

**University of Birmingham**

**Healing Teaching and Practice in the Word of Faith: An Appraisal**

**By**

**Thomas Frederick Piers Hamlyn, M.A.**

**A thesis submitted to the Department of Theology and Religion of**

**The University of Birmingham**

**For the degree of**

**Master of Philosophy**

**Department of Theology and Religion**

**University of Birmingham**

**ERI Building G3**

**Pritchatts Road**

**Birmingham B15 2TT**

**April 2015**

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

## Abstract

This work seeks to determine the nature of Word of Faith (WOF) teaching and practice of healing, and that nature in relation to the incidence of the blessing of divine healing within the WOF. The alleged anomaly of metaphysical (when ‘metaphysical’ is defined as Mind-Cure) teaching and practice embedded within WOF teaching and practice of healing is assessed.

Amongst surveys of the WOF examined was Dan McConnell’s *A Different Gospel* having as its central tenet the claim that healing in the WOF is a ‘wolf in sheep’s clothing;’ that is, that its source is not divine as it claims, but rather derived from Mind-Cure (particularly Christian Science and New Thought, which McConnell defines as ‘metaphysical’) and so is demonic in practice. This research into both claimed Christian origins of the WOF and also into Mind-Cure helps establish the true *origins* of healing in the WOF, suggesting it to be a *continuance* of evangelical divine healing evangelism, such as practiced by Carrie Judd Montgomery. That is, the WOF is found heavily influenced by leading personalities of the nineteenth century Divine Healing Movement in the United States, like Carrie Judd Montgomery, personalities who also straddle Modern Pentecostalism’s development.

The research revealed that argument put forward for the Mind-Cure metaphysical’s influence within the WOF, even argument for the Mind-Cure metaphysical’s fundamental existence within the WOF, seems to be not only tenuous, but even specious. However, a serious shortcoming with WOF teaching and practice of healing has been identified. This identified shortcoming is failure to emphasise the reported biblical stipulation for all to, at least, help the poor on a regular basis.

Comparison was made between divine healing in the WOF and divine healing as encountered within books comprising the Holy Bible content agreed following the Council of Nicea (AD 325), sometimes called the ‘content of the Protestant Bible.’<sup>1</sup> The research identifies discrepancies between divine healing as taught and practised in the WOF, on the one hand, and between the subject of divine healing as contextualised within the Holy Bible, on the other. The research suggests that problems with the model of divine healing of the WOF will be partly rectified by teaching obedience to the biblical commandment, and particularly the New Testament commandment, to *at least* regularly help the poor thereby avoiding an outworking of the biblical condemnation of those *not* helping the poor. The research suggests incidence of the blessing of divine healing in the WOF is prevented by the failure of the WOF to teach this commandment to Christian believers that they regularly help/bless the poor : for those *not* showing lovingkindness in, at least, helping the poor on a regular basis there will be *decreased* incidence of the lovingkindness of God’s blessing of divine healing experienced.

---

<sup>1</sup> That is : “Today the [ Old Testament ] canon exists in two main forms : that found in the Hebrew Bible, followed by Jews, Protestants and some Orthodox churches, and that found in the Septuagint, which includes the Apocrypha, followed by Roman Catholics and also some Orthodox churches...the thirty-ninth Paschal [ Easter ] Letter of Athanasius, metropolitan of Alexandria, written in 367 CE,...listed all the books of the present New Testament.” ( Bruce M. Metzger, & Michael D. Coogan ( eds. ), *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, [ Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1993 ], pp. 102, 103. )

## **Acknowledgments**

I thank first Almighty God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, for lending me this life, and for graciously ordering my steps. I thank my father Peter Hamlyn for having given me access to his library, and for his encouragement. I thank the late Revd. Dr. Norman Cliff (of China Inland Mission/Overseas Missionary Fellowship fame), also thanking Norman's widow Joyce for having kindly given me the pick of Norman's library, with only one exception. I thank my friend and adviser Revd. Dr. Richard Massey (formerly principal of Birmingham Christian College) for all his kind helps down the years, including the timely loans of books. I thank my supervisor Revd. Dr. Andrew Davies, and Revd. Dr. Mark Cartledge, for helpful suggestions, and I also thank those fellow students at the University of Birmingham, past and present, for helpful works and conversations. To others to whom I owe thanks, I trust to duly thank you: hopefully sooner not later.

I desire this study contributes to greater knowledge of the love and mercy of Almighty God.

## **Abbreviations.**

Apart from occasional use of *sic*, and *vice versa*, I complied with the request to remove all Latin from the thesis - the sole exception being one phrase in chapter four, where an English translation is provided in parentheses.

To aid the reader I left the large number of newspaper, journal, and other periodical names unabbreviated. The King James translation of the Bible (last revised in 1767, so more modern than the still-read English of Shakespeare's plays) is the preferred translation in both the nineteenth century U. S. Divine Healing Movement and also in most WOF material, despite the availability of more recent English translations of the Bible. This project recognises that in making it the default bible translation used. However, I have found it helpful to also resort to Jay Green's *The Interlinear Bible*, and his *KJ3 Literal Translation* (2008), also specifying the Revised Standard Version and other Bible translations when used.

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| Green   | Jay Green's The Interlinear Bible                |
| Green 2 | Jay Green's KJ3 Literal Translation of the Bible |
| Knox    | The Knox Translation of the Bible                |
| NIV     | The New International Version Bible              |
| RSV     | The Revised Standard Version Bible               |

0-----0

# Healing Teaching and Practice in the Word of Faith: An Appraisal

## Table of Contents

|                  |  |    |
|------------------|--|----|
| <b>Chapter 1</b> | <b>Evangelical Roots of the WOF</b>  |    |
| 1.1              | Backgrounds, Thesis, Research Question. . . . .  | 7  |
| 1.2              | Methodology. . . . .   | 10 |
| 1.3              | The Question of a WOF Healing Hermeneutic. . . . .   | 12 |
| 1.4              | How This Chapter Supports the Thesis. . . . .  | 14 |
| 1.5              | Chapter Structure. . . . .   | 15 |
| 1.6              | WOF Teaching. . . . .  | 16 |
| 1.7              | WOF Teachers/WOF Movement. . . . .   | 17 |
| 1.8              | The WOF is Pentecostal. . . . .  | 21 |
| 1.9              | The Divine Healing Movement. . . . .   | 26 |
|                  | 1.9.1 Introduction. . . . .  | 26 |
|                  | 1.9.2 Phoebe Palmer (1807-1874): Claiming Sanctification By Faith. . . . .                                       | 28 |
|                  | 1.9.3 Sarah Anne Freeman Mix (1832-1884): Healing &<br>Discipling of Carrie Judd Montgomery (1858-1946). . . . . | 30 |
|                  | 1.9.4 ‘Experience’ & ‘Receiving By Faith:’ John Wesley vs.<br>Carrie Judd Montgomery. . . . .                    | 33 |
|                  | 1.9.5 Carrie Judd Montgomery, E. W. Kenyon<br>and ‘Finished Work’. . . . .                                       | 39 |
| 1.10             | Healing in Modern Pentecostalism. . . . .  | 42 |
| 1.11             | Conclusion. . . . .  | 44 |
| <b>Chapter 2</b> | <b>Questioning Whether the WOF is Metaphysical</b>   |    |
| 2.1              | How This Chapter Supports the Thesis. . . . .  | 47 |
| 2.2              | Traditional definition of ‘Metaphysical’ and Chapter Structure. . . . .  | 48 |
| 2.3              | Mind-Cure. . . . .   | 51 |
|                  | 2.3.1 Mind-Cure’s Content. . . . .   | 51 |
|                  | 2.3.2 Christian Science Variance From Christian Doctrine. . . . .  | 53 |
|                  | 2.3.3 Quimby’s Practice of Healing. . . . .  | 56 |
|                  | 2.3.4 New Thought. . . . .   | 61 |
| 2.4              | Rejection of the Term ‘Faith-Cure’ in Favour of ‘Divine Healing’. . . . .  | 61 |
| 2.5              | Criticism of Essek William Kenyon<br>and the Divine Healing Movement. . . . .                                    | 62 |
|                  | 2.5.1 Summary of McConnell’s Criticism of the Metaphysical<br>in the WOF. . . . .                                | 62 |
|                  | 2.5.2 McConnell’s Criticism of the Divine Healing Movement. . . . .  | 63 |
|                  | 2.5.3 Kenyon’s Evangelical Manner of Life. . . . .   | 65 |



*The word count limit for this thesis is:* 40,000.

*The word count total in this thesis is:* 39,970.

*The word count starts after this colon:*

## Chapter 1                      Evangelical Roots of the WOF.

### 1.1      Backgrounds, Thesis, Research Question.

I concur with Stephen Pattison that the issues of illness and healing are central to human existence.<sup>2</sup> My own background is of baptism in the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues (in Pentecostal parlance ‘experiencing Pentecost’) in 1980.<sup>3</sup> I rapidly encountered WOF teaching, Kenneth E. Hagin purportedly offering a conduit of divine healing based on Jesus’ healing teaching and practice, encountering the anomaly that not all sick people adhering to Hagin’s teaching received ‘their’ healing. My own feelings were that if a Christian believer *obediently* carried out God’s reported commandments that should help prepare them receive the reported *blessing* of divine healing:

“The kingdom of the living God drives out the germs of death and spreads the seeds of life. It doesn’t merely bring salvation in a religious sense. It brings health in bodily experience too. In the healing of the sick the kingdom takes bodily form. The Spirit makes what is sick and dying alive again...the divine vitality desires to penetrate our bodies too...”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Stephen Pattison, *Alive and Kicking : Towards a Practical Theology of Illness and Healing*, ( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1989 ), p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> As Charles Parham earlier wrote as clarification : “the speaking in other tongues is an inseparable part of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit distinguishing it from all previous works ; and that no one has received the Baptism of the Holy Spirit who has not a Bible evidence to show for it.” ( Charles F. Parham, *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness*, [ Baxter Springs, Kansas: Robert L. Parham, 1944 ], p. 35, cited in Paul G. Chappell, *The Divine Healing Movement in America*, [ unpublished PhD. thesis, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, 1983 ], p. 342. )

My own ‘Baptism of the Holy Spirit,’ referred to in the text, occurred at the 1980 European Convention of the FGBMFI in the Wembley Conference Centre, London. Concerning the FGBMFI ( Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship International ) : “Demos Shakarian and his Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship have taken the doctrine [ of faith-cure ] to the business executives of the nation [ the U. S. ].” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. iii, and see Demos Shakarian, *The Happiest People on Earth*, [ London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1975 ]. ) Quite soon after that, while working fulltime as an IBM mainframe computer programmer, I spent seven years attending/helping run an independent Pentecostal fellowship.

<sup>4</sup> Jurgen Moltmann, *Jesus Christ for Today’s World*, ( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1994 ), p.13. By the same token : “All severe illnesses are heralds or foretokens of death, and we have to see Jesus’ healings as heralds or foretokens in just the same way: they are heralds of the resurrection.” ( Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, p. 14. )

So, not being unhelpful priests and Levites “passing by on the other side” (Luke 10:30-37), the church is commanded to be a “Good Samaritan,” ministering with compassion to physical needs of the sick and afflicted.<sup>5</sup> The reason *behind* formulating my thesis and research question is my theodicy: that the WOF teaching in the main does not accurately teach the commandments of the gospel of Jesus/teachings of Jesus’ apostles; that this failing to teach, and carry out, biblical commandments goes some way towards explaining why some do not receive the blessing of divine healing.<sup>6</sup>

Added to this, I discovered some accepted criticism of the WOF seemed lacking in critical vigour. Professor Keith Ward reasonably suggests theological thinking should be as sophisticated and self-critical as scientific thinking.<sup>7</sup> My own surmise, fair or not, was that some criticism seemed grounded in dislike of Pentecostalism and suspicion of the notion of modern-day divine healing.<sup>8</sup> Some might even argue that this scholarship consisted of tenuous arguments thinly veiling rants against Pentecostal evangelism. Here were claims that the WOF, therefore synecdochically Pentecostal-evangelism-linked WOF teaching and

---

<sup>5</sup> Fred Francis ( F. F. ) Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, ( New Kensington, Pennsylvania : Whitaker House, 2000 ), p. 91.

<sup>6</sup> This reflects my underlying agreement with Karl Barth’s statement : “The freedom of theology is both freedom for exegesis and freedom for what we call dogmatics. At least in his endeavour to sum up the content of...the variety of biblical testimonies, the exegete embarks upon dogmatical thinking. Dogmatics is the conscious and systematic account of the common understanding of all Biblical testimonies with due regard for their variety. Only through a formidable misunderstanding can the two functions of theology – exegesis and dogmatics – be set one against the other.” ( Karl Barth, ‘The Gift of Freedom,’ in Karl Barth, *The Humanity of God*, [ London, Collins : 1971 ], p. 90. )

<sup>7</sup> Keith Ward, ‘A Guide for the Perplexed,’ in T. W. Bartel ( ed. ), *Comparative Theology, Essays for Keith Ward*, ( London : Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2003 ), p. 194.

<sup>8</sup> Thus, also, William Atkinson says “Opinions vary from, at one extreme, viewing Word-Faith views as “occultic,” through seeing them as “heresy” and as a “peculiar mix of truth and error” to, at the other extreme, regarding such theology as “legitimately...placed within an evangelical Holiness tradition.”” ( William P. Atkinson, *The ‘Spiritual Death’ of Jesus, A Pentecostal Investigation*, [ Leiden, The Netherlands : Brill, 2009 ], pp. 10-11. )

Milmon Harrison describes in *Righteous Riches*, his study of WOF African Americans, how that concerning the WOF “*scholars of religion have left it relatively untouched.*” ( Milmon F. Harrison, *Righteous Riches, The Word of Faith Movement in Contemporary African American Religion*, [ London : Oxford University Press, 2005 ], p. viii, my italics. )

And “There are no comprehensive accounts of the development and spread of the modern Word of Faith movement.” ( Andrew Perriman [ ed. ], *Faith, Health and Prosperity : A Report on ‘Word of Faith’ and ‘Positive Confession’ Theologies by ACUTE [ the Evangelical Alliance Commission on Unity and Truth Among Evangelicals ]*, [ Carlisle : Paternoster Press, 2003 ], p. 1. )

practice of healing, is non-Christian. Dan McConnell's *A Different Gospel* is preeminent in such criticism,<sup>9</sup> claiming the WOF's alleged originator, E. W. Kenyon, based his teachings on Mind-Cure teaching comprising a non-Christian 'metaphysical.'<sup>10</sup> If McConnell's claim is true, the WOF would indeed be tainted: by association if not practice; and I agree with William Atkinson that whoever studies the WOF cannot ignore this claim.<sup>11</sup> My thesis is: *'arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the metaphysical. The Word of Faith does not teach obedience to the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. Biblical scripture suggests that not obeying this biblical commandment to regularly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the blessing of divine healing.'*

---

<sup>9</sup> D. ( Dan ) R. McConnell, *A Different Gospel*, ( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, 1995 [ 2007 ] ). And see also Dave Hunt & T. A. McMahon, *The Seduction of Christianity: Spiritual Discernment in the Last Days*, ( Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1985 ) ; Dave Hunt, *Beyond Seduction, A Return to Biblical Christianity*, ( Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1987 ), and Hank Hanegraaff, *Christianity in Crisis*, ( Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1993 ) .

As will be seen, McConnell's book is widely regarded as pre-eminent in criticising the WOF ; and, it seems reflecting this, even though McConnell's book was published *after* the other books referenced above, in a book he published in 2013 Russell Morris recognised McConnell's book as *seminal*. While I do not want to be unkind, it could be argued that in Morris's case the claim of being seminal may in fact be the result of Morris rather uncritically regurgitating McConnell's assertions, instead of critically engaging with McConnell's assertions' refutation by the likes of Geir Lie and William DeArteaga. ( William A. Morris, *Truth Matters, A Pastoral Assessment of Word of Faith Theology*, [ Bloomington, Indiana : CrossBooks, 2013 ], p. 9. ) In his 2004 book *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* Professor Allan Anderson saw fit not to refer to McConnell's book, but Anderson's rejoinder is to instead mention a 1990 article in *Pneuma*, that seems very much *a la* McConnell. ( Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism : Global Charismatic Christianity*, [ Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004 ], pp. 222-223 ; the article is : H. Terris Neumann, 'Cultic Origins of the Word-Faith Theology Within the Charismatic Movement,' *Pneuma* 12: 1 [ 1990 ], pp. 32-55. )

<sup>10</sup> Regarding the word 'metaphysical:' throughout *A Different Gospel* McConnell makes use of what is the U. S. archaic usage of this word. It had been used to describe firstly, institutions that comprised Mind-Cure, and secondly, adherents of the teachings comprising Mind-Cure. Unlike William James ( referenced further in chapter two ), McConnell attempted no comprehensive definition of what Mind-Cure incorporated and, after short discussion, McConnell uses the word Mind-Cure to signify the two most influential of its constituents : Christian Science and New Thought.

<sup>11</sup> Atkinson, *'Spiritual Death' of Jesus*, p. 47.

I take a biblical notion of ‘the poor’ not as fulsome as *en totale* in scripture.<sup>12</sup> No person is called to be content when they are in the state of being ‘*without* food and clothes’ (1 Tim. 6:8), an implied definition of ‘being poor’ that I define as the state of being ‘the poor’ for the purposes of this thesis. ‘Word of Faith’ will be unpacked in this chapter, ‘metaphysical’ is not defined by McConnell in its traditionally understood sense, as unpacked in the *next* chapter; an interim definition of McConnell’s metaphysical is ‘mind over matter,’ or the content of the Mind-Cure movement, with the pointer it consists of metaphysical material McConnell says infiltrated the WOF.

My research question asks: *‘is the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing metaphysical? If not, are there biblical injunctions suggesting why Word of Faith teaching and practice of divine healing does not result in more incidence of the blessing of divine healing than it does?’*

## **1.2 Methodology.**

This thesis spans theology and history. Different strands of theology are encountered in the research, research historical in the fields of doctrine and ecclesiology.<sup>13</sup> The thesis is also concerned with biblical studies that within the thesis confines is Kenneth J. Archer’s ‘Bible

---

<sup>12</sup> A more fulsome biblical definition of ‘the poor’ is, in a mixture of typification and extrapolation, stated by Moltmann : “The gospel is preached to ‘the poor’ : first of all to the people who in the world *are* nothing and *have* nothing. The collective term ‘the poor’ embraces the hungry, the unemployed, the enslaved, the people who have lost heart and lost hope, and the suffering. It means the oppressed people itself as a whole – the people Greek calls *ochlos* and Korean *minjung*. The poor are socially the non-persons, the work force, human fodder; and as a rule the poorest of the poor were, and still are, old women who are allegedly ‘no more use’.” ( Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, p. 17. )

<sup>13</sup> Ecclesiology ideally helps the church in its attempt to respond to a society finding it “irrational and arrogant to claim...the church’s witness is true...[ and ] that the orientation it makes possible for its discipleship is superior to all others.” ( Nicholas M. Healy, *Church, World and the Christian Life, Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology*, [ Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000 ], p. 21 ). There needs to be a meeting of minds enabled by a willingness to be self-critical about one’s ecclesial thought and action. ( Healy, *Church World*, p. 75. ) Moltmann points out that this involves taking on a new identity/profile. ( Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, p. 108 ). The truth is thereby being sought by the destruction of ‘wrong thinking.’ ( William Portsmouth, *Healing Prayer*, [ Evesham, Worcs. : Arthur James Limited, 1957 ], p. 40 ). However, underpinning all this is that an ‘untidy’ ecclesiological situation is merely expression of longstanding ‘untidy’ ecclesial situations which cannot be ‘tidied’ in any facile way. ( Jose Miguez Bonino, *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age*, [ London : SPCK, 1975 ], pp. 156-157 ).

reading method.’<sup>14</sup> Those using this ‘Bible reading method’ do not consider themselves autodidacts, but claim to be what I term ‘theodidacts,’ typically appealing to scripture promising divinely-guided erudition (John 16:13, Gal. 1:11-12, 1 John 2:27). The biblical account is Jesus’ followers’ behaviour was marvelled at when it was considered *they were uneducated men* (Acts 4:13); Paul, reported as accounting himself previously attending the ‘biblical studies’ (and probably Talmudic) school of rabbi Gamaliel (Acts 22:3), is reported of that on becoming a Christian he resorted to spending years in the desert rather than enrol with another teacher (Gal. 1:15-20). Those using Archer’s ‘Bible reading method’ do not consider their brand of biblical studies inferior to the more academically-founded variant, characterising some academics’ scholarship stunted from lack of affiliation by/with the ‘living God.’<sup>15</sup> However, Archer’s ‘bible reading method’ was employed by the teachers of the WOF but resulted in their teaching – a teaching my thesis seeks to demonstrate is *not* the fulsome teaching of Jesus’ Gospel on the crucial subject of ‘the poor.’ My method of proceeding is to use *their same* ‘Bible reading method,’ but demonstrate by it that if WOF teachers were *consistent* in their reading of scripture then they would have presented an accurate account of ‘the poor.’

The proving of all three parts of the thesis combines theology with biblical studies.<sup>16</sup>

Although arguably more historical than the second and third parts of the thesis, in the first

---

<sup>14</sup> Kenneth J. Archer, *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the Twenty-First Century*, ( London : T & T Clark International, 2004 ). Archer’s ‘Bible reading method’ is contrasted with the more technical reading of scripture synthesising such disciplines as criticism that is Textual, Historical, Grammatical, Literary, Form, Tradition, Redaction, Structuralist and Canonical, which are typically the aegis of university bible studies departments. ( John H. Hayes & Carl R. Holladay, *Biblical Exegesis, A Beginner’s Handbook*, [ London : SCM Press Ltd., 1995 ] ; Gordon D. Fee & Douglas Stuart, *How To Read the Bible for All its Worth*, [ Blethchley, Bucks. : Scripture Union, 1997 ] )

<sup>15</sup> This is related to the perception that Christian practice leads to a better understanding of the word of God itself, and that the Word which became flesh launches a new practice. ( Antonio Moser, & Bernardino Meers, *Moral Theology : Dead Ends and Ways Forward*, [ Tunbridge Wells, Kent : Burns and Oates, 1990 ], p. 56. )

<sup>16</sup> Archer is seeking to anchor a ‘Pentecostal hermeneutic’ in what he calls the ‘Bible reading method’ which is, Archer admits, also an evangelical hermeneutic. Peter Althouse, rather than having Archer’s overall greater stress on biblical scripture as a whole ( in spite of Archer having referred to the ‘power-mentioning’ scripture of Luke-Acts ), stresses the role of *power* for Pentecostals : “Power formed a *hermeneutical key* in the early Pentecostal movement, from which all other beliefs and practices derived...Christian service in evangelism,

part biblical studies contrasts evangelical healing evangelism theology and WOF theology, on the one hand, with teachings of McConnell's Mind-Cure metaphysical on the other hand. The proving of the second and third parts of the thesis *also* fuse theology with biblical studies.

This occurs in contrasting WOF healing theology with the biblical theme of helping the poor: examining biblical commandment to regularly help the poor incorporates surveying topical scripture.

The research was carried out predominantly by literature review: critical engagement with multi-media included various forms of literature, cassette tapes, internet-based material, and DVDs. Background knowledge was acquired through the kind of long-term participant observation normal to ethnographic studies, and involved in-depth interviewing of experts in Pentecostalism. In this interviewing the normative was speaking both face-to-face and over the telephone with each person.

### **1.3 The Question of a WOF Healing Hermeneutic.**

Communication is considered in-/under- determinate in that a receiver of communication is needed to extrapolate meaning(s) latent within it.<sup>17</sup> Thus, language of 'hermeneutic' or interpretation, concerns communication, language, meaning, and understanding.<sup>18</sup>

---

missions and church ministry and Pentecostal leadership within the emerging organizational structures all hinged on the Pentecostal's confidence in the power of the Holy Spirit, emanating from the experience of Spirit baptism." ( Peter Althouse, *The Ideological Development of 'Power' in Early American Pentecostalism*, [ Lampeter, Cardiganshire : The Edwin Mellen Press, 2010 ], p. 204, my italics. ) Althouse saw that early modern Pentecostals interpreted powerlessness in society as rooted in opposition to God, whereas the empowered Pentecostal would confront this opposition/powerlessness through the power of Jesus Christ. ( Althouse, *Power*, pp. 205-206. ) For Althouse the empowered Pentecostal believer is an example of sociologist Max Weber's charismatic model of authority, demonstrating social power by means of personal charismatic experience. ( Althouse, *Power*, p. 209. ) I feel both Archer's and Althouse's approaches should be borne in mind when considering a Pentecostal hermeneutic. This should also be seen as complementary to the WOF healing hermeneutic/divine healing hermeneutic to be imminently discussed in the text.

<sup>17</sup> Archer, *Pentecostal Hermeneutic*, pp. 157, 160. Archer discusses earlier hermeneutics with which his proposed Pentecostal Hermeneutic is in contradistinction.

<sup>18</sup> Sinclair B. Ferguson, and David F. Wright, ( eds. ), *New Dictionary of Theology*, ( Leicester : Inter-Varsity Press, 1991 ), p. 293 ; Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory, An Introduction*, ( Oxford : Blackwell Publishers, 1994 ).

A 'New Hermeneutic' in the 1960's underlined subjectivity in interpreting biblical texts. ( Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, [ Leicester : Apollos, 1990 ], pp. 134-135 ).

Formulating a *Pentecostal/WOF hermeneutical* perspective is to some extent informed by the texts of Luke-Acts.<sup>19</sup> This involves a process of readers balancing scriptures with their experience, just as those in the first century church reportedly balanced their experience with scripture.<sup>20</sup> Biblical passages were thus dialogical.<sup>21</sup> Dynamic between experience and scripture reported of Peter (Acts 2:16) showed *prior* knowledge when he said “this (experience) is that (scripture).” Thereby, scripture fulfills a function of helping shape readers’/hearers’ lives through challenging them to praxis oriented theology, orthopraxy as well as orthodoxy.<sup>22</sup> This ‘hermeneutical circle’ leads from theory and ethics through missionary and ministry experience to leading again to theory and ethics.<sup>23</sup>

I agree with those claiming there is no *unique* Pentecostal/WOF hermeneutic separate from an *evangelical* hermeneutic.<sup>24</sup> For evangelicals, the Bible is interpreted as a coherent collection of documents expected to offer some unitary message despite inner divergences, its primary purpose being to witness to Christ and teach His people.<sup>25</sup> Exegesis is attempted assuming that an original author’s intention is reasonably accessible, grammatico-historical methods employed in seeking to discover that meaning.<sup>26</sup> My own research interest focuses on poverty and divine healing, and Kimberley Alexander proposes a hermeneutic specifically for the *Divine Healing* Movement: the Spirit’s outworking experience of divine healing in

---

<sup>19</sup> John Christopher Thomas, *The Devil, Disease and Deliverance*, (Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1998 ); Thomas, *The Devil*, chapter 9.

<sup>20</sup> Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out On All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan : Baker Academic, 2005 ), p. 27.

<sup>21</sup> Archer, *Pentecostal Hermeneutic*, p. 157. That is : “the spiritual and extraordinary supernatural experiences of the biblical characters are possible for contemporary believers.” ( Kenneth J. Archer, ‘Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect,’ *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 8 [ 1996 ], p. 75. )

<sup>22</sup> Archer, *Pentecostal Hermeneutic*, p. 168.

<sup>23</sup> Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out On All Flesh*, p. 29. There is a parallel with the data processing ‘project life cycle,’ where business-contingent iterations of the project cycle are made.

<sup>24</sup> Atkinson points out that there is really no such thing as a WOF hermeneutic to be considered as *distinct* from an evangelical hermeneutic. ( Atkinson, ‘*Spiritual Death*,’ pp. 73-77. )

<sup>25</sup> Atkinson, ‘*Spiritual Death*,’ p. 77.

<sup>26</sup> Atkinson, ‘*Spiritual Death*,’ p. 77.

someone's life melded with use of biblical scripture to put that work of the Spirit in context.<sup>27</sup> In this she follows Paul Chappell's: "experience provided the hermeneutic through which most followers of the faith healing movement interpreted scripture and formulated their doctrine."<sup>28</sup> It appears to me Chappell's hermeneutic of the Divine Healing Movement could also do service helping formulate my own statement of a divine healing hermeneutic: *the expectation that when people acted upon biblical scripture then divine healing will follow.*<sup>29</sup> I prefer to state 'divine healing hermeneutic' rather than 'WOF healing hermeneutic,' as I find it contradictory talking of a WOF healing hermeneutic as ostensibly distinct from a *divine healing hermeneutic*; indeed, as will be seen, the statement of a separate WOF healing hermeneutic risks wrongly expressing the paramouncy of faith.

#### **1.4 How This Chapter Supports the Thesis.**

Chapter one commences explanation of the WOF's consistency, presenting my research findings that the WOF is rooted in evangelical healing evangelism. As found rooted in evangelical healing evangelism, this will be held in balance when examining in chapter two the *counter-claim* that the WOF is rooted in McConnell's Mind-Cure metaphysical. Chapter one goes some way toward addressing the question comprising the first part of the research question: *'Is the Word Of Faith teaching and practice of healing metaphysical?'* but chapters two and three complete the addressing of this first part of the research question. Both chapter one and the following two chapters will contribute to proving the first part of the thesis: *'Arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there*

---

<sup>27</sup> Kimberley Ervin Alexander, *Pentecostal Healing : Models in Theology and Practice*, ( Blandford Forum, Dorset : Deo Publishing, 2006 ), p. 36.

<sup>28</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 149, my italics.

<sup>29</sup> Jennifer Ann Miskov, *Life on Wings : The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery ( 1858-1946 )*, ( unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2011 ), p. 186.

*adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical.’*

## **1.5 Chapter Structure.**

As touched on, in answering ‘*Is the WOF teaching and practice of healing metaphysical?*’ I must first state the WOF’s consistency. This chapter discusses the WOF manifested in WOF teaching, WOF teachers/WOF Movement. These contexts are unpacked prior to examining the relationship between the WOF and Pentecostalism. Next, in looking for the roots of the WOF, I evaluate connections between WOF, Pentecostalism, and Pentecostalism’s antecedent, the U. S. Divine Healing Movement. This Divine Healing Movement had two wings. The first was the setting up of Healing/Faith Homes for the appropriation of the blessing of divine healing. The second was preaching that divine healing has been made available in Christ’s atonement/redemption, besides preaching salvation has been made available in Christ’s atonement/redemption. It is with this second wing that my project is concerned. Inclusion of divine healing in Christ’s atonement in the message of the evangelist seems to have led to the term ‘healing evangelist’ arising, differentiating between ‘evangelists’ who preached salvation in Christ’s atonement, and ‘healing evangelists’ who not only preached salvation in Christ’s atonement but who also preached divine healing in Christ’s atonement.<sup>30</sup> My findings show WOF teaching and practice of healing seemingly an extension of this ‘healing evangelism’ of the Divine Healing Movement.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Thus the following use of the term ‘healing evangelist’ ( by someone who was subsequently healed ) is not untypical : “Every *healing evangelist* in America had laid hands on me...God uses *healing evangelists*.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *Seven Things You Should Know About Divine Healing*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library Publications, 1992 ], p. 43, my italics. )

<sup>31</sup> And healing evangelist Hagin subsumes healing under “signs and wonders” in the following : “We certainly believe in signs and wonders, but signs and wonders do not save anyone. They attract people’s attention. Once signs and wonders happen, people can be told how to be saved.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library Publications, 1986 ], pp. 19-20. ) There is no ministry of ‘healing evangelist’ mentioned in the scripture of the Bible. It seems likely that if divine healing had continued to be practised as it had been in the days of Jesus’ apostles there would never have arisen the separate term ‘healing evangelist,’ as opposed to a continued use of the coverall term ‘evangelist.’ ( Eph. 4: 11. )

## **1.6 WOF Teaching.**

‘Word of Faith’ is derived from scripture: “The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart...the *word of faith* which we preach” (Rom. 10:8).<sup>32</sup> It can be helpful to view WOF teaching as the trinity ‘Health,’ ‘Wealth,’ and ‘Word/Faith.’<sup>33</sup> Stated most simply, the WOF is words about a Christian believer having faith; WOF teaching tends to centre on ‘faith plus anything God is reported *in scripture* as saying He has done/will do for Christian believers.’ Mostly, WOF teaching is faith *and* divine healing, faith *and* prosperity, faith *and* favour with God and man, faith *and* longevity.<sup>34</sup> WOF teaching appears to be three-stage. In stage one, a Christian believer may come to understand a certain *scripture* pertinent to some situation in life they are concerned about changing, most typically a search for divine healing or financial prosperity. In stage two, the Christian believer should develop faith in this *scripture*. In stage three, they should speak this *scripture* aloud to demonstrate to God they are ‘taking Him at His word.’<sup>35</sup> Having developed faith/believed, this believed word needs to be spoken aloud by the Christian believing it – “I believed; so I speak;” (Ps. 116:10, Green 2) showing “the law of faith, which says, ‘...I BELIEVED...therefore have I SPOKEN...’” (2 Cor. 4:13).<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> My italics. This expression ‘word of faith’ occurs in the KJV Bible predominantly used by the WOF. Hagin’s comment on this scripture is “Notice that the word of faith must be in your *mouth* as well as in your *heart*.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 1993 ], p. 12. )

<sup>33</sup> Derek Vreeland proposes both a trinity and a quatrain. ( Derek E. Vreeland, ‘Reconstructing Word of Faith Theology: A Defense, Analysis and Refinement of the Theology of the Word of Faith Movement,’ presented at the 30<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies [[www.pneumafoundation.org/resources/articles/Reconstructing-DVreeland.pdf](http://www.pneumafoundation.org/resources/articles/Reconstructing-DVreeland.pdf)], pp. 1, 2. )

<sup>34</sup> Regarding longevity - commenting on Ex. 15: 26’s conditional promise that God would take sickness away Hagin says “God had promised He would take sickness from the midst of them. That means that they just wore out, fell asleep, and went home, bless God, without sickness.” ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 18. )

Max Weber plausibly generalised that the sacred values of most religions were ( with the partial exception of Christianity and “other...ascetic creeds” ), grounded in the “quite solid goods of this world” comprising “health, a long life and wealth.” ( Max Weber, ‘Major Features of World Religions,’ in Roland Robertson ( ed. ), *Sociology of Religion*, [ London : Penguin Books, 1978 ], pp. 30-31. )

<sup>35</sup> That is, that reported scripture is ‘God’s Word,’ and that ‘God’s written Word’ comprises the Holy Bible.

<sup>36</sup> Kenneth E. Hagin, *Bible Faith Study Course*, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : RHEMA Bible Church, 1991 ), p. 127. Emphasis of words ‘believed’ and ‘spoken’ is Hagin’s. E. W. Kenyon also mentions 2 Cor. 4: 13. ( E. W. Kenyon in E. W. Kenyon, & Don Gossett, *The Power of Your Words*, [ New Kensington, Pennsylvania : Whittaker House, 1981 ], pp. 179-180. )

The WOF also teaches the Christian can *alternatively proceed* from stage one to stage three and then proceed to stage two, equivalent to the believer saying “I have *not yet believed*, therefore have I spoken (in the hope of thereby coming to believe).” Hagin says “faith will grow with your confession.”<sup>37</sup> That is, speaking scripture aloud (stage three) is said to help engender faith (stage two). Romans 10:17 is used to justify this: “faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.” Speaking aloud becomes a vehicle, seemingly a deterministic process, by which faith *may be received* for healing and financial prosperity. This helps explain why the WOF is sometimes summarily described as ‘what you say is what you get,’<sup>38</sup> part of rhematology, the theology of the spoken word. WOF participants tend not to like being described as espousing a ‘Prosperity Gospel;’ in a BBC Radio4 programme *The Prosperity Gospel*, one contributor proposed a more accurate description: ‘The Provenance Gospel.’<sup>39</sup>

### **1.7 WOF Teachers / WOF Movement.**

The WOF does not comprise a denomination with the resources of denominational literature, history, and personnel to help define it.<sup>40</sup> To gauge the WOF one needs to engage with WOF teaching in the form of books, booklets, audio/video tapes, DVDs, television/internet

---

<sup>37</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 36.

<sup>38</sup> This is the title of a book written by a less well-known Word of Faith teacher, Don Gossett : ( Gossett, Don, *What You Say Is What You Get*, [ Springdale, Pennsylvania : Whittaker House, 1976 ] )

<sup>39</sup> BBC Radio 4, on 6/7/13.

<sup>40</sup> Having said that, there has been some attempt to move toward forming a WOF denomination : “in 1979, Hagin’s son-in-law, the Reverend Doyle ‘Buddy’ Harrison, pastor...and president of Harrison House, the major publisher of Faith books, founded the International Convention of Faith Churches and Ministers (ICFCM)...The ICFCM...claims that it is nothing more than a ‘service bureau’ intended to facilitate communication and coordination of common activities of Faith churches and ministers. Nevertheless, the...constitution and bylaws of the ICFCM depict an organization as structured as any denomination, mandating annual meetings of a board of trustees, an executive board, and various standing committees.” ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 82, 83 ). This organisation has now been renamed the ICFM ( International Convention of Faith Ministries ), and is based in Arlington, Texas. It has as its object “To Hold Forth, Contend for, and Propagate the Word of Faith Worldwide.” ( [www.icfm.org](http://www.icfm.org), accessed 26/2/14 ) See Harrison’s *Word of Faith* for more detail about the ICFM and also for RMAI ( Kenneth Hagin’s Rhema Ministerial Association ), the latter organisation having 1, 315 churches in it and which, surprisingly, has little overlap with ICFM. Harrison also mentions the FICWFM ( Fellowship of Inner-City Word of Faith Ministries ). ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, pp. 15-18. )

programmes, and tracts.<sup>41</sup> Delineating the WOF does not necessitate drawing attention to *all* WOF teachers. Listing WOF participants shows its leading (wo)men to be mostly healing evangelists, plus: personnel of attendant ministry organisations, churches, and individuals adhering to teachings of one or more WOF teachers. The WOF comprises loosely affiliated networks of individuals, churches and parachurch organisations.<sup>42</sup> Milmon Harrison's first of two, in my view, overly U.S.-centric definitions of the WOF states "It is a contemporary American religious subculture made up of denominationally independent churches, ministries, Bible training colleges and other educational institutions, voluntary organizations and fellowships, information and entertainment production facilities, and mass media broadcast networks...all of these entities are bound together into a relational network, based upon a shared understanding of the Bible..."<sup>43</sup>

Harrison's second definition is: "a relational community of believers, voluntary organizations, fellowships, conferences, and ministries loosely bound by a shared doctrine, a network without a definite leader or governing body...it is difficult to map this bit of religious territory against the larger contours of contemporary American religious experience."<sup>44</sup>

Alternative names for the WOF,<sup>45</sup> some objective others pejorative, are 'Faith Movement,' 'Health and Wealth Gospel,' 'Prosperity Gospel,'<sup>46</sup> 'Name it and Claim it,' (or, 'Blab it and

---

<sup>41</sup> Tom Smail, & Andrew Walker, & Nigel Wright, ' "Revelation Knowledge" and Knowledge of Revelation: The Faith Movement and the Question of Heresy,' [ *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 5 ( 1994 ), pp. 57-77. ], p. 63.

<sup>42</sup> Walter Hollenweger, in his preface to *Streams of Renewal*, describes the British Charismatic movement thus : "The early cohesion of the movement was not of the nature of an organization but rather of the nature of an emerging network of friends;" it seems to me this description also fairly accurately characterises the WOF. ( Walter J. Hollenweger in Peter Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, [ Carlisle, Cumbria : Paternoster Press, 1997 ], p. xiii. )

<sup>43</sup> Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 5.

<sup>44</sup> Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 14.

<sup>45</sup> Concerning the text's following list of alternative names of the WOF see Perriman, *Faith*, p. xviii.

<sup>46</sup> "The distinctive feature of Prosperity Theology...that material prosperity and, usually, also perfect health are God's will for every Christian in this life, and that there are divine principles which, if followed, will guarantee this comprehensive prosperity or well-being." ( Geoffrey Grogan, 'Liberation and Prosperity Theologies,' *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*, Volume 9, Number 2, Autumn 1991, pp. 118-132, p. 121. ) Grogan mentions "comprehensive prosperity" advisedly - one scripture is reported as promising "whatsoever he doeth

Grab it’).<sup>47</sup> *Time* magazine presented the interesting finding, that should nonetheless be investigated before acceptance as a generality, that the WOF “swept beyond its Pentecostal base into more buttoned-down evangelical churches...even into congregations in the more liberal mainline.”<sup>48</sup> Although personalities are recognisable through broadcast media, scholars of the WOF seek for context in which to place them.<sup>49</sup>

Disagreement about WOF Movement composition seemingly reflects uncertainty about its origin : anthropologist Simon Coleman portrays the WOF/Faith Movement as an amalgam of

---

shall prosper.” ( Ps. 1: 3b ) Robert Jackson concurs with Grogan, and Jackson uses the terms “*prosperity theology*, and the movement which adheres to it the *faith movement*.” ( Robert Jackson, ‘Prosperity Theology and the Faith Movement,’ *Themelios* 15.1 [ Oct. 1989 ], pp. 16-24. )

Whether names are thought ‘pejorative/accurate’ is subject to debate. The description “Health and Wealth Gospel” connotes a skewed Gospel, but Christians preoccupied with material advancement, particularly the 3 billion in the world earning [ *mostly far* ] less than \$2 a day, in nations providing no payments to the unemployed, negligible free healthcare/education, *may* welcome it. ( Paul Alexander, *Signs and Wonders, Why Pentecostalism Is the World’s Fastest-Growing Faith*, [ San Francisco, California : Jossey-Bass, 2009 ], p. 69. ) Thus : “Lawrence, who is from Nigeria, was telling me that God wants all Christians to be prosperous...I told him that God does not want us to be rich; he wants us to live simply and be generous with all that we have...In my American context, I had seen materialism and consumerism...a bloated, greedy church that seemed to lust after more and more possessions...As a Pentecostal, I have had more than my fill of ‘God wants you to be rich’ preaching...Lawrence...explained that the Bible clearly teaches prosperity. I shook my head and said that prosperity was not biblical and could not be justified theologically or practically...we began to see each other in our respective contexts...The word we were using, *prosperity*, had confused us. I was arguing against overabundance, hoarding, greed, exorbitance, and consumerism – and *for enough for a healthy life*. I argued for a *simple* existence. He was arguing against starvation, poverty, sickness, and hopelessness – and *for enough for a healthy life*. He argued against subsistence and for a simple *existence*. I was looking up the mountain of money and trying to bring the wealthy down; he was looking down into the valley of despair and trying to bring the poor up.” ( Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, pp. 65-66. )

<sup>47</sup> “ ‘Name it and claim it’ ...a phrase...detractors use pejoratively...Members are taught that once they know who they are in Christ, they can then speak the same words about themselves that God has spoken about them in the Bible.” ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 10. ) In U. S. vernacular ‘Name it and Claim it’ is sometimes referred to as ‘Blab it and Grab it.’

<sup>48</sup> Van Biema, D., & Chu J., ‘Does God Want You To Be Rich ?’ *Time Magazine* ( 2006 ) - [www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1533448,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1533448,00.html).

According to Phiri and Maxwell global appeal of the WOF is attributable to influence of such U.S. based religious media as Trinity Broadcasting Network ( TBN ). However, it is among the very poor that the ‘health and wealth’ teaching is making inroads, among the 2 billion people in the world with little access to electrical mains power, televisions or, for them, expensive internet services. This limits the applicability of Phiri and Maxwell’s argument. ( I. Phiri, & J. Maxwell, ‘Gospel riches: Africa’s rapid embrace of prosperity Pentecostalism provokes concern – and hope,’ *Christianity Today* July 2007 - [www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2007/july/12.22.html](http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2007/july/12.22.html). )

Concerning TBN, it “bills itself as ‘The largest Christian [ television ] Network in the World.’...founded in 1973 by Paul and Jan Crouch in association with Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker, the husband-and-wife televangelist team who were disgraced in the late 1980s when reports of their legendary financial excesses became public. Headquartered in Santa Ana, California, today TBN claims that it owns and is affiliated with 536 networks in North and South America. The network’s programming is carried in at least sixty-two countries, in the Caribbean and Pacific, on the African continent, and in Europe ( including the former Soviet Union )...[ and ]broadcasts its programming via thousands of cable carriers throughout the world...Even a prison in Arizona serves as a cable outlet where viewers are still within reach of TBN...” ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, pp. 14-15. )

<sup>49</sup> This is what Milmon Harrison declares as one of his aims. ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. viii. )

Pentecostal evangelism (he uses the term ‘revivalism’) and positive thinking.<sup>50</sup> Confusingly, the term ‘Positive Confession Theology’ is that under which ‘WOF Movement’ is discussed in the *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, there being no separate entries provided for ‘Word of Faith’ or ‘Faith Movement.’ However, for his part in this *Dictionary*, R. M. Riss *does* differentiate between the WOF and Positive Confession since ‘Word of Faith’ and ‘Positive Confession’ are not described as one and the same movement, but as “*movements*” (plural).<sup>51</sup> Riss thus differentiates between ‘Word of Faith’ and ‘Positive Confession’ whereas the tenor of the *Dictionary* as a whole subsumes ‘Word of Faith’ under ‘Positive Confession.’ To be discussed, the seemingly most widely accepted and pervasive WOF teacher is healing evangelist and teacher Kenneth Erwin Hagin (Kenneth Hagin, Sr.), whose teaching appears most to epitomise the WOF.<sup>52</sup>

I now turn to characterise the relationship between the WOF and Pentecostalism, under a section heading that less-and-less comprises a controversial statement.

---

<sup>50</sup> Simon Coleman, ‘Conservative Protestantism and the world order: the faith movement in the United States and Sweden,’ *Sociology of Religion* 54 ( 4 ), p. 355, cited in Liroy, Dan, ‘The Heart of the Prosperity Gospel: Self or the Savior ?,’ p. 42 - [www.satsonline.org/userfiles/Liroy.Theheartoftheprosperitygospel.pdf](http://www.satsonline.org/userfiles/Liroy.Theheartoftheprosperitygospel.pdf), accessed in 2011.

Constituents of “Positive Confession” are considered in chapter two in examining the putative origin of WOF healing teaching and practice that is Mind-Cure ; chapter two also deals with Kenyon’s treatment of ‘confession.’ Hagin’s treatment of ‘confession’ is dealt with in chapters two and three.

<sup>51</sup> R. M. Riss in Stanley M. Burgess, & Gary B. McGee, ( eds. ), *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ( Grand Rapids, Michigan : Zondervan Publishing House, 2006 ), p.687, my italics.

<sup>52</sup> “Almost all of the Faith churches have some link with the ‘father’ of the Faith Movement, Kenneth Hagin, Sr of Tulsa, Oklahoma...the teachings and practices of the Faith movement undoubtedly owe much to Hagin...” ( Peter Hocken, *The Challenges of the Pentecostal, Charismatic and Messianic Jewish Movements, The Tensions of the Spirit*, [ Farnham, Surrey : Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009 ], p. 47. ) Hagin died in 2003. ( Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing : Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis MacNutt in Dialogue*, [ Leiden, The Netherlands : Brill, 2010 ], p. 25. ) Although they claim it is not easy to determine who can properly be called the leaders of the Faith Movement, Smail, Walker and Wright also focus on Hagin and [ Kenneth ] Copeland, who are accepted by most observers as the main teachers of the Faith Movement. ( Smail, Walker, & Wright, *Revelation Knowledge*, pp. 59, 63. ) Dan McConnell did not think it worthwhile considering Kenneth and Gloria Copeland in detail, concentrating instead on the more seminal Kenyon and Hagin.

## **1.8 The WOF is Pentecostal.**

This section heading is controversial, although some demurrers believe its statement to be axiomatic: it has well been said “It is not easy to reduce the huge diversity of Pentecostal phenomena to a *generalized formula acceptable to all.*”<sup>53</sup> Certainly, Paul Alexander in *Signs and Wonders* finds it appropriate speaking of a Pentecostal prosperity gospel rather than naming a ‘WOF.’<sup>54</sup> Alexander ascribes Pentecostalism’s popularity to this: that although wanting a prosperous life is not *uniquely* Pentecostal, claiming a prosperous life as a guaranteed blessing from God *is.*<sup>55</sup> Here Alexander is not entirely accurate since Mind-Cure metaphysical teaching *also* regards prosperity as a guaranteed blessing from God (although what Mind-Cure metaphysical teaching means by ‘God’ is at variance with Paul Alexander’s understanding). So, if Alexander had added to his statement something *like* ‘based on Christ’s provisions as reported in biblical scripture’ then his statement would have better approached the ‘uniqueness’ he ascribed it. My main point is Alexander includes the WOF *within*

---

<sup>53</sup> Anderson and others, *Studying Global Pentecostalism*, p. 4, my italics.

<sup>54</sup> From an earlier cited quote, and see Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, p. 64. Alexander admits “not all Pentecostals agree on the prosperity gospel...recognizing the diversity is important.” ( Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, p. 68. ) He quotes position papers of the U. S. Assemblies of God : “Christians have famously tried to save ‘souls’ but have often forgotten or ignored the fact that God is concerned for the whole person. The Assemblies of God statement against prosperity teaching is dangerously complicit in this overly spiritual focus, claiming that adherents of ‘name it and claim it’ faith teaching can be ‘more concerned with physical and material prosperity than with spiritual growth.’ This assumes that spiritual growth is independent from and more important than physical and material well-being. But it’s not, and prosperity teaching unites them...Mary, mother of Jesus, said in Luke 1: 53 that God wants to fill the hungry with good things. There is no need to ‘spiritualize’ this – feeding the hungry is spiritual, and it is what God wants. The Law given to Moses said that there should be ‘no needy among you’ because government and the community of the faithful will be wise and generous with the resources of creation...” ( Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, pp. 73-74, citing Assemblies of God, ‘The Believer and Positive Confession’ - [www.ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position\\_Papers/pp\\_4183\\_confession.cfm](http://www.ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_4183_confession.cfm), accessed on 31<sup>st</sup> Jan, 2008 )

On the WOF being Pentecostal Alex Tang only goes so far as saying : “It came into being about the time that the Pentecostal movement became a worldwide phenomenon...many proponents of the Word-Faith[WOF] movement such as Kenneth Hagin, Kenneth Copeland and Benny Hinn had some Pentecostal or Charismatic background.” ( Alex Tang, ‘Examining the Theology of the Word-Faith Movement,’ written in November 2006, [www.Kairos2.com/word-faith.htm](http://www.Kairos2.com/word-faith.htm), accessed in 2011. )

<sup>55</sup> Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, p.63. Grant Wacker concurs. ( Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below, Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, [ London : Harvard University Press, 2001 ], p. 28. )

Barrett reported 601 million Pentecostals ( including ‘Charismatics’ and ‘Neo-Pentecostals’ ) worldwide in 2008, and projected this figure to rise to 798 million by 2025. ( David B. Barrett, Todd M. Johnson, and Peter F. Crossing, ‘Missiometrics 2008: Reality Check for Christian World Communions,’ *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 32:1 [ 2008 ], p. 30, cited by Allan Anderson in ‘Varieties, Taxonomies, and Definitions,’ in Allan Anderson and others [ eds. ], *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, [ London : University of California Press, 2010 ], p. 14. )

Pentecostalism, never mentioning WOF characteristics *except* as ‘Pentecostal.’ Neither does he mention the WOF when speaking of the ‘promise and peril of prosperity teaching.’<sup>56</sup> Gerardo Marti mentions the prosperity orientation in contemporary Pentecostal churches;<sup>57</sup> Nanlai Cao discovered the prosperity gospel in Pentecostal development in modern China;<sup>58</sup> James Kinnebrew’s thesis describes the ‘faith movement,’ a term substituted for ‘WOF,’ as a “specific faction of Pentecostalism.”<sup>59</sup> Perriman concedes the WOF a ‘radical wing’ of Pentecostalism.<sup>60</sup> Naturally reflecting these findings of the ‘Prosperity and Health Gospel’ being an orientation in Pentecostalism, is the finding it was a *Pentecostal minister who first instructed Kenneth Hagin Sr. to specifically preach prosperity.*<sup>61</sup>

Continuing to claim ‘there is a WOF Movement,’ as opposed to ‘the WOF is Pentecostal,’ helps attacks on the WOF not to fall on Pentecostalism *itself* – anything disreputable about the WOF can be kept from being a slur on Pentecostalism.<sup>62</sup> Besides *this* possible aspect of keeping alive the concept of a WOF separate from Pentecostalism, a separate issue is of those labelling themselves ‘WOF’ to distance themselves from Pentecostalism they feel to be far

---

<sup>56</sup> Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, p. 72.

<sup>57</sup> Gerardo Marti, ‘“I Determine My Harvest” : Risky Careers and Spirit-Guided Prosperity in Los Angeles,’ in Katharine Attanasi and Amos Yong ( eds. ), *Pentecostalism and Prosperity, The Socio-Economics of the Global Charismatic Movement*, ( Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave MacMillan, 2012 ), p. 148.

<sup>58</sup> Nanlai Cao, ‘Urban Property as Spiritual Resource: The Prosperity Gospel Phenomenon in Coastal China,’ in Attanasi and Yong, *Pentecostalism and Prosperity*, p. 151.

<sup>59</sup> James M. Kinnebrew, *The Charismatic Doctrine of Positive Confession: A Historical, Exegetical, and Theological Critique*, ( unpublished Ph.D. dissertation for Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988 ), p. 250.

<sup>60</sup> Perriman, *Faith*, pp. 58, 211.

<sup>61</sup> Thus “In December 1954, I held a meeting for Brother A. A. Swift in New Jersey...He was an Assemblies of God minister and an executive presbyter of the Assemblies of God denomination...He later oversaw a Pentecostal Bible school for nearly seventeen years...Brother Swift got out his notes on the subject of prosperity and gave them to me...Later I wrote a book entitled *Redeemed From the Curse of Poverty, Sickness, and Spiritual Death*, based in part on the excellent study notes he gave me...this respected man of God said to me, ‘Brother Hagin, preach that message everywhere you go!’ So I began including a message on the subject of prosperity in some of my revival meetings.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Midas Touch, A Balanced Approach to Biblical Prosperity*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 2002 ], pp. 37-38. )

<sup>62</sup> Pentecostalism being “family,” the WOF “child” in : “the family has not always approved of the child’s often reckless and extravagant lifestyle.” ( Perriman, *Faith*, p. 58. )

from its roots, a wandering-Pentecostalism no longer stressing the overarching need for believers to experience miraculous divine healing and speaking in tongues.<sup>63</sup>

Although the WOF *does* seem Pentecostal, I criticise the view of the WOF as more-or-less *solely* populated by immaculately, expensively dressed, bejewelled, coiffured U. S. preachers preaching to congregations and audiences already predominantly ‘well-off.’ It seems plausible that this view is derived from representation of the WOF in widely available television programmes and internet-casts, where the tone set is aspirational showing a wealthy yet allegedly divinely-approved lifestyle that viewers could identify with/aspire to, backing up the accompanying ‘health and wealth’ message. I criticise this telecentric/netcentric view of the WOF, not because of invalidity, but because it is used to *typify* the WOF. A comprehensive view of the WOF acknowledges the appeal of divine promises of prosperity to vast numbers of Christians not ‘well-off:’

“the Pentecostal prosperity gospel appeals to *hungry* Christians...proclaims...if you have faith in God, you will be financially secure. Over 90 percent of Pentecostals and Charismatics in Nigeria, South Africa, India, and the Philippines believe that ‘God will grant “material prosperity” to all believers who have enough faith.’ ”<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> That is : “it is one thing to reduce the kingdom of God to a definition, and another to experience it, to feel it, to see it and to taste it. *It is not the term which must be allowed to define the experience. The experience must define the term.*” ( Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, p. 9, my italics. )

Hollenweger and company ( stated below ) ask us to consider the early days of Pentecostalism in order to understand the movement, inferring we cannot examine modern-day Pentecostal churches to truly understand - reflecting a shift between what was and is. Peter’s reported statement “this is that” ( Acts 2: 16 ) seemed appropriate to describe Pentecostalism of the early decades of the twentieth century, but Hollenweger points to the routinisation of modern Pentecostalism, saying of *early* modern Pentecostalism “*that was that.*”

So, Peter Hocken says the independent Pentecostal Cecil Cousen “saw the Pentecostals as having lost their *earlier* fire and thus becoming less authentically Pentecostal.” ( Hocken, *Streams of Renewal*, p. 39, my italics. ) Also Perriman, *Faith*, p. 232, citing Bruce Barron, *The Health and Wealth Gospel*, ( Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1987 ), pp. 137-139.

<sup>64</sup> Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, pp. 63-64, italics are Alexander’s, citing *Spirit and Power: A 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals*, ( Washington, D. C.: Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 2006 ), p. 29. “To...three billion people, or half the population of the world – moving from \$1 per day to \$2 per day to \$3 per day is being delivered from the oppression of poverty. They’re not becoming rich; they’re simply escaping poverty. They can care for their families better, send their children to elementary school, visit a health clinic and buy penicillin,

A report on contemporary ministry states Pentecostalism's greatest growth to be among the poor in some of the most difficult areas of the world for the Gospel.<sup>65</sup> Kenneth Hagin says those in 'developing nations' can begin to believe and practice the scripture of the Bible and experience prosperity.<sup>66</sup> Although the health and wealth gospel *is* popular with the wealthy, historian Andrew Chesnut concurs with Paul Alexander and myself in saying the health and wealth gospel is also popular because of its promise to deliver from poverty.<sup>67</sup> I have both Chesnut's and Paul Alexander's support in disagreeing with Charles Farah's statement that adherence to the health and wealth gospel is restricted to Western Europe and the U. S.<sup>68</sup> Farah seems to equate the gospel of prosperity and healing *solely* with penetration of a relatively few large ministries involved in television, radio, and internet work, to the relatively wealthy owning televisions, radios, computers and PDAs (personal digital appliances). In disagreeing with Farah, Chesnut reports a dynamic between the poverty of those who subscribe to the theology and their strong desire to have abundance.<sup>69</sup> Chesnut claims there to be such an orientation in the health and wealth gospel to rescue the poor from poverty that there is almost no message of substance left for those who *already* have

---

perhaps even have furniture. That is a godly message of deliverance and hope." ( Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, p. 72. )

At the same time, it has been recognised that not all Pentecostals are poor or sympathetic to the poor ; thus Walter Hollenweger reported "a neo-Pentecostal power elite...in Central America...actively support police terror and torture...in certain cases, torturing those of their own faith, the poor Pentecostals. The aim would appear to be freedom for big business and suppression of social protest through an authoritarian state." ( Walter J. Hollenweger, 'The Pentecostal Elites and the Pentecostal Poor,' in Karla Poewe, *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture*, [ Columbia, South Carolina : University of South Carolina Press, 1994 ], p. 203, citing Heinrich Schafer, 'Religious Dualism and Social Opposition,' in *Ways Toward Humanity*, [ *Wege Zum Menschen* ] 41 (2), pp. 52-70. )

<sup>65</sup> *Charismatic Crossroads : The Report of a Leadership Consultation on the Current Situation in the Charismatic Churches*, ( Bawtry, South Yorkshire : The Centre for Contemporary Ministry, 1995 ), p. 5.

<sup>66</sup> Thus "The things they were thankful for might not seem like very much to people in developed nations, but just having clean water for their children or a roof that didn't leak represented a dramatic improvement for them." ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 200. )

<sup>67</sup> R. Andrew Chesnut, 'Prosperous Prosperity: Why the Health and Wealth Gospel is Booming across the Globe,' in Attanasi and Yong, *Pentecostalism and Prosperity*, p. 220.

Also see R. Andrew Chesnut, *Born Again in Brazil: The Pentecostal Boom and the Pathogens of Poverty*, ( New Brunswick : Rutgers University Press, 1997 ).

<sup>68</sup> Charles Farah, Jr., *From the Pinnacle of the Temple: Faith vs. Presumption*, ( Plainfield, New Jersey : Logos International, no date ), p. 154.

<sup>69</sup> Chesnut, 'Prosperous Prosperity,' in Attanasi and Yong, *Pentecostalism and Prosperity*, p. 217, my italics.

abundance, but of course this is Chesnut concentrating on prosperity and not considering divine healing.<sup>70</sup>

It could be argued the WOF not only represents a ‘healing evangelism arm’ of Pentecostalism, but that its emphasis on divine healing and speaking in tongues is *at the very heart of Pentecostalism*. This leaves Perriman’s admission that the WOF is a ‘wing’ of Pentecostalism looking tepid.<sup>71</sup> Certainly overall, the WOF is *not* considered to be some ethereal sub-movement intangibly linked *to* Pentecostalism; rather, the WOF is widely regarded as distinctly Pentecostal.<sup>72</sup> The findings show that Pentecostalism/WOF has a divine healing tradition inherited from its antecedent nineteenth century U. S. Divine Healing Movement.

---

<sup>70</sup> Chesnut, ‘Prosperous Prosperity,’ in Attanasi and Yong, *Pentecostalism and Prosperity*, p. 217. And, reiterating earlier findings: “In much of the developing world where the majority of followers of the health and wealth gospel [ WOF ] live, there is nothing resembling the welfare state in which a government safety net exists for the most impoverished citizens.” ( Chesnut, ‘Prosperous Prosperity,’ in Attanasi and Yong, *Pentecostalism and Prosperity*, p. 219. )

<sup>71</sup> And, rather than simply admit the WOF as Pentecostal, Paul King says the “vast majority” of WOF advocates are charismatic or Pentecostal ( Paul E. King, *Only Believe*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Word and Spirit Press, 2008 ], p. 13. )

<sup>72</sup> However, although as discussed the prosperity gospel has been characterised as Pentecostal, Randall Stephens hints at a prosperity gospel of an *earlier era*, implying the WOF’s Pentecostalism gained the prosperity gospel a wider hearing than it would’ve had were it *not* part of Pentecostalism. ( Randall J. Stephens, *The Fire Spreads, Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South*, [ London : Harvard University Press, 2008 ], p. 280. )

## 1.9 The Divine Healing Movement.<sup>73</sup>

### 1.9.1 Introduction.

While a comparative wealth of material has been written/is being written about Pentecostalism, there is relative paucity of material about the Divine Healing Movement.<sup>74</sup> Perhaps this is understandable in terms of the Divine Healing Movement being almost entirely regarded as ‘been and gone,’ whereas Pentecostalism is very much a ‘going concern.’ It is probably not helpful to consider the Divine Healing Movement *extant* as Dan McConnell does, but rather to consider it as Paul Chappell does (and, incidentally, he is joined in this by the great majority of other scholars), as existing discretely at the advent of modern Pentecostalism and, *en large*, being integrated within Pentecostalism.<sup>75</sup> Thankfully, there is

---

<sup>73</sup> Chappell : “One of the most significant, yet controversial, phenomena to emerge in the history and theology of the American Church in the past century has been the doctrine and ministry of divine healing or ‘*faith-cure*,’ as it was called in the nineteenth century (commonly referred to as faith healing).” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. ii, my italics. ) Although Chappell did once state the Divine Healing Movement to be ongoing ( subsuming Pentecostalism *within* it, see Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 365 ) his general tenor is - the Divine Healing Movement has these start and end dates : “a *discernible divine healing movement in America beginning in the latter half of the nineteenth century...to the turn of the twentieth century when a large portion of the movement was integrated with the new Pentecostal movement.*” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 358, my italics. ) An instance of Chappell alternatively citing the Divine Healing Movement ( American faith healing movement ) as lasting *into the second decade of the twentieth century*, is Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. v.

<sup>74</sup> That is, a situation mentioned ( at time of writing ), three decades ago is ongoing : “Divine healing has been one of the most fascinating, yet controversial themes to develop in the modern history and theology of the American Church. *It has also been one...which has remained almost completely unexamined by church historians.*” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p.358, my italics. ) Besides Paul Chappell’s *Divine Healing Movement*, Donald Dayton’s *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, and David Harrell’s *All Things Are Possible*, there is something of a paucity of scholarly works on the Divine Healing Movement, that is “Regretfully, the American divine healing movement has been generally neglected by the academic community.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. iii ). ( Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, [ Metuchen, New Jersey. : The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1987 ]; David Erwin Harrell, *All Things Are Possible. The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America*, [ Bloomington, Indiana : Indiana University Press, 1975 ] ) A recently-completed trilogy on divine healing has recently been reviewed ; Ben Pugh recommends these three volumes be abridged to pick out “different *theologies* of healing,” and “*themes* in healing praxis,” the italics are Pugh’s. ( Ben Pugh, Review, *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, Vol. 35, No. 1, April 2015, pp. 89-90. Pugh was reviewing James Robinson’s trilogy - *Divine Healing: The Formative Years, 1830-1890: Theological Roots in the Transatlantic World*, [ Eugene, Oregon : Pickwick Publications, 2011 ] ; *Divine Healing: The Holiness-Pentecostal Transition Years, 1890-1906: Theological Transpositions in the Transatlantic World*, [ Eugene, Oregon : Pickwick Publications, 2013 ] ; *Divine Healing: The Years of Expansion, 1906-1930: Theological Variation in the Transatlantic World*, [ Eugene, Oregon : Pickwick Publications, 2014 ] )

<sup>75</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, throughout; Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 358. Kimberley Alexander notes one feature of the Divine Healing Movement, healing homes, becoming rare and Alexander attributed this to Pentecostalism *itself* becoming a “healing home.” But Vinson Synan attributes the decline in the number of

Jennifer Miskov's recent work *Life on Wings*, a study of the healing evangelist and teacher Carrie Judd Montgomery, a personality straddling the Divine Healing Movement and Pentecostalism.

The concern a datum *belongs* with data is perennial when drawing boundaries for a collection/movement. Chappell sifted “a confusing patchwork of non-related ministries and individuals, and provide[d] a coherent frame of reference by which they may be examined and understood.”<sup>76</sup> I agree with Kimberley Alexander's description of Chappell's work as the most helpful history, to date, of the Divine Healing Movement.<sup>77</sup> Chappell seems to denominate all U. S. nineteenth century exponents of divine healing as comprising the Divine Healing Movement, which I think useful labelling of a collection of people and events in a specific time period, that included more-or-less organised (some impromptu) camp meetings provided for settlers colonising western and some southern parts of the U. S., and that might otherwise be regarded amorphous.<sup>78</sup> The Divine Healing Movement typified those believing physical disease or illness cured by divine healing when the prayer of faith is prayed. They took at face value, firstly, Christ's reported acts of healing, secondly, Christ reported the same “yesterday, today, and forever,” and thirdly the report that “by His stripes” the believer is healed (Heb. 13:8, 1 Pet. 2:24).<sup>79</sup> In common with (though earlier than) popular authors

---

healing/faith homes to the rise of healing evangelists, rather than to Pentecostalism *itself*; now, large crusades and evangelistic tent meetings were places where healing was received. ( Vinson Synan, ‘A Healer in the House? A Historical Perspective on Healing in the Pentecostal/Charismatic Tradition,’ *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3:2, 2000, p. 201. ) Set against this decline in the number of ‘healing homes’ is the *rising* use of ‘healing rooms.’ ( Margaret Poloma, ‘Old Wine, New Wineskins : The Rise of Healing Rooms in Revival Pentecostalism,’ in *Pneuma* 28: 1 [ Spring 2006 ], pp. 59-71. )

To sum up: as I mentioned earlier, subsumation is the overall impression given by Chappell, the suggestion that the Divine Healing Movement was wholly subsumed within the Pentecostal Movement : “the movement became an integral part of the later Pentecostal and Charismatic movements.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p.vi. )

<sup>76</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 358.

<sup>77</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 8.

<sup>78</sup> These camp meetings characteristically had demonstrations of the same manifestations accompanying the preaching of John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, and George Whitefield. In the early camp meetings Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists would preach at the same camp meeting. ( Kenneth Scott Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age, Volume 3*, [ Exeter, Devon : The Paternoster Press, 1970 ], p. 19. )

<sup>79</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, pp. v, 362.

Hyatt and Allen, Chappell sought instances of divine healing occurring within an enduring pattern still proceeding, so divine healing has become/is becoming normative practice for a large part of Christendom.<sup>80</sup> Seen in the light of Chappell's seminal thesis, WOF teaching and practice of divine healing appears iterative of teaching and practice of divine healing of the Divine Healing Movement; part of popularisation of a concept of salvation which includes health and healing.<sup>81</sup>

### 1.9.2 Phoebe Palmer (1807-1874): Claiming Sanctification By Faith.<sup>82</sup>

A precursor of the WOF was the Divine Healing Movement's Phoebe Palmer, known for her "altar theology:" Palmer instructed believers to come to the area at the front in a meeting-place, which she called the 'altar,' this being the place she allocated in which to receive Christ's reported provision of blessings in the New Covenant, particularly sanctification.<sup>83</sup> In Palmer's teaching sanctification (seen as the *momentous* enduement of holiness in distinction to the *gradual process* of a life becoming more holy) was immediately attainable to all believers through this 'act of faith' of coming to the 'altar' to receive Christ's blessings. This 'shorter way' consisted of three steps to holiness: (1) entire consecration; (2) faith; and (3) testimony.<sup>84</sup> Contrasting Wesley's envisioned long struggle leading to sanctification, Palmer's 'shorter way' nevertheless still involved total devotion of one's self and possessions to God (Heb. 8:6,8).<sup>85</sup> Taking Jesus' reported words from Matt. 23:19 "the altar that sanctifieth the gift," Palmer was confident anyone offering full consecration to God would be sanctified completely/entirely.<sup>86</sup> Palmer insisted this was so even with no accompanying

---

<sup>80</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 357.

<sup>81</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. ii, my italics.

<sup>82</sup> Dates for Phoebe Palmer are from Perriman, *Faith*, p. 59.

<sup>83</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 12. Stephens attributes much of "the success of northern [ U.S. ] holiness" to Palmer. ( Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, p. 29. ) And see Heb. 13: 10, and also 8: 12; 9: 11-12; 12: 24.

<sup>84</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 12 ; Alexander cites Henry H. Knight III, 'From Aldersgate to Azusa: Wesley and the Renewal of Pentecostal Spirituality,' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 ( 1996 ), p. 89, and Dieter Melvin, 'The Development of Nineteenth Century Holiness Theology,' *Westminster Theological Journal* 20.1 ( Spring, 1985 ), pp. 61-77.

<sup>85</sup> Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, p. 30.

<sup>86</sup> Stephens, *The Fire Spreads*, p. 29.

emotion of assurance of reception at that time. Asked how soon a person could expect to experience this ‘entire sanctification,’ Palmer apparently replied: “as soon as you come believingly...come complying with the conditions and claim it...*it is already yours*. If you do not now receive it, the delay will not be on the part of God, but wholly with yourself.”<sup>87</sup> In the 1850’s, Palmer began referring to this ‘entire sanctification’ as “Christian Perfection,” and “the Baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” “an enduement with power,” “the baptism of fire,” and ultimately “baptism of the Holy Ghost” and “Pentecostal Baptism.”<sup>88</sup> This phraseology was inaccurate: her ‘Pentecostal Baptism’ was *not* characterised by the book of Acts ‘Bible evidence’ of accompanying ‘speaking in other tongues.’ Like Judd Montgomery later, Palmer emphasised appropriating God’s blessings by faith; this ‘claiming’ by faith was identical to looking back to the ‘finished work’ of the atonement of Finished Work theology, present in the WOF (discussed in chapters two and three). When one accepted the presupposition of the Divine Healing Movement that all sickness is ultimately related to sin and Satan, and accepted the presupposition of the Holiness Movement that the

---

<sup>87</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 75, citing Phoebe Palmer, *Faith and Its Effects; or Fragments from My Portfolio*, [ New York: Palmer, 1854 ], p. 52, my italics emphasising Palmer’s ‘Finished Work’ teaching, which will shortly be discussed in the text. Thus for Phoebe Palmer: “Justification and sanctification are essentially two aspects of the one work of grace which becomes ‘experientially’ appropriated in the individual through faith.” ( William David Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, [ Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1993 ], p. 84. And see Phoebe Palmer, *The Way of Holiness, with Notes by the Way* [ New York: Lane and Tippet, 1845 ], pp. 60ff. ;and Phoebe Palmer, *Faith and Its Effects* [ New York: Published for the author, 1852 ], p. 53. ) “Sanctification...did not mean that the Christian would be free from the *presence* of sin in this life (that occurs with glorification) but one can be free from its *power*. Christian Perfection, or Entire Sanctification, is the most...misunderstood of Wesley’s doctrines...[ Alexander noting Wesley used the term ‘perfection’ not in the sense of meaning ‘without error or flaw’ but in the sense of ‘right motive.’ ]” ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 40. )

<sup>88</sup> A “key revival of this period occurred in the years 1857-58. Beginning in Hamilton, Ontario, where *Phoebe Palmer* was conducting Higher Life meetings, the revival spread throughout North America, primarily concentrating itself in the northern urban centers...Its primary focus was holiness of life and freedom from the power of sin. The message quickly spread to Britain and western Europe.” ( Alexander, *Healing*, pp. 12-13, my italics. ) As an introduction to ‘Higher Life,’ of which I will say more later, one definition of Higher Life Theology is: “A pattern of Christian holiness teaching popularized by the American Presbyterian minister, William Edward Boardman ( 1810-1886 ), in his *Higher Christian Life* ( 1859 ). Boardman’s book, which sold over 100,000 copies on both sides of the Atlantic, asserted that *the experience of sanctification is a distinct work of grace, clearly separable from justification...*” ( Burgess, *New Dictionary of Theology*, p. 301, my italics. )

Daniel Steele, an academic returned to the pastorate, in his 1874 *Guide to Holiness* exasperatedly urged Christians to “cease to discuss the subtleties and endless questions arising from entire sanctification or Christian perfection, and all cry mightily to God for the baptism of the Holy Spirit.” ( Dayton, *Roots of Pentecostalism*, p. 79. )

believer is endowed with the pentecostal power of the book of Acts, then sanctified/empowered/endued with power believers, who through God have power over sin and Satan, also have power over sickness.<sup>89</sup>

### 1.9.3 Sarah Anne Freeman Mix (1832-1884): Healing and Discipling of Carrie Judd Montgomery (1858-1946).<sup>90</sup>

Black woman Mrs Edward Mix was healed of tuberculosis in 1877 when healing evangelist Ethan Otis Allen (1813-1902) prayed for her.<sup>91</sup> Allen, whom Paul Chappell names as the father of the Divine Healing Movement, encouraged Mix to become the first full-time female faith healing evangelist in the U. S.<sup>92</sup> Mix's healing ministry lasted about seven years: doctors sent so many patients to her for prayer that even by 1879 she is claimed to have thus 'treated' over two hundred and thirty people.<sup>93</sup> However, it seems that it was mainly as a result of her connection with Carrie Judd Montgomery's February 1879 healing, that Mix's reputation became widespread.<sup>94</sup> Mix's ministry included letter-writing discipleship of the

---

<sup>89</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 79.

<sup>90</sup> Mix's dates are from Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*; Judd Montgomery's dates are from Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*. Incidentally, at the time of Judd Montgomery's 1879 healing, already two of her sisters had died of cancer at about the same age. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 231, citing Carrie Judd Montgomery, 'Miraculously Healed by the Lord Thirty Years Ago,' *The Latter-Rain Evangel*, II [ October, 1909 ], p. 6. )

<sup>91</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 36, citing Mrs. Edward Mix, *The Life of Mrs. Edward Mix*, ( New York : Syracuse University Press, 2002 [ first pub. 1884 ] ), p. 210. "Some believe that Allen was the first American to engage in faith healing as his full time ministry...Utilizing Mark 16: 17 as his key verse, Allen expected healing to be instantaneous whenever he prayed." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 36. ) And : "For fifty years he [ Allen ] travelled throughout New England and the eastern half of the United States praying for the sick and teaching divine healing...One of his earliest assistants was Mrs. Elizabeth[ Sarah ] Mix, a black woman from Wolcottville, Connecticut, who had been healed of tuberculosis under Allen's ministry. She was a well-educated, articulate, and persuasive person. She and her husband, Edward, travelled with Allen until they decided to devote full time to their own independent faith healing ministry." ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, pp. 92-93. ) See Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, pp. 88-99. Mrs. Mix was "a highly respected and successful black [healing] evangelist, who had been healed of tuberculosis through [ E. O. ] Allen's ministry." ( Perriman, *Faith*, p. 59. )

Paul King concurs with, but does not credit, Paul Chappell in saying "[ Ethan Otis ] Allen's ministry impacted Mix's ministry, which impacted Judd's [ Judd Montgomery's ] ministry, which in turn stimulated much more faith teaching and practice." ( King, *Only Believe*, p. 48. )

Although "Mrs Mix is identified by Chappell as *Elizabeth* Mix... Gooden's recent research has shown her name to be *Sarah* Mix." ( Alexander, *Healing*, my italics ). Bit of a mix up.

<sup>92</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 181.

<sup>93</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 37, citing 'Miraculous Cures in Connecticut,' *The Buffalo Daily Courier*, 20 Feb., 1879.

<sup>94</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 40. Judd was Montgomery's maiden name.

younger Judd Montgomery.<sup>95</sup> Showing how relatively biblically untutored Judd Montgomery was prior to contact with Mix, Judd Montgomery was ignorant that Mix's first letter to her included scripture concerning divine healing from James 5.<sup>96</sup> Nevertheless, once Mix visited Judd Montgomery in New York they together prayed for the sick.<sup>97</sup> It appears the more biblically knowledgeable healing evangelist Sarah Mix trained Judd Montgomery in healing evangelism. Thus, it was untruthful of Judd Montgomery to later *not* acknowledge Mix's agency, Judd Montgomery claiming she received no teaching from any human being

---

<sup>95</sup> At the time of her being healed in 1879, Judd Montgomery had been an Episcopalian, her pastor at that time being "Rector C. F. R. Bielby of the local *Episcopalian Church*" ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 233, my italics ). Judd Montgomery's later evangelical credentials are documented by both Chappell and Miskov. This entailed Judd Montgomery being a regular speaker in "German Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Disciples of Christ, Christian Alliance, Salvation Army, and...independent holiness and Pentecostal churches." ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 234 ). Thus naturally, famous British evangelical Mrs. Michael Baxter visited, and ministered with, Judd Montgomery on each of her trips to the U. S. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 235 ). Judd Montgomery's monthly journal *Triumphs of Faith* regularly featured articles by well-known evangelical advocates of 'healing by faith' such as William E. Boardman, Mrs. Baxter, A. B. Simpson, Andrew Murray, Mrs. Mix, and A. J. Gordon. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 236 ). Judd Montgomery joined the evangelical Salvation Army in 1892. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 242 ).

<sup>96</sup> See Miskov on Judd Montgomery's first major illness ( 1879 ). Judd Montgomery's failing to connect Mix's reference to the James 5 'prayer of faith' seems to account for why "In Carrie's [ Judd Montgomery's ] 1879 healing, the anointing of oil mentioned in James 5 was absent from her experience." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 214. ) Judd Montgomery later said: "At the time of my first healing I had never understandingly read this passage in James, so I was healed by the touch of God in answer to the prayer of faith, without any such service of consecration as the anointing implies." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 215, citing Judd Montgomery, 'The Path of Obedience,' *Triumphs Of Faith* 21:9 [ Sept. 1901], pp. 194-195. ) Mrs Edward Mix's letter ( she signed it "Yours in faith, Mrs. Edward Mix." [ Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 178. ] ) read : "I can encourage you, by the Word of God that, 'according to your faith,' so be it unto you; and besides you have this promise, 'The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up.' Whether the person is present or absent, if it is a 'prayer of faith,' it is all the same, and God has promised to raise up sick ones, and if they have committed sins to forgive them." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 178. ) "Now if you can claim that promise, I have not the least doubt but what you will be healed. You will first have to lay aside all medicine of every description. Use no remedies of any kind for anything. Lay aside trusting in the 'arm of the flesh,' and lean wholly upon God and His promises...I want you to begin to pray for faith, and Wednesday afternoon the female prayer-meeting is at our house. We will make you a subject of prayer, between the hours of three and four. I want you to pray for yourself, and pray believing, and then *act faith*. It makes no difference how you feel, but get right out of bed and begin to walk by faith. Strength will come, disease will depart and you will be made whole. We read in the Gospel, 'Thy faith hath made thee whole.' Write soon." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 178, citing Mrs. Edward Mix, *Faith Cures, and Answers to Prayer*, [ New York : Syracuse University Press, 2002 ], pp. 38-39. ) See also Carrie F. Judd, 'The Prayer of Faith,' in Donald W. Dayton, *The Life and Teachings of Carrie Judd Montgomery*, ( New York and London : Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985 ), pp. 13-15. The account of Judd's healing became well-known, teaching others they could be healed : "Carrie Judd's story was printed in newspapers and other periodicals and she later published...*The Prayer of Faith*...this book included instruction in faith and healing. Carrie...went into ministry. She was immediately sought after as a speaker. *The Prayer of Faith* was published in five languages." ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 26. )

<sup>97</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 40, citing Mix, *Life of Mrs. Mix*. Judd Montgomery on Mrs. Mix: "she and I went out together to visit friends...who were ill, and to offer prayer for them, and the glory of God certainly came down upon us when we were engaged in prayer." ( Carrie Judd Montgomery, *Under His Wings : The Story of My Life*, [ Los Angeles, California : Stationers Corporation, 1936 ], pp. 54-60, in Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 40. )

on the subject of divine healing, that it all came directly from the Holy Spirit.<sup>98</sup> When Judd Montgomery *did* acknowledge help, it was Charles Cullis's.<sup>99</sup> Miskov tacitly confirms Judd Montgomery's book *The Prayer of Faith* was based on Mix's teaching. However, to my mind unfairly, Miskov gives Judd Montgomery joint-credit when claiming both Mix and Judd Montgomery used Phoebe Palmer's theology of expectation of receiving immediate sanctification by applying that theology to expectation of receiving immediate divine healing.<sup>100</sup> Mix/Montgomery teaching on divine healing corresponded with that of the WOF, corresponding with WOF teaching warning of danger in taking medicine while wanting to experience divine healing: taking medicine in conjunction with "looking to the Lord for healing" could encourage unbelief and hinder receiving the complete cure they would have if willing to forgo medicine and thereby "trust Him fully."<sup>101</sup> However, it transpired through Mix's influence, Judd Montgomery joined medical doctor Charles Cullis's network of those advocating divine healing by faith, Cullis sometimes allowing the taking of medicine concurrently with praying the prayer of faith.<sup>102</sup> So far, Mix's/Judd Montgomery's teaching on receiving healing by faith seems congruent with WOF teaching on the subject.

---

<sup>98</sup> Judd Montgomery, *Under His Wings*, pp. 65-66, in Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 42.

<sup>99</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 230, citing Carrie F. Judd [ Judd Montgomery ], 'Faith-Work,' *Triumphs of Faith*, IV ( December, 1884 ), p. 265. But, it was *Mrs. Mix*, not Charles Cullis, initially helping Judd Montgomery: Judd Montgomery only received Cullis's book *Answers to Prayer in the Healing of the Sick* ( published in 1879 ) "after her healing...[ and ] It appears that the few other early books on divine healing had not made it into Carrie's hands before her healing account." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 43, my italics. )

<sup>100</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 179. It would be instructive to answer the following research question: "if the teaching was Mrs. Mix's, then could it be traced back to the teaching of Ethan O. Allen, the healing evangelist under whose healing Mix had been healed from tuberculosis, or did Mix herself derive it from Palmer, or was there another source ?"

Further indebtedness of Judd Montgomery to Mix was through Mix's teaching Judd Montgomery the practice of healing the sick through "long distance praying." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 222f. )

<sup>101</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 181, citing Judd [ Montgomery ], *The Prayer of Faith*, p. 83. Following Judd Montgomery *again* becoming seriously ill in 1898, and healed once more, she wrote "I want to say here that I have no controversy with physicians...I praise God for all they are able to do for suffering humanity. If people have no faith to trust God for healing I always advise them to seek the best medical aid, but when God has called one to trust in Him as their Jehovah Rophi ( "I am the Lord that healeth thee." – Ex. XV [ 15 ]: 26 ) medicines will not help ; they will only hinder." ( Judd Montgomery, 'A Miracle of Healing,' *Triumphs of Faith* 18:7 [ July 1898 ], p. 143, in Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 181. )

<sup>102</sup> Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, ( Metuchen, New Jersey : The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1987 ), p.125. For Dr. Charles Cullis, see Chappell on Cullis in *Divine Healing Movement*.

#### 1.9.4 ‘Experience’ & ‘Receiving By Faith’: John Wesley vs. Carrie Judd Montgomery.<sup>103</sup>

Founder of Methodism John Wesley’s teaching was regarded as key by the ‘Holiness Movement,’ in stressing perception of experiencing God rather than only mental assent to Christianity in theory:<sup>104</sup>

“Wesley’s...‘strangely warming’ experience at Aldersgate brought the much needed assurance of forgiveness of sin. Assurance is Wesley’s way of describing the perception of the Spirit’s work in one’s life; it is *experiential*.”<sup>105</sup>

Arguably, Judd Montgomery’s teaching on divine healing critiques Wesley’s, besides showing Mix/Judd Montgomery precursors of WOF teaching and practice of healing. So, paradoxically, Wesley’s implied concept of waiting on something experiential from God

---

<sup>103</sup> Carrie Judd Montgomery’s autobiography, *Under His Wings* ( published in 1936 ), details her life and a ministry then spanning six decades, although her ministry continued until after WWII and her influence for longer. ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 27. ) Summarised thus: “As Carrie F. Judd she founded [ a healing home ] Faith Rest Cottage in Buffalo [ New York state ] in 1882 and in 1880 authored The Prayer of Faith...After her marriage to George Montgomery she moved to San Francisco and then to Oakland to found the Home of Peace [ a healing home ] and finally was swept into Pentecostalism in the wake of the Azusa Street Revival. Carrie Judd Montgomery’s magazine, *Triumphs of Faith* [ was ] ‘a monthly journal devoted to faith-healing and to the promotion of Christian Holiness.’ ” ( Dayton, *Roots of Pentecostalism*, pp. 125-126. )

<sup>104</sup> Albert Outler has analysed what he calls the ‘Wesleyan Quadrilateral,’ Wesley deriving his doctrine from consideration of Scripture, reason and tradition ( the Anglican Triad ) with his addition of the important hermeneutical consideration of ‘experience.’ Scripture then is interpreted in light of what experience dictates. This is no blanket endorsement of all experience but provides a more integrative approach to scripture interpretation, where appeal to primitive tradition influences the reader to look for the actions of the early church and take them as indicative of what the *experienced* life of the church is to be. ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 28, citing Albert C. Outler, ‘The Wesleyan Quadrilateral in Wesley,’ *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, 20.1, pp. 7-18. )

<sup>105</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 40. It should be noted that Wesley, though he received *assurance of salvation* at the time of this experience, did not believe that he had gained his goal of holiness or Christian perfection in this Aldersgate experience. Rather, Christian perfection was a process of the perfection of motives and desires. ( Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic movements in the Twentieth Century*, [ Grand Rapids, Michigan : William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997 ], p. 5, and see pp. 4-8. )

“Assurance” here should not be crudely characterised as referring only to ‘feelings’ but should also carry the meaning of ‘conviction by the Holy Spirit’ ( which some Christians describe as akin to what some call ‘gut feeling.’ ) That is, John Wesley’s experience being ‘strangely warmed’ should not be extrapolated from to over-emphasise the possibility of receipt of a *physical* feeling of warmth : that would be opposed to being *warmed in the sense of being convicted by the Holy Spirit that one had been changed*. The point the Finished Work Pentecostals make is that even if this *was* the meaning John Wesley’s intended to convey, the meaning had become changed to mean that one had to have some kind of emotional encounter accompanied by *physical* manifestations, separate from the ‘heart conviction’ (‘gut feeling’), as some kind of Holy Spirit ‘earnest’ ( Eph. 1: 14 ) of God being truly at work on a particular occasion. Thus, many preachers talking about faith being *substantial* ( Heb. 11: 1 ), teach that its presence is something one *should be* aware of before claiming one has faith. Such assurance of *substantial* faith is preached as a safeguard against presumption ( Num. 14: 44 ). As Kimberley Alexander points out, this teaching of *substantial* faith has been undermined: “Because waiting on *assurance*, before offering testimony of *experience*, is seen as doubt or unbelief, what has evolved is a theology which mandates the denial of symptoms and claims of healing which are false.” ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 238, my italics. )

(akin to Wesley’s own being “strangely warmed”) is categorised as ‘lack of faith,’ if it became an *expected* accompanying phenomenon to the main object of faith, rather than construed as a mere *resultant* accompaniment. Any waiting on the *experience* of assurance as a guarantee of the Spirit having worked constituted lack of faith. <sup>106</sup> Judd Montgomery wrote that to receive salvation someone had to ‘reckon’ Christ’s death on the Cross as a substitute for them is true, that they have no *work* to do, which was done for them long ago, they have only to ‘reckon’ it *is* done , done for them personally. <sup>107</sup> Judd Montgomery’s subject here is reception of (experience of) salvation through faith (Eph. 2:8, Rom. 5:1). Her readers are warned *not to rely on feelings/immediate experience*; instead, the only need is to “*act as though we believe what we profess to believe.*” <sup>108</sup> This involves reliance on the ‘finished work’ of Christ’s atonement, asking and expecting that the Holy Spirit will manifest this in their lives. <sup>109</sup> As related, Phoebe Palmer taught her ‘seekers’ to testify to receiving blessing “by faith” even if failing to experience emotional feelings at the time. <sup>110</sup> This teaching of Palmer/Mix/Judd Montgomery is the WOF teaching, Judd Montgomery’s monthly magazine *Triumphs of Faith* having more WOF teaching on healing in its first issue’s editorial:

“Very simple and plain is our part in the obtaining of God’s promised blessings, and this *laying hold by faith* is much easier of accomplishment than most of us are willing to believe. *Our part is simply to reckon our prayer as answered*, and God’s part is to *make faith’s reckonings real*. This is by no means a question of *feeling* faith, but of

---

<sup>106</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 46, concerning healing evangelists Mix and Judd Montgomery.

<sup>107</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 45, citing Judd Montgomery, *Triumphs of Faith* 2.1 ( Jan. 1882 ), pp. 1, 2. Note the use of ‘reckon’ of Rom. 6:11.

<sup>108</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, pp. 238-239, citing Judd, ‘Faith’s Reckonings,’ *Triumphs of Faith*, p. 2, my italics.

<sup>109</sup> Judd Montgomery, *Triumphs of Faith* 2.1 ( Jan. 1882 ), p. 3. Concerning this ‘finished work [ of Calvary ]’ / ‘event of the cross’ : “This decisive action by Jesus was viewed as perfect, in the sense of complete and final. It was a *finished* work...With the juridical action of Christ in atonement, and satisfaction of God the Judge complete, merit was made available to humanity...” ( Last two quotes are from Alexander, *Healing*, pp. 210-211. )

<sup>110</sup> Synan, *Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition*, p. 18.

*acting* faith...Christ bore our sickness as well as our sins, and if we may reckon ourselves free from the one, why not from the other?"<sup>111</sup>

Judd Montgomery insisted that according to Psalm 107:20 we must simply believe we are healed by the word of God.<sup>112</sup> Prior to Judd Montgomery's 1879 teenage healing, Mix instructed her to stop taking medicine and then claim the promise of her healing and then "act faith."<sup>113</sup> The next step, which Judd Montgomery also taught, was that no matter how bad you felt you had to get out of bed and begin to walk by faith. Following this, strength would come, disease would depart and you would be made whole.<sup>114</sup> This reiterates Mix's/Judd Montgomery's belief healing came immediately one chose to act in faith, even if evidence of that healing in the body came later.<sup>115</sup> This is again an instance of the WOF teaching of healing – what it will be seen WOF teacher Kenneth Hagin himself did when arising from his own teenage sickbed, aged seventeen.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Dayton, *Roots of Pentecostalism*, p.126, quoting Judd [ Montgomery ], Carrie F., 'Faith Reckonings,' *Triumphs of Faith* 1 ( Jan. 1881 ), pp. 2-3 ; Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 238, my italicisation of 'our part is simply to reckon our prayer as answered.'

<sup>112</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 237.

<sup>113</sup> Judd [ Montgomery ], *Prayer of Faith*, pp. 14, 15, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 46. Also see Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 238, citing Carrie F. Judd, 'Faith's Reckonings,' ( Oakland, California: Office of Triumphs of Faith, no date ), p. 5.

<sup>114</sup> Judd [ Montgomery ], *Prayer of Faith*, pp.14, 15, in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 46. And "...if symptoms still existed, Carrie [ Judd Montgomery ] taught that people should deny those symptoms and believe what God's word said about their healing regardless..." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 206. ) This is the outworking of : "The kingdom of the living God drives out the germs of death and spreads the seeds of life. It doesn't merely bring salvation in a religious sense. It brings health in bodily experience too. In the healing of the sick the kingdom takes bodily form. The Spirit makes what is sick and dying alive again...the divine vitality desires to penetrate our bodies too..." ( Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, p. 13. )

<sup>115</sup> Judd Montgomery, 'Some Secrets of Faith,' *Triumphs Of Faith* 31.4 ( April 1911 ), p. 76 ; Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 227.

<sup>116</sup> So, Judd [ Montgomery ] again : "Faith is belief, and the question is not how much we must believe God's word, but whether we accept it as true or not true; whether we deem it reliable or not reliable."

( Judd [ Montgomery ], *Prayer of Faith*, p. 41, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 46. )

Judd Montgomery's friend A. B. Simpson agreed : "We believe that God is healing before any evidence is given...We are to act as if it were already true." ( A. B. Simpson, *The Four Fold Gospel*, p. 62, cited in Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 8. ) For detail of Judd Montgomery's long friendship with A. B. Simpson, ( founder of both the Christian Alliance and the Missionary Alliance that coalesced into the Christian and Missionary Alliance ), see Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*.

Judd Montgomery wrote she often reminded God of the covenant she had taken by faith.<sup>117</sup>

A phrase beloved in the WOF is “it worketh ,” that by faith ‘putting biblical scriptures to work’ those scriptures are shown effective (Eph. 3:20, Gal. 5:6, 1 Thess. 2:13). Judd Montgomery spoke of possible delay before believed promises in scripture are “realized;” this period of delay was a time for praising God for the manifestation of the believed promises, “the praise of faith.” In tune with this, when reflecting on her own first being healed (in 1879) Judd Montgomery said that though her healing was instantaneous, her strength returned only gradually: this return of strength was the “*manifest* answer.”<sup>118</sup> Judd Montgomery wrote that those going about sick, faint, and miserable are *manifesting* death and forgetting the resurrection life of Christ should be made *manifest* in their bodies.<sup>119</sup>

Judd Montgomery instructed prayer: “Thou has[t] said the sign of recovery shall follow (literal, accompany). Lord, I believe Thy word alone. I believe the sign of healing now follows or accompanies the laying on of hands in Thy Name.”<sup>120</sup> This faith claim demands one claim healing took place at that moment, which will be seen to also be teaching of the WOF on faith for healing.<sup>121</sup> Despite serious illnesses in 1898 and 1907 Judd Montgomery

---

<sup>117</sup> Judd Montgomery in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 46 ; I think Judd Montgomery’s practice reflects obedience to the juridical-sounding commandment: “Put me in remembrance : let us plead together : declare thou, that thou mayest be justified.” ( Is. 43: 26 ).

<sup>118</sup> Judd Montgomery, ‘The Praise of Faith,’ in *Triumphs of Faith* 15.5 ( May 1895 ), pp. 97-103, in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 46.

To answer the claim Judd Montgomery was non-Christian because she used the word ‘manifest,’ a word also used by non-Christian Christian Scientists: it seems more probable to me that Judd Montgomery obtained ‘manifest’ from a more accurate rendition of the Greek of Colossians 3: 4. That is “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory” becomes “When Christ, who is our life, shall *be made manifest*, then shall ye also *be made manifest* with him in glory.” ( my italics. ) The Greek word given in Strong’s, when looking up ‘appear’ ( Col. 3: 4 ), is *incorrect* ( Strong’s word 5316 is given ), when it is actually Strong’s Word 5319, *phaneroo*, translated in Young’s as ‘to make manifest.’ Green has Strong’s word 5319 in his own translation, but he opts for ‘revealed’ rather than ‘manifest.’ ( Strong, *Bible Concordance*, p. 73, the concordance includes Strong’s Greek Dictionary of the New Testament, see p. 75 ; Young, Robert, *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*, ( Iowa Falls, Iowa : Riverside Book and Bible House, no dates of publication ), p. 45 ; Green, Jay P., Sr., ( trans. ), *The Interlinear Bible*, [ Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, 2010 ], p. 915. )

<sup>119</sup> She was referring to 2 Cor. 4:10-11, 16. Judd Montgomery, ‘The Life Also of Jesus,’ *Triumphs of Faith* 25:2 ( Feb. 1905 ), p. 26, my italics, in Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 200.

<sup>120</sup> Judd Montgomery in *Triumphs of Faith* 28.5 ( May 1908 ), p. 99, in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 158.

<sup>121</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 48. Regarding the case of the child in Mark 9, Judd Montgomery writes in her famous *Prayer of Faith*: “This shows that in some cases the healing in answer to prayer may not be apparent at once. The spirit of disease may, in its exit from our tormented bodies, ‘rend us sore,’ and prostrate us more than ever

reportedly refused medical succour, experiencing healing and continuing abstinence from medicine.<sup>122</sup> Judd Montgomery said in her book *The Prayer of Faith* that faith in God involved believing scriptures pertaining to healing in the Bible, without regarding natural circumstances that were apparent obstacles to one being bold enough to ‘act faith.’<sup>123</sup> She used the illustration of the father in Mark 9 lacking, then receiving, faith. She described this man as knowing he needed faith, then making effort to believe and asking Jesus to ‘help his unbelief’ and that *it was an effort of intellect and will for him to then say “Lord, I believe.”*<sup>124</sup> I think, as will be remarked on when later discussing Hagin’s inferred same teaching, for those following this teaching of Judd Montgomery there may be instances where there is trouble following it. That is, her ‘making the effort to believe’ carries attendant risk for those ‘making the effort to believe’ of wrongly negating the fact that sometimes *there may be no granting of a genuine faith/a pertaining “word of God.”* In a case where *no genuine faith* is granted, Judd Montgomery’s one ‘making the effort’ may possibly wrongly name their own psychological/physical effort as ‘faith.’ By way of reply to this objection of mine to Judd Montgomery’s teaching, some might counter-argue Judd Montgomery’s citation of Jesus’ cleansing ten lepers. Namely, that unbelief would have prevented these lepers from leaving Jesus until they saw that the cleansing had been accomplished, but rather they had accepted the blessing in faith, *acting faith*, and it was soon given them in reality, so that those not yet sure of their ‘faith’ should persevere until they had either full confidence or the manifestation of the object of their faith.<sup>125</sup> My counter to this counter-argument is: this is *not* what I am talking about, for in this instance the lepers were reportedly being obedient to a

---

for a time. But shall this make us believe for a moment that God is failing to keep His word ? as if that word which upholds the universe could fail ! Let us be ready even to rejoice if increased pain and weakness are ours after prayer has been offered, feeling sure that it is the departing struggle of the disease which Jesus has rebuked.” ( Carrie Judd [ Montgomery ], *The Prayer of Faith*, [ Buffalo, New York : Carrie F. Judd, 1880 ], pp. 102-103, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 48. )

<sup>122</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 183.

<sup>123</sup> Judd [ Montgomery ], *Prayer of Faith*, p. 43, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 46.

<sup>124</sup> Judd [ Montgomery ], *Prayer of Faith*, pp. 52-53, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 47, my italics.

<sup>125</sup> Judd [ Montgomery ], *Prayer of Faith*, p. 101., cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 47.

*genuine* “word of God” so their ‘acting faith’ *did* result in their healing. That is, I am saying there is in enactment *potential* danger of presumption, which presumption would mean such enactment stemmed from presumption not faith: when presumption is called faith.

Although Judd Montgomery concluded the man in Mark 9 made effort to believe and that it was as he made this effort that power was given him, this again involves receipt of an available ‘word of God.’<sup>126</sup> Thus, it nevertheless seems right to me one should not automatically think effort to obtain faith (Judd Montgomery’s “accepting the blessing in faith”) *is* presumption.<sup>127</sup> Rather, one be willing to countenance the possibility of faith being granted. But I point out no one can really gauge exactly how long one should maintain this state of ‘expecting faith’ – some would say ‘until it comes,’ others counsel the danger of presumption robbing the applicant of what blessings from medical science they might appropriate by *not waiting for a faith that is not going to come anyway*.<sup>128</sup>

Waiting on experience was construed, by Mix/Judd Montgomery, to be ‘lack of faith.’ Did Judd Montgomery *blame* Wesley for suggesting one should expect ‘mysterious emotion,’ Wesley noting, almost certainly not from pride but in his attempt to help, being ‘strangely warmed’ as part of his own process of assurance? Whereas Judd Montgomery disagreed with taking medicine, Wesley himself promoted science “especially in terms of its medicinal effects” and Wesley provided free medical clinics for the poor.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Judd [ Montgomery ], *Prayer of Faith*, pp. 52-53, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 47.

<sup>127</sup> Along the lines of what I am saying, Farah’s *From the Pinnacle of the Temple* has as its thesis the necessity of hearing God ( receiving faith ) as a prerequisite for exercising faith. Referring to Exodus 14, Farah says “Israel went through the Red Sea, proving God. The Egyptians did exactly the same thing, and they died for their presumption. What was the difference ? Israel heard a word from God; Egypt did not.” ( Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 25. )

<sup>128</sup> See particularly in chapter three the replication of Judd Montgomery’s teaching, with the provision of Hagin’s overshort list of impedances to faith, which Hagin calls ‘blockages to faith.’

<sup>129</sup> Yong, *Spirit Poured Out On All Flesh*, p. 274. One of Wesley’s treatises was *Primitive Physic; or, An Easy and Natural Method of Curing Most Diseases*, first published in 1747 and in its 13<sup>th</sup> edition in 1768. ( Yong, *Spirit Poured Out On All Flesh*, p. 274. )

Judd Montgomery's message was: "We are to claim these glorious truths by *faith* and not by *feeling*...we may ask and expect that the Holy Spirit will *bear witness to the truth*." <sup>130</sup>

Because of Judd Montgomery's many years criss-crossing the U. S. in peripatetic ministry, and publishing her influential monthly *Triumphs of Faith*, besides her personal influence on many Christian ministers, I feel Kimberley Alexander right in saying Judd Montgomery was a "primary shaper" of healing theology in the nineteenth century. <sup>131</sup> To complete my examination of the Divine Healing Movement I want to show how her theology of faith for healing became part of Pentecostalism. As stressed, her teaching and practice of faith for divine healing is very much that favoured by the Pentecostal WOF.

#### 1.9.5 Carrie Judd Montgomery, E. W. Kenyon and 'Finished Work.' <sup>132</sup>

The term 'Finished Work Theology' is used to denote theology affirming Christ's atonement provided all forgiveness of sin and provided all healing. This has been seen to be the theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery. <sup>133</sup> That is, believers, in order to receive forgiveness and healing provided at that historic moment, need only appropriate it by faith. <sup>134</sup> Judd Montgomery

---

<sup>130</sup> Judd Montgomery, *Triumphs of Faith* 2.1 ( Jan. 1882 ), p. 3, in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 151.

<sup>131</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 151. Judd Montgomery received her Pentecostal baptism in the Spirit experience of 'speaking in new tongues' in the same way she preached for receiving divine healing : "She chose to believe that by faith, she had already received her experience even if the manifestations had not yet come. Her application of 'taking' things by faith, whether that be healing, God's [ financial ] provision, or even Pentecostal Spirit baptism is prevalent here." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 146. ) According to Miskov, after Judd Montgomery prayed for the baptism in the Spirit and claimed she had received it by faith, it did take a week for Judd Montgomery to experience the *manifestation* of speaking with tongues. ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 147. ) This was on 29<sup>th</sup> June, 1908 ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 147. )

<sup>132</sup> Concerning Christ's atonement : "This substitutionary act of Christ was appropriated by faith and belief on the name of Jesus. In so doing, the *Finished Work Pentecostals* held that the believer is identifying with Christ, seeing himself/herself as dead in Christ, crucified with Him and quickened to newness of life. It was through that one act that the sinner is made righteous...One of the effects of the Fall, which the Finished Work of Calvary was capable of dealing with, was the loss of the state of health. While [ William ] Durham said little about healing in relation to his Finished Work view, it is clear that his followers, and even some of his predecessors who were already proposing a Finished Work theology [ such as Carrie Judd Montgomery ], linked their understanding of 'healing provided for all in the atonement' to a Finished Work soteriology." ( All quotes are from Alexander, *Healing*, pp. 210-211, my italicisation of 'Finished Work Pentecostals.' )

<sup>133</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 169. Alexander notes that David Petts does not accept there is healing in Christ's atonement, except "ultimately" and "indirectly." ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 235. )

<sup>134</sup> The response to Durham's teaching of the 'Finished Work' had been that, although the leaders of Azusa Street, William Seymour and Florence Crawford, rejected it, Durham's teaching was nevertheless widely received : "Pentecostal leaders recanted their own earlier testimonies in which they had testified to a second definite work of sanctification and [ now ] preached and published this 'new truth' which they hailed as the 'true Gospel.'" ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 183. ) F. J. Ewart said Durham's 'revelation' of the 'Finished Work' meant

taught this substance of ‘Finished Work theology’ from as early as 1880, *pre-dating Durham by four years*.<sup>135</sup> Things seem interwoven here, albeit ‘interwoven’ can be a euphemism for ‘tangled:’ so, it seems ‘Finished Work’ preacher William Durham’s sermons were based on E. W. Kenyon’s teaching.<sup>136</sup> Concerning the claim, examined later, that *many* plagiarized E. W. Kenyon’s work, I would say Durham *himself* should not be considered guilty of plagiarism since Kenyon apparently consciously helped him, probably aware of Durham’s resultant sermons, and never accused Durham of plagiarism. Pursuing the ‘interwoven’ referred to, Kenyon’s work *itself* seems emulatory of teaching having been continually expressed by Judd Montgomery in her long-running monthly magazine *Triumphs of Faith*.<sup>137</sup> E. W. Kenyon and Judd Montgomery, both living much of their lives in California, were friends, but, *more notably*, Judd Montgomery showed her approval of Kenyon’s teaching by

---

“A deadly blow has been dealt to the crumbling unscriptural plank of a second, definite work of grace.” ( F. J. Ewart, ‘Defending Heresies,’ in *The Good Report* 1.3 [ 1912 ], p. 12, in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 183. ) Bartleman tells us that when Durham had come from Chicago to Los Angeles in February 1911 and remained there preaching : “on May 2, I went to Azusa Street...But to our surprise we found the doors all locked with chain and padlock. Brother Seymour had hastened back from the east and with his trustees decided to lock Brother Durham out. But they locked God and the saints out also. It was Durham’s message they objected to...Brother Durham rented a large building...A thousand people attended the meetings here on Sundays. We had an ordinary congregation of four hundred week nights. Here the ‘cloud’ rested. God’s glory filled the place. ‘Azusa’ became deserted. The Lord was with Brother Durham in great power. **God sets His seal especially on present truth to be established.** He preached a gospel of salvation by faith. He was used mightily to draw anew a clear line of demarcation between salvation by works and faith, between law and grace. This had become very much needed, even among the Pentecostal people. ” ( Frank Bartleman, *How “Pentecost” Came to Los Angeles, “As It Was In the Beginning,”* [ F. BARTLEMAN, 5606 Isleta Drive, Los Angeles, California, April 1925 ], p.146 : the bold type in the quote is Bartleman’s own. ) Prior to Seymour returning ‘from the east’ Durham *had* been preaching at Azusa Street, Bartleman paying tribute to the blessedness of those meetings. ( Bartleman, *Pentecost in Los Angeles*, p. 145. )

<sup>135</sup> “Carrie [ Judd Montgomery ] taught on this theme even earlier in 1880, predating Durham’s [ own earlier ] teaching by at least four years.” ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 196. ) And - Judd Montgomery’s ministry was influential in being *geographically extensive* in the U. S. as she was “crisscrossing the nation conducting “Consecration and Divine Healing” meetings.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 183. ) But note that, just as it was possible to reckon oneself dead to sin according to Romans 6: 11 without being a Methodist, so too, it has been possible for *almost the last two thousand years* to have a ‘Finished Work’ theology by appealing to aspects of the ‘finished work’ of Christ.

<sup>136</sup> Dale H. Simmons, *E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty*, ( Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 1997 ), pp. ix-x.

<sup>137</sup> Paul Chappell claims *Triumphs of Faith* ceased publication in September 1979 ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, footnote on p. 183. ) However, it has also been claimed : “The periodical *Triumphs of Faith* was continued by her daughter Faith Montgomery Berry and is still published by the Home of Peace in Oakland, California.” ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 27. ) Perhaps *Triumphs of Faith* has been re-instituted ? As for Miskov she claims that *Triumphs of Faith* was only published “up to the mid-1970s” ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 170 ).

re-producing Kenyon's teaching in her journal over several decades.<sup>138</sup> Among many examples peppered through Kenyon's works, these are typical: *showing Judd Montgomery's language in Kenyon*: "Healing and victory are ours. They are ours without asking. All we need to do is to simply know it and praise Him for it."<sup>139</sup> And: "'By His stripes ye were healed.' The afflictions in our bodies were laid upon Jesus. He bore them. We do not need to bear them. All we need to do is to recognize and accept that fact. We refuse to allow disease in our bodies. We are healed." (1 Pet. 2:24).<sup>140</sup> The *language* of Judd Montgomery and the *language* of E. W. Kenyon is the language of the healing evangelist. Having herself been a famed healing evangelist it is not completely surprising that Judd Montgomery was ordained 'evangelist' by the U. S. Pentecostal denomination the Assemblies of God even *before* they officially formed.<sup>141</sup> Judd Montgomery said:

"Those who went to Jesus could not have thought of asking Him to restore their souls, and leave their bodies full of disease. Even those of them who realized, as we so fully realize, that the soul-healing is vastly above anything else in importance, would not

---

<sup>138</sup> "Carrie [ Judd Montgomery ] was friends with the significant Faith leader, E. W. Kenyon." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 244. ) Besides Miskov, Joe McIntyre is another source of Judd Montgomery and Kenyon's friendship "Carrie Judd Montgomery was a close friend of Kenyon." ( Atkinson, *'Spiritual Death' of Jesus*, p. 81, citing Joe McIntyre, *E. W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story*, [ Orlando, Florida : Creation House, 1997 ], p. 75. )

And : "faith founder E. W. Kenyon, appeared in her journal [ *Triumphs of Faith* ] over several decades." ( King, *Only Believe*, p. 53. )

<sup>139</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, ( Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 2004 [ 30<sup>th</sup> printing ] ), p. 28.

<sup>140</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 33.

<sup>141</sup> Thus : "Carrie [ Judd Montgomery ] was already a profound and influential writer and *healing evangelist* in her day before her Pentecostal Spirit baptism experience." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 148, my italics. )

'A certificate of ordination with the Assemblies of God reveals that she was ordained with them as an "Evangelist and Missionary." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 163, citing "'Certificates of Ordination,' *Personal Papers of Carrie Judd Montgomery*, 1914." ) Miskov's footnote revealed : "These were dated January 11, 1914 before the Assemblies of God were officially formed several months later." And "While it took several years after this for the Assemblies of God to become an official denomination, Carrie associated herself with the movement in its earliest stages of development." ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 163. )

It was from 'Finished Work' that other prominent women healing evangelists emerged, such as Maria Woodworth-Etter, Aimee Semple McPherson and Mattie Crawford. ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 240. )

have thought of pleading for the greater boon without the less. Why *should* they, why should *we* – when Christ is able and willing to give us both?”<sup>142</sup>

Judd Montgomery and the WOF (Kenyon and Hagin) stress 3 John 2:

“He wants to give Divine health to all His children, and then you will know the meaning of the prayer of John when he says, ‘Brother, I wish above all things that thou mayest be in health (not natural health, but Divine health), even as they soul prospereth.’ ”<sup>143</sup>

Concerning the findings of Finished Work healing evangelist Judd Montgomery being a precursor of the WOF: “from a reading of early Finished Work Pentecostal literature...the prevalence of what has more recently been understood as *the language of the Word of Faith or Health and Wealth Movement is widespread.*”<sup>144</sup>

### **1.10 Healing in Modern Pentecostalism.**<sup>145</sup>

Carrie Judd Montgomery encountered minimal opposition to her Pentecostal message because, firstly, many people had earlier encountered her teaching on divine healing, and secondly because Judd Montgomery *continued* to teach on divine healing alongside her espousing the teaching of receiving by faith the Baptism in the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues.<sup>146</sup> It was thus that Pentecostalism was enabled to become an important part of the

---

<sup>142</sup> Judd Montgomery, *Prayer of Faith*, p. 65, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 43.

<sup>143</sup> Judd Montgomery, *Triumphs Of Faith* 30.7 ( Jul. 1910 ), p. 167, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 157.

<sup>144</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 227, my italics.

<sup>145</sup> I denote the *early decades* of modern day Pentecostalism by saying ‘early modern,’ not classical, Pentecostalism. I want to avoid the ambiguity of the phrase ‘classical Pentecostalism;’ for, ‘classical Pentecostalism’ carries the cadence of something approximating to the *first* reported outpouring of the Spirit at the feast of Pentecost in the first century ( reported in the book of Acts chapter 2. ) In other words, there is ambiguity of whether first century Pentecostalism or *modern Pentecostalism* around, and subsequent to, the twentieth century is being alluded to. In order to more clearly differentiate : I call the outpouring in the book of Acts chapter 2 ‘early Pentecostalism’: I call the *early decades* of modern Pentecostalism ‘early modern Pentecostalism’; subsequent modern Pentecostalism ( and modern Pentecostalism as a whole ) simply as ‘modern Pentecostalism.’ Any Pentecostalism that occurred between ‘early Pentecostalism’ and ‘modern Pentecostalism’ I call ‘incidents of Pentecostalism.’

<sup>146</sup> Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 158. Pentecostalism’s appeal was contingent on incorporation of divine healing within it : “healing miracle stories were a major reason for the explosive growth of the movement.” ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 2. ) Also : “The testimonies...circulated in the wider geographic community, were in most cases the ‘word of mouth’ advertising which was utilised by the growing movement.” ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 2. )

broader divine healing movement.<sup>147</sup> Early Modern Pentecostals agreed with Judd Montgomery, saying that the Christian believer should not wait to see a manifestation, or sign, of their healing before believing. That was because the signs were to *follow* and not precede believers.<sup>148</sup> And there was a frequent commanding of people to be healed “to get up and walk in the name of Jesus:” this was mostly employed by the prominent female healing evangelists Maria Woodworth-Etter, Aimee Semple McPherson, and Kathryn Kuhlman.<sup>149</sup> Another such Pentecostal healing evangelist was Mattie Crawford (1879-1948)<sup>150</sup> who insisted the sick exhibit determination to obey by acting upon their faith. She

---

<sup>147</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 364. It has been plausibly claimed that the largest and most extensive group to proclaim the divine healing message in the twentieth century has been the Pentecostal churches and their respective evangelists. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 364 ).

<sup>148</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 106, citing Thomas B. Buckalew writing in *The Church of God Evangel*, 10.10 ( Mar. 8, 1919 ), p. 4.

<sup>149</sup> *The Christian Evangel* ( 9<sup>th</sup> Jan 1915 ), p. 3, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 176. “Maria Woodworth–Etter ( 1844-1924 ) was a healing evangelist who...reluctantly began to pray for the sick in 1885 after she claimed that she heard God call her to that.” ( Wayne Warner, ‘Maria B. Woodworth-Etter and the Early Pentecostal Movement,’ *Assemblies of God Heritage* 6:4 [ Winter 1986-1987 ], pp. 11-14, cited in Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 95. And see Burgess, *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, pp. 1211-1213. ) I also list Kathryn Kuhlman as I have seen old footage of one of her meetings where she successfully commanded a disabled woman to walk in the Name of Jesus.

Kathryn Kuhlman’s book *I Believe in Miracles* sold several million copies. *Renewal* magazine’s book review is quoted as saying it was “one of the most readable books on divine healing. In most cases the healing was instantaneous and well substantiated by work capacity, weight gain, further X-rays, operations and biopsies...In every case the patients find Christ as well as physical healing. Miss Kuhlman emphasizes this point and reminds us that this new life is a greater miracle than bodily cures.” ( *Renewal* magazine cited on the back cover of: Kathryn Kuhlman, *I Believe in Miracles*, [ London : Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1968 ] Another bestseller was: Kathryn Kuhlman, *Nothing is Impossible with God*, [ Alachua, Florida : Bridge-Logos, first published in 1974 ] ) The biblical account of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful ( Acts 3 ) shows apostles Peter and John demanding that this lame man get up and walk, and Peter’s later explanation was that the lame man had been healed through “his [ Christ’s ] name through [ Peter’s ( and John’s ? ) ] faith in his name.” ( Acts 3: 16 ) ( See Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, pp. 37, 39. ) Previously, when Jesus was still performing His Galilean and Judean ministry, Jesus had not yet entered into His High Priestly mediatorial role at the right hand of the Father, so that it was not then appropriate to have prayed in His Name.

Commanding people to be healed is practiced in some WOF meetings - a Norvel Hayes meeting reportedly saw a thus prayed-for lady propelled through the air from her wheelchair and when she reached the ground she reached it healed. This miracle is testified to by members of the congregation present at the time, who give verbal assent to the miracle in the taping of a Norvel Hayes series of sermons ‘Don’t Let the Devil Steal Your Ministry.’ Hayes is probably most well-known through his book and cassette tape series *How To Live and Not Die*, about the cursing of, and recovery from, cancer. Most of the people Hayes has been able to minister to first had recourse to medical science, and only came to Hayes because they were “no better but rather grew worse.” ( Mk. 5: 26 ). ( Norvel Hayes, *How To Live And Not Die*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Harrison House, 1986 ] ).

<sup>150</sup> Concerning Crawford ( 1879-1948 ) : “...after moving to Los Angeles, she came in contact with a Pentecostal Mission...and was baptized in the Holy Ghost, speaking in ‘about fifteen different languages.’ ” ( Mattie Crawford, *The Story of My Life*, [ Los Angeles, California : Mattie Crawford, 1923 ], p. 63, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 186. )

[ Crawford’s dates came from a Google search of ‘Pentecostal Mattie Crawford,’ which also reported her having been known as ‘the blonde evangelist.’ ]

taught this putting-faith-into-action would bring about manifestation of the healing prayed for.<sup>151</sup> Again, this teaching of Judd Montgomery/Mattie Crawford is typical of teaching in the WOF.<sup>152</sup> Hollenweger mentions the existence within the Assemblies of God *itself* of noted healing evangelists such as Dr. Lilian B. Yeomans, besides Judd Montgomery.<sup>153</sup> Hollenweger quoted another U. S. Assemblies of God evangelist, which evangelist showed continued use of Judd Montgomery's language/the healing evangelist language of the WOF.<sup>154</sup> I agree with what Hollenweger infers when reporting that rejection of healing evangelists by the U. S. Assemblies of God was tantamount to rejecting their own heritage.<sup>155</sup>

### **1.11 Conclusion.**

I draw attention to 1.4 '*How This Chapter Supports the Thesis*' and repeat the gist now as *aide de memoire*: this chapter starts explaining the WOF's consistency, moving on to present research findings that the WOF seems rooted in evangelical healing evangelism. As being

---

[ Incidentally, Hagin reported the Pentecostal pioneer Dr. John Lake as having agreed with other Mattie Crawford teaching when he said that gradual healings were beneficial in that "people who are gradually healed can see that they get better and better as they walk in [obedience to] God..." ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 64. ) ]

<sup>151</sup> Crawford, *Discourses*, p. 84, in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 193. "Crawford would ask the person to put down crutches and walk or lift a crippled foot. For some the healing was instantaneous, as they felt the power of God move through their bodies, while for others the healing was gradual. Mrs. A. M. Knutson testified of receiving her eyesight as she walked home from a Crawford meeting." ( Crawford, *Discourses*, pp. 52, 103, 99, 100, 108, 94, 101, 98, cited in Alexander, *Healing*, p. 193. ) This is reminiscent of the report of the ten lepers who were healed afterwards "as they went" ( Luke 17: 14 ); similarly, the nobleman's son is reported to have begun to get better from the hour he was ministered to until he was healed ( John 4 ).

<sup>152</sup> Crawford's attitude to medicine and doctors was *also* in accord with that of Judd Montgomery and Hagin : "She instructed that one must obey the laws of the land so it was necessary to obey quarantine laws and to consult with a doctor so that a death certificate might be obtained...she felt that there should be a friendly relationship where possible between doctors and those who adhered to belief in divine healing. Doctors were necessary for those who did not have faith. However, 'poisonous drugs and unnecessary surgical operations' brought about 'great bondage.' ...Crawford was adamant...that God should be the physician for His people." ( Alexander, *Healing*, p. 194, citing Crawford, *Discourses*, pp. 87-89. )

<sup>153</sup> Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, p. 35. Hollenweger cites Yeomans' testimony of her own divine healing and her subsequent teaching ( L. B. Yeomans, *Healing From Heaven*, [ Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1926 ], p. 22 f. )

<sup>154</sup> Evangelist Richard Vinyard reported in Donald Gee, ( ed. ), *Pentecostal World Conference Messages, preached at the Fifth Triennial World Conference*, ( Toronto : Testimony Press, 1958 ), p. 67f, in Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, p. 358.

<sup>155</sup> Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, p. 35, that is : "it must not be forgotten that the healing evangelists do not represent any more extreme a view than what was known until a short while ago in the Assemblies of God as 'the full gospel', e.g., in the writings of the Assemblies of God evangelist Dr. Lilian B. Yeomans."

rooted in evangelical healing evangelism, it is important to consider this when moving to examine the *counter-claim* the WOF is rooted in McConnell's Mind-Cure metaphysical.

This chapter therefore went some way toward addressing the question comprising the first part of the research question: *'is the Word Of Faith teaching and practice of healing metaphysical?'* Mainly the second chapter, and to some extent the third, completes the addressing of this first part of the research question. Both this chapter and the next two will contribute to proving the first part of the thesis: *'arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the metaphysical.'*

What will increasingly be revealed in chapters two and three is research findings that the WOF predominantly fulfills the role of healing evangelism previously seen in camp meetings and more particularly in the mainstream Divine Healing Movement discussed in this chapter.<sup>156</sup> The ramification for the thesis is, firstly, the U. S. Divine Healing Movement seems clearly to be a demonstration of evangelical Christianity at work, not a demonstration of the Mind-Cure metaphysical. Secondly, if the WOF *is* rooted in this Divine Healing Movement, that tends to lead one to conclude that the question comprising the first part of the research question *'Is the Word Of Faith teaching and practice of healing metaphysical?'* be answered in the negative. That would support the first part of the thesis *'Arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical*

---

<sup>156</sup> Chapter three, particularly, will relate research findings showing the WOF's Kenneth Hagin reflecting the weakness of his inherited Divine Healing Movement teaching and practice of divine healing. By 'weakness' I mean that Hagin makes little and rare admission that there is anything *more* to receiving divine healing than what he characterises as a pretty-well automatic/guaranteed process of the Christian believer *following a few certain steps* to get faith, followed by the exercise of that notional faith for healing.

*can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the metaphysical.*' I take issue with Bruce Barron claiming "much of" the WOF theology was developed during the years 1910-1947.<sup>157</sup> Rather, the research findings have indicated, and will be shown to continue to indicate, that it seems to have been the teaching and practice of divine healing of the Divine Healing Movement that informs WOF theology. There have been indications the WOF flowed naturally from the Divine Healing Movement: the language of Judd Montgomery herself was seen to be that of the healing evangelist. The language of her friend and associate, the WOF's E. W. Kenyon, emphasising the importance of 'faith in the Word' for divine healing, is also the language of the healing evangelist.

0-----0

---

<sup>157</sup> The Bruce Barron statement : "During these years of relative oblivion ( 1910-1947 ), healing revivalists continued to cross the country...developing much of the theology that Hagin, Copeland and many others continue to proclaim today." ( Bruce Barron, *The Health and Wealth Gospel*, [ Downers Grove, Illinois : InterVarsity Press, 1987 ], p. 44, cited in Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 8. )

## **Chapter 2                      Questioning Whether the WOF is Metaphysical.**

### **2.1      How This Chapter Supports the Thesis.**

As stated, this second chapter examines the claim the WOF teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical. Research findings in the first chapter pointed to a WOF rooted in evangelical healing evangelism. These findings should be borne in mind as a counter-balance when in this chapter examining the *counter-claim* the WOF (and its teaching and practice of healing) is rooted in the metaphysical. This *thesis's* initial definition of McConnell's Mind-Cure 'metaphysical' is 'mind over matter,' or the content of the Mind-Cure movement, with the pointer it consists of that metaphysical material said by McConnell to have infiltrated the WOF; precisely how the 'metaphysical' should be defined for the purposes of this thesis will be explored in this chapter.

This chapter addresses the question comprising the research question's first part: *'is the Word Of Faith teaching and practice of healing metaphysical?'* This is to test the first part of the thesis: *'arguments supporting the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, there is no adequate ground to initially make the claim the Word of Faith is metaphysical, or that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the metaphysical.'* This chapter relates findings about the metaphysical so that I can demonstrate understanding of what McConnell's Mind-Cure version of the metaphysical consists in, in furtherance of adequately answering the question comprising the research question's first part: *'is the Word Of Faith teaching and practice of healing metaphysical?'* Research findings will continue to steadily reveal in this chapter and in chapter three that WOF healing teaching and practice is not

Mind-Cure metaphysical, but rather that the WOF predominantly fulfills a role of healing evangelism previously particularly seen in the Divine Healing Movement.<sup>158</sup>

In examining the life and work of E. W. Kenyon in this chapter, it becomes apparent Kenyon seems silent on the need to carry out the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. In this being apparent, the chapter progresses toward testing the second part of the thesis: *'The Word of Faith does not teach obedience to the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor.'* This also progresses toward answering the second part of the research question: *'if not [metaphysical], are there biblical injunctions that suggest why Word of Faith teaching and practice of divine healing does not result in more incidence of the blessing of divine healing than it does?'* In doing so, this chapter starts the process of testing the third part of the thesis: *'Biblical scripture suggests that not obeying this biblical commandment to regularly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the blessing of divine healing.'*

## **2.2 Traditional definition of 'Metaphysical' and Chapter Structure.**

I start by describing the *more traditional* view of metaphysics/metaphysical, one that is *not* Dan McConnell's. This is important to deal with because time-and-time again one will come across those who say: when thinking of this *more traditional* view of metaphysics/the metaphysical: that Christian theology draws heavily on metaphysics/the metaphysical. The question needs to be asked: 'what do you mean by 'metaphysical?'' Thus, one could readily accept that Christian theology has been influenced by metaphysics/the metaphysical in its *more traditional* sense, *whilst at the same time rejecting the notion that Christian theology has been influenced by what McConnell describes as metaphysics/ the metaphysical that is*

---

<sup>158</sup> As an *aide de memoire* : chapter three particularly relates the research findings showing the WOF's Kenneth Hagin reflecting both the strength and weakness of his inherited Divine Healing Movement teaching and practice of divine healing. By 'strength' I refer to the myriad upon myriad of divine healings experienced through the teaching on faith for divine healing; by 'weakness' I mean that Hagin makes little and rare admission that there is anything more to receiving divine healing than what he characterises as an automatic/guaranteed process of the Christian believer getting faith, followed by the exercise of that notional faith for healing.

*part of Mind-Cure*. The traditional view of metaphysics can be simply phrased: “metaphysics is philosophic inquiry into and proposal about the nature of reality.”<sup>159</sup> So, Seventeenth century Christian clergyman poets George Herbert and John Donne were referred to as ‘metaphysical poets.’<sup>160</sup> Likewise, when studying for my bachelor degree, those of us studying Philosophy who professed ourselves Christians were known in the Philosophy department as ‘metaphysicals.’ Therefore it is important not to be confused by this more traditional conception of metaphysics/the metaphysical and what McConnell defines metaphysics/the metaphysical to be. Happily, there is a term ‘Mind-Cure’ under which all that McConnell means by metaphysics/the metaphysical can be placed.<sup>161</sup>

So, this chapter explores Mind-Cure: what McConnell terms ‘metaphysics’ (the ‘Metaphysical Movement’) is found within Mind-Cure.<sup>162</sup> Mind-Cure is based on a still contemporary admixture of idealism, gnostic and spiritualist influences for the purpose of using the power of the mind for healing.<sup>163</sup> There is a fairly numerous number of different

---

<sup>159</sup> Julian N. Hartt, ‘Metaphysics,’ in Marvin Halverson & Arthur Cohen ( eds. ), *A Handbook of Christian Theology*, ( London : Fontana Books, 1960 ), p. 229. Hartt continues “Actually Christian theology has frequently drawn heavily and wittingly upon metaphysics ; and some Christian theologians believe ( and a long tradition supports them in this ) that a particular system of metaphysics is a necessary theoretical foundation for Christian theology.” ( Hartt, *Metaphysics*, p. 229. )

Thus, Paul is reported to have both recognised and reacted to the then current Athenian metaphysical issue of a memorial to ‘the unknown God’ ( Acts 17: 18-23, 28 ).

<sup>160</sup> See D. J. Palmer & Malcolm Bradbury ( eds. ), *The Metaphysical Poets*, ( London : Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd., 1970 ). Another such metaphysical poet was Andrew Marvell, a clergyman’s son who became a tutor and politician ; a more comprehensive list of these poets is provided in Helen Gardner ( ed. ), *The Metaphysical Poets*, ( London : Penguin Books Ltd., 1964 ).

<sup>161</sup> I am not only describing what McConnell’s ‘metaphysical accusation’ consists of, in order to answer the question of whether or not the WOF teaching and practice of healing can properly be described as ‘metaphysical.’ That is the research also, in this chapter, uncovers evidence that the Mind-Cure metaphysical is not rooted in Christian teaching. Thus, in the light of this finding, it would *not be correct to argue* “It does not matter that the WOF is metaphysical, or originated in the metaphysical, because the metaphysical is Christian, anyway.”

<sup>162</sup> See Horatio W. Dresser ( ed. ), *The Quimby Manuscripts*, ( London : T. Werner Laurie Ltd., 1929, 4<sup>th</sup> edition ). Chappell reflects a general avoidance of examining Mind-Cure, stating that his own work “*will not examine the mind-cure movement or Christian Science phenomenon*, nor the psychotherapeutic movement which issued in the modern pastoral care and pastoral psychology ministries.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. v, my italics. )

<sup>163</sup> William DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit, Discover the REAL Spirit Behind the Charismatic Controversy*, ( Orlando, Florida : Creation House, 1996 ), p.165. Idealism is the philosophical position that mind and matter interact, with mind having some influence over matter. Mind-Cure has as its cornerstone the allegedly all-efficacious latent power of the mind. Such teaching seems antipathetic to a need for Divine grace, unless Divine grace were solely interpreted as ‘indwelling power’ innate in all. Mind-Cure is considered to be a ‘cult:’ “In the

systems that comprise Mind-Cure, extant at the time of McConnell publishing *A Different Gospel*, and though some of these have been influential McConnell chooses not to mention them probably because McConnell does not believe them to have had any influence on Kenyon, Hagin, and the Faith Movement; some of the more notable of these elements of Mind-Cure unmentioned by McConnell are: The Forum/Est (Erhard Seminar Training), Lifespring, Actualisations, and Silva Mind Control.<sup>164</sup> Probably because McConnell's interest in Mind-Cure is predicated on Mind-Cure's influence on Kenyon, Hagin and the 'Faith Movement' McConnell seems to treat Mind-Cure as comprising only *four* parts: " 'metaphysics' ...encompasses such religious groups as Christian Science, New Thought, Unity School of Christianity, and Science of the Mind."<sup>165</sup> Following the lead of McConnell's argument, I think it reasonable to investigate only those parts of the metaphysical that McConnell claims Kenyon, Hagin, and the 'Faith Movement' have been affected by. Therefore, this chapter analyses only Christian Science and New Thought: the other two groups mentioned in the recent McConnell quote are *less influential and are anyway only variants of the first two, Christian Science and New Thought*.<sup>166</sup> Bearing this out, although McConnell described metaphysics comprising *four* parts, he himself only mentions Christian Science and New Thought when discussing Emerson College, which E. W. Kenyon

---

evangelical world, the term [ cult ] is of rather recent development, having been popularized by J. K. Van Baalen's *The Chaos of the Cults* ( 1962 ), Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults* ( 1963 ), and Walter Martin's *The Kingdom of the Cults* ( 1965 )...a cult as defined by Martin would be considered 'a group of people gathered about a specific person or person's interpretation of the Bible' which 'contain not a few major deviations from historic Christianity. ' ' ( John Mark Terry, & Ebbie Smith, & Justice Anderson ( eds. ), *Missiology, An Introduction to the Foundations, History, and Strategies of World Missions*, [ Nashville, Tennessee : Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1998 ], p. 402. )

<sup>164</sup> The short book *The Facts on the Mind Sciences* presents itself in a small way as a reader for research into Mind-Cure/Mind Science, although the book does fail to mention the seminal P. P. Quimby. ( John Ankerberg & John Weldon, *The Facts on the Mind Sciences*, [ Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1993 ] )

<sup>165</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 24, my italics.

<sup>166</sup> 'Unity School of Christianity' was begun in 1889 in Kansas City, Missouri by Charles and Myrtle Fillmore, both erstwhile devotees of Christian Science. Unity diverged from Christian Science in asserting that matter is real, and preaching re-incarnation which was claimed to constitute the New Birth ( the "You must be born anew" of John 3: 7. ) Jesus's Divinity and the Holy Spirit's existence were denied. ( <http://carm.org/unity-school-christianity>, accessed in April, 2013. )

'Science of the Mind' ( and 'The Church of Religious Science' ) stressed the importance of avoiding negative thoughts : "negative thoughts creating negative results." Also, they are said to deny the existence of Heaven and Hell and the Devil. ( <http://www.allaboutcults.org/Science-of-the-mind.htm>, accessed April, 2013. )

attended.<sup>167</sup> Then, McConnell once again solely concentrates on Christian Science and New Thought, claiming: “The roots of Kenyon’s theology may be traced to his personal background in the metaphysical cults, *specifically New Thought and Christian Science.*”<sup>168</sup>

On having discussed Christian Science and New Thought, I turn to examine the WOF’s E. W. Kenyon questioning whether or not he should rightly be regarded as an exponent of the Mind-Cure metaphysical.

### **2.3. Mind-Cure.**

#### **2.3.1 Mind-Cure’s Content.**

Mind-Cure has the nature of being a contemporary admixture, rather than being an established mixture. Reflecting this feature of being an admixture being no *new* feature of Mind-Cure (and prior to his recommending the work of Horatio Dresser), William James presents a somewhat tortuous deposition of Mind-Cure’s components:

“One of the doctrinal sources of Mind-cure is the four Gospels; another is Emersonianism or New England transcendentalism; another is Berkeley idealism; another is spiritism, with its messages of ‘law’ and ‘progress’ and ‘development;’ another the optimistic popular science evolutionism of which I have recently spoken; and, finally, Hinduism has contributed a strain.”<sup>169</sup>

James presents a Mind-cure rather *smorgasbord*-like; a postmodern religious melting pot.

But it seems that here is another didactic intent besides accurate description of Mind-Cure,

---

<sup>167</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 47.

<sup>168</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 184, my italics.

<sup>169</sup> William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, ( London : Penguin Books, 1982 [ 1902 ] ), p. 94. This book contains the 1901 Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion delivered at the University of Edinburgh. ( James, *Religious Experience*, pp. xv, xxxv. ).

On an earlier visit to the U.S. in 1898, Indian Pentecostal pioneer Pandita Ramabai remarked “the ‘new’ philosophy of America, called Christian Science, was nothing new...It had been taught, she added, in her country [India] these four thousand years...It could not show sympathy since it considered both suffering and sufferers unreal.” ( Jan Karel Van Baalen, *The Chaos of Cults*, [ London : Pickering and Inglis Ltd., 1958 ], p. 102. )

for James uses this dismissive characterisation as bombastic preface to his subsequently lauding Christian Science:

“we can also overlook the verbiage of a good deal of the mind-cure literature, some of which is so moonstruck with optimism and so vaguely expressed that an academically trained intellect finds it almost impossible to read it at all.”<sup>170</sup>

In a word, James says he found a good deal of Mind-Cure literature incoherent; this quote occurs at the end of James’s preface that prepares us for the ‘safe waters’ of Christian Science. James only eulogises Mind-Cure once it has been safely re-defined as the Christian Science expounded by Horatio Dresser:

“To the importance of mind-cure the medical and clerical professions in the United States are beginning, though with much recalcitrancy and protesting, to open their eyes. It is evidently bound to develop still farther, both speculatively and practically, and its latest writers are far and away the ablest of the group.”<sup>171</sup>

James reveals the identity of these “latest writers...far and away the ablest:” “*I refer to Mr. Horatio W. Dresser and Mr. Henry Wood, especially the former.*”<sup>172</sup> The “especially” goes to Dresser, the presenter of Quimby’s teaching; for, the first teacher claiming ‘discovery’ of Christian Science doctrine was ‘Dr.’ Phineas Parkhurst Quimby of Portland, Oregon and Belfast, Maine in the U. S.<sup>173</sup> However, even as early as his ‘Editor’s Preface’ Quimby’s amenuensis Dresser mentions Christian Science’s second teacher, Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy.<sup>174</sup> But, since Dresser plausibly claims Mary Baker Eddy plagiarised Quimby, I concentrate

---

<sup>170</sup> James, *Religious Experience*, p. 96.

<sup>171</sup> James, *Religious Experience*, p. 96.

<sup>172</sup> James, *Religious Experience*, p. 96, my italics. Although delivering his lectures twenty-five years after the publication of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy’s best-selling book, James does not recommend her writings.

<sup>173</sup> Quimby’s dates, ( 1802-1866 ), are from Latourette, *Christianity*, p. 120.

Quimby was “clockmaker by trade...doctor only by courtesy” ( Van Baalen, *Cults*, p. 99. )

<sup>174</sup> Eddy’s dates, ( 1821-1910 ), are from Latourette, *Christianity*, p. 120; Eddy’s full name was Mrs Mary Baker Glover Patterson Eddy.

more on Quimby's seminal work.<sup>175</sup> McConnell himself calls Quimby "the founder of nineteenth-century metaphysics,"<sup>176</sup> reflecting Quimby's precedence over Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy.

### 2.3.2 Christian Science Variance from Christian Doctrine.

Quimby reportedly claimed adherence to New Testament scripture, but not to Old Testament scripture.<sup>177</sup> Although Quimby is said to have devoted much time to challenging "religious beliefs"<sup>178</sup> composition of these beliefs remains unspecified;<sup>179</sup> however, Quimby clearly questions the veracity of two biblical concepts occurring in both Old and New Testaments – firstly, the concept that disease may be inherited from our parents, and, secondly, the concept that our own behaviour can result in our disease.<sup>180</sup> Reported in John 9:2-3, in answering His disciples' question Jesus is quoted as not disagreeing with Old Testament teaching of becoming ill through parental sin; neither does Jesus deny Old Testament teaching assumed in the question that disease may be the result of our own disobedience.

As well as not believing in these two biblical concepts, neither did Quimby believe the Christian doctrine of Hypostatic Union.<sup>181</sup> Rather, Quimby taught that Jesus the man was trying to lead people to 'the Christ.' For Quimby 'the Christ' consisted in the principle of the

---

<sup>175</sup> To partly explain Christian Science's runaway success, Mrs. Eddy apparently selling 400,000 copies of her book, was: "emotional hunger after the [ U. S. ] Civil War which, in the case of many, found Moody's revivalism too noisy, and yet craved the 'exceedingly self-centered and individualistic gospel' that Eddyism is." ( Van Baalen, *Cults*, pp. 101-102 ; for Eddy's book sales see p. 100. ) Christian Science was also successful in Britain ; at time of Riddle's publication in 1931 there were, in England alone, over : "one hundred and twelve towns...in the work of Christian Science healing." ( Rev. T. Wilkinson Riddle, *Christian Science in the Light of Holy Scripture*, [ London : Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd., 1931 ], p. 87. )

<sup>176</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 154.

<sup>177</sup> Dresser wrote Quimby was "devoted to truth as his own insight led to it, without regard to prior teachings save those of the New Testament." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 16. )

<sup>178</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 10.

<sup>179</sup> We seem forced to 'make do' with Dresser's brief explanation that Quimby "found many of them victims of what we now call the old theology. The priests and ministers of that theology were to him blind guides." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 10. )

<sup>180</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 323.

<sup>181</sup> "The doctrine of the union of divine and human natures in Jesus Christ, without confusion of their respective substances." ( Alister McGrath, *An Introduction to Christianity*, [ Oxford : Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1997 ], p. 429. ) For a more detailed treatment see Alister McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, ( Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1994 ).

‘truth’ that disease does not exist.<sup>182</sup> Quimby reportedly says *Jesus and the apostle Paul failed to find ‘the Christ.’* The reason reportedly given by Quimby for Jesus’ failure was that He was crucified before He could achieve it; as for Paul and the other disciples they also tried to find ‘the Christ,’ and no one has ever yet been able to.<sup>183</sup> However, Quimby is reported as claiming that he *himself* has succeeded in discovering ‘the Christ,’ which Quimby also calls “Divine Science,” consisting in the tenet that disease is a deranged state of mind, and that the cause of our having this deranged state of mind is our belief.<sup>184</sup> In Quimby’s system Jesus’s place is that of a kind of ‘John the Baptist’ forerunner of Quimby. Thus, Jesus was to convince humankind of their errors and lead (wo)men to “Christ, health, or Truth [that is provided through Quimby].”<sup>185</sup> In Quimby reportedly denying that Jesus is the Christ, Quimby denies the Christian notion of *Christ* (Messiahship) wedded with the Christian notion of the promised comforter, the ‘Spirit of Truth.’ In Quimby’s system, Quimby himself performs the function of this ‘Spirit of Truth,’ since it is Quimby who through the ‘truth’ of “Science of Health” can “correct the errors of the world.”<sup>186</sup> Quimby is a ‘Christ alternative’ to the Christ of Christian teaching, in biblical parlance Quimby is an “instead-of-Christ” or “antiChrist.”<sup>187</sup> In spite of Quimby’s antipathy to Christian teaching, because

---

<sup>182</sup> Besides being called “Science of Health” ( see below ), Quimby’s ideas are also called “Divine Science” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 17. )

<sup>183</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 405. And “The theology of Christian Science is Unitarian – God alone is worshipped. Jesus is the Way-shower, and the Holy Ghost is understood to be Christian Science – the promised Comforter...Jesus was [ merely ] human and an exemplar whom men might successfully emulate.” ( Bryan R. Wilson, *Sects And Society, A Sociological Study of Three Religious Groups in Britain*, [ London : William Heinemann Ltd., 1961 ], pp. 121, 122. )

<sup>184</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 33.

<sup>185</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 347. And : “The Science or Christ is not dependent on persons, books, or organizations...It...is demonstrable by its works or ‘fruits.’ ” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 347. ) Quimby is reportedly referring to ‘the power of the mind’ when saying : “Christ is that unseen principle in man of which man is conscious, but which he has never considered as intelligence. It is God in us, and when man comes to recognise it as intelligence transcending belief and learns its principles, then death will be swallowed up in Wisdom.” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 409. ) It seems that Quimby wanted to win over other practitioners of healing ; Quimby is reported as saying: “Some believe in various remedies, and others believe that the spirits of the dead prescribe. I have no confidence in the virtue of either.” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 33. )

<sup>186</sup> Thus “P. P. Q. [ Quimby ] is the medium of the Truth to *correct the errors of the world*, just as Jesus was the medium of God or Science to convince man of his errors and lead him to Christ, health, or Truth.” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 347, my italics. )

<sup>187</sup> In spite of Quimby reportedly claiming his “Science of Health” would result in long life, Quimby himself did not live to “great age,” dying aged 63. Quimby was born on 16<sup>th</sup> February 1802 and died on 16<sup>th</sup> January 1866

Quimby is claiming to propose a *true* Christianity, Dresser says Quimby is “thoroughly Christian,” Dresser summarily saying: “Quimby’s standard calls for a Science that can be demonstrated, can prove itself *thoroughly Christian* in thought, life, interpretation of Scripture...we must adopt life as given in its fullness in order to entertain as ideal ‘the Christ.’”<sup>188</sup> Reportedly, Quimby is to deliver us from Hell, which Hell Quimby says consists solely of earthly suffering prepared for us by medical doctors.<sup>189</sup> Reportedly regarding humankind as morally perfect and therefore being in no danger of punishment in the biblical Hell, Eddy claimed that her/Quimby’s system improved humankind through making them realise that they are perfect already.<sup>190</sup> Thus, in Quimby’s/Eddy’s reported words there is no need for biblical scripture’s preoccupation with *restraint* in avoiding sin and iniquity in order to be exercised *unto* a state of godliness. In Quimby’s/Eddy’s reported system, there is no need for man to be “transformed.” (Rom. 12:2).<sup>191</sup> God is regarded like William Paley’s distant watchmaker God who set Creation in motion: anyone correctly understanding the ‘Science of Health’ will find healing for all their ‘sicknesses’ ineluctable.<sup>192</sup>

---

( Dresser, *Quimby*, pp. 8, 7 respectively. ) It seems then that Quimby did not *himself* experience “an old age that is never old.” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 18. )

<sup>188</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 17, my italics.

<sup>189</sup> Thus : “this place of torment prepared by the medical faculty.” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 35. )

<sup>190</sup> Wilson, *Sects*, pp. 127-128, 128. Eddy contradicted herself in that though ascribing perfection to humankind she warned of the need to defend oneself against “malicious animal magnetism” emanating from supposedly “perfect” humankind : “Christian Scientists [believe]...illness is caused...by this particular force” and Malicious animal magnetism comprises “the baleful effects of the conscious or unconscious thought of any who feel hostility or resentment toward him...another’s malice, or from resentment, ingratitude, bitterness...” ( quotes are from Wilson, *Sects*, p. 131. ) This is in accord with Ralph Waldo Trine who claims “the very atmosphere around us is continually filled with the thought forces that are being continually sent...in the form of thought waves. We are all affected, more or less, by these thought forces...influences shall enter...into our lives...Every evil thought is as a sword drawn on the person to whom it is directed.” ( Ralph Waldo Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, [ London : George Bell & Sons, 1903 { first pub. 1897 in the U. S. } ], pp. 26-27, 34-35. )

And “...the fear of witchcraft, that is of occult damage as a result of another’s malignity, was revived in Mary Baker Eddy’s concept of ‘malicious animal magnetism.’ ” ( Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, pp. 798-799. )

<sup>191</sup> Following Quimby: “Christian Science does not even recognise the evil of which Theosophy speaks...Salvation is superfluous...virtually the only thing that counts is that Man can destroy all evil with his thought...We shall no doubt continue to exist somehow after the delusion of death ; but how and where is not nearly as important as to demonstrate in the present life that the here and now can become free from anxiety and suffering.” ( Van Baalen, *Cults*, pp. 107, 103. )

<sup>192</sup> William Paley ( 1743-1805 ) : “Paley is chiefly remembered for his use of the analogy of the watch and the watchmaker as a defence of the existence of God...The watchmaker analogy, which appears in his *Natural Theology* is a classic statement of the argument from design ( the teleological argument ) for the existence of

### 2.3.3 Quimby's Practice of Healing.

Quimby attributed healing to guidance by a "Presence."<sup>193</sup> Although Dresser's capital 'P' is denotation normally reserved for divinity, it seems this "Presence" resulted in reception of the kind of insights a "spirit of divination" reportedly gave a girl in Philippi following Paul, prior to her deliverance from this spirit (Acts 16:16ff).<sup>194</sup> Quimby's healing with the aid of a "Presence" I denote as the first aspect of Quimby's healing practice, which Quimby called "spiritual healing."<sup>195</sup> These healings involved recurring ability to tell patients about their conditions, referred to as being clairvoyant: Quimby "always told his patient at the first sitting what the latter thought was his disease...he never allowed the patient to tell him anything about his case."<sup>196</sup> It seems this was the reason Dresser praised Quimby as having had greater intuition than those who came after him;<sup>197</sup> this is borne out by Dresser specifically mentioning the nature of the limitation of those who came after Quimby, that

---

God... 'Every indication of contrivance, every manifestation of design, which existed in the watch, exists in the works of nature...', and the conclusion is therefore irresistible that nature too has its maker." ( Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, J. I. Packer ( eds. ) *New Dictionary of Theology*, [ Leicester, England : Inter-Varsity Press, 1991 ], pp. 485-486. ) The physical and biological worlds were coming to be regarded as self-regulating with God as merely the 'First Cause.' ( R. J. Berry, 'Miracles: Scepticism, Credulity or Reality ?', in Walker, *Different Gospels*, p. 114. )

<sup>193</sup> Dresser claimed this "Presence" is "the indwelling presence of God as love and wisdom" saying "if to live by this Presence so as to realize its reality vividly in the practice of spiritual healing, is to be religious, then indeed few men have been more truly religious than he [ Quimby ]." ( Both quotes from Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 10. ) One well-known psychic researcher's findings were that "Almost without exception, the great mediums...felt they were instruments of a higher power which flowed through them. They did not presume to have the power themselves." ( Jess Stearn, *Adventures into the Psychic*, [ New York : Signet Books, 1982 ], p. 163. )

Another notable report : "Any study of healers immediately brings the investigator face to face with the concept that spirit intelligences (variously referred to as guides, controls, or protectors) are working through the minds of healers to supply information of which the healer himself has no conscious knowledge." ( George W. Meek, 'The Healers in Brazil, England, U. S. A., and U. S. S. R.,' in George W. Meek [ ed. ], *Healers and the Healing Process: A Report on Ten Years of Research by Fourteen World Famous Investigators*, [ Wheaton, Illinois : Theosophical/Quest, 1977 ], p. 32. )

<sup>194</sup> "Here might be a case for seeing the *Creator Spiritus* at work...wasn't the fortune-teller clearly endorsing the ministry of the servants of God ? But for Paul and Silas the occasion did not call for a discernment of the Spirit's work in other religions; it called for exorcism." ( Chan, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, p. 114. )

<sup>195</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 11.

<sup>196</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 14. For 'clairvoyant' see Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 32.

<sup>197</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, pp. 14-15. Later Dresser says, and then asks "It is an undisputed fact that Dr. Quimby cures disease and that without any medicine or outward applications...Where does he get his power ?" The answer is given that Quimby "operates intelligently under the direction of a Principle...the Principle of Goodness." ( both quotes from Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 309. )

they were limited to having to ask their patients why they had come.<sup>198</sup> Just as the Philippian girl had no need to question Paul to know his business, neither did Quimby need to question his patients.<sup>199</sup> There is parallel evidence suggesting Quimby's pupil Mary Baker Eddy had a long history of resorting to her own 'spirit guides'/psychic spirits/spirits of divination.<sup>200</sup>

The second aspect of Quimby's healing practice is "mental healing."<sup>201</sup> This was Quimby's reported teaching that the mind creates ideas which comprise matter; therefore, the mind can create the idea, hence the matter, of sickness. Reciprocally, the mind can *heal* by destroying the idea, therefore the matter, of sickness.<sup>202</sup> Quimby is reported as saying that because the mind can be changed, matter dependent on the former state of mind must necessarily also be changed: "...sickness being what follows a belief [then] the belief contains the evil which I must correct."<sup>203</sup>

Although chronologically divination seems the first aspect of Quimby's healing practice, this second aspect ("mental healing") allegedly flowed from Quimby's initial "mesmerising period."<sup>204</sup> For, it was reportedly while he was using mesmerism that Quimby became

---

<sup>198</sup> Thus: "when [ Quimby's ] ideas and methods began to become known...the therapists who took up the work *had to depend upon questioning their patients...*" ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 15, my italics. )

<sup>199</sup> Dresser describes Quimby's "greater intuition" as "his method of silent spiritual healing, with its dependence on the Divine presence." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 15. )

<sup>200</sup> These evidences are both referenced and laid out in Ankerberg & Weldon, *Mind Sciences*, pp. 35-37.

<sup>201</sup> In *Editor's Preface* provided for the second edition of *The Quimby Manuscripts* Dresser tells us the work contains Quimby's "views regarding mental and spiritual healing." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 3. ) As early as page 16 Dresser says Quimby "was a mental and spiritual healer..." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 16. ) In spite of these two terms being given different meanings, "spiritual healing" and "mental healing" are to a large extent used interchangeably throughout *Quimby*.

<sup>202</sup> "Men create ideas which are matter...As mind is matter, its form can be annihilated." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 319. ) So : "...we shall then have our happiness or misery in our own hands ; and of course much of the suffering of the world will be done away with." ( Dresser, *Quimby*. )

<sup>203</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 351.

<sup>204</sup> Mesmerism is "The art or power of inducing an abnormal state of the nervous system, in which the will of the patient is controlled by that of the agent ; the hypnotic state so induced." (*New English Dictionary*, [ London : Odhams Press Ltd., 1935 ], p. 680. ) Before long, Quimby "ceased to experiment with mesmerism..." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 10. ) Dresser speaks of Quimby's "mesmeric period 1843-47" ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 16. ) Clues are offered as to why Quimby abandoned mesmerism. Firstly, "Mr. Quimby was vilified and frequently threatened with mob violence, as the exhibitions smacked too strongly of witchcraft to suit the people." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 31. ) Secondly, it could be argued Quimby's own reception of a spirit of divination would render the presence of his normal mesmerised subject Lucius Burkmar superfluous ; it would be cheaper for Quimby to dispense with Mr. Burkmar's services. Dresser said of Lucius Burkmar "...it is not stating it too

convinced disease was an error of the mind, and not real.<sup>205</sup> This conviction came about partly through Quimby believing it was doctors who put the idea of disease into their patients minds, causing disease in their patients. Thus, Quimby reportedly writing he “frequently visited the sick with Lucius [Lucius Burkmar]...he [Lucius] prescribed some simple herb tea, and the patient recovered; and the doctor believed the medicine cured him. But I believed that the doctor made the disease; and his faith in the boy made a change in the mind, and the cure followed.”<sup>206</sup> Although we cannot ask him, Quimby seems to speak here of two slightly different things, firstly of what has become known as the ‘placebo effect’ (of which more later), secondly here seems to be reference to what is a *greater* emphasis on ‘thinking causing cure’ than that acknowledged in the placebo effect, to be announced as New Thought doctrine, of which more later too. In this quote, Quimby reportedly leaves the impression he believes the doctor caused the disease; what is not clear is the more secondary matter of whether the doctor believed in the doctor’s *own* earlier prescribed medicine curing the patient (“the doctor believed the medicine cured him”), or alternatively whether the herb tea was believed to be that medicine. But, neither is it totally clear whether the doctor’s “faith in the boy” should be construed either as resulting in the boy agreeing with the doctor’s new confidence and so the boy having had faith too, or whether this faith of the doctor caused the boy’s mind to be changed, in a way akin to what occurred under Quimby’s mesmerism. It does seem this kind of ambiguity may have been marketable in leaving the door open to

---

strongly to assert that with him he [ Quimby ] made some of the most astonishing exhibitions of mesmerism and clairvoyance that have been given in modern times.” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 30. ) That is “Lucius when in the mesmeric sleep would often read what was in the mind of the patient and diagnose the case according to opinions [earlier] expressed by physicians, Lucius also discerned at other times the actual state of the body...he possessed remarkable clairvoyant power in such cases...” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 32. )

<sup>205</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 32. The mesmerised Lucius Burkmar reportedly spoke thus to Quimby about Quimby’s own illness : “his explanation and remedies always convinced me that I had no such disease, and that my troubles were of my own make...I had been deceived into a belief that made me sick.” ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 34. )

<sup>206</sup> Quimby quoted in Dresser, *Quimby*, pp. 34-35.

different interpretations thereby making Quimby's teaching's appeal more universal.<sup>207</sup>

Quimby made pronouncements to his patients such as the following: "your senses have left his [the doctor's] opinion and have come to my wisdom. This is the new birth, you have risen from the dead and you are free from the doctor's ideas. This truth has destroyed death, and brought life and health through Science. Now, I say unto you, Take up your bed or this Truth and go your way, and when the night of error comes spread out the garment of Wisdom that enfolded Jesus, and wrap yourself in its folds or Truth, till the sun of Life shall shine upon your body, and you rise free from the evils of the old belief."<sup>208</sup> In this reported utterance Quimby proposes a novel form of the Christian doctrine of "new birth," renewing grounds for arguing Quimby uses Christian words to make his "Science of Health" teaching more palatable.<sup>209</sup> As Eddy put it "Sickness is part of the error which Truth casts out...Christian Science is the law of Truth."<sup>210</sup> Christian Science must therefore reduce all healing miracles reported in the New Testament to a specie of disillusionment of those allegedly healed.<sup>211</sup> Christian Science presents itself as a universal panacea: every illness is presented as a lack of Christian Science: "Every sort of sickness is error."<sup>212</sup> Despite Quimby's and Eddy's mention of 'science,' the following digest of scientific observation on the *Typische* of

---

<sup>207</sup> In line with this, not only does Quimby call his work "Divine Science" and "Science of Health," but also "Science of Happiness." ( Dresser, *Quimby*, p. 253. )

<sup>208</sup> Dresser, *Quimby*, pp. 314-315.

<sup>209</sup> Also Eddy's use of Christian language "When man demonstrates Christian Science absolutely, he will be perfect. He can neither sin, suffer, be subject to matter, nor disobey the law of God." ( Eddy, *Science and Health*, p. 372. )

Thus, too, sin "is destroyed, *as are disease and death*, by altering human belief. It is at this point that metaphysical argument, or truth, is supposed to impinge upon, and transform, the physical. Physical improvements are desired as confirmation of the efficacy of Truth, but Truth is nonetheless in no way impaired when such evidences are not forthcoming, for then the failure lies in the individual's inability to realise, and thereby demonstrate, Truth...prayer means something other than what is usually meant by Christians. It is neither praise nor supplication, but...it is largely silent affirmation...an attempt to bring subjective attitudes into accord with what Science proclaims to be objective reality. " ( Wilson, *Sects*, pp.123, 125, 126, and 125 again, my italics. Wilson refers to W. D. McCracken, *Mary Baker Eddy and Her Book*, [ Tamworth, New Hampshire : no publisher cited, 1925 ], p. 1. ) Wilson's book provides an extensive bibliography on Christian Science ; reflecting that Wilson's PhD thesis subject was the origin of Christian Science. ( Wilson, *Sects*, p. 130. )

<sup>210</sup> Eddy, *Science and Health*, p. 482.

<sup>211</sup> For example "If Jesus awakened Lazarus from the dream, illusion, of death, this proved that the Christ [Christian Science] could improve on a false sense." ( Eddy, *Science and Health*, p. 493. )

<sup>212</sup> Eddy, *Science and Health*, p. 408.

healing under Christian Science is telling: “...in general...only such cases yield to suggestion as have been caused by suggestion, while those that are of an organic nature not only refuse to respond to this so-called healing system, but ‘Scientists’ from Mrs. Eddy down have repeatedly gone to physicians and dentists to have their troubles treated...”<sup>213</sup> From this, it seems certain types of ailment may be helped under Christian Science, but other types of ailment not helped. In addition to this observation, some healings that have taken place under Christian Science may be those within the possibility of any healing anywhere at any time being a simple expression of the reported works of God “that the works of God might be made manifest” (John 9:3); in cases of healing rooted in mental suggestion, it is argued such healing could have occurred anyway through erstwhile sufferers simply mundanely ‘changing their minds,’ another counter-argument to Christian Science’s effectiveness being solely attributable to the placebo effect.<sup>214</sup>

From both testamentary evidence and the acknowledged influence of the placebo effect, it seems fair to claim Christian Science has no *comprehensive* ministry of healing. That is, although Christian Science does call out ‘come one, come all’ to the sick, organic diseases do

---

<sup>213</sup> Van Baalen, *Cults*, p.107. The “...difference between herself [Mrs. Eddy] and others is that, while a faith-healer asserts that God is able to cure the disease, which really exists, the Christian Science practitioner declares that the apparent disease has no real existence.” ( Maurice C. Burrell, & J. Stafford Wright, *Some Modern Faiths*, [ London : Inter-Varsity Press, 1973 ], p. 73. )

<sup>214</sup> “The pill in which both patient and doctor have faith may achieve remarkable results, however trivial its pharmacological content...placebos, i.e. inert substances administered as if they were real drugs, can sometimes have a high rate of success in dissipating such complaints as headaches, seasickness or post-operative pain.” ( Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic, Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England*, [ London : Penguin Books, 1985 ], p. 248. )

And Nigel Wright seems content to discount miracles of healing by concentrating on what he says is ‘the vast majority of claimed healings’ saying “the vast majority of claimed healings” is merely the operation of this “placebo effect” : “We cannot help but feel...that the vast majority of claimed healings are in the area of the placebo effect.” ( Nigel Wright, ‘The Theology and Methodology of “Signs and Wonders,” ’ in Tom Smail, Andrew Walker, & Nigel Wright, *Charismatic Renewal, The Search for a Theology*, [ London : SPCK, 1995 ], p. 76. )

This observed ‘placebo effect’ has been taken so seriously that there is now a branch of brain research, psychoneuroimmunology, that endeavours to find correlation between state of mind and the immune system. ( Liz MacLaren, *Mind Over Matter*, [ London : Brockhampton Press, 1996 ], p. 148. )

not seem to be healed under Christian Science, in contrast to divine healing of organic diseases that *does* take place in the Pentecostal WOF.<sup>215</sup>

Having examined that part of the Mind-Cure metaphysical known as Christian Science, it remains to consider New Thought to complete looking at the two Mind-Cure metaphysical systems of thought McConnell claims to be the origin of the WOF.

#### 2.3.4 New Thought

In spite of New Thought's comparative seeming lesser significance, in chapter three New Thought teachings *are* interspersed with Hagin's teachings to show contrast; and New Thought teaching is yet again considered in chapter four. Christian Science's greater significance seems reflected in its particularly strong numerical growth, as detailed by Bryan Wilson in *Sects and Society*.

#### **2.4 Rejection of the Term 'Faith-Cure' in Favour of 'Divine Healing.'**

It may have been partly due to the popularity of Christian Science (and New Thought) that there arose disquietude among evangelical Christians over widespread use of the word 'faith.' That is, the word 'faith' could be thought to imply affirmation to Christian Science/New Thought doctrine. So, although the expression 'faith-cure' had first been used by Divine Healing Movement personality Charles Cullis and others, 'divine healing' was later seen as a more fitting expression, locating the healing as God's work, rather than the work of faith.<sup>216</sup> For instance, it is reported Andrew Murray also preferred the term 'divine healing' to 'faith

---

<sup>215</sup> Bryan Wilson helpfully describes Christian Science belief : "Man is understood to be made in the image and likeness of God, and because God is spiritual, so must man be. Man is an idea of Mind, God ; he is perfect, eternal, unlimited, and reflects the divine. He is immortal, has all intelligence, is incapable of suffering sin, disease or death. The material, bodily, mortal man is not the real man, but a counterfeit, an apparition, man's distorted view of himself – a false belief about man, which binds man to exactly those limitations which it suggests. If man were but to elevate his consciousness above the seeming mortal man, all these limitations would fall away. Likewise the whole material world is a counterfeit, since God is all-in-all and is spiritual." ( Bryan R. Wilson, *Sects And Society, A Sociological Study of Three Religious Groups in Britain*, [ London : William Heinemann Ltd., 1961 ], pp. 122-123. )

<sup>216</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 9.

healing.’<sup>217</sup> A. B. Simpson concurred that ‘faith-cure’ placed too much emphasis on faith, without looking properly to God as healer.<sup>218</sup>

Thus, too, there was/and is the favouring of the expression ‘scripture confession,’ rather than ‘positive confession.’ This was designed to show that *the positive confession that consisted in the quoting of biblical scripture* was at variance with, and a reaction to, the notion of ‘positive confession’ incorporating making extempore ‘confessions’ of the desire/will for an ideal state within Mind-Cure (howsoever much the latter were couched in biblical-sounding language).<sup>219</sup>

Having examined the *consistency* of the Mind-Cure metaphysical that Dan McConnell characterises as the WOF’s root, I now examine the content of Dan McConnell’s claims that the Faith Movement/WOF is rooted in this metaphysical.

## **2.5 Criticism of Essek William Kenyon and the Divine Healing Movement.**<sup>220</sup>

### **2.5.1 Summary of McConnell’s Criticism of the Metaphysical in the WOF.**

I link above-stated findings about Mind-Cure with McConnell’s allegations that a WOF teacher, E. W. Kenyon, became a Mind-Cure adherent who then provided the WOF with Mind-Cure teaching. Such allegations are synecdochical criticism of WOF teaching and practice of healing being a conduit of Mind-Cure teaching.

McConnell’s threads of argument can be summarised thus:

---

<sup>217</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 24.

<sup>218</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 22 citing “A. B. Simpson, p. 64.” Alexander fails to say which of Simpson’s publications she refers to, but I think it is probably Simpson’s *The Four-Fold Gospel*.

In similar vein, it is claimed : “...the label ‘healer’ is unanimously abhorred by all Christian ministers of healing since they agree that they cannot heal by their own power. To the contrary, they proclaim Jesus to be the healer.” [ Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing : Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis MacNutt in Dialogue*, ( Leiden, The Netherlands : Brill, 2010 ), p. 17. ]

However, it should also be remembered that “the terms *divine healing*, faith healing, or *faith cure*...are used interchangeably just as they are and have been by most advocates of the doctrine.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. v, my italics. )

<sup>219</sup> Kinnebrew, I believe mistakenly ( but I do not have space here to enter a detailed evidenced discussion explaining why I feel he is mistaken ), maintains that ‘positive confession’ came to Christendom from the “New Thought movement.” ( Kinnebrew, *Positive Confession*, p. 249. )

<sup>220</sup> E. W. Kenyon’s dates ( 1867-1948 ) are from Perriman, *Faith*, p. 70.

1) E. W. Kenyon was indoctrinated early with metaphysical (Mind-Cure) teaching:

Kenyon from then on was a metaphysical, not an evangelical Christian; so Kenyon's WOF teaching should be seen as metaphysical;

2) WOF teacher Kenneth Hagin's works are plagiarised from Kenyon's writings.

Therefore Hagin's WOF teaching, and synecdochically WOF teaching and practice of healing, are also outputs from metaphysical (Mind-Cure) teachings.

Counter-argument to these threads of McConnell's argument can be summarised:

1) Kenyon was *not* indoctrinated with Mind-Cure;

2) Kenyon's whole manner of life, as well as his teachings, over many years demonstrate him to have been an influential evangelical Christian. Kenyon's teaching reflects Jesus's and Paul's teachings in the New Testament.

### 2.5.2 McConnell's Criticism of the Divine Healing Movement.<sup>221</sup>

It seems objections McConnell's *A Different Gospel* makes of Kenyon and Hagin are also levelled against the Divine Healing Movement's Judd Montgomery and Woodworth-Etter, although McConnell's allegations are purportedly *not* levelled at the latter: "McConnell hesitates to group him [Kenyon] with the faith healers predating the Pentecostal movement."<sup>222</sup> It seems plausible arguing McConnell might wish to avoid the issue of his work implicitly criticising the Divine Healing Movement; it is possible a nuanced approach might say McConnell thinks the WOF more modern, and unconnected to, the Divine Healing Movement. However, such a 'nuanced approach' would be *wrong* because McConnell

---

<sup>221</sup> McConnell is not alone. Concerning Dave Hunt's *Beyond Seduction*, DeArtega's comment reflects what seems an anti-miraculous tendency in Hunt, who, in DeArtega's own words "puts miracles in opposition to the virtue of self-surrender to Jesus. [But] Miracles, spiritual power and the like are not in opposition to humility, self-sacrifice and love...The gifts of the Spirit, properly understood, empower the Christian for witnessing...Hunt's theology resembles in many ways that of St. John of the Cross, the Spanish mystic who urged avoidance of the gifts of the Spirit because of their danger to humility." ( DeArtega, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 252. )

Derek Vreeland's own listing of "some of the harshest critics" of the WOF *itself* includes Hannegraff, Hunt ( in co-authorship with T. A. McMahon ), as well as McConnell. ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 1. )

<sup>222</sup> Geir Lie, 'E. W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister ?,' in *EPTA Bulletin, The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, Vol. XVI, 1996, ( pp. 71-86 ), p.75.

characterises as ‘Faith movement’ what Paul Chappell and others call the ‘Divine Healing Movement.’ Thus, McConnell speaks of ‘Faith theology’ ongoing in the late twentieth century, that “because of its cultic origins...represents a serious threat to...the independent charismatic movement.”<sup>223</sup> Regardless of whether or not the Divine Healing Movement should really be regarded ‘ongoing,’ nevertheless the findings show Mix, Judd Montgomery, and company espoused ‘Faith theology.’ So McConnell includes the Divine Healing Movement in being “a serious threat to...the independent charismatic movement.” However, when McConnell wrote this the seminal research of Chappell into the nature of the Divine Healing Movement had *already* discovered the Divine Healing Movement to be a movement of Christian evangelicals.<sup>224</sup> McConnell disagrees with Chappell: “This divine healing movement is known as ‘metaphysics’...”<sup>225</sup> In this McConnell sees the Divine Healing Movement as commensurate with Kenyon and Hagin. I agree with McConnell that they *are* commensurate, but I disagree with McConnell when he characterises the Divine Healing Movement as ‘metaphysical.’ Thus for instance, the evangelical orthodoxy of the Divine Healing Movement’s Judd Montgomery and Woodworth-Etter has widespread acceptance. It is the documentary evidence of the thousands of individuals converted and healed under the ministries of these two women in particular that is most remarked upon, not the regurgitation of the many old then-contemporaneous accusations of these ladies having been “demonic,” such accusations having been made by “hundreds of ministers and laymen.”<sup>226</sup> Mentioning firstly McConnell’s *A Different Gospel*, and secondly Hanegraaff’s *Christianity in Crisis*, Paul King concurs with my observation.<sup>227</sup> McConnell’s subsuming of the Divine Healing

---

<sup>223</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. x.

<sup>224</sup> Alexander, *Healing*, p. 30.

<sup>225</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 24.

<sup>226</sup> That is: “Hundreds of ministers and laymen of the Victorian era denounced the Faith-Cure movement [the Divine Healing Movement]...calling it demonic.” ( DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 291. )

<sup>227</sup> Namely: “those same critics [ McConnell and Hanegraaff ] also attack teachings on faith that have been taught by other respected evangelical leaders of the early healing and holiness movements.” ( King, *Only Believe*, p. 16. )

Movement under ‘Metaphysics’ (Mind-Cure) denigrates Paul Chappell and all the other scholars showing the Divine Healing Movement to be solely the platform of many demonstrations of God’s power to heal. So also, it could well be argued such criticism by McConnell is tantamount to ‘blaspheming against the Holy Spirit’ (Matt. 12:24, Mark 3:22).<sup>228</sup> At the very least, the occurrence of undeniable miracles means that any alternative interpretation of what took place would be a distortion.<sup>229</sup> Jesus is reported as saying that to be called ‘of the devil’ is the fate of those who have a Godly ministry. Jesus is Himself reported having been called the Devil (Beelzebub), and telling His disciples they would be so-named (Matt. 10: 25).<sup>230</sup> If McConnell’s particular criticisms of the origin and nature of the Divine Healing Movement and ‘Faith theology’ are *false* then McConnell has fallen into Jesus’s category of those calling God’s servants devils.

### 2.5.3 Kenyon’s Evangelical Manner of Life.

If McConnell’s allegations that E. W. Kenyon is a Mind-Cure metaphysical are true, then the title of this section could be challenged as erroneous. However, the findings convinced me Kenyon *was* an evangelical Christian. Because of the interrelation of Kenyon’s *lifestyle* as a healing evangelist, bible college founder, and pastor on the one hand, and Kenyon’s *teaching* on faith and healing on the other hand, I felt it appropriate to take the less usual step of considering Kenyon’s lifestyle as well as his teaching, not solely relaying analysis of his teaching output. Moreover, McConnell *himself* criticises Kenyon’s manner of life; McConnell alleges Kenyon’s manner of life, in his attending Emerson College, demonstrates that Kenyon became a metaphysical.

---

<sup>228</sup> “Jesus is the charismatic Messiah who operates with the power of the Holy Spirit...As far as the Pharisees are concerned, however, Jesus’ works are occult demonstrations. They are, in short, demonic. Jesus...[ replies ] ... ‘If you call the works of the Holy Spirit demonic...That is called “*blaspheming against the Holy Spirit*”, and that is an unforgivable sin.’ ” ( Mark Stibbe, *Times of Refreshing, A Practical Theology of Revival for Today*, [ London : Marshall Pickering, 1995 ], pp. 173-174, my italics. )

<sup>229</sup> Paul Helm, *The Divine Revelation*, ( London : Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982 ), p. 34.

<sup>230</sup> “If they have cried Beelzebub at the master of the house, they will do it much more readily to the men of his household.” ( Matt. 10: 25 [Knox] ) And see Luke 11: 15f.

Speaking for himself, Kenyon claimed to have Plymouth Brethren roots, not tracing *all* his roots to the evangelical Higher Life and Faith-Cure Movement: “The teaching of the Brethern [sic] thru J. N. Darby, C. H. M. [Charles H. Mackintosh], and others is the real foundation of all advanced Bible study. They unfolded the Grace of God, Sonship and Righteousness... These men loved the Word.”<sup>231</sup> Kenyon also mentioned influences on him in the form of the Christian ‘mystics’, Molinos, Thomas a Kempis and William Law.<sup>232</sup> However, Kenyon veered away from those Christian mystics who Kenyon felt relied too much on their subjective experience rather than on the teaching within the Bible.<sup>233</sup> Kenyon reminisced that as a young minister he had been an eager reader of most of the leading evangelical and full gospel authors.<sup>234</sup> Kenyon had been particularly influenced by George Muller’s faith: Kenyon resigned a pastorate rather than cease following George Muller’s example:

“While pastoring a Free Will Baptist church in Worcester, Massachusetts, he [Kenyon] attempted to follow the George Muller faith pattern, trusting in God to provide for the church’s needs. The deacons did not have as much faith and forced him to resign.”<sup>235</sup> Kenyon, courageously undeterred, founded Bethel Bible Institute - *again* following George Muller’s ‘living by faith.’ ”<sup>236</sup>

<sup>231</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, pp. 79-80, citing E. W. Kenyon *The Decadence of Faith*, Bethel Trumpet, ( Oct. 1902 ), p. 133.

<sup>232</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 80. Respective references are *Bethel Trumpet*, ( Sept. 1902 ), p. 128 [ for Molinos ]; ‘Kempis Of Bearing With the Faults of Others,’ *Bethel Trumpet*, ( Sept. 1901 ), p. 52 [ for Thomas a Kempis ]; *Bethel Trumpet*, ( Feb. 1902 ), p. 91, ( March 1902 ), p. 99 [ for William Law ]. Lie opines that “mystics’ influence on Kenyon came via Faith-Cure leaders such as A. J. Gordon and A. B. Simpson.” ( Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 80. Lie cites A. J. Gordon, and see Wade Pickren, [ ed. ], *In Christ, The Believer’s Union with the Lord*, [ Sanford, Florida : Wade Pickren Publications, 1983 ], and Charles W. Nienkirchen, *A. B. Simpson and the Pentecostal Movement*, [ Peabody : Hendrickson, 1992 ], p. 10. )

<sup>233</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 81.

<sup>234</sup> Kenyon in Kenyon and Gossett, *The Power of Your Words*, p. 206.

<sup>235</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 215.

And “Kenyon had gotten hold of George Muller’s autobiography *Life of Trust*...Kenyon was greatly impressed and ready to live by faith like Muller. He expected the church to trust the Lord for the regular expenses, although the Baptist church was struggling with paying its mortgage while at the same time their auditorium went unfinished.” ( Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 73, citing E. W. Kenyon, ‘Foot Prints of Faith,’ *Reality*, [ July-Oct. 1911 ], p. 23 ; and Evva [sic] S. Kenyon, ‘God’s Leadings,’ *Tabernacle Trumpet*, [ Jan. 1901 ], pp. 131-136. )

<sup>236</sup> “Kenyon began a Bible school for young people...In 1900 he received the donation of a large farm in nearby Spencer to house the school. Kenyon renamed the school Bethel Bible Institute and ran it on the Muller principle. No salary was paid to instructors, and no tuition was charged to students...Kenyon and the board of

Against such reports of Kenyon’s solid evangelicalism, McConnell states that Kenyon became a ‘metaphysical’ *early* in life. But Geir Lie produces further evidence of evangelicalism suggesting not only that Kenyon was keenly evangelical, but that Kenyon, like many other evangelicals, became part of the burgeoning modern Pentecostalism. In this, Lie calls McConnell wrong to assert Kenyon’s theology not to be within Pentecostalism. Building his argument, Lie lists Kenyon’s “extensive contacts” with Pentecostal leaders William Durham, Aimee Semple McPherson, John G. Lake and F. F. Bosworth.<sup>237</sup> Even as early as in 1908, the same year Kenyon’s friend Carrie Judd Montgomery was baptised in the Spirit with speaking in tongues, Kenyon spent some days with Pentecostals in Los Angeles. Lie examined the diaries of Los Angeles’ Azusa Street Pentecostal pioneers, finding dairy entries showing Kenyon praying with the Pentecostals of Azusa Street.<sup>238</sup> By 1924, the Baptist Kenyon had now become *so* Pentecostal that he applied for ordination as a Pentecostal Assemblies of God pastor. Kenyon claimed he spoke in tongues, and held a theology consistent with that of the Pentecostal Assemblies of God.<sup>239</sup> Considering all this, it therefore seems natural that Kenyon had a

“reputation as a gifted speaker and anointed expositor of Scripture...frequently invited to speak to Pentecostal audiences...invited to speak at Aimee Semple McPherson’s

---

directors clashed. He wanted to maintain the faith policies of Muller ; they wanted to pay the full-time staff and charge tuition to the students. Kenyon resigned and moved his family to California...in...Los Angeles...he established an independent Baptist church.” ( DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 216. ) Ruth Kenyon, writing about her father in a book of her father’s writing ( with co-author Don Gossett ), says of her father and Bethel Bible Institute : “...at the age of thirty he founded and was president of Bethel Bible Institute at Spencer, Massachusetts. ( This school was later moved to Providence, Rhode Island and is known as Providence Bible Institute ). Through his ministry at Bethel, hundreds of young men and women were trained and ordained for the ministry, and are now out preaching the Word in all parts of the world.” ( Ruth Kenyon in Kenyon and Gossett, *Power of Your Words*, p. 209. )

<sup>237</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 76. Regarding Fred Francis ( F. F. ) Bosworth the healing evangelist, it seems that there were in fact ( at least ) two Bosworth brothers who ministered together, as in “I do praise God that He put healings in the Gospel and that the Bosworth brothers ever came to Detroit and told us about it.” ( Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, p. 172, my italics. ) Again, in another healing testimony : “When the Bosworth brothers came to see me the same morning, I...showed them how I could eat.” ( Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, pp. 175-176, my italics. )

<sup>238</sup> Thus, Azusa Street Pentecostal pioneer George B. Studd’s diary reads : “May 13 - ...Essek Kenyon came to see me – had a good visit and prayer. May 14 – Another visit from E. Kenyon – God is dealing with him.” ( Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 76. )

<sup>239</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 76.

famous Angelus Temple...ministered with F. F. Bosworth, another noted Pentecostal healing evangelist.”<sup>240</sup>

It does then seem spurious of McConnell to counter-claim: “Kenyon was no Pentecostal, either experientially or theologically, and he was openly hostile towards the movement until late in his life.”<sup>241</sup> Besides Kenyon’s Pentecostalism, Kenyon had many contacts in the Faith-Cure movement, such as A. J. Gordon, and A. B. Simpson; A. B. Simpson invited Kenyon to preach in his ‘Gospel Tabernacle’ church in New York City.<sup>242</sup> Lie categorises Kenyon as belonging in the group he calls ‘evangelical faith healers’ predating modern Pentecostalism.<sup>243</sup> As far as *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* is concerned, Kenyon was a pastor, healing evangelist, and bible college founder:

“After attending various schools and pastoring several churches in New England, he founded Dudley Bible Institute in Dudley, MA [Massachusetts], *a faith venture he financed with proceeds from his evangelistic meetings in Canada, Chicago...where thousands of conversions and healings were reported.*”<sup>244</sup>

Accounts so far seem incompatible with McConnell’s *speculation* concerning the time the young Kenyon spent a single year at Emerson College, commencing in 1892, where, McConnell claims, Kenyon became a Mind-Cure metaphysical indoctrinated with a cultic view of the supernatural.<sup>245</sup> Concerning this speculation of McConnell’s, Geir Lie makes a

---

<sup>240</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 217.

<sup>241</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 205.

<sup>242</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 79, citing E. W. Kenyon ‘The Decadence of Faith,’ *Bethel Trumpet*, ( Oct. 1902 ), p. 133, and : “Joe McIntyre who pastors ‘Word of His Grace Fellowship’ in Kirkland, Wa. [Washington] found a newspaper clipping in one of Kenyon’s personal Bibles announcing him to preach in Simpson’s church.”

<sup>243</sup> Geir Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 75.

<sup>244</sup> R. M. Riss, ‘Kenyon, Essek William,’ in Burgess, *Dictionary*, p. 819, my italics.

<sup>245</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 47. McConnell states 1892 as the year Kenyon enrolled at Emerson College ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 34. ). According to Lie’s source Kenyon only attended this college for one year, Kenyon having already taken “a brief course at an academy...later took a year’s course at the Emerson college of oratory, Boston.” ( ‘Rev. E. W. Kenyon Lectures Sunday at Town Hall,’ *Spencer Leader*, Feb 16<sup>th</sup>, 1912, cited in Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 72. )

*counter-speculation*: that Kenyon was instead influenced by evangelical Christianity while at Emerson College, mutually exclusive to his having been influenced by Mind-Cure. <sup>246</sup>

However, Lie does concede that he could be wrong in his counter-speculation, but only simply because the young Kenyon may actually have been *indifferent* to religion during his stay at Emerson, Kenyon then wanting to become an actor. <sup>247</sup> However, Lie's *counter-speculation* to McConnell's *speculation* does serve to place the onus on McConnell to present *more tangible* evidence of Kenyon's having become a metaphysical. Instead of this, McConnell further weakens his own argument by, within a few pages of alleging Kenyon's "intimate knowledge of New Thought metaphysics," (also consider McConnell's *later* charging Kenyon of being "indoctrinated with a cultic view of the supernatural" <sup>248</sup>) suddenly *admitting* : "Kenyon does attempt on the basis of this knowledge to correct their faulty beliefs." <sup>249</sup> The point here is, how on earth could Kenyon possibly correct "their faulty beliefs" if those *were* Kenyon's beliefs too?

It seems most probable that in common with other literate U. S. Christians, Kenyon was exposed to, and read, Christian Science literature. <sup>250</sup> But where Kenyon differed from most of these other Christians was that Kenyon is recorded *attacking* Christian Science and other

---

Emerson had taught at Charles Cullis' Faith Training College in Boston from 1876 to 1887, during nine of which eleven years Emerson presided over Emerson College ( Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 78. ). However, McConnell may have suspected Emerson of having been 'unsound right from the beginning' in learning that later, some sixteen years after leaving Cullis's college, and some ten years after having taught Kenyon, Emerson in 1903 became a Christian Scientist. ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 36. )

<sup>246</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 78. Dale Simmons, broadly agreeing with Lie, speculates with McConnell's "certain[ ty ]" : it is "certain that Kenyon's days at Emerson served to reinforce his interest in the Higher Christian Life [ Higher Life ]." [ Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 78. Lie citing Dale Hawthorne Simmons, *The postbellum pursuit of peace, power, and plenty: As seen in the writings of Essek William Kenyon*, ( subsequently published Ph.D. thesis, Drew University, 1990 ), p. 25. ]

<sup>247</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 78. In the year 1892 when Kenyon attended Emerson College, the college was *supposedly* just beginning to be exposed to New Thought doctrine. However, as the New Thought teacher Ralph Waldo Trine *did not begin teaching New Thought doctrines until 1894*, when Kenyon had already left Emerson, *it seems incongruous to claim that New Thought could possibly have influenced Emerson College two years before it was first annunciated !*

And McConnell admits that Trine did not get around to *publishing* his New Thought ideas ( in the book *In Tune with the Infinite* ) until 1897. ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 4 ; McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 41. )

<sup>248</sup> See McConnell's earlier quote.

<sup>249</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 43.

<sup>250</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, pp. 214-215.

forms of Mind-Cure, saying that divine healing “is not mental as Christian Science and Unity [Unity School of Christianity] and other metaphysical teachers claim,”<sup>251</sup> and:

“Christian Science, Unity [Unity School of Christianity], and the other Metaphysical and philosophical teachers of today do not believe that God is a person...They do not believe in sin as Paul taught it in the Revelation given to him. They do not believe that Jesus died for our sins, but that he died as a martyr. They do not believe He had a literal Resurrection, a physical Resurrection, but puts [*sic*] it as, ‘a metaphysical resurrection’ (whatever that means). If God is not a person and Jesus did not put sin away, then who is Jesus and what is the value of our faith in Him?”<sup>252</sup>

It may be that one reason for Kenyon attacking the ‘metaphysical’ was the scenario facing Kenyon the healing evangelist and pastor of the crisis of Christian churches’ congregations leaking away to join Christian Science churches. As will be seen, Kenyon’s concern seems to have been two-pronged: the ‘metaphysical’ must be rebutted, but also evangelical Christians needed to be encouraged to experience the miraculous in their own churches. That is, churches were failing because they produced no signs and wonders and Kenyon wanted to redress an anti-supernatural tendency within Christian churches which was driving bored Christians into joining Christian Science churches.<sup>253</sup>

So far the findings make McConnell’s claim of Kenyon being a Mind-Cure metaphysical look ill-founded: Kenyon had never *been* a metaphysical, and moreover Kenyon’s life was that of evangelical pastor, healing evangelist, and Bible college founder, Kenyon having Pentecostal friends and leanings and Kenyon clearly attacking metaphysical Christian

---

<sup>251</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, ( Seattle, Washington : Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, 12<sup>th</sup> edition, 1968 ), p. 77. Hagin reiterates this sentiment *almost* word-for-word : “Divine healing is not “mental,” as Christian Science, Unity and other metaphysical teachers claim.” ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 65. )

<sup>252</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Faith*, ( Lynnwood, Wash.: Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, 1969 ), p. 214.

<sup>253</sup> Jackson, *Prosperity and the Faith Movement*, p. 16. Scripture mentions the occurrence of true Christians deciding to follow Christ no longer ( Heb. 6: 4-8. )

Science and New Thought. In the interest of a full examination of whether Kenyon is metaphysical, I now examine his teaching.

#### 2.5.4 Kenyon's Teaching.

McConnell claims Kenyon teaches “spiritual deism...[where] the active upholding of the universe is not attributable to the continuing presence and wisdom of Almighty God, but rather to impersonal/spiritual principles.”<sup>254</sup> However, it could be argued that even within this rather sterile depiction God as well as ‘upholding the universe’ also *sovereignly* gives faith which, in turn, is effectual and accomplishes something when God, again *sovereignly*, prevails with His measured answer to our faith.<sup>255</sup> So, this claim of Kenyon belittling God’s *sovereignty* does not appear particularly convincing. McConnell continues his claim of ‘spiritual deism’ by stating Kenyon teaches: “The ‘law of faith’ is to the spiritual realm what the law of gravity is to the physical realm. Whenever the law is set into motion, it works. Thus, *anybody, Christian or non-Christian, can plug into this universal law of faith and get ‘results.’*”<sup>256</sup> But what I discovered Kenyon *actually* said was the opposite of what McConnell claims, saying “Every man is a failure outside of Christ.”<sup>257</sup> Neither is Kenyon’s use of “law” intended to be understood as supporting a deistic world view. Instead: “*Sin guarantees heartaches, sin guarantees shame and sorrow every time...It is bound to do*

---

<sup>254</sup> Geir Lie, ‘The Theology of E. W. Kenyon : Plain Heresy or Within the Boundaries of Pentecostal-Charismatic “Orthodoxy” ?,’ *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1, Spring 2000, ( pp. 85-114 ), pp. 102-103.

<sup>255</sup> See Lie, *Theology*, p. 104.

<sup>256</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 133-134, my italics. McConnell claims for Kenyon : “when he speaks of ‘the great spiritual laws that govern the unseen forces of life,’ he is espousing *deism*, the metaphysical world view that the universe is governed by impersonal, spiritual laws rather than a personal, sovereign God.” ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 44, McConnell’s italics. ) Vreeland’s comment on this is that to claim Kenyon espouses deism is ludicrous. ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 6. ) Vreeland then quotes Kenyon : “Sin Consciousness has given us a wrong picture of God and a wrong picture of the New Creation. It has made us see God as holy, just, austere, and [an] unapproachable Being who is ever on the alert to discover sin in us and condemn us. That conception has made us afraid and caused us to shrink from Him. The conception is wrong : He is a Father God. John 14: 23 says that He will make His home with us...When we know Him as a loving, tender Father who longs for our fellowship and longs to live with us, the whole picture is changed.” ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, citing E. W. Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Righteousness*, [ Seattle: Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, 1965 ], p. 33. )

<sup>257</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 61.

it, it is one of those laws that lie deep down in the human experience.”<sup>258</sup> That is, Kenyon uses the term ‘spiritual laws’ in referring to biblical principles that appear constant in explaining the essence and activity of God: Bill Bright used the same didactic in his much-produced Gospel tract *The Four Spiritual Laws*; these laws themselves do not imply an impersonal Creator,<sup>259</sup> neither does scripture mentioning “the law of faith...through faith...we establish the law” (Rom. 3:27,31). What Kenyon *does* claim is that as far as faith in the Word of the Bible is concerned *the words themselves have no power to heal*, since it is *only* when they are empowered through being translated into the Christian believer’s life “becom[ing] a part of you, [that] you utter them with lips of joy and Satan’s power is broken and diseases are healed.”<sup>260</sup> Kenyon places this same stress when discussing the ‘Name of Jesus’- “The Name gives us access to the Father. But *if we step out of love, the Name is of no value to us. We can only use the Name of Jesus as we walk in love.*”<sup>261</sup> That is, Kenyon’s theology says that *not even a Christian simply by virtue of being a Christian* can claim/say something and automatically get it.

Kenyon’s teaching constituted a sustained attack upon the modern-day-miracle-precluding dispensationalism still favoured by many Protestants: “The Name [of Jesus] has lost none of its authority; none of its power, and *the effort to rob us of some of the major portions of Scripture by a false dispensational division of Scripture fails utterly*; for in Paul’s ministry with the Gentiles and his epistles to the Gentiles, he gives the Name of Jesus a place that

---

<sup>258</sup> Both quotes come from Lie, *Theology*, p. 104, citing E. W. Kenyon, ‘Sin Can Never Bring Joy,’ *Reality*, April-May 1915, pp. 57-58. Lie reminds of how relatively ‘down to earth’ Kenyon is being : “This ‘law’ is exclusively anchored in ‘human experience,’ and no attempt is made to explain the cosmological basis of the law within a deistic Weltanschauung [ worldview ].” ( Lie, *Theology*, p. 104. )

<sup>259</sup> Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 6. Thus, *Chappell reports the Divine Healing Movement’s William Boardman as also speaking of ‘laws,’* saying that healing by faith, like salvation, was a continual work of the Church belonging “clearly to the *permanent laws of God* in His economy of grace and salvation.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, pp. 202-203, my italics, citing William Boardman, *The Lord That Healeth Thee*, pp. 51, 57. )

<sup>260</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Life*, ( Seattle, Washington : E. W. Kenyon, 1943 ), p. 114, cited in Lie, *Theology*, pp. 107-108.

<sup>261</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *The New Kind of Love*, ( Seattle, Washington : E. W. Kenyon, 1942 ), p. 13, cited in Lie, *Theology*, p. 108, my italics.

absolutely refutes the entire teaching of those who would put the power of the Name of Jesus over into the kingdom period.”<sup>262</sup>

Although Kenyon *did* believe doctrine that Calvin believed, the now-frowned-upon doctrine that Jesus died both spiritually and physically, this entails neither Kenyon nor Calvin being Gnostic, for as far as Gnosticism is concerned:

“Gnostics held...Jesus did not die physically; some...that Jesus himself was in need of redemption...redemption involved deliverance from the world and from the physical body, all matter being inherently evil.”<sup>263</sup>

Kenyon, in contrast to Gnosticism, did believe in the physical resurrection of Christ, the redemption of the physical bodies of believers, the centrality of the incarnation, the necessity of the Virgin Birth, and the importance of the pre-existence of Christ, all of which are antithetical to the central tenet of Gnosticism.

#### 2.5.4.1 Sense and Revelation.

Kenyon teaches knowledge is divisible into two categories, sense and revelation.<sup>264</sup> For Kenyon, sense knowledge is derived through the five senses, bringing information about the physical world but not the reason for the world’s creation. By contrast, revelation knowledge “is another kind of knowledge that has come to us through the Revelation called the Bible.”<sup>265</sup> To Kenyon the very act of becoming a Christian, not through paedobaptism but

---

<sup>262</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 80 citing E. W. Kenyon, *The Wonderful Name of Jesus*, ( Los Angeles: West Coast Publishing, 1927 ), pp. 70-71, my italics.

<sup>263</sup> R. M. Riss, ‘Kenyon, Essek William,’ in Burgess, *Dictionary*, p. 820. Although he defends Kenyon from the charge of Gnosticism, Riss fails to negate the charge made *elsewhere* in the *Dictionary* that “Conceptually, the views espoused by E. W. Kenyon can be traced to his exposure to metaphysical ideas...” ( Burgess, *Dictionary*, p. 992. )

It seems fair to say that while “modern-day Gnostics...claim direct revelation from the Spirit and...bypass or ignore the written Word of God...the vast majority of Pentecostals, Charismatics and renewed evangelicals believe that the Bible is the inspired and authoritative revelation of God’s nature and God’s acts.” ( Stibbe, *Times of Refreshing*, p.xii. )

<sup>264</sup> Hagin agrees with Kenyon, using similar terms “There are two kinds of truth: truth based on what God’s Word says and sense-knowledge truth based on what our physical senses tell us.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Real Faith*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries Inc., Eleventh Printing in 1995 ], p. 1. )

<sup>265</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, chapter one “The Two Kinds of Knowledge,” p. 5 ; Kenyon also published a book with the title *The Two Kinds of Knowledge*. ( E. W. Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Knowledge*, [ Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, n. d. ] )

through being born again, is a *proof* of one having acted on God's revelation knowledge.<sup>266</sup> Nevertheless, as referred to above, those born again must *continue to act* on the revelation knowledge available to them.<sup>267</sup> Those born-again who fail to walk in/by this revelation need to repent of this and to resume walking in/by revelation. The terms 'sense knowledge' and 'revelation knowledge' are teaching aids, didactic helps by which Kenyon teaches Christians to conduct themselves obediently to God's leading. Kenyon happily admits exceptions to what might otherwise be characterised adamant separation between 'sense' and 'revelation.' That is, insight communicated by God directly to our spirit is not the sole preserve of 'revelation knowledge.' As an instance of this "the Incarnation...Revelation of Christ...was given to man...on the level of the senses of his physical body..."<sup>268</sup> That is, Jesus' disciples had 'sense knowledge' of Him. Again, beside God communicating directly with our spirit, revelation is mediated through *the sense of sight* in reading, or *the sense of hearing* in hearing read, the written Word of God.<sup>269</sup> Sense of hearing is also needed to hear 'revelation knowledge' preached. People are dependent on the two forms of knowledge, sense and revelation, being conjoined.<sup>270</sup> McConnell ignores Kenyon's admission of this complementarity of sense and revelation, in which the senses are vehicles for revelation. Instead, McConnell inaccurately and crudely claims Kenyon's position is: "...[intellect] can process only Sense Knowledge."<sup>271</sup> Kenyon's role for mental processes/intellect is actually

---

<sup>266</sup> Lie, *Theology*, pp. 92-93, citing Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Knowledge*, pp. 31-36. That is : "Although the Old Covenant believer was prevented from approaching the Lord's presence, except through specific means such as priesthood, dreams, angelic visitations, and so on, God has now chosen to reveal himself directly to the reborn human spirit." ( Lie, *Theology*, p. 88. )

<sup>267</sup> Lie, *Theology*, p. 93, and Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Knowledge*, pp. 37-39, 47-49, 55-57.

<sup>268</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *The Bible in the Light Of Our Redemption, A Basic Bible Course*, ( Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, n. d. ), p. 162.

<sup>269</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 5.

<sup>270</sup> Kenyon, *The Two Kinds of Knowledge*, p. 9.

<sup>271</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 104. Indeed, McConnell criticises Kenyon's *separate* mention of revelation and the senses : "When Kenyon refers to "God breaking into the sense realm," he is espousing *dualism*, which is the metaphysical view of reality that the spiritual realm and the physical realm are mutually exclusive and even opposed to one another." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 44. ) Vreeland disagrees with McConnell, and I think Vreeland right to disagree with what seems to be McConnell's unfair characterisation of Kenyon's teaching as being dualistic; Vreeland helpfully characterises Kenyon's phrase as merely being similar to the writing of George Eldon Ladd, which John Wimber famously had recourse to: "Kenyon's phrase is much more

reminiscent of Romans 12:1-2 requesting the “brethren” be “transformed by the renewal of your mind,” Kenyon saying “...*the Word is built into our mental processes, as well as our spirit lives...*” <sup>272</sup>

What Kenyon was sustainedly combatting is many Christians’ practice of wrongly giving precedence to sense knowledge *over* revelation knowledge: “A man believes what he can see. He is like [the apostle] Thomas who said, ‘I will not believe unless I can put my hand into His side.’...Faith is acting in the face of contrary evidence. The senses declare, ‘It cannot be,’ but Faith shouts above the turmoil, ‘It is!’” <sup>273</sup> Kenyon returns to his theme of addressing what he feels a chronic anti-miraculous tendency in the church:

“You can see why Sense Knowledge, which cannot understand spiritual things, will deny miracles, will deny answers to prayer, and will deny the deity of Jesus, discrediting His resurrection and miracles...The Church is a spiritual organization, a spiritual body, to be governed through the spirit instead of through the senses...*The unhappy fact is that Sense Knowledge has gained the supremacy in the Church.*” <sup>274</sup>

Kenyon proposed the resurgence of the miraculous within Christian churches. <sup>275</sup> To bring this about, he establishes the doctrinal basis for a sick Christian to realise that by faith, which

---

consistent with [George Eldon] Ladd’s theology of the kingdom, the inbreaking of God’s kingly rule into history than [with] metaphysical dualism...Ladd writes, “The Kingdom of God, which is described in apocalyptic language, is in reality the transcendent order beyond time and space that has *broken into history* in the mission of Jesus.” ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 6, citing George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament Revised Edition*, [ Grand Rapids : Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993 ], p. 56, Vreeland’s italics. )

<sup>272</sup> Lie, *Theology*, p. 90, quoting E. W. Kenyon, [ Ruth Kenyon Housworth, ( ed. ) ], *The Hidden Man: An Unveiling of the Subconscious Mind*, ( Seattle, Washington : Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, 1970 ), p. 58, my italics. This statement of Kenyon contradicts McConnell’s claim that Kenyon’s teaching on revelation knowledge created an epistemology in which “the physical senses are of no value in understanding it or using it.” ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 108. )

<sup>273</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 65. Similarly, Hagin says that ‘Thomas faith’ is a natural, human faith whereas ‘Abraham faith’ is a spiritual faith, a heart faith based on what God said. And “Too many try to get Abraham’s blessing with Thomas’ sense-knowledge faith.” ( Hagin, *The Real Faith*, pp. 7, 9. )

<sup>274</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 5, my italics.

<sup>275</sup> As Keith Ward says of miracles : “they show, in an outward and visible way, something of the spiritual character of reality, the fact that there are spiritual forces at work in the world as well as the unconscious material laws of nature which we nowadays take so much for granted.” ( Keith Ward, ‘Miracles,’ in Andrew Walker, [ ed. ], *Different Gospels*, [ London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1988 ], p. 97. )

is ‘revelation knowledge,’ they *could* be healed, even if their ‘sense knowledge’ negated that possibility. But McConnell insists that Kenyon’s two-knowledge-system proposes a Gnostic dualism. But this argument of McConnell’s necessitates McConnell laying the same charge at the feet of Paul, whose “dialectical theology is superficially similar to true dualism...a tension exists between the flesh and the spirit...matter was created as good, but after the fall it has been used as a vehicle for sin. Ultimately man’s body will be glorified in the resurrected body. *Only in the present era does the flesh war against the spirit.*”<sup>276</sup> It seems Paul’s juxtaposition of flesh and spirit has been *worked upon* by Kenyon, Kenyon bringing forth explanation of the relationship between sense and revelation.<sup>277</sup> Thus seen, Kenyon’s position is a re-statement of Paul’s faith, that “we walk by faith, not by sight” (2 Cor. 5:7) as also annunciated by Pentecostal healing evangelist Smith Wigglesworth reported saying “I am not moved by what I see or hear; I am moved by what I believe.”<sup>278</sup> It appears McConnell’s criticism of Kenyon fails to distinguish between what is, on the one hand, the denying of the reality of matter (Gnosticism) and, on the other hand, recognizing matter as real but asserting that faith can be a vehicle for the *change* of matter (Paul, Smith Wigglesworth and Kenyon):<sup>279</sup>

“I make the confession that ‘by his stripes I am healed;’ *the disease and its symptoms may not leave my body at once, but I hold fast to my confession...*I know that I am healed because He said I was healed, and it makes no difference what the symptoms may be in my body...in the Name of Jesus I command...disease to leave my body...I

---

<sup>276</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 236, my italics. DeArteaga quotes Gal. 5: 16-17. ( DeArteaga suggests for further reading W. H. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, [ New York: Harper and Row, 1967 ], chapter 2, ‘The Old Enemy: Flesh and Sin,’ pp. 17-35. ) For McConnell’s charge of Gnosticism see *Different Gospel*, pp. 107-109.

<sup>277</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, pp. 236-237.

<sup>278</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 237. The Smith Wigglesworth quote is from Stanley Howard Frodsham, *Smith Wigglesworth, Apostle of Faith*, ( Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1990 ), p. 68.

<sup>279</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 237. McConnell’s response to DeArteaga’s *Quenching the Spirit* is to accuse DeArteaga of *himself* proposing New Thought : “faith for DeArteaga is New Thought,” but in this McConnell unwittingly condemns the apostle Paul’s doctrine of faith, too. ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 207. )

have learned this law, that when I boldly confess, then, and then only, do I possess.”<sup>280</sup>

As seen in this quote, Kenyon’s use of the term ‘symptom’ is not supposed to be interpreted as Christian Science denial of the reality of one’s actual disease.<sup>281</sup> Nor here does Kenyon encourage denial of the reality of someone’s ‘disease.’ Rather, Kenyon encourages Christians to command the disease to depart. As chapter one showed, denial of the *power of symptoms* of sickness, not the denial of the *existence of symptoms*, was characteristic of the Divine Healing Movement.<sup>282</sup> Kenyon takes Judd Montgomery’s position, believing that taking medication after saying a prayer of faith for healing invalidated the prayer.<sup>283</sup> Using the same terms as Judd Montgomery, Kenyon claims that it is not good taste to ask God to heal us for He has already done it. That is, that God is reported in scripture as declaring that we are healed and so therefore we are (1 Pet. 2:24).<sup>284</sup>

#### 2.5.4.2 Eternal Beings.

Kenyon taught, unexceptionally for an evangelical Christian, that we are only eternal in the sense that we were created to live for eternity.<sup>285</sup> It is through the Incarnation of Christ that the new covenant believer is also an incarnation through being indwelt by God’s Spirit.<sup>286</sup> The *mechanics* of the Hypostatic Union, how Jesus entered the state of being completely God and completely Man at the same time, do not have a simple explanation readily available. Kenyon, though providing an explanation, also admits his own desire for clarity about this:

---

<sup>280</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *The Hidden Man*, (Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, 1970 ), p. 99, cited in DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p.220, my italics.

<sup>281</sup> Lie, *Theology*, p. 113.

<sup>282</sup> That is : “similar repudiation of sickness was encouraged...by evangelical Faith-Cure adherents.” (Lie, *Theology*, p. 91. )

<sup>283</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 221, citing Kenyon, *Two Kinds of Faith*, pp. 42-45.

And “God’s intervention will be accelerated by the believer’s faith being accompanied by ‘corresponding actions’ – e.g. that he stops using medicine after having been prayed for.” ( Lie, *Theology*, p. 133, citing Kenyon, *Two Kinds of Faith*, pp. 46-49. )

<sup>284</sup> Kenyon and Gossett, *Power of Your Words*, p. 118 ; Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 20.

<sup>285</sup> Lie, *Theology*, p. 96.

<sup>286</sup> “If Jesus was Incarnate, Man and God can become united; God can dwell in these human bodies of ours; God can impart His own life and nature to our spirits and we may have God’s life in these human bodies.” ( E. W. Kenyon, *The Father and His Family*, (1916), p. 39, cited in Lie, *Theology*, p. 95. )

“the Spirit of Jesus was deity and His mind human, and Jesus['] body in which the Spirit and mind dwelt was human. If you have anything better than this, I wish you would give it to me. I am after light. I want to get the correct coloring of things from the Lord.”<sup>287</sup>

*Christian Supermen.*<sup>288</sup>

DeArteaga, from the U.S. and almost certainly familiar with fictional U. S. ‘superhero’ Superman, calls unfortunate Kenyon’s use of the moniker superman/supermen.<sup>289</sup> Kenyon had been pointing out God’s enabling the Christian believer to be an ‘overcomer’ and ‘more than a conqueror:’ “In the mind of the Father...We are *supermen and superwomen.*”<sup>290</sup> Paul is reported as saying of Christian believers: “we are more than conquerors through him that loved us...[and] I can do all things through Christ which strengthens me.” (Rom. 8:37, Phil. 4:13). It is this ‘can do’ attitude of Paul that Kenyon sought to contrast with the dispensationalist/cessationist Christian. As healing evangelist Watchman Nee said “the *superman Christian* would heal the sick regularly and cast out demons...Christ’s life in him would reproduce the Jesus life on earth in reality, not just in theory.”<sup>291</sup> Like Kenyon, Watchman Nee exhorted Christians to live lives filled with the works worked by Christians as reported in scripture. Nee called his ‘superman Christian’ way of life ‘The Normal Christian

---

<sup>287</sup> E. W. Kenyon, ‘The Incarnation,’ a previously unpublished sermon delivered by Kenyon at Bethel Temple, Los Angeles, 29th December, 1925, and quoted in Lie, *Theology*, p. 96.

<sup>288</sup> Talking of ‘God’ *in isolation* from ‘Man’ does seem abstruse, for there is no room in Christianity for an abstract notion of God that takes no account of the communion between God and man. ( Barth, *Evangelical Theology*, p. 9. ) That is : “Theology is in reality not only the doctrine of God, but the doctrine of God and man.” ( Barth, *Evangelical Theology*, p. 24. )

<sup>289</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 222.

<sup>290</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 28, my italics.

Hagin is, like Kenyon, rather sloppy in his language when organising his discussion of this issue. Thus, the following statements occur on sequential pages: although in the sense of the biblical landscape *en totale* they can be interpreted as complementary Hagin provides no interplay between them, and perhaps this is an invitation for any one of the statements to be wrested away and quoted out of context. The whole needs to be read carefully to appreciate the different nuances: “Man was never made to be a slave. He was made to reign as a king under God...*He was created on terms of equality with God.*...The Hebrew Bible actually says (talking about man), “*Thou hast made him a little lower than God.*” ” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *ZOE: The God-Kind of Life*, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1997 ), pp. 36-37 ; my italicisation of the statement ‘He was created on terms of equality with God.’ )

<sup>291</sup> Watchman Nee, *The Normal Christian Life*, ( Fort Washington, Pennsylvania : Christian Literature Crusade, 1973 ), my italics, cited in DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 222.

Life.’<sup>292</sup> Kenyon’s Super(wo)man and Nee’s Super(wo)man/Normal Christian are a challenge to Nietzsche’s Superman. In the following, Jurgen Moltmann does not imply ‘self-transcending’ means independence from God, but that co-operating with God’s will the self is transcended/transformed:

“Teilhard [de Chardin] used Nietzsche’s words about the ‘*superman*’ and the growth of a ‘super-consciousness’, [saying]...A new form of organization is evolving which will one day lift humanity into the sphere of ‘the ultrahuman’...[to] coincide in concrete terms with the climax which all Christians expect under the concept ‘incarnation.’”

Moltmann refutes de Chardin’s non-biblical concept of ‘evolving’ in favour of transcending/transformation; it seems likely to me, in the light of Kenyon’s earlier plea for “more light” on the incarnation, that the following Moltmann ideal of “self-transcending humanity” is what Kenyon would assent to as being the aim of his *own* teaching:

“United, self-transcending humanity ends in God, while at the same time God “incarnates himself” in the process of this development...The incarnation of God in Christ should be understood as the beginning of a new phase of humanity...Christ is the beginning of the divinization of humanity.”<sup>293</sup>

---

<sup>292</sup> Nee, like Kenyon, had been an effective healing evangelist with many conversions and healings occurring in his ministry. ( Norman Howard Cliff, *The Life and Theology of Watchman Nee, Including a Study of the Little Flock Movement Which he Founded*, [ unpublished MPhil dissertation, The Open University, 1983 ] ). And see DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 239.

<sup>293</sup> Both quotes from Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, pp. 100-101, citing Teilhard De Chardin, ( N. Denny, [ trans. ] ), *The Future of Man*, (London, no publisher given, 1964), p. 268, translation altered by Moltmann, my italicisation of “superman.”

A note about Kenyon’s/Hagin’s supposed doctrine of men being ‘little gods,’ bearing in mind that - anyway - scripture reports that “all [ little ] gods bow down before Him [ Almighty God ]” ( Ps. 97: 7b, Green 2 ): “Do those who argue man is literally a ‘god’ apply the same woodenly literal hermeneutic to the Apostle Peter when Jesus calls him ‘Satan’ in Matthew 16: 23 ?”...what is to be made of the phrase ‘partakers of the divine nature?’ [ 2 Pet. 1: 4 ]...In just a few weeks, I will celebrate a birthday. On that day, I will partake of my birthday cake. However, I will not assume the constituent elements of the cake. Nor will I assume the nature of the cake. Peter’s epistle is written to Christians ( verse one ), and his declaration is that we partake of the divine nature through promises...the verses following the declaration that we are partakers of the divine nature make clear that

Having discussed various findings, and having not yet found *any* evidence of Kenyon being a Mind-Cure metaphysical, I turn to look at an issue which may have led to the formulation of much criticism of E. W. Kenyon.

#### 2.5.4.3 Ambiguity in Kenyon's Teaching.

This section extensively quotes from Kenyon: the finding of ambiguity in *Kenyon's choice of words* is examined. There is inappropriate use of, or ignoring, Kenyon's teaching, in the way any text can be wrested out of context to justify something it arguably was not/is not intended to. However, although James Kinnebrew rightly points out the danger of such miscontextualising, he claims Kenyon himself is guilty of it in teaching about Mark 11:22. Regarding Mark 11:22, that teaches the need to receive faith from God "the faith (that comes) of God:" Kenyon points out the Greek language seeming to sit better with the translation "faith of God," not "faith in God." But miscontextualisation can occur if it is extrapolated from this that Christians need to have the same kind of faith that somehow God himself needed to have in order for Him to be able to create. Kinnebrew dismisses such teaching as attacking God's omnipotence: "A person who can see all, as God surely can, would have neither a need for faith nor any way of exercising it."<sup>294</sup> Thus, claiming God created the universe using "faith-filled declarations" has the consequence "there is a power that transcends even God, for true biblical faith is always placed in someone perceived to be

---

redeemed man can reflect the *moral character* of God by adding to faith...[ a list of ]divine attributes...the contrast is made between the corruption of the world through lust ( verse four ) and the virtue added by our reflection of the divine moral character of the Lord...Satan's original lie to Eve was that she would be 'like God.' If Adam and Eve were *already* gods, this is not only an exercise in futility for the devil ; it also means that the temptation could never have been a genuine temptation in the first place." ( William A. Brown, Jr., 'Man is Not a Little God: An Evaluation of the Word-Faith Teaching of the Deification of Man,' [ a paper accessed via Google Scholar and reportedly presented at Dallas Theological Seminary in October, 2006 ], pp. 7, 10. )

<sup>294</sup> James M. Kinnebrew, *The Charismatic Doctrine of Positive Confession: A Historical, Exegetical, and Theological Critique*, ( unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988 ), p. 192. Stated again as : "If God can see all, as all of Scripture intimates, He cannot properly be said to have faith." ( Kinnebrew, *Positive Confession*, p. 215. )

greater than oneself. In whom, or what, could God place His faith?"<sup>295</sup> Lie is forced here to offer an *interpretation* of Kenyon's writing: "Kenyon writes, 'I am a partaker of God's very nature. I have in me His faith nature.' This nature can be developed through obedience toward the Word and through fellowship with the Father."<sup>296</sup> Lie's *having had to explain* what Kenyon meant seems *implicit* admission of Kenyon's ambiguity (or Kenyon's inarticulacy). Furthermore, it seems to me the most obvious interpretation here is not the one Lie provides. Rather, what Kenyon just implied is that God *has faith* when God is envisaged as speaking things into being, that *this* is "God's very nature" and our receiving God's faith is having "His faith nature."<sup>297</sup> And, as Kinnebrew said, it is discordant with the notion of an omnipotent God to say God has faith when He speaks things into being. Here is my own

---

<sup>295</sup> Kinnebrew, *Positive Confession*, p. 192. Kinnebrew quotes Hagin saying "God believed that what He said would come to pass. He just said let there be an earth and there was...He just said it and it was so. That's the God kind of faith." ( However, when you check Kinnebrew's source, you cannot find it there – Kinnebrew, *Positive Confession*, pp. 62-63, *wrongly* citing Hagin, *Bible Faith Study Course*, p. 88. )

<sup>296</sup> Lie, *Theology*, p. 109, citing E. W. Kenyon, *In His Presence*, ( Seattle, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 14<sup>th</sup> ed., 1969 ), p. 129, Kenyon, *Two Kinds of Faith*, pp. 7, 109, 43, and Kenyon, *In His Presence*, pp. 106-107.

It should be borne in mind that God had reportedly enabled good works in the 'name of the Lord' ("in thy name") through the miracle-working "workers of iniquity" ( Matt. 7: 21-23 ). It seems that concerning these reported miracle-working "workers of iniquity" of whom Jesus in judging them said "I never knew you," that the Lord had *never* known them 'straying out of Fellowship' since they had *never* been in fellowship with the Lord ("I never knew you") in the first place. Thus, at the time God produced the deliverances and works in His name through them they *were* able to effectively 'use the Name,' showing that in that case Kenyon's statement 'No one can use the Name while out of Fellowship...' is *not* true. ( Kenyon's statement is from : E. W. Kenyon, *The Wonderful Name of Jesus*, [ Seattle, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing House, 19<sup>th</sup> ed., 1964 ], p. 75, cited in Lie, *Theology*, p. 109. )

As touched on earlier, *some* of those who obtained the admired state of becoming 'mighty in...prayer life' ( cf. the Kenyon quote below ) Jesus reportedly does *not* approve as - they are judged to have '*mightily* missed the point :' "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name ? and in thy name have cast out devils ? and in thy name done many wonderful works ? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you : depart from me, ye that work iniquity." ( Matt. 7: 23 ) That is, reportedly the believer is to be 'right with God' through a process of imbibing the principles of the Word of God to the extent of having entered into the iterative process of eschewing sin and eschewing iniquity and seeking the kingdom of God and his righteousness ( Matt. 6: 33 ). Kenyon had said : "Our faith is measured by our confession...When the confession of our lips perfectly harmonizes with the confession of our hearts, and these two confessions confirm God's Word, then we become *mighty in our prayer life*." ( Kenyon, *Two Kinds of Faith*, pp. 72-73, cited by Lie, *Theology*, pp. 104-105, my italics. )

<sup>297</sup> Both phrases in quotations are taken from the quote above. And Hagin's transcribed preaching mirrors this : "God is a faith God. We are faith children of a faith God." ( Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, p. 28 ; & cf. Hagin, *Zoe*, p. 38. )

To McConnell this is redolent of Kenyon referring to : " "God imparting His own nature to the human spirit" and "God becoming a part of our very consciousness"...[ which McConnell claims is ] espousing *deification*, which is the metaphysical view that salvation entails man becoming a god..." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 44, McConnell's italics, citing E. W. Kenyon, *The Hidden Man : An Unveiling of the Subconscious Mind*, [ Seattle : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1970 ], pp. 74, 137. )

explanation of what Kenyon probably meant:- ‘by *our speaking words of faith given us by God* and then our seeing things being spoken into being *by these given-to-us words* we also, in a different way *because we have been recipients of faith*, do things seemingly the same way as God does.’ A little more needs saying on and around this: Kenyon wrote “By a new creation, *we are partakers of His very nature*. We have become heirs of God, joint heirs with Jesus Christ. We are the next of kin to the Son of God.”<sup>298</sup> Kenyon derives the phrase “partakers of His nature” from 2 Pet.1:4, Derek Vreeland explaining Kenyon’s interpretation of “partakers,” on which the question of possible unsound doctrine hinges:

“The word *koinonoi* translated “partakers” in the King James Version is a nominative, masculine, plural noun from *koinonos* meaning ones who take part in as companions or partners...not...ontological fusing, but a harmonious relationship between individual parties...Kenyon chooses to use the phrase “partakers of His nature”...It can produce an unsound doctrine if it is followed to its logical ends, i.e. deification – which McConnell claims has occurred...[But] Nowhere does Kenyon state that this union between the human and Divine nature produces a fused entity whereby a human being enters godhood.”<sup>299</sup>

---

<sup>298</sup> E. W. Kenyon, *In His Presence*, ( Seattle : Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society, 1969 ), p. 197, my italics.

<sup>299</sup> Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 7. Kenyon writes “One stands mute in the presence of a fact like this, that we have in us God’s nature. The thing that hurts us is that we have never given that nature sway. We have held His nature in bondage. God has been a prisoner in us. Paul was no more a prisoner in Rome than the Holy Spirit has been a prisoner in us.” ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, citing Kenyon, *In His Presence*, p. 191. ) This passage illustrates Kenyon’s understanding of the nature of God as located within a human person, but *not* fused to human nature creating a divinised humanity ; Kenyon contrasts between “God” an *individual* person, and “us” *individual* people indwelt by God, the Holy Spirit. Kenyon’s series of affirmations help make Kenyon’s position clear :

God is who He says He is.

I am who God says I am.

God can do what He says He can do.

I can do what God says I can do.

God has what He says He has.

I have what God says I have. ( Gossett and Kenyon, *The Power of Your Words*, pp.

46-47. )

Barth says of Jesus Christ “*He wants in fact to be man’s partner*, his almighty and compassionate Saviour. He chooses to give man the benefit of His power, which encompasses not only the high and the distant but also the deep and the near, in order to maintain communion with him in the realm guaranteed by His deity...[Man] is the being whom *God willed to exalt as His covenant-partner...*” ( Karl Barth, ‘The Humanity of God,’ in Karl

As Kenyon says, agreeing with Vreeland's tenor, Christians are not on the same level as God, rather "*What God says, is. What man says, may be*"<sup>300</sup>

Another instance of Lie having to explain Kenyon's ambiguity is: "When Kenyon says faith in his own faith, he *really* means recognition of God's effectual response to the faith which the latter has imparted to him. [For] Kenyon's unusual emphasis is due to the illegitimate faith many congregations placed in other ministers' faith."<sup>301</sup> I think this explanation of Lie's more plausible than Lie's last explanation discussed, and that Kenyon's 'faith in one's faith' is *not* derived from metaphysical New Thought. Rather, it seems more readily attributable to Kenyon's exasperation with streams of people expecting *him* to have faith for *them*, rather than their relying on their *own* faith: "Why is it that people haven't faith in their own faith? They have faith in my faith. *I receive letters from many far away countries asking for prayer. Why? Because the people who ask for prayer haven't confidence in their own faith.*"<sup>302</sup> Kenyon taught *each* Christian needed to receive their *own* faith;<sup>303</sup> Kenyon hated lack of faith:- for why should Christians be spiritually puny, placing sole reliance on the 'prayer power' of their church leaders/other spiritually mature believers? But while Christians *were* still puny in faith Kenyon warned such: "Don't attempt to abandon yourself to God when it means a leap in the dark. Faith is not a leap in the dark, it is walking in the bright light of absolute confidence in my Father...I will not ask any man to trust Him until he gets acquainted with Him."<sup>304</sup> Sadly, taking such a "leap in the dark" seems to be what Kenyon

---

Barth, *The Humanity of God*, [London, Collins : 1971], p. 48, 50 ; my italics. Barth also speaks of humankind being God's 'partner' in 'The Gift of Freedom,' in the same volume, pp. 65, 73, 78, 79, 80, 85. ) This 'partnership' has been remarked on earlier by George Muller in his nineteenth century writings, and latterly and currently by Kenneth Copeland, WOF teacher.

<sup>300</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 72, my italics.

<sup>301</sup> Lie, *Theology*, p. 109, my italics.

<sup>302</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 7, my italics.

<sup>303</sup> It is probable Kenyon was conversant with Romans 12: 3 speaking of the "measure of faith" each believer has been given.

<sup>304</sup> E. W. Kenyon, 'Faith,' *Reality*, November 1908, pp. 9-10, quoted in Lie, *Theology*, p. 113.

himself succumbed to.<sup>305</sup> For such an advocate of faith as Kenyon to die refusing medical treatment, when that treatment may have extended his life, is salutary. It has been said action is meant to *emanate from faith*, rather than faith being granted *following* action that did *not* emanate from faith:<sup>306</sup> “Luther and Kenyon were correct in their reading of Paul. Every believer can be inspired by the Holy Spirit to some sort of revelation knowledge. The problem is that any theology of revelation knowledge must be accompanied by a Pauline *theology of discernment*.”<sup>307</sup> The Christian believer is meant to *discern* whether they do in fact have faith, or not.

Having noted and discussed Kenyon’s ambiguities, but finding therein no evidence of Kenyon being a Mind-Cure metaphysical, I now examine McConnell’s claim concerning Kenneth Hagin’s plagiarism of Kenyon. Although Hagin is examined in detail in chapter three, because McConnell pointed out this connection between Hagin and Kenyon I feel it more appropriate to deal with it here. Hagin’s plagiarism of Kenyon is important to McConnell because McConnell claims Kenyon is metaphysical and so through Hagin’s wholesale plagiarism of Kenyon there occurred the spreading of metaphysical teaching throughout the WOF.

---

<sup>305</sup> “Kenyon’s emphasis on genuine faith’s being characterised by acting on the Word, no doubt, led some of his followers to reverse the concept, *believing that merely acting on the Word proved the authenticity of their faith*. The end results proved to be devastating...Kenyon’s acting on the Word, irrespective of a threatening lymphoid malignancy from which he had suffered for awhile, proved disastrous and was probably the cause of his passing away in 1948. *At least on this occasion even Kenyon himself reversed the concept and acted on presumption instead of faith*.” ( Lie, *Theology*, p. 113, my italics. ) And : “Denying physical symptoms in the belief that this will demonstrate the faith which in turn works the healing can be deadly. Andrew Brandon tells of the tragic and unnecessary death of a Cornish pastor who delayed seeking medical attention for an ailment which is only curable if treated during its early stages – he died!” ( Jackson, *Prosperity and the Faith Movement*, p. 20, citing Andrew Brandon, *Health and Wealth*, [ Eastbourne, Sussex : Kingsway, 1987 ], pp. 48 ff. )

<sup>306</sup> Price, *The Real Faith*, p. 25.

<sup>307</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 238, my italics.

### 2.5.5 Hagin's Plagiarism of Kenyon.

The dating of WOF teaching may tend to be Hagin-centric: Kenyon's WOF teaching was predominantly produced in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s; Hagin's WOF teaching was produced *predominantly* in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s.<sup>308</sup> Some such time-lag seems inferred by McConnell: "...the very doctrines that have made Kenneth Hagin and the Faith movement such a distinctive movement *are all plagiarized from E. W. Kenyon.*"<sup>309</sup>

McConnell's discovery of Hagin's plagiarism of parts of *eight* of Kenyon's works indeed shows some of Hagin's teaching to be derived from Kenyon.<sup>310</sup> McConnell's use of the phrase "the very doctrines" combined with McConnell's exposure of 'word for word' instances of Hagin's plagiarism suggests McConnell accuses Hagin of both taking his doctrines from Kenyon, *as well as* Kenyon's phraseology. McConnell's observation of Hagin's plagiarism of Kenyon unwittingly provides a helpful indication of the continuity of WOF teaching from Kenyon to Hagin.<sup>311</sup> Dale Simmons with some justice claims it is widespread plagiarism of Kenyon's writings that spread Kenyon's teachings to millions worldwide.<sup>312</sup> It can I think equally be argued that Kenyon *himself earlier borrowed* from the writings of his friend Carrie Judd Montgomery, who has been seen to be one influential

---

<sup>308</sup> "Hagin readily admits to reading the Kenyon literature during the 1950s. The Hagin literature was written starting in the 1960s and continuing on until today." ( DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 244. ) The last book written by Kenneth E. Hagin ( Kenneth Hagin, Sr. ) was *The Midas Touch*, published in the year 2000.

<sup>309</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 7, my italics. A reiteration of the claim: "Hagin plagiarized in word and content the bulk of his theology from E. W. Kenyon." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 183. ) And another reiteration of the claim, occurring overleaf : "It was Kenyon...who formulated every major doctrine of the modern Faith movement...the guts of the Faith theology...were taken from the writings of Kenyon." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 184. )

McConnell agrees with Kenyon's daughter Ruth Kenyon Housworth that her father E. W. Kenyon is "the True Father of the Faith Movement." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 13. ) And McConnell admits other preachers ( evangelists ), besides Hagin, did not pay sufficient tribute to Kenyon, thus : "Kenyon was 'seldom footnoted, but widely quoted' among the evangelists." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 28. )

<sup>310</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 8-11.

<sup>311</sup> As mentioned, McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 8-11.

<sup>312</sup> Simmons, *Postbellum pursuit of peace, power, and plenty: Kenyon*, p. x : "After the 1960s his [ Kenyon's ] theology was widely broadcast through the ministry of Kenneth Hagin ( usually without credit )." ( cited in DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 212. )

healing evangelist straddling the Divine Healing Movement and emergent Pentecostalism.<sup>313</sup>

*Kenyon provided one conduit for the teaching of the Divine Healing Movement to be fed easily into the WOF: despite McConnell's asseveration of plagiarism of both Kenyon's doctrines and phraseology by Hagin, Hagin was arguably far from being majorly influenced by Kenyon himself.* Healing evangelist F. F. Bosworth, *who had himself been influenced* by Divine Healing Movement (and Pentecostal) healing evangelist Maria Woodworth-Etter, was also a large influence on Hagin. Hagin attended Bosworth's healing evangelistic meetings, and Hagin used Bosworth's book *Christ the Healer, not one of Kenyon's works*, as the preeminent source text at his Bible school.<sup>314</sup> Just as Kenyon had himself been influenced earlier, Hagin himself was influenced by writings of "Faith-Cure leaders" and Wesley and other evangelicals.<sup>315</sup> Mel Montgomery scorns McConnell's claim of Kenyon having had overbearing influence on Hagin: "The influence of the Goodwins on Brother Hagin's ministry *dwarfs the influence of Kenyon's writings.*"<sup>316</sup> Again, Paul King traced back Hagin's 'trademark' teaching on the authority of the believer *not to Kenyon* but to Christian and Missionary Alliance leader John MacMillan.<sup>317</sup> Kenyon and Hagin being influenced by the same, or congruent, sources may have seemed to McConnell to be Hagin's

---

<sup>313</sup> See 1.9.5 'Carrie Judd Montgomery, E. W. Kenyon and 'Finished Work.'

<sup>314</sup> Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms*, pp. 24-25, citing Hagin, *The Name of Jesus*, Preface. But even Bosworth may have been influenced by Kenyon or Judd Montgomery as well as his having been influenced by Woodworth-Etter. McConnell's interviewee Ern Baxter claimed "after Bosworth had 'picked up on Kenyon,' he took T. L. Osborn under his wings and 'immediately introduced him to Kenyon.'" ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 74. ) F. F. Bosworth's dates are 1877-1958 ( Perriman, *Faith*, p. 63. )

And see DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 217.

<sup>315</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 134. In one sermon Hagin reportedly said "I began to read John Wesley's writings first way back in 1938...Did you ever read the autobiography of Charles G. Finney ? I have more than once. It has blessed me immeasurably...George Whitfield, who was a co-labourer with John Wesley actually, came over here to America...You can read about it actually in some books that are in the Library of Congress...Did you ever read after Peter Cartwright ? The Wesley-Methodist preacher...I read his autobiography – great – blessed ya." ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 9, citing Kenneth E. Hagin, *Why Do People Fall Under the Power ?*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 1976 ], Audio Tape 17H06. )

<sup>316</sup> Rev. Mel C. Montgomery, 'J. R. Goodwin and Kenneth Hagin, Sr.' ( 2006 ), p. 2, my italics ( from MCM\_Goodwin\_Hagin.pdf, accessed in [www.brothermel.com](http://www.brothermel.com) in June 2013. ) It had been, firstly "In 1938, [ that ] Brother Hagin met Dad Goodwin." ( ditto, p. 3. )

<sup>317</sup> King, *Only Believe*, p. 65. King does not speak of seeking to pursue this trail of influence further to A. B. Simpson the founder of the Christian Alliance and Missionary Alliance ( that Simpson coalesced to become the Christian and Missionary Alliance ), *who was a friend of, and had greatly been influenced by, Carrie Judd Montgomery.*

*comprehensive* plagiarism of Kenyon. One dissimilarity between Kenyon and Hagin is that despite the influence of Calvin on many Baptist denominations, former-Baptist Hagin's taped messages and books make sparse, and no recent, reference to former-Baptist Kenyon's acceptance of Calvin's belief in the 'spiritual death of Jesus.'<sup>318</sup> Rather, it is the WOF's Kenneth and Gloria Copeland, not Hagin, who have greatly expounded the 'spiritual death of Jesus.' Overall, it seems to be fair to say Hagin derived his teaching from a *melange* of sources. Allied to this is that it does seem that accusations regarding the plagiarism of Kenyon do seem impercipient if Kenyon's work *itself comprises a continued, if re-packaged, delivery of healing evangelism in the Divine Healing Movement, as well as a delivery of the even more promiscuously distributed biblical testimony.*<sup>319</sup>

---

<sup>318</sup> See DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, showing Calvin's teaching of this doctrine. Atkinson criticises McConnell for *erroneously claiming that Kenyon obtained the 'spiritual death of Jesus' teaching from New Thought and Christian Science.* ( Atkinson, 'Spiritual Death' of Jesus, p. 255. ) McConnell is suspicious of Hagin for not being willing to give credit to Kenyon. Rather than this being due to a nefarious plot of Hagin to secretly introduce Kenyon's allegedly metaphysical teaching into the 'Faith movement', it might be argued that this *actually* reflected Hagin's wish to distance himself from Kenyon's strong insistence on the 'spiritual death of Jesus.' ( see McConnell, *Different Gospel*, chapter four, especially pp. 65-66. ) Atkinson agrees with my, and others, view that the 'spiritual death' of Jesus "occurs in only a relatively small proportion of [ Hagin's ] books and articles," and it is also useful to point out that the works where Hagin *did* mention the 'spiritual death' of Jesus seem to have been solely Hagin's *earlier works*, dated respectively 1966, 1975 and 1979. Indeed, in the last-referred to *The Name of Jesus* ( 1979 ), Hagin only spends three and a half pages on the subject out of one hundred and sixty pages, while repeatedly thanking E. W. Kenyon for *The Wonderful Name of Jesus*, which book was the basis for Hagin's *The Name of Jesus* - ( Atkinson tells us that Hagin openly quoted Kenyon twenty-two times. ) ( Atkinson, 'Spiritual Death' of Jesus, pp. 20, 21; Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Name of Jesus*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, Inc., 1979 ], pp. 30-33. ) Hagin declared himself wrong in his earlier teaching of the 'spiritual death' of Jesus : "The Lord has been showing me some things I have been wrong about. At one time I taught certain things such as...Jesus dying spiritually. Now I have quit teaching such things, and I have made it clear that I no longer believe them." ( Kenneth Hagin speaking to the magazine *Charisma* ; see *Charisma*, August 1993, p. 24. This is cited in Thomas Smail, Andrew Walker and Nigel Wright, ' "Revelation Knowledge" and Knowledge of Revelation : The Faith Movement and the Question of Heresy,' in *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 5 ( 1994 ), pp. 57-77, p. 59. ) Here is Hagin, more recently, on the events at Jesus' death : "No wonder Jesus cried out on the cross when He was made to be sin, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' ( Matt. 27: 46 ). God had forsaken Him because He was taking our place. He became what we were. He took our sin that we might become righteous. He took our spiritual death that we might have eternal life. He took our ostracism, our outlawed nature, that we might become sons of God...Jesus carried His own blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies, thus cancelling the need for the High Priest to make an annual atonement...Jesus was made sin...For three days and nights He was locked up in the prison house of death because that is where we should have gone." ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Present Day Ministry of Jesus Christ*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, Inc., Eighth Printing in 1990 ], p. 6. )

<sup>319</sup> Hagin plagiarised from at least one other person : Dale Simmons discovered one of Hagin's best-selling pamphlets to be a plagiarism of John A. MacMillan's *The Authority of the Believer* (1932). Hagin's subsequent treatment of the publishing house owning the rights to MacMillan's work seems to have been shabby, possibly even larcenous. For, there is no record of Hagin giving them financial recompense, only a letter containing what, in the light of Simmons' discovery, seems to be the dubious claim that the Holy Spirit had inspired Hagin to

### 2.5.6 McConnell's 'Lack of Available Material on Kenyon.'

Geir Lie says McConnell only claimed Kenyon to be a metaphysical because McConnell was ignorant; Lie's statement is that McConnell lacked available material on Kenyon.<sup>320</sup>

However, McConnell, allegedly before publishing *A Different Gospel*, had received evidence that Kenyon was influenced by Faith-Cure not Mind-Cure: "Dale Simmons, who was a fellow student at ORU [Oral Roberts University] with McConnell and who similarly pursued postgraduate research on Kenyon...informed McConnell of the Faith-Cure influence on Kenyon. Unfortunately McConnell rejected Simmons' findings and insisted that his interpretation of Kenyon's theology was the valid one."<sup>321</sup> Additionally, McConnell is claimed, in a conversation with Paul King, to *also have been unaware of Kenyon's Keswick/Higher [Christian] Life connections.*<sup>322</sup> Having taken some pains to reject McConnell's claim of Kenyon being a metaphysical Geir Lie would almost certainly have no truck with Russell Morris's recent unfounded assertion that "Kenyon admitted to having drawn upon metaphysical sources."<sup>323</sup> From reading McConnell's *A Different Gospel* the case seems to be that rather than authenticating the findings of his colleague Simmons regarding Kenyon's orthodoxy/orthopraxy McConnell *instead placed over-much reliance on what his two interviewees had told him.* One of these two, Ern Baxter, is quoted in the book as saying: "Kenyon 'undoubtedly was influenced by Mary Baker Eddy.'" <sup>324</sup> In the light of the findings, McConnell seems to have been deceived by unsubstantiated assertions of these

---

reproduce exactly the same thoughts as MacMillan ; against this, Simmons discovery had been that Hagin's *The Authority of the Believer* ( 1967 ) followed MacMillan's *The Authority of the Believer* "as much as 75%...word-for-word..." ( see McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 67-69. )

<sup>320</sup> Lie, *Evangelical Minister*, p. 81.

<sup>321</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, pp. 235-236.

<sup>322</sup> King, *Only Believe*, p. 65.

<sup>323</sup> Morris, *Truth Matters*, p. 28. If E. W. Kenyon were alive today, and also litigiously-minded and wealthy enough to bring a prosecution, he could feasibly bring a legal action against Russell A. Morris for libel/defamation ; for, at my own count Morris makes over a dozen unsubstantiated claims about E. W. Kenyon. So, too John Ankerberg and John Weldon call Kenyon a "New Thought Christian" ( John Ankerberg & John Weldon, *The Facts on the Faith Movement*, [ Eugene, Oregon, Harvest House Publishers, 1993 ], p 15. )

<sup>324</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 25, the italics are McConnell's. And see McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 25-26 ; the names of the two interviewees McConnell cited are John Kennington and Ern Baxter.

two interviewees. One possible factor behind their assertions may have been McConnell's two interviewees 'sensing which way the wind was blowing,' and providing McConnell with what both thought McConnell would find most welcome; we do not know whether or not any financial emoluments were provided for these two interviewees.<sup>325</sup>

## **2.6 Conclusion.**

Research findings of the first chapter pointed to a WOF rooted in evangelical healing evangelism. This second chapter examined the claim that WOF teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical. E. W. Kenyon was seen unswayed by Mind-Cure (Christian Science and New Thought); rather, Kenyon entered the arena as Mind-Cure's critic.<sup>326</sup>

McConnell's arguments that Kenyon *and the WOF* are metaphysical were so far found to be weak. The nature of this observed weakness of McConnell's argument deserves comment, for arguably his argument was somewhat specious rather than being merely tenuous. Besides Kenyon the man having been shown not to have been a metaphysical, neither was Kenyon's teaching metaphysical: nor was it in any way markedly influenced by the metaphysical. Rather, Kenyon's teaching was influenced by the teaching on faith found in the Divine Healing Movement, alongside the other Christian influences (such as Calvin) there seem to have been on Kenyon. The findings show Kenyon to have been yet another healing evangelist, and an admitted significant source for the more recent WOF teaching typified by

---

<sup>325</sup> McConnell : "*It is my conviction that the Faith theology of Kenyon...is...heretical...*" ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 208, my italics. )

<sup>326</sup> There is another book also "disputing McConnell's attempt to establish a causal link between Kenyon and New Thought." ( Lie, *Theology*, p. 86. ) The book concerned is : J. (Joe) McIntyre, *E. W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story*, ( Lake Mary/Altamonte, Florida : Creation House, 1997 ) ; Besides Geir Lie, McIntyre is also recognised as a 'Kenyon researcher' ( see William P. Atkinson, '*Spiritual Death*' of Jesus, Acknowledgments page ). McIntyre had served as President of Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society. Also, another of Judd Montgomery's friends beside Kenyon, A. B. Simpson, categorised the healings of non-Christians as 'pagan instruments' and "the agency of Satan," identifying these forces as the reported false prophets which Christ foretold in Matthew 24: 24 would perform "signs and wonders" and deceive the very elect. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 271, citing A. B. Simpson, 'Divine Healing and Demonism Not Identical: A Protest and Reply to Dr. Buckley in the Century Magazine,' *Word, Work, and World*, VII [ June, 1886 ], pp. 52-58 ; part two, as before, [ July, 1886 ], pp. 114-122. )

Hagin, the latter who like Kenyon was also a healing evangelist and had a healing evangelism emphasis in his own teaching.

This second chapter in a large way completed the addressing of the question comprising the first part of the research question: *'Is the Word Of Faith teaching and practice of healing metaphysical?'* This was to test the first part of the thesis: *'Arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the metaphysical.'* This chapter presenting findings explaining consistency of McConnell's Mind-Cure metaphysical, on one hand, examining the life and teaching of E. W. Kenyon, on the other, has been able to support this first part of the thesis. It only remains to examine the WOF's Kenneth Hagin more fully in the next chapter, to continue to support this first part of the thesis.

Findings showed E. W. Kenyon seemed silent on the need to carry out the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. In this, this chapter has gone somewhat toward answering the second part of the research question: *'If not [ metaphysical ], are there biblical injunctions that suggest why Word of Faith teaching and practice of divine healing does not result in more incidence of the blessing of divine healing than it does?'* This, then, has also started the process of supporting the second part of the thesis: *'The Word of Faith does not teach obedience to the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor.'*

0-----0

## **Chapter 3    Healing in the WOF and the Poor.**

### **3.1    How This Chapter Supports the Thesis.**

Against the background provided by chapter one of findings of a WOF rooted in evangelical healing evangelism, chapter two's findings about E. W. Kenyon's life and work showed him unswayed by Mind-Cure (Christian Science and New Thought), except his being induced to become a destructive critic of what constituted Mind-Cure. McConnell's arguments that Kenyon is a Mind-Cure metaphysical were found unconvincing.

Although Kenyon was found a significant source for the more recent WOF teaching as typified by Hagin's, this should not preclude Hagin himself from being examined as a possible Mind-Cure metaphysical. In thus examining Hagin, this chapter provides further support for the first part of the thesis: *'Arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the metaphysical.'*

Chapter two's findings showed E. W. Kenyon seemed silent on the need to carry out the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. Therefore, chapter two went somewhat toward supporting the second part of the thesis: *'The Word of Faith does not teach obedience to the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor.'* This chapter, examining Kenneth Hagin, as well as continuing to support the first part of the thesis, also supports this second part of the thesis.

In its survey of scripture concerning the theme of regularly helping the poor, this chapter also seeks to support the third part of the thesis: *'Biblical scripture suggests that not obeying biblical commandment to regularly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the blessing*

of divine healing.’

### **3.2 Chapter Structure.**

This chapter focuses on WOF teaching and practice of divine healing exemplified by healing evangelist Kenneth E. Hagin.<sup>327</sup> I start by reporting the significance of Hagin towards answering the question ‘why examine Hagin’s teaching in particular?’ Examining Hagin’s teachings on faith and divine healing, among his other noteworthy books I thought it particularly apposite to not neglect his *Bible Faith Study Course*. Especially, because I have been told by various sources that *Bible Faith Study Course* is preeminent at Hagin’s Rhema Bible Training centres. *Bible Faith Study Course* was published in the 1970s; I have found it referred to in the back of one of Hagin’s books, *The Holy Spirit and His Gifts*, that was *itself* published in the 1970s.

Partly to ascertain whether Hagin’s teaching on faith and divine healing was sustained, I thought it important to report on his last-published book *The Midas Touch* (2000).<sup>328</sup>

---

<sup>327</sup> Apart from solely referring to it obliquely, I neither deal with Hagin’s inflated view of Satan’s power, nor with Hagin’s discussion of ‘naming your seed.’ (Hagin, *Midas*, pp. 143-145.) McCrossan had written that it was Satan: “who caused Adam and Eve to disobey God’s command and so bring sin, sickness, and death...Then Satan, and not God, is the real author of sin, sickness, and death...we are absolutely sure Satan is the author of sickness as well as sin...” (T. J. McCrossan, [Roy Hicks and Kenneth Hagin (eds.)], *Healing and the Atonement*, pp. 1, 2, my italics.) A typical Haginism is that “Jesus came to the earth and defeated Satan.” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 22.) This statement ignores Satan having been defeated long before and exiled from Heaven, it also ignores the binding and loosing of Satan (Matt. 18: 18, Rev. 20: 7), also ignoring the report that it will only take just one angel to bind Satan (Rev. 20: 1-2), and ignores humankind’s own evil. Hagin agrees with Kenyon who had earlier said “Sin and sickness come from the same source. Satan is the author of both.” (Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 14.)

William Kay traces ‘naming your seed’ to the importunities of televangelists for the fee-money to enable them to continue to air their programmes: “They would encourage donations and then tell their hearers that, if they did this [donated] and if they imagined that their gifts were seeds, a wonderful harvest of plenty would follow.” (Kay, *Pentecostalism*, p. 66.)

<sup>328</sup> According to Greek mythology, King Midas lived in Phrygia in the eighth century B.C. In the story, even Midas’s food and water turned to gold on his touching it, and his beloved daughter too, so Midas’s blessing of a ‘golden touch’ turned out to be a curse. Hagin’s own comment on this is “If You Get What You Want, Will You Want What You Get?” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. xi.)

Hagin study to date tends to quote fleetingly from various booklets, tapes and books selected from Hagin’s output. No Hagin study to date, besides Russell Morris’s *Truth Matters* (2013), has considered Hagin’s *The Midas Touch* published in 2000. Besides this, seemingly the only other book studying Hagin that makes reference to *The Midas Touch* is Paul L. King’s *Only Believe*. (Paul L. King, *Only Believe: Examining the Origin and Development of Classic and Contemporary “Word of Faith” Theologies*, [Tulsa, Oklahoma: Word and Spirit Press, 2008]) Furthermore, no Hagin study yet has considered at length the only book Hagin produced that purports to be a detailed teaching on the subject of faith, Hagin’s *The Bible Faith Study Course*. Some helpful analysis of Hagin’s teaching on the interrelated subjects of prosperity and healing has already been done. There are several works on Hagin that I have felt worthy of mention (and some others I have not mentioned, and I felt them to be making the same points as the works that I do refer to. And see Atkinson, ‘Spiritual Death’ of Jesus for a helpful summary of works on Hagin.) So, besides my pointing to the report of

Hagin subsumes health under prosperity.<sup>329</sup> It will become apparent the WOF's stance on 'wealth and the poor' does not teach obedience to biblical commandment to regularly help the poor, supporting the second part of the thesis. Findings of reported scripture carrying the suggestion that not regularly helping the poor is detrimental to the incidence of the blessing of divine healing supports the third part of the thesis.<sup>330</sup>

### **3.3 The Significance of Kenneth E. Hagin's Teaching.**

In the WOF *today* Kenyon, who died in 1948, is almost completely unknown. By contrast, Hagin had his teaching material distributed *over the last forty years or so*, so that it is a current verisimilitude to characterise it as 'widely distributed.' DeArteaga sees Hagin as conduit for Kenyon's teaching to permeate the charismatic renewal.<sup>331</sup> McConnell says all major ministers of the Faith movement readily admit Hagin's tutelage, that Hagin's leadership "forged the movement."<sup>332</sup> Hagin "the granddaddy of the Faith teachers" was known affectionately within the WOF as "Dad" Hagin.<sup>333</sup> Harrison even claims it was Hagin's magazine, *The Word of Faith*, that provided the WOF with their name.<sup>334</sup> Although McConnell may be exaggerating ministers' willingness to admit their debt to Hagin, Hagin is still regarded as the most influential WOF teacher: even a decade after his death.<sup>335</sup> Hagin's providing ministerial training and accreditation since 1968 also

---

the Evangelical Alliance commission produced by Andrew Perriman, I point particularly to one piece of analysis done relatively recently, and performed skilfully, seemingly almost in passing, by William Atkinson in his *'Spiritual Death' of Jesus*.

<sup>329</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p.1.

<sup>330</sup> That is : "One of the principles that guides us in appraising doctrine or teaching is not only the presence of isolated verses to support a particular teaching, but... 'What does the Scripture as a whole teach ?' " ( Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 40. )

<sup>331</sup> DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit*, p. 223. Derek Vreeland claims "No other movement has been more pervasive in the independent charismatic tradition than the word of faith movement..." ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 1. )

<sup>332</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 55, 75. Vreeland agrees that in "various faith ministries...a common denominator can be found in the influence of Hagin... The most efficient analysis...of word of faith theology...is to concentrate on the theology of Kenneth Hagin in particular." ( Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 12. )

<sup>333</sup> Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 5.

<sup>334</sup> I think it a little tenuous to argue this because the expression 'the word of faith' replicates biblical scripture ( Rom. 10: 8 ) ; thus, many were/are unaware of Hagin's magazine-name but were/are familiar with Rom. 10: 8. ( see Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 7. ) Harrison himself admits this when he says of Rom. 10: 8 "this is the source of the...name as well." ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 164. )

<sup>335</sup> McConnell points to an "ever-widening circle of Hagin imitators – and imitators of the imitators..." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 76. ) And "Hagin...sanctioned...[ Kenneth ] Copeland, who, in turn, raised up Jerry Savelle, his longtime associate and neighbour in Ft. Worth [ in Texas ]." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p.

contributed to his continuing influence; his 1974-founded Rhema Bible Training Center still in 2015 continues to train WOF ministers.<sup>336</sup> Even in 2015 there is still recognition of the centrality of Hagin's teaching material in the WOF. As for Hagin himself, he claimed even greater import for himself than that claimed for him by McConnell ; Hagin claims that it was he himself who prophesied the U.S. post-WWII healing revival in 1943, as well as his being a participant minister.<sup>337</sup>

---

77. ) Amongst WOF teachers regarding Hagin as their "spiritual father," Harrison cites Copeland and Frederick K. C. Price of Los Angeles, California. ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 5. ) [ Fred Price subsequently severed ties with Hagin due to Hagin supporting Kenneth Hagin Junior's preaching against interracial marriage - Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 163. ] As well as mentioning Copeland and Fred Price, William Atkinson cites Charles Capps and John Osteen as *also* having acknowledged "the profound impact of Kenneth Hagin on their lives and ministries." ( Atkinson, '*Spiritual Death*' of Jesus, p. 8. ) Pentecostal leader Atkinson is happy to cite the U. S. version of McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 4 for this. Atkinson reasonably claims "Copeland can now be regarded as the unofficial leader of the whole Word-faith movement." ( Atkinson, '*Spiritual Death*' of Jesus, p. 23. ) Jonathan Walton agrees : "The senior guard of today's Word of Faith cadre is connected to the ministry of the late Kenneth Hagin, Sr. Of Broken Arrow, Oklahoma...His Word of Faith magazine, Faith Seminar of the Air radio program, audiocassette tapes, and scores of published books and pamphlets remain valuable commodities within charismatic circles *even years after his death.*" ( Jonathan L. Walton, 'Stop Worrying and Start Sowing! A Phenomenological Account of the Ethics of "Divine Investment," ' in Katharine Attanasi and Amos Yong [ eds. ], *Pentecostalism and Prosperity, The Socio-Economics of the Global Charismatic Movement*, [ Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan, 2012 ], p. 110, my italics. )

<sup>336</sup> In 1968 Hagin founded the Rhema Correspondence School to help ministerial students undertake study through distance-learning. ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 7. ) Regarding the Bible Training Center, the standard inside-back-cover of modern editions of Hagin's books states "RHEMA Bible Training Center...Founded in 1974...offers...ministerial studies...to enter the Evangelistic, Pastoral, Teaching, Missions, Helps, Youth, and Children's ministries...thousands of graduates of RHEMA have ventured into every inhabited continent of the earth, carrying the Good News of the Gospel of Jesus Christ – with signs following." ( Hagin, *The Real Faith* and various other books' inside-back-cover. ) Rhema Bible Training Center has recently been referred to as Rhema Bible Institute in Broken Arrow, Oklahoma. ( Thomson K. Mathew, & Kimberly Ervin Alexander, 'The Future of Healing Ministries,' in Vinson Synan [ ed. ], *Spirit-Empowered Christianity in the Twenty-First Century*, [ Lake Mary, Florida : Charisma House, 2011 ], p. 324. )

And : "*Hagin's protégés* such as Kenneth Copeland ( Fort Worth [ Texas ] ), John Osteen ( Houston [ Texas ] ), and Fred Price ( Los Angeles [ California ] ) built many of the largest Protestant ministries, both congregational and media-based, in the United States during the 1970s and '80s, just as Copeland subsequently mentored and launched the ministries of persons such as Creflo Dollar and Jesse Duplantis." ( Walton, *Divine Investment*, p. 113, my italics. )

<sup>337</sup> Thus : "As I was praying for those five hours and forty-five minutes, God gave me the interpretation of what I was praying about. We were in World War II at that time, and God said, "At the end of World War II there shall come a revival of divine healing to America." I proclaimed this truth the first Monday of September of 1943...before the war was over in 1945." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 108. ) McConnell had instead claimed that the U.S. post-World War II Healing Revival "influenced Kenneth Hagin" ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 147. ) Hagin is very definite on the dates of what he calls the "Healing Revival, which was from 1947 to 1958." ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 187. ) Hagin includes the then current advice from British Pentecostal leader, writer and editor Donald Gee ( Hagin, *Midas*, pp. 188-191, citing Donald Gee, 'Extremes Are Sometimes Necessary,' *The Voice of Healing*, April 1953, p. 9 ).

### **3.4 A Short Introduction to Hagin's Teaching.**

This section aims at providing a cameo of Hagin. It is noted Hagin does not eschew use of medicine and doctors by a Christian believer who has no faith for the blessing of divine healing.<sup>338</sup> And, Hagin's last book *Midas Touch* declares him against what he characterises as wresting of his teaching out of context by those wanting to justify luxurious living.<sup>339</sup> However, despite criticising various extra-biblical practices, *Midas Touch* is Hagin-output-as-it-ever-was, but with the difference Hagin is able to speak of having had over sixty-five years of ministry.<sup>340</sup> Hagin's not deviating from his earlier

---

<sup>338</sup> Here, Hagin's position is at variance with that of Carrie Judd Montgomery. Hagin reflects that historically the church's involvement in healing has been a comprehensive one that included medical healing on the basis of creation as when the church founded hospitals ( from the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD ), provided hospices and grew medicinal plants in the herb gardens of monasteries. ( Ferguson, Wright, Packer, *New Dictionary of Theology*, p.288. ) Farah quotes Tom Smail as saying : "*Medical healing* bears witness to the providence of God in creation, providing within the natural order remedies and human skills for the ills of His creatures whereas *divine healing* bears witness to the operation of the Holy Spirit breaking through the limitations of the natural in a way analogous to what he did when he raised Christ from the dead." ( Thomas Smail, *Reflected Glory: The Spirit in Christ and the Christians*, [ London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1977 ], p. 123, cited in Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p.123, my italics. ) Farah would include Carrie Judd Montgomery among the group who "do not understand doctors and healers to be different members of God's one great team...Either you have faith or you use medicine, they believe. If you use medicine, you have no faith. So the Christian is left with a difficult choice of either bearing his suffering and pain in "faith," or seeking relief and healing through medicine in unbelief. *This kind of either/or teaching ignores the necessity of faith for healing in either of God's methods.*" ( Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, pp.122-123, my italics. ) It is interesting to note there is no scriptural evidence to suggest Luke, the beloved physician ( Col. 4: 14 ), gave up being a doctor. The fact Paul *still calls him a physician*, is suggestive of his continuing to use his skills for the good of others.

<sup>339</sup> Hagin asks "Is it our desire to minister to others or to ourselves ? Do we seek prosperity to help finance the work of God or to enjoy the luxuries of life – big houses, showy cars, expensive clothes, fancy food, and lavish entertainment ?" ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 69, and also see p. xiv. ) Concerning material wealth Hagin states "God wants to bless and prosper His children," "We are to seek first the Kingdom of God as opposed to being materialistically oriented," "Preachers should teach the truth of God's Word about money, but they shouldn't be self-serving," and "Preachers should keep their teaching on prosperity in balance with the many other truths of God's Word." ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 184. ) Hagin stresses the importance of diet, exercise, not over-working and taking rest, claiming his own teaching is balanced. ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 194. ) Hagin says, "there is a main road of truth with a ditch of error on either side of the road." ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. xiii. He counsels making sure one's revelation is in accord with scripture. ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 37. ) Therefore his readers may hope to find a 'balanced gospel.' Thus Hagin saying : "There are those in the ditch on one side of the road who teach that Jesus lived in abject poverty, that money is evil, and that biblical prosperity has nothing at all to do with material things. And in the other ditch...preaching that getting rich is the main focus of faith..." ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. xiv. )

<sup>340</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. xiii, and also pages 82, 93, 173. It was in 1937 that Hagin was baptised in the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues and was therefore thrown out of his Baptist denomination : he immediately joined the Pentecostals ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 5 ) ; thus : "I came over among the Pentecostals in 1937." ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 163.) Although Hagin began evangelising at age seventeen he pastored several churches before concentrating on being a healing evangelist : "I left my last church in 1949 and went out into what we call field ministry." ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 11. ) In 1962 Hagin founded his ministry, the Kenneth E. Hagin Evangelistic Association ( now known as Kenneth Hagin Ministries, Inc. ). Following this, Hagin severed his denominational affiliation with the Pentecostal Assemblies of God, becoming an independent Pentecostal, and moved to Tulsa, Oklahoma in 1966 where his fellow healing-evangelist Oral Roberts was already headquartered. ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 6. )

teaching is to some extent understandable for Hagin who was, functionally-speaking, continuously a healing evangelist, despite twelve years spent as a ‘pastor.’ Healing evangelist Hagin wants to use divine healing as a vehicle by which to minister Christ’s salvation: “If we were getting more answers to prayer, we would have more joy. And if more of our joy were showing, we would get more people saved.”<sup>341</sup> Hagin: “I have a list of purposes, arranged by priorities : 1. To get people born again 2. To get people filled with the Holy Spirit 3. To get people healed...”<sup>342</sup> These three priorities of Hagin are predicated by Hagin’s teaching it is important for the Christian believer to have the prerequisite of the revelation of faith in order for them to receive from God. Those not receiving what they should from God are described by Hagin as living “beneath their privileges [their privileges in Christ].”<sup>343</sup> The statement “all that you receive from God comes the same way: through faith” is at once typical of Hagin, but also opens Hagin to the criticism that he is monistic, as will be discussed.<sup>344</sup>

Having said this, it has been mentioned that the ‘Lord’s Prayer’ *itself* is the classic example of affirmative prayer, laying our needs trustfully before God without anxiously dwelling on them and “acknowledging that the Kingdom is already in God’s safe hands...content at the end to say triumphantly “Amen”, “So be it”, which is not a request, but an affirmation.”<sup>345</sup>

---

<sup>341</sup> Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 41.

<sup>342</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 145. Hagin’s fourth priority is “to help establish believers in faith.” Hagin’s fifth priority is “To present [ his ] RHEMA Bible Training Center for financial support” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 145. )

In *Midas Touch* Hagin reiterates that God can heal through the use of natural means, which includes medical means. ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 179. ) Hagin *disagrees* with the statement: “Healing has been done away with. The day of miracles is past.” Hagin also *disagrees* with the statement: “Divine healing is the only legitimate way to go. Using doctors or medicine is a sin.” ( for both quotes see Hagin, *Midas*, p. 179 ) And: “I am not saying that it is wrong to go to a doctor. But why not just put God’s Word first, instead of using it as a last resort [ ? ].” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 166. ) Elsewhere Hagin says “Thanks God for doctors. I appreciated everything they could do for me. They were so kind.” ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 62. ) But Pattison, in trying to keep people from the rocks of eschewing medical help to their detriment, states that such suggestions as Hagin’s to ‘put God’s Word first’ are foolhardy since in his experience any ‘religious’ healing method came a poor second to medical therapy, and for safety’s sake ‘religious’ healing methods must therefore be relegated to only being considered as a “last hope.” ( Pattison, *Alive and Kicking*, p. 49. ) Against this viewpoint, *Pentecostal Evangel* editor Charles Robinson had stated that not only was divine healing superior, but it was also free – that wasting money on doctors and medicines dishonours God. ( Wacker, *Heaven Below*, p. 137 citing Charles E. Robinson, *Pentecostal Evangel*, Sept 21<sup>st</sup>, 1929, p. 7. )

<sup>343</sup> Anyone living thus is also subject to being described as living a ‘defeated’ life. ( Harrison, *Word of Faith*, p. 9. )

<sup>344</sup> Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, p. 11.

### **3.5 Hagin on ‘The Need For Revelation prior to Exercising Faith.’**

John Christopher Thomas said that of all New Testament texts advocating divine healing, solely James 5:14-16 describes a procedure for divine healing to be followed;<sup>346</sup> this procedure includes confession of sin, particularly with a view to forgiveness/removal of sin which might have been thought to have resulted in the sickness.<sup>347</sup> However, Hagin rightly argues Mark 11:23-24 *also* describes a procedure *of faith* to be followed; illustrating the rightness of this is the practice of WOF ministers like Norvel Hayes routinely taking these scriptures as their instruction to curse cancers.<sup>348</sup> Hagin says faith (for healing) comes the same way as faith (for salvation), by hearing the Word of God which includes healing.<sup>349</sup> Perusing and listening to Hagin’s teaching on faith and healing the thing that strikes one is Hagin’s repetitiveness. Hagin claims this a didactic device, a tool to help eradicate ‘spiritual backwardness’ of the kind Hagin admits to having himself had when his own healing had evaded him.<sup>350</sup> Hagin relates how he had spent over twelve months in bed, with nothing

---

<sup>345</sup> William Portsmouth, *Healing Prayer*, ( Evesham, Worcestershire : Arthur James Ltd., 1957 ), p. 11.

<sup>346</sup> Thomas, *Devil*, p. 17. As far as Kenyon is concerned, James 5: 14-16 “is not for full-grown believers, but for those who have never developed their spiritual life so as to take their places in Christ. It is for those who must depend on others to pray for them.” ( Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 32. ) Price agrees “It is scriptural for people who are in need to seek out the elders and to call for prayer from the lips of some consecrated man, but it is not God’s ultimate. *In Him* we need no priest, for *He is* indeed our High Priest. *In Him* we need no intermediary, for He is *The One Mediator* between God and man.” ( Price, *Real Faith*, p. 100, Price’s italics. ) Hagin says “Most people who are untaught in the Word are seeking someone who can pray the prayer of faith for them. The prayer of faith may deliver them temporarily, but unbelief eventually will annul the effects of that prayer.” ( Hagin, *The Real Faith*, p. 2. )

<sup>347</sup> The pursuance of following the gospel of Jesus has as a concomitant of the avoidance of sickness through avoidance of sin – better not to sin in the first place than have to get forgiveness, better to be healthy in the first place than to get sick and need healing. God is described as sending illness or death to teach the Christian community that sin must not be tolerated, that affliction is pedagogical. ( Thomas, *Devil*, p. 299. ) Paul stated in 1 Cor. 11 that abuse of the Eucharist resulted in sickness and death. Luke’s description of Zechariah’s dumbness is attributed to unbelief in response to the divine promise spoken by the angel Gabriel ( Luke 1 ).

<sup>348</sup> Norvel Hayes, *How To Live And Not Die*, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Harrison House, 1986 ).

<sup>349</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 1. Hagin explains this via Acts 14: 7-10 - “Paul did these three things : 1. He preached the gospel to the man. 2. He perceived that the man had faith to be healed. 3. He told the man to rise up and walk. The man also did three things : 1. He heard Paul preach the gospel. 2. He had faith to be healed. 3. He leapt up and walked...If Paul preached what we call the gospel of salvation, how did the man get faith to be healed ? The man got faith to be healed because Paul preached what *the Bible* calls *the gospel*, which also includes healing.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 2, Hagin’s italics. ) Hagin cited an account from John Alexander Dowie’s 1888 healing campaign in San Francisco, when Dowie prayed for only one woman out of hundreds because he perceived that she alone had faith. ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *Healing Belongs To Us*, [ Tulsa: Faith Library Publications, 1991 ], pp. 18-19, cited in Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 9. )

<sup>350</sup> So also Hagin saying : “I got their attention, and then I began to drop a little faith on them. I just gave them a spoonful occasionally...When I would see they were slipping from me...I’d get them with me again, and then I’d drop a little more faith on them.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *Must Christians Suffer ?*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries Inc., 1996 ], p. 24. )

much to do except read the Bible, yet he had *still* not received revelation from God enabling his healing:

“I finally saw what Mark 11:23 and 24 said...as though someone had turned on a light inside of me...I keep teaching people about the truth of this scripture *over and over...* they’ll have to understand it with their spirits...I must keep teaching about Mark 11:23 and 24 because the more you teach a truth, the more folks will eventually catch on...when the truth of that scripture dawns on them...their eyes kind of light up.”<sup>351</sup>

Hagin says that it had taken him fully sixteen months to understand that divine healing was possible in modern times.<sup>352</sup> Referring to 1 Cor. 2:14, Hagin explains the natural man doesn’t receive what pertains to the Spirit of God because the Word of God seems nonsensical to the natural mind:

“...you can read certain verses over and over again and not understand the meaning. Then one day you can be reading along, and suddenly you see the truth of a particular verse of Scripture, and you say, “Why didn’t I ever see that before?” Well, you just then understood it with your heart.”<sup>353</sup>

---

Hagin describes his own healing as following a biblical pattern : “in Mark 5: 34, concerning the woman with the issue of blood, Jesus said, “...*Daughter, THY FAITH hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague.*”...My faith tapped into the power of God and I was made whole ! My paralysis disappeared and my heart condition was healed.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 2, Hagin’s italics and block capitals. )

<sup>351</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 51, my italics. Again, of Mark 11: 24 “And when Jesus said “...when ye pray...,” He meant the *very moment* you pray. You are to believe you receive whatsoever things you desire the *moment* you pray. Jesus said, “...*BELIEVE that ye RECEIVE them, and ye shall HAVE them.*” In common, everyday language, Jesus said, “You’ve got to believe you’ve got your answer before you get it ! When the light of this scripture first dawned on me, I immediately said, “Why, Lord, I see what I’ve got to do. I must believe while I’m still lying here flat on my back that my paralysis is healed, not going to be healed, but healed now.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 52. ) And “*God will do everything for you that you believe Him to do ( Mark 11:24 ). Many have read the scriptures concerning these things but those scriptures never mean a thing to them.*” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 145, my italics, and Hagin’s italicisation of his paraphrase of Mark 11:24. )

Others have not placed such emphasis on Mark 11: 23-24. Thus, in a Mark Stibbe book of the *most significant* Bible scriptures, Mark 11: 23-24 is not found. ( Mark Stibbe, *The 100 Verse Bible*, [ Oxford : Monarch Books, 2010 ], pp. 83-84. ) Stibbe considers Mark 10: 25 before passing on to Mark 12: 17, both these verses having more to do with living a lifestyle of neither poverty nor riches, and helping the poor, and being wholly given to God than the training concerning miracles of Mark 11: 23-24. Some scriptures on how vital faith is are Luke 18: 8, 22: 32 ; 2 Cor. 1: 24, 5: 7 ; Gal. 2: 16 ; Eph. 2: 8, 3: 17, 1 Thess. 1: 3 ; Heb. 6: 1, 11: 6 ; 1 Pet. 1: 5, 7 ; 1 John 3: 23 ; Jude 3.

<sup>352</sup> “Gradually I began to see what God’s Word says on the subject of divine healing. It took me a long time to see it – 16 months – because I had not been taught that divine healing is for us today...people did tell me that healing and miracles had been done away with.” ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 33 ).

<sup>353</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 50. And “Someone said, “I just don’t understand that.” I told you that you can’t understand the Bible with your head. The things of the Spirit of God are foolishness to the natural mind, and the Bible is of the Spirit of God. The Scriptures are *spiritually* discerned [ 1 Cor. 2: 14 ]. You have to grasp or understand the truth of the Word with your *spirit*...to believe with the heart means to believe apart from what your physical body may tell you or what your physical senses may tell you.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 52, Hagin’s italics ). Again “...the reason we miss it so much of the time is, *we take the testimony of our physical senses instead of taking the testimony of the Word of God.*” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 81-82, Hagin’s italics ). Hagin reinforces this with Prov. 3: 5 “Trust in the Lord with all thine HEART; and lean not unto thine own

Hagin instances how one cannot intellectually appreciate the truth of scripture until one's spirit has had revelation of its truth, duly passing on that revelation to one's mind. This is being *renewed* "in the spirit of one's mind."<sup>354</sup> The tenor of Hagin's teaching is that his message will be understood spiritually *or not at all*.<sup>355</sup> Hagin explained that as a youth he himself was not healed for many months because he had been *hoping to be healed* and had not been *having faith to be healed*. It was only through faith that he received an answer to his prayers.<sup>356</sup> Hagin, though still feeling ill, arose from his sickbed, initially clinging on to his bedpost.<sup>357</sup> This was his response to reportedly hearing "Now you believe you are healed. But healed people – well people – don't have any business being in the bed at this time of day. They need to be up." Hagin's analysis is: "to be in faith, you have to take steps of faith because faith requires corresponding action."<sup>358</sup> Hagin eventually walked from his bedpost

---

understanding [ or your mind ]." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 53, Hagin's capital letters and square brackets ). Hagin's paraphrase of Prov. 3: 6-7 is "Don't be wise with natural human knowledge which would lead you to repudiate or to act independently of the Word of God" ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 53 ).

<sup>354</sup> Eph. 4: 23. Hagin expends a great deal of effort in describing the scriptural teaching of the tripartite nature of humankind ( 1 Thess. 5: 23 ), interlaced with his own and others' experiences.

<sup>355</sup> Lack of understanding seems to have been the problem with most of the Pharisees, Saducees, and the multitudes exposed to Jesus's teaching. Perhaps this is also reminiscent of Woody Allen's character saying in Allen's film *Annie Hall* (1977): "one thing intellectuals have taught us is that you can be absolutely brilliant and have no idea what is going on."

<sup>356</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 19. Reportedly suffering from two concurrent chronic heart conditions, during his sickness Hagin claims to have suffered two or three heart attacks *per day*. ( Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 64 ; concerning the two heart conditions, see p. 63. ) Hagin claims he was "saved the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April 1933." ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 33. ) Then Hagin began to preach as "a young seventeen-year old Baptist boy...a young Baptist boy preacher." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 67, 158. ) And "preaching in the jails and on the streets and working in the church..." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 67. ) Hagin "spent 3 years as a Baptist evangelist ( 1934-1937 )..." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 58. ), and "received the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in other tongues in 1937." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 106 ; *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 21. ) Subsequent to this speaking in other tongues as a Baptist, and also in 1937 "Hagin was licensed as an Assemblies of God minister and pastored...Assemblies churches in Texas." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 58 ; Kinnebrew, *Positive Confession*, p. 14. ) It was in 1949 that Hagin began his healing evangelist ministry, in his words "In 1949 I went on the field ministering." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 159. ) During the "Healing Revival ( around 1947-58 )...Hagin began to minister in the circles of such independent healing evangelists as William Branham, Oral Roberts, A. A. Allen, Jack Coe, and T. L. [ and Daisy ] Osborn...[ and ] with Gordon Lindsay, whose *Voice of Healing* magazine was the official periodical of the Healing Revival." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 58, my italicisation of 'Voice of Healing ;' both Oral Roberts and Kenneth Hagin spoke on the radio programme *Voice of Healing*. Oral Roberts used to tell listeners to place their hands on their radios as he prayed for them – reportedly many were healed when they did this. Their thus having laid hands on their radios 'in faith' was seen as a "point of contact" part of a "definite transaction" resulting in divine healing, based on the healing of Jairus' daughter ( Mark 5: 22-23 ). In Oral Roberts' reported words "Use a point of contact for the release of your faith [ Then ]...Release your faith." ( Mathew & Kimberly Alexander, 'Future of Healing Ministries,' in Synan, *Spirit-Empowered Christianity*, pp. 321, 318-319. ) And "Many have been healed over the radio when they stopped mentally assenting, and acted on the Word." ( Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 65. )

<sup>357</sup> Hagin said "If I had gone by feelings, I'd have to say I wasn't healed because I was still partially paralyzed." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 20. )

and kept walking, and Hagin teaches that since the word of God is the means whereby faith can be produced and is available to us then *it is our own responsibility whether or not we have faith.* <sup>359</sup> Hagin stresses the importance of the believer *becoming rightly confident* in what they have *initially hoped for*, since it is *only faith* that is reported to be *the substance* of things hoped for. <sup>360</sup> Hagin stresses that this ‘right confidence’ is the foundation to the vitally important *experiencing* of the word of God; that one will never really *experience* God’s word to be good until being able to act on it and reap the results of it. <sup>361</sup> Faith demonstrates God’s word by this process of acting upon it, *demonstratably* giving *substance* to things hoped for.

<sup>362</sup> In this teaching, Hagin refers to John Wesley’s term ‘mental assent,’ an agreement

---

<sup>358</sup> Quotes from Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 19. Hagin also reminds Christian believers that “we walk by faith, not by sight” (2 Cor. 5: 7) (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 37). “My sight may tell me it isn’t so, but if I am to please God, I am going to have to learn to walk by faith and to think God’s thoughts after Him.” (Hagin, *Present Day Ministry of Jesus Christ*, p. 26.) Hagin says “I certainly believe in feelings, but I put feelings last when it comes to faith and prayer.” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 37-38.) Thus also “Acts 2: 4 says...“*they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and [ THEY ] began to speak with other tongues...*”...*They began to speak with other tongues after they were filled...You believe and receive the Holy Ghost first, then you speak with tongues as a result of having received.*” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 39, Hagin’s italics.)

<sup>359</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 1; “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” (Rom. 10: 17). However, Charles Price points out that a better translation is ‘faith cometh by a word of God’ not ‘faith cometh by the word of God.’ (Price, *Real Faith*, p. 68.) According to Price receiving a word of God involves the reception of hope that blossoms into faith: “When He speaks, hope is kindled until it becomes a fire that burns away all doubt and unbelief, and the warmth of a divine and beautiful faith brings healing...” (Price, *Real Faith*, p. 69.) And “You cannot have faith in God, unless you have the faith of God.” (Price, *Real Faith*, pp. 74-75, Price’s italics.)

<sup>360</sup> Heb. 11: 1. So, while one might *hope* for physical strength, one can develop *faith* in the scripture that “...the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?” (Ps. 27: 1) Hagin develops the theme of this scripture through relating his own faith in it, when after sixteen months bedfast he needed to find work and that work took the form of hard physical labour: “Of course, if I had gone by my feelings, I would never have gotten out of bed because I *felt* like staying in bed. I never felt so weak in my life; I felt like I couldn’t do anything – let alone a strenuous job like that! But I stayed with it. I acted upon the Word because I knew what faith is...Then after I prayed and asked God for His strength and confessed that I had it, I would never get any help or strength until I actually started to work. You see, it wasn’t enough to have faith; I had to *act* on my faith.” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 7, Hagin’s italics.) That is “I was just a youth, fifteen years of age, when I was saved on the bed of sickness. I remained in a bedridden condition until I was about seventeen years of age when I was healed...” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 112.) Hagin only weighed 89 pounds when he arose from his sickbed and, of his work-colleagues, was “weakest and the skinniest” yet had faith that the Lord was the strength of his life (Ps. 27: 1): “[And] every morning when we started on the first tree or sometimes the second tree, I would feel something hit me on the top of my head and it would go through my body, out the ends of my fingers and out the ends of my toes. It was the supernatural strength of the Lord, and I would work all day long under the power of that strength.” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 8; concerning Hagin’s weight see p. 20.)

<sup>361</sup> Faith to experience the things scripture talks about.

<sup>362</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 8. And, concerning the woman in Mark 5: “It wouldn’t have done the woman with the issue of blood any good if she had said, “If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole,” and then hadn’t *acted* upon what she said.” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 143, Hagin’s italics.) And “First, the woman said it. Then she came forward to receive her healing by touching Jesus. That was her *faith in action*. Then she received it and felt in her body that she was healed of the plague.” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 144, my italics.) Also “Notice that the *feeling* and the *healing* followed the *saying* and the *doing*. Most people want the *feeling* and the *receiving*

*mentally* that God's word is true, noting that *mental* assent does not receive from God because it is "with *the heart* [that] man believeth,"<sup>363</sup> thus the scripture reportedly saying if someone "shall not doubt in *his heart*, but shall believe [in his heart]..."<sup>364</sup> Bosworth had taught that it is impossible to have faith for divine healing as long as there is the slightest doubt that it is God's will,<sup>365</sup> and Hagin agrees, characterising faith as reasoning "If God's Word says it's so, then it's so. The promise is mine; I have it now!...Faith...is the evidence of things not seen [Heb. 11:1]." <sup>366</sup> That is, Hagin teaches that if you already had the promise manifested before your eyes, you wouldn't *have to* believe it, for you would know it. By contrast, to come to knowing-by-faith one takes the step of believing without seeing.<sup>367</sup>

---

first and then they think they'll do the saying and the *doing*...It was only after the woman with the issue of blood *said* and *did*, that Jesus said that the power had gone out of Him." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 144, Hagin's italics. )

<sup>363</sup> Rom. 10: 10. And see Hagin, *The Real Faith*, p. 4.

<sup>364</sup> Mark 11: 23.

Hagin told a husband that it was unscriptural to pray to God to heal his wife using the words, "If it be Thy will." The reason why Hagin claimed 'if' was inappropriate was that if one put an 'if' in a prayer praying for anything God has promised one in His word, then one is praying in doubt. ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 4. ) Hagin reasoned with the man "If the New Testament said that Jesus took your wife's infirmities and bare her sicknesses [ Matt. 8: 17 ], then wouldn't it be God's will for her to have her healing ?" ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 4-5. ) And, following Hagin's reasonings from scripture, the wife was healed : "Years later, the wife was still healed. How did she get faith ? *From hearing the Word !*" ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 5. ) However, Hagin concedes that when one is praying a prayer of consecration, committing one's life to the plan of God, then one can use the phrase "If it be Thy will," because one doesn't know for sure what the Lord's will is. Hagin reflects the earlier teaching of F.F. Bosworth ( Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, p. 51. )

<sup>365</sup> Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, p. 99 ; and "faith is expecting God to do what we know it is His will to do...Just as a little girl's faith for a new dress comes by hearing the promise of her mother to buy it the next Saturday, so our faith for healing comes by hearing God's Word, or promise, to do it [ Rom. 10: 17 ]." ( Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, pp. 100, 101. )

<sup>366</sup> And : "...if I say, "I believe I'm going to get my healing *sometime*," that's not believing at all. It's hope, not faith, and hope won't bring healing to you. I've seen good people who were sick, yet died saying that. They were wonderful people who are now in heaven, and I would not speak disparagingly of them at all because they were wonderful Christians. They just didn't know what faith is." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 17, Hagin's italics. ) Hagin says "The principles of faith are the same in any area, whether it be finances, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, divine healing, or whatever the petition is." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 15. )

Hagin's phrase "If God's Word says it's so, then it's so. The promise is mine ; I have it now !" is found on no one's lips in the New Testament – that is, the characters of the New Testament were able to have faith without repeating this formula. Again, one can repeat this formula and yet *not* have faith ; Hagin's teaching on 'hindrances to faith' carries the flaws of his flawed presentation of the gospel of Jesus.

<sup>367</sup> See Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 8-9. Hagin says that just as in the report the woman with the issue of blood had said "if I may touch but his [ Jesus' ] clothes, I shall be whole [ healed ]" ( Mark 5: 28 ) and Jesus had later said to her "Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole" ( Mark 5: 34 ), so Hagin claims that God said to Hagin before Hagin's being healed " "If *her faith* made *her* whole, *your faith* can make *you* whole." And [ subsequently ] *my faith* made *me* whole !" ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 62. )

Thus also, Mark 11: 24 "...What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them," mentioning the 'having' *after* the 'believing.' In the case of the apostle Thomas, Thomas refused to believe in Jesus' resurrection until he had sensory data of it ( John 20: 25 ). The resurrected Jesus' response to Thomas was "because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" ( John 20: 29 ) Jesus is stressing that we should seek the blessing of having faith.

Hagin teaches each believer is to have their *own* faith, not place reliance on the faith of others; otherwise, one's own unbelief will destroy effects of others' faith.<sup>368</sup> In this, Hagin *does* recognise 'baby Christians' can be helped by another's faith, but also recognises the time will come when those 'babies' are expected to develop their own faith, walking in maturity on their own two feet. Hagin mentions healings occurring via "mass faith" in a large meeting and that such healings (unless they are the healings of 'baby Christians'), must be buttressed by the recipient's own faith in their *having been healed*, coupled with their own faith in their *retaining their healing* in spite of attacks of doubt-suggesting twinges and bodily malfunctions.<sup>369</sup>

Hagin stresses reading or listening to scripture in order to *obtain faith*. However, there is a tendency among some WOF Christians to come to regard 'faith' as their own ability to believe a promise or a truth, their ability to successfully struggle in driving away doubt and unbelief through making continuous affirmations.<sup>370</sup> In one sense they are correct, it is testified to by many that it is possible to be determined to seek out God's reported words and by exposure *ineffably assimilate faith*; in the other sense they are incorrect, we do *not* learn faith, neither from ourselves nor under stress of circumstances.<sup>371</sup> A typical

---

Bosworth had taught "Faith never waits to see before it believes, because it *"cometh by hearing"* ( Rom. 10:17 ) about *"things not seen as yet"* ( Heb. 11:7 ), and is *"the evidence of things not seen"*...[Heb. 11: 1]."<sup>368</sup> ( Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, p. 113. )

<sup>368</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 82. Hagin's explanation claims the agency of Satan in re-instating sickness : "They have been in a service where there was mass or corporate faith and they received healing. But when they got on their own, Satan took advantage of their unbelief and put the ailment back on them because they didn't know how to stand against him with their own faith." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 82-83 ). And "...even if these people did receive healing by someone else's faith, it would not be permanent...I've seen people temporarily helped, but later they lost what they had received because they didn't know how to hold on to their healing through their own faith." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 82 ). Hagin provides a rider to this "...baby Christians can be carried for awhile by other people's faith. But the time comes when even they have to begin to exercise and develop their own faith." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 82 ).

Hagin quotes fellow healing evangelist Dr. Lilian B. Yeomans saying : "God delights in his children stepping out over the aching void with nothing underneath their feet but the Word of God." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 55 ). And "Dr. Yeomans also said that to look to see whether God is healing you is a sin." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 55 ). Hagin reminds of the scripture that says of God "thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." ( Ps. 138: 2, Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 73 ).

<sup>369</sup> Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, p. 29. And "There has been criticism of mass healing meetings because, in many cases, the healings do not last...where a mass faith is present, people can be helped temporarily." ( Hagin, *The Real Faith*, p. 3 ). Hagin does not always point out that 'baby Christians' *may* retain their healings in such circumstances. This failure to stipulate reflects the nature of the production of Hagin's works, that they are transcribed from recordings of his preaching and therefore, individually, they are not complete statements of his teaching.

<sup>370</sup> Price, *Real Faith*, p. 89.

bullish instruction from Hagin: “Pray, forget about it, and begin to conduct yourself as if the answer came the minute you prayed!”<sup>372</sup> It is here Hagin’s stress on believers having been given the measure of faith can be pernicious (Rom. 12:3); believers think that because they *already have* the measure of faith it is wholly up to them to ‘have faith’ (that they supposedly already have), or ‘act faith’ (that they supposedly already have).<sup>373</sup> This is discussed in section 3.6 ‘Hagin on Confession.’

It has been/is argued that rather than repetitively read scripture until one obtains faith to be healed it is possible to make ‘prevailing prayer.’ However, just as Carrie Judd Montgomery characterised ‘prevailing prayer’ as ‘lower faith,’ so too Hagin does not favour it illustrated by his not *even mentioning* ‘prevailing prayer’ in *Bible Faith Study Course*. This abnegation of ‘prevailing prayer’ is in contrast with the reported New Testament account of ‘Paul’s thorn’ suggesting Paul’s habit, in some cases, to make ‘prevailing prayer:’ to continue praying about a specific infirmity until either relief came or one ‘heard from God.’<sup>374</sup>

---

<sup>371</sup> That is, faith is a type of revelation : “only through revelation, an impartation of God passing all understanding, is it given unto us and do we have even the proof that God has graciously turned and come nigh unto us.” ( Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen, *Come Holy Spirit*, [ London : Mowbrays, 1978 ], p. 34, and see p. 33 ).

<sup>372</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 65.

<sup>373</sup> Hagin talks about the measure of faith which is mentioned in Romans 12: 3, in a passage explicitly addressing believers ( “brethren,” Rom. 12: 1 ) “God hath dealt to every man *the measure of faith*.” And, Ephesians 4: 7 reports that “unto every one of us [ believers ] is given grace according to *the measure* of the gift of Christ.” ( my italics ). Speaking of Mark 11: 23-24 Farah explains “the context shows that it is...a faith God himself gives linked to miracles ( 1 Cor. 12 ), specifically mentioned by Paul as the summit of faith: “If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains” ( 1 Cor. 13:2a ). They [ the WOF ] often contend that every believer has a measure of this kind of faith.” ( Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 124. ) Hagin treats the measure of faith given the believer as synonymous with the authority over Satan given the believer ; just as faith needs to be exercised, so too does authority over Satan : “It’s not enough just to have authority in Christ. Believers need to exercise the authority they have over the devil before it will do them any good.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *The Triumphant Church*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, Inc., 1998 ], p. 102 ). However, although faith may *not* have been granted, it seems ‘authority’ connected with the ‘Name of Jesus’ *is* a given ; thus, the Christian believers in Matt. 7 are reported as having had success “in thy [Jesus’s] name” even though Jesus subsequently commands these “workers of iniquity” to depart from Him.

<sup>374</sup> 2 Cor. 12: 7-10. John Christopher Thomas, *The Devil, Disease and Deliverance*, ( Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1998 ), p. 305. On ‘Paul’s thorn,’ see an analysis of the grammatico-historical context provided by John Avanzini in his short book *Paul’s Thorn* ; also “In Numbers 33: 55, ‘thorns in the sides’ of God’s people refers to the harassment and persecution which Israel’s neighbours inflict...These nations are referred to again as thorns in Joshua 23: 13 and in Ezekiel 28: 24. The Old Testament concept of a “thorn in the flesh” refers to persecution and harassment, not sickness. Now notice the context of Paul’s thorn in 2 Corinthians 12. In [ what is ] the previous two chapters, Paul speaks of his being persecuted and harassed by false prophets and political and religious authorities. This discussion of his suffering at their hands leads directly into his discussion of his “thorn in the flesh.” In Paul’s Hebrew mind, a “thorn in the flesh” carried an idiomatic meaning much like “pain in the neck” does to us. It connoted personal persecution, and this is the very context

In his discussion of faith, only rarely does Hagin mention *abiding* in the word/*abiding* in Christ. Jesus taught that abiding in the word goes further than mere reading/hearing in ‘feeding upon the word;’ *abiding entails ‘doing the word,’ obeying Jesus.*<sup>375</sup> In tandem with under-stressing ‘abiding,’ Hagin has an impoverished interpretation of Prov. 4:20-22, interpreting it in terms of ‘confessing scripture,’ when the material is richer implying a life devoted to God, obedient to God’s commandments.<sup>376</sup>

### **3.6 Hagin on Confession.**

#### **3.6.1. Introduction.**

“Paul says in Romans 10:9, “...if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus”...This is not a negative confession; it is a positive confession!”<sup>377</sup>

Hagin is known as an advocate of ‘positive confession.’<sup>378</sup> However, instead of Hagin speaking solely of ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ confession, he also designates confession to be either ‘right’ or ‘wrong.’<sup>379</sup> ‘Negative confession’ is the *valid* form of confession taking the form of confessing one’s sins and shortcomings.<sup>380</sup>

---

of his mention of it in 2 Corinthians 12.” ( Blue, *Authority to Heal*, pp. 28-29; John F. Avanzini, *Paul’s Thorn ‘Satan’s Messenger Not Sickness,’* [ Fort Worth, Texas : His Publishing Company, 3rd Printing 1987, ( 1980 ) ] )

<sup>375</sup> Matt. 7: 21-27. And another report: “he who says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he walked.” ( 1 John 2: 6, RSV ).

<sup>376</sup> “My son, be attentive to my words...let them not escape from your sight ; keep them within your heart. For they are life to him that find them, and healing to all his flesh.” ( Prov. 4: 20-22, RSV ) And consider : “thou art near in their mouth, and far from their heart...believe them not, though they speak fair words to you...” ( Jer. 12: 2, 6, RSV ). Hagin stated that the phrase ‘faith in God’ in Mark 11: 22 should better be translated ‘faith of God.’ This was from the margin of Hagin’s Bible ; thus Hagin says of Mark 11: 22 “as the margin reads, ‘Have the faith of God.’ ” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *New Thresholds of Faith*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library, 1980 ], p. 74. ) And most King James Versions of the Bible that provide marginal notes include the note to Mark 11: 22 : “Or, Have the faith of God.” Hagin re-published a book on healing in the atonement by a Professor of Hebrew and Greek, Dr. T. J. McCrossan ; but McCrossan is happy with the translator’s ‘have faith in God’ in Mark 11: 22, McCrossan stressing the atonement provides for the believer’s divine healing, without feeling the need to suggest an alternative suggestion to ‘faith in God.’ ( T. J. McCrossan, [ Roy H. Hicks, and Kenneth E. Hagin ( eds. ) ], *Bodily Healing and the Atonement*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library Publications, 1992 ], pp. 82-84. )

I believe the translators and McCrossan are right, not Hagin.

<sup>377</sup> Kenneth E. Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library Publications, 1986 ), p. 7.

<sup>378</sup> The following crude summation of the subject is typical : “...the phrase “positive confession” refers quite literally to bringing into existence what we state with our mouth, since faith is a confession ( hence...*Word-Faith* or *Word of Faith* ).” ( Burgess, Stanley M. [ ed. ], & Van der Maas, Eduard M. [ Associate ed. ], *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, [ Grand Rapids, Michigan : Zondervan, 2002 ], p. 992. )

<sup>379</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 79, thus “We have been discussing right and wrong thinking, right and wrong believing, and *right and wrong confession.*” My italics. And “...wrong thinking produces wrong believing, and wrong believing produces *wrong speaking.*” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 144, my italics. )

The nexus between Hagin's healing evangelism and 'confession' is as follows. Firstly, what we believe is resultant of our thinking it; therefore if we think wrongly we believe wrongly.

<sup>381</sup> Secondly, we "will not be able to make the right confession until our thinking is right."<sup>382</sup>

Hagin feels the church overly-concentrating on *negative* confession of failings, such preoccupation demoting the positive confession that is the preaching of the gospel and other speakings-out of scripture.<sup>383</sup> Hagin goes so far in trying to dethrone 'negative confession' as teaching people should not confess their sins to other people, only to God.<sup>384</sup> Although reportedly the believer *is* to confess their sins to God (1 John 1:9), Hagin here contradicts "confess your sins to one another...*that you may be healed*," (James 5:16, RSV) although it will be seen Hagin does elsewhere teach this latter scripture. Hagin admits negative

---

<sup>380</sup> "...whenever we use the word 'confession,' folks invariably think of confessing sins, weaknesses and failures. That is the negative side of confession, but there is a positive side." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 66.) Although he does not explicitly mention the early English Christian King Edward the Confessor, Kenyon had said "Whenever the word 'confession' is used we instinctively think of confessing sin, weakness and failure...Testifiers and witnesses and confessors have been the great leaders in the revolutionary life that Jesus gave to the world." (Kenyon, in Kenyon and Gossett, *Power of Your Words*, p.11.) Kenyon neglects to state, and so ignores, the willingness of these "testifiers and witnesses and confessors" to 'leave all for Christ's sake,' the sufferings they were willing to endure, and sometimes did endure. Kenyon quotes : " 'Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession' Hebrews 3: 1. Christianity is called our confession and in Hebrews 4: 14, He tells us to 'hold fast our confession.' The old version [KJV] reads 'profession' but the Greek means witnessing a confession of our lips. You understand Romans 10:8-10, 'That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.' You see the place that confession holds in salvation. It holds the same place in our faith walk. Christianity is a Confession. It is our open confession of what we are in Christ, of what Christ is to us. Our faith is gauged by our confession...it is the confession of our place in Christ, of our legal rights, of what the Father has done for us in Christ and what the Spirit has done in us through the Word and what He is able to do through us." (Kenyon in Kenyon and Gosset, *Power of Your Words*, pp. 36-37.) And "We dare to take our place and confess before the world that what the Word says about us is true." (Kenyon in Kenyon and Gosset, *Power of Your Words*, p. 129.) That is "We should begin to confess that we are what He says we are, and hold fast to that confession in the face of every contrary evidence." (Kenyon in Kenyon and Gosset, *Power of Your Words*, p. 137.)

<sup>381</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 1 ; Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, p. 17.

<sup>382</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 2.

<sup>383</sup> "If we live on only one side of confession and constantly confess our faults and failures, we will grow lopsided in our Christian life, building...failure-consciousness into our spirits." (Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, p. 12.) And "...making positive confessions based on our rights and privileges in Christ is almost an unknown practice in the church world today." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 97.) Hagin cites Prov. 6: 2 as an admonition against speaking *wrongly* "Thou art snared with the words of thy mouth, thou art taken with the words of thy mouth." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 141, Hagin's italics in Proverbs quote). Hagin suggests our confession be "around these principal truths : 1. What God has done for us through Christ in His plan of salvation. 2. What God has done in us by the Word and the Holy Ghost in the new birth and the filling of the Holy Ghost. 3. Who we are to God the Father in Christ Jesus. 4. What Jesus is presently doing for us at the right hand of the Father where He ever lives to make intercession for us. 5. What God can accomplish through us, or what His Word will accomplish through us as we proclaim it." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 66).

<sup>384</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 83.

confession (of sin) appropriate when the believer sins, being ‘*right negative confession.*’ However, if believers became preoccupied with declaring their wretched condition and *knowingly* did not declare God’s provision for them in Christ, such is ‘*wrong negative confession*’ through the *sinfulness* of contradicting God’s utterances about them as believers, and its deleterious effect on the believers.<sup>385</sup>

As mentioned, Hagin taught the possibility of making ‘*wrong positive confession*’ through using ‘confession’ to attempt to enrich oneself inordinately. That is, confession is only as powerful as God’s desire to act in accordance with the word spoken. ‘*Right positive confession*’ declares what God has done/will do for the believer, particularly what wrought for the believer in Christ’s atonement.<sup>386</sup> This naturally reflects Hagin’s long ministry of healing evangelism; Hagin, like healing evangelist Carrie Judd Montgomery and other Finished Work healing evangelists insists the believer claim they are healed – that God does not promise healing but proclaims He has (already) healed us in the atonement, so we therefore need to agree with God’s proclamation by claiming this healing.<sup>387</sup> Right positive confessions are therefore positive affirmations of biblical statements.<sup>388</sup> Hagin reports “I

---

<sup>385</sup> “We are not magnifying ourselves when we talk about our inheritance in Christ; we are magnifying God and what He has done for us through the Lord Jesus Christ. We did not make ourselves new creatures ; *God* made us new creatures.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 88, Hagin’s italics. )

<sup>386</sup> More generally, as Charles Farah admits : “Scripture enjoins positive thinking and a positive approach to life.” ( Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 116. )

<sup>387</sup> Thus, Judd Montgomery said the Christian believer would, through being divinely healed, bear the evidence of this ‘healing-in-the-atonement’ within their own bodies. (Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 229, citing Judd Montgomery, ‘Healing in the Atonement,’ *Triumphs of Faith* 22:6 ( June 1902 ), pp. 121-122. Here is an example of what Hagin is talking about : “the healing of a certain 9-year-old boy. Three doctors – two were specialists – had given him up to die. They said “We’ve done all we can...The boy’s kidneys have stopped functioning. It is just a matter of time and he will be gone.” When neither of the child’s parents spoke or showed any sign of emotion, the doctor, thinking they were too shocked to speak, repeated what he had just said and concluded with the statement “Your child will be dead shortly.” “No, doctor,” they said calmly. “He will not die. The Word of God says in Matthew 8: 17, ‘*Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses.*’ Our child will live.” The child was in intensive care. His mother could go in to see him for ten minutes in the morning and his father could see him briefly at night. The father told the boy, “Now, son, if you don’t sleep, quote the Scripture in Matthew 8: 17 all night long and say, ‘Himself took *my* infirmities and bare *my* sicknesses. Himself took my infirmities and bare my sicknesses. Himself took my infirmities and bare my sicknesses. By His stripes I am healed.’ ” After three nights of repeating that, the boy was healed and went home.” ( Hagin, *The Real Faith*, p. 26. )

<sup>388</sup> Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 15. A ‘right positive confession’ is not defined as a *command* in the following sense “...a *command in the name of Jesus* was sufficient for healing ( Acts 3: 6 ), but beginning in the book of Acts, we find prayer to be the church’s general method of healing. Peter prayed for Tabitha in Acts 9: 40. Paul prayed before healing the father of Publius in Acts 28: 8.” ( Blue, *Authority to Heal*, p. 113, my

stopped holding onto the confession of my senses, and I held onto what God's Word said instead.”<sup>389</sup> Christians are instructed to learn scriptures and/or recite them regularly to remind themselves God reportedly wants to meet their needs, comfort, strengthen them, and take away their bondage to worry and fear.<sup>390</sup> To be effective this faith is not to waver.<sup>391</sup> Thus Hagin said “I learned at an early age to take my stand, say, “I believe I receive,” and never move from that position. I hold fast to that confession.”<sup>392</sup> Hagin implies that reiterating one's confession is this not wavering in faith. But Hagin should have emphasised the importance of the bold *steadiness of received faith* that makes this reiteration of one's confession a *natural unforced thing*. That is, it is important to appreciate the subtlety of the inherent ambiguity with this approach *when it is isolated* from the issue of Christian believers actually *first having* faith. This approach is used as a faith-substitute in the form of a *method to obtain faith*, Hagin claiming “our faith will grow...as we maintain that confession.”<sup>393</sup> Therefore it is difficult to tell whether received faith is, *or is not*, involved in any given confession when also “Confession is faith's way of expressing itself...*Faith...grows with your confession.*”<sup>394</sup>

When McConnell found New Thought practitioner Ralph Waldo Trine saying that the healing process must be performed by the operation of life forces within, McConnell concluded that this showed similarities with the views of the Faith theology/WOF.<sup>395</sup> But McConnell here

---

italics ). It could be argued that we do not know whether the ‘prayer’ mentioned in the book of Acts *may have included* the use of the command to be healed as in Acts 3: 6 ( or a proclamation of healing ).

<sup>389</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 69, my underlining.

<sup>390</sup> That is : “Whoever keeps his mouth and his tongue keeps his soul from distresses.” ( Prov.21: 23, Green ) Though one interpretation of this scripture may be ‘keep your mouth shut’ ( as in be “slow to speak,” James 1: 19 ), the WOF would posit another layer of truth here as this being an instruction to be attentive about the words that come out of one's mouth. Thus also it is reported “A fool's mouth is his destruction, and his lips are a snare of his soul.” ( Prov.18: 7, Green ) ; “A man's belly shall be satisfied with the fruit of his mouth ; he shall be satisfied with the produce of his lips.” ( Prov.18: 20, Green ) ; “Death and life are in the power of the tongue, and those who love it shall eat its fruit.” ( Prov.18: 21, Green ) ; God is reported as saying “I create the fruit of the lips.” ( Is. 57: 19, Green ).

<sup>391</sup> James 1: 6, 7.

<sup>392</sup> Hagin, *The Real Faith*, p. 27, my italics.

<sup>393</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 62.

<sup>394</sup> Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, pp. 22-23 ; Hagin's italics.

<sup>395</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 155, citing Trine, *In Tune With The Infinite*, p. 43 ; it seems odd that McConnell cites page 43 since there appears to be no relevant information on that page. He would have done better simply citing the frontispiece stating Trine's aim that one “*come into the full realization of your own...interior powers...to be able to condition your life in exact accord with what you would have it.*” ( Trine, *In*

misinterprets Hagin; only when Hagin over-stresses the believer's *already having received from God* the measure of faith (in order to have been able to *become* a Christian believer), and *then* saying that *this original* gift of faith is sufficient for the 'job in hand' that Hagin fails to signify applying to God for *further gifts of faith*. But this over-stressing by Hagin of the *Christian's* 'measure of faith' does not constitute McConnell's characterisation of it as an appeal to some innate life-force residing *within all people*. Rather, Hagin is here producing an elementary teaching, teaching 'boot camp,' concerning necessity of the individual having *first* arrived at the place where they have received a gift of faith from God. Whereas Hagin states the necessity of *coming to receive* the gift of faith from God, Trine says that all are already equipped with the building-blocks for their needs, since *all* have thoughts: "thoughts are forces...thought is the force with which we build."<sup>396</sup>

McConnell led us to believe that he is, and ostensibly he is, critiquing Hagin's teaching on faith and confession, but in the event McConnell devotes more room to "Hagin's *disciple*" Fred Price in his chapter '*The Doctrine of Healing*,' so McConnell here fails to adequately

---

*Tune With the Infinite*, frontispiece [ p.3. ], my italics ). These 'own...interior powers,' according to Trine, consist in our ability to use our thoughts to turn on the tap of "divine inflow exactly as we choose." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 23 ). That is, Trine says "*our...thought forces, have...creative power*" ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 25 ) ; again, "Thoughts are forces...For one to govern his thinking...is to determine his life." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 33 ).

McConnell is also inaccurate in characterising WOF teaching on longevity as limiting man's life to one hundred and twenty years. *This characterisation of McConnell's is based on Fred Price's, not Hagin's, teaching.* ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 156, 157. ) The idea of man being limited to one hundred and twenty years is based on an interpretation of the report in Gen. 6: 3 in which God is supposed to have decreed a maximum longevity for man of one hundred and twenty, while others have plausibly interpreted Gen. 6: 3 as God meaning that there were one hundred and twenty years for that estate of man to go until the flood, and noting that later on Abraham is reported to have lived to one hundred and seventy-five years, ( Gen. 25: 7 ) and Isaac, later on still, is reported to have lived to one hundred and eighty years old ( Gen. 35: 28 ).

The later spoken of *usual* span of human life, seventy or eighty years, was reportedly spoken by Moses, a man reputed to have *himself* lived till one hundred and twenty with eyes undimmed ( neither had his "natural force abated" ) before being taken by God ( Ps. 90: 10, Deut. 34: 7 ).

<sup>396</sup> Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, Preface, p. 5. Trine's doctrine corresponds with Paley's idea of the 'watchmaker God' with there being no personal God since for Trine "there is nothing in all the great universe but law...This Spirit of Infinite Life and Power that is behind all is what I call God." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 12 ). Trine contradicts himself, on the same page twelve maintaining that *we are all parts of this one universal spirit* of infinite life and power "all is from Him and in Him, and there is nothing that is outside [ Him ]," but then claiming "we are individualized *spirits*." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 12. ) Trine cuts out humankind's reported need for Jesus Christ, instead proposing "Conscious unity of man in spirit and purpose with the Father." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 40. ) But, in tension with this claimed 'purpose with the Father,' Trine says that concerning our "voice of intuition...just how and from what source these inspirations come he does not fully know...but...they come." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, pp. 107, 129. ) Trine teaches : "Send out your thought, - thought is a force, and it has occult power of unknown proportions." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, pp. 178-179. )

critique *Hagin's* teaching.<sup>397</sup>

Hagin's use of 'wrong' and 'right' confession may constitute an attempt by Hagin at distancing himself from Christian Scientists metaphysicians on the one hand, and New Thought metaphysicians on the other, who use(d) the term 'positive confession' to mean, respectively, 'denying the delusion that sickness exists,' and 'releasing the latent power within your mind.' Hagin defines the differentiation: "Over in the realm of Christian Science and the science religions, *they use some of the same scriptures we use, and they make confessions.* However, they make their confessions based upon their own will and their own ability to make their confessions work. *They think that their mind is God...Theirs is a mental confession.*"<sup>398</sup>

An example of this 'mental confession,' confession *not* based on Christ's reported provision in the atonement is "Today, I realize my true perfection in my God-nature. I affirm truth and goodness are mine always. I now visualize divine abundance as my true heritage. No evil or lack shall come my way. Health, joy, and peace are mine forever."<sup>399</sup>

An explanation of such 'mental confession' is given when Ralph Waldo Trine teaches: "The spoken word is...the means whereby the thought forces are focused and directed upon any particular line; and this concentration, this giving them direction, is necessary before any outward or material manifestation of their power can become evident."<sup>400</sup> Here Trine uses the word 'manifestation' much-used previously, and being used contemporaneously when

---

<sup>397</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 151 ( my italics ), and see pp. 147-168. McConnell uses a story of Fred Price's to "deduce that the real issue of healing is *one's ability to endure physical pain*" ( my italics ). McConnell thus ignores not only testimony of Christians who maintain that symptoms ( whether painful or not painful ) do disappear, but also ignores testimony of those Christians who have not had a re-occurrence of symptoms, or if they have had a re-occurrence of symptoms then they have quickly 'chased them away' with faith, and still been in a healed state regarding that healing many years later after being healed.

<sup>398</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 130, my italics. It seems that such 'mental confession' is akin to the expression 'mental assent' seemingly coined by John Wesley, and referred to by Hagin. Thus "Talkers of the Word *mentally assent* that the Word of God is true. But the Word doesn't do them any good or profit them because they are not making the blessings and the benefits of God's Word their own by faith. Faith receives the promised blessing ! Faith appropriates what God has already promised in His Word." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 132, my italics. )

<sup>399</sup> Ankerberg & Weldon, *Mind Sciences*, p. 16.

<sup>400</sup> Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 25. Again : "If we desire one thing and expect another, we become like houses divided against themselves...Determine resolutely to expect only what you desire, then you will attract only what you wish for...what corresponds to your own dominant quality of thought." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 35. )

Trine wrote, by Judd Montgomery and others in the Divine Healing Movement. Trine, rather than teaching the teaching of the Divine Healing Movement/Hagin that God-given gifts of faith are manifested to those in the act of becoming Christian believers, or are manifested to established Christian believers, teaches instead that *thought forces are manifested*. For Trine, faith does not consist in what is reported of in biblical scripture – a God-given gift for God’s purposes. In contradistinction, for Trine “Faith is nothing more nor less than the operation of the *thought forces* in the form of an earnest desire, coupled with expectation as to its fulfillment.”<sup>401</sup> It appears this Trine formulation of ‘faith’ is an ersatz faith built on a foundation of what may originate as earnest desire stiffened up into a foundation of ‘positive thinking.’<sup>402</sup> Trine hereby produces a Christless, and Trine claims it to be Buddhist, ‘confession:’

“I now open my body, in which disease has gotten a foothold, I open it fully to the inflowing tide of this Infinite Life, and it now, even now, is pouring in and coursing through my body, and the healing process is going on.”<sup>403</sup>

In spite of Hagin’s general teaching, Hagin *occasionally* slips into referring failure to make a positive confession as ‘negative’ (rather than ‘wrong’) confession, contradicting his defining ‘negative’ confession as comprising confession of sin.<sup>404</sup> Furthermore, Hagin speaks

---

<sup>401</sup> Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 35, Trine teaching that “ideas have occult power...Faith, absolute dogmatic faith, is the only law of true success...This is to come into fullness of peace, power, and plenty. This is to be in tune with the Infinite.” ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, pp. 181, 184, 222. )

<sup>402</sup> Thus : “Can’t help it !...Don’t say that you can’t help it. If you think you can’t, the chances are that you can’t. If you think you can, and act in accordance with this thought, then not only are the chances that you can, but if you act fully in accordance with it, that you can and that you will is an absolute certainty. It was Virgil who in describing the crew which in his mind would win the race, said of them, - They can because they think they can.” ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 146. )

<sup>403</sup> Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 58 ; and “It was the inspired one, Gautama, the Buddha, who said, - ‘The mind is everything ; what you think you become.’ ” ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 78. ) For Trine, Christ is one in a range of saviours, Trine’s rating of Christ being “he has become probably the world’s greatest saviour.” ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 169. )

<sup>404</sup> For example, towards the end of *Bible Faith Study Course* Hagin lapses : “The reason so many are defeated is that they have a *negative* confession. They talk of their *weaknesses* and failures...” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 116, my italics. ) But Hagin does not seem to be consistent through his avowal of the importance of confession ; for, it could be argued Hagin’s teaching derives from *lack of faith in God’s promises* when Hagin teaches, specifically, one needs to go around ‘confessing *wealth* [ in order ] to possess.’ That is because God has *already* said that He will meet my needs as a faithful believer. So, instead of Hagin teaching the believer should confess aloud a personalisation of Phil. 4: 19 : “My God shall supply all my needs according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus” Hagin insists the believer *claim* what s/he thinks s/he needs financially. ( It could be argued that surely *God knows* how much, and what, we need and according to the report of Phil. 4: 19 God *will* supply that need - not according to that need but - according to his reported riches in glory by Christ Jesus ! ) See especially Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 71.

elsewhere of ‘three kinds of confession,’ in reference to the Christian confessing: 1) the Lordship of Christ, 2) sin, 3) faith in the Word, Christ, and God the Father. These ‘three kinds of confession’ do not detract from Hagin’s teaching on confession. Instead, they are the road Hagin teaches the unbeliever needs to take to become a Christian believer as a prerequisite for each Christian believer then being able to exercise their faith/‘turn his faith loose.’<sup>405</sup> Hagin teaches that the only effective confessions are “the confessions of a believer’s lips *that have grown out of faith in his heart.*”<sup>406</sup> So: “if a believer does not believe in his heart the confessions his lips are making, these confessions will not work.”<sup>407</sup> Hagin fails to stress God’s grace as an underpinning, rather Hagin claims faith is the believer’s underpinning. Having said this, one reason those taught by Hagin may think they are not receiving their expectations (though the reason may be they are not complying with Jesus’ reported gospel), is they have been taught to keep confessing until eventually they experience victory through some symbiosis between confession of scripture and receiving of faith. In this, Hagin displays an overly-narrow teaching on ‘doing the works of God’ by equating “doing the Word” with ‘confessing the Word,’ failing to cite any expansive teaching on ‘doing the Word.’<sup>408</sup> Hagin said when people asked him

“can you tell me why I can’t get healed?...I always say, “Yes, I surely can.” I respond “It’s because you just said you can’t...and as long as you say you can’t and believe you can’t, you can’t...just as soon as you start believing you can receive from God and you believe you receive whatever it is you need, you will get your answer.”<sup>409</sup>

Such advice may help *some* to subsequently receive healing, as Hagin claims. However, if someone asked Hagin ‘why have I not had the manifestation of my healing I claimed?’ Hagin cannot gainsay this since it claims one believes one has been healed, but that that

---

<sup>405</sup> Chapter one of *How To Turn Your Faith Loose* is titled ‘Three Kinds of Confession.’ ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *How To Turn Your Faith Loose*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, Inc., 1993 ] )

<sup>406</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 52, my italics.

<sup>407</sup> Hagin, *Right and Wrong Thinking*, p. 52.

<sup>408</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 83. Thus the expression ‘keep on keepin’ on.’ On the same lines : “In Christ you have redemption through His blood, and you can overcome the devil in every single combat, no matter what the test or trial is.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 86 ).

<sup>409</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 26. Hagin says “If you can’t understand faith yet, you just keep reading these lessons and studying God’s Word. As you do, eventually your mind will be renewed with the Word and the light will come to you.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 39 ).

healing has not yet been manifested (not been made obvious). Hagin's answer would be to refer the believer to his list of 'blockages to faith.'<sup>410</sup> But because of the restricted nature of Hagin's version of the gospel of Jesus Hagin has a correspondingly scant list of possible 'blockages.'<sup>411</sup> Although Hagin quotes James 5: 16 "Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another, THAT YE MAY BE HEALED..." (Hagin's capitals) he fails to admit that one fault, or series of faults, could be failure(s) to adhere to the gospel of Jesus as disciples of Jesus *in regularly helping the poor*; Hagin's 'Full Gospel' is *not* full.<sup>412</sup> Although McConnell claims Faith teaching says a believer will definitely get sick by uttering a negative confession,<sup>413</sup> Hagin only teaches that it is *habitual* disagreement with what God is reported as saying, that would make the believer *likely* to suffer sickness.<sup>414</sup> Hagin offers sick believers the hope that they can look to the provisions of the atonement and start to agree with God's reported utterances: start making their own 'right positive confession.' Also "It takes those people awhile to renew their minds with the Word of God so they will have actions that correspond with their confession of faith."<sup>415</sup>

---

<sup>410</sup> Hagin is best known for talking of 'blockages to faith' but note chapter 17, 'Six Big *Hindrances* to Faith,' in Hagin's *Bible Faith*, my italics. Smith Wigglesworth's own talk of 'blockages' to faith is reported as his maintaining that "If there is anything in the heart which savors of condemnation, you cannot pray the prayer of faith." ( Hibbert, *Smith Wigglesworth*, p. 27 ). This seems Wigglesworth's reiteration of 1 John 3: 21 : "...if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God."

Hagin says "...there are folks who come for prayer for the same things again and again and again. Those folks who are prayed for again and again and do not get their healing, do not have faith in the Word." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 53 ). While it may seem axiomatic for Hagin to say this, because 'confessed/worked out faith' always works, it does not excuse Hagin's stinting in producing a stunted list of 'blockages to faith.' This is concomitant to teaching a *limited* gospel comprising the teaching of healing evangelism alone. Again, Hagin is able to classify some people as 'not wanting help ;' "...it is amazing how little the Word means to some people. We can help folks who want to be helped. But we can't do anything for those who don't want to be helped. If you beat people over the head with the truth, so to speak, that still does not help them if they don't want to be helped." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 76 ).

<sup>411</sup> Hagin, in addition to providing a short list of 'blockages of faith,' mentions that the believer can resort to praying in tongues and then interpreting those tongues in order to find out 'what is going on' in terms of there being blockages preventing prayer being answered : "When you interpret what you are praying in tongues, you will know in your own language what you prayed for. *This gift belongs to every Spirit-filled believer*, because Paul plainly stated, "...let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue pray that he may interpret" ( 1 Cor. 14: 13 )." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 105, Hagin's italics ).

<sup>412</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 57. But Hagin proclaims his version of the 'Full Gospel' is superior to other versions of the 'Full Gospel' he has encountered : "For years I preached healing in Full Gospel churches and the very pastor I would be preaching for would criticize me. Pastors would tell me, 'Healing is not important.' " ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *Must Christians Suffer ?*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries Inc., 1996 ], p. 23 ).

<sup>413</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 150.

<sup>414</sup> Farah's own description of his experience of 'confession' is : "Oftentimes, I do catch myself in a "negative confession," but *God in His mercy still visits me with good*. Nor is it always true that if I doubt my healing, I always lose it." ( Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 119, my italics. )

### 3.6.2 Preaching the Gospel as a specie of Confession.

Hagin cites consequences of confession (‘manifestations’) occurring directly after the preaching of the gospel ‘confirming the word [gospel] with signs following.’<sup>416</sup> Hagin’s comment is God acted after/at the time of the preaching which is confession of the gospel.<sup>417</sup> Conversely: “People have asked me, ‘Brother Hagin, if healing is ours, why don’t we have it in our church?’ I’ll tell you why: because you don’t *preach* it in your church.”<sup>418</sup> Quoting Rev. 12:11, Hagin starts by quite reasonably equating a Christian’s testimony with their confession; however, by ignoring the rest of that scripture “and they loved not their lives even unto death,” Hagin shrivels the sense of sanctification.<sup>419</sup> Again, Hagin’s teaching on the instruction to the believer “glorify God in your body” is limited to “Could God get any glory out of a body...being deformed or afflicted by the enemy with sickness or diseases? No, certainly not!”<sup>420</sup> Hagin says the crippled man at Lystra needed to get up to act on the faith he received on hearing Paul preach, since faith will not work without outworking in expression/action.<sup>421</sup> As mentioned, Hagin calls such expression/action ‘turning your faith

---

<sup>415</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 132.

<sup>416</sup> “And they went forth, and preached [ the gospel, or the Word ] everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following...” ( Mk. 16: 20 ). Hagin’s comment is : “Notice that the Lord confirmed *the Word*. He didn’t do a thing until they preached *the Word*. *Signs* don’t follow an individual ; they follow *the Word*.” ( Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, p. 19 ; Hagin’s italics ). Hagin refers to Christianity having been called the ‘Great Confession.’ ( Hagin, *How to Turn Your Faith Loose*, p. 12 ).

<sup>417</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 74, 76.

<sup>418</sup> Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 31. And “A preacher said to me years ago, “I’ve discovered something. When I only preached salvation, I had a church full of people who were saved - and they had needed to be saved...But not many had the baptism in the Holy Spirit. I couldn’t figure it out. Then I began to preach the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and they began to get filled with the Spirit...I just kept preaching on it until everybody in the church was baptized in the Holy Spirit...We had not had many people get healed,” the pastor said, “so I just started preaching on healing at least once a week. And the moment I started preaching on it, people started getting healed.” ” ( Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 35 ).

<sup>419</sup> Rev. 12: 11, RSV.

<sup>420</sup> 1 Cor. 6: 20 ; Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 87.

<sup>421</sup> Acts 14: 7-10, Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 26. And “If you want to help someone get healed, if you want to help someone receive the Holy Ghost, or if you want to help someone get an answer to prayer...There are two things that you have to work on : the *believing* part and the *action* part. If you act without faith, nothing will happen – it won’t work. And if you believe without action, nothing will happen – it won’t work. However, when faith and action are combined, than the Word works.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 27 ). Hagin gives an example : “when Israel came into Canaan land and came up against the city of Jericho, God told the Israelites exactly what to do. But in order to enjoy the victory God had promised, they first had to *believe* they received God’s Word to them and act upon it. Their acting upon the Word was their faith in action. They were to march around the walls of Jericho one time a day for six days, and on the seventh day, they were to march around the city seven times... ( Joshua 6: 3-5 )...when they acted on their faith, God’s promise became a reality and those walls came down

loose.’<sup>422</sup> Hagin appeals to the scripture “...with the mouth confession is made unto salvation” (Rom. 10:10) and, the Greek word rendered ‘salvation’ also incorporating divine healing, Hagin says “it is with the *mouth* that confession is made unto healing.”<sup>423</sup> Thus, a measure of faith is dealt to the sinner through hearing the Word, *then* the sinner uses *that* faith (confessing it with their mouth) to be saved.<sup>424</sup> Hagin reminds that with the mouth confession is made *unto*.<sup>425</sup> Hagin says ‘whosoever’ in Mark 11:23 means ‘me’ just as much as the more-often preached ‘whosoever’ in John 3: 16 means ‘me.’<sup>426</sup>

---

( Joshua 6: 20 ).” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 29, Hagin’s italics. ) Again : “The man who was bedfast [ Luke 5: 18-25 ] demonstrated that he had faith because how many bedfast people would let someone take them up on top of a house and let them down through the roof ! We also know that the man who was bedfast had faith because when Jesus said to him, “Rise up,” he wasn’t any better. He was lying there just as helpless as he ever was. Instead of trying to get up, he could have said, “Why, Lord, didn’t you see them carry me in here ? I can’t possibly get up. You’ll have to heal me first.” But, no, when Jesus said, “Rise, take up thy bed and walk,” the man with the palsy began to move, and when he did, healing was the result...because he acted on what Jesus said, he did receive his healing.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 29-30 ).

On speaking in tongues for the first time “When the Holy Ghost gives you utterance, *you* must have faith to act and speak out that utterance. You’re not supposed to keep from yielding to the Holy Ghost. You are supposed to yield to Him!” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 31, Hagin’s italics ).

<sup>422</sup> “Jesus told us how to *turn our faith loose* or how to exercise it. He said to *say with your mouth what you believe in your heart* [ Mark 11:23, 24 ].” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 121, my italics ). And “Faith is governed by our confession. If I say that I have been prayed for and I am *waiting* for God to heal me...I have repudiated my healing. Instead, my confession should be this: “The Word declares that I am healed. Based on God’s Word, I thank the Father for my healing now, not when I *see* my healing. And I praise Him I am healed because according to His Word it is a fact.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 129, Hagin’s italics ). And: “Notice this impotent man in Acts 14: 8. He’s crippled, and he has faith. Paul perceived that the man had faith...Paul also knew he was going to have to get the man to act on the faith that he had. Acts 14: 10 says, “[ Paul ] *Said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked.*” When Paul said, “Stand upright on your feet,” and the man mixed action with his faith, he leaped and walked.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 27, Hagin’s italics ).

<sup>423</sup> Rom. 10: 10. Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 65 ; note Hagin’s italicisation of ‘mouth.’ And “Make the confession that by His stripes you are healed [ 1 Pet. 2: 24 ]. The disease and its symptoms may not leave your body at once, but as you hold fast to your confession, those symptoms will leave ( Heb. 4:14 ). We are to hold fast to our profession or confession because we know that what God has said in His Word, He is able also to perform ( Rom. 4:21 ).” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 129 ).

<sup>424</sup> Rom. 10: 17. Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 120. This is Hagin not stressing *the* measure of faith ( Rom. 12: 3, and note Eph. 4: 7 ) “And after you’re born again, to enjoy the blessings and the benefits of salvation, you must still have faith...Second Corinthians 5:7 says, “*For we walk by faith, not by sight.*” ” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 152-153, Hagin’s italicisation of the scripture ). Again, Rom. 10: 8 says that the word is in your mouth, and that word in your mouth *is* the word of faith. Hagin’s commentary on this is “the word of faith must be in your mouth as well as in your heart for faith to work for you.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 65 ). Hagin reminds that Christianity has been called ‘The Great Confession.’ ( Hagin *Bible Faith*, pp. 66, 126. ) Hagin compares faith to love “Faith, like love, is of the heart or the spirit. And you know...there is no love without word or action.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 76. )

<sup>425</sup> Rom. 10: 10. Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 123, Hagin’s italics. Hagin makes the additional point that not only does confession of faith lead to the object of faith being received, be it salvation or healing or whatever else. Hagin *also* says that where the confession of the Word of God is taking place, and such confession may only be a reading aloud of the Word of God and not necessarily the confession of a state of faith, that faith can *then* come about as a result of that confession : “Faith grows in the atmosphere of the confession of the Word of God.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 126. This is Hagin’s plausible interpretation of Rom. 10: 17, that “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” ).

### **3.7 Hagin on Wealth for Preaching the Gospel.**

Hagin says one good reason for believers to have wealth is: “for it is He [God] who gives to you power to get wealth; that he may establish His covenant...” (Deut. 8:18, Green). That is, Christian believers possessing wealth surplus to their needs should use that wealth to ‘partner’ with God in the New Testament version of this ‘establishing the covenant:’ the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.<sup>427</sup>

Hagin muses over one minister not being able to do much through lacking financial resource.<sup>428</sup> But Hagin’s comment could potentially be denigrating what might have been regarded as excellent Christian ministry, a ministry that might actually have achieved *less* for the kingdom of God with *more* financial resource/wealth, since reportedly “the deceit of riches choke[s] the word, and it becomes unfruitful” (Matt. 13:22, Green). Hagin claims that to preach the gospel we need to walk in prosperity to have the funds: Hagin does *not* point out that preaching can be achieved by people like Jesus and the apostles espousing a lifestyle of “neither poverty nor riches” – it is not necessary to be rich to preach the gospel.<sup>429</sup>

Scripture reports that it was *rich men* who were oppressing and punishing Christians (James 2:6). What Hagin takes from the lives of the Apostles is not their sacrificial lifestyles, but their great preaching and healing campaigns.<sup>430</sup> In my own experience of a third of a century preaching the gospel the large majority of those I encounter(ed) so doing seem to have the lifestyle of “neither poverty nor riches;” that is, even if some had large amounts of money

---

<sup>426</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 123. Hagin suggests that the woman with the issue of blood who was healed had *spoken out loud* when she said “If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole.” (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 141.) Hagin believed it was Job’s imperfect faith that made Job vulnerable to what was a legal visitation by Satan. For McConnell on Job, see McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 161-163.

<sup>427</sup> “In God’s economy, prosperity is the means to an end – world evangelism.” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 69). Hagin says “I believe the purpose of prosperity for a Christian is to do God’s work and God’s will.” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 68). Hagin then equates God’s will with our emulating Jesus in spreading the “gospel of the kingdom,” and cites a little medley of scriptures John 3: 16-17, Matt. 9: 35 and John 14: 12 – “Jesus is our great example. What He did, we should do.” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 68).

<sup>428</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 39.

<sup>429</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 72. Although he does point out the limitations on the *poor* preaching the gospel: “Poverty-stricken people are limited in their ability to fulfil the Great Commission...have difficulty going into all the world and neither can they help send someone else.” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 72).

<sup>430</sup> McCrossan [Hicks and Hagin (eds.)], *Healing and Atonement*, p. 9. Contrast this with Paul saying that Jesus Christ in Paul first was showing forth “all longsuffering, for an example to those being about to believe on Him to everlasting life.” (1 Tim. 1: 16, Green).

flowing to them, they as faithful stewards obeyed/were obeying God's prompts to give it away, the destination of the monies they received was not into their own bank or own other financial instrument – they refuse(d) to allow those monies to hurt them through becoming riches “kept by their owner to his hurt” (Ecc. 5:13, RSV).<sup>431</sup>

### **3.8 Hagin on Symptoms and Abraham.**

McConnell says Faith teaching teaches Christian Science doctrine: “symptoms should be denied because they are not real...Faith theology engages in the same sort of denial of physical symptoms advocated by both New Thought and Christian Science.”<sup>432</sup> But Hagin denies his ‘Faith theology’ is metaphysical, denying both Christian Science and McConnell’s claim: “*We do not deny symptoms because they are real. Of course pain is real; sin is real; and the devil is real. But notice what the Bible said: “Abraham considered *not* his own body” (Rom. 4:19).*”<sup>433</sup> McConnell claims: “The Faith teachers may have...biblical proof-texts to justify the practice of denial, but the source of the practice itself is decidedly cultic.”<sup>434</sup> However, Hagin merely teaches Christian believers to consider Paul’s reported teaching on Abraham’s faith. Hagin points to the apostle Paul as also having been part of the ‘Faith Movement,’ by having being a *previous* ‘faith teacher’ who appeals to biblical proof-texts:<sup>435</sup> Paul reported in what is now known as the New Testament that Abraham’s faith reported in the Old Testament book of Genesis was not staggered by unprepossessing physical circumstances, including Abraham’s own body. Abraham is described in the New Testament as the ‘father of faith,’ so it is obvious Hagin finds him worthy of consideration when the subject of faith is considered, Abraham moreover being reported to have walked with God

---

<sup>431</sup> The word ‘steward’ is no idle word as Jesus is reported as telling His hearers that what humankind possesses does not belong to them, for it is all “another’s” ( Luke 16: 12 ). Jesus is reported as talking about “unrighteous mammon [ wealth ]” in contradistinction to “the true [ wealth ]” God will bestow on stewards counted by God to be faithful. ( Luke 16: 9-12 ). It had already been reported “The earth [ and every particle of wealth in it ] is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof, the world, and those who dwell therein [ all people belong to God as well as all wealth ]” ( Ps. 24: 1, RSV ).

<sup>432</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 151, 153.

<sup>433</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 10, my italicisation of ‘We do not deny symptoms because they are real’ ; Hagin’s italicisation of the ‘not’ in ‘Abraham considered not...;’ it is natural for Hagin to talk of Abraham, the “father of all them that believe.” ( Rom. 4: 11 ).

<sup>434</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 153.

<sup>435</sup> Although note that Paul claims his ordination was not like Hagin’s claimed instruction from God to ‘go teach My people faith,’ but Paul’s ordination was to teach both “faith and verity” ( 1 Tim. 2: 7 ).

(Gen. 48:15). Hagin notes scripture reporting Abraham's faith pleased God/found favour with God, and Hagin suggests the way this occurred was in Abraham *ignoring the 'symptoms'* of Abraham's own aged body: for Abraham "considered not his own body" (Rom. 4:19).<sup>436</sup>

Hagin teaches Abraham is reported as not considering his physical sight or physical feelings, in favour of being "strong in faith...fully persuaded that, what he [God] had promised, he was able also to perform" (Rom. 4:20-21).<sup>437</sup> Hagin teaches the ability of Abraham to then '*call those things which be not as though they were*' comes to believers, like it came to Abraham, from their *first* possessing faith the 'evidence of [those] things not [yet] seen' (Rom. 4:17, Heb. 11:1)<sup>438</sup> Hagin stresses being 'strong in faith' by speaking of incidences of being 'weak in faith:' saying he's seen Christians get healed but not accept it by faith and so they ended up losing that healing.<sup>439</sup> Using Abraham as his exemplar, Hagin warns believers to

---

<sup>436</sup> And, incidentally, it is reported that neither did Abraham consider the 'symptoms' of his wife's aged body.

<sup>437</sup> Hagin gives a testimony to illustrate this: "Even after I was healed, I had some of the most alarming heart symptoms that seemed to return to me...Finally, I said to the Lord, "Lord, I must have some relief." God spoke to me, "Consider not thine own body."...Later...I had some of the same symptoms...I said, "Lord, I'm not considering my own body. What am I going to consider then?" The Lord said, "Consider Him, who is the Author and Finisher of your faith and your High Priest" ( Heb. 3: 1; Heb. 12: 12 )...Immediately I got my mind on Jesus, and I began to consider Him and what He had done for us. The Bible says, "...*Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses*" (Matt. 8: 17) I began to consider that scripture and to focus my mind and attention on Jesus and the Word, and I stopped considering my body with its symptoms. Then I was able to drift off to sleep. When I woke up every symptom had gone." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 10, Hagin's italics ).

<sup>438</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 36 ; my italicisation of 'call.' Hagin was influenced by Smith Wigglesworth, who wrote: "It is a blessed thing to learn that God's word can never fail...God can work mightily when you persist in believing Him in spite of discouragements from the human standpoint...*I am not moved by what I see. I am moved only by what I believe.* No man considers how he feels if he believes. The man who believes God has it." ( Smith Wigglesworth, *Ever Increasing Faith*, [ Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1924 ( 27<sup>th</sup> Printing 1996 ) ], p. 30, my italics of a phrase of Wigglesworth's that Hagin then himself repeatedly used. Hagin quoted this saying of Wigglesworth's in *The Believer's Authority*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library Publications, 1984 ], p. 24. )

<sup>439</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 77. And "Many times miracles have begun but they have not been consummated because the person began to look at circumstances or symptoms. Jesus called that "little faith." " ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 150. ) By 'little faith' Hagin refers to Jesus speaking to Peter when "Peter quit acting in faith on what God had said...(Matt. 14:31)...Looking at the circumstances caused Peter to begin to sink." ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 150, 151. ) The following account is illuminating: "Years ago I prayed for an elderly man who had suffered from rheumatism for many years. After I laid hands on him and prayed, the Lord healed him. About eight months later...I happened to see him...When he started to straighten up, he grabbed his back and could scarcely move. Finally he straightened up and said, 'Oh, my, my, that rheumatism has come back on me.' I said, 'Brother, I thought God had healed you.' He replied, 'Well, I thought He had, too, but I guess He didn't. The day before yesterday, while I was milking the cow, a pain hit me in the hand. Then it went up my arm, into my shoulder, and down my back. Since then, my arm has been stiff...Until then, I hadn't had a symptom or pain since you prayed for me...I asked him how long he had had rheumatism before that and he said, 'Nearly 30 years.' 'At any time during those 30 years was there ever an eight-month period when you didn't have any pain or symptoms?' I asked. 'No,' he said. 'I had to take something every day for the pain...to help me get by a little.' 'Isn't it strange, then,' I said, 'that these symptoms and pains disappeared when hands were laid on you in the Name of Jesus, and for eight months you had no more pain. You see, the Lord really did heal you. I'll tell

beware having confidence by considering the sensory data of *another's* healing: one's confidence should first-and-last be Christian confession: "the Word of God says healing belongs to *me* (Isa. 53:4,5; Matt. 8:17; 1 Peter 2:24)." <sup>440</sup> Hagin teaches that not only is divine healing *through* faith, but it takes faith to *maintain* divine healing. <sup>441</sup> Hagin suggests the way to have faith to maintain divine healing is: substitute looking at one's body with looking at what the Bible teaches about divine healing; Hagin cites Prov. 4:20-22, saying that if this scripture, and other scripture concerning divine healing, does not depart from before one's eyes then one is bound to see oneself well. <sup>442</sup> Hagin teaches a further part of this process is speaking aloud good reports about God. <sup>443</sup> This is not as unendingly frenetic as it might

---

you exactly what happened. The minute the first pain struck your body, you said, 'I thought I was healed, but I guess I'm not,' and you opened the door for the devil to come right back in again.' I talked with him a while, teaching him that if the pain came back he was to resist it because it was of the devil...James 4:7. I prayed for him again, and all of his symptoms left. During the remaining four years that I pastored there, he never had any more rheumatism." (Hagin, *The Real Faith*, pp. 1-2. )

Another account of Hagin's is illuminating :

"[God] said in the service that night when I got ready to pray for the sick, I shouldn't minister to the sick out in the main auditorium...He said I shouldn't even allow the pastor and his wife to come back there unless they were to be prayed for...Then the Lord reminded me about the Scripture in Mark chapter 8 which tells how Jesus took the blind man out of the city to pray for him. And Jesus also reminded me of Mark chapter 7 [ verse 33 "( Jesus ) took him aside from the multitude..." ]. The Lord told me that He took the man aside because there was so much unbelief in the town. He often took the sick aside so He could get them healed...I did what Jesus said, and from the time I began praying for the sick in this way, more of them got healed." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 151-152. ) The result of Hagin's separating the sick to be prayed for was that a very seriously ill young girl Hagin had unsuccessfully prayed for before was *now* healed : "The mother had taken the child back to the hospital and she had been checked by doctors. They said they had really seen a miracle. Her heart was perfect and she was walking." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 152. ) As Hagin the healing evangelist said concerning this "It's hard to pray for the sick and do what the Lord says when the pastor sitting on the platform with you is breathing the hot breath of unbelief down your collar !" (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 152. )

<sup>440</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 9, my italics.

<sup>441</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 153. Hagin claims the support of P. C. Nelson ( founder of Southwestern Bible Institute ) who "said that more people lose their healing over a counterattack than any other one reason... [ that is ] the devil is going to come back against you with symptoms to make you think you didn't get your healing in the first place." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 153 ).

<sup>442</sup> "My son, attend unto my words; incline thine ears unto my sayings. Let them not depart from before thine eyes ; keep them in the midst of thine heart. For they [my words] are life unto those that find them, and health to all their flesh."

<sup>443</sup> Thus: "Say, "The Lord is my Helper" (Heb. 13: 6). Is He ? Then *say that He is*. Say, "The Lord is my Healer." Say, "Jesus took my infirmities, and bore my sicknesses" (Matt. 8: 17). Didn't He ? Then keep talking about God's delivering power. *Say* the right things and believe the right things." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 12 ; my italicisation of 'say' four times, the other italicisation of 'say' is Hagin's. ) Conversely "there are so many believers who are *talking* doubt and unbelief, and who are taking sides against the Word of God. Then these same believers wonder why God's Word doesn't work for them." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 23, my italics. ) And Hagin spends some effort on the subject of 'doubt and unbelief,' quoting Matt. 13 :58 – Jesus' ministry being hampered by unbelief ; Matt. 14: 31 – Jesus criticising Peter for doubting ; Mark 4: 40 – Jesus criticising His disciples for being fearful and not having faith ; Mark 11: 23 – Jesus mentioning not doubting in one's heart as a condition for having "whatsoever he saith." : "...doubt caused people to receive something less than the best God had for them...the Lord rebuked them for their doubt and unbelief." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 149. ) Using the report of the twelve spies ( Numbers 13-14 ) Hagin equates the 'evil report' of the ten spies ( the majority

sound for, the process described in this early chapter of *Bible Faith Study Course* is a ‘*faith-building*’ exercise. Somewhat reminiscent of Charles Atlas’s body-building tips, Hagin describes himself as having *already* built up his faith, and that he now just *maintains* his faith in the promises of God: “I just simply quietly rest on the Word, for the Word says, “*For we which have believed do enter into rest...*”<sup>444</sup> This Hagin ‘rest on the Word’ involves Christian believers having taken on a way of *speaking* whereby nothing they say contradicts what God is reported as saying concerning what they are believing about in the ‘Word,’ and that if they *do* inadvertently say something that contradicts God’s reported utterances, they quickly repent of this sin of ‘wrong talking,’ adjusting their speech accordingly. Hagin’s rider to all this is that if one does *not* see oneself well, that is because scripture concerning divine healing has departed from before one’s eyes.<sup>445</sup>

In Hagin’s teaching all sickness emanates from the Devil, and the believer is only sick because they lack faith.<sup>446</sup> Hagin’s and Judd Montgomery’s doctrine all sickness emanates from the Devil is *not* what the scripture of the Bible teaches; if *sin as the origin of a sickness* can be discerned by a believer, then *God’s hand in sickness* can also be discerned in that case.<sup>447</sup> Since a system of punishing sin by infirmity was reportedly instituted by God, sickness as the punishment of sin is indeed ‘the hand of God,’ not the hand

---

report ) with unbelief, and the ‘good report’ of the two spies with faith. ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 155. ) God is reported to have said to those who made and affirmed the ‘evil report’ : “As ye have spoken in mine ears, so will I do to you.” ( Numbers 14: 28 ) and, as Hagin points out, the two spies with the ‘good report’ ( who said they were well able to possess the Promised Land ) also got what they said. ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 156. )

<sup>444</sup> Heb. 4: 3. Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 12. Again “Quietly rest on the Word regardless of natural evidence that would satisfy the physical senses. *Real faith is built on the Word !* We should meditate in the Word and dig deeply into it and feed upon it. Then the Word will become a part of us just as natural food becomes a part of us.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 12-13, Hagin’s italics in both quotes ).

<sup>445</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 11.

<sup>446</sup> Note the contrast : “The Elizabethan Prayer Book required the clergy when visiting a sick parishioner to begin by reminding him that whatever form the sickness might take he must realize that it was God’s visitation.” ( Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, p. 98 ). Perhaps the WOF were reacting to this old unnuanced position ( by which also it could be argued that all forms of evil, such as rape and murder, are God’s visitation ), by propagating their own opposite unnuanced position with a great deal of Arminian emphasis on the freewill of the believer. Calvin had stressed that if the Almighty had marked out the moment of a man’s death then no medicine could avert it. ( Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, p. 99, citing Calvin, Institutes, I.xvii.3. )

<sup>447</sup> Thomas, *Devil*, p. 314. For Hagin, any instance of seemingly unwarranted sickness may be attributable to ‘affliction’ that may actually be a test of one’s faith, to prove the effectiveness of one’s faith in the same way one proves a new gun by firing it. Or, according to Hagin, as in the case of Job, the affliction may be the result of having a faulty faith where Job ‘attracted’ affliction to him by not resting in God’s blessing – Job said “the thing that I greatly feared [destruction] is come upon me,” also saying “though I had no rest, [yet] trouble came.” Job, a righteous man, thus had chinks in his faith-armour allowing his destruction to come on him.

of the Devil. The finding Hagin ascribes sickness to the Devil is yet more evidence that Hagin's teaching is not metaphysical. For, as the findings have shown, metaphysicals do not teach that the Devil exists, teaching instead: all is God, that God is good and so all is good and so all that does not *seem* good is the result of illusion.<sup>448</sup> Hagin has repeatedly been found *not* to be a Mind-Cure metaphysical in his teaching.

### 3.8.1 Symptoms signs of what proves unrestrained sickness.

Hagin claims never to have been able to receive healing without first believing he had received his healing. In being aware of needing healing, then believing, Hagin speaks of symptoms of sickness making mental assault – telling him he is not healed after he believed he is.<sup>449</sup> Hagin responds to his flesh “The Bible says, ‘...let God be true, but every man a liar.’ So if you say I’m not healed, you are a liar because God’s word says I am!”<sup>450</sup> There is a need for nuance but Hagin does not admit it; Hagin does not discuss Christian believers combating ‘symptoms’ while *not* having been recipients of faith but instead labouring under misapprehension/presumption/delusion through strong *mental assent* to scriptures concerning divine healing. Such mental assent may be buttressed by the believer having *genuinely* had faith for divine healing on previous occasions.<sup>451</sup> In the present case, the believer mistakenly thinks they are ‘refusing to agree with symptoms,’ whereas they have not received faith for divine healing; they are not dealing with mere *symptoms* but with *unrestrained* sickness itself.

---

<sup>448</sup> Hence the summary being made that “the Mind Sciences [ Mind-Cure ] universally reject the idea of a personal devil” ( Ankerberg & Weldon, *Mind Sciences*, p. 34. )

<sup>449</sup> Regarding symptoms : “I remembered reading in James where it says, “...count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations” (James 1:2). I knew that “temptation” here meant *tests* or *trials*. So I started counting it all joy when I would go through a test or a trial, when symptoms would try to attack my body. I would start praising God with all diligence and fervor, and sometimes as I was doing this, all the symptoms would leave my body.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 125 ).

<sup>450</sup> Rom. 3: 4, in Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 9.

<sup>451</sup> Or, it may be it was unappreciated by one supposedly having ‘exercised faith’ that it had *not* been their faith in operation, but someone else’s faith in terms of what has been called at evangelistic meetings ‘mass faith.’ Thereby, over-reliance on this experience of supposedly themselves having ‘exercised faith’ came into being so that the person was later supposedly ‘exercising faith’ to be divinely healed, but was not divinely healed.

### **3.9 Hagin's 'Blockages to Faith'.**

Hagin declares the “good fight of faith” (1 Tim. 6:12) should not be conceived in the context in which it most obviously occurs, but seemingly *only* in the context of Hagin's teaching. Thus, Hagin's ‘good fight of faith’ and his ‘blockages to faith’ ignores the fighting of faith/blockages to faith in 1 Timothy 6, particularly verses 6-10. Similarly, Hagin ignores the substance of Paul's ‘pressing toward the mark for the prize’ (Phil. 3:7-19).<sup>452</sup> Hagin's rather stunted list of ‘blockages to faith’ comprises six ‘lacks of understanding:’ 1) Regarding the New Creation, 2) Concerning Our Place in Christ, 3) Regarding Our Righteousness, 4) Regarding Our Right To Use the Name of Jesus, 5) About Acting on the Word, 6) About Holding Fast to Our Confession of Faith.<sup>453</sup> As far as Kenyon was concerned, Kenyon added a caveat/‘get-out clause’ referring to the state of Christian believers following their having made a prayer of faith for divine healing: “The only problem now [to ensure divine healing actually happens] is to get in perfect harmony with His Word.”<sup>454</sup> Hagin's *The Midas Touch* (2000) provides no new helpful teaching material, only reiterating earlier teaching. Neither does Hagin nuance his teaching with the issue of discovering the sin and iniquity of one's forebears which may be affecting one: Hagin does not talk of renouncing the sin and iniquity of one's forebears but only of asking forgiveness for one's *own* sin “God doesn't hold your sin against you after you have asked for forgiveness. God forgives, forgets, and He cleanses us from all unrighteousness by the blood of Jesus (1 John 1:9). Now the devil doesn't have any right to dominate you.”<sup>455</sup> Hagin's theology is a restricted picture of

---

<sup>452</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 111. And Heb. 13: 5 : “Let your conversation be without covetousness ; and be content with such things as ye have : for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.” However, it seems that a more obviously fitting translation of Heb. 13: 5a is “The way of life is without money-loving, being satisfied with present things...”

<sup>453</sup> See Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 111-117. In addition to Hagin's list of ‘blockages’ it also seems apparent from Hagin's teaching that Hagin could add a further blockage comprising someone not healed having only ‘mental assent.’

<sup>454</sup> Kenyon and Gossett, *Power of Your Words*, p. 118.

<sup>455</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 89.

scripture's notion of what it is to have undergone spiritual development.<sup>456</sup> It might be pointed out Hagin's scant teaching on 'spiritual maturity' means it remains a 'mysterious subject,' that since Christ reportedly taught His disciples that mysteries would be made *plain* to them, Hagin shows himself *not* to be a mature disciple of Christ through not having received revelation on spiritual maturity (Matt. 13:11). Although Hagin does mention getting/being connected to the Vine [Christ], Hagin fails to point out that reportedly it is by *obeying Christ's commandments* one abides in the Vine, and Christ's words abide in one (John 15:1-10; Matt. 7:13-28). Rather, Hagin substitutes his own version of what it is to be 'abiding in the Vine;' Hagin implies if a born-again, Holy-Ghost-filled believer does not exercise sufficient faith then the Spirit of Christ will not make His *permanent* home in that believer's heart: "Paul...wrote, "May Christ through your faith [actually] dwell...in your hearts!..." That's what folks haven't allowed Him to do...make His permanent home in our hearts. How does He do that? Through our faith!"<sup>457</sup> That is, according to Hagin the Christian believer will not experience the present reality of the Holy Spirit within their life unless the Christian believer operates at some level of faith taught by Hagin, which level of faith however is somewhat nebulous because unspecified, other than being taught by Hagin to consist in the acquisition of prosperity that includes divine healing. This teaching of Hagin is *not* the teaching of Jesus on abiding in Him as reported in the gospels, nor does Hagin properly refer to Jesus' teaching (John 15:1-10, Matt. 7:13-28). Hagin gives *only* passing reference to Paul's commandment believers present their bodies "a living sacrifice...to God" (Rom. 12:1-2, RSV). Again, Christ's reported commandment "be doers of the word, and not

---

<sup>456</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 92.

<sup>457</sup> While commenting on Eph. 3: 16-17 ; Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 102. Hagin derived the word 'permanent' from the translation in *The Amplified Bible*.

hearers only...” is taught by Hagin solely in terms of exercising faith: “Being doers of the Word means that we *act on the Word*.”<sup>458</sup>

### **3.10 Scripture in Tension with Hagin’s Expressing Faith/Power of Confession.**

A good example of limitation that should be made on belief that talking about/‘confessing’ bad experiences leads to God’s displeasure, therefore to God not sending good experiences is: “If I said, My foot slides, O Jehovah, Your mercy has held me up” (Ps. 94:18, Green). Here it is reported someone *says/confesses* their foot is sliding yet *don’t* ‘get what they say’ in negative outcome to their ‘negative confession.’ Instead, God’s mercy holding them up, so it does not matter if their foot continues to go on sliding and they continue ‘negatively confessing’ the fact (or not): God’s mercy upholds. Jacob is reported as saying: “They shall gather themselves together, and slay me ; and I shall be destroyed and my house,” which manifestly did not occur (Gen. 34:30b, Green). Again it is reported God *did* move on the Christian believer’s behalf when they were *not* ‘acting on the Word’ and when they were His enemies (Rom. 5:6,8,10). Other reports: Jesus raised the widow’s son, the young girl, and Lazarus, from the dead *without their first ‘acting on the Word.’* James B. Shelton makes the point that reportedly neither did Jesus’s disciples berate Jesus for uttering a ‘negative confession’ when Jesus told them Lazarus was dead (John 11:14), neither did Jesus’s reported ‘negative words’ about Lazarus being dead prevent Jesus raising Lazarus from the dead.<sup>459</sup> Shelton also mentions that reportedly when Jesus’ disciple Peter *did* rebuke Jesus for Jesus’ ‘negative word’ about Jesus travelling to Jerusalem to die then Jesus is reported in turn as retorting to Peter “Get behind me , Satan!...” (Matt. 16:22, NIV).<sup>460</sup> When Peter reportedly ‘negatively confessed’ to Jesus the failure of his night fishing, moments later he had two boats filled with fish; the disciples’ reportedly made ‘negative confession’ to Jesus that their resources were inadequate to feed the thousands outside Bethsaida yet everyone was

---

<sup>458</sup> James 1: 22, RSV. Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 125, italics in both quotes is Hagin’s. See also p. 135, where Hagin quotes the same scripture, in the context that *not worrying is doing the Word* ( note Matt. 6: 34, Phil. 4: 6, and 1 Pet. 5: 7 ), and that this ‘not worrying’ means that one’s faith is not impeded.

<sup>459</sup> James B. Shelton, ‘A Pendulum Swing Between Prosperity and Suffering,’ in Synan, *Spirit-Empowered Christianity*, p. 363.

<sup>460</sup> James B. Shelton, ‘Pendulum,’ in Synan, *Spirit-Empowered Christianity*, p. 363.

filled leaving twelve baskets of leftover food (Luke 5:4-9,Luke 9:10-17).<sup>461</sup> Mary reportedly ‘negatively confessed’ to Jesus that there was no wine and the result of this confession of lack was provision of approximately one hundred and fifty gallons of high-quality wine (John 2:1-11).<sup>462</sup>

I mentioned earlier the report of the Lord sending His rain/His sun on the righteous *and also on the unrighteous*. But Hagin’s strong healing evangelist bent implies the believer not ‘exercising faith’ is bereft of God’s blessings: “If you don’t accept the Word and believe and confess it, God doesn’t have anything to make good in your life...if you don’t act upon His Word, then *He doesn’t have anything to make good in your life.*”<sup>463</sup> Hagin’s overwhelming stress on ‘confession’ leads him to make the ludicrous contradiction of the corpus of scripture: “To tell you the real truth about it, what I confess, I possess. *And that is all I will ever possess.*”<sup>464</sup> This abnegates the scripture relating to us that the grace of God *has* moved towards us, and surely is capable of moving again towards us, even while we are at odds with God (Rom. 5:8). I touch again on God’s reported sending of His blessing of the sun on both the evil and the good and His blessing of rain on both the just and the unjust (Matt. 5:45). Paul ‘negatively confessed’ that Satan had hindered him (1 Thess. 2:18); Paul also ‘negatively confessed’ being a fool, weak, despised, hungry, naked, and reviled (1 Cor. 4:10-13).<sup>465</sup> Paul, the teacher of the principles of faith that Hagin teaches, ‘negatively confessed’ the *decay* of our “outward man” in contrast to the *renewal* of our “inward man” (2 Cor. 4:16, Green). Also ‘positive confession’ by businesspeople is

---

<sup>461</sup> Kinnebrew, *Positive Confession*, p. 98.

<sup>462</sup> Kinnebrew, *Positive Confession*, p. 99.

<sup>463</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 132, my italics.

<sup>464</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 126, my italics.

<sup>465</sup> Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 128. Farah asks the rhetorical question “Who then is correct ? This suffering, despised servant of the Lord Jesus, or the “faith people” who categorically renounce such confessions as wrong believing and negative ?” Paul is reported as making this further ‘negative confession:’ “Who now rejoice in my sufferings for *you*, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his *body’s sake*, which is the church” ( Col. 1:24 ) Also, under the strictures of what a negative confession is said to be, Jesus Himself could be accused of making negative confessions. For, Jesus referred to His impending death, and of how He had come to give his life a ransom for many ( Matt. 20:28 ), He promised tribulation to His followers ( John 16:33 ), and revilings and persecution ( Matt. 5:11 ) and spoke of the coming death of one of His disciples ( John 21: 18-19 ). But no one would attribute to Jesus a causative effect for all these terrible experiences to come, through Jesus’s having made ‘negative confessions.’ ( see Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, pp. 129, 130, 130-131 ).

denounced: “Come now, those saying, Today or tomorrow we will go into this city, and we will spend one year there, and we will trade and will make a profit...*Instead of you saying, If the Lord wills, even we will live, and we will do this or that*” (James 4:13-15, Green).

Similarly, another ‘positive confession’ is denounced, of those in the Laodicean church ‘confessing:’ “I am rich, and I am made rich, and I have need of nothing” when reportedly those saying it are, as far as God is concerned, “wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked” (Rev. 3:17, Green).<sup>466</sup>

Again, Hagin fails to make much of scripture reporting that asking, purportedly with faith, from one’s “lusts” means one will “receive not” (James 4:3), although Hagin claims in *Midas Touch* that he decries some excesses found within the WOF.<sup>467</sup> God is reported as declaring there is a discrepancy in the lawless (those to whom God is reported saying “you hate instruction, and toss My words behind you”) *even making mention of God’s laws, let alone obeying them* (Ps. 50:16-17, Green). Jesus is reported as telling us not to “use vain repetition [of words]” when we pray (Matt. 6:7, Green).<sup>468</sup> Hagin and the WOF talk of negative words (words disagreeing with what God is reported as saying He will do) as ‘idle

---

<sup>466</sup> It seems that the Laodiceans are reportedly not lacking in wealth – that is, they are not making a ‘positive confession’ with a view of *obtaining* wealth. Rather, they should be using their wealth to ‘trade’ with God, as it is reported that they have something to trade so as to be able to “buy of me Gold” ( Rev. 3: 18 ).

<sup>467</sup> That is: “Ye ask, and receive not, because *ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts.*” My italics. Sometimes, this may only be an issue of spiritual immaturity in relatively ‘new’ believers: that when we are ignorant we ask God for the wrong things ; later on, we ask God to forgive us for having earlier asked Him for these wrong things. That is, in addition to charlatans ( false brethren/false shepherds ) asking on their lusts, immature believers may also be inclined to do this.

<sup>468</sup> The word translated as “use vain repetition [ of words ]” is Strong’s word 945 ; Thayer’s Lexicon concludes its discussion of the classical origins of the word to discuss the context of the word here as being “to repeat the same things over and over, to use many idle words, to babble, prate ; so Mt. vi. 7...” ( Joseph H. Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, [ Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1999 ], p. 99. ) This does not seem to be referring to ‘prevailing prayer.’

And, in the Hebrew language the word *Dabhar*, translated as ‘word,’ *implies deeds and actions, not just words.* ( Matthew Fox, *Original Blessing, A Primer in Creation Spirituality*, [ Santa Fe, New Mexico : Bear and Company Inc., 1983 ], p. 39 ).

Fox should *also* have pointed out that the Hebrew word translated ‘said’ as in “and God said, let..[ exist ]” is *amar*. *Amar* is the word translated ‘said’ from the beginning of Genesis right up to Genesis 17: 23, and is the most commonly occurring word in the Hebrew Old Testament translated ‘said.’ Strong’s own comment about the word is, just as Fox said of *dabhar*, it is *also* “used with great latitude,” and among the meanings he ascribes to it are ‘appoint,’ ‘avouch,’ ‘certify,’ ‘publish,’ ‘report,’ and ‘tell.’ ( Strong, James, *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*, [ Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, no date of publication ], pp. 857-865, and in *Hebrew and Chaldean Dictionary*, p. 14. ) This implicitly criticises the WOF for over-concentrating on speaking aloud ‘word[s],’ straying from appreciation that ‘word’ implies *performing actions*, not just speaking aloud.

words,' words on which faith cannot be manifested (cannot be 'operated on'). But for someone to continually use 'positive words' (those agreeing with what God is reported as saying He will do), when their lives are continually *discordant* with these words, *is* also an instance of 'idle words' because their continual disobedience qualifies them for inclusion among those who "shall not find" God, though they now "seek me early" (Prov. 1:28, Green). Although Hagin claims he could tell story after story of how the Word worked, not *all* such successes should be ascribed to the working of faith, but to God's reported grace/kindness working in a different way, with unbelief being helped (Mark 9:24).<sup>469</sup> But also, God can reportedly give people the answer to their prayers, yet, if their request is *disgusting* to God He may at the same time 'send wasting into their soul,' or just destroy them on the spot (Ps. 106:15, Green; Num. 11:33).<sup>470</sup> God reportedly *promises to send diseases* on those who hate His faithful followers (Deut. 7:15).

### **3.11 God's Use of Sickness and Death and Utter Alienation.**<sup>471</sup>

Reportedly, affliction which may take the form of sickness, even death, can be instructive:

"When he killed them, *then they sought Him*" (Ps. 78:34, Green); "Before I was afflicted [made sick?] I went astray; but *now I have kept Your word*" (Ps. 119:67, Green, my italics);

<sup>472</sup> "For my good I was afflicted [made sick?], *to learn Your statutes*" (Ps. 119:71, Green); "I know, O Jehovah, Your judgments are right, and *in fidelity You afflicted me* [made me sick?]"

---

<sup>469</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 39.

<sup>470</sup> Sometimes God is reported to 'pick an argument' with those who have previously grievously offended Him (Jud. 14:4 ; Amos 1,2 ; 2 Sam. 22: 28, 42. )

<sup>471</sup> Although sicknesses are believed to occur through "natural causes," these causes are believed to derive from being in a "fallen world." It could be argued the writers of the New Testament do not mention infirmity being the result of living in a fallen world simply because this was already regarded as overarching truth, a truth under which - nevertheless - relief from infirmity was to some extent possible. Thomas does not mention the issue of 'simple human errancy ;' for instance, the Western diet produces bowel cancers whereas the more suitable high fibre diet of African *peasants in rural Africa* does not. What Thomas does mention is that James ( see James 5: 14-16 ) assumes healing from physical infirmities is an expected and ongoing part of the community's life. ( Thomas, *Devil*, p. 17, and Dr. Andrew Stanway, *Taking the Rough With the Smooth*, [ London : Pan Books, 1981 ], pp. 25-27. ) Thomas juxtaposes James 5: 14-16 with the possibility of there being those with the 'gift of healing' ( 1 Cor. 12: 9 ), who could have used their gift instead of needing the elders ( and body of believers, verse 16 ) to follow James 5: 14-16. It seems an omission of Thomas not to mention the 'gift of faith' in the same verse ( 1 Cor. 12: 9 ), particularly as James mentions that it is "the prayer of faith shall save the sick" ( Jam. 5: 15 ). Perhaps Thomas might also have mentioned the gift of 'working of miracles,' too ( 1 Cor. 12: 10 ).

<sup>472</sup> In this verse, and following verses, the writer is reported as saying they were *not* afflicted in vain, because they *were* corrected through having been afflicted. Contrast this with God being reported as saying "In vain I have stricken your sons ; they received no correction." ( Jer. 2: 30. )

(Ps. 119:75, Green). Reportedly, when God dealt with Egypt he sent them plague(s) and death: “He sent the heat of His anger on them...a sending of evil angels...He did not keep back their soul from *death* But gave their life over to the *plague*” (Ps. 78:49-50, Green). And God is reported as giving leprosy to King Uzziah: “...he was leprous in his forehead...*for Jehovah had touched him*” (2 Chron. 26:20, Green 2, my italics). God is also reported as saying “I kill, and I keep alive. I wound and I heal...” (Deut. 32:39b, Green 2). As for Israel later on, God reportedly “*gave His people to the sword*” (Ps. 78:61ff, Green).<sup>473</sup> In an earlier-reported utterance God is reported as saying to the *disobedient* that “Also every sickness and every plague...Jehovah shall cause them to come on you until you are destroyed...*Jehovah shall exult over you to destroy you...*” (Deut. 28:61,63, Green 2, my italics). God is reported as using sickness as a stricture to lead us to repent, as in the blindness that came on the apostle Paul on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:1-9); following Paul’s change of attitude and behaviour he was healed of this blindness (Acts 9:17-18).

Paul mentioned that sickness and death experienced by the Corinthian church was punishment for sin (1 Cor. 11:20-34, noting verses 21, 29-30). Just as following deliverance from Egypt God feeding Israel manna and water in the desert did not guarantee ultimate approval by God, so the receipt of bread and wine does not predicate divine approval.<sup>474</sup> Those going hungry (verse 21) seem to be the poorer members of the church, perhaps slaves, working all day and finding all the food eaten when they arrive at the meal.<sup>475</sup> The “not discerning the body of the Lord” (verse 29, Green 2) is twofold. Firstly, rich Christians’ grievous treatment of poor Christian brethren unheeding of the Spirit behind the warning (apparently expressed later than 1 Corinthians in the gospels<sup>476</sup>): “In so far as you did it to

---

<sup>473</sup> Reportedly, death by sword was promised earlier when God commanded : “You shall not afflict an orphan or a widow. If you afflict him, if he at all cries to me...*I will kill you with the sword...*” ( Ex. 22: 22-24, Green, my italics. ) And note the reported observation : “As they were increased, so they sinned against Me...” ( Hos. 4: 7, Green. )

<sup>474</sup> Raymond Bryan Brown, ‘1 Corinthians,’ in *The Broadman Bible Commentary*, Volume 10, ( London : Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971 ), p. 355.

<sup>475</sup> Brown, *1 Corinthians*, p. 356.

one of these, the least of My brothers, you did it to Me.” (Matt. 25:40, Green 2) – the implication being that by depriving their poor brethren of food they are guilty of depriving Christ Himself of food. Secondly, something beyond their understanding happened to the bread and wine proclaimed the body and blood of Christ: at the very time Christ was, ineffably, sustaining them with His body and blood, they refused to sustain their poor brethren.<sup>477</sup> This particular failure to discern Christ’s body resulted in condemnation of weakness, sickness, and death amongst the offending Christians (verse 30).<sup>478</sup> Examining oneself in the light of Christian love would highlight the wrongness of the rich Corinthians’ action (1 Cor. 11:28).<sup>479</sup>

Whereas suffering for Christ may be regarded in a positive light, many authors on the subject of healing talk of discovering the “roots of the sickness.”<sup>480</sup> Those who get material gain, although it seems unjust (greedy) gain is implied here, are left to deal with the report that it “...takes away its owner’s soul.” (Prov. 1:19, Green).<sup>481</sup> This scripture infers that it is a *healing* thing *not* to be greedy of gain.<sup>482</sup> And scripture talks of those who:

*“...do not plead the cause, the cause of the orphan, that they may prosper; and they do not vindicate the right of the needy. Shall I not visit for these things? declares Jehovah. Shall not My soul be avenged on such...?”* (Jer. 5:28-29, Green)

---

<sup>476</sup> Brown, *1 Corinthians*, p. 356; Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, ( London : The Tyndale Press, 1963 ), p. 159.

<sup>477</sup> In the first century AD the poor would attend pagan feasts held in honour of the rich or gods. Such meals, in which the rich shared with the poor, were called *eranoi* when they occurred in pagan religions. ( Morris, *1 Corinthians*, p. 158. ) There were also memorial meals held among Greeks on the birthdays of the departed. ( Brown, *1 Corinthians*, p. 357. ) Greek guilds would hold feasts in affectionate remembrance of some departed friend and member once a year. (James Moffat, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, [ London : Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1959 ], p. 170 ). All these meals provided the poor with needed sustenance. The *agapes* ( love-feasts, held in association with the Lord’s Supper, by first-century Christians ) helped mediate the replacement of these pagan ( and also Jewish ) feasts (see 2 Pet. 2:13, Jude 12). Thus, at Christian *agapes* the Christian would not be obliged to forgo food that had been offered to gods ( 1 Cor. 8 ).

<sup>478</sup> That is, a proof that there was no proper sense of Christ’s Body ( verse 29 ) is the disrespect shown to Christ by this open contempt for His poorer members. ( Moffat, *1 Corinthians*, p. 162 ).

<sup>479</sup> Brown, *1 Corinthians*, p. 359.

<sup>480</sup> This particular instance is from Blue, *Authority to Heal*, p. 120 ; and see pp. 117-130. “The New Testament consistently defines suffering as some sort of persecution *and not as physical sickness.*” ( Blue, *Authority to Heal*, p. 26, my italics. ) See Ps. 62, 31: 10, 38: 3 ; Prov. 3: 5-8, 14: 30, 17: 22.

<sup>481</sup> This I feel is implied in the more obvious interpretation, rather than in the other possible interpretation that one greedy of gain takes away the lives of ( i.e., murders ) those currently possessing the gain they are greedy of.

<sup>482</sup> This is in accord with the reported instruction “Do not labor to be rich...” ( Prov 23: 4, Green. )

There is much rightly said about Jesus' *healings* as 'signs.' But also, there may occur signs signposting God's disapprobation, as reported when two hundred and fifty destroyed men "became a sign" (Num. 26:10, Green). Thus, punishments can be signs: instances when God is reported as refusing to hear those who have alienated Him are also signs (Prov. 1:25-30).<sup>483</sup> So then some failures to be healed may themselves be included in the category of 'signs.' It is reported that Christian Believers are expected to *obey* Jesus: "Every one to whom much is given, of him *much will be required*" (Luke 12:48, RSV, my italics); *ongoing* lack of obedience, and therefore a concomitant lack of the gift of faith, may *partly* explain why some are not healed when others are:

"...there were a number of old rascally roustabouts who hadn't been inside a church for fifty years and had come to scoff – utterly without faith – who were suddenly and miraculously touched by the grace and mercy of God..." "Lord, did you see that? Did you see that old boozier get healed just now?" Sometimes I could hardly stand it. It seemed so unfair, especially in the light that many of the praying, severely crippled saints, who attended every single meeting, were never healed..."<sup>484</sup>

I am attempting to see beyond merely blaming people for their lack of faith, to understand just *why* they lack faith in the first place, since reportedly all faith is a gift from God. Why does it seem that God has not given them the gift of faith for this particular need of healing?

If that question can be answered, in *general* terms of identifying reported scriptural

---

<sup>483</sup> In Jer. 9:17 it is reported God will send snakes to bite the people; for the initial audiences of this report this may have had the resonance/*been a sign* of God reportedly earlier sending "fiery serpents" that killed many of the people of Israel (Num. 21:6).

Besides the multitudinous reported promises/arrivals of military incursions against them, the people of Judah and Israel reportedly continued their monolatry. Then there were reportedly promised exiles performed through five captivities. These were reported as: 2 Kings 15:29,17:6; Jer. 52:28,29,30.

<sup>484</sup> Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 74; and see Hagin, *Seven Things About Divine Healing*, p. 28. Hagin : "A pastor once told me of a man for whom he had prayed...His left arm and leg were paralyzed, and he had extreme difficulty speaking. The pastor thought, *Well, I'll just anoint this fellow with oil and pray for him. No doubt he's heavily sedated now, so I'll come back in a few days to find out whether he is saved. I might eventually get him healed.* So he anointed him with oil and left. When he returned a few days later, the man's wife was in the yard...The pastor asked, 'How's your husband getting along?' 'Oh, he's just fine,' she replied. 'He's working...The Lord healed him.' Incredulous, the pastor drove over to where the man was working...The pastor sat in his car and watched as this 60-year-old man, who the doctor had said would never work another day in his life, climbed up and down the ladder carrying shingles for the roof ! The pastor just couldn't understand how this man, whose salvation he was unsure of, could receive such a marvellous healing from God while some dedicated members of his church had been prayed for by himself and every visiting evangelist and still weren't healed." ( Hagin, *Present Day Ministry of Jesus Christ*, pp. 20-21. )

Hagin mentions two different families, one who hardly ever attended church but who were very quick to repent and forgive others and who got healed quickly ; another family who attended all the church meetings and were slow to repent, slow to forgive and did not get healed. One of the latter family said : "We always end up going to a hospital, and being operated on, or just dying." ( Hagin, *Present Day Ministry of Jesus Christ*, pp. 21-22. )

commandments they may *not* heed yet *need* to heed, the way then is potentially more open for them to receive faith from God for their need of healing. This is engagement with the divine healing hermeneutic I suggested in place of a WOF healing hermeneutic: *the expectation that when people acted upon biblical scripture then divine healing will follow.*<sup>485</sup> Jesus is reported saying He wants His disciples to count the cost, *and pay it*, of being one of His disciples: then faith for healing and other miracles will be gifted; but God is reported as saying “In vain I have stricken your sons; they received no correction” (Jer. 3:30, Green). As well as sickness/death there is reportedly the place where God has been utterly alienated and absolutely refuses to respond to erstwhile recipients of His blessings: “*Cursed is the man who does not obey the words of this covenant...I will bring evil on them...And though they cry to Me, I will not hear them*” (Jer. 11:3b,11, Green 2, my italics). Thus the prophet being instructed “...do not pray for this people; and do not lift up a cry or prayer for them. For *I will not hear in the time they cry to Me for their evil doings*” (Jer. 11:14, Green 2, my italics).<sup>486</sup> It is said of God that He hates all workers of iniquity (Ps. 5:4). But, reportedly, God, not for people’s sake but for His own name’s sake, may defer punishment: “For My name’s sake I will put off My anger; and for My praise I will hold back for you, so as not to cut you off” (Is. 48:9, Green).

I now lay out the terms of biblical commandment to regularly help the poor, starting by contrasting the teaching of Hagin with the apostles’ on the subject of Jesus’ substitution of our poverty for wealth.

---

<sup>485</sup> A list of categories of why some are not healed can prove very extensive, including those ignorant of the root cause for their sickness, in line with the reported scripture “My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge...” ( Hosea 4: 6, Green ; I use the literal Hebrew rendering of the word ‘destroyed’ for Strong’s Hebrew word 1820, rather than Green’s ‘cut off.’ ).

<sup>486</sup> And see Prov. 1: 24-32. This should not be confused with a sometime ‘dryness’ of a believer’s experience of God. Judd Montgomery had instructed “pray, ‘Lord, make Thy Bible a living Book by Thy Holy Spirit’s power that I may ever hear Thy voice through its pages...’ ” This is tacit recognition that without divine aid the Bible may otherwise seem a ‘dead’ book. ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 185, citing Judd Montgomery, ‘Living By Faith,’ *Triumphs of Faith* 22:3 [ March 1902 ], p. 51 ). Some Christians have testified to not experiencing ‘the presence of God’ in their Bible reading, saying they ‘felt dry’ or that their reading ‘seemed leaden’ or ‘uninspiring.’ This is normally ascribed to the fact that those Christians need to perform some other action(s) at the time, which may simply mean resting, and/or to perform some kind of restitution/repentance, before returning to Bible reading in which there *will be* a sense that ‘the presence of God is manifested.’

### **3.12 Hagin teaching on Jesus' Substitution of our Poverty for Wealth.**

Hagin teaches Jesus' death involved four-fold blessing/atonement, for (Wo)man's sin, poverty, sickness and death. That is, that Jesus suffered vicariously in presenting Himself as the perfect sacrifice, preventing (Wo)man forgoing forgiveness, wealth, health and eternal life. But this teaching is normally abbreviated to *three-fold* blessing of deliverance from 'poverty, sickness and [spiritual] death.'<sup>487</sup> Hagin points out that the tense used in Colossians 1:13 is the past tense, that reportedly Jesus has already delivered us ('us' being the "saints in light" of verse 12) from the "power of darkness" and already "translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son."<sup>488</sup> Hagin fails to mention the commandment to these "translated" believers to "walk in the light." While Hagin cites Christ having "spoiled principalities and powers" (Col. 2:15), Hagin provides no teaching on *how* the believer can *truly* vanquish the 'power of the enemy' within their lives.<sup>489</sup> And, in the light of Christians dying young sick and poor, rather than Hagin comprehensively explain the gospel of Jesus teaching of *how* the believer can 'possess the inheritance that Christ bought us' Hagin confines himself to teaching to 'shout at the devil:' "we have the authority to tell Satan to take his hands off what belongs to us - including our finances."<sup>490</sup> Hagin fails to teach how the Christian can

---

<sup>487</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 25 ; note that 'poverty' is mentioned before 'sickness' and 'death ;' this blessing is not described in WOF circles as being delivered from 'death, sickness, and poverty.' There may be an element of Christian perfectionism in the common elimination of the word 'sin' in the WOF bandying about of the triply freedom from 'poverty, sickness and death.' That is, it is not uncommon to hear WOF Pentecostals thanking God for having set them free from sin, something that they look on as a setting-free experienced *in the past*. To the sceptic, they point to the report of 1 John 2: 1 which says "if [ *and not 'when'* ] any man sin...," that there is no compunction on them to sin, that this implies their having entered a state where to commit sin is not normal. They claim that being able to confess one's sin according to 1 John 1 : 9 is only a 'fail-safe' – that 1 John 1 : 9 exists so that in the unlikely event of a Christian believer sinning they can then quickly repent and be cleansed of that sin. As for 1 John 1 : 10: "if we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us," their answer is that they are not denying they have sinned, but that they are affirming that because Christ saved them from sin ( they might here catalogue some previous sin(s) that they no longer commit ) they are no longer sinners but saints. Although this might involve entering into a debate about the appellative nature of 'sinner' and 'saint,' with the word 'saint' ('separate one') implying something aspirational, the perfectionist may then answer with 1 John 3: 9 which reports "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin...he cannot sin, because he is born of God." The answer to that is to present empirical evidence of the sinful conduct of such who are 'born-again,' to which, in turn, the explanation is that these 'born-again' either are not 'born-again' or that what 1 John 3: 9 is really implying is that the truly 'born-again' cannot remain in a state where sin is, or becomes, normal to them, rendering any sins they commit ( even a life of repeated sinful behaviour ) as being regarded as mere 'blips.'

<sup>488</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 23.

<sup>489</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 24.

<sup>490</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 25.

actually avoid the activity that enables the bad things to happen, which bad things Hagin consistently associates with the Devil's agency and does not associate with God's reported punishment of wrongdoing.

The chapter in Hagin's *Midas Touch* entitled 'Was Jesus Poor?' maintains Jesus was not poor, but "was *made poor* upon the Cross when he became our Substitute and paid the penalty and price for our sin."<sup>491</sup> Just as Hagin does not define 'being rich'/'being poor'/'neither poverty nor riches,' Hagin does not explore Biblical material suggesting Jesus' lifestyle of "neither poverty nor riches."<sup>492</sup> Hagin does note that Jesus is reported as giving to the poor, but Hagin only uses this report to draw the conclusion that Jesus was not poor but that He obviously *had* money available to give: that is, Hagin's main emphasis remains that because Christ endured poverty (on the cross) for us, the Christian believer does not need to obey/endure the scriptural recommendation of "neither poverty nor riches" but should be rich. The WOF logic says that since God wants all believers to be rich, as well as God wanting them to be Christ-like, therefore Christ must Himself have been rich.<sup>493</sup>

---

<sup>491</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 43, Hagin's italics. Hagin conjoins poverty with other grievous issues dealt with at Calvary: "When did Jesus take on sin, sickness, the curse, and poverty? On the Cross!" (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 46.) And "the Gospels...portray Jesus...as a Man whose needs were met and who was regularly involved in meeting the needs of others." (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 46.)

<sup>492</sup> Thus, for instance Jesus' adoptive father Joseph was a '*Teknon*' an 'artificer in wood, metal and stone,' a builder, someone neither poor nor rich. So, nowhere is Jesus and his family associated with camel transport, the transport of the rich. At Jesus's consecration the offering suitable for Him was the two pigeons, the middle size offering between the lamb of the rich and the grain of the poor. Again, sometimes Jesus had a place of residence, at Capernaum where His disciples came and lived with Him, whereas at other times He lived as an itinerant with nowhere to lay His head. Jesus did not have about His person His tax money, but was able instead to instruct Peter to catch a fish which had a gold coin in its mouth. (Matt. 17: 24-27). At his execution, some of Jesus' clothes were simply divided up, but one object of His clothing was too good to be so divided, and so lots were cast for it. Hagin instead infers that Jesus was rich, that He, through being "prosperous...assisted the poor financially on a regular basis." (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 53.) Hagin also cited John 13: 27-29, suggesting reasonably "Buying provisions for a feast and giving to the poor were apparently ordinary events to the disciples. And a person can't do either of these without having money. We know Jesus had *some* money at least, because He had a treasurer who regularly embezzled money from the funds entrusted to his keeping" (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 54, and on p. 55 citing John 12:6 for Judas's embezzlement.) As Hagin points out "If there was enough money in the bag for Judas to embezzle on a regular basis and still have enough to sustain the group, Jesus could not have been poor." (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 55.)

Blomberg is content to describe Jesus as having been lower-middle class (Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, p. 106.)

<sup>493</sup> A few scriptures Hagin cites are: Deut 29: 9; Josh. 1: 7; 1 Ki. 2: 3; 1 Chron. 22: 13; 2 Chron. 20: 20; 26: 5; Job 36: 11; Neh. 1: 11; Psa. 1: 1-3. (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 65.)

### **3.13 Apostolic Teaching on Jesus' Substitution of our Poverty for Wealth.**

The prophet John had reportedly demanded that people with two coats give to those who had none, and do likewise with their food (Luke 3:11); typologically-speaking, such largesse could be seen as outworking of Jesus' substitution of our poverty for wealth. Jesus is said to have endured poverty so that the Christian believer might enjoy wealth: "For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich, He became poor for your sake, so that you might become rich by the poverty of that One" (2 Cor. 8:9, Green).<sup>494</sup>

However, this scripture was reportedly written in the *context* of reminding Christian believers to give to the poor; part of Christian believers' 'filling up the sufferings of Christ' is that they are to lay aside their riches in the interests of the poor. Just as Christ is reported as having left what were infinite riches, so that Christian believers through His relative (not absolute) poverty might be made rich, so now Christian believers are to follow Christ in enriching the poor (2 Cor. 8:13-15). This is a matter of the Christian faith, and a matter where *faith* can be employed: namely, it takes faith in God as a faithful supplier to be able to relinquish one's wealth to others (Phil. 4:19). So, reportedly, it is inferred it was because of their faith that the Macedonians were able to give so much wealth for the poor. These had first given themselves to the Lord, and *following that* gave "*beyond their ability:*" the ability they gave under was inferred not to be their ability, but the ability of God through faith, which was *beyond their ability* (2 Cor. 8:5,3, Green). The inference that this was faith, that *they were not in fact giving beyond their means, merely beyond their ability*, is underlined by Paul being reported as stating their giving was "through the will of God" (2 Cor. 8:5, Green): God would supply these Macedonians' needs. The scriptures concerning sowing bountifully are made in this same context of giving to the poor; note even within these verses "He

---

<sup>494</sup> And, the question could be asked : why then did Jesus send out His disciples without money or spare clothes, and with instructions to depend on the charity of others ( Matt. 10: 9f. ) ? ( Robert Jackson, *Prosperity Theology and the faith movement*, p. 2. ) That is, what has not been suggested is 1) that one reason why Jesus encouraged His disciples to not take spare clothes may have been so that they would be able to bear a testimony of a simple lifestyle ( one of 'neither poverty nor riches' ), and 2) His disciples could live, and live simply, from preaching the gospel ( note the report of Paul saying that one could live from the gospel [ 1 Cor. 9: 14 ] ), and 3) it is possible also that they then were able to give their spare clothes to the poor.

scattered; he gave to the poor” (verse 9 in 2 Cor. 9:6-11, Green). Yet, surveying those giving reflective answers in a plethora of anecdotes, these verses are routinely used out of their context in WOF churches and other churches to importune believers to give to the *church* not to the *poor*. Reinforcing the importance of giving to the poor, towards the end of a lengthy discussion on this (the whole of 2 Cor. chapters 8 and 9), Paul says their giving to the poor is *proof* of their “freely expressed submission to the gospel of Christ” (2 Cor. 9:13, Green).<sup>495</sup> It is also, I believe, of note that in discussing qualifications of apostleship following on from the importance of giving to the poor Paul mentions “the growing faith among you will be made larger” (2 Cor. 10:15, Green). It seems feasible to argue their faith would be increased in the much-stressed just-discussed giving to the poor. A rhetorical question seems appropriate here: how could anyone claim to have the fruit of the spirit, love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance if they *didn't* help the poor on a regular basis? (Gal. 5:23). To regularly help the poor is to obey the commandment to “bear one another’s burdens, and so you will fulfill the law of Christ” (Gal. 6:2, Green). To *regularly* help the poor is to “not grow weary in well doing” (Gal. 6:9, RSV).<sup>496</sup> Paul rounds off saying “let us do good to all men, and especially to those who are of the household of faith” (Gal. 6:10, RSV).<sup>497</sup> In all this, the *context* of what Paul is saying is collecting from the various churches to help *the poor saints* in Jerusalem/Judea: helping the poor, especially those who are Christians. And in the New Jerusalem there will be no poverty,

---

<sup>495</sup> The poor saints who would receive the collection money would *by the dokime* ( Strong’s word 1382 : experience, proof, trial ) of the collection money be “glorifying God by your freely expressed submission to the gospel of Christ.” This is the only place in the New Testament where this word for proving one’s submission to the gospel of Jesus is used.

<sup>496</sup> God is not mocked ( Gal. 6: 7, RSV ), He looks at people’s actions. And this “well doing” relates to the earlier mention of not sowing to the flesh, but sowing to the Spirit ; it could be argued that sowing to the flesh is *not* regularly helping the poor, whereas sowing to the Spirit *is* regularly helping the poor ( Gal. 6: 7-8 ).

<sup>497</sup> Although it could be argued that there are not particularly numerous scriptures implying that those who do not help the poor will suffer, attention should be drawn to the whole tenor of biblical scripture. Just as reportedly it seems to be impossible for someone with the ‘fruit of the Spirit’ not to emulate Jesus in helping the poor, so also reportedly none can maintain they love God when they hate their ( poor ) brother by not loving that brother as themselves ( 1 John 2: 9, 11 ).

Regarding ‘household of faith,’ in the Old Testament the ‘congregation of the Lord’ reportedly comprised the Israelites plus the ‘strangers’ that had joined themselves to them, akin to the non-Jewish ‘God worshippers’ found in the synagogues of the first century. When in the Old Testament God is reported as commanding Israel to help the ‘strangers’ He shows concern for all the poor, not just those strictly among the Israelites.

no pain of hunger “death shall be no more, neither... crying, nor *pain any more*” (Rev. 21:4, RSV,my italics). It is one of God’s priorities to see that there is no poverty.

### **3.14 Commandment to Regularly Help the Poor as a Tradition and Pillar of Jesus’ and Apostolic Teaching.**

Scripture reports that in all labour is profit (Prov. 14:23). Also, that those who obey God in covenant with Him are to expect enrichment since God’s blessing reportedly makes rich and God adds no sorrow with that blessing (Prov. 10:22).<sup>498</sup> God is also reported as promising to increase those who please Him, increase them more-and-more, and their children too (Ps. 115:14). It is recorded that God gives increase (1 Cor. 3:6), that God teaches people to profit so that for those following the terms of His covenant, there will be prosperity in everything they do (Is. 48:17, Deut. 29: 9). The reported reason for this is that God takes pleasure in the prosperity of His servants (Ps. 35:27b). It has been recorded that there is no want to those who fear the Lord (Ps. 34:9). That is, that not only are their needs met, but that since those who fear the Lord refuse to be covetous, they do not have the wants that come from having given rein to covetousness.

There can be no valid excuse for the Christian believer to say that ‘there are no poor around me’ for Jesus is reported as saying that the poor would always be with them (John 12:8). This statement of Jesus came as a judgment on the absolute refusal of the Israelites to observe the year of Jubilee as well as being a judgment on their failure to keep the other requirements of the law, so the conditions contained in the earlier report that “*there will be no poor among you...if only you will obey the voice of the Lord your God*” were never satisfied (Deut. 15:4-5, RSV, my italics).<sup>499</sup> Also reported in the Pentateuch, Israel had

---

<sup>498</sup> This scripture is one often quoted by Hagin ( as in Hagin, *Midas*, p. 83 ). Those criticising Hagin’s teaching risk being categorised as having a “poverty mentality,” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 38 ) which is a blanket term under which objections to WOF teaching can find themselves liable to being pigeonholed and ignored.

<sup>499</sup> Deut. 15: 11’s report implies that this never came to fruition when it states: “the poor will never cease out of the land.” This latter scripture has been used to encourage the rich to give to the poor – on perhaps the rather dubious-sounding premise that if the poor *did* starve to death, then some of those self-same rich who had been unsuccessfully appealed to to help these poor would then *themselves* subsequently have to be made poor in order to “justify God’s statement.” ( Louis I. Newman [ translator and compiler ], *The Hasidic Anthology*, [ New York : Schocken Books, 1968 ], p. 34, an attribution to the Khelmer Maggid. )

had words spoken to them to the effect that if they obeyed God then God would put no diseases on them, that He had put on the Egyptians, “for I am Jehovah your healer” (Ex. 15:26, Green). That is, there were reported promises that obedience would lead to *no poverty and no sickness*.<sup>500</sup>

Because all good *gifts* are said to come from God (James 1:17), and it is reported that all people have been *given* to them (1 Cor. 4:7), a refusal to obey God by refusing to help the poor is tantamount to ‘rewarding evil for good,’ making the actors candidates to receive the reported curse: “Whoever rewards evil for good, evil shall not depart from his house” (Prov.17:13, Green).<sup>501</sup> Such evil-in-return-for-evil may take the form of sickness, an outworking of the report that “the cruel troubles his own flesh” (Prov. 11:17, Green).

Another curse on maintaining over-abundance is “the abundance of the rich will not allow him to sleep” (Ecc. 5:12b, Green). This not sleeping is unpleasant and may also lead to sickness.<sup>502</sup> On this theme, scripture says there are many curses for those not giving to the

---

Along these lines, rather than plainly stating that there is no extant evidence of the reportedly commanded income-equalising Jubilee ever having been observed, Blomberg says “The celebration of the Jubilee year is shrouded in obscurity,” while mentioning that it is reported that neither were sabbatical years observed [ cf. Lev. 26: 35-36, 43 ; 2 Chron. 36: 21 ], although 1 Maccabees 6: 49, 53 do refer to the sabbatical year being observed *after the exiles*, in the second century BC. ( Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, pp. 44-45. ) Sider’s comment is that the absence of references to the year of Jubilee in the historical books available suggests it was never implemented. As well as citing Roland de Vaux’s *Ancient Israel* concerning this, Sider also cites Donald W. Blosser, ‘Jesus and the Jubilee,’ ( unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of St. Andrews, 1979 ). An interesting typological statement on the Jubilee, couched in confessional language, plausibly suggests that the Jubilee was to be considered part of the atonement : “God said that, on the Day of Atonement, “*ye shall return every man unto his possession*” (Lev. 25:10). The order in the Year of Jubilee was this: *first*, the atonement, *then*, the sounding of the trumpet of the Jubilee, with the glad tidings, “*Ye shall return every man unto his possession.*” Likewise, the order is the same now: first Calvary, then, the Gospel trumpet that He “*bare our sins*” (1 Pet. 2:24), “*bare our sicknesses*” (Matt. 8:17)...to be sounded “*to every creature*” (Mark 16:15), showing us that we may “*return every man unto his possession.*” ” ( Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, p. 14 ).

<sup>500</sup> “Wherever there are oppressed people, God is concerned for their liberation and Christians must be also... In Israel’s experience, liberation and prosperity were the two sides of the same coin, for the God who brought them out – from Egyptian bondage – also brought them in – to a land flowing with milk and honey.” ( Grogan, *Liberation and Prosperity*, pp. 120, 121. )

<sup>501</sup> And consider: “...pray not thou for this people, Neither lift up cry nor prayer for them Neither make intercession to Me : For I will not hear thee.” ( Jer. 7: 16 ).

<sup>502</sup> Modern medical science declares that during sleep the body produces ‘T cells,’ which are part of the body’s immune system, comprising the attack-cells which combat cancer cells. In recent experiments with depleted sleep ( sleep depleted a few hours less than normal ) the number of T-cells produced was shown to be 40% less in number. The average human being is attacked by cancer between one hundred and two hundred times in the course of their lifetime. ( source : BBC Radio 4 in 2014 [ for sleep depletion research ] ; Henry Wright, U. S. wholeness teacher based in Georgia in the course of his cassette tape series ‘A More Excellent Way.’ [ for number of cancer attacks in the average human life ]. )

poor: “He who gives to the poor shall not lack; but *he who hides his eyes shall have plenty of curses*” (Prov. 28:27, Green, my italics).<sup>503</sup> Scripture reports that those who refuse to hear the cry of the poor (and that cry of the poor may now come through the media of radio, television or internet), will themselves come into a situation where they will cry and will not be helped – such a situation does not preclude becoming sick “Whoever stops his ears at the cry of the poor, he himself shall also call, and shall not be answered” (Prov. 21:13, Green).<sup>504</sup>

Contrariwise it is reported: “He who has a good eye, he is blessed; for he gives of his bread to the poor” (Prov. 22:9, Green).<sup>505</sup>

The reported iniquity of the city of Sodom that God destroyed involved Sodom not aiding the poor and needy (Ezek. 16:49; see Is. 1:10-17). Martin Hengel adroitly pointed out that in the Old Testament “the right to property was in principle subordinated to the obligation to care for the weaker members of society.”<sup>506</sup> Surveying Hagin’s written and taped ministry to the sick makes obvious the glaring omission that he fails to mention the report that *whoever gives to the poor will find his health rising speedily*, that whoever gives to the poor lends to the Lord and the Lord will repay that loan (Is. 58:6-8, Prov. 19:17).<sup>507</sup> Certainly, in the Isaiah scripture the way the Lord reportedly repays the loan is providing the giver-to-the-poor with speedy *healing*. Reciprocation is spoken of in the report the needy have been sold for a pair of shoes, the heads of the poor have been trampled into the dust of the earth, the way of the afflicted has been turned aside: that *these are some factors in God not ‘revoking*

---

<sup>503</sup> I believe an interpretation that limits these reported curses only to the expletives uttered by those exasperated at being deprived of the charity/love they should receive, and other expletives uttered by onlookers, is an over-narrow interpretation.

<sup>504</sup> Thus: “...society has been made aware by cheap travel, press, television and books that other societies are poor, sick, homeless and starving.” ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 183. )

<sup>505</sup> That is, there is a reported commandment to: “Open your mouth for the dumb...Open your mouth ; judge righteously, and *defend the poor and needy*” ( Prov. 31: 8-9, Green, my italics ).

<sup>506</sup> Martin Hengel, ‘Property and Riches in the Early Church,’ in Martin Hengel, *Earliest Christianity*, (London : SCM Press Ltd., 1979), p. 160. See for instance Ps. 72: 4, 12-14, and see the text below.

<sup>507</sup> Particularly the Egyptians, and other ancient cultures besides, knew far more about medicine and health than is today popularly ascribed to them ; regardless of this knowledge, certainly today we understand ‘health rising speedily’ as an indicator of *an excellent immune system*, a harbinger of a state of good health.

*the punishment.*' (Amos 2:6-7).<sup>508</sup>

On this theme Jesus is reported as instructing His disciples "You have freely received, freely give" (Matt. 10:8, Green). But it is not just a question of only Jesus' disciples having to help the poor, it is a commandment to *all humankind* reflected in *Jesus reportedly commanding the Pharisees who did not believe in Jesus as the Christ and who were not His disciples to help the poor* - "give alms" (Luke 11:41, Green).<sup>509</sup> If someone is kind-hearted, loving/helping their neighbours, the poor *being* their neighbours: for Jesus says in the parable of the Good Samaritan that our neighbour is *someone needing help* - that kind-hearted loving helping person "does good to his own soul" (Prov. 11:17, Green).<sup>510</sup>

Furthermore, Jesus is reported saying it is as hard for a (*any*) rich man to get to heaven as a camel to go through the eye of a needle (Matt. 19:23-24).<sup>511</sup> Concerning this imagery it has been pointed out that the reader should not make it easier for the rich man by supposing that the 'needle's eye' is a small gate within the larger city gate of Jerusalem.<sup>512</sup> That is, Jesus

---

<sup>508</sup> And more bad behaviour towards the poor is reported in Amos 4: 1, Amos later repeating the shoe-accusation of those who "make the poor of the land to fail" ( 8: 4 ) and who wish to "buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes" ( 8: 6 ).

<sup>509</sup> Furthermore, Jesus is reported as suggested to the Pharisees who were reportedly preoccupied with outward cleansing and appearance that by giving to the poor they would be cleansed ; that is, the insides of the Pharisees were "full of robbery and evil" ( verse 39 ), but they would be cleansed by giving to the poor. The Pharisees were reportedly "money-lovers" ( Luke 16: 41, Green's translation of Strong's Greek word 5366 ).

<sup>510</sup> "A *merciful* man does good to his own soul ; but the *cruel* troubles his own flesh" ( Prov.11: 17, Green, my italics ). Although there seems to be no category mentioned besides 'merciful' and 'cruel,' it is reported that concerning the "neither cold nor hot" God finds them unappetising and will vomit them out of his mouth ( Rev. 3: 15-16, Green ).

And in the parable of the Good Samaritan "Jesus redefines the meaning of love for neighbour ; it means love for any man in need." ( George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, [ Guildford, Surrey : Lutterworth Press, 1975 ], p. 133 ).

<sup>511</sup> An interesting observation is that in the apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews quoted by Origen in his *Commentary on Matthew*, we read that when Jesus bade the man make so great a renunciation, "he began to scratch his head, and it did not please him ; and the Lord said to him 'How sayest thou I have kept the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law that thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, and behold many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed in filth and dying of hunger, and thy house is full of many good things, and nothing goes out from it to them.' " ( R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, [ London : The Tyndale Press, 1963 ], p. 188. ) In David Dickson's trenchant seventeenth century commentary Christ is said to make "the man who would appear perfect to be seen a gross worshipper of mammon." ( David Dickson, *A Brief Exposition of the Evangel of Jesus Christ According to Matthew*, [ Edinburgh : Banner of Truth Trust, 1981 {1647} ], p. 259. )

<sup>512</sup> That supposition suggests that it is *just* possible for a camel to get through the gate in old Jerusalem called the "eye of a needle," but only for a camel 'in its skin' – that is, only for a kneeling shuffling camel, not a laden camel : analogously, an *unladen* rich man, a rich man divested of vested wealth can theoretically qualify for admittance to heaven. Whereas F.F. Bruce is content merely to not give credence to the existence of this small gate, Blomberg gives further detail by stating that in the *first millenium* of Christianity this gate was unknown.

used deliberate hyperbole with the intention of representing the salvation of a rich man as being nothing short of a miracle, possible only with God: just as it would be a miracle for a camel, the largest animal in Palestine, to go through the eye of a sewing needle.<sup>513</sup> Entry into the kingdom is especially difficult for those attached to material encumbrances: only with divine aid can it be achieved. *As an illustration of this, even selling goods and giving the proceeds to the poor would not exhaust the meaning of the law of love (1 Cor. 13:3), but would seem to be a step towards fulfilling it and would show that the person was in earnest.*<sup>514</sup> A plausible commentary on “many that are first shall be last; and the last shall be first” (Matt. 19:30;20:16) is: that all who gave up possessions and earthly ties for Jesus’ sake would ‘inherit eternal life’ and be abundantly recompensed (though the recompense was not one which by worldly reckoning would make the sacrifice worthwhile) – and then it will be seen that the first (by secular standards) are last (by the standards of the kingdom) and *vice versa*.<sup>515</sup> Jesus reportedly commanded the rich young ruler to do *two* things, firstly to give his wealth to the poor and thereby have treasure in heaven, secondly to ‘come follow’ Jesus.<sup>516</sup> It was because the young man would be following Jesus that his material and other

---

That said it should be pointed out that this argument of Blomberg’s is an argument out of silence, something of a speculation particularly in the light of the lack of European Christian access to Jerusalem in much of the first millennium, coupled with the first millennium having included that period known as ‘the dark ages’ precisely because there was a dearth of information about *that* period. It would be natural for Christians to discover the truth about the ‘eye of a needle,’ supposing this gate existed, following second millennium successful Christian counter-attacks to the attempted spread of Mohammedanism within Europe, involving the Christian conquest of Jerusalem. Again, so often things, or even events, are not mentioned because they are mundane, a given known by all and therefore not seen as worthy of mention. ( F. F. Bruce, *St. Matthew*, [ London : Scripture Union, 1970 ], p. 63 ; Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, p. 139. )

<sup>513</sup> Frank Stagg, ‘Matthew,’ in *The Broadman Bible Commentary*, ( London : Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1970 ), Vol. 8, p. 192.

<sup>514</sup> Bruce, *St. Matthew*, pp. 63, 64. Paul is reported as commanding the rich be commanded to “do good, to be rich in good works, to be ready to share, generous, treasuring up for themselves a good foundation for the coming age, that they may lay hold on everlasting life.” ( 1 Tim. 6: 18-19, Green ). Paul also reportedly stated that “covetousness is idolatry” ( Col. 3: 5 ), inferring that those who are covetous must “make a direct assault upon...covetousness.” ( Tasker, *St. Matthew*, p. 187. ) It is a moot point on whether those using/abusing Matt. 19: 23-24 in order to prise wealth ‘for a good cause’ from the dying rich can really so simply thereby enable those dying rich to “lay hold on everlasting life” ( 1 Tim. 6: 19, Green ).

<sup>515</sup> Bruce, *St. Matthew*, p. 64, and “The assessment in the light of the coming Day [ of Judgment ] is implied here, as it is expressed in [ Matt. ] 16: 25-27.” ( Bruce, *St. Matthew*, p. 64 ).

<sup>516</sup> It has been pointed out that Christ is concerned with one’s relationship with both one’s neighbour and with Christ. So, too, Christ’s reported counsel to the rich young ruler was both to sell all he had to give to the poor ( helping his neighbour ), and then to follow Christ ( Matt. 19: 16-22 ). ( see John White, *The Golden Cow*,

needs would be met.<sup>517</sup> This ‘middle position’ of ‘neither poverty nor riches’ would attract neither the various curses on inordinately keeping wealth nor the overthrow of the rich into poverty in Hannah’s and Mary’s exaltations (1 Sam. 2:3-5, Luke 1:51-53).<sup>518</sup>

Reportedly, one is not to withhold the good one has from its owners, when one is able to give it (Prov. 3:27). It seems this implies that those to whom one should do good, such as the poor, *actually are the owners of the good that is in one’s hands*; that those who do not use

---

[ London : Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979 ], p. 47 ).

<sup>517</sup> Mark 10: 21-22. Though Jesus and His apostles reportedly themselves had times when they had been hungry ( Mk. 11: 12, 1 Cor. 4: 11-13 ), the reports of them never imply they suffered from *unremitting* poverty. For Jesus and His apostles, had they suffered unremitting poverty it seems likely the analysis would have occurred to both they and their observers that “he who is crushed by poverty is like one to whom all the troubles of the world cling *and upon whom all the curses in Deuteronomy have descended.*” ( Jonathan Sacks, *Wealth and Poverty: A Jewish Analysis*, [ London : The Social Affairs Unit, 1985 ], p. 4, my italics. ) There is a Jewish idea that man as an embodied soul cannot reach stable religious heights *without* attending to the needs of the body : however, it is not clear whether this Jewish idea was current at the time when Jesus fed the hungry multitudes who had come to hear him. ( Sacks, *Wealth and Poverty*, p. 4, citing Exodus Rabbah 31: 14. ) There is also the idea that the gifts of God are to be found in this world as well as the next, and the ability to enjoy is itself a religious experience. Again, the prevalence of this idea/relevance of this idea to Jesus’ Galilean/Judean/Samaritan ministry is unclear ( Sacks, *Wealth and Poverty*, p. 4. ) Jesus telling the rich young man to sell what he had and give the money to the poor was at loggerheads with the Jewish idea that to give all one’s wealth away was ‘folly.’ This Jewish judgment of ‘folly’ is predicated on the idea that anyone giving all their wealth away would then be dependant on others for sustenance. ( Sacks, *Wealth and Poverty*, p. 5. ) Sacks ignores the gospel account of Jesus’ reported command to the rich young man to also follow Jesus, which arguably implied material provision for the to-be-formerly rich young man.

<sup>518</sup> Perhaps it is all very well stressing ‘neither poverty nor riches,’ but what of the practical questions of how to live that way ? The answer to this is that, like the question of where/when to give one’s tithe money, the believer is thrown back onto God – to the necessity of regularly hearing God’s voice/regularly feeling the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. As Jesus says “My sheep know My voice.” ( John 10: 27 ). ‘Neither poverty nor riches’ is to be the mean of life: Jesus reportedly sometimes had a house ( “ ‘Master, where dwellest Thou ?’ ‘Come and see.’ ” [ John 1: 38 ] ), Jesus reportedly sometimes had none ( “The Son of Man has not where to lay His head” [ Matt. 8: 20 ] ). When Jesus was born, reportedly the *middle-value* sacrifice of thanksgiving was offered for him, not the lamb, neither the corn, but the two young pigeons. Paul the apostle knew what it was to abound and to be abased ; even after Paul’s abasement ( Phil. 4: 12-13, 1 Cor. 15: 32, 2 Cor. 11: 23-28 ), he was subsequently enriched enough to the point of being able to afford the astronomical house rents charged in first-century Rome for a full two years ( Acts 28 ). ( I apologise here. I had thought the book reference for this was contained in one of my MA essays. Then I remembered it was in an essay I had written for my diploma in Practical Theology, and sadly that essay is not yet to hand. ) In James the curses on the rich are reported not long before the instruction to pray for the sick is reported ( James 5: 14-16 ) ; it could possibly be argued that this juxtaposing implies one should first have one’s wealth in the correct balance ( one of ‘neither poverty nor riches’ ), before one comes to think about praying for healing from sickness : that is, that the sickness may potentially be rooted in being nothing more than the manifestation of the curse on the rich. If a sickness was so rooted, the believer could repent of their riches/bad behaviour and determine to live a life of ‘neither poverty nor riches, and *only then* pray for healing.

John Wesley had wrestled with the problem of increasing wealth. Firstly, he rather gloomily predicted that any revival bore the seeds of its own destruction : “I do not see how it is possible in the nature of things for any revival of religion to continue for long. For religion must necessarily produce both industry and frugality, and these cannot but produce riches. But as riches increase, so will pride, anger, and love of the world in all its branches.” Secondly, Wesley attempted to live a life of ‘neither poverty nor riches’ by, on the one hand, refusing to raise his standard of living and, on the other hand, by giving away his ever-increasing excess of income. ( Jackson, *Prosperity Theology*, p. 3, citing K. Fullerton, *Calvinism and Capitalism*, in R. W. Green [ ed. ], *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, [ D. C. Heath and Co., 1959 ], p. 74. )

the power of their hands to hand over the good to its rightful owners (such rightful owners as the poor) are *thieves*.<sup>519</sup> It is reported a certain rich man not talking of making provision for the poor but of storing his wealth in barns was unable to enjoy his increased wealth, in accord with the report of Ecc. 6:1-2 (Luke 12:16-40).<sup>520</sup> Just as in *gaining* wealth one has taken part in its re-distribution, this re-distribution must *go on*, wealth not being allowed to “become corrupted”<sup>521</sup> but maintained ‘friendly to us’ through the irony of re-distributing it away from

us again. As well as this being a precursor of Keynesian economics that would benefit the whole economy, this partly fulfils the reported commandment that the strong should bear the infirmities of the weak, since not even Jesus pleased Himself (Rom. 15:1,3). This is an application of the reported concept of a whole city’s wealth, “gain and...wages,” being “holiness to Jehovah,” that “it shall not be hoarded and not stored,” but rather that it shall provide the food and clothes of them who are in need of them: “for those who dwell before Jehovah, to eat to satiety, and for a choice covering” (Is. 23:18, Green 2).

The following scripture concerns a reported agreement between Jesus’ apostles to preach the gospel of Jesus to all gentile/heathen nations; it seems significant that *the only issue mentioned in this passage* is that of remembering, namely helping, the poor:<sup>522</sup>

“James, and Cephas, and John, those seeming to be pillars, gave right hands of fellowship to Barnabas and to me, that we go to the nations, but they to the

---

<sup>519</sup> Thus Latimer had preached “The poor man hath title to the rich man’s goods...so that the rich man ought to let the poor man have part of his riches to help and comfort him withal.” ( Latimer cited in Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 104 ). This is arguably redolent of : “Let him that stole steal no more : but rather let him...give to him that needeth.” ( Eph. 4: 28 ).

<sup>520</sup> And “There is an evil which I have seen under the sun And it is common among men : A man to whom God hath given riches, wealth, and honour, So that he wanteth nothing for his soul of all that he desireth, *Yet [God] giveth him not power to eat thereof*” ( Ecc. 6: 1-2 ). The ability to not just have our daily bread, but also have the power to consume it, reportedly comes from God. Thus, reportedly all are to pray “Give us this day our daily bread;” for, even if one already possesses the bread, this is no diminution of one’s need of the power from God in order to consume it.

<sup>521</sup> Translation of the Greek of James 5: 2 (Green).

<sup>522</sup> To the argument that this reported instruction to Paul in Gal. 2: 10 could have been selfishly motivated, since it transpired that money for poor Christian brethren was reportedly raised exclusively for poor Christians in Judea, I feel the stronger argument is that it is in the context of both the reported Mosaic covenant and the lifestyle and teaching of Jesus and the apostles themselves that the poor be helped, and that this accounts for the readiness to help the poor *wherever* they could happen to be.

circumcision; *only that we might remember the poor, which same thing I was eager to do*" (Gal. 2:9-10, Green, my italics).

Helping the poor appears considered by the apostles a vital part of the gospel of Jesus, one worth being reminded of, but also here of *having to be reminded to remember*. Jesus had reportedly commanded His disciples to sell what they had and give the proceeds to the poor (Luke 12:33-34). In Jesus' wanderings, He is reported to have preached and healed and given to the poor. Thus, the inclusion of the poor widow in Luke 21 may partly be a sign of Jesus' readiness to find the poor in His travels and to meet their needs. To answer those who might point out that Jesus is reported as saying on one occasion that the poor were blessed in their state of being poor, I agree with Jose Miguez Bonino that this context seems to be not that of *all* poverty but the poverty of a faithful remnant unyielding to apostasy who "suffer contempt, persecution, and oppression but place their trust in God's promise and wait for the manifestation of his righteousness."<sup>523</sup> The centrality of the theme of Jesus' apostles continuing helping/feeding the poor is underlined by Paul including it in rhetorically describing the 'high-achieving' Christian: someone who prophesies, understands all mysteries and all knowledge, has all faith including ability to remove mountains, *and has bestowed all their goods to feed the poor*, besides giving their body to be burned for Christ's sake (1 Cor. 13:2-3).

Just as defrauded wages themselves are reported to cry out (James 5:4) as well as the labourers deprived of them, perhaps the money kept back from the poor to the owner's hurt is crying out as the "cry of the poor."<sup>524</sup> The curse on the rich in the book of James seems to involve a large number of variables in order to be activated, so does not condemn out of hand *everyone* who is rich (James 5:1-6).<sup>525</sup> And there was an apparent 'safe time:' an intervening

---

<sup>523</sup> Bonino, *Revolutionary Theology*, p. 112 ; and see Matt. 5: 3, 6, 10.

<sup>524</sup> Given that the wealth possessed by some is *not* the property of those who possess it, since that wealth is *supposed* to have been given to the poor : then the keeping of that wealth is robbery ; reportedly, the violence of the wicked "ensnares them, because they refuse to do justice." ( Prov.21: 7, Green ). Later in the text I mention that the Hebrew word for giving to the poor *tzedakah* carries the meaning not of 'charity' but of '*judgment*.' Also, the Hebrew word *mishpat* consists in doing justice to the poor, where it is considered that "almsgiving is nothing more than restitution of what has been stolen..." ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 210 ). ( Here are a few scriptures reporting on the vexed subject of how *not to become poor in the first place* : Prov. 19: 15, 20: 13, 21:17, 23: 21, 24: 33-34, 28: 22. )

time leading up to the *time of blight* (dynamically between acquisition of wealth and refusal to relinquish it and subsequent punishment for that refusal) – reminiscent of another scripture mentioning curse on the rich “riches were kept by their owner [up] to his hurt” (Ecc. 5:13, RSV).<sup>526</sup>

### **3.15 Tithes and Offerings Regularly Helped the Poor.**

The reportedly promised blessing of God rebuking one’s devourer (Mal. 3:11) was made to those giving the tithes and offerings under the Mosaic covenant that provided for sustenance of the poor, the widows, orphans, and strangers.<sup>527</sup> The idea behind making provision for the sustenance of widows, orphans and strangers was that they *were* poor – that unless provisions were stipulated for their sustenance they might starve to death. Their plight, and God’s concern for them, is *conjoined* in such scripture as Ps. 140:12: “I know that the Lord will maintain the cause of the afflicted, and the right of the poor,” “who executes judgment for the oppressed; who gives food to the hungry” (Ps. 146:7, Green 2). Malachi is effectively reporting that if one provided not only for the priestly order of the temple but also for the poor, the widows, orphans, and strangers that *only then* would God ‘rebuke the devourer.’<sup>528</sup>

---

<sup>525</sup> The reported curse is activated by the wealth of the rich, riches, garments, gold and silver, also involving fraud, living in pleasure and wantonness, and condemning and killing the just. His having just quoted Luke 1: 46, 52-53 ; 1 Sam. 2: 2-8 ; and Luke 6: 20-25 to combine as a sampler, Sider reasonably states that James 5: 1, concerning the miseries to come on the rich, is part of a “a constant theme of biblical revelation.” ( Sider, *Rich Christians*, p. 61 ).

<sup>526</sup> Besides the reported curse in James 5 mentioning non-specific “miseries that shall come upon you,” this curse “shall eat your flesh as it were fire.” A consumption of the flesh has been likened by some to the action of gangrene. But it could also be argued it could be likened to phenomena associated with cancers : cancer sufferers, sadly, in the *advanced* stages of their consumption, suffer ‘burning pains,’ i.e. their flesh is being consumed and they suffer pains ‘like fire.’

<sup>527</sup> Scriptures reportedly affirming God’s concern for providing for the needs of the poor ( including provision for them by way of tithes and offerings ) : Ex. 23: 10-11, Lev. 19: 9-10, 23: 22, Deut. 15: 7-11, 10: 17-18, 14: 28-29, 16: 10-14, 24: 19-21, 26: 12-13, 27: 19. Regarding the first of these scriptures : the land was reportedly worked for six years, but every seventh year it was to lie fallow, and the poor could eat what it at that time produced spontaneously.

<sup>528</sup> Hagin misrepresents tithing, taking reported scripture in Malachi out of context and telling Christian believers that on their giving 10% of their income to their local church God will ‘rebuke the devourer.’ Hagin cites a book from the nineteenth century by T. S. Linscott called *The Path to Wealth* [ Thomas Samuel Linscott, *The Path to Wealth*, ( Richmond, Virginia : B. F. Johnson, 1888 ), pp. 106-110, cited in Hagin, *Midas*, p. 75ff. ] This book may have influenced Hagin, for in it the author also seems to conflate the blessing of having helped the poor with the practice of tithing, saying in a prophetic manner to the tither “I will give health to all of you.” ( Linscott, *Wealth* reproduced in Hagin, *Midas*, p. 77. ) The passage from Linscott reproduced in Hagin’s *Midas* is rather redolent of the blessings catalogued in Deut. 28: 1-14. However, the blessings of health reported in

However, the Abrahamic 10% tithe Hagin teaches about is *not* the calculated roughly 22.3% of one's income inferred in Malachi required to pay one's 'minimum' Mosaic 'tithes and offerings' that would also sustain the poor, widows, fatherless and strangers.<sup>529</sup> Hagin teaches "*the combined tithe [10%] of a congregation provides the funds to support...ministering to the poor.*"<sup>530</sup> Hagin thus abnegates Christian believers' responsibility to give to the poor through teaching their 10% tithe, far less than the 'tithes and offerings' of Malachi, should cover the running costs of maintaining the church

---

Deut. 28 and repeated *en petite* in Deut. 29 ( "Keep therefore the words of this covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do." [ Deut. 29 : 9 ] ) are contingent on maintaining the *Mosaic system's* sustenance of the poor, the widow, the fatherless, and the stranger. But under the *Abrahamic tithe* the blessings of health are not promised ; therefore, under the Abrahamic tithe it would only have been separate provision for the poor that would have brought God's blessings of health for having helped the poor.

It is worthwhile considering the life of Isaac, Abraham's reported 'son of promise.' It is probable that Isaac kept up his father's tradition of tithing. However, what is reported is that Isaac would not 'take the lead' insofar as he did not consult God on behalf of his wife Rebekah, once she was pregnant ( Gen. 25: 22-23 ). Also, although God spoke that Jacob, the younger twin, should inherit ( "the elder shall serve the younger" verse 23 ) Isaac discarded this, and even the name given to the younger twin was the insulting 'Jacob' meaning 'supplanter.' Isaac's favouritism of the elder twin, Esau, is first mentioned. We do not know whether Rebekah's favouritism of Jacob was in part a reaction to this, or whether she wished to protect God's choice of who would inherit, or whether she liked Jacob because he was a companion to her as someone "dwelling in tents" (verse 27), rather than Esau who was, in U.S. parlance, an 'outdoorsman.' Whereas we read of no reported sickness in Abraham, Isaac is reported as having become so blind that he could not recognise his sons by their appearance, but only by their differing voices. And Isaac attempted to go against God's expressed bestowal of inheritance going to Jacob, and was tricked into conforming with what God was reported as having said (Gen. 27). Moreover, Isaac allowed Jacob to seek a wife with no ten camels of goods in tow (cf. Gen. 24: 10), and Jacob had no pillows (Gen. 28: 11), but he had some oil (Gen. 28: 18). **I feel that it could be argued that this reported callous treatment of his son by Isaac, a rich man, would be paralleled by this same rich man's not being a helper of the poor ; indeed, Jacob went out a poor man and Isaac did not help him. Therefore the mention of Isaac's blindness would, to the careful reader of the accounts, make it seem certain that Isaac was a mean man who did not help the poor (poor men like his travelling son Jacob) and who therefore did not qualify to get God's blessing of good health.**

Now, a second point. Even though it was Esau who reportedly was in fact the supplanter of all the material goods which reportedly should have gone to Jacob, Esau who inherited all of Isaac's material wealth though Jacob had been blessed in accordance with God's reported wishes, Jacob did not ask God for riches but all he asked for was for God to be with him, to keep him safe, and provide him with "bread to eat, and raiment to put on" ( Gen. 28: 20 ). **Note that this is the same 'food and raiment' level of 'neither poverty nor riches' that 1 Timothy 6: 8 is reported as telling Christians to be content with.**

<sup>529</sup> I talk of a 'minimum,' which in my experience most talking of the 22.3% 'income tax' under the Mosaic covenant ( such as, famously, John McArthur in the U. S. ) do not mention. Speaking of the financial obligations under the Mosaic covenant Blomberg says "Pro-rated annually, these added up to a 23.3 % tithe." ( Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, p. 46, and Blomberg cites J. G. McConville, 'Law and Theology in Deuteronomy,' *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 1984. ) However, as instances, this 'minimum' could increase if one felt one needed to increase the number of sin offerings one made for oneself, or if one was jealous of one's wife due to her supposed infidelity and made a jealousy offering.

<sup>530</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 74, and also p. 87: "your church's income...multiplied...greater impact...helping more poor people." Bearing out Hagin's *de-emphasis* of the *individual* believer's responsibility to help the poor: "the Rhema churches of South Africa, which are associated with Hagin's ministry, have been considered "the most compassionate and generous Christians" in South Africa." [ Edward K. Pousson, *Spreading the Flame*, ( Grand Rapids : Zondervan Publications, 1992 ), p. 144, cited in Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 19. ]

*plus the costs of their local church ministering to the poor* instead of believers having to do it. This abnegation of reported responsibility of the individual to help the poor, placing this responsibility instead on the church unsurprisingly seems to have led to the making of the following statement: “no church in our area that we know of gives enough of its budget towards meeting the needs of the poor at home and abroad.”<sup>531</sup> Hagin teaches about tithing yet neglects the importance of giving to the poor, rather concentrating on what tends to make churches, preachers and ministers financially richer.<sup>532</sup> The message of the Bible is that all lives belong to God, that through God’s grace folk are able to live lives freely and iteratively offered to God.<sup>533</sup>

From the above discussion of diminution of a minimum 23.3% levy to one of just 10%, it seems the Christian believer tithing 10% must make additional provision for the poor if they are to receive God’s aforementioned blessing of speedy healing for those who help the poor.

### **3.16 Jesus’ Lifestyle of Regularly Helping the Poor and Healing.**

It seems significant that the order in the reported synopsis of Jesus’ ministry was not that He was ‘healing all that were oppressed by the devil, and went about doing good.’ Rather, the reported order *is* Jesus “went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil” (Acts 10:38). The Greek word here translated ‘doing good’ is *euergeteo*, which has the meanings ‘to be philanthropic’ and ‘to do good, bestow benefits.’<sup>534</sup> While it must be

---

<sup>531</sup> Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, p. 250.

<sup>532</sup> Financial/pastoral abuse in churches is a subject with its own literature. A popular satirising of the inordinately rich pastor occurred in the 1976 film *Car Wash*. Richard Pryor’s character ‘Daddy Rich’ pastored ‘The Church of Divine Economic Spirituality;’ the registration plate of his gold Cadillac was ‘TITHE.’

<sup>533</sup> Ps. 24: 1, 1 Cor. 6: 20. Ignoring the reported biblical warning ( including sickness ) to those who abuse/do not help the poor, Hagin expatiates on the benefits to us of giving God this mere 10% : “Realizing that we can become a partner with God in carrying out His will brings great fulfilment and satisfaction - mentally, emotionally, and spiritually. And it also opens the windows of Heaven for an outpouring of material blessings.” ( Hagin, *Midas*, pp. 74-75 ). Scriptures abound that report God’s kindness and that He blesses, and wants to have blessed, all His creatures. In Hebrews chapter eleven, besides the other heroic deeds wrought through faith, there were those heroic deeds wrought *through faith* that entailed the deed-doer being ‘financially ruined :’ “they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented ;...they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth...having obtained a good report through faith...” ( Heb. 11: 37-39 ). And yet Hagin *contradicts this biblical scripture in saying* : “No one can have a good and prosperous journey if he is broke, lacking, in poverty, and in want every step of the way.” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 230. )

admitted that not all such ‘philanthropism,’ and even not all such ‘bestowing benefits’ necessarily involves giving to the poor,<sup>535</sup> Hagin forgets about this “doing good,” which would seem to include Jesus’ giving to the poor. Instead, Hagin concentrates on Jesus “healing all that were oppressed by the devil.” By Hagin divorcing “doing good” from “healing” (alternatively attempting to subjugate “doing good” under “healing”), Hagin does not encourage the giving to the poor under Jesus’ “doing good.” The reported point made that “God was with” Jesus is made after describing this two-fold nature of Jesus’ lifestyle being one of *both* “doing good” and “healing.” Jesus’ two-fold lifestyle of “doing good” and “healing” was the badge “God was with Him.”

In spite of findings revealing unsoundness in McConnell’s criticism of Faith/WOF theology, I nevertheless feel McConnell incisive characterising it “a movement in which faith is exalted above all other Christian virtues.”<sup>536</sup> Paul wrote “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who...humbled Himself, and became obedient” (Phil. 2:5,8). WOF interpretation of this scripture tends to be the overly-narrow one the believer should humble themselves to become obedient to exercise faith for themselves.

The importance of giving to the poor is reinforced in the account of Cornelius (Acts 10). It was said of Cornelius not only that he prayed to God, but that he “gave much alms to the [poor] people” (Acts 10:2). The angel appearing to Cornelius confirmed that it was not just Cornelius’ “prayers” but his “alms” constituting “a memorial before God.”

Reportedly, Cornelius himself repeats what the angel said but Cornelius more greatly emphasises alms, rather than the previous half-and-half attribution of the source of the “memorial before God” to ‘prayer’ and ‘alms;’ Cornelius says his prayer was heard, but

---

<sup>534</sup> Respectively, Strong, *Exhaustive Concordance* ( in the Greek Dictionary of the New Testament, p. 33 ), and Joseph H. Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, ( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1999 ), p. 258 ( Strong’s New Testament word 2109 ). Vine concurs with his translation of “to bestow a benefit, to do good.” ( W. E. Vine, *A Comprehensive Dictionary of the Original Greek Words with their Precise Meanings for English Readers*, [ McLean, Virginia : MacDonald Publishing Company, no date ], p. 506 ).

<sup>535</sup> Thus “If a man has ‘charity,’ giving to the poor is one of the most *obvious* things he does, and *so people come to talk as if that were the whole of charity.*” ( C. S. Lewis, *Christian Behaviour*, [ London : Geoffrey Bles, 1952 ], p. 47, my italicisation of ‘so people come to talk as if that were the whole of charity.’ )

<sup>536</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 154.

it is his *alms* that “are had in remembrance in the sight of God” (Acts 10:31). It could be argued the whole series of events implies Cornelius’ giving to the poor helped make him an eligible candidate for receiving faith; it was in Peter’s preaching to Cornelius’s congregation where Peter spoke of Jesus’ life: “who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil; for God was with Him” (Acts 10:38).

In the WOF particular stress is placed on the scripture where Jesus says “He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and *greater works than these shall he do*” (John 14:12, my italics). This scripture is interpreted in the WOF predominantly in terms of all Christian believers aiming to being involved in ‘healing all that are oppressed by the devil.’ However, the ‘greater works’ than Jesus *includes the works of greater almsgivings than Jesus*: in considering this reported scripture consider not so much the apparent smallness of its first audience, but their *quality of life*. The apostles gathered with Jesus had been willing to give up all for Jesus, and reportedly continued willing to give up all for Jesus. Peter, an eminent apostle, reportedly declared of the apostles to Jesus that “we have left all and have followed thee” (Mark 10:28, see Matt. 19:27, Luke 18:28).<sup>537</sup> Later, in company with another apostle, Peter reportedly says “Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee” (Acts 3:6); which is not the utterance of someone rich. Indeed, Jesus is reported as commanding His would-be disciples to sell their possessions and give the money raised thereby to the poor (Luke 12: 33a); congruent with this, it is reported that whoever does not forsake all cannot be Jesus’ disciple (Luke 14:33). Peter’s having reportedly said ‘silver and gold have I none’ is reported as having occurred not long after Peter the former professional fisherman suggested he and his fellow apostles go fishing – not for recreation but it seems for sustenance for they were willing to fish all night long in order to catch fish (John 21:3). Paul wrote “I have suffered the loss of all things...that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings...if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you” (Phil. 3:8,10,15). When believers were stripped of their

---

<sup>537</sup> *Typologically*, the field of Judas Iscariot symbolises Judas’ apostasy from the community of the Twelve who had renounced their possessions. ( Liu, *Voluntary Poverty*, pp. 296-297. )

possessions, it was reported they willingly “took joyfully the spoiling of [their] goods” knowing that they had “in heaven a better and an enduring substance” (Heb. 10: 34 ). The point of Jesus’ parable of ‘the Good Samaritan’ is Jesus telling it in answering “who is my neighbour?” (Luke 10:29).<sup>538</sup> The answer reportedly given by Jesus is that one’s neighbour is

whoever one is aware of who is in need of help that one can *oneself* give them. *This person in need takes the place of those who, at least relatively, are ‘the poor.’*<sup>539</sup> By our not helping those we know to be in need (the poor), at a time when we do have the means to help them, we fail to love our neighbour as ourselves.

### **3.17 Assaying to Live a Life of Works For God.**

In Hagin’s suggested lifestyle of “healing” but not regularly giving to the poor, there seems little likelihood that the kind of divine healing success experienced by Jesus and His apostles will be replicated by a believer opting to not do good by giving to the poor. For the Christian believer to do the ‘greater works than Jesus did’ entails the Christian believer doing greater works of service to the poor than Jesus did (John 14: 12). For, Jesus went about ‘doing good’ and healing. Having faith to be divinely healed is not *automatic*, although the healing evangelist’s message states God *lovingly wants* to give faith, God *lovingly will* give faith to those who ‘hear,’ since “faith cometh *by hearing*, and hearing by the word of God” (Rom. 10:17, my italics). Nevertheless, if the believer refuses to *hear* the reported word of God’s message on *lovingly* regularly giving to the poor, the ability of that believer to receive the *gift* of faith from God is compromised: God is reported unwilling to show mercy/compassion when He judges the person who has not been merciful/compassionate (James 2:13a). This is a fulfilment of Jesus’ reported saying “You cannot serve God and money” (Matt. 6:24, Good News Bible).<sup>540</sup> The Christian believer is taught they have a part

---

<sup>538</sup> The underlying theme is the command from God that you should ‘love your neighbour as yourself.’

<sup>539</sup> The point that the neighbourly action is reportedly implied to have been performed on a Jew by a Samaritan ( one of a race of ‘ritually unclean’ half-Jews despised by ‘ritually clean’ Jews ), emphasises we should be prepared to recognise *anyone* in need as our neighbour – no matter whether they come from a nation/race ‘at loggerheads’ with our own, as the despised Samaritan showed himself willing to do.

to play, such as *lovingly* regularly giving money to the poor, in making themselves *eligible* to receive faith for blessing from God like Cornelius did; Zacchaeus reportedly declared he would give half his fortune to the poor, and then declared he would pay the hefty fines for theft in the Mosaic law, presumably out of the half of his fortune left him, to those he had wronged – and Jesus’ reported response to Zacchaeus was “This day is salvation come to this house...” (Luke 19:9). And as late as 212 AD Christians in Alexandria were reported as holding their property in common.<sup>541</sup> Repeatedly, the *continuation* of prosperity is taught to be conditional on obedience to God’s commandments: “Keep therefore the words of this covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do” (Deut. 29:9). These words were reportedly spoken to a relatively small people who had wealth since they had reportedly recently obediently plundered the riches of an immensely prosperous state, Egypt (Ex. 3:22, 12:36).<sup>542</sup> Keeping the “words of this covenant” is not merely speaking aloud its promises of prosperity, but entails *performing* the covenant in true adherence to the stipulations of “words of this covenant.”<sup>543</sup> This scripture refers back to the reported admonition of Israel to “walk in all his [God’s] ways” (Deut. 10:12). Patriarch of Constantinople John Chrysostom

---

<sup>540</sup> Many bible translations use ‘Mammon’ the word Jesus reportedly used to symbolise ‘money’ and ‘wealth.’ Mammon was the Syrian god of wealth, so Jesus suggests that if anyone is serving wealth they are idolatrous, servants of Mammon not of God. That is why covetousness, the wanting of more, is idolatry : it is the serving of the god ‘more wealth,’ be it named Mammon or whatever other name may be ascribed ( Eph. 5: 5, Col. 3: 5 ). But there are those who bless the covetous whom reportedly the Lord abhors ( Ps. 10: 3 ); and reportedly the Pharisees were covetous ( Luke 16 : 14 ).

<sup>541</sup> Redmond Mullin, *The Wealth of Christians*, ( Exeter : The Paternoster Press, 1983 ), pp. 46, 62, citing Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, Loeb, 1977 ( xxxix, 5-10 ). Clement of Alexandria taught that a Christian held possessions “for his brothers’ sake rather than his own... [ that ]...all possessions are by nature unrighteous, when a man possesses them for a personal advantage as being entirely his own, and does not bring them into the common stock for those in need.” ( Clement of Alexandria, [ trans. G. W. Butterworth ], *Quis Dives Salvetur*, Loeb, 1919, pp. 303, 337, cited in Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 56. )

Augustine of Hippo’s The Epistle to Diognetus, written in 124 AD, says : “If a man will shoulder his neighbour’s burdens; if he be ready to supply another’s need from his own abundance; by sharing the blessings he has received from God...such a man is indeed an imitator of God.” ( Cited in Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 57. ) So also, in 253 AD Cyprian is reported as sending 100,000 sesterces from Carthage to the Christians in devastated Numidia, while around this time, the Roman church cared for about 1,500 needy people, many of whom were refugees or strangers, with Rome being a major source of funds for other Italian communities and fugitives from persecution. ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 61. )

<sup>542</sup> The word badly translated ‘borrowed’ in the King James version of these verses is the Hebrew word *natsal*, meaning ‘to snatch away.’ Jay Green in his KJ3 translation substitutes this ‘borrowed’ with the more accurate translation ‘plundered’ ( see for example Young, *Concordance*, p. 926 ).

<sup>543</sup> For the reported promises of prosperity forming the blessings of compliance see Deut. 28: 1-14 ; a much longer list of curses for non-compliance follows in Deut. 28: 15-68.

argued:

“Tell me, then, whence art thou rich?...The root and origin of it must have been injustice. Why? Because God in the beginning made not one man rich, and another poor...He left the earth free to all alike. Why then, if it is common, have you so many acres of land, while your neighbour has not a portion of it?”<sup>544</sup>

When Hagin teaches the scripture “Christ in you, the hope of glory” (Col. 1:27), he does not challenge his audience as to whether or not they are going to cooperate with God to facilitate their being changed from a reported “glory to glory” (2 Cor. 3:18). If they *refuse to cooperate with God’s reported utterances* then Christ being in them will, in that parlance, remain unfulfilled *hope* of glory. Concerning 1 John 5:4-5, Hagin stresses it is our ‘faith’ that overcomes, but verse 5 shows this faith to be simply that of “he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God.” That is, this ‘faith’ implies the faithful life of the Christian believer.

Possibly because Hagin is aware of the promise to faithful Christians that God will supply all their needs, he feels able to teach God will supply faith for *every* Christian’s need (Phil. 4:19, see Phil. 4:15-18); and Hagin makes another extra-biblical promise with his over-narrow version of ‘gospel works:’ “*As you determine to feed upon the Word continually, you will see your faith grow to be able to receive the wonderful promises God has provided for His children.*”<sup>545</sup> However, against this is the richness of reported James 2 ‘gospel works’ described in terms of *physically helping* brothers or sisters “naked and destitute of daily food,” rather than indulging in what may be cynical proclamation over them of ‘faith confessions’ such as ‘In the Name of Jesus *be warmed!*,” “In the Name of Jesus *be filled!*” A gospel of such proclamations *devoid of* the gospel works of physically helping the poor is a dead gospel (James 2:14-17,20,26).<sup>546</sup> James reportedly writes that by works a (wo)man is

---

<sup>544</sup> John Chrysostom was patriarch of Constantinople ( 398-404 AD ). ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 51, citing John Chrysostom, Homilies on the First Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, Hom. XII, Oxford, 1848, p. 100f. )

<sup>545</sup> Cf. Rom. 10: 17 ; Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 5, my italics. This is very similar to what Smith Wigglesworth is reported as saying : “Faith is the principle of the Word of God. The Holy Spirit, Who inspired the Word, is called the Spirit of Truth; and as we receive with meekness the engrafted Word, faith springs up in our hearts.” ( Hibbert, *Smith Wigglesworth*, p. 99. )

justified, not by faith only (James 2:24). This can be seen by way of being a commentary on Rom. 5:1, and agreeing with the completeness of Eph. 2:8-10.<sup>547</sup> Abraham's faith was expressed *in his works*; his "faith worked with his works" (James 2:22). Origen, commenting on Matthew's gospel, taught a Christian should sell their possessions and give the proceeds to the poor.<sup>548</sup> And, those who reportedly argued they had prophesied, cast out devils, and done many wonderful works "in thy name ["in the Name of Jesus"]" probably fulfilled Hagin's feeding upon the word, seeing their faith grow, and receiving 'the wonderful promises' - yet Jesus says to them "I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:22-23).<sup>549</sup> Jesus here denounces these in the context of "by their fruits ye shall know them" arguably disqualifying prophesying, casting out devils, and doing wonderful works from consideration as 'good fruit;' the one who *actually* enters the kingdom of Heaven

---

<sup>546</sup> By contrast Hagin and Bosworth follow Judd Montgomery in stressing that these scriptures teach that "it is following on our acting on our faith when God's healing is manifested." ( see Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, p. 120. )

<sup>547</sup> Romans 5: 1 - "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Eph. 2: 8-10 - "For by grace are ye saved through faith ; and that not of yourselves : it is the gift of God : Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

<sup>548</sup> Origen, *Commentary On Matthew*, XV, 15, cited in Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 52. So, too, it is reported that : "By 410 [ AD ] Pope Leo the Great, urged on by John Cassian, had set up registers and systems of relief for the poor, and in the Eastern Empire, by the sixth century, the Church had special privileges and financial support so that it could undertake full official responsibility for the relief of the poor." ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 66. )

Again, it is reported that the senator Cassiodorus, compiling in about 550 AD an academic syllabus of classical and patristic learning for his monks at Vivarium, wrote "Above all else welcome the traveller, give alms, clothe the naked, break bread for the hungry...he is truly comforted who comforts the wretched." ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 67. ) Benedict, drawing on earlier rules in his own Rule ( written before 580 AD ), instructed : "relieve the poor, clothe the naked, visit the sick, bury the dead, help those that are in trouble, comfort the afflicted." ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 67. ) The monk Gildas, writing in 540 AD, described a church already corrupt : the priests "certainly do not care for the wellbeing of the people, but make sure their own bellies are full...They regard the honourable poor as snakes, and cultivate the wicked rich ; they say with their lips that alms should be given, but give not a halfpenny themselves." ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 67. ) Happily by contrast, Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, finished in 731 AD, praises the Irish monks who had only those buildings essential to the communal life, and "Owned no property except cattle; and if they received any kind of contribution from the wealthy, they promptly gave it to the poor." Bede also recounted the East Saxon king Sebba who, with his wife, after thirty years of rule, brought the bishop "no small sum to be given to the poor, keeping nothing for himself, preferring to stay poor in spirit for the sake of the kingdom of heaven." ( Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 76, citing Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, [ Bertram Colgrave, & R. A. B. Mynors (eds.) ], Oxford, 1969, III, xxvi, p. 310 ; IV, iii, p. 338 ).

<sup>549</sup> Hagin says "A person gets saved by receiving Jesus Christ into his heart. The only way people can lose their salvation is by what they do about Jesus...If they keep on yielding to the devil, mature Christians could finally get to the point where they choose to deny Christ..." However, Hagin means by this denying Jesus their telling Him they don't want Him as Lord, whereas in Matt. 7: 22-23 these reportedly *do say* "Lord, Lord," yet Jesus tells them their denial of Him somehow involves their being "workers of iniquity." ( Hagin, *Triumphant Church*, p. 107. )

is “he that *doeth the will* of my Father” (Matt. 7:20-21, my italics). Jesus concludes this particular preaching by stressing one should ‘hear *and do*’ His teaching not just prophesy, cast out devils, and do the wonderful works of healing the sick; not ‘to do’ Jesus’ commandments courts disaster (Matt. 7:24-27).

### **3.18 Jesus’ Reported Contextualisation of the Request ‘Increase our Faith.’**

A teaching on faith was reportedly delivered by Jesus in response to the apostles asking Jesus: “Lord, increase our faith” (Luke 17:5). Jesus’ reported response is seemingly bringing two teachings, but they are actually two parts of one teaching. In the first part Jesus talks of the mighty work (planting a sycamore tree in the sea) that can be done with what seems to be a very small (mustard) seed amount of faith (Luke 17:6). Thus, Jesus is telling his apostles that they are *missing the point*, that the issue is not about increasing your faith it is about having faith in the first place - since even a *tiny* amount of faith can plant a sycamore tree in the sea then surely your faith does not need to be increased.

The second part of Jesus’ reported teaching is redolent of Jesus saying He only does the will of His Father (and only does what He sees His Father doing – John 5:19-20). Jesus is here commending to the apostles the life of being ever-ready to obey the commandments of their Master. What Jesus is saying is that by being in attendance on their Master (their Heavenly Father) they will accomplish those things God the Father commands them. And Jesus is telling His apostles that when they have done *all those things* which are commanded them, then it will still not be an issue of their having ‘*big faith*’ but that they need to recognise that the faith they exercised in carrying out “all those things which are commanded you” (verse 10) was not *their* faith - it was all gifted faith and the truth of the matter is not *they had* ‘big faith’ but that all faith they needed for “all those things which are commanded you” was given them by God; that truly they *are* unprofitable servants who are just doing their duty which incorporates being recipients of faith from God. Therefore, there is no need to be concerned about faith, but only in hearing the commandments which - under God’s providence - they will find themselves with faith enough to be able to obey (Luke 17:7-10).

Just as in Jesus' reported teaching 'tomorrow will be perceived to have taken care of the things of itself,' so too here, the 'hearing of and obeying the commandments of the Father will be perceived to have taken care of the faith needed *for* itself' (Matt. 6: 34). As far as 'faith' itself is concerned it is something 'incidental,' gifted, rather than being desirable as itself being 'instrumental:' the Christian believer should have incidences of faith since it is by *God's instrumentality of faith* that they have been saved (Eph. 2:8-10); as already being born through faith it is natal, natural, for them to have gifts of faith.

### **3.19 Hagin's Teaching Against the Biblical Commandment to Regularly Help the Poor.**

The following is quite a long connected teaching of Hagin's. I start discussing this teaching by citing Hagin's teaching of four steps of faith: "1. Have God's Word for what you desire to receive from God. 2. Believe God's Word. 3. Consider not the contradictory circumstances. 4. Give praise to God for the answer."<sup>550</sup> In what some might feel is redolent of the language of 'cure-all' Hagin says: "Follow these four steps and you'll always get the desired result because these are four certain or sure steps to deliverance, healing, answered prayers, or *whatever it is that you are seeking from God.*"<sup>551</sup> But surely, Hagin should have added a step 5 to his 4 steps of faith: that of living a life (like Abraham's) reportedly *given over to pleasing God* as trusting in God's munificence. Hagin stresses the report of Psalm 35:27 "the Lord hath pleasure in the prosperity of His servant," while at the same time Hagin signally fails to establish in any fulsome sense what it *is* to be a servant of God. Hagin fails to concentrate sufficiently on the reported quality of Abraham's relationship with God, Abraham even showing himself having *faith to be obedient* to make a human sacrifice of the believed-for Isaac when God commanded it.<sup>552</sup>

Instead Hagin restricts himself to saying: "When you know who you are in Him, and when you think in line with that and confess that, then there is no failure for you."<sup>553</sup> Such a

---

<sup>550</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 36.

<sup>551</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 36, my italics. And "...you can have whatever you say from God's Word. You can write your own ticket with God." (Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 140.)

<sup>552</sup> As the book of Hebrews reports, this involved Abraham having faith that when he sacrificed Isaac God was able to raise the sacrificed Isaac from the dead (Heb. 11: 17-19).

definition from Hagin of who-you-are-in-Christ does not include conforming to Jesus' reported lifestyle of giving to the poor (also neglecting the pattern of Jesus' reported lifestyle of 'neither poverty nor riches').<sup>554</sup> In spite of the fact that one reported regular work of Jesus was giving to the poor, and in spite of the report of Jesus' apostles commanding the poor should not be forgotten (Gal. 2:10), Hagin only places giving to the poor in what he calls the "well and good," *not among* "the works of Jesus:" "when they think of doing good, they think of doing good works, such as giving to the poor. These things are *well and good*, but, actually, the fruits of righteousness are doing *the works of Jesus.*"<sup>555</sup> Thus, Hagin fails to equate that Jesus's 'going around doing good' (Acts 10:38) *included* the 'works of Jesus' that consisted in Jesus regularly helping the poor. Hagin seems also to be unaware that the Hebrew term for giving to the poor *tzedakah* "...belongs to the notion of justice rather than [to only that of] benevolence..."<sup>556</sup> Similarly, Hagin ignores the *promise of health* reported in Isaiah to those who show lovingkindness: "...loose the bands of wickedness...undo the heavy burdens...let the oppressed go free...break every yoke...deal thy bread to the hungry...bring the poor that are cast out to thy house...When thou seest the naked...cover him...hide not thyself from thine own flesh...Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, *And thine health shall spring forth speedily...*" (Is. 58:6-8, my italics). Not only is Hagin neglecting the importance to healing of helping the poor, but Hagin also re-defines prosperity to include the issue of healing and health.<sup>557</sup> This despite the Isaiah scripture just discussed

---

<sup>553</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 75.

<sup>554</sup> "He poureth contempt upon princes, And causeth them to wander in the wilderness...Yet setteth He the poor on high from affliction, And maketh (him) families like a flock." ( Ps. 107: 40-41 ). Jesus and his apostles are reportedly concerned with the 'absolute subsistence level.' This reported emphasis by Jesus would enable *more* people to be given sufficient food and clothes than if one had to bestow luxuries on each in order to overcome any psychological aspect of the poverty of the one who lacks the former luxuries they had. The proof text for Jewish giving to the poor had been Deut. 15: 8 "Thou shalt open thy hand wide to him, and shall surely lend him sufficient for his need, in that which he lacks." The text was given a wider reading than Jesus and His apostles were willing to do : for, the motivation of Jesus and His apostles seemed to be to alleviate extreme suffering, at the expense of not pandering to any hurt feelings of the formerly rich. A traditional Jewish hermeneutic for the phrase "sufficient for his need" covered food, housing, basic furniture, funds to pay for a wedding ; the hermeneutic for the phrase "that which he lacks" had covered an element of restitution of a lost lifestyle of affluence, which could even include providing a horse to ride and a slave to run before the horse. ( Sacks, *Wealth and Poverty*, p. 10. )

<sup>555</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 98-99, my italics.

<sup>556</sup> Sacks, *Wealth and Poverty*, p. 11.

and other scripture such as 3 John 2 which reportedly expresses *both* ‘prosper’ and ‘health,’ not ‘prosperity’ with health included within it *a la* Hagin. ‘Prosper’ does not include ‘health’<sup>558</sup> rather, health is to *accompany* prosperity (and prosperity is to accompany health) *only* “as thy soul prospereth.” Hagin never claims that one can have too much money, that having a certain level of wealth and prosperity may be wrong; Hagin says “God is not against wealth and prosperity.”<sup>559</sup> All Hagin does say is that it’s not wrong to have money but “wrong for *money* to have *you*.”<sup>560</sup> In the light, together with these quotes, of Hagin’s earlier-mentioned attacks in *Midas Touch* on those living too flamboyantly with expensive jewellery, big cars, big houses, and the like, it could be argued that *functionally* Hagin is not against someone having stupendous wealth, so long as they are relatively drab and not ostentatious. Thus, Hagin is never on record as having preached or taught the scripture “having food and raiment let us be therewith content” (1 Tim. 6:8).<sup>561</sup> Rather, all Hagin admits to is the scripture Hebrews 13:5 “...be content with such things as ye have...” that, for those *already* overly-wealthy, may be construed as being in the realms of ‘shutting the gate after the horse has bolted.’<sup>562</sup> In 1 Timothy chapter 6, reported conjunction of godliness with contentment is

---

<sup>557</sup> “I believe in prosperity...by that I do mean spiritual well-being and physical health. But I also mean material or financial blessing.” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 1.)

<sup>558</sup> “Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth.” (3 John 2) As for the reported word *euodoo* here rendered ‘prosper’ and ‘prospereth’ it occurs in only two other verses in the New Testament (Rom. 1: 10 ; 1 Cor. 16: 2). In the first instance it is in the context of making a ‘ministry-trip,’ in the second instance of using prosperity to feed the poor, the pillaged Christians of Judea (note Heb. 10: 32-34).

<sup>559</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 7. Hagin presents a question-and-answer style of teaching : ““Do you mean God is going to make us all rich ?” Yes, that’s what I mean. “Do you mean He’s going to make us all millionaires ?” No, I didn’t say that. But He is going to make us rich...The dictionary says it means “a full supply” or “abundantly provided for.” Praise God, there is a full supply in Christ.” (Kenneth E. Hagin, *Redeemed from Poverty, Sickness, and Spiritual Death*, [Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library Publications, 1966 ], p. 5 ).

<sup>560</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 8.

<sup>561</sup> Although Hagin does cite a selection of pertinent scripture ( 1 Tim. 6: 6-9, 17 ) that does include the phrase “And having food and raiment let us be therewith content,” this only occurs *towards the end* of Hagin’s book, *nor does Hagin offer any comment on it*, and nor does Hagin admit that it ( together with other scriptures as for example are found in Prov. 31 and James 5 ) contradicts his teaching of the Christian believer *maintaining* wealth. So, too, Hagin’s selection of scripture includes verse 9 but misses out verse 10 which starts “For the love of money is the root of all evil...” (Hagin, *Midas*, p. 138. ) Hagin does again quote from 1 Timothy 6, this time quoting 1 Timothy 6: 5-10, 17-19, *but again Hagin offers no comment*, other than the rather tame heading given it “Believers are not to love or trust in money.” It is as though my own thirty years of criticism of the WOF that “you never hear them preaching from 1 Timothy chapter 6” had somehow got back to Hagin ( but if this kind of criticism ever affected Hagin, *it is hugely more likely that it was someone else’s words* - not mine - that had been reported to him ), so that here it is quoted, though again Hagin offers no comment. It is not enough to argue that ‘no comment is needed here,’ since Hagin neglects not only to teach it but also neglects to teach the other allied scriptures I mention.

defined as great gain/prosperity. Nowhere does Hagin cite this ‘scriptural equation’ of ‘godliness (plus) contentment (equals) great gain.’<sup>563</sup> God is reported not to expect us to be content in the wretched state of *not* having food and clothes, which is the state of poverty, a state in which we would be liable to become *sick*. *Having* food and clothes we are not to consider ourselves poor but to be content with our state of non-poverty. As mentioned, Hagin himself never offered a definition of poverty. Hagin, from a rich Texan family,<sup>564</sup> living much of his life in oil-rich Texas, was there exposed to huge extremes of wealth and both relative and absolute poverty, with many U. S. citizens dying of starvation in the ‘Great Depression’ of the 1930’s.<sup>565</sup> Though Hagin says of God “He is concerned about us and wants us to have good things in life”<sup>566</sup> Hagin fails to talk about God reportedly commanding people to follow Jesus by humbling ourselves in the interests of the Kingdom of God that includes helping those who truly *are* in the state of poverty, since reportedly “the profit of the earth is for all.” (Ecc. 5:9a). Hagin fails to point out that if one has an excess of money, and is unwilling to give regularly to the poor (and so doing conform to the reported concomitant implied lifestyle of “neither poverty nor riches”), then the findings of the reports of scripture suggest that therefore one will be inclined to become sick.<sup>567</sup>

---

<sup>562</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 103.

<sup>563</sup> “But godliness with contentment is great gain” ( 1 Tim. 6: 6 ). Covetousness is a declared opposite of ‘godliness with contentment:’ “fornication, and all uncleanness, *or covetousness*, let it not be named among you, as becometh saints...no whoremonger, nor unclean person, *nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God*” ( Eph. 5: 3, 5, my italics ). Though the believer is said to have died with Christ, covetousness is listed as one of the things which the believer on earth must continue to put to death : “For ye are dead...*Mortify therefore...covetousness, which is idolatry.*” ( Col. 3: 3, 5, my italics ).

<sup>564</sup> Thus, in his account of his suffering a life-threatening heart condition at age seventeen, Hagin describes his grandfather travelling around the town collecting rents from the properties he owned; besides this, Hagin mentions his family affording a medical team of five doctors for him, including one doctor from the famed Mayo clinic (see Hagin, *Bible Faith*, pp. 18, 157 ).

<sup>565</sup> “ If the origin[ al reason ] for the emergence of this [ WOF ] teaching within Pentecostalism must be found, it probably lies in the hearts and minds of the American Pentecostal preachers who lived through the dustbowl years of depression in the 1930s. Many of these grew up in grinding poverty...” ( Kay, *Pentecostalism*, p. 64 ). In the state of Texas it is still the law that anyone owning land owns all the mineral rights of that land and therefore possesses all the oil under their land ; poor farmers could therefore come to ‘strike it rich.’

<sup>566</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 7 : “let them say continually, Let the Lord be magnified, which hath pleasure in the prosperity of his servant” ( Psalm 35: 27 ).

<sup>567</sup> Contrast Hagin’s teaching with that of another healing evangelist Charles Price who wrote of financial gifts sent to him as a healing evangelist “I do not regard these gifts as belonging to me; they belong to Him, whose I am, and whom I serve. Save for myself ? I dare not ; it would dishonour my loving, gracious, all bountiful Father.” ( Price, *Real Faith*, p. 29 ).

### 3.19.1 Christian Giving.

Particularly in WOF evangelistic (and pastoral) boasting of ‘big [financial] offerings,’ Jesus’ teaching around the widow’s mites is ignored. Jesus reportedly taught that the poor widow’s tiny financial offering was in fact bigger than the ‘big offerings’ of the “rich men” because of the issue of *keeping back*. That is, what made her offering bigger was that the widow had not denied God her living: “she of her penury [poverty] hath cast in all the living that she had.” (Luke 21:4).<sup>568</sup> By reportedly giving money she needed to live by, it seems the widow was not *keeping back* her whole life from God. Jesus does not praise ‘giving more,’ but here praises ‘*keeping less back*’ implying such ‘*keeping less back*’ is *giving a great deal more* than giving supposed ‘big offerings.’<sup>569</sup>

Hagin mentions ‘sowing bountifully to reap bountifully’ in the context of giving money to preachers/ministries or in giving money to the local church, as implied, Hagin says, by the report of 2 Cor. 9:6-10. However, Hagin never stresses the reported verse 9 “he hath given to the poor,” mentioning which verse would undermine his own teaching of this scripture passage. Reportedly, this scripture passage is *solely in the context of Paul warning of being about to take up a Corinthian collection for the poor Christians in Judea*, having already done so in the “churches of Macedonia” (2 Cor. 8:1-6).<sup>570</sup> And this giving to the poor, Paul writes, would “prove the sincerity of your love” (2 Cor. 8:8). It is possible this money was to be spent by the recipients on buying seed to plant crops; certainly, the giving of this money by the Corinthian believers would be those believers themselves ‘sowing’ for themselves to reap ‘bountifully’ the blessings from God for their ungrudging giving (2 Cor. 9:10, 6-8). In spite of scripture reporting that church collections are *exclusively for the poor*, but might also

---

<sup>568</sup> Jesus was reportedly saying that these two mites she gave as her offering was money she needed to provide her sustenance, to prevent her going hungry, if she was not already hungry. I feel it seems likely that Jesus propitiously noticing this widow’s action would have resulted in Jesus ensuring she was then given food and/or money from the bag, fulfilling “He hath filled the hungry with good things” ( Luke 1: 53 ).

<sup>569</sup> Hagin expects pastors and other ministers to promote their own enrichment, but some evangelists have lived sacrificially “Even the mighty evangelist, Chas G. [ Charles ] Finney, was so poor after fifteen years prodigious labours for the Lord that he was obliged to sell his travelling trunk to buy a cow, for the support of his family.” ( Bartleman, *Pentecost in Los Angeles*, p. 29. )

<sup>570</sup> And Rom. 15: 26 : “For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make *a certain contribution for the poor saints* which are at Jerusalem” ( my italics ).

be taken up (or, partly used?) for the *occasional* purposes of providing support for ministers (2 Cor. 11:8), Hagin does not teach or practise this.

Furthermore, in spite of the biblical teaching of 1 Tim. 6: 8, WOF church congregation members who are *not* poor by the standards of this biblical definition are being told by their leaders that they *are* poor, and that they need to ‘give more [to the church] to get more [more material things].’ In this way WOF church members are *encouraged to be covetous*. And yet it seems that the more obviously fitting translation of Heb. 13:5a is “The way of life is without money-loving, being satisfied with present things.”<sup>571</sup>

Hagin says putting God’s Word first and walking in truth is spiritual prosperity, but he doesn’t tell his audience *how* to ‘spiritually prosper,’ when the answer to that question certainly involves one obeying the reported teachings of Jesus and His apostles.<sup>572</sup> Neither does Hagin tell his audience *how* to “esteem earthly things lightly and to put first things first.”<sup>573</sup> The gospel of Jesus is to be obeyed and Jesus’ words *truly* abided in, but Hagin is vague and emphasises tithing, or a pledge to start tithing immediately, as prerequisite for a Christian believer to prosper.<sup>574</sup> Hagin says this tithe should be given to their local church.

<sup>575</sup> And of tithers: “The bottom line was that when they paid their tithes, they had more

---

<sup>571</sup> Green follows the King James Bible convention of italicising what is not literally present in the underlying language, but seems implied, translating Heb. 13: 5a as: ‘*Set your way of life without money-loving, being satisfied with present things.*’

<sup>572</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 8. Hagin says he wants to stress the importance of making scripture the final arbiter throughout the believer’s life : “What does God’s Word say ? Ask yourself that question on any subject.” ( Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 81 ).

<sup>573</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 10.

<sup>574</sup> Thus, in this vein of being vague or arguably even venting forth an air of fatalism, at the top of the first page of his book *Must Christians Suffer ?*, Hagin quotes Isaiah 55: 9 ( “For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” ), then Hagin says “One great lesson to be learned by the born-again Christian is that God has His own way of working out His will in our lives.” ( Kenneth E. Hagin, *Must Christians Suffer ?*, [ Tulsa, Oklahoma, Kenneth Hagin Ministries Inc., 1996 ], p. 1 ).

<sup>575</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 74. In the midst of teaching tithing Hagin does relent, later on the same page, in qualifying this by saying that it is only “*in most situations*, [ that ] the tithe should go to the local church.” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 74, my italics. ) Hagin teaches that the Christian believer should be obeying “the Spirit of God. But most of the time, we should be systematic in our giving. We should support our local churches on purpose with our tithes.” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 170 ), Hagin later says “The tithe should go to the church to support the ministers and the outreaches of that assembly of believers.” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 202 ). Any Christian giving to “other ministries...should come from offerings over and above the tithe.” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 202 ). It seems that Hagin’s teaching is confusing giving “as the Spirit leads” on the one hand, with any on-the-spot prompts from the Holy Spirit to give in a particular situation on the other hand, when Hagin says : “Giving “as the Spirit leads” is fine, but that should be done in addition to one’s planned and systematic giving, not in place of it.”

financially and did better.”<sup>576</sup> But Hagin seems ‘all at sea’ concerning those Christian believers who are tithing yet who are not prospering: “it could simply be because they’re not abiding in God’s Word...”<sup>577</sup> In Hagin’s inaccurate teaching of tithing under the New Covenant (see the previous footnote), Hagin emphasises the necessity of giving ten per cent of one’s income to the local church one attends.<sup>578</sup> Even though, as mentioned, Hagin teaches Jesus must have been prosperous because He had a level of income where He “assisted the poor financially *on a regular basis*,”<sup>579</sup> Hagin fails to teach the Christian believer should *imitate Jesus* in this practice of *regularly* giving to the poor. The nearest

---

( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 202 ).

<sup>576</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 83. That is Hagin claims “if they persisted [ tithing ], the promised blessings came” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 82 ), even if the blessings alluded to in Malachi were concerning God ‘rebuking the devourer’ on paying systemic *Mosaic* “tithes and offerings” ( Mal. 3: 8 ), and are not referring to the stand-alone Abrahamic tithe.

Hagin does not mention rich churches who squander or embezzle money given them and where God reportedly directed His children not to tithe to that church, even if such believers also obey God in nevertheless continuing to attend that church and may still be receiving/and giving some spiritual sustenance there. In such cases believers’ tithes would simply be paid where God directed, which seems to be the implied Abrahamic practice to be followed under the New Covenant.

<sup>577</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 15. Hagin makes a presentation of tithing that misrepresents what is a subject more nuanced than the way in which it is portrayed by many church leaders. Making the frequent omission of the expression “tithes and offerings” that occurs in the book of Malachi ( Mal. 3: 8 ), which helps to show that the subject in Malachi is actually ‘tithes *and offerings*,’ ( my italics ) which means the whole gamut of financial givings stipulated under the Mosaic covenant ( calculated to be about 22.3% not 10% ), and not the pre-Mosaic Abrahamic/Jacobite ten-per-cent tithing, Hagin seems to capitalise on the punitive undertones in Malachi in insisting that the tithe should be given to the local church which the Christian believer attends ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 73 ). This stipulation of Hagin’s, and that it seems of so very many church leaders, ignores the typology of Abraham’s tithe to king Melchizedek who the book of Hebrews underlines as a type of Christ, showing that in type the itinerating Abraham thereby ( having so far as we know no equivalent of a ‘local church’ ) gave his tithe to God. Hagin’s stipulation also ignores that Jacob was not ‘at home’ when he promised to give God ten per cent of his increase, so Jacob therefore could not give his tithe to the equivalent of ‘the local church.’ Thus, again before the Mosaic covenant, the ancient tithe was given by Jacob wherever God Himself directed Jacob to bestow it. This truly is the tithe God expects Christian believers to give – BUT it is not automatically to be given to the local church being attended in the way emulating the done-away-with Mosaic giving ( to the temple, for the priests, and concerning the whole system of offerings of sacrifices, and for the poor and widows and strangers, implied by ‘tithes and offerings.’ ) Leaving aside the ignorance of some sincere church leaders, it could be argued that it is for the financial self-interest of church leaders, as well as for other interests, that the continued misrepresentation of the book of Malachi appears to be so popular. There is an underlying lack of appreciation of the different nature of life for the itinerant Abraham (Abrahamic tithe and offerings from time to time), and *life for a nation-state with a temple system (Mosaic tithes and offerings.)*

<sup>578</sup> “More than a few pastors preach of spectacular returns on tithes invested in church : fivefold, sixfold, sevenfold – a multiplication of talents that would rival the profits earned by narcotraffickers.” ( Chesnut, *Prosperous Prosperity*, p. 218 ). A South Korean pastor friend told me that through the kind of tithing practice I typified in the previous footnote a lot of money can be made by South Korean pastors and that in recent times a ‘large number’ of South Korean gangsters have become pastors. My friend offered no comment but smiled when I said it would be useful to make sure these gangsters’ conversion experiences were genuine.

Although misrepresenting tithing, *Hagin rightly promotes tithing as a reported biblical imperative*. Jesus castigated the scribes and Pharisees for their lack of judgment, kindness and faith but at the same time *He praised them for tithing their garden produce* “these ought ye to have done” ( Matt. 23: 23 ). In Today’s Living Bible, the phrase in Matt. 23: 23 is simply rendered “Yes, you should tithe.”

<sup>579</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 53, my italics.

Hagin seems to get to this is the *irregularity* suggested by “Sure, there may be occasions when we are led by the Spirit of God to support a particular individual or cause.”<sup>580</sup> In spite of Jesus’ reported *regular* giving to the poor, and all Jesus’ reported injunctions in scripture to give to the poor, together with the fact that reported church collections were only taken up by Paul *exclusively for the poor* with *occasional* help for ministers such as Paul from church-collected money, and the collections made were not collected for the needs of the church collecting money, and the apostles commanded Christians to “remember the poor” (Gal. 2:10), Hagin *does not* follow Jesus and the apostles.<sup>581</sup>

### **3.20 Not Receiving Effective Faith from God Because Faith Works By Love.**

Hagin teaches that under the New Covenant we have the commandment of love (John 13: 34).<sup>582</sup> Jesus reportedly included the law and prophets under the commandment to both *love* God and to *love* one’s neighbour. Hagin’s teaching ignores the love that acts by regularly giving to the poor (ignoring the love that in regularly giving to the poor is concomitantly prepared to embrace living a lifestyle of ‘neither poverty nor riches’). Those not receiving healing they expected in the WOF might be counselled they need to be set free from a spirit of infirmity, and/or they lack faith, and/or they have unconfessed sin in their lives, and/or they have not applied the faith teachings expeditiously. However, one important scripture about faith that Hagin *fails to expound* says that what *avails* in Jesus Christ is “faith which worketh by love” (Gal. 5:6).<sup>583</sup> There seems a clue here to at least some of the non-receipt of faith in the WOF, when it is considered in tandem with the reported commandments of the gospel of Jesus. In the report of Paul’s last message to his beloved church at Ephesus, Paul referred rather to the “word of His grace” (Acts 20:32) instead of to the ‘word of faith.’

---

<sup>580</sup> Hagin, *Midas*, p. 170. In the light of Hagin’s glaring omission, the following sentiment of Hagin’s may seem ridiculous : “What counts is that the giver *does it as unto the Lord.*” ( Hagin, *Midas*, p. 170, Hagin’s italics ).

<sup>581</sup> Paul asked for the money for the poor to be ready waiting for him so that Paul would not have to importune on the subject when he arrived ( 1 Cor. 16: 2 ).

<sup>582</sup> Hagin, *Bible Faith*, p. 264.

<sup>583</sup> That is, there is no reference to this ‘faith’ scripture in Hagin’s *Bible Faith Study Course*, nor in his last work *The Midas Touch*. It is possible that Hagin has referred to it somewhere in the corpus of his printed work and recorded messages, but it is a scripture that should be given prominence in understanding the nature of faith and should be central to any teaching on faith, especially by a ‘faith-teacher !’ Hagin by no means makes it central. Neither does Hagin teach about Paul’s congratulation of the Ephesians telling them when he had heard “of your *faith* in the Lord Jesus, and *love* unto all the saints.” ( Eph. 1: 15, my italics ).

Going on to relate how he had not coveted anyone's silver, gold or clothing, and how he had worked to support himself, Paul's reported conclusion was "I shewed you all things, how that so labouring *ye ought to support the weak*, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, '*It is more blessed to give than to receive.*'" (Acts 20:35, my italics). If Christian believers neglect to obey the gospel of Jesus with its *inbuilt* minimum of regularly helping the poor (plus the gospel of Jesus' reported inferred lifestyle of neither poverty nor riches, and eschewal of 'works of iniquity'), then such believers are *not loving God* (John 14:15) and should therefore *not expect* to find that faith comes to them, because faith works by love, and they cannot routinely expect that for them "faith *cometh by hearing*, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17, my italics). Though the following statement of McConnell might be accused of being hubristic, it seems to me that, sadly, his portrayal of the WOF is accurate: "...they incessantly proclaim the *benefits* of the cross of Christ for the believer, such as prosperity and healing. But rarely, if ever, do they speak of the *claims* of the cross on the life of the believer."<sup>584</sup> Obeying Jesus is reportedly a 'walk in love' as "Whoever keeps his word, in him truly love for God is perfected...he who says he abides in him ought to walk in the same way in which he walked" (1 John 2:5-6).<sup>585</sup>

Paul is reported as giving the advice to Jews and gentiles "that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance" (Acts 26:20). This is the order: 1) repent, 2) turn to God, 3) do works worthy of the earlier-arrived at state of repentance.<sup>586</sup> John is reported as having told the Pharisees and Sadducees that they hadn't repented, because hadn't brought forth the works (fruits) worthy of repentance (Matt. 3:7-10). And it is reported that "God...will render to every man according to his deeds: to them...by patient continuance in

---

<sup>584</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 177.

<sup>585</sup> I do admit that there is another aspect of 'faith works by love;' as healing evangelist F. F. Bosworth relates: "In our revivals, I have seen faith rise "mountain high" when the truth of God's present love and compassion began to dawn upon the minds and hearts of the people. It is not what God *can* do, but what we know He *yearns* to do, that inspires faith." (Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, p. 76 ).

<sup>586</sup> Bartleman reported Martin Luther saying : "When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ says repent, he means that the *whole life of believers on earth should be a constant and perpetual repentance*. Repentance and sorrow – i.e. true repentance – endure as long as a man is displeased with himself – that is, until he passes from this life into eternity." ( Bartleman, *Pentecost in Los Angeles*, p. 13, my italics ).

well doing...eternal life.” (Rom. 2:5-7). We should reportedly be fleeing from iniquity “as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness.” (Rom. 6:19). For, reportedly, “if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die,” but we shall be “joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him.” (Rom. 8:13,17). This ‘suffering with Christ’ implies the Christian obey Christ in picking up their cross – their cross simply being the outworking of the works of the gospel of Jesus in their life. (Matt. 16:24-27). The Christian has no *carte blanche* to go around ‘calling those things which be not as though they were’ (Rom. 4:17) – this can only be done as faith is received from God for particular instances. The use of the expression *carte blanche* is apposite here, since believers cannot, although Hagin suggests they can – ‘write our own ticket with God.’<sup>587</sup> The teaching of Hagin and behaviour of WOF adherents may reflect Pentecostal ‘same old same old;’ Bartleman reported of people attending even the *earliest* ‘Azusa Street’ Pentecostal meetings: “Most were seeking selfish blessings. They rushed to meeting like a big sponge, to get more blessing. They needed stepping on. And so with the Pentecostal people today, largely.”<sup>588</sup> Thus, although an example of a ‘faith confession’ says “Let there be plenty where poverty has reigned. Let there be freedom where bondage has held sway”<sup>589</sup> it is asked whether there is any profit in making such ‘faith confessions’ as “Be warmed [in Jesus Name] Be filled [in Jesus Name]”

---

<sup>587</sup> The tendency of reported scripture is that rather than laying down our terms to God, we are to cooperate with Him. That is, reported scripture suggests one should, ideally, agree with what God is reported as saying He has done or says He will do. If one doesn’t agree with God’s reported sayings one then, notionally, needs to ask God to ‘open one’s eyes’ as a prerequisite for better ‘agreeing with Him.’ Reportedly, He will forgive us any previous sins committed ‘ignorantly in unbelief’ by our failure to ‘agree with Him.’ ( 1 Tim. 1: 13 ).

<sup>588</sup> Bartleman, *Pentecost in Los Angeles*, p. 26. In Bartleman’s little-repeated words : “I was tired of so much evanescent froth and foam, so much religious ranting and bombast.” ( Bartleman, *Pentecost in Los Angeles*, p. 27. ) Contrast this depiction of what may have been Azusa denigrating an *earlier sanctity*, that of the Pentecostal outpouring in Wales pre-dating Azusa, whose initial stages implied *earlier sanctity* conditional for the ‘downpouring of the Holy Spirit:’ “*We had a mighty downpouring of the Holy Spirit...This was preceded by the correcting of the people’s views of true worship. 1. – To give unto God, not to receive. 2. – To please God, not to please ourselves. Therefore looking to God, and forgetting the enemy, and also the fear of men, we prayed, and the Spirit descended.* I pray God to hear your prayer...and to save California...your brother in the fight. Evan Roberts.” ( My italics. Bartleman reports that this was the third letter he had received from Evan Roberts and that he believes the prayers of this ‘Welsh Revival’ resulted in the *later* Pentecostal outpouring in the ‘Azusa Street Revival’ in Los Angeles. [ Bartleman, *Pentecost in Los Angeles*, p. 35. ] Thus “*Slowly but surely the conviction is coming upon the saints of Southern California that God is going to pour out His Spirit here as in Wales.*” ( Bartleman, *Pentecost in Los Angeles*, p. 39, my italics ).

<sup>589</sup> Kenyon, *Jesus the Healer*, p. 66.

when the same Christians making these ‘faith confessions’ already possess the money to help the poor, and should be doing so out of their own pockets, which would thereby *be them* ‘in Jesus Name’ warming, and ‘in Jesus Name’ filling.<sup>590</sup> It seems the Christian believer showing no lovingkindness to their fellow-believer in need will be less inclined to receive lovingkindness themselves.<sup>591</sup> In that case, they will not receive the lovingkindness of the blessing of divine healing. Furthermore, when their not helping the poor leads to those poor becoming *diseased*, why should God heal the disease of those who are causing the poor to become diseased?<sup>592</sup> Such failure to feed the poor is reported as resulting in eternal damnation (Matt. 25:45-46).

### **3.21 Conclusion.**

Chapter two provided findings about E. W. Kenyon showing him not affected by Mind-Cure (Christian Science and New Thought), except insofar as his *criticising* Mind-Cure. This current chapter examined Kenneth Hagin to help support the *first part* of the thesis:

*‘Arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the*

---

<sup>590</sup> Just as Jesus is reported as saying that the Pharisees proclaiming their almsgiving in order to get glory from men have had their reward *in full* ; that is, that they can expect no reward from God. ( Matt. 6: 1-2 ). Another way to help the poor is to encourage *government* to help the poor : “Imagine the potential if the wisdom of the prosperity message, tempered to be more biblical by being less focused on individual greed and wealth accumulation, could be focused on the policies that would bring true prosperity to millions more folks who need it. Something like “*We Pentecostals know God is against poverty and is for prosperity, and we encourage the government to reallocate more money for education and health care.*” ” ( Paul Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, pp. 71-72, my italics ).

Alexander points out that Luke’s gospel reportedly shows the ‘Sermon on the Mount’ to have been delivered *part-way up a hill* ( Luke 6: 17 ), and *Alexander feels this symbolises the ‘neither poverty nor riches’ teaching of Jesus’ gospel* : “hoping to escape squalor is not greed ; it’s a more than legitimate response to *the invitation to move up the mountain*, an invitation straight from the heart of God.” ( Paul Alexander, *Signs and Wonders*, p. 73, my italics. )

<sup>591</sup> The reciprocal of the report of Matt. 5: 7 ; see Matt. 25: 34-46.

<sup>592</sup> Death has resulted from diseases that starved bodies could not resist. ( Sider, *Rich Christians*, p. 10. ) Certainly in Western Europe, great epidemics of infectious disease have been prevented *by providing the poor with better hygiene, nutrition, sanitation and living conditions*. This has reportedly been of more import than the acquisition of new therapeutic methods ( Pattison, *Alive and Kicking*, p. 27, and the rest of chapter 2 ).

*metaphysical.*' Just as McConnell's arguments Kenyon is a Mind-Cure metaphysical have been found unconvincing, McConnell's argument Hagin is such were also found wanting.

Chapter two's findings also showed Kenyon seemed silent on the need to obey reported biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. This finding went partway toward supporting the *second part* of the thesis: '*The Word of Faith does not teach obedience to the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor.*' The current chapter, examining Kenneth Hagin, continued to support this second part of the thesis. Hagin has, like Kenyon, also been found not to teach the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. <sup>593</sup>

By this current chapter also containing findings of the examination of reported biblical scripture concerning the subject of commandment to regularly help the poor, the *third part* of the thesis has also been supported: '*Biblical scripture suggests that not obeying this biblical commandment to regularly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the blessing of divine healing.*'

WOF teaching and practice of healing rejoices demonstrating to the miracle-denying that miracles of healing do still occur. One curious expression of McConnell is: "supernatural experiences and ministries are the heritage of the people of God...[but] not, however, the gospel itself." <sup>594</sup> In the light of the evidence of Jesus, the apostles, and approximately two

---

<sup>593</sup> It has been suggested that to argue from such a negative presents an 'unassailable difficulty.' Saying that this is not necessarily so, I assert that in the present research project the data being examined is all available for further examination. Therefore, it is only a matter of engaging with this data to declare what it does, *and what it does not* (arguing from a negative), describe. That is, the present research is no instance of 'arguing from silence;' because the data in question exists in full : therefore there is no room for the speculation of 'arguing from silence' implied in scholarly attempts to wrestle with an area in which data is *incomplete or unavailable*.

<sup>594</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 157. McConnell has a good subsidiary point here that he does not seem to develop. That is, the history of the early church is reportedly not one of 'rich ministries,' but of dedicated sacrificial preaching of the gospel ; there is therefore no need to collect money to finance ministries - for instance, reportedly the only money the apostle Paul was wont to pick up ( he didn't want to have to collect it from/importune individuals himself ) was for the despoiled Christian believers in Judea ( and reportedly there had also been a famine in Judea ), what Blomberg refers to as "the severe famine of the late 40s...almost certainly the same as the one Josephus mentions, which hit Judea particularly severely in AD 45-47 ( [ Josephus ] Antiquities 20.2.5 )." ( Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, pp. 163, 171. ) Regarding the despoilation of Christian believers, Sider justifiably feels that persecution wreaked havoc with the normal income of Christians - open persecution was reported in Acts 8: 1-3 ; 9: 29 ; 12:1-5; 23: 12-15. ( Sider, *Rich Christians*, p. 93. )

McConnell presents an exegesis of Rom. 8: 22-23 that includes the context of sickness, so that the reader/hearer of that reported scripture should not preclude sickness, as well as other forms of degradation/decay, from the groaning of creation and believers for "redemption." ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, pp. 158-159. McConnell

thousand years of following and ongoing supernatural experiences, McConnell should rather have said: ‘supernatural experiences (such as divine healing) are an important or integral part of the reported gospel of Jesus, but do not comprise the whole gospel.’

McConnell says Hagin’s teaching propagating the infallibility of biblical faith in divine healing thereby cheapens any WOF divine healings, where healing is not sovereignly bestowed through God’s mercy but mere result of a “cause-and-effect formula.”<sup>595</sup>

McConnell thus functionally trying to take the aspect of the mercy of God out of divine healings experienced in the WOF, McConnell fails to consider the *atonement itself is presented as a sovereign miracle bestowed by a merciful God: every miracle of divine healing (or other provision) wrought through faith in reported provisions of the atonement is a sovereign miracle bestowed by a merciful God.* Just as much as every reported healing wrought through faith in Jesus in Jesus’ Judean and Galilean and other ministry was also a reported sovereign miracle bestowed by a merciful God. In the report of the blind men in Matt. 20:29-34 asking for ‘mercy,’ they had sensed that the opening of their eyes *was a mercy* and therefore asked for that mercy; in Jesus granting them the mercy of healing He demonstrated that healing, as well as forgiveness, is a mercy (see Phil. 2:27 and so on).

In McConnell’s and Smail, Walker and Wright’s writing, there is a theme that WOF applications to God for healing are brash or peremptory, that God is thereby deprived of the aura of mystery appropriate to Him. However, scripture reports that Jesus told His close disciples that it was given to them to *know* mysteries, that these mysteries would no longer be mysteries to *them* (Matt. 13:11). This seems reported expression that God delights in

---

mentions Rom. 8: 19-21, but see also Rom. 8: 22-23. ) There is a danger with either over *or under* stressing sickness’s inclusion in this reported passage of scripture ; judging by the tendency of McConnell’s writing, it seems fair to argue that he is likely to be among those who overstress the inclusion of sickness in the exegesis.<sup>595</sup> McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 158. McConnell also appeals to what he characterises as universal everyday experience when he says “They [Faith teachers] are ignoring the obvious fact that Christians get sick all the time.” ( McConnell, *Different Gospel*, p. 158 ). Although it is axiomatic to point out that Christians do become sick, it is wrong of McConnell not to admit those exceptional Christians who have gone/go through life living healthily without a lifestyle of sickness, even if that lifestyle included/includes incidences of sickness having been divinely healed.

revealing Himself; God is not desiring things necessary to know (in order to receive the blessing of divine healing) remaining shrouded in mystery.

Because of the phenomenon of miracles of divine healing still occurring within the WOF, being documented with medical attestation (such as Dodie Osteen's book *Healed of Cancer* and the still more recent academic work of Candy Gunther Brown, besides other), the WOF feels justified boldly claiming its teaching and practice of healing is the 'definitive word' for acquisition of divine healing. This WOF confidence has been built on what has been extrapolated out from dramatic and wonderful instantaneously-manifested healings ('snap-healings') of revivalist tent-meetings to present a doctrine of healing. For over sixty years, Hagin the healing evangelist reasoned with his audience for them to receive faith for becoming 'born-again,' or to speak in tongues, or to be divinely healed. His ministry had perforce had a pragmatic bent: it seems this pragmatic-evangelistic "tent-meeting" teaching of *faith for* divine healing was adopted by Hagin as his sole teaching of divine healing.<sup>596</sup>

While Hagin's teaching and practice of divine healing might be regarded as appropriate for the evangelistic 'job in hand' in evangelistic meetings, an examination of Hagin's material has proved Hagin's teaching unsuitable to view in terms of constituting a well-rounded description of the reported gospel of Jesus and concordant biblical *materiel*.

Through Hagin concentrating on the instrumentality of faith for divine healing (and faith for prosperity) Hagin ignominiously ignores reported biblical testimony that divine healing is intertwined with the issue of obeying commandment to at least regularly help the poor.

Hagin derogates biblical commandment to regularly help the poor to an unspecified amount of money notionally given to the poor as some portion of the believer's 10% tithe money paid

---

<sup>596</sup> Concurrent with Pragmatism was anti-miraculous teaching in contention. Thus : "many modern theologians, following [ Rudolf ] Bultmann, insist that miracles do not, by the nature of things, occur. Bultmann, deeply influenced by neo-Kantian philosophy and mechanistic physics, set up an antinomy between the supernaturalism of the Bible and what he saw as the scientific world-view : 'It is impossible to use electric light and the wireless and to avail ourselves of modern medical and surgical discoveries, and at the same time to believe in the New Testament world of daemons and spirits.' " [ Andrew Walker in Smail, Walker, Wright, *Charismatic Renewal*, p. 123, citing Rudolf Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology*, in H. W. Bartsch, (ed.), *Kerygma and Myth*, ( London : SPCK, 1953 ), p. 5. ] And see Rudolf Bultmann [ Schubert M. Ogden ( ed. ) ], *New Testament and Mythology, and other Basic Writings*, ( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1985 ). Farah implies rejection of the occurrence of modern-day miracles, among "the Southern Baptists who claim the whole canon of Scripture as their only guide for doctrine, yet spiritualize away the miracles." ( Farah, *Pinnacle of the Temple*, p. 230 ).

to their ‘local church.’

Despite Vreeland saying WOF theology exalts biblical scripture’s authority, the findings show Kenyon and Hagin teaching adherence to only a *subset* of the reported teaching of the gospel of Jesus and His apostles (and supporting biblical scripture): thus the WOF subtly *denigrates* the authority of biblical scripture.<sup>597</sup> I feel it has been demonstrated both Kenyon and Hagin’s teaching as depicting the teachings of the gospel of Jesus and His apostles could *itself* be described as constituting a ‘blockage to faith’ for the reception of the blessing of divine healing. Hagin’s WOF theology, which he claims to promote balance, is found inadequate to the task he claims for it. In championing Kenyon and Hagin’s teaching, the WOF presents an incomplete model of healing; such a *part-model* of healing is – unsurprisingly - hampered in its effectiveness. The WOF propagates Hagin’s teaching with its inbuilt ignoring of God’s reported commandment to *at least* regularly help the poor (if not selling all they possess, or half they possess, and giving the proceeds to the poor).<sup>598</sup> In doing so, the WOF opens up those accepting Hagin’s teaching as an accurate representation of the reported gospel of Jesus to receive the reported curse/negativity in scripture, including their not being able to receive faith to receive the blessing of divine healing.

0-----0

---

<sup>597</sup> Vreeland, *Word of Faith Theology*, p. 10ff.

<sup>598</sup> Even from solely an Old Testament perspective, it has been taught that if someone wishes to break off their sins by helping the poor (Dan. 4: 27), then they may give their all : “all that a man has will he give for his life [for his soul]” ( Newman, *Hasidic Anthology*, p. 38, a saying attributed to the “Yud.”) The question can be posed – what did/does Jesus reportedly require of His disciples, and indeed of the whole world, when He issues the call to ‘leave everything ?’ By way of answering what is a personal question of discipleship, I point out that there are reported biblical passages indicating that the ‘neither poverty nor riches’ of Proverbs 30 may entail a call for voluntary poverty *on the one hand*, and/or only the call for a right attitude to the continuing possession of wealth, *on the other hand*. As an example of these differing ‘calls’ within the call to follow Jesus : “Besides those who, like the Apostles, have abandoned all to follow him, there are also people like Mary Magdalene and Joanna (Lk. 8: 1-3), who support the itinerant Master and his disciples with their means.” ( Peter Liu, ‘Did the Lucan Jesus Desire Voluntary Poverty ?,’ *The Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. LXIV No. 4 October, 1992, p. 298 ). Also, the command of self-denial reported in Luke 14: 25ff is addressed to the crowds, not *only* to those who are intent on becoming missionaries. Again, the reported context of Luke 12: 33 indicates the presence of crowds of onlookers ( 12: 1, 13 ), so reportedly the demand for renunciation could not have been intended for an inner core only – when Peter asked whether Jesus was addressing the inner core of the crowd ( 12: 41 ), Jesus refused to restrict the scope of the teaching to a select group. ( Liu, *Voluntary Poverty*, pp. 292-293 ).

## **Chapter 4                      Conclusion.**

First I re-state the thesis. Then follows statement of the research findings, including answers to possible charges of weakness. I also make suggestions for future research. One of these concerns research which extends that carried out for this thesis.

I then draw the final conclusion.

I advanced the thesis that:

*Arguments brought to support the claim that the Word of Faith teaching and practice of healing is metaphysical can be judged unsubstantiated. Furthermore, neither is there adequate ground for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith is metaphysical, nor for the fundamental claim that the Word of Faith originated in the metaphysical. Therefore Word of Faith lack of appropriation of the blessing of divine healing cannot be blamed on the metaphysical. The Word of Faith does not teach obedience to the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. Biblical scripture suggests that not obeying this biblical commandment to regularly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the blessing of divine healing.*

The thesis is tripartite:

- 1) Healing Teaching and Practice in the WOF is not metaphysical;
- 2) The WOF does not teach obedience to the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor;
- 3) Biblical scripture suggests that not obeying the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the blessing of divine healing.

All three parts of the thesis have, I feel, been adequately supported. I now summarise the way research carried out supports the thesis. I do this through both reviewing contributions made, reflecting critically on the research, and also defending the thesis against possible charges of weakness.

*The first possible charge of weakness is that by not concentrating solely on E. W. Kenyon, or solely on Kenneth Hagin, Sr., there is no presentation of a comprehensive depiction of either personality's work, so that the WOF has not properly been analysed. However, such a charge*

is tantamount to stating that a thesis must depict *either* Kenyon *or* Hagin but cannot combine the teachings of the two men in one thesis. In a sense, this ‘first possible charge of weakness’ makes the rather futile claim that no one can ever truly write a thesis on the WOF itself since they could only ever examine Kenyon or Hagin, but never examine both together. In further answer to this first charge, I state that in order for a thesis to examine the WOF, be it a thesis examining an aspect of the WOF such as healing or prosperity, there is going to be discussion of not only Kenneth Hagin in isolation, but also examination of others in the WOF, be that E. W. Kenyon or perhaps Kenneth and Gloria Copeland or Norvel Hayes or Creflo Dollar. As a most pertinent illustration of this, Dan McConnell’s own MTh. thesis spoke in the main of *two* WOF personalities, E. W. Kenyon and Kenneth E. Hagin. It is partly because I have been addressing the content of McConnell’s book based on his MTh. thesis, that my thesis also deals with E. W. Kenyon and Kenneth E. Hagin. Of course, it is possible to write a thesis on any personality in the WOF, and to restrict one’s focus to the teachings, collaboration, output and influence and so on of that one person, but that is not to present a thesis on the WOF *en grosse*.

*The first finding of the research is that healing teaching and practice in the WOF is not that of the Mind-Cure metaphysical. This supports the first part of the thesis.* The WOF is found largely to derive from evangelical healing evangelism, being notably influenced by personalities from the U. S. Divine Healing Movement. The research indicates that teaching and practice of divine healing of this Divine Healing Movement has been replicated in the WOF; the language of Judd Montgomery particularly, has been seen to be that of the healing evangelist. The WOF has been found to seem to fulfil a role of healing evangelism typically *previously* seen in camp meetings and in this Divine Healing Movement. McConnell’s arguments concerning E. W. Kenyon and Kenneth Hagin and the WOF being metaphysical, metaphysical in the sense of being in some way allied to Mind-Cure, were found

unconvincing. Rather, the language of E. W. Kenyon and Kenneth Hagin, emphasizing the importance of ‘faith in the Word’ for healing, was found to be the language of the healing evangelist. It seems clear the Divine Healing Movement’s evangelical healing evangelist teaching and practice of divine healing is replicated in the WOF healing evangelist’s teaching and practice of divine healing.

*The second possible charge of weakness is that the word ‘metaphysical’ within the thesis and research question is nebulous. The answer to this possible second charge is that I have answered in the negative McConnell’s own charge *couched in the language* that the theology of ‘Faith theology,’ particularly the WOF teaching of E. W. Kenyon and Kenneth Hagin is ‘metaphysical.’*

McConnell uses the word ‘metaphysical’ in the same fashion as it seems to have been used in the nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century *U. S.* As such, speaking by the standards of *U. S.* parlance, McConnell’s use of the word might be thought faintly archaic. Moreover, as I mentioned, such use of the word ‘metaphysical’ should not be confused with the traditional *English* use of ‘metaphysical,’ such that even as late as in the 1980’s I was among a small group of professing Christians studying Philosophy at university, and known by that university’s Philosophy department as ‘metaphysicals.’

The word ‘metaphysical’ had been used in the *U. S.* to describe firstly, groups/institutions that were considered part of Mind-Cure, and secondly, individual adherents of the teachings comprising Mind-Cure. Unlike *U. S.* philosopher and psychologist William James had done earlier, on the advent of the twentieth century, Dan McConnell attempted no comprehensive definition of what Mind-Cure incorporated and, after short discussion, McConnell started to use the word Mind-Cure as shorthand for the two most influential of its constituents: Christian Science and New Thought. Likewise, the word ‘metaphysical’ ends up being used by McConnell as synonymous with ‘Christian Science and New Thought.’ In my replication of the word in the thesis and research question I followed McConnell’s use of language,

signifying I wished to question McConnell's claim Kenyon's and Hagin's teachings are 'metaphysical' (subscribing to the doctrine of Christian Science and New Thought). This necessitated the research delving into what both Christian Science and New Thought constitute; neither the teaching of E. W. Kenyon nor that of Kenneth Hagin were found to be metaphysical. Indeed, both Kenyon and Hagin spoke out against Christian Science and New Thought. I pointed out that the only way Kenyon was demonstrably influenced by Mind-Cure (Christian Science and New Thought) is when he destructively criticised Mind-Cure.<sup>599</sup> Furthermore, Kenyon was reportedly distressed about how many members of Christian churches had abandoned them in favour of attending Christian Science churches instead; Kenyon was a staunch critic of the anti-miraculous stance of many Christian churches. The findings show Kenyon to have been a healing evangelist. Kenyon, an admitted significant source for what came to be designated the WOF, therefore has a healing evangelism emphasis in his teaching.

*The second finding of the research is that the WOF does not teach the reported biblical commandment of love to regularly help the poor; the WOF does not teach the stipulated blessings attendant on regularly helping the poor, and the stipulated curses of not doing so.*

*This supports the second part of the thesis.* Moreover, this second finding of the research showed antagonism between Hagin and the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor; Hagin's *tradition* of teaching is thereby one fulfilment of Jesus' reported words "you annulled the command of God on account of your tradition." (Matt. 15:6b, Green).

*The third finding of the research is that reported biblical scripture suggests that not obeying the commandment to regularly help the poor is evil, and is therefore detrimental to incidence*

---

<sup>599</sup> There is another book also "disputing McConnell's attempt to establish a causal link between Kenyon and New Thought." ( Lie, *Theology*, p. 86 ). The book concerned is : J. [ Joe ] McIntyre, *E. W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story*, ( Lake Mary/Altamonte, Florida : Creation House, 1997 ). Joe McIntyre joins Geir Lie as being also recognised as a 'Kenyon researcher' ( Atkinson, '*Spiritual Death*' of Jesus, acknowledgments page ). McIntyre had served as President of Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society.

of the blessing of divine healing. <sup>600</sup> *This supports the third part of the thesis.*

*The third possible charge of weakness is that it is foolhardy to try to explain lack of divine healing in the WOF by pointing to a lack of regularly helping the poor. My answer to this third charge is that the thesis does not claim that all incidences of a lack of divine healing in the WOF can be explained by pointing to a lack of regularly giving to the poor. However, the thesis is affirmed in its claim that biblical scripture does suggest that not obeying the biblical commandment to (lovingly) regularly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the blessing of divine healing.*

*The fourth possible charge of weakness is that very little was said about other possible reasons for non-incidence of divine healing in the WOF. The answer to this charge is a spatial one: the relative shortness of an MPhil thesis. This has precluded scope to develop what I believe are interconnected themes implied by ‘at least regularly giving to the poor.’ These consist of, firstly, the theme of an implied lifestyle for the Christian believer of one of ‘neither poverty nor riches,’ secondly, the theme of the role of iniquity: speaking of sickness either generationally (congenitally) or non-generationally (non-congenitally). I discuss this in some further detail in the last suggestion for further research.*

*The first suggestion for further research: research into what should properly be thought of as the start and end dates of the U. S. ‘Post-WWII Healing Revival.’ Also, attempting to answer the question of what seems to have been catalytic for it. There should ideally be a comprehensive determination of which personalities were involved, a timetable for this revival, and its subsequence.*

*The second suggestion for further research: Investigate the historical demographic of pastor/evangelist/prophet in Pentecostal leadership.*

*The third suggestion for further research: Ascertain the full extent of E. W. Kenyon’s U. S. Divine Healing Movement credentials. Answer the question of whether there were others in*

---

<sup>600</sup> Put in other words, WOF teaching and practice of healing is undermined by WOF failure to teach the implications of being a Christian believer.

the Divine Healing Movement, besides Carrie Judd Montgomery, who influenced Kenyon. Also, discuss not only who Kenyon's contacts in the Divine Healing Movement were, but also consider what role Kenyon fulfilled strengthening or influencing the movement.

*The fourth suggestion for further research:* Rather than rest content with categorising the WOF as an expression of evangelical healing evangelism, there is also the question of whether the WOF can be considered a continuation of the work of the early modern Pentecostal healing evangelists with the *same emphasis on prosperity*. It should be considered *whether or not* the WOF can be correctly regarded as a new expression, with *greater emphasis on prosperity*, of the tradition of the early modern Pentecostal healing evangelists.

*The fifth suggestion for further research:* Research for a thesis complementary to this one. To explore the nature of biblical 'wholeness,' investigate the role of the lifestyle of 'neither poverty nor riches,' as precursive of a lifestyle of, at least, regularly helping the poor. Connected to this, explore the theme of *iniquity* in the incidence/non-incidence of the blessing of divine healing/divine health, towards the identification of biblical wholeness.<sup>601</sup> Then, juxtapose the work of two existing Christian ministries who claim they promote biblical wholeness against the nature of this identified biblical wholeness. The carrying-out of this particular research would help part-fulfil prediction of the likelihood that "a more comprehensive theology of wholeness will undergird healing ministry in the twenty-first

---

<sup>601</sup> Craig Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*; Ronald (Ron) Sider, *Rich Christians*; Bob Goudzwaard, & Harry de Lange, *Beyond Poverty and Affluence: Toward an Economy of Care*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995). Thus: "Over and over again God specifically commanded his people to live together in community in such a way that they would avoid extremes of wealth and poverty. That is the point of the legislation concerning the jubilee and the sabbatical year...Paul's collection was simply an application of the basic principle of the jubilee...Since the Greeks at Corinth were now part of the people of God, they were to share with the poor Jewish Christians at Jerusalem – that there might be equality...the biblical norm for material possessions is 'sufficiency.'" (Sider, *Rich Christians*, pp. 100, 119). Investigations of the inter-connected themes of 'neither poverty nor riches' and 'iniquity' are carried out towards whole fulfilment of "He sent His word and healed them; and delivered them from all their pitfalls." (Ps. 107: 20, Green).

The following observation by Blomberg seems to be one that is rather common-or-garden: "In most affluent or suburban Western communities, it is impossible to detect any outward differences between the expenditures of professing Christians and the religiously unaffiliated who surround them in their neighbourhoods." (Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, p. 20). This seems rather to grate with Blomberg's claim on the next page that it is Christians who have distinguished themselves from their surrounding cultures and adherents of other religions in a Christian championing of concern for the poor. (Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, p. 21).

century.”<sup>602</sup> Seeing a lack of wholeness from a medical point of view it has been said “we have not succeeded in preventing degenerative processes and malignant growth, the two most common diseases of middle life and old age.”<sup>603</sup>

0-----0

*“What matters is whether I am accepting God’s rule or not. Is there something in my life that is meriting the chastisement of God ?”*<sup>604</sup>

I would like, somewhat tentatively, to attempt to use indications to trace the tendency not to concentrate on regularly helping the poor. John Wesley’s simplicity of life in favour of helping the poor has already been noted, and will be noted again below. It is instructive to historically trace the steady treatment of divine healing based on provision in the atonement through, particularly, Dr. Charles Cullis, Carrie Judd Montgomery, Essek William Kenyon, and Kenneth Erwin Hagin.

There seems to have been a great degree of faithfulness to the gospel of Jesus in the ministry of Charles Cullis that seems relatively absent in the ministries of Judd Montgomery, Kenyon and Hagin. I suggest that this finding is the inspiration for Paul Chappell referring to Cullis’s gospel as the “balanced gospel.”<sup>605</sup> In defining Cullis’s ministry as a ‘balanced gospel,’ Chappell is not positing an exclusive ‘gospel of social concern.’ Rather, Chappell is alluding to the balance of the reported gospel of Jesus that included/includes *both* miraculous health/healing and at least regularly helping the poor.<sup>606</sup>

Besides Cullis advocating divine healing based on the provision in the atonement, *he also spent a great deal of his time regularly ‘helping the poor’ in his ministry.*<sup>607</sup> Being a regular helper of the poor it seems *naturally consequential* that Cullis’s life was one of ‘neither

---

<sup>602</sup> Mathew & Kimberly Alexander, ‘Future of Healing Ministries,’ in Synan, *Spirit-Empowered Christianity*, p. 332.

<sup>603</sup> Dr. Andrew Stanway, *Taking the Rough With the Smooth*, ( London : Pan Books, 1981 ), p. 18.

<sup>604</sup> D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *From Fear to Faith*, ( London : The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1957 ), pp. 48, 64.

<sup>605</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 279.

<sup>606</sup> Evidence shows that the WOF have a pattern of miraculous healing, but the WOF need to take on the pattern of at least regularly helping the poor in order to also have the ‘balanced gospel [of Jesus]’ Chappell refers to.

<sup>607</sup> “The practitioners of divine healing were *actively involved in meeting the social needs and concerns of their day. The most vivid example of this is seen in the work of Charles Cullis.*” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p.vii, my italics ).

poverty nor riches;’ in favour of his policy of ‘supporting the weak/poor’ Cullis renounced the rich medical practice he could have had as a full-time doctor (Acts 20:35, 1 Thess. 5:14).

608

Though it is interesting to see the same approach as Cullis’s to ‘healing scripture’ in the ministries of Judd Montgomery, Kenyon and Hagin, it is perhaps more prescient to denote what seems a dire lack of regularly helping the poor in these ministries. As for Judd Montgomery, in the course of a very long ministry she did open two ‘healing homes’ similar to those operated by her seeming healing-home-inspiration Cullis.<sup>609</sup> However, sadly, Judd Montgomery closed the first healing home when she moved to California with her very rich husband, rather than hand it over to others to continue to run it – something she could have well-afforded to fund.<sup>610</sup>

Cullis’s Seventh Annual Report had reported a local newspaper that stated that in 1871 Cullis’s two healing homes still formed “the *only institution of its kind* in [the whole of] America.”<sup>611</sup> But Judd Montgomery did not pursue the compassionate ministry of Cullis in his helping so many different groups from blacks to Jews to street-children to prostitutes.

This was despite the fact that, as just touched on, George Montgomery, Judd Montgomery’s

---

<sup>608</sup> The apostle Paul is reported to have at times carried out his trade of tent-making, and analogously it seems the reason Cullis did maintain a little of his private medical practice was to fund his multitudinous ‘ministries of helps.’ ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 141. ) By 1871, just seven years after Cullis began his faith ministry, his work included “four consumptives’ homes, an out-patient dispensary, an orphanage, a deaconesses’ home, a local church, a publishing house, an evening college, and a ‘free-circulating’ library.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 117. ) But Cullis expanded on this: eventually he “operated the Willard Tract Repository, five churches, a college, two orphanages, and healing homes specializing in the care of spinal patients, cancer patients, paralytics, the insane, and ‘fallen women.’ He also oversaw missions to the American Jewish population, black freedmen in the South, Chinese Americans and several missions in California. Missionaries were sent from his work to India and South Africa.” ( Alexander, *Healing*, pp. 17-18 ).

<sup>609</sup> Chappell calculates Judd Montgomery’s ‘grand total’ over her long ministry as two faith healing homes (one she subsequently closed ), two orphanages and a rescue mission, very modest in terms of what her associate Charles Cullis achieved for the weak. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 183 ). Judd Montgomery’s periodical ‘*Triumphs of Faith*’ was published monthly from 1<sup>st</sup> January 1881 until September, 1979. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 183 ). As Jennifer Miskov says “Because divine healing was not a popular subject in the church, healing homes provided a safe place for people to come and learn about this “new” truth and also pray for and receive healing.” ( Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*, p. 222 ). Whereas Miskov reported that Judd Montgomery charged the patients in her healing homes, Chappell says of Cullis’s home for consumptives “At the home they received *totally free* the comforts of a warm home and complete medical care.” ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 115, my italics. )

<sup>610</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, pp. 241-242.

<sup>611</sup> Charles Cullis, ‘Seventh Annual Report ( period ending September 30, 1871 ),’ p. 23, in Charles Cullis, *Annual Reports of the Consumptives’ Home, and Other Institutions Connected with a Work of Faith*, ( Boston, Massachusetts : Willard Tract Repository, 1864-1892 ), cited in Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 117.

husband and ‘partner’ in her ministry was approximately equivalent to a twenty-first century dollar billionaire in terms of his then wealth, and could with ease have paid for ministries similar to those Cullis had carried out.<sup>612</sup> Alongside the photograph of the rather small and paltry-in-comparison healing home that Judd Montgomery and her rich husband set up in Oakland, California once moved to California, Cullis within California alone “*had several missions.*”<sup>613</sup> Perhaps behind the Montgomerys’ apparent tight-fistedness was some credence given to R. H. Tawney’s plausible argument that “the recognition accorded by Puritan ethics to the economic virtues...[had] modified the traditional attitude towards social obligations.”<sup>614</sup> Allied to this was a belief that the distress of the poor was a proof of their demerit, that it was a duty *not to help the poor* so they would be encouraged to work harder and relieve their poverty by their own efforts. This would avoid the danger of pampering poverty.<sup>615</sup> This specie of argument ignores Jesus’ reported lifestyle of regularly helping the poor, and ignores Jesus reportedly explaining His messiahship in terms of His preaching *to the poor*, as well as healing (Matt. 11:4-5); discipleship to Christ is to be seen as ongoing acknowledgement of Christ, christology outworking in christopraxy, orthodoxy in

---

<sup>612</sup> In the late-nineteenth-century U. S. when anyone possessing one hundred thousand dollars was considered very wealthy, George Montgomery among his fellow *multi-millionaires* was one of the wealthier. He had amassed \$6 million in one particular business venture, and gone on from that in money-making, before marrying Carrie Judd. ( see the chapter concerning Judd’s marrying in Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery* ). Carrie Judd’s marriage to George S. Montgomery of Oakland, California had taken place in June 1890. ( Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 241 ).

<sup>613</sup> Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*, p. 126, my italics, citing William H. Daniels, *Dr. Cullis and His Work. Twenty Years of Blessing in Answer to Prayer. A History of the Hospitals, Schools, Orphanages, Churches, and Missions Raised up and Supported by the Hand of the Lord through the Faith and Labors of Charles Cullis, M. D. Of Boston, USA*, ( Boston, Massachusetts : Willard Tract Repository, 1885 ), pp. 154, 319f., 336-337.

The photograph can be seen in Miskov, *Carrie Judd Montgomery*.

<sup>614</sup> R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, ( London : Penguin Books Ltd., 1969 ), pp. 251-252 ; Tawney made clear that by “economic virtues” he meant hard work, saving money and thrift. This was connected to the belief that by a curious osmosis, a notional dripping down of the wealth of the rich to the poor : “the advancement of private persons will be the advantage of the public,” whereas “the teaching most characteristic of medieval writers had been that the relief of the needy was a primary obligation on those who had means. St Thomas...quotes with approval the strong words of St Ambrose about those who cling to the bread of the starving...and concludes...that to withhold alms when there is evident and urgent necessity is mortal sin.” Again “ ‘The poor man,’ preached Latimer, ‘hath title to the rich man’s goods ; so that the rich man ought to let the poor man have part of his riches to help and to comfort him withal.’ ” ( Tawney, *Religion*, pp. 257, 258-259, 260. )

<sup>615</sup> Tawney, *Religion*, p. 265. Tawney quoted one writer writing “every one but an idiot knows that the lower classes must be kept poor, or they will never be industrious.” ( Tawney, *Religion*, p. 268, citing Arthur Young, *Eastern Tour*, 1771, vol. iv, p. 361. ) Tawney characterised this statement as being a mere bauble, a trite commonplace of the time.

orthopraxy.<sup>616</sup> Contrasting with Jesus' reported teaching and example, societally severity towards the poor was turned "from a sin into a duty."<sup>617</sup> Tawney's own rather acrimonious conclusion is:

"A society which reverences the attainment of riches as the supreme felicity will naturally be disposed to regard the poor as damned in the next world, if only to justify itself for making their life a hell in this."<sup>618</sup>

Ralph Waldo Trine, claiming his New Thought pertaining to "all phases and conditions of life," gave ammunition to those blaming the poor for being in their predicament: "We invite whatever comes, and did we not invite it...it could not and it would not come."<sup>619</sup> In the laws laid down in Trine's a-religious New Thought Trine insists: "If one hold himself in the thought of poverty, he will be poor, and the chances are that he will remain in poverty. If he hold himself, whatever present conditions may be, continually in the thought of prosperity, he sets into operation forces that will sooner or later bring him into prosperous conditions."<sup>620</sup>

As I have already said, Kenyon, like Hagin, did not teach the importance of at least regularly helping the poor. A counter-argument to this could be that Judd Montgomery, Kenyon and Hagin in this may have been adhering to Jesus' teaching that *one should not trumpet* the fact of one's helping the poor (Matt. 6: 1-4). However, to counter this counter-argument: part of the dynamic of telling/not telling about good deeds (such as helping the poor) is also being aware of Jesus' reported teaching that *men should see* our good deeds and glorify God the Father (Matt 5: 16);<sup>621</sup> Cullis's good deeds have been clearly seen/noted (to the reported glory of God the Father), so why then could not deeds of Judd Montgomery, Kenyon, and

---

<sup>616</sup> Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, p. 2.

Calvin's teaching reflected that of the New Testament: "We are not our own...We are God's...All the endowments which we possess are deposits i[sic]ntrusted to us for the very purpose of being distributed for the good of our neighbour..." (Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 87, citing John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1559), III, vii, 1 and 5 [II pp. 7 and 10f.] )

<sup>617</sup> Tawney, *Religion*, p. 264. For example, Daniel Defoe suggested that laziness is the cause of poverty. (Mullin, *Wealth of Christians*, p. 85, citing Daniel Defoe, *Giving Alms no Charity*, London, 1704 ).

<sup>618</sup> Tawney, *Religion*, p. 265.

<sup>619</sup> Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 65 ; and the poor are to be blamed because it seems they neglected their 'birth-right': "You are born to have absolute control over your own dominion, but if you voluntarily hand over this power, even if for a little while...then you of course become the creature, the one controlled." ( Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 66. )

<sup>620</sup> Trine, *In Tune With the Infinite*, p. 176.

<sup>621</sup> That is, one needs discernment to know which of the two differing commandments God is instructing one to follow in a particular instance.

Hagin also be seen? Not, I suggest, because they were hidden with pious intent, but because they were largely absent. It seems to have been Cullis who pre-eminently heeded John Wesley's famous sermon *The Use of Money* declaring: "money...is food for the hungry, drink for the thirsty, raiment for the naked...*a means of health to the sick, of ease to them that are in pain;*"<sup>622</sup> The text Wesley had chosen for this sermon was Luke 16:9, the gist of which was commandment one should spend one's money in such a way as to make God your friend.<sup>623</sup> As widely reported, it seems to have been nuns and monks who reacted to Jesus' and apostolic teaching by taking vows of poverty, whereas for 'lay' people the reported requirement laid on Jesus' disciples that they should at least regularly help the poor has become at best something extraneous to everyday life, some ethereal optional extra task.<sup>624</sup>

It seems McConnell could have heeded *ex abusu non arguitur ad usum* ('from the abuse no argument is drawn against the use'): WOF teaching and practice of divine healing *itself* is not found to be that of Mind-Cure metaphysicals. On another tack, what McConnell *could have said* but did not, perhaps because he was seeking to prove that the WOF *is* metaphysical, was that emphasizes in the WOF *could be attractive to those who are metaphysicals*. This attractiveness is implied by Bryan Wilson's taxonomy of sects when he talks of the 'manipulationist' sect.<sup>625</sup> As a counter-argument to this, it might be pointed

---

<sup>622</sup> John Wesley, 'The Use of Money,' in *Sermons on Several Occasions*, ( London : The Epworth Press, 1954 ), p. 578, my italics. This sermon is more famous for the advice it contained that became a slogan, to 'gain all you can, save all you can, give all you can.' These three tenets are not particularly helpful in light of the most obvious source of contradiction seeming to lie between the second and third tenets. However, it seems that, toward the end of this sermon, Wesley went some way toward abnegating improper use of these tenets when commanding "Render unto God, not a tenth, not a third, not a half, but all that is God's, be it more or less; by employing all on yourself, your household, the household of faith, and all mankind, in such a manner, that you may give a good account of your stewardship, when ye can be no longer stewards;" ( John Wesley, *Use of Money*, p. 588. )

Although this sermon was first preached in 1744, it was reserved for publication in the last, fourth, volume of Wesley's published sermons. The four volumes of Wesley's sermons were published in 1746, 1748, 1750, and 1760 respectively. ( see "Note" serving as frontispiece in John Wesley, *Sermons on Several Occasions*.)

<sup>623</sup> Wesley, *Use of Money*, p. 576.

<sup>624</sup> Antonio Moser, & Bernardino Meers, *Moral Theology: Dead Ends and Ways Forward*, ( Tunbridge Wells, Kent : Burns and Oates, 1990 ), p. 186. Reflecting this, the idea of love, or charity, has been reduced to patchy almsgiving, prompting adoption of the cry "We want justice, not charity." ( Moser, *Moral Theology*, p. 160. )

<sup>625</sup> "A manipulationist sect can come into being only when *metaphysical thought* has extended into the religious and philosophical traditions of a society...They tend to offer visions of prestige and power, as well as the short cuts for achieving them...The special means offered by the sects to attain these goals are defined in terms of

out that in order, say, for Christian Scientists to truly fit within the WOF it would be necessary for them to adopt orthodox Christology, abandoning Christian Science teaching portraying Jesus Christ as a failure. This said, McConnell is right to suggest the WOF portrays a ‘different gospel.’<sup>626</sup> That is, *in the sense of the findings that the WOF do not teach obedience to the reported biblical commandment to regularly help the poor, the WOF is not being faithful to the reported gospel of Jesus and His apostles.*<sup>627</sup> The findings show scripture suggests that not obeying the biblical commandment to regularly  *bless/help* the poor is detrimental to the incidence of the  *blessing* of divine healing. Reported commandment to regularly help the poor occurs severally in the Mosaic covenant of the Pentateuch, in the wisdom books, in the books of the prophets, and in the lifestyles and teachings of Jesus and His apostles in the New Testament, involving ‘the faithful’ exercising self-denial in fulfilling God’s reported mandate to provide regular blessing for the poor. The findings make seem rather glib Morris saying “what is problematic in word of faith theology *is not that basic doctrines have been subtracted;*”<sup>628</sup> - for the findings show that in WOF teaching there is a lack of the ‘*basic doctrine*’ of regularly helping the poor.<sup>629</sup>

We read reports of Jesus’ ministry where Jesus singled out particular individuals for

---

*verbal techniques and metaphysical theories.* They use a language which attracts confidence and creates assurance, and their pre-occupation with the explanation of their theories tends to exclude all other activity. Well-being in this world, perceived in terms of health, wealth, comfort and social status, constitutes the practical sanction for these sects’ teaching.” ( Bryan. R. Wilson, ‘A Typology of Sects,’ in Robertson, *Sociology of Religion*, p. 374, my italics. And see pp. 367-368 ).

<sup>626</sup> The title of the UK edition of McConnell’s book is *A Different Gospel*; this carries the resonance of Galatians chapter one with Paul pronouncing anathema on anyone preaching a *different* gospel ( Gal. 1: 6-9 ).

<sup>627</sup> Hollenweger : “I have often asked myself why in our [ Pentecostal ] meetings the Spirit is so eloquent on ‘peace of heart,’ on marriage problems... and so silent on...oppression, and starvation ?...Could it be that we do not listen...?” ( Hollenweger, *The Pentecostal Elites*, p. 209. )

<sup>628</sup> Morris, *Truth Matters*, p. 158, my italics.

<sup>629</sup> On the love of money which is characteristically sitting in place of the practice of regularly helping the poor it has been said, in U. S./King James Version English : “I would like to see greater minds than mine, leaders of experience and seniority gather in Lausanne or any other suitable place to talk about filthy lucre. There might be fireworks, but there might also be fruit. Is it impossible that God should revive his people as far down as their pocketbooks ? Is it impossible for the Holy Spirit to show us how we may reform our principles and practices ?” ( White, *Golden Cow*, p. 102. )

Though both forgiveness for sin and divine healing are claimed in Jesus’ atonement/redemption, Jesus is reported as saying that few will be saved and that the poor will always be with you, significant of widespread failure to eradicate material poverty, and also few are divinely healed. There is a reported provision made for a future ‘healing of the nations’ in the leaves of the tree of life ( Rev. 22: 2b ). But once again, such healing is reportedly conditional on obedience to ‘his commandments,’ which includes at least regularly helping the poor – reportedly “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life...” ( Rev. 22: 14 ).

healing (John 5:2-9); Jesus sought out those who were ready and willing to be healed by Him.<sup>630</sup> It seems that people needed to be brought to a place where they were ready to receive the divine healing that Jesus would like to give them; phrased otherwise, Jesus' reported model of divine healing is that although Jesus divinely healed everybody He ministered to, He didn't minister to everybody who needed divine healing.<sup>631</sup> *The spirit of the third part of the thesis is that biblical scripture suggests that not keeping the biblical commandment to, at least, regularly lovingly help the poor is detrimental to incidence of the loving blessing of divine healing. It is reported "Whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself, but shall not be heard."* (Prov. 21:13, my italics).<sup>632</sup> If our not helping the poor with food and clothes *renders the poor sick*, how can we ask God to help *us* when we are sick, unless we first repent and start helping the poor as we are directed to? Those who do not, at the very least, regularly help the poor thereby deny a testimony of the Kingdom, deny the kindness of God through themselves; so, in terms of Christians who are poor it is reported: "But if any one has the world's goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart against him, how does God's love abide in him?" (1 John 3:17, RSV).<sup>633</sup>

---

<sup>630</sup> If it is understood that God's reported will for people is for them to be made whole (*sozo*), then it could be the case that for an individual to ask God to heal them could be an adjunct to rebellion if that person was at that time of asking God for healing unwilling to forsake sinful behaviour/iniquity offensive to God, that is, when that person was unwilling to be made whole.

As here said "The Greek word for "salvation," *soteria*, implies deliverance, preservation, healing, health, soundness, and, in the New Testament, is sometimes applied to the soul and at other times to the body only. The Greek word *sozo*, translated "saved," also means "healed," "made sound," "made whole." In Romans 10:9, it is translated "saved," and in Acts 14:9, the same word is translated "healed" in referring to the healing of the man lame from birth. Both Greek words for "salvation" and "saved" mean both spiritual and physical salvation; or, in other words, spiritual and physical healing." (Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, pp. 70-71.)

<sup>631</sup> "[ B ]ecause of his [ Christ's ] complete openness to God, he knows when to heal and when not...There was no instance where Jesus prayed for healing that failed to take place." ( Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, p. 69 ). And note : "Did he [ Jesus ] not love the scribes and Pharisees whom he violently and consistently criticized and condemned ? Did he not love Herod to whom he referred with contempt as "that fox" ? Do we not read that he loved the rich young ruler whom he sent away after requesting an absolute renouncement of the riches to which he clung ?...*love must be interpreted in such a way that it may include condemnation, criticism, resistance, and rejection.*" ( Bonino, *Revolutionary Theology*, p. 122, my italics. ) It seems that Jesus' reported stipulation to the rich young ruler was tantamount to His sending away the young ruler in the event of the latter's non-compliance with Jesus' command.

<sup>632</sup> And see Prov. 22: 9 - "He that hath a bountiful eye *shall be blessed ; for he giveth of his bread to the poor*" ( my italics ). And in terms of the earlier-discussed not robbing the poor through withholding from them the good that one reportedly should be giving them : "*Rob not the poor, because he is poor : neither oppress the afflicted in the gate : For the Lord will plead their cause, and spoil the soul of those that spoiled them*" ( Prov. 22: 22-23 ).

My last statement is the *happy reciprocal* of this third part of the thesis: scripture suggests that were the Christian believer in the WOF to *lovingly* keep the biblical commandment to regularly *lovingly* help the poor, there would be no detriment to incidence of the *loving* blessing of divine healing caused by not obeying the biblical commandment to regularly help the poor. <sup>634</sup> In the reported words of Jesus “He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me...If a man love me, he will keep my words...*If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.*” (John 14: 21,23;John 15:7, my italics).

Faith will vanish into sight  
 Hope be emptied in delight  
 Love in Heaven will shine more bright  
 Therefore give us Love.  
 Faith and Hope and Love we see  
 Joining hand in hand agree  
 But the greatest of the three  
 And the best, is Love. <sup>635</sup>

0-----0

---

<sup>633</sup> That is, people have hardened their hearts against the desperate needs of others : “they accept such things with a shrug of the shoulders, because *they do not want to see the misery of other persons.*” ( Jurgen Moltmann, *The Open Church*, [ London : SCM Press Ltd., 1978 ], p. 19, my italics. ) To see the misery of another is a potential challenge to help that miserable one if one has the means.

<sup>634</sup> Jesus is reported as saying “If you love me, you will keep my commandments.” ( John 14: 15, RSV ). The WOF may be *considered as part of* the ‘healing arm of evangelicalism,’ inheriting a healing evangelism tradition from the U. S. Divine Healing Movement. *Then*, it seems contingent that what pertains as a finding concerning divine healing in the WOF also pertains as a finding concerning divine healing in evangelicalism.

<sup>635</sup> Verses from a hymn by Christopher Wordsworth ( 1807-1885 ), *Hymns Old and New*, ( London : Kevin Mayhew, 2007 ), hymn 233.

As Moltmann trenchantly says : “The church is not there for its own sake. It is there for the sake of ‘Jesus’ concern.’ ...If the spirit and institutions of the church are in line with God’s kingdom, then the church is Christ’s church. If they run counter to God’s kingdom, the church loses its right to exist and becomes a superfluous religious society.” ( Moltmann, *Jesus Christ*, p. 27 ).

## Bibliography

In the interest of brevity I have not cited in the bibliography newspaper articles referred to; instead, in each case I have cited in the bibliography the book or thesis where the newspaper article was referenced (the sole exception is the bibliography referencing an article by Mother Cotton). This said, I have endeavoured to cite in the bibliography every journal article referred to. However, again in the interest of brevity, I have not placed in the bibliography the thesis's multitudinous references to Carrie Judd Montgomery's journal *Triumphs of Faith*. As the bibliography is already over twenty pages long (fairly long for a 40,000 word thesis), placing such extra references in the bibliography would, I feel, render the bibliography somewhat unwieldy.

Ahlstrom, Sidney, A Religious History of the American People, Vol. 1,  
( New York : Image, 1975 )

Alexander, Kimberley Ervin, Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice,  
( Dorset : Deo Publishing, 2006 )

Alexander, Paul, Signs and Wonders : Why Pentecostalism is the World's Fastest Growing Faith, ( San Francisco, California : Jossey-Bass, 2009 )

Allen, David, The Unfailing Stream, A Charismatic Church History in Outline,  
( Tonbridge, Kent : Sovereign World Ltd., 1994 )

Althouse, Peter, The Ideological Development of 'Power' in Early American Pentecostalism, ( Lampeter, Cardiganshire : The Edwin Mellen Press, 2010 )

Anderson, Allan, An Introduction to Pentecostalism : Global Charismatic Christianity,  
( Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2004 )

Anderson, Allan, & Bergunder, Michael, & Droogers, Andre, & Van der Laan, Cornelis ( eds. ), Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods,  
( London : University of California Press, 2010 )

Ankerberg, John, & Weldon, John, The Facts on the Faith Movement,  
( Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1993 )

-----, The Facts on the Mind Sciences,  
( Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1993 )

Anonymous : Charismatic Crossroads : The Report of a Leadership Consultation on the Current Situation in the Charismatic Churches,  
( Bawtry, South Yorkshire : The Centre for Contemporary Ministry, 1995 )

Archer, Kenneth J., A Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the Twenty-First Century,  
( London : T & T Clark International, 2004 )

- , Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 8 ( 1996 )
- Assemblies of God, The Believer and Positive Confession,  
[www.ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position\\_Papers/PP\\_4183\\_confession.cfm](http://www.ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/PP_4183_confession.cfm),  
 accessed on 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2008.
- Athanasius, St., Life of Antony, in Schaff, Philip, and Wace, Henry ( eds. ), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ( Grand Rapids : Eerdmans, 1978 )
- Atkinson, William P., Spirit, Soul and Body: The Trichotomism of Kenyon, Hagin and Copeland, *Refleks 5:1* ( 2006 ), pp. 98-118.
- , The Spiritual Death of Jesus : A Pentecostal Investigation,  
 ( Leiden, The Netherlands : Brill, 2009 )
- Attanasi, Katharine and Yong, Amos ( eds. ), Pentecostalism and Prosperity, The Socio-Economics of the Global Charismatic Movement,  
 ( Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave MacMillan, 2012 )
- Avanzini, John F., Paul's Thorn Satan's Messenger Not Sickness,  
 ( Hurst, Texas : His Image Ministries, 1987 )
- Baker, Ernest A., New English Dictionary, ( London : Odhams Press Ltd., 1935 )
- Barker, Margaret, Atonement: The Rite of Healing, *Scottish Journal of Theology*,  
 Volume 49, Number 1, 1996, pp. 1-20.
- Barrett, David B., & Johnson, Todd M., & Crossing, Peter F., 'Missiometrics 2008: Reality Check for Christian World Communions,' *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 32:1 ( 2008 )
- Barrett, David B., & Kurian, George T., & Johnson, Todd M., World Christian Encyclopedia : A Comparative Survey of Church and Religions in the Modern World, second edition, Vol. 1 ( New York : OUP Inc., 2001 )
- Barron, Bruce, The Health and Wealth Gospel, ( Leicester : IVP, 1987 )
- Barth, Karl, & Thurneysen, Eduard, Come Holy Spirit, ( London : Mowbrays, 1978 )
- Barth, Karl, The Humanity of God, ( London, Collins : 1971 )
- Bartleman, Frank, How "Pentecost" Came to Los Angeles, "As It Was In the Beginning." ( F. BARTLEMAN, 5606 Isleta Drive, Los Angeles, California, April 1925 )
- Bengel, John Albert, ( Faussett, Andrew [ ed. ] ), Gnomon of the New Testament,  
 ( Edinburgh : T. And T. Clark, 1857 )

- Blomberg, Craig L., Interpreting the Parables, ( Leicester : Apollos, 1990 )  
 -----, Neither Poverty Nor Riches, ( Leicester : IVP, Apollos, 1999 )
- Blosser, Donald W., Jesus and the Jubilee,  
 ( unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of St. Andrews, 1979 )
- Blue, Ken, Authority to Heal, ( Eastbourne, East Sussex : Monarch, 1989 )
- Blumhofer, Edith L., ‘Purity and Preparation: A Study in the Pentecostal Perfectionist Heritage,’ in Burgess, Stanley M. ( ed. ), Reaching Beyond: Chapters in the History of Perfectionism, ( Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Press, 1986)
- Boardman, William E., Faith Work Under Dr. Cullis, in Boston,  
 ( Boston, Massachusetts : Willard Tract Repository, 1874 )  
 -----, The Lord that Healeth Thee ( Jehovah Rophi ),  
 ( London : Morgan and Scott, 1881 )
- Bodamer, William G. Jr., The Life and Work of Johann Christoph Blumhardt,  
 ( unpublished PhD. thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1966 )
- Bonino, Jose Miguez, Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age,  
 ( London : SPCK, 1975 )
- Boulton, E. C. W., [ Cartwright, Chris ( ed. ) ], George Jeffreys – A Ministry of the Miraculous, ( Tonbridge, Kent : Sovereign World Ltd., 1999 )
- Bosworth, Fred Francis ( F. F. ), Christ the Healer, ( New Kensington, Pennsylvania : Whitaker House, 2000, first published 1924 )
- Bowman, R. M., The Word-Faith Controversy : Understanding the Health and Wealth Gospel, ( Grand Rapids : Baker Books, 2001 )
- Braden, Charles S., Spirits in Rebellion: The Rise and Development of New Thought,  
 ( Dallas, Texas : Southern Methodist University Press, 1963 )
- Brandon, Andrew, Health and Wealth, ( Eastbourne, Sussex : Kingsway, 1987 )
- Briggs, Richard, Words in Action : Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation,  
 ( Edinburgh : T & T Clark, 2001 )
- Broadbent, E. H., The Pilgrim Church, Being Some Account of the Continuance Through Succeeding Centuries of Churches Practising the Principles Taught and Exemplified in the New Testament, ( London : Pickering and Inglis, 1981 [ 1931] )
- Brouwer, S., Gifford, P., and Rose, S. D., Exporting the American Gospel,  
 ( New York : Routledge, 1996 )

- Brown, Candy Gunther, Testing Prayer,  
( Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard University Press, 2012 )
- Brown, P. A., The Development of the Legend of Thomas Becket,  
( Philadelphia, 1930 ), in Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic
- Brown, Raymond Bryan, 1 Corinthians, in The Broadman Bible Commentary,  
Volume 10, (London : Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1971)
- Brown, William A., Man is not a Little God: An Evaluation of the Word-Faith  
teaching of the Deification of Man, ( Paper accessed via Google Scholar and  
said to have been presented at Dallas Theological Seminary in October 2006 )
- Bruce, F. F., St. Matthew, ( London : Scripture Union, 1970 )
- Brumback, Carl, Suddenly...From Heaven. A History of the AoG,  
( Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1961 )
- Bultmann, Rudolf, New Testament and Mythology, in Bartsch, H. W. ( ed. ),  
Kerygma and Myth, ( London : SPCK, 1953 ) ; also, Rudolf Bultmann  
[ Schubert M. Ogden ( ed. ) ], New Testament and Mythology, and other Basic  
Writings, ( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1985 )
- Burgess, Stanley M. ( ed. ), Reaching Beyond: Chapters in the History of  
Perfectionism, ( Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendricksen Press, 1986 )
- Burgess, Stanley M. & McGee, Gary B., ( eds. ),Dictionary of Pentecostal and  
Charismatic Movements, ( Grand Rapids, Michigan : Zondervan Publishing  
House, 2006 )
- Burgess, Stanley M., ( ed. ), & Van der Maas, Eduard M. ( Associate ed. ),  
The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements,  
( Grand Rapids, Michigan : Zondervan, 2002 )
- Burrell, Maurice C., & Wright, J. Stafford, Some Modern Faiths,  
( London : Inter-Varsity Press, 1973 )
- Calvin, John, [ Beveridge, Henry ( trans. ) ], Institutes of the Christian Religion,  
( London : James Clarke, 1953 )
- Carter, R. Kelso, “Faith Healing” Reviewed, ( Boston : Christian Witness, 1897 )
- Cartledge, Mark P., Testimony in the Spirit : Rescripting Ordinary Pentecostal  
Theology, ( Farnham, Surrey : Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2010 )
- Chan, Simon, Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition,  
( Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 2000 )

- Chappell, Paul G., The Divine Healing Movement in America  
( unpublished PhD. thesis, Drew University, 1983 )
- Chesnut, R. Andrew, Born Again in Brazil: The Pentecostal Boom and the Pathogens of Poverty, ( New Brunswick : Rutgers University Press, 1997 )
- , 'Prosperous Prosperity: Why the Health and Wealth Gospel is Booming across the Globe,' in Attanasi and Yong, Pentecostalism and Prosperity.
- Coleman, Simon, 'Conservative Protestantism and the world order: the faith movement in the United States and Sweden,' *Sociology of Religion* 54 ( 4 ), p. 355, cited in Lioy, Dan, 'The Heart of the Prosperity Gospel: Self or the Savior?', p.42,  
  
(www.satsonline.org/userfiles/Lioy,Theheartoftheprosperitygospel.pdf, accessed in 2011)
- Collins, Gary, The Magnificent Mind,  
( Waco, Texas : Word Books, 1985 )
- Cook, Philip Lee, Zion City, Illinois: Twentieth Century Utopia,  
( unpublished PhD thesis, University of Colorado, 1965 )
- Cox, Raymond L., The Four-Square Gospel,  
( Los Angeles: Foursquare Publications, 1969 )
- Coxe, F., A Short Treatise,  
( published in 1561, cited in Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic )
- Crawford, Mattie, Discourses on Divine Healing,  
( no publishing detail, cited in Alexander, Pentecostal Healing )
- , The Story of My Life,  
( Los Angeles, California : Mattie Crawford, 1923 )
- Cullis, Charles, Annual Reports of the Consumptives' Home, and Other Institutions Connected with a Work of Faith, ( Boston, Massachusetts : Willard Tract Repository, 1864-1892 ), cited in Chappell, Divine Healing Movement.
- , Faith Cures; or, Answers to Prayer in the Healing of the Sick,  
( Boston, Massachusetts: Willard Tract Repository, 1879 )
- Curnock, Nehemiah ( ed. ), The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.,  
( London : Epworth, 1912 )
- Daniels, William H., Dr. Cullis and His Work. Twenty Years of Blessing in Answer to Prayer. A History of the Hospitals, Schools, Orphanages, Churches, and Missions Raised up and Supported by the Hand of the Lord through the Faith and Labors of Charles Cullis, M. D. Of Boston, USA,

- ( Boston, Massachusetts : Willard Tract Repository, 1885 ), in Chappell, Divine Healing Movement.
- Darnall, Jean, Heaven Here I Come,  
( London : Lakeland, 1974 )
- Davies, W. H., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology, ( New York: Harper and Row, 1967 )
- Davies, William R., Spirit Baptism and Spiritual Gifts in Early Methodism,  
( Jacksonville: Cross Fire Ministries, 1974 )
- Dayton, Donald W., The Life and Teachings of Carrie Judd Montgomery,  
( New York and London : Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985 )
- , Theological Roots of Pentecostalism,  
( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson, 1987 )
- DeArteaga, William L., Quenching the Spirit: Discover the REAL Spirit Behind the Charismatic Controversy, ( Orlando, Florida : Creation House, 1996 )
- De Chardin, Teilhard, ( N. Denny, [ trans. ] ), The Future of Man,  
( London, no publisher given, 1964 )
- Dempster, Murray W., Klaus, Byron D., & Petersen, Douglas, ( eds. ),  
The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel,  
( Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999 )
- De Vaux, Roland, Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions,  
(London : Darton, Longman & Todd, 1974)
- Dickens, A. G., Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, ( 1959 )
- Dickson, David, A Brief Exposition of the Evangel of Jesus Christ According to Matthew, ( Edinburgh : Banner of Truth Trust, 1981 [ 1647 ] )
- Douglas, Mary, Atonement in Leviticus, *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, No. 1 ( 1993-4 ),  
pp. 117-118 ( the article may in fact be somewhat longer than this  
quotation citation implies it to be ).
- Douglas, W. M., Andrew Murray and His Message – One of God’s Choice Saints,  
( London : Oliphants, 1926 )
- Dresser, Horatio W. ( ed. ), The Quimby Manuscripts: Showing the Discovery of Spiritual Healing and the Origin of Christian Science,  
( New York : Thomas Y. Crowell, 1921 )
- Dunn, James D. G., Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity, ( London: SCM Press Ltd., 1990 )

- Du Plessis, J., The Life of Andrew Murray in South Africa,  
 ( London : Marshall Brothers, 1919 )
- Eagleton, Terry, Literary Theory, An Introduction,  
 ( Oxford : Blackwell Publishers, 1994 )
- Farah, Charles, From the Pinnacle of the Temple : Faith vs. Presumption,  
 ( Plainfield, New Jersey : Logos International, no date )
- Faupel, William David, The Everlasting Gospel,  
 ( Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1993 )
- , 'Whither Pentecostalism?', PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for  
 Pentecostal Studies, 15.1 ( Spring 1993 )
- Fee, Gordon D., How the Health and Wealth Gospel Twists Scripture, ( quoted in  
 The Watchman Expositor, [http://www.watchman.org/re/top/health\\$.htm](http://www.watchman.org/re/top/health$.htm). )
- Fee, Gordon D. & Stuart, Douglas, How To Read the Bible for All its Worth,  
 ( Blethchley, Bucks. : Scripture Union, 1997 )
- Ferguson, Sinclair B., Wright, David F., & Packer, J. I., ( eds. ) New Dictionary of  
 Theology, ( Leicester, England : Inter-Varsity Press, 1991 )
- Finney, Charles G., Power From On High, ( London : Victory Press, 1964 )
- Fincham, F. W. X., Notes from the ecclesiastical court records at Somerset House,  
 T. R. H. S., 4<sup>th</sup> ser., iv ( 1921 ), in, Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic
- Flower, J. Roswell, Birth of the Pentecostal Movement, *Pentecostal Evangel*,  
 ( 26<sup>th</sup> November, 1950 ), in Chappell, Paul, The Divine Healing Movement
- Fox, George, Book of Miracles, ( inspite of my asking for it at the Quaker European  
 Research Centre, based at Woodbrooke in Birmingham, it seems that in the  
 UK, besides hopefully being available at the British Library in London, this  
 book is only available at the Bodleian Library at Oxford University. )
- , Journal, ( inspite of my asking for it at the Quaker European Research  
 Centre, based at Woodbrooke in Birmingham, it seems that in the UK, besides  
 hopefully being available at the British Library in London, this book is only  
 available at the Bodleian Library at Oxford University. )
- Fox, Matthew, Original Blessing. A Primer in Creation Spirituality,  
 ( Sante Fe, New Mexico : Bear and Company Inc., 1983 )
- Fuller, T., The Holy State, ( 3rd ed., 1652 ), in Thomas, Keith, Religion and the  
 Decline of Magic.

- Fullerton, K., Calvinism and Capitalism, in R. W. Green ( ed. ), Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ( D. C. Heath and Co., 1959 )
- Gardner, Helen ( ed. ), The Metaphysical Poets,  
( London : Penguin Books Ltd., 1964 )
- Gee, Donald ( ed. ), Pentecostal World Conference Messages, preached at the Fifth Triennial World Conference, ( Toronto : Testimony Press, 1958 )
- Gee, Donald, Wind and Flame, ( Croydon : Heath Press, 1967 )
- Gilley, Gary E., The Word-Faith Movement, in Gilley, Gary E., Think on These Things, ( Springfield, Illinois : Southern View Chapel, April 1999 )
- Godbey, W. B., Spiritual Gifts and Graces,  
( Cincinnati: God's Revivalist Office, 1895 )
- Gordon, A. J., ( Pickren, Wade [ed.] ), In Christ, The Believer's Union with the Lord,  
( Sanford, Florida : Wade Pickren Publications, 1983 )
- Gordon, A. J., The Ministry of Healing : Miracles of Cure in All Ages,  
( Harrisburg, Pennsylvania : Christian Publications, 1961 )
- Gossett, Don, What You Say Is What You Get,  
( Springdale, Pennsylvania : Whitaker House, 1976 )
- Goudzwaard, Bob, & De Lange, Harry, Beyond Poverty and Affluence: Toward an Economy of Care, ( Grand Rapids, Michigan : Eerdmans, 1995 )
- Green, Jay P., Sr., ( trans. ), The Interlinear Bible,  
( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, 2010 )
- , ( trans. ), The KJ3 Literal Translation Bible,  
( Mulberry, Indiana : SGPBooks.com, Inc., 2010 )
- Green, Michael, The Meaning of Salvation, ( London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1965 )
- Grogan, Geoffrey, 'Liberation and Prosperity Theologies,' Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology, Volume 9, Number 2, Autumn 1991, pp. 118-132.
- Hagin, Kenneth E., Bible Faith Study Course,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1997 [ 1991 ] )
- , Healing Scriptures, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1995 )
- , How To Turn Your Faith Loose,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1993 )

- , Must Christians Suffer?, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1996 )
- , Redeemed from Poverty, Sickness, and Spiritual Death,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Faith Library Publications, 1966 )
- , Seven Things You Should Know About Divine Healing,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1992 [ 1979 ] )
- , The Holy Spirit and His Gifts,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin, n.d. )
- , The Midas Touch, A Balanced Approach to Biblical Prosperity,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Kenneth Hagin Ministries, 2002 [ 2000 ] )
- , The Name of Jesus,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1987 )
- , The Present-Day Ministry of Jesus Christ,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1990 )
- , The Real Faith,( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1995 )
- , The Triumphant Church : Dominion Over All the Powers of Darkness,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1998 [ 1993 ] )
- , ZOE: The God-Kind of Life,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Rhema Bible Church, 1997 )
- Haines, Mick, Editorial, in *Jesus Life*, Issue 89 ( one/ 2012 ), ( *Jesus Life* is published by Jesus Fellowship Church, Nether Heyford, Northampton, often referred to as 'Jesus Army.' )
- Hanegraaff, Hank, Christianity in Crisis, ( Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1993 )
- , What's Wrong with the Faith Movement ( Part One ) : E. W. Kenyon and the Twelve Apostles of Another Gospel,( Christian Research Journal, volume 15, number 3 [ 1993 ] ) ( www.equip.org )
- Harrell, David Edwin Jr., All Things Are Possible: The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America,  
( Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1975 )
- Harrison, M. F., Righteous Riches : the Word of Faith movement in contemporary African American religion, ( New York : OUP, 2005 )
- Hartt, Julian N., Metaphysics, in Marvin Halverson & Arthur Cohen ( eds. ),  
A Handbook of Christian Theology, ( London : Fontana Books, 1960 )
- Hayes, John H. & Holladay, Carl R., Biblical Exegesis, A Beginner's Handbook,  
( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1995 )

- Hayes, Norvel, Don't Let the Devil Steal Your Ministry, ( Cassette Tape Boxset from Norvel Hayes Ministries, P. O. Box 1379, Cleveland, Tennessee 37311 )
- , How To Live and Not Die, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Harrison House, 1986 )
- Healy, Nicholas M., Church, World and the Christian Life, Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology, ( Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000 )
- Hejzlar, Pavel, Two Paradigms for Divine Healing : Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis MacNutt in Dialogue, ( Leiden, Netherlands : Brill, 2010 )
- Helm, Paul, The Divine Revelation, ( London : Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982 )
- Hengel, Martin, Property and Riches in the Early Church, in Hengel, Martin, Earliest Christianity, ( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1979 )
- Hobsbawm, Eric, The Age of Capital 1848-1875, ( London : Abacus, 2004 )
- Hocken, Peter, Streams of Renewal, ( Carlisle, Cumbria : Paternoster Press, 1997 )
- , The Challenges of the Pentecostal, Charismatic and Messianic Jewish Movements : The Tensions of the Spirit, ( Farnham, Surrey : Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2009 )
- Hoekema, Anthony A., The Four Major Cults, ( London : Paternoster Press, 1983 [ 1963 ] )
- Hollenweger, Walter J., Pentecostalism : Origins and Developments Worldwide, ( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, 1997 )
- , The Pentecostals : The Charismatic Movement in the Churches, ( Minneapolis, Minnesota : Augsburg Publishing House, 1972 )
- , The Pentecostal Elites and the Pentecostal Poor, in Karla Poewe, Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture, ( Columbia, South Carolina : University of South Carolina Press, 1994 )
- Horton, Stanley, Into All Truth: A Survey of the Course and Content of Divine Revelation, ( Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1955 )
- Howard, George P., Religious Liberty in Latin America ?, ( Philadelphia, Pennsylvania : Westminster Press, 1944 )
- Hunt, Dave, Beyond Seduction : A Return to Biblical Christianity, ( Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House Publishers, 1987 )
- Hunt, Dave, & McMahon, T. A., The Seduction of Christianity: Spiritual Discernment in the Last Days, ( Eugene, Oregon : Harvest House, 1985 )

- Hyatt, Eddie L., 2000 Years of Charismatic Christianity : A 21<sup>st</sup> Century Look At Church History From A Pentecostal/Charismatic Perspective,  
( Dallas, Texas : Hyatt International Ministries, Inc., 1998 )
- Jackson, Robert, Prosperity Theology and the Faith Movement,  
Themelios 15.1 ( Oct. 1989 ), pp. 16-24.
- James, William, The Varieties of Religious Experience,  
( London : Penguin Books Ltd., 1982 [ 1902 ] )
- Jeffreys, George, and others, The Miraculous Foursquare Gospel – Doctrinal, vol. 1,  
( London: Elim Publishing, 1929 )
- Judd, Carrie F., Faith's Reckonings,  
( Oakland, California : Office of Triumphs of Faith, no date )
- , The Prayer of Faith, in Dayton, The Life and Teachings of Carrie Judd Montgomery.
- Kant, Immanuel, Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone,  
( New York : Harper & Row, 1960 )
- Kay, William K., Pentecostalism, A Very Short Introduction,  
( Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2011 )
- Kendrick, Klaude, The Promise Fulfilled. A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement, ( Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1961)
- Kenyon, Essek W., In His Presence, ( Seattle, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1969 [ 14<sup>th</sup> edition ] )
- , Jesus the Healer, ( Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 2004 [ 40<sup>th</sup> Printing ] )
- , The Bible in the Light of our Redemption: Basic Bible Course,  
( Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1999 )
- , The Father and His Family, ( 1916 )
- , The Hidden Man: An Unveiling of the Subconscious Mind,  
( Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1998, [ and 1970 ] )
- , The New Kind of Love, ( Seattle, Washington : E. W. Kenyon, 1942 )
- , The Two Kinds of Faith, ( Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, 1969 )
- , The Two Kinds of Knowledge, ( Lynnwood, Washington : Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society, no date )

- , The Two Kinds of Life, ( Seattle, Washington : E. W. Kenyon, 1943 )
- , The Wonderful Name of Jesus,  
( Los Angeles, California: West Coast Publishing, 1927 )
- Kenyon, Essek W., & Gossett, Don, The Power of Your Words,  
( New Kensington, Pennsylvania : Whittaker House, 1981 )
- King, Paul L., Only Believe, ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Word and Spirit Press, 2008 )
- Kinnebrew, James M., “The Charismatic Doctrine of Positive Confession: A Historical, Exegetical, and Theological Critique” ( unpublished ThD dissertation, Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988 )
- Kendrick, Klaude, The Promise Fulfilled. A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement, ( Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1961 )
- Knight, Henry H. III, From Aldersgate to Azusa: Wesley and the Renewal of Pentecostal Spirituality, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 ( 1996 )
- Kuhlman, Kathryn, I Believe in Miracles,  
( London : Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1968 )
- , Nothing is Impossible with God,  
( Alachua, Florida : Bridge-Logos, first published in 1974 )
- Ladd, George Eldon, A Theology of the New Testament,  
( Guildford, Surrey : Lutterworth Press, 1975 )
- Land, Steven J., Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom,  
( Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1993 )
- Larson, Martin A., New Thought Religion: A Philosophy for Health, Happiness, and Prosperity, ( New York : Philosophical Library, 1986 )
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott, Christianity in a Revolutionary Age, Volume 3,  
( Exeter, Devon : The Paternoster Press, 1970 )
- Lee, Carl Q., John Alexander Dowie,  
( Chicago, Illinois : publisher not mentioned, 1944 )
- Lewis, C. S., Christian Behaviour, ( London : Geoffrey Bles, 1952 )
- Lie, Geir, E. W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister ?, *EPTA Bulletin, The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, Vol. XVI, 1996, pp. 71-86.
- , The Theology of E. W. Kenyon : Plain Heresy or Within the Boundaries of Pentecostal-Charismatic “Orthodoxy” ?, *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1, Spring 2000, pp. 85-114.

- Liroy, Dan, The Heart of the Prosperity Gospel: Self or the Savior ?, ( accessed via Google Scholar )
- Liu, Peter, Did the Lucan Jesus Desire Voluntary Poverty ?, The Evangelical Quarterly, Vol. LXIV No. 4 October, 1992, pp. 291-317.
- Lloyd-Jones, D. Martyn, From Fear to Faith,  
( London : The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1957 )
- Mabie, Henry C., The Divine Reason of the Cross,  
( New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1911 )
- , The Meaning and Message of the Cross: A Contribution to Missionary Apologetics, ( New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1906 )
- MacLaren, Liz, Mind Over Matter, ( London : Brockhampton Press, 1996 )
- Mahan, Asa, Faith Healing, Earnest Christian 48 ( September 1884 )
- Martin, Walter, The Kingdom of the Cults,  
( Bloomington, Minnesota : Bethany House Publishers, 2003 [ 1965 ] )
- Maslow, Abraham, Motivation and Personality, ( New York, Harper and Row, 1970 )
- McCann, Vincent, An Evaluation of the Key Doctrines in the Health and Wealth Faith Movement, ( <http://www.spotlightministries.org.uk/faithmov.htm> ) accessed on 4/3/11.
- McConnell, Dan R., A Different Gospel,  
( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, 2007 )
- McConville, J. G., Law and Theology in Deuteronomy, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1984, cited in Blomberg, Neither Poverty Nor Riches.
- McCracken, W. D., Mary Baker Eddy and Her Book,  
( Tamworth, New Hampshire : no publisher cited, 1925 ), cited in Wilson, Sects.
- McGrath, Alister E., An Introduction to Christianity,  
( Oxford : Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1997 )
- , Christian Theology : An Introduction,  
( Oxford : Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1997 )
- McIntyre, J.[ Joe], E. W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith,  
( Orlando, Florida, Creation House, 1997 )
- Meek, George W., 'The Healers in Brazil, England, U. S. A., and U. S. S. R.' in Meek, George W.( ed. ), Healers and the Healing Process: A Report on Ten

- Years of Research by Fourteen World Famous Investigators,  
( Wheaton, Illinois : Theosophical/Quest, 1977 )
- Melvin, Dieter, The Development of Nineteenth Century Holiness Theology,  
Westminster Theological Journal 20.1 ( Spring, 1985 ), pp. 61-77.
- Menzies, William W., Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,  
( Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1971 )
- Menzies, Robert P., Healing in the Atonement, in Menzies, Robert P., & Menzies  
William W., Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience,  
( Grand Rapids, Michigan : Zondervan, 2000 )
- Mercer, Nick, Postmodernity and Rationality: the Final Credits or just a Commercial  
Break?, in Billington, Antony, & Lane, Tony, & Turner, Max, ( eds. ), *Mission  
and Meaning, Essays presented to Peter Cotterell*, ( Carlisle, Paternoster  
Press, 1995 )
- Metzger, Bruce M., & Coogan, Michael D. ( eds. ), The Oxford Companion to the  
Bible, ( Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1993 )
- Miskov, Jennifer Ann, Life on Wings : The Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie  
Judd Montgomery (1858-1946),  
( unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2011 )
- Mix, Mrs. Edward, Faith Cures, and Answers to Prayer,  
( New York : Syracuse University Press, 2002 )
- Moffat, James, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, ( London : Hodder and  
Stoughton Ltd., 1959 )
- Moltmann, Jurgen, Jesus Christ for Today's World,  
( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1994 )
- , The Open Church, ( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1978 )
- Montgomery, Carrie Judd, Faith Without Works,  
( Oakland, California : Office of Triumphs of Faith, no date )
- , Have Faith in God,  
( Oakland, California: Triumphs of Faith, first published in 1880) [ In 1880  
Judd Montgomery had not yet met and married George Montgomery before  
moving to Oakland, California from New York State.]
- , Under His Wings : The Story of My Life,  
( Los Angeles, California : Stationers Corporation, 1936 )
- Morris, Leon, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians,  
( London : The Tyndale Press, 1963 )

- Morris, Russell A., Truth Matters, A Pastoral Assessment of Word of Faith Theology, ( Bloomington, Indiana : CrossBooks, 2013 )
- Moser, Antonio, & Meers, Bernardino, Moral Theology : Dead Ends and Ways Forward, ( Tunbridge Wells, Kent : Burns and Oates, 1990 )
- Mother Cotton, Inside Story of the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Azusa Street, April, 1906, Message of the Apostolic Faith, I ( April, 1939 ), cited in Chappell, The Divine Healing Movement
- Muller, George, ( Bergin, G. Fred., compiler ), Autobiography of George Muller, ( London : J. Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1914 )
- Murray Andrew, Divine Healing, ( Springdale Pennsylvania : Whitaker House, 1982 )
- Mullin, Redmond, The Wealth of Christians, ( Exeter, Devon : The Paternoster Press, 1983 )
- Nee, Watchman, The Normal Christian Life, ( Fort Washington, Pennsylvania : Christian Literature Crusade, 1973 )
- Newman, Louis I. ( translator and compiler, with collaboration by Spitz, Samuel ), The Hasidic Anthology, ( New York : Schocken Books, 1968 )
- Nicholls, William, Barth's Theological Revolution, in Nicholls, William, The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, Volume 1, ( London : Penguin Books Ltd., 1971 )
- Nienkirchen, Charles W., A. B. Simpson and the Pentecostal Movement, ( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson, 1992 )
- Noh, Jeane, & Kirkland, W. A., Worldliness as Godliness: The Deception of the Health and Wealth Gospel ( 1 Timothy 6: 3-10), ( written in 2003, accessed via Google Scholar in 2014, 2015 )
- Onken, Brian, The Atonement of Christ and the 'Faith' Message, ( Christian Research Institute, P.O. Box 7000, Rancho Santa Margarita, California, 92688 )
- Origen, Against Celsus, in Roberts, Alexander, and Donaldson, James ( eds. ), The Ante-Nicene Christian Library, ( Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1874 ), volume 4.
- Orr, J. ( ed. ), The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, volume IV ( Chicago : Howard-Severance Company, 1915 )
- Osteen, Dodie, Healed of Cancer, ( Houston, Texas : Lakewood Church, 1986 )
- Outler, Albert C., The Wesleyan Quadrilateral in Wesley, Wesleyan Theological Journal, 20.1, pp. 7-18.

- Palmer, D. J. & Bradbury, Malcolm ( eds. ), The Metaphysical Poets,  
( London : Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd., 1970 )
- Palmer, Phoebe, Faith and Its Effects; or Fragments from My Portfolio,  
( New York: Palmer, 1854 ) ; Faith and Its Effects, ( New York: Published for  
the author, 1852 )
- , The Way of Holiness, with Notes by the Way,  
( New York: Lane and Tippett, 1845 )
- Parham, Charles F., A Voice Crying in the Wilderness,  
( Baxter Springs, Kansas : Robert L. Parham, 1944 [ 1902 ] )
- , Leadership, Apostolic Faith, II ( September, 1913 ), in Chappell, Paul, The  
Divine Healing Movement
- , Restoration of Divine Healing and the Pentecostal Power, Apostolic Faith,  
IV ( June, 1915 ) in Chappell, Paul, The Divine Healing Movement
- , The Latter Rain, The Apostolic Faith, II ( August, 1926 ) in Chappell,  
Paul, The Divine Healing Movement
- Parham, Sarah E., The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith  
Movement, ( Joplin, Missouri: The Tri-State Printing Co., 1930 )
- Parkhurst, Genevieve, Healing and Wholeness,  
( Evesham, Worcs.: Arthur James Limited, 1957 )
- Pattison, Stephen, Alive and Kicking : Towards a Practical Theology of Illness and  
Healing, ( London : SCM Press Ltd., 1989 )
- Peck, M. Scott, People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil,  
( New York : Simon and Schuster, 1985 )
- Perriman, Andrew ( ed. ), Faith, Health and Prosperity : A Report on 'Word of Faith'  
and 'Positive Confession' theologies by ACUTE ( the Evangelical Alliance  
Commission on Unity and Truth among Evangelicals ),  
( Carlisle : Paternoster Press, 2003 )
- Petts, David, Healing and the Atonement,  
( unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham, 1993 )
- Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, Spirit and Power : A 10-Country Survey of  
Pentecostals, ( Washington D. C. : Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life,  
2006 )
- Phiri, I., & Maxwell, J., Gospel Riches : Africa's Rapid Embrace of Prosperity  
Pentecostalism provokes concern – and hope, in Christianity Today  
( [www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2007/july/12.22.html](http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2007/july/12.22.html) )

- Podmore, C., The Moravian Church in England, 1728-1760,  
 ( Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998 )
- Poloma, Margaret, Old Wine, New Wineskins : The Rise of Healing Rooms in Revival Pentecostalism, in PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, 28: 1 ( Spring 2006 )
- Portsmouth, William, Healing Prayer,  
 ( Evesham, Worcestershire: Arthur James Limited, 1957 )
- Pretorius, Stephan P., Is 'Divine Healing' in the 'Faith Movement' founded on the principles of Healing in the Bible or based on the Power of the Mind ?,  
 ( HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies, 65( 1 ), Art. #277. )
- Price, Charles S., The Real Faith for Healing,  
 ( Gainesville, Florida: Bridge-Logos Publishers, 1997 [ 1940 ] )
- Randall, Ian M., 'A Missional Spirituality: Moravian Brethren and eighteenth-century English evangelicalism,' Transformation, Vol. 23 No. 4, Oct. 2006, pp. 204-214.
- Read, Donald, Documents from Edwardian England 1901-1915,  
 ( London: Harrap, 1973 )
- Riddle, T. Wilkinson, Christian Science in the Light of Holy Scripture,  
 ( London : Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd., 1931 )
- Roberts, Oral, The Miracles of Christ,  
 ( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Pinoak Publications, 1977 )
- Robinson, James, Divine Healing: The Formative Years, 1830-1890: Theological Roots in the Transatlantic World,  
 ( Eugene, Oregon : Pickwick Publications, 2011 )
- , Divine Healing: The Holiness-Pentecostal Transition Years, 1890-1906: Theological Transpositions in the Transatlantic World,  
 ( Eugene, Oregon : Pickwick Publications, 2013 )
- , Divine Healing: The Years of Expansion, 1906-1930: Theological Variation in the Transatlantic World,  
 ( Eugene, Oregon : Pickwick Publications, 2014 )
- Rowntree, John Stephenson, Quakerism; Past and Present,  
 ( Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Henry Longstreth, 1860 )
- Sacks, Jonathan, Wealth and Poverty: A Jewish Analysis,  
 ( London : The Social Affairs Unit, 1985 )

- Sarmiento, Domingo F., 'Conflicto y armonia de raza en America,' in Zea, *The Latin American Mind*, ( no publishing detail provided ), in Bonino, *Revolutionary Theology Comes of Age*.
- Shakarian, Demos, The Happiest People on Earth,  
( London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1975 )
- Sheldrake, Edna, [ compiler ], The Personal Letters of John Alexander Dowie,  
( Zion City, Illinois : Wilbur Glenn Voliva, 1912 )
- Sider, Ronald ( Ron ) J., Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger,  
( London : Hodder & Stoughton, 1990 )
- Simmons, Dale Hawthorne, A Theological and Historical Analysis of Kenneth E. Hagin's Claim to be a Prophet,  
( unpublished MTh. Thesis, Oral Roberts University, 1985 )
- , E. W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty,  
( London : Scarecrow, 1997 )
- The postbellum pursuit of peace, power, and plenty: As seen in the writings of Essek William Kenyon, ( published Ph.D. thesis, Drew University, 1990 )
- Simpson, A. B., Divine Healing and Demonism Not Identical: A Protest and Reply to Dr. Buckley in the Century Magazine, in *Word, Work, and World*, VII ( June, 1886 ), pp. 52-58 ; part two, as before, ( July, 1886 ), pp. 114-122 ; both cited in Chappell, *Divine Healing Movement*.
- , The Four-Fold Gospel, ( New York: Gospel Alliance Publishing, 1925 )
- Simpson, W. Sparrow., On the Pilgrimage to Bronholm in Norfolk, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, XXX ( 1874 ), in Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*.
- Smail, Thomas, Reflected Glory: The Spirit in Christ and the Christians,  
( London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1977 )
- Smail, Thomas, Walker, Andrew, & Wright, Nigel, 'Revelation Knowledge' and Knowledge of Revelation: The Faith Movement and the Question of Heresy, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 5 ( 1994 ), pp. 57-77.
- , A Careful Assessment of the Problems Within the Charismatic and Word-of-Faith Movements, ( Minneapolis, Minnesota: Bethany House, 1994 )
- Stagg, Frank, 'Matthew,' in *The Broadman Bible Commentary*,  
( London : Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1970 )
- Stanway, Dr. Andrew, Taking the Rough With the Smooth,  
( London : Pan Books, 1981 )

- Stearn, Jess, Adventures into the Psychic,  
( New York : Signet Books, 1982 )
- Stephen, L., History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century ,  
( 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1902 ), volume 1, cited in Thomas, Religion and the Decline of  
Magic.
- Stephens, Randall J., The Fire Spreads, Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American  
South, ( London : Harvard University Press, 2008 )
- Stibbe, Mark, Times of Refreshing, A Practical Theology of Revival for Today,  
( London : Marshall Pickering, 1995 )
- Stokes, E., The Wiltshire Rant, ( 1652 ), cited in Thomas, Religion and the Decline of  
Magic.
- Strachan, Gordon, The Pentecostal Theology of Edward Irving,  
( London : Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973 )
- Strong, James, Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible,  
( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, no date of publication )
- Synan, Vinson, 'A Healer in the House? A Historical Perspective on Healing in the  
Pentecostal/Charismatic Tradition,' Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies 3:2,  
2000
- , The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition : Charismatic Movements in the  
Twentieth Century,  
( Grand Rapids, Michigan : William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997 )
- Synan, Vinson ( ed. ), Spirit-Empowered Christianity in the Twenty-First Century,  
( Lake Mary, Florida : Charisma House, 2011 )
- Tang, Alex, Examining the Theology of the Word-Faith Movement,  
( accessed via Google Scholar )
- Tasker, R. V. G., The Gospel According to St. Matthew,  
( London : The Tyndale Press, 1963 )
- Tawney, R. H., Religion and the Rise of Capitalism,  
( London : Penguin Books Ltd., 1969 )
- Terry, John Mark & Smith, Ebbie, & Anderson, Justice ( eds. ), Missiology, An  
Introduction to the Foundations, History, and Strategies of World Missions,  
( Nashville, Tennessee : Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1998 )
- Thayer, Joseph H., Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament,  
( Peabody, Massachusetts : Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1999 )

- Thiselton, Anthony C., New Horizons in Hermeneutics : The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading, ( London : Marshall Pickering, 1992 )
- Thomas, John Christopher, The Devil, Disease and Deliverance,  
( Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1998 )
- Thomas, Keith, Religion and the Decline of Magic, Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth-and Seventeenth-Century England,  
( London : Penguin Books, 1985 )
- Todd, J. H. ( ed. ), An Apology for Lollard Doctrines,  
( Camden Society, 1842 ), in Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic
- Tomlinson, A. J., The Last Great Conflict, in Donald W. Dayton ( ed. ), “The Higher Christian Life” Sources for The Study of the Holiness, Pentecostal, and Keswick Movements, ( London : Garland, 1985 )
- Trine, Ralph Waldo, In Tune With the Infinite,  
( London : George Bell & Sons, 1903 [ first pub. 1897 in the U. S. ] )
- , The Power That Wins: Henry Ford and Ralph Waldo Trine in an Intimate Talk on Life, ( Indianapolis, Indiana : Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1929 )
- Trudel, Dorothea, ( introduction by Cullis, Charles ), Dorothea Trudel; or, The Prayer of Faith, ( Boston, Massachusetts : Willard Tract Repository, 1872 )
- Tyndale, William, Expositions and Notes, ( no publishing detail ), cited in Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic.
- Van Baalen, Jan Karel, The Chaos of Cults,  
( London : Pickering and Inglis Ltd., 1958 )
- Van Biema, D., & Chu J., Does God Want You To Be Rich ? Time Magazine (2006),  
( [www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0.9171.1533448.00.html](http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1533448,00.html) )
- Vine, W. E., A Comprehensive Dictionary of the Original Greek Words with their Precise Meanings for English Readers,  
( McLean, Virginia : MacDonald Publishing Company, no date )
- Vreeland, Derek E., Reconstructing Word of Faith Theology: A Defense, Analysis and Refinement of the Theology of the Word of Faith Movement, presented at the 30<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies ,  
( [www.pneumafoundation.org/resources/articles/Reconstructing-Vreeland.pdf](http://www.pneumafoundation.org/resources/articles/Reconstructing-Vreeland.pdf) )
- Wacker, Grant, Heaven Below, Early Pentecostals and American Culture,  
( London : Harvard University Press, 2001 )
- Walker, Andrew ( ed. ), Different Gospels, ( London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1988 )

- Ward, Keith, A Guide for the Perplexed, in Bartel, T. W. ( ed. ), Comparative Theology, Essays for Keith Ward,  
( London : Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2003 )
- Warrington, Keith, Jesus the Healer, ( Carlisle : Paternoster Press, 2000 )
- Weber, Max, Major Features of World Religions, in Roland Robertson ( ed. ),  
Sociology of Religion, ( London : Penguin Books, 1978 )
- Wesley, John, Sermons on Several Occasions, ( London : The Epworth Press, 1954 )
- White, John, The Golden Cow, ( London : Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979 )
- White, J., The Way to the True Church, ( 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1610 ), cited in Thomas, Keith,  
Religion and the Decline of Magic.
- Whittaker, Colin C., Seven Pentecostal Pioneers,  
( Basingstoke : Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1983 )
- Wigglesworth, Smith, Ever Increasing Faith,  
( Springfield, Missouri : Gospel Publishing House, 1996 [1924] )
- Williams, George H., and Waldvogel Edith, A History of Speaking in Tongues and Related Gifts, in Hamilton, Michael ( ed. ) The Charismatic Movement,  
( Grand Rapids : Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975 ), pp. 81-89.
- Wilson, Bryan R., A Typology of Sects, in Robertson, Roland ( ed. ), Sociology of Religion, ( London : Penguin Books, 1978 )
- , Sects And Society, A Sociological Study of Three Religious Groups in Britain, ( London : William Heinemann Ltd., 1961 )
- Womersley, Harold, Wm. F. P. Burton, Congo Pioneer,  
( Eastbourne, Sussex : Victory Press, 1973 )
- Woodworth-Etter, Maria [B.], Holy Ghost Sermons,  
( Tulsa, Oklahoma : Harrison House, 1997, first published 1918 )
- , Signs and Wonders God Wrought in the Ministry for Forty Years,  
( Indianapolis, Indiana : Maria Woodworth-Etter, 1916 )
- Wright, Henry W., A More Excellent Way, Be In Health,  
( Thomaston, Georgia : Pleasant Valley Publications, 2005 )
- Yong, Amos, The Spirit Poured Out On All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology, ( Grand Rapids, Michigan : Baker Academic, 2005 )
- Young, Arthur, Eastern Tour, 1771, vol. ix  
( cited in Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. )

Young, Robert, Analytical Concordance to the Bible,  
( Iowa Falls, Iowa : Riverside Book and Bible House, no dates of publication  
provided [ first published in UK ] )

0-----0