8); (3) what he says while away, he does in person (vv 10–11). A first section of rhetorical proof (10.12–11.21a) supports these claims and proves why Paul dare not join the résumé ritual of self-commendation and compare his ministry with the activities of rivals (10.12). Proof develops through a contrastive *synkrisis* that rehearses Paul's history with the Corinthians and distinguishes his ministry from the rivals' activities on five counts. A second section of rhetorical proof (11.21b–12.13) centers on the Fool's Speech ("FS": 11.21b–12.10). In it Paul finally relents and agrees, foolishly, to compare himself with his rivals. The FS proves both that Paul is not weak (through a hardship list that boasts, foolishly and *kata sarka*, that he is a better servant of Christ, 11.21b–11.29) and that he is weak, divinely (about which he boasts *en kyrio*, with a climactic divine oracle that valorizes the weakness critics disdain, 11.29–12.10). Rivals now forgotten, the remainder of the discourse (12.14–13.13[14]) resumes the opening appeal that the Corinthians mend their ways, allowing Paul to continue to be weak—exercising his authority without severity, for their upbuilding, not their destruction. This summary abstracts my "Weak Enough to Lead: Paul's Response to Criticism and Rivals in 2 Corinthians 10–13: A Rhetorical Reading," Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 2002.

¹⁷ Ceslas Spicq, ταπεινός, ταπεινώω, ταπεινώσις, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (James D. Ernest, trans. and ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994) 369. Yet ταπεινώσις "was also considered a virtue even by pagans, namely the virtue of modesty or moderation," associated with other virtues, including πραύτης (370). Philo uses the term as negative and social in his critique of first-century sophistry. "The Worse Attacks the Better" (*Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet*) contrasts Abel (the better, people of virtue)

(footnote continued)



Beyond the charge in 10.10, the next direct reference to his weakness appears in 11.4–7, which coheres with criticisms expressed in 10.10. Although no form of “weak” appears in 11.4–7, Paul nonetheless confirms the social-status nature of his alleged weakness by denying that he is inferior to the “super apostles,” even though he is an amateur at speaking.¹⁸ This understanding of weakness is further confirmed when Paul asks if he has sinned by humbling himself,¹⁹ presumably through manual work (1 Cor 4.12; 2 Cor 11.27), in order to give the gospel freely. The contempt in which social elites held labor and laborers is well known. So in these few vv., Paul has touched on two social behaviors that mark him as socially inferior and powerless—not the qualities some desired in the leader of God’s *ekklesia* at Corinth. But yet another dimension of Paul’s weakness is alluded to here. When he laments that the Corinthians’ betrothal to Christ is threatened by their accepting another Jesus, spirit, and gospel (11.4),²⁰ Paul refers to their accepting the abusive leadership of his rivals, which he expresses at 11.20, concluding, “To my shame, I say, that we were too weak [for that]!” (11.19–21a). Paul’s ironic confession of weakness restates the qualities of his opening appeal—the leniency and meekness of Christ (10.1).²¹ His faithfulness to these qualities of Christ prevents his governing the church as the rivals would—with undue severity (11.21a; 13.10).

and Cain (the worse, sophists). After Philo’s sophists have praised their lives of social privilege and bodily pleasure (#33), they disparage their opponents: “The so-called lovers of virtue are almost without exception obscure people (ἄδοξοι), looked down upon (εὖ καταφρόνητοι), of mean estate (ταπεινοί), destitute of the necessities of life, not enjoying the privileges of subject peoples or even of slaves, filthy, sallow, reduced to skeletons, with a hungry look from want of food, the prey of disease, in training for dying” (this final phrase evoking 1 Cor. 4.9; Whitaker, transl., LCL).

¹⁸ v 5: λογίζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν ὑστερηκέμαι ; v 7: ἐποίησα ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν

¹⁹ ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε

²⁰ Understanding “another” Jesus, spirit, and gospel as a result of rivals’ sophistic view and practice of leadership causes the ideas of this passage to cohere strongly. Contrary to the practice of interpreters’ seeking to identify how Paul and his rivals differed in Christology, pneumatology, and soteriology, this proposed interpretation centers on different understandings and practices of Christian leadership, apostleship, specifically. Timothy Savage develops this view in *Power through Weakness: Paul’s Understanding of the Christian Ministry in 2 Corinthians* (SNTSMS 86; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 156–157.

²¹ For a definitive exegesis of 10.1 within chs. 10–13, see Donald Dale Walker, *Paul’s Offer of Leniency (2 Cor 10:1): Populist Ideology and Rhetoric in a Pauline Letter Fragment* (WUNT, Series 2, vol. 152; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2002).

These portions—11.4–7 with 11.19–21—contrast Paul and his rivals and clarify the charge that he is a weak leader.²² Unlike rivals, Paul serves and leads humbly, without projecting a strong or authoritarian personality; he does not lead through powerful (sophistic) oratory; he does not demand money from followers; and he is lenient in church governance.²³ As Anitra Kolenkow points out, from a sociological point of view, such behaviors make Paul a weak leader in conventional terms because they exclude his using conventional levers of power.²⁴

As Paul agrees, ironically, in 11.21a with the charge that he is weak, so he continues to agree with and submit to this charge, both ironically and straightforwardly, throughout the Fool’s Speech (hereafter, FS; 11.21b–12.10). He also submits to the desire of critics that he too boast—that is, perform his résumé, supporting his claim to be an apostle. In 10.12 he refuses to compare or classify himself with rivals, but now he accedes to this demand. But he agrees to this ludicrous boasting contest only as a fool,²⁵ perhaps adopting the role of a low-status comic fool from stage mimes.²⁶

The first part of the FS (11.21b-29) features boasting *kata sarka*, beginning with Paul’s point-by-point boast of comparability with rivals (v 22). But to rivals’

²² who, it is alleged, cannot therefore be a true apostle of Christ, 10.7

²³ leading to the accusation that he is powerful only when absent but impotent in person, 10.10

²⁴ Anitra Bingham Kolenkow, “Paul and Opponents in 2 Cor 10–13 — *Theioi Andres* and Spiritual Guides,” in Lukas Bormann, Kelly del Tredici, Angela Standhartinger, eds., *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition the New Testament World* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994) 351–374; here, 364–366. This article does not, however, deal with a leader’s speech.

²⁵ Adopting this role gives Paul a kind of deniability. With it both of these statements are true: Paul is boasting (but only in character as a fool), and he (sober, right-minded Paul) is not boasting. Adopting this role allows Paul to do what he otherwise could not approve doing.

²⁶ Laurence Welborn has developed the century-old suggestion that Paul performs the role of the fool drawn from the stage mimes in “The Runaway Paul,” *Harvard Theological Review* 92: 2 [1999] 115–163. This role fits well into the contrast between Paul and high-status sophists because, according to theatre historian William Beare, “[t]he social status of [mime] performers was low”; “[w]ide indeed was the gulf between [mime] performers and the actors who, in dignified mask and costume, appeared in the theatre of Dionysius to perform the tragedies of Aeschylus” (William Beare, *The Roman Stage: A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic* (London: Methuen & Co, 1964; 3rd rev. ed.; 149). Even in choosing how to play the fool, Paul has chosen a role that he knows signifies low status.

claim to be servants of Christ (v 23), Paul boasts of superiority—"I am a better one" (RSV). Then follows Paul's lengthiest hardship catalog (vv 23c-29), through which he imitates rivals' boasting of enduring trials and sufferings, demonstrating that he is a superior servant of Christ.²⁷ The catalog ends with the introduction of the topic and language of weakness. "In labor . . . and without enough clothing" (v 27) are features of Paul's hardships that not merely supersede rivals' catalogs but that also contrast in kind. Only Paul labors to support himself, and this practice contributes to the status-conscious criticism that he is unfit to lead (11.7-12). Beyond this expression of weakness, the word itself emerges again as Paul expresses his burden for his churches, his solidarity with believers: "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is scandalized, and I do not burn?" (vv 28-29). Scholars propose various referents for "weak" and "scandalized"; however, the vocabulary and context coheres well with uses of "weak" and "strong" in 1 Cor 8-10. Referring thus, the present text expresses to Paul's critics (presumably the upper-status "strong") that he identifies intentionally with those believers whom others (now using the language of 1 Cor 11-12) fail to discern as valuable members of Christ's body. Within his foolish boasting, this willingness to labor, to abase himself to exalt others (2 Cor 11.7), and this compassion for the weak (v 29) shows that he serves Christ better than his rivals do.

While 11.27-29 introduces weakness into the FS (11.21a precedes it), vv 21b-29 do not boast of weakness overall but rather boast *kata sarka* in Paul's superiority as a servant of Christ based on criteria rivals have chosen. But 11.30 marks a transition—"If I must boast, I will boast of the things pertaining to my weak-

²⁷ Interpretations of this catalog divide in fundamental ways. (See my "Weak Enough to Lead," 198-236, for fuller discussion.) Dieter Georgi expresses the perhaps most influential Protestant view: "[w]hereas Paul boasted of his sufferings, the opponents . . . [listed] their spiritual experiences and powerful deeds. In their opinion (but not Paul's) these attested to the authenticity and vividness of their representation of Christ. . . . [T]hey must have believed that the power of Christ was present in the mighty deeds of his messengers." (*The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 280; cf. 245; English trans. and slight revision of *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur Religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964).) However, I am convinced that Paul's hardship catalog imitates his rivals' similar boasting. Kolenkow points to 1 Cor. 13, beatitudes from Q, and other early Christian literature (*Didache, Acts of Thomas*) to show that trials and suffering are among elements universal among early Christian leaders: "Tradition:lineage [2 Cor. 11.22], power:miracles [12.1-10], and trials:suffering [11.23-29; 11.30-12.10] are elements Paul and his opponents have in common" ("Paul and Opponents" 366).

ness.”²⁸ The FS may continue to follow the rivals’ order of topics; or it may turn to topics—visions, revelations, healings—that critics thought evinced Paul’s puny claim to being an apostle. Either way, from 11.30 forward, Paul boasts of his weakness (11.30–12.10), which is a boasting *en kyrio* (10.17). Besides the statement of 11.30, this shift of focus is marked also by a shift in form—from the catalog of instances to three short episodes (11.32–33; 12.1–6; 12.7–10). Moreover, at this point in the FS, the comedy of Paul’s foolish, mimic boasting may be most apparent.

In the first episode (11.32–33), Paul escapes from the ethnarch of Damascus. Edwin Judge has proposed that Paul’s descent parodies the *corona muralis*, an award given to the first Roman soldier to scale the wall of a city under assault. Paul boasts that he was the first one retreating down the wall!²⁹ Similarly, Welborn emphasizes Paul’s successful flight, but the flight nevertheless of a runaway fool, whose low status and self-humiliating behaviors amuse an audience.³⁰

In the second episode (12.1–6), Paul boasts of his ascent to Paradise in a way that keeps his opening word: “there is nothing to be gained by it.” Playing the prolix comedic fool, Paul tells us twice in a short space that he does not know whether the visionary was in or out of the body. Despite the feat of ascending to the highest heaven, what the man heard cannot be told. Truly the ascent delivers no benefit, no knowledge beyond the report of its occurrence. Paul reiterates that he will boast only of his weaknesses (12.5) and launches into the third and final episode (12.7–10). It opens with paradoxical irony that invites us to keep reading these as lines of a mimic fool:³¹ Paul’s receiving an “abundance of revelations”—

²⁸ confirming that the boasts of vv 23–29 imitate boasts of rivals, who do not boast of the weaknesses for which they criticize Paul

²⁹ “Paul’s Boasting in Relation to Contemporary Professional Practice,” *Australian Biblical Review* 16 (1968) 37–50; here 47.

³⁰ Welborn (“The Runaway Paul”) proposes that Paul adopts five stock mimic characters throughout the FS (137): here the ‘runaway fool’; in 11.21b–23 the ‘leading slave’; in 11.24–27 the ‘braggart warrior’; in 11.28–29 the ‘anxious old man’; and in 12.1b–4 and 12.7–9 the ‘learned impostor’.

³¹ Karl Plank distinguishes two kinds of irony: “Where the irony of dissimulation suggests that the expressed meaning appears to be other than it is [hyperbole or litotes, e.g.], the irony of paradox notes that the expressed meaning *is* what it appears to be, but what appears to be is not all that is” (*Paul and the Irony of Affliction*, SBLSS [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987] 40).

abundance through the ascent to Paradise?—prompts God’s giving him the thorn in the flesh,³² to keep him from becoming conceited. Should we take this only straightforwardly? We may believe that Paul has received abundant revelations (12.6) and the painful thorn to humble him; yet this straightforward reading still leaves us with an incoherent, foolish assertion that non-revelations from one heavenly ascent fourteen years ago (clearly not beneficial to the Corinthians now) necessitated a painful *skolops* to prevent his becoming conceited. Paul both confirms his reception of revelations and parodies it in order to prick the pretensions of boastful rivals.

The Corinthians may have known what Paul’s thorn was, but we can only propose possible, perhaps plausible, identities.³³ Regardless of our uncertainty about its identity, we recognize the thorn’s important characteristics: God sent it, yet it was “a messenger of Satan,” and it was painful and persistent. Paul seeks the Lord three times for relief (or healing), but God does not grant his plea.

Paul has boasted of his weaknesses from 11.30 to this point. He has performed the role of a fool, humiliating himself in actions inviting onlookers to be amused at his expense: as a runaway fool or a soldier leading in retreat (11.32-33); as a visionary whose heavenly ascent delivers nothing yet results in divinely ordained, painful Satanic buffeting (12.2-7); and as a supplicant denied (12.8-9). If in 11.21b-29 Paul overwhelms rivals in showing himself to be a better servant of Christ, the three episodes of 11.30–12.8 underwhelm. Especially the episodes of ascent and the thorn portray Paul as ineffectual in specifically religious acts, charismatic acts that the Corinthians valued (1 Cor 12–14). In these Paul goes beyond accepting the general judgment that he is foolish by adopting the role of a fool; he sharpens the focus of the performance by showing himself to be weak—in critics’ eyes—as a pneumatic, or charismatic. He confirms to them their judgment that he is fleshly and not spiritual (10.2-3; 1.17).

At this moment of his greatest concession of weakness, he reports a charismatic word from the Lord (12.9). Its two clauses are parallel: “My grace is sufficient for you for [my] power is fulfilled in weakness.” While the oracle does not relieve Paul from the thorn, it does confirm Paul in his apostolic vocation and rebuke critics and rivals in their judgment against Paul. They have rejected Paul’s assertion of apostleship because of his weaknesses; but the Lord declares that his power completes its purpose precisely through such weaknesses. Paul concludes

³² reading ἐδόθη as a divine passive

³³ Note 1 refers to a summary of chief proposals of the thorn’s identity.

exultantly (vv 9-10) because God's power inheres in his weaknesses: "when I am weak, then I am strong."

What, then, is this weakness that divine power perfects? Common to the behaviors identified as weak are these features: (1) Paul considers each to be crucial to his apostolic task of re-presenting Jesus Christ, but (2) critics hold them and Paul in contempt. Amplified, Paul says, "when I am weak—that is, when I perform my apostolic mission in the way God directs and when in being faithful to this mission I suffer contempt and rejection—I am strong—that is, God enables me to endure and to minister faithfully and effectively." The contrast between weak and strong in 12.10 parallels the contrastive pairs in 1 Corinthians 1.18-29 and in the hardship catalog of 1 Corinthians 4.9-13. Paul's apostolic weakness in 2 Corinthians 10-13 is nothing other than the ways he shares "abundantly in Christ's sufferings" for the "comfort and salvation" of others (2 Cor 1.5, 6), including even those high-status critics and rivals to whom an apparently low-status Paul "may seem to have failed" (13.7).



INDEX

Article index

- Andersen, Kjellaug Marie: "Skriftsynet hos M. Basilea Schlink." *Refleks* 4-1 (2005), 26-47.
- Anderson, Allan H.: "The Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements in Britain: An Historical Overview." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 78-90.
- Atkinson, William: "Spirit, Soul and Body. The Trichotomy of Kenyon, Hagin and Copeland." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 98-118.
- Barabas, Steven: "Biographical sketches of some Keswick leaders." *Refleks* 5-2 (2006), 94-112.
- Barnes III, Roscoe: "F.F. Bosworth. A Profile in Divine Healing Ministry." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 71-82.
- Barnes III, Roscoe: "Persecuted for Christ. A Defining Moment in the Life of F.F. Bosworth." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 89-97.
- Bundy, David D.: "Benjamin Hardin Irwin, Pentecostal and Thomas Ball Barratt." *Refleks* 7-1 (2008), 35-40.
- Bundy, David D.: "Visions of Sanctification: Themes of Orthodoxy in the Methodist, Holiness, and Pentecostal Traditions." *Refleks* 7-1 (2008), 78-119.
- DeArteaga, William L.: "Agnes Sanford: Apostle of Healing, and First Theologian of the Charismatic Renewal." *Refleks* 6-1 (2007), 69-88.
- DeArteaga, William L.: "The Wesleyan Revival as Model for the Convergence Movement." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 74-88.
- Elbert, Paul: "Acts of the Holy Spirit. Hermeneutical and Historiographical Reflections." *Refleks* 4-1 (2005), 48-97.
- Elbert, Paul: "Narrative-Rhetorical Aspects of Literary Hermeneutics. Leaving Questionable Methods Behind and Retaining What Greco-Roman Christian Writers Appreciated and Respected." *Refleks* 6-1 (2007), 89-131.
- Engelsviken, Tormod and Geir Lie: "Nils E. Bloch-Hoell: In Memoriam." *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 2.
- Faupel, D. William: "The Life and Ministry of Frank Weston Sandford." *Refleks* 7-1 (2008), 41-62.

Faupel, D. William: "Theological Influences on the Teaching and Practices of John Alexander Dowie." *Refleks* 8-1 (2009), 2-29.

Halldorf, Joel: "Förnyelseväckelsens uppgång och fall." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 103-112.

Hollenweger Walter J.: "My Pilgrimage in Mission." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 88-102.

Holmes, Pamela: "An Educational Encounter: A Pentecostal Considers the Work of Elisabeth S. Fiorenza." *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 52-87.

Hunter, Harold D.: "A Journey Toward Racial Reconciliation: Race Mixing in the CGP." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 19-42.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti: "En överraskande dialog i utkanten av ekumeniken. Dialogen mellan den romersk-katolska kyrkan och pingströrelsen som har redan pågått i över 25 år." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 66-77.

Kartveit, Magnar: "Ved Hans sår er vi blitt leget." *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 36-50.

King, Paul L.: "The Christian and Missionary Alliance. Higher Life Movement of Missions, Holiness, and Healing." *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 21-30.

King, Paul L.: "Christian Psychics and Shamans. A Response to Morton Kelsey, Agnes Sanford and DeArteaga's Defense and Acceptance of Psychic Phenomena." *Refleks* 8-1 (2009), 48-63.

King, Paul L.: "A Historical Survey of Belief and Practice regarding Deliverance of Demonized Christians." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 53-65.

King, Paul L.: "A Historical Survey of the Concept of Strategic Level Spiritual Warfare. Spiritual Mapping, Territorial Spirits, and Related Praxis." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 56-70.

King, Paul L.: "The Inner Healing Movement in Historical Context." *Refleks* 8-1 (2009), 30-47.

King, Paul L.: "The New Apostolic Movement in Historical Context." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 60-73.

King, Paul L.: "The Prophetic Movement in Historical Context." *Refleks* 6-1 (2007), 46-68.

Lie, Geir: "Amerikansk Healing Revivals innflytelse på norsk Maran Ata bevegelse." *Refleks* 7-1 (2008), 2-14.

Lie, Geir: "Andrew Murray: sørafrikansk 'Keswickforkynner' med vidt nedslagsfelt." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 44-47.

- Lie, Geir: "Apostler og aposteltjeneste i internasjonal pinsekristendom." *Refleks* 1-1 (2002), 3-11.
- Lie, Geir: "Charles P. Schmitt – a brief introduction." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 57-59.
- Lie, Geir: "The ecclesiology of Witness Lee." *Refleks* 6-1 (2007), 2-15.
- Lie, Geir: "Ekklesiologi på avveie – fra Watchman Nee til Witness Lee." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 7-34.
- Lie, Geir: "E.W. Kenyon og tidshusholdingslæren." *Refleks* 4-1 (2005), 98-115.
- Lie, Geir: "Fra pinsevern til karismatiker. Norsk pinsekristendom og karismatisk fornyelse fra 1980-årene og fram til idag." *Refleks* 8-1 (2009), 64-90.
- Lie, Geir: "Gene Edwards og hans menighetsforståelse." *Refleks* 5-2 (2006), 4-33.
- Lie, Geir: "Helbredelse ved tro: Frau Möttlingen til Tulsa – et historisk overblikk." *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 3-19.
- Lie, Geir: "Hellighetsbevegelsen i USA og Storbritannia – et historisk riss." *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 3-20.
- Lie, Geir: "Jessie Penn-Lewis – en kortfattet presentasjon." *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 31-40.
- Lie, Geir: "Den karismatiske bevegelsen i USA – et historisk riss." *Refleks* 4-1 (2005), 2-12.
- Lie, Geir: "Lance Lambert – a brief introduction." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 83-87.
- Lie, Geir: "Norsk fellesskapsbevegelse – med fokus på opprinnelse og tidlige år." *Refleks* 6-1 (2007), 16-45.
- Lie, Geir: "Norsk karismatisk fornyelse – en kortfattet historikk." *Refleks* 7-1 (2008), 63-77.
- Lie, Geir: "Norsk katolsk-karismatisk fornyelse. Intervju med sr. Ingrid Marie Nilsson." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 53-55.
- Lie, Geir: "En oversikt over premillennismens historie i Storbritannia og USA." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 2-16.
- Lie, Geir: "Pinsebevegelsen i USA fram til omlag 1920 – et historisk riss." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 2-18.
- Lie, Geir: "Plymouthbrødrene – en kortfattet introduksjon." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 2-6.

Lie, Geir: "Poul Madsen og Kristent Fællesskab-bevegelsen i Danmark." *Refleks* 5-1 (2006), 35-56.

Lie, Geir: "T. Austin-Sparks – a brief introduction." *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 48-52.

Lie, Geir: "Trosbevegelsen i Norge – en historisk gjennomgang." *Refleks* 7-1 (2008), 111-151.

Matthew, David: "Restorationism in British Church Life from 1970." *Refleks* 5-2 (2006), 34-49.

McIntyre, Joseph: "Healing in Redemption." *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 20-35.

Paulsen, Reidar: "Apostler og aposteltjeneste i dag – et karismatisk perspektiv. Notater langs veien." *Refleks* 1-1 (2002), 40-61.

Richie, Tony: "Is Pentecostalism Just Another American Success Story? A Response to Jürgen Moltmann on the Place of Optimism in the Pentecostal Tradition." *Refleks* 5-2 (2006), 77-93.

Rimehaug, Erling: "Toronto-bølgen – en velsignelse?" *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 84-89.

Roberts, Mark E.: "Weakness That Divine Power Perfects (2 Cor. 12.9-10)." *Refleks* 8-1 (2009), 91-102.

Rodgers, Darrin: "Rediscovering Pentecostalism's Diverse Roots." *Refleks* 5-2 (2006), 50-64.

Råmunddal, Lars: "Teologi og karismatikk. Akademisk teologistudium og karismatisk spiritualitet i lys av ulike forståelsesparadigmer." *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 69-83.

Di Sabatino, David: "The Birth of Jesus Music." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 49-52.

Di Sabatino, David: "Lonnie Frisbee: A Modern Day Samson." *Refleks* 4-1 (2005), 12-24.

Di Sabatino, David: "The Spiritual Sixties and the Jesus People Movement." *Refleks* 4-2 (2005), 17-48.

Salvesen, Reidar: "Ja eller nei til kvinner som menighetsledere. Om debatten innad i den evangelikale bevegelse i USA." *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 68-81.

Schrag, Martin H.: "The Spiritual Pilgrimage of the Reverend Benjamin Hardin Irwin." *Refleks* 7-1 (2008), 15-34.

Skarsaune, Oskar: "Hva er og gjør en apostel? Noen trekk fra det eldste apostelbildet." *Refleks* 1-1 (2002), 29-39.

Sverker, Per-Axel: "Evangelikal tro och karismatisk erfarenhet." *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 82-101.

Synnes, Martin: "Hvem er apostler i Det nye Testamente?" *Refleks* 1-1 (2002), 20-28.

Thu, Erling: "Apostlar og profetar i dag." *Refleks* 1-1 (2002), 12-19.

Vreeland, Derek: "Reconstructing Word of Faith Theology." *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 51-68.

Welch, Tim: "God's 'Moses' for Pentecostalism: Remapping the Smale-Trail." *Refleks* 5-2 (2006), 65-76.

Wendel, Jorunn: "Elevine Heede – glemt av kirkehistorien, men husket av Gud." *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 41-51.

Book Review Index

- Bjerkholt, Thomas: *Bibelens kvinnesyn* by author Turid Smith Polfus. *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 105-106.
- Braaten, Per: *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century* by author Melvin E. Dieter. *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 102.
- Dahl, Rune: *Quenching the Spirit. Discover the REAL Spirit Behind The Charismatic Controversy* by author William L. DeArteaga. *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 93-94.
- Edwards, Troy J.: *The Word-Faith Controversy. Understanding the Health and Wealth Gospel* by author Robert M. Bowman. *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 92-93.
- Elbert, Paul: *Encountering the Holy Spirit. Paths of Christian Growth and Service* by author French L. Arrington. *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 95-100.
- Estdahl, Samuel: *God's Word to Women. One Hundred Bible Studies on Woman's Place in the Divine Economy* by author Katharine C. Bushnell. *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 104.
- Fragell, Levi: *Levis resa* by author Per Olov Enquist. *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 108-111.
- Halldorf, Joel: *The Everlasting Gospel. The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought* by author David William Faupel. *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 91-93.
- Hollenweger, Walter J.: *God's Showman. A Historical Study of John G. Lake and South African / American Pentecostalism* by author Kemp Pendelton Burpeau. *Refleks* 3-1 (2004), 93-95.
- Johannesen, Geir Harald: *A Different Gospel – A Historical and Biblical analysis of the Modern Faith Movement* by author D.R. McConnell. *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 91-92.
- McIntyre, Joseph: *E.W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister?* by author Geir Lie. *Refleks* 2-1 (2003), 106-108.
- Robins, Roger G.: *E.W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty* by author Dale Hawthorne Simmons. *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 96-99.
- Synan, Vinson: *E.W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story* by author Joseph McIntyre. *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 95-96.
- Åleskjær, Åge M.: *All Things Are Possible. The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America* by author David Edwin Harrell jr. *Refleks* 1-2 (2002), 90.

Books in the Refleks-series

1. Geir Lie, *E.W. Kenyon: Sektstifter eller kristen lederskikkelse? En historisk undersøkelse av Kenyons teologi med særlig henblikk på dens historiske røtter og innflytelsen på samtid og ettertid.* 2003. Out of print.
2. Geir Lie, *E.W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister? A Historical Analysis of Kenyon's Theology With Particular Emphasis on Roots and Influences.* 2003. Out of print.
3. Kemp Pendleton Burpeau, *God's Showman. A Historical Study of John Graham Lake and South African / American Pentecostalism.* 2004. Out of print.
4. Geir Lie, *Plymouthbrødrene, hellighetsbevegelsen, pinsebevegelsen og moderne karismatikk. En bibliografisk introduksjon.* 2005. Out of print.
5. Kjell Olav Sannes, *Det guddommeliggjorte menneske og den menneskeliggjorte Gud. En kritisk teologisk analyse av synet på forholdet mellom mennesket og Gud hos Kenneth E. Hagin, trosbevegelsens grunnlegger og lærer.* 2005. Out of print.
6. Lars Olav GjØra, *Den nye reformasjonen. En vurdering av Åge M. Åleskjærs syn på frihet fra loviskhet ut fra sentrale bibeltekster.* 2006. Out of print.
7. Steinar Moe, *De skal støtes ut. Utstøtelse i Den Kristelige Menighet (Smiths Venner) i møte med en luthersk tankegang.* 2007. Out of print.
8. Geir Lie, ed., *Norsk pinsekristendom og karismatisk fornyelse. Ettbinds oppslagsverk.* 2007, 2008. **Only book still in print.**
9. Merete Moe Halvorsrød and Steinar Moe, *Elihumanigheten, Vestfold. En analyse og vurdering av menighetens konfesjonelle og dogmatiske egenart.* 2009. Out of print.
10. Geir Lie, ed., *Løft dem opp. Kjente lederskikkelser innen internasjonal helighets-, pinse- og karismatisk bevegelse.* 2009. Out of print

Books in the Akademia-series

1. Steinar Moe, *Kristendomstolkninger. Noen prinsipteologiske betraktninger*. 2007. Out of print.
2. Torleiv Austad, *Gud møter oss. Artikler om bønn og gudsbilde*. 2008. Out of print.