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He's Real to Me.

"We are in him that is real."—1 John 5:20.

ESSEX W.KENTON.

HELEN E. BERNAUER.

1. My Father God is real to me; In Christ revealed his heart I see.
2. My Savior's name is real to me; In battle gives me victory;
3. The Spirit's real, His mighty power Protects me in temptation's hour;
4. The Word is real, O soul rejoice! It is my blessed Savior's voice!
5. His promise is so real to me; He's coming in reality,
6. O soul, he will be real to thee If thou but claim reality;

I am his child, a princely heir; In royal rights with Christ I share,
It breaks the rule of Satan's host, Re-stores the pow'r of Pentecost,
In perfect light he guideth me, And makes himself Real-ity.
It tells me of his constant love, That intercedes for me above,
When I shall see his blessed face, And praise him for his matchless grace.
Be real thyself in every part, Reality will fill thy heart.

CHORUS. With spirit.

He's real to me, he's real to me, My Father God is real to me;

My soul demands reality; My Father God is real to me.
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Preface

This paper is a translation of a somewhat revised version of my original master’s thesis which was submitted to the Faculty of the Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology in Oslo in 1994.¹

My background, to a certain degree, falls within the modern Faith movement—in the sense that I attended Victory Bible Institute and the church, Victory Christian Center, in Tulsa, Oklahoma, from 1983-84. I have read much of the literature of the most prominent American faith ministers. Almost from the very beginning Kenyon’s books predominated my reading, and in 1982 I translated ten of his books into Norwegian. Copyright was not granted, but the very translation work created within me a desire to get behind the teachings and get better acquainted with the author. However, Kenyon died in 1948, and his books contain very little autobiographical information. In spite of massive plagiarism of Kenyon’s writings within the Faith movement, Kenyon himself has been surrounded by a certain mystery even within their circles.

It was not until Daniel Ray McConnell’s book *A Different Gospel* was published in 1988 that Kenyon’s name was recognized outside of Faith circles. I read McConnell’s book in 1989. Much of the content was new to me, and I went through a theological crisis which lasted for approximately two years. McConnell claims that Kenyon was influenced by non-Christian philosophy, basically derived via Christian Science, New Thought, and the Unitarians. His stating that Kenyon’s message represents a different gospel and that his Jesus is another Jesus, seemed rather radical (to put it mildly), but since McConnell provided so much new information, I felt it necessary to take him seriously. I wrote 3 or 4 of my former instructors at the Bible school in Tulsa (those I considered most competent to provide alternative solutions to McConnell’s critique), but as I never heard back from any of these, I had no other choice than to wade my way through unfamiliar literature on my own. In order to be able to reach a neutral point of study and as well as possible eliminate my positively preconceived notions towards Kenyon’s teachings, I chose to take my point of departure in the fact that McConnell’s claim (as I

¹ Geir Lie, “E. W. Kenyon: Sektstifter eller kristen lederskikkelse? En historisk undersøkelse av Kenyons teologi med særlig henblikk på dens historiske røtter og innflytelsen på samtid og ettertid.”
erroneously interpreted it) was a correct one. The consequences would then be that the “Jesus” I had believed to have served for several years was a false one.²

Arriving at a neutral point was not easy. A strong emotional loyalty towards the individuals, contexts and milieus which I had been associated with, made it difficult to consider Kenyon objectively, from the outside so to speak. In addition to having translated several of his books, I had consciously incorporated parts of his own vocabulary within that of my own, and on those occasions when I had ministered God’s Word I had never hidden the fact that I was “preaching Kenyon.” It took nearly a year until I experienced some sort of shift of identity where I was no longer afraid of discovering unpleasant aspects with Kenyon himself or with his actual teachings. As this process came close to completion, I began to occupy myself with the thought as to whether my interests in regard to Kenyon might be of any use for a possible master’s thesis in theology. At the point I had succeeded in locating much relevant American literature which was supplementary to McConnell’s bibliography (of which absolutely nothing was available in my own country). Besides, I had developed some contact with Dale Simmons, who (I was told later) had completed his doctoral dissertation in 1990—on Kenyon! We have corresponded somewhat, and I have received lots of suggestions which since have resulted in new invaluable knowledge concerning previous holes in Kenyon’s biography.

Generally speaking, I would like to remove some of the mystery that has surrounded Kenyon. Who was he? And what were his beliefs? Chapter 1 is dedicated to a quite thorough presentation of Kenyon’s life and ministry. This is followed in chapter 2 by an overall description of central aspects of

² Several conversations with Daniel Ray McConnell later on have convinced me that I radically misunderstood him on this issue. What McConnell wanted to communicate was rather that Kenyon/The Faith movement tended to present a somewhat flawed picture of Jesus. He did not mean to suggest that they were in need of regeneration. I agree with him. Nevertheless, admitting that statements such as “the overwhelming majority of the members of the Faith movement are sincere, Bible-believing Christians” and that the movement only is “cultic” in the sense that it “has certain doctrines and practices that are cultic in thought and historical origin” (Daniel Ray McConnell, A Different Gospel [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988], p. 19) seem rather inconsistent with other statements such as that “many in the present charismatic renewal preach and practice a different gospel” (p. xvi), and that “Kenyon’s Faith movement ... is, in fact, a ‘different gospel’” (p. 94). Despite the validity of critiquing the teachings for possibly causing people to suffer shipwreck on their faith, McConnell’s own book might be guilty of the same towards honest subscribers to Kenyon’s/The Faith movement’s ideas—as was the case with myself. Despite my strong disagreement with McConnell’s interpretation of Kenyon’s theology, his pioneer work on the theological architect of the Faith movement has a strong message to the contemporary charismatic movement. I am more and more inclined to give merit to McConnell in his criticism of what is going on among us. Let no one interpret my refutation of his understanding of Kenyon’s theology as being a rejection of what is actually on McConnell’s heart to communicate to the charismatic world. In that respect I cannot help but recommend his book.
his theology. My aim is basically to understand/explain, not evaluate. While the biographical chapter will be covered by a historical, descriptive methodology where I will describe chronologically the most important incidents in Kenyon’s life and ministry, chapter 2 consists of a thematic analysis of his actual teachings.

One important factor in order to remove the mystery which has surrounded Kenyon is to explore his actual historical and theological roots, which will be treated in chapter 3. Here it is natural to take my point of departure in McConnell’s views as reflected in his book, *A Different Gospel*. But what does Kenyon himself have to say on this important issue? Who—if anyone—has influenced his thinking? Does he mention role models? To what extent does he depart from these? My aim in this chapter is not to evaluate, but to understand. My only “defense” of Kenyon is one directed against the erroneous claims made against his actual teachings. I just want to point out that he often did not hold some of the specific views for which he has been attacked. In this study, few attempts will be made to compare Kenyon’s specific teachings with the Word of God. The need to reach any conclusion concerning the validity of Kenyon’s teachings as having Bible approval is not the primary focus.

Kenyon’s historical and theological influence will be treated in chapter 4. McConnell points out Kenyon’s influence on several prominent leaders within the so-called post-World War II healing movement. Foremost of these is Kenneth E. Hagin, and through him the modern Faith movement has been greatly influenced. But actually how far-reaching was Kenyon’s influence? Does he deserve a better/worse destiny than just standing in the shadow of Hagin? The latter states that he was introduced to Kenyon’s writings in 1950. He claims not to be influenced by him, however, in spite of the numerous similarities. McConnell and others have documented long sequences in Hagin’s many books which have been taken verbatim from Kenyon’s books, although Hagin himself ignores this fact. How has Kenyon affected other faith ministers?

Kenyon’s influence has also pervaded Europe and the Scandinavian Peninsula. In Norwegian faith churches Kenyon’s literature is found on the book tables. What has Kenyon’s role been in these contexts? How about other milieus? Has Kenyon’s message affected Norwegian churches outside of the Faith movement? These are questions which will be discussed in chapter 5.

My primary sources apart from Kenyon’s published books primarily are newsletters from the various churches he pastored. The books include very little autobiographical information; my biographical description of his life and ministry is consequently based more on the newsletters. Where these
tend to conflict with available secondary sources, for example, contemporary articles in secular newspapers, I might attempt to evaluate the integrity of the various sources. The critique which has been directed towards Kenyon’s teachings, however, has taken its point of departure in the latter’s published books. Consequently, my descriptive presentation of Kenyon’s overall teachings, to a large extent, will be based on the same sources. For the most part I will not touch upon the issue of a possible development in Kenyon’s theology as found in the doctrinal contents in his earliest newsletters when compared with his published books authored many years later.

Chapters 3 and 4 are mostly based on secondary sources. Paul Gale Chappell’s dissertation serves as a basis for my presentation of the evangelical faith-cure movement, while Dale Simmons’ analysis of similarities and divergencies between the evangelical movement and New Thought metaphysics will be heavily leaned upon in my attempt to place Kenyon within a valid Church History context.

In order to investigate Kenyon’s influence--both in the U.S. and in Europe--my sources are basically private correspondence and personal interviews. The interviews have been written down and signed by the informants. One of these--my interview with Leif Jacobsen--will not be made available, as the named individual who introduced Jacobsen to both Hagin and Kenyon’s literature back in 1968 has asked me to let him remain anonymous.

I would hereby like to thank all of those who have been willing to be interviewed, or in other ways have made contributions to this paper. In addition to my indebtedness to Dr. Simmons, who has been tremendously open-minded with regard to his own non-completed research (which is just about to be published in book form), I have also had continual contact with pastor Joe McIntyre of Kirkwood, Washington, who is also just about to finish up his book on Kenyon. Thanks to McIntyre I received access to several unpublished sermons by Kenyon. McIntyre also helped me to photocopy issues of Kenyon’s two newsletters, Tabernacle Trumpet and Bethel Trumpet. Also thanks to William L. DeArteaga of Atlanta, Georgia, and Glenn Gohr from the Assemblies of God Archives in Springfield, Missouri, for transforming my own “Norwenglish” translation of my original Norwegian thesis into more proper English. What a job! Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Tormod Engelsviken at the Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology for his many words of encouragement and positive evaluations during the writing of this thesis.
E.W. Kenyon’s life and ministry

Until quite recently, E. W. Kenyon and his influence on his contemporaries within the Pentecostal movement and the participants of the post-World War II healing revival have been largely ignored by the scholarly community. Although ORU professor Charles Farah started the ball rolling, it was with D. R. McConnell’s exposé of Kenneth E. Hagin as a plagiarist of Kenyon’s writings and McConnell’s refutation of Hagin’s theology that the role of Kenyon drew critical attention. McConnell’s attacks on Hagin/Kenyon have since been repeated in Dave Hunt’s two best seller books, The Seduction of Christianity, and Beyond Seduction and in Hank Hanegraaff’s Christianity in Crisis. These three books are based on either McConnell’s M.A. thesis from 1982 or his expanded and updated book, A Different Gospel.

Proving Hagin to have plagiarized most of his teachings from Kenyon, McConnell rightfully conferred the title of “father” of the modern Faith

---

1 Despite Kenyon’s influence on prominent charismatic ministers, this influence has nevertheless only affected a narrow segment within charismatic Christendom. This point is illustrated in the following advertisement of Kenyon’s book, What Happened from the Cross to the Throne (Seattle: E. W. Kenyon, 1945), which was signed by someone with the initial “H,” and appeared in the New Wine magazine, March 1972, 13: “There is a kind of whispering campaign about the Kenyon titles of which ‘What Happened’ is one. The books are seldom advertised and consequently generation after generation have to pass on the news of their existence by casual remarks at meetings where the gospel is being preached in depth.” Due to the final words in this advertisement—“Be warned, once you have purchased ‘What Happened’ (perhaps several copies at this low price) you will want to read them all and you will never cease to thank God you came across this outstanding author.”—After reading this advertisement, Rev. Sten Nilsson, then a Methodist minister and later initiator of the Faith movement in Sweden, decided that Kenyon’s books were to have an impact on his life.


4 (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1985 and 1987.)

5 (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1993.)

6 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988.)
movement to the latter. McConnell also discovered that 25-year-old Kenyon studied for a year at Emerson College of Oratory, an institution that was “absolutely inundated with metaphysical, cultic ideas and practices.” However, McConnell’s claim that Kenyon’s historical roots exclusively can be traced to pseudo-Christian groups such as Unitarians, Christian Science, and New Thought, hopefully will be convincingly refuted in this paper, where Kenyon will be grouped with the evangelical “faith-cure” adherents who predated the Pentecostal movement.

Since *A Different Gospel* is the only published work dealing with Kenyon in depth, I will basically discuss this book as a means of understanding Kenyon and his teachings.

As McConnell correctly points out, Kenyon’s published literature contains very little autobiographical information. Considering the mystery that has surrounded him—especially from within the modern Faith movement, it is hardly to be expected that the many invented stories about Kenyon could stand the test of historical scrutiny. For example, the popular Faith teacher Kenneth Copeland, claimed:

> E. W. Kenyon told his family one day that he was going to be with the Lord. He was over 80 years old. When the time came, he raised his hands, spoke in tongues, and went on home [without sickness and disease].

Kenyon’s own daughter, Ruth Kenyon Housworth, however, who took care of her father during the last few months of his life while he was weak and was having back problems, says that her father definitely did not speak in...
tongues at that point or previous to it.\textsuperscript{12} She actually had to call for the doctor when she found her father in a coma and dying.\textsuperscript{15}

Copeland is not alone among the faith leaders who would like to give the impression that he has invaluable insight concerning “legendary” E. W. Kenyon. Kenneth E. Hagin, who claims to have “checked up on Mr. Kenyon’s life,”\textsuperscript{14} admitted, when confronted with his “research,” that he knows nothing factual about his theological mentor: “I do not have any information regarding his early life and ministry nor about his personal life.\textsuperscript{15}

### Childhood and adolescence

Essek William Kenyon was the son of William A. Kenyon and Ann Eliza Knox.\textsuperscript{16} He was born April 24, 1867 in Hadley, Saratoga County, in the state of New York.\textsuperscript{17} His father was a logger and his mother a school teacher. While in his teens the family moved to the city of Amsterdam\textsuperscript{18} where young Kenyon was born again at the age of 18.\textsuperscript{19} The desire for knowledge immediately confronted him:

I stood by the loom in the factory as a boy and vowed that I would become an educator. I did not know what it meant, but I knew that within me was a teaching

---

\textsuperscript{12} McConnell, \textit{A Different Gospel}, 23. As McConnell states in his book, Kenyon did speak in tongues earlier in his life, but gave up this practice because it “dragged him into an area of subjective experience” (p. 28). Kenyon at least kept up his practice until 1924 when he applied for ordination through the Southern California District of the Assemblies of God. Evidently Kenyon was not accepted, or alternatively gave up the process before ever meeting with any committee to consider receiving credentials. (A copy of Kenyon’s application might be secured through the Assemblies of God Archives.) Also interesting are various references to Kenyon in the diary of George B. Studd of Los Angeles from 1908 which gives proof that Kenyon was in Los Angeles during the Azusa Street revival, i.e. “May 14--Another visit from E. Kenyon--God is dealing with him.”


\textsuperscript{15} Kenneth E. Hagin, letter to author, July 15, 1993.

\textsuperscript{16} Copy of death certificate, no 1219, Washington State Department of Health, Seattle, Washington (King County), 1948.


\textsuperscript{18} Ruth Kenyon, “He is At Rest,” \textit{Herald of Life}, April 1948, 1.


We hardly know anything about Kenyon’s educational background beyond his years at Amsterdam Academy. According to daughter Ruth he attended several schools in New Hampshire, but she does not know which ones. Most probably he never did attend any schools there. His first steps on the path of faith were not only marked by zeal but also by stumbling:

I remember when I was born again; I said to myself that nothing could happen to me. I was so happy. Joy seemed to run out of my fingers. How I labored with the boys to bring them to meeting. One day I went to a picnic with a company of young people. I was amusing the crowd that day; I amused them to such an extent that I got out of fellowship with the Father and I did not know what ailed me. I had sinned and was lost. I had no one to help me. As I went down stairs with the boys, they told me that I ought to go to the altar and be justified again. One of the boys said to me, “Don’t go back into sin again. We have banked on you.” They tried to make excuses for me. Days and days went past before I got my fellowship back.

The spiritual awareness must have happened early. As a young boy he felt called to preach, and in 1886—at the age of 19—he held his first sermon in a Methodist church of Amsterdam, where he was also given an exhorter’s

---

24 “At twelve years of age he went to work in a factory. As he plied the shuttle in his loom there raged more and more fiercely within the longing for an education. There were no night schools, so he studied as best he might; often registering a vow that he would obtain the coveted treasure. At eighteen he became a Christian and at once set to work with untiring zeal and energy to make the most of himself. He succeeded in getting a brief course at an academy [Amsterdam Academy], and later took a year’s course at Emerson College of Oratory, Boston.” (“Rev. E. W. Kenyon Lectures Sunday at Town Hall,” *Spencer Leader*, February 16, 1912.) This article was first brought to my attention by Dr. Dale Simmons of Bethel College, Mishawaka, Indiana.
26 Ruth Kenyon, “He is at Rest,” *Herald of Life*, April 1948, 1.
Kenyon described the first years of his Christian experience as quite traumatic: “Years went by and I lost it and went back into sin; I dropped back deeper and deeper until I went back into agnosticism.”

At about age 20, Kenyon was employed as an organ and piano seller, where he claims to have been making $5,000 to $7,000 a year, a princely sum for that time in his life.

I became one of the pioneers of sales talk, teaching the art of salesmanship. But I found that I could not sell unless I had confidence in the thing I was selling. I was selling pianos and organs from house to house. I tried to sell an instrument in which I had no confidence. I was an utter failure. I went back to the office and asked the manager which was the best piano for such a price. He told me. I went back to the factory to find out all about pianos. I wanted to know how the things were built. I went through the factory and studied them until I knew everything a young fellow could learn about the instruments. Then I went out on the road. I knew that I had the best thing on the market for the money.

Kenyon is rather silent concerning the first years of his Christian experience. However, it still is possible to read something out of the many fragmented statements with regard to this period in his life: “I first knew Him as my Savior, and never knew Him as anything else but Savior for ten years of my Christian life. Then I learned to know Him as my Healer.” If we take our point of departure in Kenyon’s being born again around 1885, the quotation above will relate to the year of 1895. Several have emphasized Kenyon’s attendance of Emerson College of Oratory in Boston during 1892-93. As will be documented later in this paper, the Boston institution was heavily

28 “§ 197 An Exhorter shall be constituted by the recommendation of the Class of which he is a Member, or of the Leaders and Stewards’ Meeting of the Circuit or Station, and a License signed by the Preacher in Charge.

§ 198 The duties of Exhorters are, to hold meetings for Prayer and Exhortation wherever opportunity is afforded, subject to the direction of the Preacher in Charge; to attend all the sessions of the District and Quarterly Conferences; to be subject to an annual Examination of Character in the District or Quarterly Conference, and a renewal of License annually by the Presiding Elder, or Preacher having the Charge, if approved by the District or Quarterly Conference” (Bishop Harris, ed. The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With an Appendix. New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884, 120).

29 Kenyon, “Justification,” Reality, Nov. 1909, 133. Kenyon claims to have spent 2 or 3 years out of fellowship with the Lord. During this period he never said a prayer, but he claims always to have carried his Bible with him. If he had received the Holy Spirit, “this would never have happened,” Kenyon wrote. Consider also “The Climax is Reached at the Revival Meetings,” Quincy Daily Ledger, Jan. 29, 1904, 1.

30 E. W. Kenyon, Sign Posts on the Road to Success, 38. It is not clear how long this period lasted. Most probably it lasted until he enrolled at Emerson College in 1892.

31 Kenyon, unpublished sermon at First Presbyterian Church in Hollywood, Aug. 27 1944. When he entered the ministry, his yearly salary was reduced to $700.

32 Kenyon, Sign Posts on the Road to Success, 38.

33 Kenyon, “Jesus Christ as High Priest,” Reality, January 1909, 33.
influenced by non-Christian philosophy. In this context it is interesting to point out that according to Kenyon it was not there that he “saw” divine healing. The school year does not seem to have altered his understanding of Jesus’ substitutionary atonement. Neither does it seem to have added knowledge with regard to the Christian faith.

Ministry on the East Coast

Years later Kenyon’s first wife wrote that he was an enthusiastic worker for a few years, winning many precious souls for the Master. Then through disgust arising from the many inconsistencies in the motives and lives of Christian leaders, and because of the pride of life, desire for fame and money in his own nature, he left his Lord’s vineyard and turned to the affairs of this world.34

When Kenyon married Evva Lydia Spurling, May 8, 1893, at the Tremont Street Methodist Church (Boston), neither of the two were professing Christians, and they had “no intention of making [Christ’s] work the business of [their] life.”35 About a month after their marriage (just after having completed his one-year term at Emerson College) the young couple attended a service in A. J. Gordon’s Clarendon Street Baptist Church where Kenyon again “heard the voice of God.”36 He repented, rededicated himself, and soon found himself involved in evangelistic meetings.

Despite his Methodist background Kenyon was convinced that the Scriptures favored full immersion baptism of believers. Through an encounter with the pastor of a Free Will Baptist Church in Amesbury, Massachusetts, both E. W. and Evva decided to join this denomination. In November of this same year (1893), Kenyon was invited to take over a church in Elmira, New York, which did not have a pastor.37 On January 17, 1894, he was ordained a Free Will Baptist minister. The ordination was authorized by the Chemung Quarterly Meeting of New York and Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Free Will Baptists.38 Though many received the Lord during his ministry in Elmira, Kenyon accepted a pastorate among the Free Will Baptists in Springville, New York, on July 1, 1894.39 He also took charge of the church in nearby

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
38 “The Minutes of the Twenty-Ninth General Conference of Free Baptists” (1895), 92.
East Concord. The churches grew immediately, but due to Kenyon’s young age the “historians” of the Springville church hesitated to praise “the ‘whippersnapper’ too highly lest he get a swelled head.”

Rev. E. W. Kenyon is the present pastor of this church. He is the youngest ever called to this charge and is of an ardent hopeful nature, not yet clouded by the cares and disappointments attending later years. He is—we were about to describe him, but as he is on the scene of action we refrain, but we give characteristics that he has not yet dreamed of possessing—and it might—make him egotistical.

After three successful years Kenyon was called to the pastorate of the Free Will Baptist Church in Worcester, Massachusetts, and left Springville, June 2, 1897. The local press was positive: “We are sorry to lose Mr. Kenyon ... His many friends wish him success.”

The Worcester church, founded in 1881, was a part of the Massachusetts Association of Free Baptist Churches and seemed to grow under Kenyon’s pastorate:

This church received seven new members Sunday, Feb 6.... The Sunday school has been steadily increasing in numbers and interest in the last few months.... Our mid-week prayer meetings were never so well attended, and the attendants were never so much interested in them as at the present time, and the work here is wonderfully helped by all our services.

But 11 months after his coming, already in May of 1898, Kenyon seems to have been replaced by evangelist A. C. Thompson, at the request of both the church and the executive board of the Massachusetts State Association. On behalf of the population in Worcester, a local journalist elaborates on people’s lack of confidence in Kenyon:

[Kenyon] has opposed many of the local pastors and endeavored in many ways to weaken their efforts in their various churches. He is charged by his former

---

40 Jeanne Spaulding (historian in East Concord), letter to author, Nov. 11 1993.
42 “History from the 29th Anniversary,” Springville Baptist Church, June 30, 1993, 49.
43 Margaret Mayerat (historian at East Concord), letter to author, September 14, 1993.
46 “Churches,” Morning Star, February 24, 1898, 124.
According to Kenyon, the problems in many ways had begun already in Springville, in spite of “three happy, profitable years ... in which the Lord taught him many of the precious truths that moulded his life for to-day.” In Springville he also had experienced the Spirit “as a person”, and many new converts had been won. The church was struggling with its finances, though, and although not selling sittings (pew rent), the money must be raised “by subscriptions, or suppers, or sales, or socials, or something of like nature.” In order to be able to keep Kenyon as pastor, not only the members of the church, but the population of Springville, had been asked for contributions. Many gave out of pressure:

Not to be outdone by others, many put down money they could ill afford. Many were urged to give, not because they loved the Lord’s work, but it would not look well if they did not. Many subscribed and afterward repented, when the minister preached something they did not like, or when he did not shake hands with them the first one, or did not call often enough. Others subscribed and sickness or loss of work made it almost a sin for them to pay, but they must because they promised.

Kenyon felt like a pauper “living on the begrudged offerings of the people.” Was this God’s way of securing the finances of His people?

His transference to the church in Worcester had been a good one. He found “an earnest, devoted people.” However, the distaste for his subscription paper continued. Kenyon’s ministry was based on a genuine calling by God. He felt his teachings must reflect what God had laid on his heart irrespective of the response from the contributors. Kenyon reasoned that God must “fix the limit of his salary. God must tell the people when, how much, and where to give, not men with their papers.”

During this process Kenyon came across George Müller’s autobiography and was introduced to teachings on faith. Kenyon felt led to follow Müller’s example by trusting God for his finances. He also felt that the church should do the same thing, in spite of its struggling with a mortgage, “and the upper Auditorium was not finished”:

Raising the interest on the mortgage was a heavy burden, so that there seemed little hope of finishing the Auditorium. They were a conscientious people, did not have suppers etc, did not sell sittings, so the regular expenses had to be covered by the weekly offerings and regular subscriptions. At the time God showed us that Mr. Kenyon was to receive no salary, he also showed us that it was his will that the Ch.

---

48 “Gift to Kenyon,” Worcester Evening Gazette, January 12, 1900, 1.
50 ibid., 132.
51 ibid.
trust him for the regular expenses, the interest money, and for finishing the Auditorium. That the collection baskets should be discontinued, substituting a box at the door, the only method of receiving money in God’s House mentioned in the Bible.\textsuperscript{52}

I remember the time when up stairs in an unfinished church I fought that battle out. They had gone into debt every year until I came there. I saw the conditions were that I could not finish that building until I took a stand. I shall never forget how, in that unfinished building on my knees, I fought that battle and said, “Yes, God, my Father, I will give up my salary; and I will preach some truths that I have been afraid to preach.” The next Sunday I preached, and as I walked home that night a man took my arm and said, “Brother, I am afraid that kind of preaching will alienate some of the church members; you would better water the stock a little. It is a little too stiff for them.” That man told me he had never loved any man as he loved me. In three week’s time he became my enemy, and fought to have my papers taken from me as a minister, just on one ground. Looking into his face I said, “I will not be a bond-servant of your committee, nor of you; I will not be bound in my preaching. I will preach the message God gives me if it is the last thing I ever do. I love you and would lay down my life for you, but I will preach the message that God wants. I will not sell out for my salary nor for your influence, and if the issue is to be fought, you may accept my resignation.” And they took it. That church died. I did not fight it; I did not split it; I did not draw any members out of it; I withdrew quietly and it died.\textsuperscript{53}

Just as Kenyon had done, A. C. Thompson also reported growth in the “dying” church, which “is said never to have been in better condition spiritually than now.”\textsuperscript{54} He did not attempt to conceal the fact, though, that the church had passed through several testings, and although having “come through all of them with good courage, and very often has been actually strengthened by them... None have withdrawn from the church but the recent pastor and his family, and it looks now as if no others would. Pray for us.”\textsuperscript{55} At a gathering of the Massachusetts Association of Free Baptists, on October 19, 1898, the body was informed that Kenyon desired to have his name removed. And from a report of the next day, we read that “The Ministers Conference rec-

\textsuperscript{52}ibid.
\textsuperscript{53}Kenyon, “Faith,” *Reality*, November 1908, 9. The Worcester Free Will Baptist Church was mentioned for the first time in the *Free Will Baptist Register* for 1883. That the church “died” possibly means that the steady flow of new members/visitors ceased after Kenyon’s resignation. When the Free Will Baptist General Convention joined the Northern Baptist Convention in 1913 the Worcester church had changed its name to Newton Square Baptist Church. No matter how we interpret Kenyon’s statement with regard to this particular church, its actual death did not occur until 1968. (James R. Lynch, letter to author, July 22, 1993.)

\textsuperscript{54}“Churches,” *Morning Star*, July 23, 1898, 396.
\textsuperscript{55}ibid.
ommends that the name of Rev. E. W. Kenyon be dropped from our roll in accordance with his request. Report adopted.”

If the first years of Kenyon’s Christian life had been traumatic, this hardly changed during the first phase of his ministry. It was an ever growing frustration for him to observe the many happy converts, who maybe after just a few weeks would lose their new-found joy and then would disappear from church just as quickly as they had showed up:

I would do my best, but could not get them back. I did not know how to help them. Many a choice man and woman did I lose out of my church. I knew that they were born again. People said, “You are too hasty; you take them in too quickly. They do not understand; you should keep them on probation.”

After his resignation, Kenyon appeared perplexed. He did not understand why he and his family had been called out to a life of faith. “One thing we were sure of, that God wished to prove to us, and the people, that He could support us financially without resorting to man’s methods.” However, he did hope that God would not keep him in Worcester as he “knew that opening an independent work would bring much misunderstanding and misrepresentation. We did not wish to seem in opposition to our late Ch. for many of the people were very dear to us.” The most tempting alternative was “to go South” in order to take up evangelical work among the black people, but “God withheld his consent.” Just one week after his resignation, though, Kenyon rented a hall in the YMCA building. After a month the little hall was overcrowded, and he moved the services to 113 Main Street. Later, during a prayer meeting on September 14, 1898, the new ministry was named Tabernacle Assembly.

During the summer of 1898 Kenyon ministered in many of the nearby towns and villages, and several young people came to him as they felt the need of more thorough Bible teaching. Most of them had to find their own lodging, but during the daytime they flocked to Kenyon’s home. Thus the “Bible School” began in mid-August 1898.

About this same period the issue of divine healing came up. Both E. W. and Evva were familiar with healing prayer--both had “given up medicine.” But

---


57 Kenyon, “Relationship and Fellowship,” Reality, December 1914, 186. (Same article appeared in May 1909, 98.)


as he feared being considered a fanatic, Kenyon had decided never to preach healing “or make it prominent in his work.” This attitude changed dramatically as Evva–although reluctantly–obeyed an inner prompting to lay hands on a certain individual who immediately was healed of consumption:

In our work at the Tabernacle, I did not teach healing except in a very guarded way. Yet as the people began to obey the Word and to test its promises, healings and other signs followed, and I could not suppress the truth. It became a part of our work without my consent. Had I any right to hold down the truth through fear of persecution or misrepresentation when I knew that God could heal, and was healing the sick.

The newly-founded Bible School continued until June 1, 1899. Several of the students wanted to remain, but Kenyon was unsure whether God really wanted them to continue. After a personal invitation by a certain H. L. Hastings, who had built up a private library “dedicated to the Lord’s work,” E. W. and Evva took the young people with them and left for Goshen, Massachusetts, where they rented a house close to the library. While E. W. basically was preaching in Worcester, Evva and the students remained in prayer regarding the future of the school.

Then it seemed that Kenyon’s desire to work with black people became partly fulfilled, for on August 23, Kenyon and his wife left New York for Savannah, Georgia and Mayesville, South Carolina:

The people both white and black have received us very kindly, for we have come, not to meddle with any of their political and social questions, but simply to preach Jesus, and we are looking to Him for a mighty Spiritual awakening throughout the South-land, which alone, we believe, will adjust lives and make this part of the nation what God desires it to be.

During the ten weeks the Kenyons ministered in Georgia and South Carolina, the students also left and took ordinary work while hoping to God that the school would reopen upon Kenyon’s return. Immediately upon the Kenyons’ arrival in Worcester, the youngsters again flocked around them. Evva and E. W. were perplexed—they would prefer to do evangelistic work. Evva went back to Goshen, but after having been searched out by several of the young people she decided to take them into their home and teach them as

---

63 Evva Spurling Kenyon, “Our Southern Trip,” Tabernacle Trumpet, September 1899, 98.
best she could until a more suitable place to have the Bible school was found.\footnote{Evva Spurling Kenyon, “God’s Leadings,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, January 1901, 135.}

The same uncertainties manifested earlier were also experienced by Kenyon’s newly-founded church in Worcester. After having rented a hall at 113 Main Street until January 1899, the meetings were moved to Beacon Street for a brief period\footnote{Evva Spurling Kenyon, “God’s Leadings,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, June 1899, 86.} until the church was allowed to rent the 9-year-old Belmont Street Church.\footnote{Kenyon, “Why We Purchase the Church,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, April 1899, 79. Due to Simmons’ reference to a secular newspaper article with regard to Kenyon’s “Belmont Street Tabernacle,” Simmons erroneously writes that Kenyon pastored two Free Will Baptist churches in Worcester—one mentioned on Wellington Street and also the alleged Belmont Street Free Will Baptist Church. (Dale Hawthorne Simmons, “The Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty: As Seen in the Writings of Essek William Kenyon,” Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University, 1990, 55).} Kenyon had intended to buy the church building, but this plan failed because of lack of money,\footnote{Evva Spurling Kenyon, “God’s Leadings,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, June 1899, 86.} and after one more relocation the Tabernacle Assembly found itself at 306 Main Street.\footnote{“Removal of Tabernacle,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, June 1899, 91.} “We are beginning to learn why God gave us the name ‘The Tabernacle,’ it means a movable place, guided by the Holy Spirit.”\footnote{Evva Spurling Kenyon, “God’s Leadings,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, June 1899, 86.}

And as if this were not enough, Kenyon also had to pay the price for not being accepted by his village neighbors:

I walked the streets an outcast in feelings; the daily papers had fought me for months; my old friends would cross the streets when they saw me coming, or dodge into a store or hallway ... I told God that day I would not be defeated, his Word could not fail me; I had been sifted by Satan, every ideal had been killed, friends, relatives, name; even my character had been blackened by enemies, and God would not allow me to answer a word ... I say it modestly, but I question if any man and wife in New England have suffered more abuse from the public than my wife and I have for three years. The crime that we suffered for, is that we went out according to Scripture to preach without a salary ... If we have injured anyone we have done it ignorantly.\footnote{Kenyon, “Some Experiences,” *Bethel Trumpet*, October 1901, 59-60.}

In 1898, John and Susan Marble of Sutton, Massachusetts heard about Kenyon’s newly-established work. The couple was much impressed by Kenyon’s ministry, and they left the local Congregational church they had been

---

69 Evva Spurling Kenyon, “God’s Leadings,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, June 1899, 86. After Kenyon left Worcester the meetings were moved to 94 Park Street (“Worcester Assembly,” *Tabernacle Trumpet*, October 1900, 120). According to the last reference in Kenyon’s magazine the meetings were being held at 543 Main Street (“The Tabernacle Assembly,” *Bethel Trumpet*, September 1901, 47).
attending and regularly went to Worcester. While the public critique against E. W. was raging, Kenyon was offered some property on which Mrs. Marble had a mortgage. John Marble bought the farm in January 1900, and Kenyon moved to Spencer, Massachusetts on February 1 of that year. The first months basically were spent cultivating the land and repairing of the house, but already by May 1 the Kenyons considered themselves sufficiently abreast to open the new Bible school—Bethel Bible Institute.

In addition to the newly established school and public meetings held in Spencer and termed, “Bethel Public Services,” Kenyon’s out of town evangelistic ministry was expanding. All of this naturally affected his involvement in Worcester. During a short period he supported the meetings when he was home in Spencer; otherwise he was replaced by one of the students. After September 1901 the meetings of the Tabernacle Assembly were no longer advertised in Kenyon’s newsletter, which had changed its name from Tabernacle Trumpet to Bethel Trumpet beginning February 1, 1901.

Early in 1903 Kenyon accepted the pastorate of the First Christian Church (Silsbee Street Christian Church) in Lynn, Massachusetts. He may have had some meetings in the church prior to this, or he may have been filling in as pastor for a short time before this, as the church records of December 29, 1902 state that the board unanimously decided to keep him. He was asked to
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72 Kenyon, “Some Experiences,” Bethel Trumpet, October 1901, 60
74 Francis S. Bernauer, “Bethel Bible Institute: Its Aim, Method, and Outlook” Reality, June 1907, 14-16.
78 Published from February 1901 until it was replaced by Reality in April 1903. The latest issue at my disposal is from December 1902, but I know for certain that other issues followed.
79 Kenyon, “Lynn Bible Conference,” Reality, May 1903, 25. The church was founded in 1835 when many American ministers emphasized the restoration of New Testament church structure. The church in Lynn joined the Disciples of Christ denomination while pastored by Thomas Penn Ullom in 1913-14. During 1915 the church moved to its current address: 270 Chestnut Street (“Lynn Church Sets Anniversary Fete,” The Lynn Item, October 25, 1985). The church’s directory listing gives 1903-04 as the only years when the church has ever been without a pastor. In that respect it seems to verify Kenyon’s involvement (Diane Shepard [Lynn Historical Society & Museum], letter to author, June 25, 1993). Kenyon possibly served as “interim pastor.” In any case, Kenyon had a busy schedule with regular evangelistic meetings during this period. From 1904 he never makes mention of the church in his newsletter, Reality. Kenyon was never registered as a minister within The Christian Church denomination (Harold F. Worthley, [Congregational Library, Boston], letter to author, March 12, 1993).
be “acting Pastor for an indefinite time.” However, on September 28, 1903
he was asked to withdraw and was given one week in order to make his deci-
26
sion. No one seems to know whether the reason was dissatisfaction with
Kenyon or if the church no longer was in need of his assistance.80

Kenyon again gave himself to evangelistic meetings in New England. The
Bible school temporarily had been closed, but it was reopened in September
1904.81 In the interim, the local press had speculated in alleged marital prob-
lems between Kenyon and his elder wife,82 and followed up with reports on
the school’s temporary discontinuation as the authorities had “attached the
personal property, consisting of farming tools, household furniture etc. at the
Kenyon bible school.”83

In spite of Kenyon being founder and president of the school and frequently
stopping by, it was his staff workers who in practice held much of the ad-
ministrative responsibility. The students did not pay for tuition, and nobody
received any salaries. Most of the income consequently came through what
was produced on the farm and via free will offerings which Kenyon received
during his revival meetings.84

Kenyon’s magazine *Reality* regularly reported that hundreds had been con-
verted during completed campaign. Kenyon’s teachings seemed to appeal to
unsaved men in particular, and many of the people being born again during
Kenyon’s ministry were men.85 Many of these later became students at Be-

80 Dr. Dale H. Simmons, letter to author, July 20 1993.
82 “Family Troubles: Kenyonite Shrine at Hillsville Has its Difficulties,” *Spencer Leader*, December 6,
1902.
After a prolonged sickness Evva died February 3, 1914. On November 25 of that same year Kenyon remarried, this time to a younger lady by the name of Alice Maud Whitney in Billtown Baptist Church, Nova Scotia, Canada. On February 14, 1916, a son, Essek Whitney was born, while daughter Ruth Alice came on December 6, 1919.

Issues of Reality published after April 1916 have not been located. Consequently we do not know very much with regard to Kenyon's ministry at that time either--apart from the fact that it was still connected to Bethel Bible Institute. Early in 1923 the Kenyons began to occupy themselves with relocating the school in Dudley, Massachusetts, and in September Bethel Bible Institute moved to Budleigh Hall Mansion, including the classrooms and gymnasium of the liberal arts institution, Nichols Academy. Whether Kenyon had objections, is not known. However, prior to the end of that year, he had moved to California in spite of the fact that he had not formally resigned from his own school. This he did in a telegram on April 24, 1924. Four days later he was appointed “president emeritus.” Two weeks after that the big property in Spencer was sold. After another year (June 4, 1925) the name of the institution was changed to “Dudley Bible Institute and Nichols Academy.” Within another year it was decided to turn back the buildings
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87 “In The Presence of Death,” Reality, February 1914, 31. Consider also “Mrs. Essek W. Kenyon: Wife of Founder of Bethel Bible School is Laid Away,” Spencer Leader, February 6, 1914. Evva and Kenyon most probably had no children together. But sure enough, Kenyon does mention a little girl he used to have a father-like relationship to, and who lived with him for a certain period (Kenyon, “Relationship and fellowship,” Reality, May 1909, 102). What later happened to the girl, is not known. A reference to “his daughter, Mrs. Harvey Morse” (“Gift to Kenyon,” Worcester Evening Gazette, January 12, 1900, 1) must relate to Evva’s daughter from her first marriage as E. W. was just 33 years old at the time.

88 “Notes,” Reality, March 1916, 176.


90 It may seem as if Kenyon--at least in the beginning--had no objections. “When we launched out at Dudley, we did not have a dollar to stand on nor at Spencer. There was nothing back of us” (Kenyon, “Taking our rights,” unpublished sermon, February 14, 1926). I interpret the quotation above as a reference to Kenyon’s staff workers’ acting in faith--in other words that Kenyon was in favor of the relocation plans. Consider also Kenyon’s unpublished sermon “The nature of the new birth,” [n.p.] [n.d.], where he describes the localities being given them in answer to prayer. However, Kenyon’s daughter claimed that her father broke with the institution as its new policy did not maintain the faith aspect patterned after George Müller, Charles Cullis et al. (Ruth Kenyon Housworth, taped interview by D. R. McConnell, February 19, 1982). Consider also McConnell’s “The Kenyon Connection,” pp. 71-73.

91 Kenyon possibly misunderstood the “honorary bestowal.” At least it is a fact that he almost immediately thereafter began to refer to himself as “Dr. Kenyon.” In this regard, consider the presentation of Kenyon’s book, The Deity of Jesus (which was never published), in the 1927 edition of The Wonderful Name of Jesus, 123.
of Nichols Academy, so the school’s name was changed to “Dudley Bible Institute” (Sept. 20 1926).

In 1929 the school was “moved to Providence, Rhode Island and re-incorporated as Providence Bible Institute.” Through a series of steps in the 1950s the Institute became Barrington College. The Barrington property was bought in 1950 and “was at first only used by half of the student body, and the other half still met in Providence. The school was renamed Providence-Barrington Bible College in 1951 and remained that until 1959.” This was its name until its merger with Gordon College in Wenham, Massachusetts in September 1985.93

Ministry on the West Coast

After leaving the East Coast Kenyon held evangelistic meetings in San Jose94 before he settled in Oakland, California, where he resided until 1925. He is listed in the telephone directory for Oakland in 1925 as pastor of the Plymouth Congregational Church.95 Then during 1926-27 the Kenyon family moved to Los Angeles where E. W. founded an independent church:

93 John Beauregard (Gordon College), letter to author, November 11, 1993. The late Howard Ferrin, one-time Chancellor of Barrington College, suggested somewhat hesitantly in an interview with D. R. McConnell that Kenyon disassociated himself completely with the school due to the relocation plans in 1923. “Kenyon never wrote Bethel, never returned to visit, and never even inquired about it after he left in 1923” (Ferrin, taped interview, February 23, 1982). [Kenyon never visited the East Coast after his move westward. That might explain why he never had the chance to visit the school!] Ferrin came to the school in 1925 and never actually knew Kenyon, although he met him once just prior to the latter’s death in 1948 (“Notes of sympathy,” Herald of Life, April 1948, 4). It was not necessarily a schism in a negative sense that took place in 1923 (cf. the honorary bestowal of the title “professor emeritus”). Even back in 1985 Ferrin’s memory was “very fuzzy and confused ... and many details which he gave with conviction did not match printed records for the period covered” (Beauregard, letter to author, August 25, 1992). It might very well be that Ferrin’s memory was beginning to fail him even back in 1982 when he was interviewed by McConnell. One example of a statement which seems to have been taken out of the air, is: “This evangelistic work [of Kenyon] was moderately successful and resulted in the founding of a few Primitive Baptist churches” (McConnell, A Different Gospel, xii). In fact, Kenyon only founded one church on the East Coast, the independent Tabernacle Assembly in Worcester, Massachusetts. He hardly ever refers to the Primitive Baptists. Neither have they been able to find any references to him in their files (Mabel Berry [The Primitive Baptist Library, Elon College, NC], letter to author, February 10, 1993).


95 Although the Plymouth Congregational Church was listed in the Congregational yearbook, Kenyon does not appear to have pastored the church. I have not succeeded in finding another Oakland church with an identical or similar name either. Considering the fact that one article by Kenyon entitled “Legal authority” appeared in Carrie Judd Montgomery’s magazine Triumphs of Faith for December 1914 (pp. 281-85), it is possible that Kenyon might have maintained contact with Montgomery’s ministry after moving to Oakland ten years later.
A small group of folks who were sincerely desirous of reaching into the deeper and richer things of God happened to come in contact with Dr. Kenyon during one of his campaigns in this city. These few attracted others, and still others until at last they succeeded in getting Dr. Kenyon to adopt them as a permanent family. 96

Since January first of this year [1927] when we first banded together under the personal leadership of Dr. Kenyon, our numbers have been growing steadily, sometimes a little slowly, but we have grown. By July we had reached the place where we had to have a real church home, and one that would accommodate greater numbers. Hence our move to our present location, the former home of the First Baptist Church ... Our auditorium provides a seating capacity of 1700. Needless to say, we have not yet filled the building, but each week sees us growing to that end. 97

The church first went by the name of “Church of the Living Word” and was soon “organized an Independent Baptist Church.” 98 In January 1928--if not even earlier--the newly founded church had relocated. The new building was on the corner of 9th Street and Figueroa Street--therefore the name change to Figueroa (Independent) Baptist Church. 99 After the relocation the growth of the church seems to have continued. The church seemed to attract young couples especially. The church’s new membership also included various individuals who “have been trained in other institutions, but have felt a call to fellowship with us.” 100

If you are without a church home and want a place where the Word is taught,--where Jesus Christ is magnified,--and the whole counsel of God declared, come with us. This church stands for the whole counsel of God, as far as we know it. Our redemption includes redemption of spirit, soul and body. Love is the dominant characteristic of this people. The sick are being healed daily. The power of God rests on the message. We would be glad, if you are dissatisfied where you are, for you to come and give us a visit. We do not care to proselyte, but we do feel there are hundreds of men and women in this city who are dissatisfied, and are longing for the type of ministry which this church gives. Just visit us once, hear the Word expounded, listen to the wonderful singing, and we are sure you will want to anchor your bark in this harbor. 101

---

97 “Our home,” Kenyon Herald, October 23, 1927, 2.
98 “Church Notes,” Kenyon Herald, October 27, 1927, 3.
99 “Church Notes,” Living Messages, January 1928, 7.
101 ibid.
In 1930 Kenyon started up with two weekly radio programs on KNX. However, he was struggling with his marriage, which ended in divorce on December 15, 1930. Shortly afterwards Kenyon wrote:

A wife unconsciously robs herself of her privileges in her husband’s life by entertaining doubts and criticism of him in her heart. If she criticizes him before others, she unconsciously closes her own life against him. She may want, she may crave fellowship with him, but entertaining a critical spirit has unconsciously robbed her of the capacity to inspire him to give his confidence to her.

Kenyon resigned from the church and moved to the state of Washington, first to Olympia, and then to Tacoma. He is only listed in the Tacoma City Directory for 1932, and as he is first listed in the Seattle City Directory for 1934, we have reason to believe that he left Tacoma in 1933. His first radio broadcast from Tacoma, “Kenyon’s Church of the Air” on KVI was October 11, 1931.

His first broadcast in Seattle, still “Kenyon’s Church of the Air,” now on KJR, was September 5, 1933. The broadcasts could be picked up “as far South as San Diego and it was heard in Northern Canada and as far East as Nova Scotia, Canada.” The programs were popular, and many were won for the Gospel by listening to them. On September 16, Kenyon’s “Seattle Bible Institute” was formally opened with fifty enthusiastic students.
week later the first issue of Kenyon’s influential newsletter Herald of Life came out. Then during September 1937 the church, Kenyon’s Church of the Air, was founded.112 During the last years of his life responsibility for the church was delegated to Jack Mitchell and Wesley Alloway,113 and in November 1941 the church’s name was changed to New Covenant Baptist Church. Kenyon again gave himself to evangelistic work, although when visiting in Seattle, he always preached in the church.114

Apart from the books The Father and His Family and The Wonderful Name of Jesus which were published in 1916 and 1927, respectively, Kenyon’s additional titles were published during the Seattle years,115 although several of them were ready for publication back in 1930.116 The late Lydia Berkey who allegedly pastored a Foursquare church in Everett just outside of Seattle, Washington, writes:

Every Sunday afternoon [Kenyon] would come and have services in our church. I’ve never been around a man as spiritual as he was, or a man who walked with God like he did. Many times he would come over to the office during the week because he wanted to get away. We’d just turn the office over to him, and there he would write some of his books.117

On an evangelistic trip Kenyon fell from a hammock and injured his back. He moved in with daughter Ruth and ex-wife Alice Whitney. In the morning of March 19, 1948, Ruth found her father in a coma and called for the doctor.118 According to his death certificate Kenyon died at noon (12:01) March 19, 1948. The doctor had been seeing him from April 10, 1947 and had also stopped by earlier on the same day that Kenyon passed away. The cause of his death was probably a lymphoid malignancy.119

---

112 Bonnie Dofelmier (Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society), letter to author, January 24, 1994. The church seems to have disbanded just after June 1946.
113 Ruth Kenyon Housworth, letter to author, June 9, 1992. According to the Seattle City Directory, 1942 was Kenyon’s last year as pastor of the church. Beginning with 1943 Alloway was listed as its pastor.
116 The Living Message, June 1930, 39.
117 “Dr. Lydia Berkey,” unpublished manuscript, n.d. Unfortunately, I have not been able to verify that Berkey ever pastored a Foursquare church in Everett.
118 Ruth K. Housworth, letter to Mr. Roy Heather (England, UK), March 6, 1992. Used with permission by both the Kenyon ministry and Mr. Heather.
119 Death certificate, registrar’s no. 1219, Washington State Department of Health, King County, 1948.
Ministry posthumously

During Kenyon’s more than 50 years of ministry he published twelve books, three Bible studies,\textsuperscript{120} several tracts,\textsuperscript{121} and hundreds of songs and poems.\textsuperscript{122}

When he died he had materials for some additional twelve books,\textsuperscript{123} and Ruth, who was appointed president of Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, published \textit{The Blood Covenant}\textsuperscript{124} and \textit{The Hidden Man} posthumously.\textsuperscript{125}

With her mother she moved to Fullerton, California, where she remained until her mother passed away with cancer on August 22, 1958. In October of the same year she married Trotwood Iams in Reno, Nevada. They moved back to Seattle in June 1959. About 10 years later, Iams developed “an infection in his kidney which ruptured and it took him the same day” in Octo-


\textsuperscript{121} Only two of these are available, “How to Become a Christian” and “All Things Are Ready.” The first is taken from later editions of \textit{The Father and His Family} (Seattle, WA: Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, 1964, pp. 229-33); the latter is from \textit{The Two Kinds of Knowledge} (pp. 62-71).

\textsuperscript{122} Consider the following books: Kenyon’s \textit{Living Poems} (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, 5th ed., 1965); Choice Revival Songs, compiled by F. S. Bernauer and E. W. Kenyon (Spencer, MA: E. W. Kenyon, Bethel Bible Institute, 1915); Songs of Reality for Evangelistic, Prayer and Missionary Meetings, Bible Schools and Young People’s Societies, Conventions, Meetings for Men and all Services of the Church, compiled by F. S. Bernauer, associate editors E. W. Kenyon and Thoro Harris (Chicago: Reality Press, 1913); \textit{New Songs from Songs of Reality}: As Sung by Paul Duffy in the Kenyon Evangelistic Campaign (Spencer, MA: Reality Press, n.d.); Leaves from Songs of Reality, compiled by B. C. Bubar, E. V. Small and E. W. Kenyon (Spencer, MA: Reality Publishing Co., n.d.); and Kenyon’s Gospel Songs, souvenir edition (Los Angeles: Victorious Press, n.d.).

\textsuperscript{123} Ruth Kenyon, “He is at Rest,” \textit{Herald of Life}, April 1948, 1. In the 1927 edition of \textit{The Wonderful Name of Jesus} (Los Angeles: West Coast Publishing, 1927), we read that the book \textit{The Deity of Jesus} “... is promised to those who have followed the ministry and teaching of Dr. E. W. Kenyon... Years of research and study have brought about this masterful work concerning the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. Watch for the announcement of its publication” (p. 123). However, the book never appeared in print. The reference to the book \textit{Jesus, the Healer of Galilee} on the same page, “soon to go to press,” is most probably identical with his published work entitled \textit{Jesus the Healer} (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, 12th ed., 1968), which appeared just prior to 1938. In his first edition of \textit{The Two Kinds of Righteousness} (Seattle: E. W. Kenyon, 1942), Kenyon refers to the following two books “in Preparation”: \textit{The Two Confessions} and \textit{The Superman} (p. 72). Neither of these titles were ever published either. In the course of my research, I have had the privilege of looking through Kenyon’s unpublished writings. And although Kenyon might have left materials for twelve additional books, much editing remains before any of these would be ready for publication.

\textsuperscript{124} Basically taken from Kenyon’s \textit{The New Covenant in My Blood}, which appeared during his brief period in Tacoma.

\textsuperscript{125} Ruth Kenyon Housworth, letter to author, September 30, 1992. Concerning the twelve books that were published prior to Kenyon’s death, for most of these also it was Ruth who organized his many “unrelated articles” and “sewed together” most of the chapters into actual books (Ruth Kenyon Housworth, “The History of the Kenyons,” taped conversation, February 24, 1980). [Due to Ruth’s age, this only applies to the books succeeding \textit{The Wonderful Name of Jesus} in 1927.]
ber of 1968. One year later, on November 15, 1969, Ruth remarried to Norman Housworth in Beaverlodge, Canada.  Together they have shared the ministry of distributing Kenyon’s literature, but since 1981 they have not been able to afford to continue publishing the Herald of Life newsletter. It is somewhat surprising that Kenyon’s son, who originally had a part in his father’s ministry, is no longer active. He has settled down in Everett, just north of Seattle, but does not wish to be contacted. While both of Ruth’s marriages were childless, her brother ensured the Kenyon line would be preserved through his son Essek Lambert Kenyon (born February 17, 1938) and daughter Cassandra Larson (born April 15, 1943).

In spite of the fact that many have been interested in translating the Kenyon literature into other languages, Ruth seldom granted permission. Rare exceptions are the translations of The Wonderful Name of Jesus and The Father and His Family into the Chinese language. In India the latter also appeared in Telugu prior to Kenyon’s death. Unauthorized translations appeared, though, in Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese, and Dutch just to name a few.

Ruth’s last years were a long struggle with cancer. She passed away on December 1, 1993. Kenyon’s Gospel Publishing Society is now headed by Bonnie Dofelmier who has worked for the ministry for more than 25 years. The staff has not decided yet on Ruth’s policy concerning limiting the translation of the Kenyon books into other languages: “We will be in prayer about the future of this policy.”
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E.W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister?

Methodist preacher (probably prior to 1890)?

Evangelist on the East Coast (approximately 1900)

Kenyon's family in 1920. From left to right: Ruth Alice, Alice, Essek William and Essek Whitney jr.
Kenyon as an elderly gentleman in Seattle (During the 1940s).
The Message

Pentecostalism has oftentimes—and rightly so—been accused of being anti-intellectual (or so-called “anti-creedal”). Kenyon too, just like his Pentecostal associates, lacked theological sophistication, although he sought to reach people’s heads just as well as their hearts.

Even though Kenyon made several rather sharp “attacks” against creeds, his criticism seems to have been directed more against a strong identification with one’s denominational belief when it came to the point that one was unable to see the need for what other Christians might add. Kenyon actually also rallied against a solely inspirational or emotion-like Christendom which is not based on the Word, and in this sense definitely is not “anti-credal.”

“The coming revival must be doctrinal.” Because of spatial limitations I do not consider it possible to give a systematic presentation of all of Kenyon’s teachings. Kenyon was no theologian either, and has naturally not presented any systematic theological discussion of the Christian faith per se. On the contrary many aspects of Christianity are either omitted, or are barely focused on. In the following outline I will present some of Kenyon’s major teachings, though.

God

God is a Trinity, consisting of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In spite of this unity, the three persons of Deity all have specific and separate functions. God is also described as omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient.  

---

4 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 250.
5 ibid., 157.
Satan

Satan is a created spirit. Originally he was the angel Lucifer and ministered in the presence of God. He was probably responsible for the praise and worship in heaven. Lucifer’s high position made him desirous for more power. Thus he rebelled against God and was supported by many of the angels. His rebellion did not succeed, however, and Lucifer and the fallen angels were thrown out of heaven and down to the earth.\(^6\)

Man

Man was created in the intellectual and spiritual image and likeness of God.\(^7\) In order to explain what constitutes man’s nature Kenyon goes back to God’s own heart as the reason for creation. God had from the very beginning longed for children, sons and daughters who by the choice of their own will would respond to His initiative of love. In anthropomorphic terms God is depicted as lonely, and none of His creation could satisfy His Father heart before the creation of humanity. The motivation of making man was to eliminate God’s loneliness--God wanted fellowship--on terms of equality.\(^8\)

Adam was created to be God’s friend and companion. Since fellowship was what God was aiming at, man had to be made as close to God as possible. Man was given an eternal body and an intellect which “matched” that of God Himself. According to Kenyon this is hinted at through Adam’s capacity not only in naming the various animals and herbs, but also in remembering which names he had given them all. Kenyon’s understanding of Adam’s intellectual capacity is not based on this, however, but on the teachings on God’s Father heart which was longing for fellowship.\(^9\)

Adam was to reign over both flora and fauna--his “kingdom” reached all the created universe.\(^10\) Since righteousness is one of the Creator’s characteristics, Kenyon describes Adam’s authority as a legal authority.\(^11\) In the temptation in the Garden where Eve surrendered to the serpent’s proposal, Ken-


\(^7\) Kenyon, The Hidden Man, 168.

\(^8\) Kenyon, Father and His Family, 16-30; Bible in the Light, 9-15.

\(^9\) Kenyon, Father and His Family, 31-40; Bible in the Light, 17-22.

\(^10\) Kenyon, Father and His Family, 36-37; Bible in the Light, 20-21.

\(^11\) Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 42.

\(^12\) ibid., 21.
yon claims that she was duped while Adam acted with full knowledge. Adam knew Lucifer and understood the consequences if he and Eve would obey the words of the serpent. Because of fear of losing his wife through a separation of nature, he consciously chose to share destiny with his wife.\(^\text{13}\)

Kenyon defines man as primarily a spirit being.\(^\text{14}\) Both God, Satan, angels, and human beings are called spirit beings and are consequently quite distinguishable from all other forms of life.\(^\text{15}\) Since Kenyon’s emphasis of man as basically a spirit being is aiming at explaining how God’s original dream of a heart fellowship might be fulfilled,\(^\text{16}\) one would not be surprised if Lucifer and the other heavenly beings were created because of a similar motivation. Nevertheless, Kenyon is careful to point out that nothing of God’s creation prior to man’s arrival was able to satisfy God’s father nature. The angels are depicted as God’s servants, while God’s heart dream was a family of actual sons and daughters.\(^\text{17}\)

**Consequences of the Fall**

Based on Adam’s spiritual and intellectual capacities, and since he knew the consequences of surrendering to the temptations of the serpent, Kenyon describes his conscious disobedience as high treason.\(^\text{18}\) Due to the holiness of God, not only was the mutual fellowship between God and man broken, but the innermost parts of Adam’s being went through a transormance of essence.\(^\text{19}\) According to Kenyon, an explicit human nature is non-existent: “Man, a creation in the image of God, a higher being, is dependent upon a higher power than he for his spiritual life. He must partake either of God’s nature or of Satan’s nature.”\(^\text{20}\) The nature of God is described through the metaphor “life”, while Satan’s nature is depicted as “death.”

One of the consequences of the fall was that spiritual life—Satan’s “life”/nature—was imparted to Adam’s spirit. The devil became Adam’s spiritual father, and the fallen/satanic substance within Adam immediately
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\(^\text{13}\) ibid., 26; *Father and His Family*, 42.  
\(^\text{14}\) Kenyon, *Bible in the Light*, 19.  
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\(^\text{18}\) ibid., 41-42; *Bible in the Light*, 25-26.  
\(^\text{19}\) Kenyon, *Bible in the Light*, 33-34; *Father and His Family*, 42-45.  
began its destructive work. Adam had had an eternal (eternal lasting) physical body. Now this body became subject to mortality, which includes being subject to sickness and physical death.\textsuperscript{21} The fact that physical death did not reach him until 930 years had passed, might indicate that man’s spirit--according to Kenyon--in spite of its being a partaker of satanic nature--not necessarily was utterly corrupted.\textsuperscript{22} It might have required some time before Adam’s “antagonistic towards God” nature succeeded in completely “absorbing” man’s thinking faculties, will and emotional life.\textsuperscript{23}

Although all of Adam’s successors automatically partook of the very same nature as Adam himself,\textsuperscript{24} Kenyon refers to a couple of Old Testament saints, who to the degree it was possible, actually enjoyed a committed fellowship life with Jehovah.\textsuperscript{25} Kenyon also refers to archeological findings which document amazing architectural abilities both prior to and after the Great Deluge during the time of Noah. Besides, Babylonian and Egyptian history document a “relatively high civilization.” All this is due to the spirit’s influence over man’s mind--in spite of man’s indwelling fallen nature. As time passed, however, man’s spirit was “overshadowed”--the information of the physical senses took priority with the consequences that men “lost all real knowledge of spiritual things.”\textsuperscript{26}

Man’s fellowship with God--”from spirit to spirit”--was destroyed, however, from the time of Adam’s disobedience. Man’s spirit did not function any longer as a source of knowledge/insight, and man became “dependent upon his senses for his life and protection.”\textsuperscript{27} Although the spirit had become a partaker of satanic nature, in many ways it stopped functioning. Man’s personality, his self-consciousness included, in practice was removed from the spirit to his physical body.\textsuperscript{28}

Adam’s disobedience had further consequences, as well. God had not only given him authority over flora and fauna, but over the whole universe. This legal binding authority had a time limit, though. Kenyon compares it to a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} ibid., 28-31.
\item \textsuperscript{22} ibid., 218.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Kenyon, Father and His Family, 266.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 29
\item \textsuperscript{25} ibid., 73-74, 141.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Kenyon, Two Kinds of Life, 102.
\item \textsuperscript{27} ibid., 101.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 34-35; Hidden Man, 7-8.
\end{itemize}
modern leasing contract. Through Adam’s disobedience he not only partook of Satan’s nature and became subject to God’s enemy, but legal rights were passed on to Adam’s new master, the devil, who consequently became the “god” of this world. If the omnipotence of God could have put a stop to the devil’s activities, He was nevertheless hindered morally speaking. As long as Adam’s time limited authority over creation still was intact, he was also free to give away his God given rights. If God should prevail and de-throne the devil before Adam’s lease had expired, He could rightly have been accused of being unjust. And as earlier mentioned—one of God’s attributes/characteristics is righteousness. God does not act against His own nature.

The Blood Covenant

Inspired by Henry Clay Trumbull’s Blood Covenant, Kenyon claims that traces of a God-given blood covenant still might be found among most of today’s “primitive” peoples. A common--almost universal view--seems to be that blood represents life. By partaking of another person’s blood—even through a mediator/substitute—one automatically becomes a partaker of this individual’s nature. This union could be between two human beings, or two separate tribes, or between man and God/gods. An essential aspect concerning entering into such a covenant seems to be the understanding that anything that one of those two individuals is or has becomes available to the other one if he should be in need of it, but that the latter in no way would make use of his rights unless his need was crucial.

Since Trumbull supported the “fact” that the many divergent covenant practices all had a common origin in God, Kenyon concluded that God must have entered the blood covenant with Adam “at the very beginning.” However, the covenant became more pronounced in the relationship between God and Abraham. At the command of God, Abraham takes an animal and slaughters this as God’s substitute. Next, Abraham circumcises himself in
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29 Kenyon, Father and His Family, 39-40.
30 ibid., 57-58.
31 Kenyon, Father and His Family, 139-140; Bible in the Light, 67-71.
33 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 67.
order for his blood to mingle with that of the animal.\textsuperscript{34} One of the things God was aiming at through His covenant relationship with Abraham was that the latter’s successors should constitute the covenant people through whom the promised Messiah would come.\textsuperscript{35} Immediately after Adam’s high treason God had proclaimed that “the seed of the woman”--apparently referring to the virgin birth--should break the power of the devil.\textsuperscript{36} Through Moses the conditions of the covenant were further expanded. Through the law, which the Israelites were unable to keep, they were continually reminded of the fact that they were sinners unable to stand in the presence of the Lord. They could only approach God through a divinely appointed priesthood and through the sacrifices the law of Moses prescribed. God’s blessings could only reach them in the physical realm--such as physical healing, financial prosperity, national security etc. Because of spiritual death they were still in union with the adversary.\textsuperscript{37}

\textit{The Incarnation}

The dilemma of mankind due to his state of spiritual death, could be solved exclusively through the Incarnation. As a union of man and God Jesus could take the place of mediator between unregenerate man and God: “Being equal with God on one hand and united with man on the other, He could bring the two together, and thereby bridge the chasm between God and man.”\textsuperscript{38} Nevertheless, it was not the Incarnation in and by itself that bridged the gap. Rather it only prepared the necessary presupposition for the mediation of Jesus, as will shortly be seen.

The Incarnation of Christ assumed logically that He had had “a separate existence previous to His coming to the earth.”\textsuperscript{39} Not only did He share God’s fellowship, He was God Himself and as such was active in the creation of the world. As all men because of their sinful nature were subject to the devil, humanity had to be redeemed by someone considered to be greater than Satan. God Himself had to do the work. He would also have to be

\textsuperscript{35}Kenyon, \textit{Bible in the Light}, 69.
\textsuperscript{36}ibid., 57-58.
\textsuperscript{38}Kenyon, \textit{Bible in the Light}, 145.
\textsuperscript{39}ibid., 148.
man, and as a man “walk this earth ... perfectly pleasing to the Father.”\textsuperscript{40} The last criteria would have been impossible if Jesus were to be born “by natural generation,” with an indwelling sinful nature, just like all of Adam’s successors automatically are born.\textsuperscript{41}

Directly inspired\textsuperscript{42} by the deceased medical doctor Martin Ralph deHaan (1891-1965),\textsuperscript{43} Kenyon claims that the fertile egg in the mother’s womb gets its blood directly from the father. Without any kind of documentation Kenyon just states as a “fact” that some mysterious connection exists between man’s blood and the spirit of man. The sinful nature any man is born with, is also connected to one’s physical blood.\textsuperscript{44} Kenyon even goes as far as claiming that modern scientists recently have been able to detect from man’s blood whether the individual be a born again believer or not.\textsuperscript{45} If Joseph had been Jesus’ biological father, Jesus automatically would have partaken of the same indwelling spiritual death as anyone else of the human race. However, through a supernatural virgin birth, where Mary’s womb just served as “a receptacle,” the Holy Spirit not only provided divine blood untainted by spiritual death; the conception of Jesus was utterly a work of the Spirit: “You see, Jesus did not partake of the mother’s nature, she simply clothed Him with sinless flesh.”\textsuperscript{46}

\textit{The role of Jesus vis-à-vis the Old Covenant}

Jehovah’s covenant with Abraham is the basis of His relationship with the Jewish people. The giving of the law to Moses is not interpreted as an isolated thing, but as an expansion of the original Abrahamic Covenant.\textsuperscript{47}

As Jesus walked the earth, He was still God and is therefore referred to in the Kenyon writings as “Jehovah” or the God of the Covenant.\textsuperscript{48} At the same time He was also a perfect man, born into a Jewish family and circumcised
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on the eighth day, as was the custom of any male Jew being accepted into the Covenant. The first phase of Jesus’ earthly ministry consequently was connected with his subordinate role to God’s Covenant with the Jewish people. He was to live the life Adam failed, a life pleasing to the Father. He was to keep the ordinances of Moses that were connected to the Abrahamic Covenant. This phase was completed on the Cross when He uttered the words, “It is finished.” Jesus had not only destroyed, but fulfilled the Abrahamic Covenant, the Mosaic Law, the Jewish Priesthood, and the sacrificial system. From a religious point of view, the nation of Israel stopped existing at that very moment.49

Jesus’ substitution

The next phase in the earthly ministry of Jesus was His substitutionary sacrifice. Adam’s disobedience not only led to his dying spiritually, but also resulted in all his successors being born with this same sinful nature.50 This common participation in spiritual death is termed “our identification with Adam.” But just as Adam’s disobedience made this identification possible, there also had to be a legal basis in order for humanity to be taken out of this context through an “identification with Christ.” This is viewed possible through Christ as our substitute who of His own will took on Himself the punishment which Adam’s sin necessitated. The substitutionary suffering of Jesus involved more than physical death on the Cross. He also had to die “spiritually.”51 By dying spiritually, Kenyon includes more than just cessation of fellowship with the Father. God actually laid on Jesus the indwelt fallen nature of humanity. The first way this was manifest is that the physical body of Jesus was made subject to mortality, and He could die physically.52 Physical death for Kenyon meant that man’s spirit and soul leave the physical body.53 In the case of Jesus, Satan (the master of spiritual death) took Jesus’ spirit with him down to the pit of hell where Jesus during 3 terrible days and nights suffered the torture of hell’s cohorts.54 The end of His sufferings are described as a new birth. After having been reborn by the Father down in hell, the motif of combat is depicted where Christ conquered

49 ibid., 42-43, 49-55.
50 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 29.
51 ibid., 164-167.
52 Kenyon, Two Kinds of Righteousness, 17, 23; What Happened, 31-33.
53 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 28.
the evil one and thereby got back the legal authority by which Satan had
reigned over the human race.\textsuperscript{55}

Man’s redemption was not completed, though, neither on the Cross or in
Hell. After Christ’s resurrection from the dead, He had to--by analogy with
the Jewish High Priest on the Day of Atonement--approach the throne of
God with His own blood.\textsuperscript{56} While the blood from the High Priest’s animal
sacrifice had covered man’s fallen sin nature, the blood of Jesus would
\textit{eradicate} the work of Satan in man’s spirit in an objective/forensic sense.\textsuperscript{57}
After Jesus on behalf of humanity had conquered the evil one, He was raised
from the dead. His physical body was no longer subject to mortality, and
with this body of His He went into the heavens in order to approach the
“heavenly Holy of Holies” with His own blood. God accepted Jesus’ sacrifice
as satisfactory, and, objectively speaking, redemption had been com-
pleted.\textsuperscript{58}

\textit{Man’s redemption}

Kenyon distinguishes between the legal/judicial and the vital/experimental
side of redemption.\textsuperscript{59} The first refers to the blessings Christ objectively has
made available for humanity through His substitutionary sacrifice, while the
latter has to do with our actual enjoyment of those same blessings.\textsuperscript{60} To be
more specific: legally all men are born again and are children of God based
on Christ’s substitution. In practice this experience will not become ours
before we personally accept what Christ did for us and actively receive Him
as our personal Lord and Savior. In this sense, Kenyon might state that we
are healed from our actual diseases in spite of the fact that the disease might
still be there.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{55} Kenyon, \textit{Jesus the Healer}, 98.
\textsuperscript{56} Kenyon, \textit{What Happened}, 73-74.
\textsuperscript{57} Kenyon, \textit{Blood Covenant}, 32-33.
\textsuperscript{58} Kenyon, \textit{What Happened}, 69, 73-74, 79.
\textsuperscript{60} Kenyon, \textit{What Happened}, 179.
The new creation

The term “new creation” sometimes refers to the individual who has accepted Christ as Lord and Savior, and other times to the life or the nature which the believer has received. As has earlier been proved, Kenyon describes man as basically a spirit being. It is the innermost parts of man--one’s spirit--which is recreated. It was one’s spirit that was ruled by a foreign or antagonistic-towards-God like nature, and it is this spirit nature which now is made a partaker of eternal life, God’s own love nature.

Kenyon sometimes seems unclear concerning whether man’s new indwelling nature is identical with the works of the Holy Spirit within the believer or whether “the new creation” refers to an explicit human nature, where the latter’s characteristics are identical to the attributes of God Himself. My overall impression seems to favor an interpretation where Kenyon mostly refers to man’s own reborn nature.

Sanctification

The “new creation” is born of God and is made a partaker of God’s own nature. Man’s mind, however, is not affected automatically by the transformation of one’s spirit. Our mind has received all its information via the five physical senses, and although neither our body per se or our senses--in themselves--are evil, they have to a great extent been used by the evil one. Practically any kind of sin man has committed is the result of our being governed by our physical bodies. Sanctification consequently refers to our mind being renewed, signifying its being brought into harmony with our regenerate spirit. Here we assume that man’s regenerate spirit is in harmony with God’s Word and the Holy Spirit. However, this is not self-evident within Kenyon’s system of thought. Although Kenyon might explain the cause of the believer’s falling in sin as due to one’s spirit having submitted to the
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physical body--synonymous for trading love for selfishness--it is still man as a spirit being who commits sin.

Authority of the believer

Jesus’ substitution not only included His victory over the demonic powers, but based on our legal participation with Christ in His mediation, objectively speaking it was our victory. Not only do we have access to spiritual salvation/fellowship with the Father, but legally we are also delivered from the yoke of sickness and poverty. In practical life our authority is made visible by God having authorized us to use the Name of Jesus. That Name represents both Jesus’ person and His works. Prayer to the Father or the commanding of angels/evil spirits--in the Name of Jesus--has the same effect as the very prayers of Jesus Himself or His confrontations with the evil spirits during His earthly ministry.

The Word

For Kenyon the Bible is God’s Word in a most literal sense. This does not mean that all 66 canonical books have the same practical value. Even though the Old Testament books prophecy concerning the coming Messiah and man’s redemption in Christ, it is still the Jewish Old Covenant people who are in focus. The four gospels also basically deal with the Old Covenant—the new creation was still not “available.” First on the Day of Pentecost Jesus’ disciples were “born again.” The Holy Spirit took up residence within the believers, and they lived in the fullness of Christ’s blessings. In spite of this, the insight into Christ’s substitution and the latter’s practical meaning were hidden from them all. The message of “the finished work of Redemption and the present ministry of Christ” was supernaturally revealed
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to the apostle Paul many years later. This “Pauline Revelation” is exclusively made known to us by reading Paul’s epistles, Hebrews included.

Kenyon refers both to the Hebrew and Greek languages in His Scriptural “exegesis.” His favorite English speaking version is American Standard Bible, but he also quotes Helen Montgomery’s Centenary Version, Conybeare, Darby, King James Version, Moffatt, Pishito [sic], Rotherham, Twentieth Century, Way, Weymouth, and Young, in addition to Kenyon’s own literal renderings.

The practical application of our redemptive blessings

The “new creation” not only has “legal right” to “health and wealth,” as previously documented, but God has also given “the ‘Power of Attorney’ the Legal Right to use [Jesus’] Name.” However, the blessings do not flow our way automatically. Kenyon distinguishes between the “two phases of re-
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demption. Based on Jesus’ substitution we are legally partakers of all the good things which are covered by redemption. But our actual possessing of these things necessitates faith in the Word.
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Historical and theological roots

Kenyon has, as previously mentioned, been surrounded by a certain mystery—even from within the modern Faith movement. This is due to the fact that his published books include very little autobiographical information, that daughter Ruth who was not born until he was 53 has little information on her deceased father’s early background,¹ and that her older brother Essek Whitney Kenyon, in case he should have more information, does not want to be contacted.²

Kenyon’s direct influence on F. F. Bosworth and indirectly on many of the participants of the Post-World War II Healing Movement have led the American author Bruce Barron and others to the conclusion that Kenyon was a Pentecostal, in spite of the fact that Ruth denies that her deceased father ever spoke in tongues.³ Daniel McConnell claims that despite Kenyon’s alleged Methodist heritage, and the fact that during the latter phase of his ministry he moved in Pentecostal circles, his theology reflects neither of these two streams of thought. McConnell is able to show how the two present ministers, “Ern” Baxter and John Kennington, who both knew Kenyon personally, are “perplexed by the strange mixture of cultic and biblical thought in Kenyon’s theology. Only as one studies Kenyon’s background does his eclectic theology begin to make sense.”

McConnell finds it virtually impossible that Kenyon’s “unique” theology might have come straight from God: “Kenyon, too, was a man of his times,
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³ McConnell, *A Different Gospel*, 22-23. In a letter dated Sept. 28, 1992, “Ern” Baxter writes: “[Kenyon] and I had some lively discussion on the things of the Spirit as he felt quite strongly about the tongues issue. He admitted to me that he had spoken in tongues, although his daughter denies that he had. When I asked him why he had not continued in the use of tongues, he replied that to him tongues was becoming a crutch which violated his strong teaching on ‘faith in the Word.’”
whose ideas and beliefs were heavily influenced by his personality, his culture, his education, and his mentors.”

*A Different Gospel* was partly written because Dan McConnell felt the need to warn against the Faith movement’s theology which “represents a serious threat to the theological orthodoxy and spiritual orthopraxy of the independent charismatic movement.” The author first documented that the so called founder of the Faith movement, Kenneth Erwin Hagin, was dependent upon Kenyon:

Actually it would not be overstated to say that the very doctrines that have made Kenneth Hagin and the Faith Movement such a distinctive and powerful force within the independent charismatic movement are all plagiarized from E. W. Kenyon.

McConnell’s accusations were carefully documented and are now generally accepted.

Thus in proving Kenyon to be “the True Father of the Faith Movement,” it is important to locate the roots of Kenyon’s theology. Since Kenyon obviously did not share the standard Wesleyan-Holiness understanding of “the second work of grace, instantaneous sanctification, and sinless perfection,” McConnell hesitates to group him with the faith healers that predated the Pentecostal movement. And since McConnell feels that Kenyon’s theology “does not fit into the Wesleyan-Holiness or the Pentecostal healing streams,” the only alternative left was the “divine healing movement [which] is known as ‘metaphysics’ and encompasses such religious groups as Christian Science, New Thought, Unity School of Christianity, and Science of the Mind.”

McConnell is wrong, however, in asserting that Kenyon’s theology “does not fit into” the Pentecostal healing stream. Kenyon had extensive contacts with Pentecostal leaders such as William Durham, Aimee Semple McPherson, John G. Lake, and F. F. Bosworth. Back in 1908 he visited the city of Los Angeles where he is referred to in the diary of Azusa Street supporter, George B. Studd. “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.” In 1924 he even applied for ordination among the Assemblies of

---

5 Ibid., xii.
6 ibid., 7.
7 ibid., 14.
8 ibid., 24.
God. According to his application, Kenyon not only spoke in tongues, but he also held a theology consistent with the teachings of the A/G.\(^9\)

In order to explore Kenyon’s actual theological roots, we will thus have to approach some of the “streams of thought” which were being advocated in the New England states during the time Kenyon ministered there. To narrow this paper, I have chosen to deal exclusively with those groups which are referred to by Kenyon himself and those which hold a theology similar to that of his own.

Orthodox Christianity—primarily Calvinism—predominated. A wave of revival which has been termed the Second Great Awakening went over New England in the 1790s, but basically touched the Congregationalists.\(^{10}\) The revival was far less influenced by the emotional manifestations of the more well known Great Awakening of the early 1700s. The first camp meetings of note in this second awakening were held in 1800, and the revival favored Baptists, Methodists, and Disciples of Christ who all emphasized the need of conscious conversion.\(^{11}\)

**Unitarianism and Universalism**

The revival had caused changes among the Congregationalists, “the prevailing form of Christianity in New England.”\(^{12}\) Officially, they subscribed to the Westminster Confession “and to doctrines contained in it, including that of predestination and election.” Nevertheless, those committed to the revivals “were forced to seek to reconcile their doctrines with the preaching which urged men to repent.” A growing opposition to Christian revivalism was apparent, particularly in the Boston area, where many leaned towards Arminianism and Socinianism. Already back in 1790 the Church of England’s oldest congregation, King Chapel, officially rejected belief in a Triune God. William Ellery Channing (1780-1842) was one of the most prominent

---

\(^9\) Application For Ordination. May be secured from the Assemblies of God Archives in Springfield, Missouri.

\(^{10}\) “The first branch of the Reformed tradition in America was Congregationalism, the church of the Puritans. They landed in 1620 and 1630 and established their theocracy. Their church operated as state church until disestablished after the American Revolution.” In 1931 the National Council of the Congregational Churches united with the Christian Church to form the General Council of Congregational-Christian Churches. In 1957 this union united with the Evangelical and Reformed Church (which in turn was a merger between Reformed Church in the United States and The Evangelical Synod of North America) and took the name United Church of Christ. (J. Gordon Melton, *Encyclopedia of American Religions*, 3rd ed. [Detroit MI: Gale Research Inc., 1989], 26, 297-300.)


\(^{12}\) ibid., 1042.
exponents of Arian views. In 1815 he “accepted the name Unitarian for the movement.” Three years later the schism within the Congregational churches began, where the “Unitarians”—despite their being in minority—“won possession of the church property and the Trinitarians withdrew and formed new churches.”

As early as in the late 1700s many had rejected belief in God’s preelection of a few. On the contrary they claimed God’s intention of saving all mankind (universal salvation). Hosea Ballou (1771-1852) appeared as the most prominent spokesperson. In 1961 the American Unitarian Association—which had been established during 1825—joined the Universalist Church in America and became the Unitarian Universalist Association.

During his stay in Boston, Kenyon seems to have attended several services of the well-known Unitarian minister, Minot Savage. Kenyon later refers to the latter’s statement concerning sin as “perverted good”—a view which Kenyon himself opposed. Savage was not just another Unitarian leader. He authored his denomination’s catechism and served as president of the National Unitarian Conference during 1895-99. McConnell believes Kenyon’s theology to a large extent was formed during his years in Boston during the mid 1890s. This period allegedly included not only confrontations with non-Christian groups such as Unitarians, Transcendentalists, and other “metaphysicians,” but most probably Kenyon actually participated in several of these groups. In fact, by frequenting Savage’s meetings Kenyon lent ear to “one of the most powerful architects and expositors of Unitarian thought.” McConnell continues: Both transcendentalism and the metaphysical movement as a whole arose as a reaction against the rigid teachings of Unitarianism: “In attending a Unitarian church, Kenyon may have been taking the first step in a well-traveled path from Unitarianism to Transcendentalism to New Thought.” McConnell does hold the opportunity open, however, that Kenyon might not necessarily have been “a full-fledged Unitarian” who consciously discarded the orthodox view concerning the Trinity, Jesus’ Deity, reconciliation, man’s depravity and eternal judgment—he simply states as a polemical “fact” that “the father of the Faith Movement seems to have associated with a religious group that denied the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.” And if this were not sufficient:

13 ibid., 1043.
14 ibid.
15 Melton, *Encyclopedia*, 562-63 [*774*]
Had this been the only such heretical group with which Kenyon associated during his years in Boston, then his Unitarian venture could be written off as a meaningless experiment in religious curiosity. That is simply not the case, for in 1892 Kenyon enrolled in the Emerson College of Oratory, an institution that was absolutely inundated with metaphysical cultic ideas and practices. His enrollment at Emerson betrays a continued involvement with New Thought and Christian Science metaphysics.\textsuperscript{17}

I will deal with Transcendentalism, New Thought, Christian Science, and Emerson College of Oratory in just awhile. However, let us remain with the Unitarians. It is not hard to criticize McConnell’s argument. Firstly, we know nothing of any Boston years (plural) prior to his school year at Emerson College in 1892-93. Most probably it was during this brief period that he—possibly just occasionally—attended Savage’s meetings: “You ask me what sin is. Minot Savage once said, when I used to attend his services in Boston, that ‘sin is perverted good.’ That is neither the fact of human experience nor Scripture.”\textsuperscript{18} This is as far as I can tell, Kenyon’s one and only reference to Savage.

In our biographical chapter we touched upon Kenyon’s agnosticism where he “left the Lord’s vineyard and turned to the affairs of this world.” The context of this quotation suggests a period of religious indifference—or rather antagonism. This period was still not over during Kenyon’s one year at Emerson College in Boston.\textsuperscript{19} And even if Kenyon should have been contaminated with Unitarian thought, we still would be just speaking of a very brief period of his life. As previously documented, he ministered among the Free Will Baptists during November 1893, among whom he was ordained two months later. An examination held prior to the ordination “proved highly satisfactory and a unanimous vote was taken to ordain Bro. Kenyon.”\textsuperscript{20} Of course Kenyon might have hidden his Unitarian views, but this does not tally with later attacks on Unitarian theology. Besides, such a course would conflict with the following Kenyon quotation:

\begin{quote}
Satan is leading many good men to teach that Christ died WITH men, a martyr to his own ideals...Many of these men are members of orthodox denominations, pastors of influential churches. As to the honesty of their convictions in regard to doctrine, we do not question, but as to their honesty in remaining in those churches and teaching pure Unitarian doctrine is another matter. It seems as though if one was examined,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 35.


accepted and ordained in a denomination that believes in the deity [sic] of Jesus of Nazareth and in His substitutionary sacrifice for our sins, and later in life came to think that this teaching was wrong....the only honorable thing he can do is to resign his pulpit and join a body of people who believe that kind of teaching...There is no ground on which one can rest an argument for remaining in any of the Baptist bodies, orthodox Congregational, Methodist,...if he remains in those bodies to teach Unitarian doctrine of salvation by works and character...But, you say, suppose one does not know what he believes. Then let him get out of the ministry or stop preaching until he does know...My message is simple. Settle this question. Is Jesus of Nazareth the Son of God or not? If He is, then give Him His place. If not, join the Unitarians. You cannot hurt their chances for heaven or eternal life.21

Considering how quickly Kenyon accepted his first pastorate among the Free Will Baptists, it is highly doubtful that he attended any of Savage’s meetings after the completion of his studies at Emerson College. The examination of Kenyon half a year later proved “highly satisfactory,” and it would not be unnatural to imagine a certain process of theological adaptations from the time he allegedly started to doubt Unitarian theology till he was ordained a Free Will Baptist minister.22

The theology of the Universalists does not seem to have appealed to him either:

Those who teach a universal salvation have only grasped the legal side of righteousness. Every child in Israel had a legal right to all the benefits of the Covenant, but it did not become theirs personally until they were individually circumcised. Eternal life becomes ours the moment we personally take Jesus Christ as Saviour and confess Him as the Lord of our Life.23

22 In support of McConnell’s claim concerning Unitarian influence, is Kenyon’s own actual admittance of having had theological doubts. “When I went in the ministry, I went in with a lot of doubts. There came an hour in my living when I faced a great problem of the Deity of Jesus...Then there was the question of the Resurrection” (Kenyon, unpublished sermon in First Presbyterian Church, Hollywood, California, Aug. 27, 1944). “There was a time when I denied the sufferings of the wicked. I believed in the annihilation of the wicked. I believed it because I was led into it by a man who gave me his book. In that book he gave no scripture proof of what he said. I noticed his quotations were almost all from the great clergy” (Kenyon, unpublished sermon [Sunday School Lecture], May 27, 1928). Considering Kenyon’s actively opposing those who had a religious faith during his one year of study at Emerson College, it is not unthinkable that the Unitarian influence was one of the reason that Kenyon was led into agnosticism prior to attending Emerson College. If that is the case, he might be describing something more of a conflict between his heart and mind after his re dedication in 1893 until the theological doubts were eliminated from his mind. Or alternatively, his warning against Unitarian influenced ministers remaining in orthodox churches might be based on his own purportedly former hypocrisy not willing to “get out of the ministry or stop preaching.”

23 Kenyon, What Happened, 67.
Transcendentalism

Transcendentalism—the idea that certain knowledge not only was available via the physical senses—arose as a reaction against Unitarian thought— influenced, among others, by the British philosopher, John Locke. Locke’s claim was refuted by the “idealists” who held that knowledge also might be derived through intuition. In spite of their being few in members, the above mentioned Transcendentalists exercised a considerable influence on their contemporaries. The core of their leaders came from various young Unitarians who were in opposition to their own movement, such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Ellery Channing, George Ripley, and Theodore Parker. They were largely influenced by former European thinkers and benefited from Immanuel Kant’s *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, Jacobi’s “mysticism,” Fichte’s “heroism,” and the works of Schelling and Goethe. In addition to intuition the Transcendentalists also emphasized human nature as divine—if not divine in itself, then at least in possession of very divine attributes. While traditional Christendom might have been positive towards God’s imparting knowledge through revelation/intuition, the Transcendentalists were accused of making available to each and every one what was supposed to be granted to just a few elect ones.24

In this respect Kenyon adheres to traditional Christian theology. Exclusively through a “new birth” does man obtain access to God. On a purely historical basis nothing seems to suggest that Kenyon followed McConnell’s “well-traveled path from Unitarianism to Transcendentalism.”25 Sure enough, McConnell does refer to “Ern” Baxter who believed Kenyon to be “fairly widely read” in Ralph Waldo Emerson and in New England Transcendental-

25 While Kenyon’s own materials, as documented, paints a picture of his brief stay in Boston as a period of religious indifference/antagonism, McConnell implies that “the crucial period of his religious... development appears to have taken place during his stay in the city of Boston.” McConnell bases this view on the previous mentioned reference to Minot Savage, and on Kenyon’s studying at Emerson College. While the latter will be touched upon more thoroughly later in this paper, I would like to comment on McConnell’s emphasis on the alleged Unitarian influence on young Kenyon. McConnell seems to base his view entirely on Charles Braden’s observation that both Transcendentalism and New Thought arose as reactions against Unitarian theology. Based on these facts, McConnell concludes that Kenyon most probably must have suffered identical destiny, going from Unitarianism via Transcendentalism ending up in New Thought (McConnell, *A Different Gospel*, 34-35). Believing to have documented the rather doubtful premises of McConnell’s claims concerning Unitarian influence, it seems rather complicated to continue arguing for the view that Kenyon also must have been influenced by the Transcendentalists based in its entirety on Braden’s observation that such a development was in no way unusual.
ism.”26 What lay behind Baxter’s belief concerning such an influence, McConnell does not say. And if we look beyond Baxter’s alleged belief, no one has been successful in tracking down additional materials which verify McConnell’s thesis. Another thing is that it should have been of interest to any evangelical pastor in New England to gain a certain basic insight into the various religious and ideological ideas which had their basis within one’s geographical neighborhood. In that respect Kenyon hopefully did not distinguish himself from his fellow ministers?

Christian Science and New Thought

Christian Science and New Thought are movements which are both indebted to clockmaker Phineas Parkhurst Quimby (1802-66), who after opening up his office in Portland, Maine, in 1859 was known far and wide due to his ability to cure sickness. As early as 1838, Quimby had been introduced to the opportunities of hypnotism through a certain Dr. Collyer. Quimby was fascinated by this and began to experiment with Lucius Burkmar as medium. While in a trance Burkmar seemed to have an amazing ability to diagnose people’s illnesses and prescribe a suitable remedy. During the early 1860s though, Quimby had started to doubt whether Burkmar’s “medical insight” was the immediate cause of the disappearance of specific sufferings. Could it be that the patients’ confidence in the doctor—or in this case the medium who prescribed the remedy—was the direct cause of healings taking place? As Quimby reached his conclusion that sickness was due to the fact that people believed their doctor’s erroneous diagnosis and thereby brought the sickness upon themselves, and that healing was attributable to one’s correcting his erroneous belief based upon the doctor’s diagnosis, Burkmar was no longer needed. Sickness, he concluded, was psychosomatic in essence, and Quimby had thereby laid a foundation for mental healing.27

26 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 26. My many attempts to locate McConnell’s taped interview with Baxter on May 15, 1987 have all been fruitless—even by contacting McConnell himself. Now Baxter does say in a letter to this author dated September 28, 1992: “It is some time since I read McConnell’s book, but as I recall, I felt that his conclusions were valid.” This positive evaluation is somewhat moderated by other statements in the same letter, such as: “All the theological matters that have since become prominent probably due to the comparison with the faith movement, I was unaware of. I do not even recall having a discussion on the theological basis of [Kenyon’s] positions. I would like to add that much of the biographical/theological/philosophical material contained in the books now published about him were new to me, so I obviously am not a major source of information.” A later letter from me questioning Baxter’s alleged belief concerning Kenyon’s being familiar with Ralph Waldo Emerson’s Transcendentalism, unfortunately, was never responded to, as “Ern” Baxter passed away just previous to receiving the letter.

27 Braden, Spirits in Rebellion, 47ff.
Christian Science

Christian Science as a movement was founded by Mary Baker [Patterson] [Glover] Eddy (1821-1910). Prolonged back problems led to her seeking out “Dr. Quimby” in 1862, which led to a temporal relief. Eddy became an enthusiastic follower of the latter’s teachings and applied his methods both in the case of her own healing and in her treatment of others. Based on the correspondence between Quimby and Eddy it seems as the former believed he took the patients’ sickness on himself and thereafter drew it out. 1866--the same year that Quimby died--became a turning point for 45-year-old Mrs. Eddy. After having fallen on the ice and been bedfast for three days, the truth concerning healing was revealed to her by the reading of Matthew 9:2. She arose from her bed and declared herself totally healed. Soon thereafter she began to give private lectures on healing and purportedly applied the manuscript Extracts From Doctor P. P. Quimby’s Writings. Not until 1875 did she publish *Science and Health*--which was the title of the first edition. This book may lead our thoughts in part towards Hinduism and in part towards European philosophers such as Berkeley, Fichte, and Hegel.28

In 1879 the Church of Christ, Scientist was founded and a couple of years later Mrs. Eddy was ordained by her own followers. In 1882 she established the Massachusetts Metaphysical College in Boston in order to train students into Christian Science practitioners. As more and more students graduated and opened their own Christian Science offices, Mrs. Eddy’s teachings were spread throughout the U.S. and Canada. The church of 1879 died in 1889, but was resurrected three years later as the First Church of Christ, Scientist in Boston. Here decisions concerning the movement as a whole are taken, and the mother church serves as the movement’s headquarters.29 Outside of their own circle the movement is most known for its emphasis on healing through faith. Sickness is understood as illusory, and the key to healing is to acknowledge one’s true state as already healed:

Consequently, the cure of sickness for Christian Science is to help a person understand that he is not really sick, that his pain is imaginary, and that his imagined disease is only the result of a false belief.30

---


Quite sensationally for Kenyon’s followers, their mentor has been identified with metaphysical cults such as Christian Science and New Thought, despite the fact that daughter Ruth Alice assures that her deceased father “taught against Christian Science all through his ministry.”31 Authors Matta,32 Stump,33 and McConnell34 document how several of Kenyon’s fellow students and instructors at Emerson College gradually were influenced by the teachings of Mrs. Eddy. Kenyon himself “was not only very conversant with Christian Science concepts but also with a lot of details of how Christian Science originated.”35 Not unprobably inspired by Walter Haushalter’s book, Mrs. Eddy Purloins from Hegel,36 Kenyon categorically stated that the teachings of Christian Science was direct plagiarism of the German philosopher and idealist Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831).37 McConnell feels the earliest phase of Kenyon’s ministry was characterized by a more hostile attitude toward the metaphysical cults although he on other occasions seems to explain their existence due to the modern church’s lack of acknowledgment of the availability of God’s power:38 “Say what we may against Christian Science..., we owe them a vast tribute for forcing upon our attention the benefits of Divine Healing.”39

34 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 42.
36 (London: Watts & Co., 1936.)
37 Kenyon, Two Kinds of Righteousness, 5, 9. “Christian Science is perhaps the strongest of the new religious cults that makes a powerful appeal to the God hungry church members as well as the world. It is a philosophy born of Hegel [sic] of Germany. The originals from which Mrs. Eddy developed her philosophy have now become public property” (Kenyon, “The Spiritual Awakening Through Satan,” unpublished sermon, [n.d.]). The accusation that Mrs. Eddy via a certain Hiram Craft of Stoughton, Massachusetts, gained access to and plagiarized Francis Lieber’s “The Metaphysical Religion of Hegel” is disproved by Thomas C. Johnsen in his article, “Historical Consensus and Christian Science” (The New Quarterly, March 1980, 3-22). Johnsen concludes that it was Mrs. Eddy who was plagiarized. Writes Johnsen: “The plagiarism accusation has had a wide popular circulation in the large body of polemical literature on Christian Science published by writers of other denominations. Such a work as Walter Martin’s The Kingdom of the Cults has continued through some fifteen editions to assert it “above challenge” and “beyond all doubt revealed” that Mrs. Eddy copied “thirty-three pages verbatim” and “one hundred in substance from the [twelve pages] Lieber manuscript. Martin seems to have assumed his readers would not bother to check the manuscript for themselves.” (p. 20.) (Johnsen’s article was first brought to my attention by William L. DeArteaga of Atlanta, Georgia.)
38 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 43, 47-48.
It would be hard to find indications that Kenyon’s critical attitude towards the cults became milder in his later years. Surely enough, he seems to defend and explain the progress of the cults by the fact that ordinary people’s legitimate need of a supernatural God was not met in most Christian churches. However, this is more of a critique of the church’s state than an acceptance of the cults. What is far “worse” is that Rev. John Kennington and “Ern” Baxter claim to have heard Kenyon speak favorable towards Mrs. Eddy’s writings. In an interview with McConnell, Baxter is said to have referred to a conversation with Kenyon where the latter claimed that there was a lot to gain by studying Mrs. Eddy’s books. John Kennington even goes so far as stating that Kenyon taught that teachings on the blood of Jesus was the only doctrine that was lacking in Christian Science. While Kennington’s claim may easily be refuted by various Kenyon quotations, Baxter’s alleged claim is harder to come to grips with. Kenyon was not the first of the healing advocates who studied the cultists’ writings in order to correct their teachings. William DeArteaga writes that Kenyon did not seem to share the fear that many of the faith-cure advocates held that their own teachings might be identified with that of Christian Science. In case this should be a correct observation, the latter’s fears might be due to the fact that their movement sprang up closer in time to Christian Science and New Thought and, consequently, many people were incapable of distinguishing. Kenyon belonged to the next generation, wherein Christian healing already was established as a tradition.

_________

42 Kennington, “E. W. Kenyon and the Metaphysics of Christian Science.” I do not want to sow doubts concerning the motives of Kennington; nevertheless, I do have problems with his unpublished paper. The author claims to know Kenyon’s writings so well that he can almost tell from which chapter and page in Kenyon’s many books certain TV evangelists have taken their sermons when listening to them. Despite Kennington’s familiarity with Kenyon’s message, he claims—as far as I can tell quite opposite to what Kenyon actually taught—that angels and demons according to Kenyon were just thoughts.
43 E.g. “Christianity is not like other religions, beautiful as they may be. For instance, in Christian Science: you become one of them by accepting the teaching of “Science and Health” and practicing its rules; or in New Thought: you become a member of that sect by accepting their charming ideals of life. But to become a Christian you must be born again by the Holy Spirit,... Becoming a Christian and becoming a Christian Scientist, then, are not to be compared...One makes you an Eddyite, the other a child of God (Kenyon, “A Suggestion,” Reality, Nov. 1913, 97). Consider also Kenyon’s refutation of Unity founder Charles Fillmore (McConnell erroneously writes that Mrs. Eddy was the only cult leader Kenyon referred to by name [p. 44.]) due to the latter’s Christology. “The Jesus of Christian Science is practically identical with the Jesus of ‘Unity’” (Kenyon, “Another Jesus,” The Living Message, March 1929, 1).
44 William L. DeArteaga, Quenching the Spirit (Lake Mary, FL:  Creation House, 1992), 201.
If he did not seem to be fearful to verbalize agreement with the metaphysicians in the areas where their respective teachings were similar to each other, we still cannot bypass his many refutations of Christian Science, New Thought, and Unity School of Christianity. ⁴⁵

McConnell is able to document obvious similarities between Mrs. Eddy and Kenyon. ⁴⁶ Both acknowledge as a fact that our physical senses are limited as they exclusively may perceive empirical knowledge. ⁴⁷ Kenyon’s statements concerning man’s spirit as one’s real person ⁴⁸ have apparent similarities, but also contrasts to the following energetic language of Mrs. Eddy: “Spirit is real and eternal; matter is unreal and temporal. Spirit is God, man in his image and likeness. Therefore man is not material; he is spiritual.” ⁴⁹ The similarities aside, is it just formal or actually significant? And--may we uncover both formal and significant similarities within some of the additional idealistic streams of thought compared to Kenyon? Prior to such a comparison being done, it appears rather superficial to uncritically place Kenyon within a Christian Science tradition. After all, Kenyon also wrote:

MAN is a part of eternity. Man is an Eternal Being. Man’s body, soul and spirit are Eternal. Man cannot be judged or crowned in Eternity without his body. Man was never designed to be a disembodied spirit. Man is not a man, not completely a man, without his body. While it is true that man is a spirit, and he has a body, yet the body is a part of the man, and God designed it to be eternal. ⁵⁰

Man is a trinity in his nature: body, soul, and spirit. ⁵¹

As I understand Kenyon, man is primarily a spiritual being. This includes, among other things, that man is fundamentally different from all other physical beings through a spiritual dimension which makes possible contact and fellowship with the Creator. ⁵² A central concern for Kenyon seems to be that man is not sufficiently aware of his unique place in the universe and

---

⁴⁵ Kenyon, Two Kinds of Faith, 19.
⁴⁷ “The corporeal senses can take no cognizance of spiritual reality” (Eddy, Science and Health, 488-89). “God cannot communicate with your senses” (Kenyon, Two Kinds of Knowledge, 18).
⁴⁸ Kenyon, Two Kinds of Life, 100-101.
⁴⁹ Eddy, Science and Health, 468.
⁵² An article called “The Nature of Man” which surely enough isn’t authored by Kenyon, but by L.R.S. in Reality, Nov. 1914, 159-60, appears still heavily influenced by Kenyon. “Man is a triple, rather than a dual, being. He is Body, Soul and Spirit...The spirit is the real man, that which makes him different from every other man, and puts him in a different class from animals.”
consequently too occupied with secondary things—things which in themselves are not necessarily wrong—and too little occupied with God. Although man deeply speaking is a spirit being, yet only a few take seriously one’s spiritual need.\textsuperscript{53} Kenyon in no way states that the body is evil,\textsuperscript{54} or that the knowledge which is available via our physical senses is illusory. On the contrary, it is given by God Himself as a guide in order to interpret empirical phenomena. It has serious limitations, though, which requires that it must be filled in with—not replaced by—knowledge derived directly from God to man’s reborn spirit: “I can see now, how Revelation Knowledge is necessary to Sense Knowledge. They should never be separated one from the other.”\textsuperscript{55}

Kenyon has also been criticized for holding a dualistic spirit-matter epistemology with obvious similarities to Mrs. Eddy.\textsuperscript{56} It is a question, however, whether Kenyon’s understanding of knowledge is not rather dialectical. Gnostic dualism acknowledges matter, our bodies included, as evil, while the spirit as good seeks to escape matter and again be joined to its actual reality. Kenyon does not consider either the body, mind or so-called sense knowledge as evils, although they might be considered as possible vessels for the Evil One in his battle against man’s spirit.\textsuperscript{57} While Mrs. Eddy seemed to reject sense knowledge entirely, Kenyon acknowledged its significance in the areas it was meant to be valid. In order to have knowledge of God, reborn man was dependent upon a supernatural insight imparted by God Himself through “revelation,” though.\textsuperscript{58}

**New Thought**

While Phineas P. Quimby may without cavil be regarded as the founder not only of the New Thought Movement but of the whole so-called Metaphysical Movement in America, credit for the spread of his ideas and methods, as well as for the organization of movements that have made these a force in American life, must go

---


\textsuperscript{55} Kenyon, \textit{Two Kinds of Knowledge}, 9.

\textsuperscript{56} McConnell, \textit{A Different Gospel}, 106.

\textsuperscript{57} DeArteaga, \textit{Quenching the Spirit}, 223-24.

\textsuperscript{58} Kenyon, \textit{Two Kinds of Knowledge}, 44-49.
Mrs. Eddy is already mentioned as one of the four. Two others who were strongly influenced by Quimby include the married couple, Annetta Seabury and Julius A. Dresser (1838-93), the latter with background within the Calvinistic Baptist Church, who were the first to organize what later would be known as New Thought. After some years on the West Coast they returned to Boston in 1882. The very next year they publicly accused Mrs. Eddy of plagiarism of Quimby “presenting [the latter’s] ideas as her own under a new label of Christian Science.” As Quimby’s son George refused to make his deceased father’s manuscripts available to the public, the dispute continued and the Dresser couple viewed it almost like their mission in life to defend Quimby’s honor. Their son Horatio (1866-1954) became an equally enthusiastic defender of Quimby and was finally granted permission by the latter’s daughter-in-law to publish *The Quimby Manuscripts* in 1921. The intention seems to have been to unveil Mrs. Eddy’s alleged plagiarism.

Warren Felt Evans (1817-87) was the last of the four who sought healing through Quimby during 1862-63. He has received little attention outside of New Thought circles, and none of his ten books are in print today. Evans was a Methodist minister for many years, but was after a while influenced by Emanuel Swedenborg’s (1688-1772) teachings on the precedence of the spiritual realm vis-à-vis matter and the emphasis of the Swedish seer on “the law of correspondence.” Evans left the Methodist Episcopal church for the Church of the New Jerusalem in 1863. Meeting with Quimby the very same year not only provided healing, but Evans became “the first to give literary form” to Quimby’s thoughts and healing methods. Evans’ former knowledge of Swedenborg’s teaching had provided a thorough theoretical basis. Evans needed only “to find a man who was actually proving what he had theoretically anticipated in order to accept the entire therapeutic doctrine.” This man he found in Quimby. In addition to authoring books Evans started to receive patients himself, after encouragement from the latter.

---

59 Braden, *Spirits in Rebellion*, 89. The four infirmed individuals were Annetta G. Seabury, Julius A. Dresser, Mary Baker Eddy, and Warren Felt Evans.

60 ibid., 131.


64 Braden, *Spirits in Rebellion*, 89-91.
Emma Curtis Hopkins (1853-1925) is another well-known leader in New Thought. She was healed through Christian Science in 1881, however, and became a practitioner three years later. Soon she was made editor for Mrs. Eddy’s Christian Science Journal in Boston. Her career within the movement was short-lived, though. Hopkins left in November 1885 and moved to Chicago. As did several others who had broken with Mrs. Eddy, Hopkins established herself as an independent practitioner. In 1886 she founded the Emma Curtis College of Christian Science. In spite of the fact that many had established their own schools where fresh practitioners were being taught, Hopkins was becoming leader of an ever growing national organization. By the end of 1887, over 17 branches of the Hopkins Metaphysical Association had been established all over the U.S., from Maine to California. One year later her college was turned into “theological seminary,” and Hopkins ordained her graduates. Many of these were later to become prominent leaders of the New Thought movement under way. Unity founders Charles and Myrtle Fillmore left for Chicago in order to be trained by Hopkins in 1890. Additional well-known New Thoughters who were directly influenced by Hopkins include Ernest Holmes (founder of Church of Religious Science), Harriet Emilie Cady (author of Unity book Lessons in Truth), Annie Rix Militz (founder of Home of Truth), and Malinda Cramer (co-founder of Divine Science). Albert C. Grier was introduced to Hopkins, via Clara Stocker, and through him the Church of Truth came into being.\(^65\)

New Thought has been characterized as a feminist movement. Most of the leaders were women, except for a few men (whose wives were very influential). This gradually changed at the turn of this century where men “assumed many prime roles as editors of movement periodicals, founders of new movement organizations, writers and historians.”\(^66\)

Although the International New Thought Alliance (INTA) was founded in 1914 after several previous attempts to unite the various New Thought groups, the organization is first of all “a symbol of unity within the general field it represents.”\(^67\) Membership is not conditioned by common theology, but despite the various views which are reflected in the different groups, most of them seem to identify with INTA’s declaration of principles. The movement as a whole is known for its emphasis on healing and in part on

---

\(^65\) Melton, *Encyclopedia*, 111.


\(^67\) Braden, *Spirits in Rebellion*, 229.
financial prosperity. As contradistinguished from Christian Science they do not deny the existence of evil (sickness included) but believe that man can conquer it through conscious exercise of faith. Most of the New Thought groups follow Christian Science’s teachings, though, regarding God as “immanent, omnipresent Spirit” and man as “a reflection of God.”

Although Mrs. Eddy is said to have been an important source of inspiration for Kenyon, it is still New Thought which has been emphasized as the movement which primarily influenced his thinking. It was on October 3, 1892 that 25-year-old Kenyon was admitted to Emerson College of Oratory in Boston. The school’s president, Charles Wesley Emerson, a former Unitarian minister, held an eclectic theology with components derived from Greek Platonism, Spencer’s Social Darwinism, Waldo Emerson’s Transcendentalism and Swedenborg’s mysticism. The various components were held together by a quasi-Darwinistic thesis regarding man’s religious evolution aiming at deification. Kenyon’s enrollment has been documented, but no one seems to know which courses he might have participated in. Now Kenyon’s own materials do confirm that he not only was admitted to, but actually did study at the Boston institution. It is still possible, however, that Kenyon dropped out prior to the completion of the school year, as copies of his graduation papers are nonexistent. Nonetheless, McConnell makes a point out of the fact that Kenyon during his brief stay at Emerson without a doubt must have been influenced by fellow student Ralph Waldo Trine, who while studying at Emerson College also served as instructor in rhetoric. Now Trine was not known as an exponent of New Thought teachings at the time, a point that has been somewhat underemphasized by McConnell, who actually dedicates one whole chapter to Kenyon’s enrollment at the institution in order to prove the so-called “Kenyon Connection.” By the latter term

68 Teahen, “Warren Felt Evans and Mental Healing,” 77. Many of Mrs. Eddy’s views are reflected beforehand in Evans’ books. The term “Christian Science” had been used by Evans in The Happy Islands (1860, 251) as well as in Quimby’s unpublished manuscripts from Feb. 1863—in other words several years prior to Mrs. Eddy’s first edition of Science and Health appeared in 1875. Even as early as 1850 “Christian Science” was applied as a term in William Adam’s book The Elements of Christian Science (Braden, Spirits in Rebellion, 58).

69 Robert Fleming (Emerson College), letter to author, June 12, 1992.


71 Fleming, letter to author, June 12, 1992. Whether this is due to the fact that Kenyon might not have finished up his one year at Emerson is impossible to say.
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McConnell refers to a historical connection link between New Thought and the modern Faith movement through Kenyon’s one year at Emerson College:

If Emerson College was simply an oratory founded by an Unitarian minister, then Kenyon’s attendance there would not be that significant. Certainly it would not justify so intriguing a label as the Kenyon Connection.75

If McConnell had sufficiently taken into consideration Kenyon’s young age, his own lack of biographical materials/information, including Kenyon’s motivation for applying at Emerson College, McConnell hopefully would have shown more cautiousness with regard to his invented term “Kenyon Connection.” DeArteaga seems considerably more careful:

How Kenyon discerned, struggled with and rejected the Gnostic elements of the Metaphysical movement while holding to its idealistic views is not known...Yet by the time he published his first theological work, The Father and His Family (1916) he had discerned and rejected the core of Gnostic beliefs in metaphysical philosophy. His writings consistently show that he considered himself strongly opposed to the whole Metaphysical movement, from Unity to its most extreme form as in Christian Science...He seems to take pleasure in his confrontations with cult members, as when he prayed for healing for a woman who was dedicated to Unity (and whom he also led in a conversion experience).76

However, Kenyon did reject “the Gnostic elements of the Metaphysical movement” long before 1916. Even McConnell mentions Kenyon’s critical evaluation of the cultists much earlier:77

Some have doubtless been thinking along the lines of so called Modern New Thought, and have come to the conclusion that we are all sons of God, that all we have to do is to develop the divine element in us, and that will make us fit to dwell with God eternally. That is, they have accepted so called New Thought instead of a New Creation, and that is not a new thought at all...Now, men and women, any doctrine that teaches you and me that we have an element in ourselves that we can develop and grow independent of God and make us fit to stand in the presence of God, is not true, to put it mildly.78

Kenyon’s attendance at Emerson College has mostly been interpreted in a negative light--in fact as an indication that it was there that his alleged New Thought theology was formed. Emerson College will be dealt with more thoroughly under our next subheading--The “faith-cure movement.” It may seem in order, though, again to remind the readers of this paper that just half a year after the completion of Kenyon’s school year he was ordained among

75 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 36.
76 DeArteaga, Quenching the Spirit, 203-04.
77 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 43.
the Free Will Baptists. The examination prior to ordination proved “highly satisfactory.”79 Just as it would be plausible to allow Kenyon a certain period of theological adaptation if he should have been contaminated with Unitarian views, the same would apply with regard to New Thought theology.

Faith-cure movement

Divine healing was not a new term within the American religious landscape. At Quaker founder George Fox’s visit in 1672 the rumors from the UK went before him. Reportedly dozens of healings and miracles, including someone allegedly being raised from the dead, took place during Fox’s brief visit to America. Ann Lee and her Shaker movement were among the few who brought this heritage into the next century.80 The 19th century Divine Healing or faith-cure movement, however, seems basically influenced by the contemporary Holiness/Higher Life movement. The latter has been divided into three separate groups: Wesleyan Methodist Perfectionists, the Oberlin Perfectionists, and the Keswick Perfectionists. While the first group appealed to John Wesley’s emphasis on personal holiness, Oberlin Perfectionism is characterized by “the basic expression of the Wesleyan doctrine which arose among the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the 1830s,” whose main exponents were Charles G. Finney and Asa Mahan--both at Oberlin College. The origin of the Keswick movement is often related to Robert Pearsall Smith and William Boardman who seem to have initiated the Holiness movement that swept over Europe during the 1870s and 80s. In contrast to the two former mentioned groups which both emphasized an instant crisis experience, sanctification among the Keswick advocates was considered a gradual process. Dwight L. Moody’s Northfield conferences contributed strongly to the extent of the American “Keswickeans”’ emphasis on power rather than on sin, and the message was spread via popular preachers such as Reuben A. Torrey, A. J. Gordon and A. B. Simpson.81

Ethan O. Allen has been characterized as “the father of the divine healing movement in America.”82 After having been prayed for with regard to healing in 1846, Allen’s 50 years of ministry with particular emphasis on healing

81 ibid., 59-63.
82 ibid., 87.
began. One of Allen’s first assistants, the black minister Elisabeth Mix, exercised a considerable influence, among other things, through her recruitment of others into full time ministry within the healing movement. One of these was Carrie Judd (Montgomery), “who was to become a significant link between the holiness, divine healing, and Pentecostal movements.”

Although Allen may have been the first, Charles Cullis (1833-92) is reckoned as the most prominent of the leaders as far as the development of the American healing revival is concerned. The homeopath from Boston opened a tuberculosis home in 1864—apparently inspired through the reading of George Müller’s autobiography, *Life of Trust*. Cullis’ interest in divine healing was awakened early, but he was first convinced of the availability of answers to healing prayer through the book *The Life of Dorothea Trudel*. During his four months of traveling in Europe during 1873 he visited the deceased Swiss lady’s faith home in Männedorf. These four months initiated a new phase in Cullis’ ministry, and back in America he dedicated more of his time to prayer for the sick. Cullis was no theologian and left to more competent authors to unfold the theological defense of divine healing through his publishing house, “The Willard Tract Repository.” During 1872-92 Cullis published more healing books than any other publishing house in the U.S. Books by the most prominent European healers—including Trudel, Otto Stockmayer, and Johann Blumhardt—were also represented among Cullis’ published titles. From 1874 Cullis arranged yearly camp meetings which to an even larger extent reinforced the attention not only towards Cullis himself, but also towards healing prayer.

Although Cullis had touched thousands by his message of healing by faith, it was thanks to his many ministerial friends that the message spread further. William Boardman had followed Cullis on the four months of traveling within Europe in 1873 and then left for UK where he together with Robert Pearsall Smith became initiator of the so-called Higher Life movement over there. Boardman mostly ministered in Europe, but his many books on divine healing were greatly influential also within the American revival. A well-known minister being healed through Boardman’s ministry was An-
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85 Boardman had a particular entrance in Sweden and in an interview with Paul G. Chappell in 1982 Joseph Daniel Mattson-Bozé stated that “the strong healing movement in Sweden by Boardman was responsible for the Swedish receptivity to the Pentecostal movement of the 20th century” (Chappell, “The Divine Healing Movement,” 202).
drew Murray (1828-1917) of South Africa. In spite of the fact that Murray only visited the U.S. once after his personal experience of healing, he became rapidly known due to his many books on healing and sanctification, including articles in American healing magazines. Adoniram Judson Gordon (1836-95), even back in 1882, was one of the leading exponents of faith-cure. Although he prayed for thousands with regard to healing, it was as an author that he exercised most influence on the ever growing movement. In his book *The Ministry of Healing* (1882) where he “marshalled the arguments for the reality of miracles of healing from the testimony of Scripture, reason, the church, theologians, the mission field, the adversary, and experience...,” he concluded that “much greater things might be expected under the new covenant after the ascension of Jesus and his continuing presence in the church.”

The book was referred to as “the most rational presentation of the view of the Faith-Healers,” by Benjamin Warfield—one of the so-called “Princeton Divines” and strong opponent of the revival. Carrie Judd Montgomery (1858-1946), briefly mentioned already, was one of the few who were active from the beginning of the healing revival in the early 1880s until the modern Post-World War II Healing Movement. She had ministered alongside most of the ministers within faith-cure in addition to William J. Seymour, Maria Woodworth-Etter, Smith Wigglesworth, and a dozen other well-known ministers within the Holiness and Pentecostal movements. She has been referred to not only as bridge builder, but also as “spokesperson, leader and molder of three important religious streams: the faith healing movement, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, and the Pentecostal movement.”

Albert Benjamin Simpson (1843-1919) was the only one of Cullis’ direct successors who founded a denomination, the aforementioned Christian and Missionary Alliance. Just as Gordon, he exercised a considerable influence through his extended authorship. This—combined with weekly healing meetings in New York City—rapidly gave him the recognition as “a leader of the faith cure school, second only to Charles Cullis.”

---


Most of the healing evangelists had their former background in the broader Holiness movement. In fact, apart from divine healing, little or nothing distinguished the two movements:

By propagating the doctrine of Christian Perfection or the Baptism of the Holy Spirit as purification from sin, the enduement with power, and the living of a consecrated life of holiness, the nineteenth century holiness movement provided the basic theological milieu in which the supernatural gifts of God, and in particular divine healing would flourish...When one accepts the basic presupposition of the faith healing movement that all sickness is ultimately related to sin and satan, and the presupposition of the holiness movement that the believer is endued with the pentecostal power of the Book of Acts, then the sanctified believer, who through God has power over sin and satan, also has power over sickness. This thesis provided the fundamental basis for the intimate connection between perfectionism and divine healing.\(^{90}\)

Analogous with the emphasis of Higher Life on sanctification/baptism in the Holy Spirit many of the healing evangelists taught healing as God’s supernatural intervention which led to sickness loosing its hold unless the believer had been caught up in personal sin or lack of faith. There were also those, however, who believed that “there was a point at which God touched the person, but that the actual physical healing or recovery would occur gradually. Thus one could receive the healing instantaneously, but must continue to exercise faith in order to experience a full recovery.”\(^{91}\)

In a similar vein divergent views were held whether the use of medicine after having been prayed for without the physical manifestation of God’s healing having taken place were an expression of lack of faith or not. On this issue Cullis and Simpson were opposed one to the other.\(^{92}\)

Emerson College—exclusively cultic?

We have previously touched upon Kenyon’s attendance of Emerson College. Modern critics have with no exceptions interpreted negatively young Kenyon’s one year of study at the Boston institution. We have also briefly touched upon its founder Charles Wesley Emerson (1837-1908) and his eclectic background. He started out as a Congregational minister in 1860, then served in a Universalist church for several years until in 1871 he was found ministering among the Unitarians.\(^{93}\) Unknown to the biographers of

\(^{90}\) Chappell, “The Divine Healing Movement,” 79.
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Emerson College--despite Emerson’s syncretistic theology he was a professor at faith-cure leader Charles Cullis’ Faith Training College in Boston from 1876 to 1887 although the faculty of Cullis’ school received no salaries. During nine of these eleven years Emerson was also president of Emerson College. Dr. Simmons concludes that at least during the eleven years in Cullis’ staff, “Emerson embraced the ‘full gospel’ message of Jesus as Savior, Sanctifier, Healer, and Coming King, which Cullis and his associates advocated.”

Simmons’ observation of Emerson’s eclectic background with basis also within the Higher Life movement is interesting, and serves as a useful corrective to McConnell’s rather hasty emphasis on the “Kenyon-Connection,” the historical and theological link between New Thought and the modern Faith movement: “… we will not say more for now than to note that Kenyon, by virtue of his attendance at Emerson College, was widely exposed to the teachings and philosophy of New Thought, albeit in its more ‘Christianized’ form. Then again, it is equally certain that Kenyon’s days at Emerson served to reinforce his interest in the Higher Christian Life.”

It is important to point out, however, that Kenyon’s own writings show him as indifferent to religion during his stay at Emerson College. His purpose for attending was definitely not to prepare for the ministry. He actually wanted to become an actor:

I tried to be an athesist [sic]. After I had been a Christian for four years I went to Emerson’s school of Oratory to get ready for the stage. However, I carried my Bible everywhere. I fought the men that were getting ready for the ministry. I wrecked one young man who was one of the cleanest boys studying for the ministry. I was so mad, but God got hold of me and brought me back into fellowship with him. I got this man back.

The turning point happened in June 1893 when Kenyon together with his newly wed bride visited in Clarendon Street Baptist Church in Boston, pastored by A. J. Gordon from 1869 till his death in 1895. Kenyon was immediately involved, as documented already, in evangelistic ministry, and after
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96 E. W. Kenyon, unpublished sermon at First Presbyterian Church, Hollywood, California, Aug. 27, 1944. Compare this to E. W. Kenyon’s “Justification,” Reality, Nov. 1909, 133. Kenyon claims to have gone “back into agnosticism” for 2-3 years. This probably happened four years after his conversion at the age of 18. He never breathed a prayer during these years, but he always carried his Bible with him.
just a few months he was invited to a local Free Will Baptist church in El-
mira, New York, where he was ordained shortly thereafter. Kenyon’s im-
mediate reference was within evangelical Christendom, and as previously
touched upon—even McConnell documents Kenyon’s critical attitude to-
wards New Thought during the first phase of his ministry.

In spite of Emerson’s obvious admiration of Drummond, the latter’s visit at
Emerson College during Kenyon’s school year (May 1893), and his “het-
erodox influences,” e.g. Swedenborgianism, Kenyon’s reference to Henry
Drummond (1851-94) as “one of the world’s greatest scientists,” may in
itself hardly be appropriated as if Kenyon assented to Emerson’s eclectic
theology. After all, Drummond also had a close relationship to D. L.
Moody, whom he worked with both in 1873 and 1882. Besides, he was of-
fered a chance to work with the American once more ten years later:

Sensitive to the embarrassment he was causing his friend, Drummond declined
Moody’s offer to assist him at the 1893 World’s Fair in Chicago knowing that this
would only expose his old friend to further attacks for working with a liberal
Christian evolutionist.

Both the term “Kenyon Connection” and its significance in McConnell’s
attempt to trace Kenyon’s roots seem considerably exaggerated.

Faith-cure or mind-cure: A brief comparison

Dale Simmons completed his doctoral dissertation on Kenyon in 1990. The
author claims that Kenyon’s teaching on “peace, power and plenty is a
unique hybrid created from the grafting together of various faith-cure and
mind-cure sources.” Although Simmons’ research primarily has been di-
rected towards Kenyon and the origins of his theology, a secondary goal has
been to analyze both similarities and divergencies between the mind-cure

---
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was bound to have influenced his later theology, is problematic to put it mildly. (1) Kenyon considered
himself an agnostic. (2) His school year did serve as a preparation, not for the ministry, but for the stage.
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some of his fellow students than did the instructors (Kenyon, unpublished sermon in First Presbyterian
Church, Hollywood, California, Aug. 27, 1944).
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(New Thought) movement and the evangelical Higher Life movement, which the faith-cure movement belonged to.103

According to Simmons, both New Thought and Higher Life claimed that personal peace was attainable through union with the divine, and that the obstacle that needed to be removed was man’s own self.104 In order to understand the distinction between the two groups we will have to touch upon both movements’ anthropology. New Thought distinguishes between the real man (higher self) and the individual mind (lower self), where the latter derives its knowledge from its five physical senses. Deity—or the Infinite—is always ready to impart peace, power, wisdom, and life to the real man to the degree that our higher self consciously opens up to the inflow of the “All-Good.” Our lower self, though, is unreliable since it is “too dependent on the five physical senses for its information.”105

While New Thought tended to distinguish between people who were conscious of their essential divinity and those who were not, Higher Life on the other hand divided humanity into three categories: the unsaved, ordinary Christians, and victorious Christians, signifying victory over sin. Among sins, worry (antithesis to peace) seems to have been the worst. Victory was to be won through the dethronement of the Christian’s self life (old nature, flesh) and through the “once-for-all abandonment to God.” However, this experience of sanctification could not guarantee that the victorious Christian automatically might remain an overcomer. Even though the victorious child of God still had an indwelling fallen nature, this might be subdued to the degree that our will actively took side with God in the combat against personal sin.106

Just like inner peace, power was also available through union with the divine. For New Thought “God” and “power” were synonymous terms, and the secret to a life filled with power is consequently “coming into a conscious, vital realization of our oneness with Infinite Life, and the opening of

103 Dale Hawthorne Simmons, “The Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty: As Seen in the Writings of Essek William Kenyon” (Ph.D. dissertation—Drew University, 1990). Simmons’ research on Kenyon is still continuing, and his updated findings are just about to be published by Scarecrow. I owe much of my own findings to Dr. Simmons, who helped me get started and who was extremely open with his own findings even though his forthcoming book had not yet been published. [Simmons’ E.W. Kenyon and the Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty appeared in 1997.]
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ourselves fully to this divine inflow.”

Even if they on the one hand encouraged people to “get out of the way and let God work,” (opening oneself up to the divine inflow), now one might next be told how spiritual power was exercised “through the discovery and utilization of immutable laws.” Two of the most important laws seem to be the law of “cause and effect” and the law that “like attracts like.” Since thoughts are things and like attracts like, “whatever we conceive in the realm of thought, necessarily manifests itself in the material world. Hence, the thought becomes the cause for which the material manifestation is the effect.”

Thoughts are often depicted as forces, “the most vital, subtle and irresistible force there is in the universe.” In spite of the fact that this “force” which has its origin within our higher self, which is “indistinguishable from God,” mentally repudiates the sensual misinformation via our lower self and positively assents to anything Deity has made available for us, oftentimes this seems to be insufficient.

New Thought also emphasizes the value of the spoken word. Since thoughts in themselves have creative ability, our spoken words--if corresponding with our thoughts--will give these direction. The spoken word therefore “is necessary before any outward or material manifestation of [the] power [of the thought forces] can become evident.” Faith is consequently “a confident assurance based on our absolute knowledge that everything is already provided for us through the operation of certain immutable laws.” “Our affirmations must always be fashioned in the present tense, as we thank God that we have (not will have) the desires of our heart.”

Higher Life was in no way ready to accept the New Thought understanding of power as “impersonal force.” Power was rather interpreted as one of the Spirit’s attributes. As time passed the understanding of the “baptism in the Holy Spirit” as a purging of sin was more and more replaced by power (en- duement) for service/ministry, especially personal evangelism. Various formulas were offered among the Higher Life advocates in order to receive the fullness of the Spirit. As Simmons points out, although Higher Life and New Thought “differed on the specifics,” both groups agreed that if one would follow the proper steps in the correct order, the result was guaranteed... It was only a matter of time before the right use of means was applied to any and all of God’s blessings... Consequently, finding an appropriate promise in

---
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the Scriptures which covered what one was seeking became a paramount concern.\footnote{110}

While New Thought claimed that the universe is governed by spiritual impersonal laws and that each and everyone can tap into these in order to obtain the desired result, Higher Life advocates searched for promises in Scripture which they claimed by faith as their own. What the two movements had in common was a spoken confession that what they had sought for was not to be manifested some time in the future, but belonged to them in the here and now. Faith was based on knowledge--impersonal laws/principles within New Thought and God’s promises within Higher Life. For both groups faith was an act of the will where one often would have to act against opposing feelings or the testimony of the senses. Even Higher Life could refer to spiritual laws, though meaning that God had put Himself under obligation under His own promises and that they consequently would be fulfilled with a 100 per cent certainty (as a law) if one dared to actively believe them. Therefore the positive confession of God’s promises was a means to conquer personal doubt (faith’s opposite) while among New Thought advocates one’s confession gave direction to faith filled thoughts which again was the basis for the creative ability which lies dormant within all human beings.\footnote{111}

**Historical Roots: Faith-cure or mind-cure?**

Based on the many doctrinal similarities between the Holiness and New Thought movements, respectively, it is natural to investigate Kenyon’s possible historical roots in the former just as his alleged entanglement with New Thought has been discussed. In an article on prayer featured in Kenyon’s *Reality* magazine, he makes note of several well-known evangelists which he esteemed:

Pray for Evangelists--Dr. Torrey, Dr. A. C. Dixon, Dr. Simpson, Andrew Murray, F. B. Meyer, G. Campbell Morgan, Gen. Boothe [sic], Ballington Boothe [sic], Chas. E. Hurlbut [sic] in British East Africa. Pray for a world-wide work of grace.\footnote{112}

The above mentioned evangelists all belonged within the Holiness tradition. While Moody in another context might be described as “the spiritual genius of the nineteenth century,” the heir to the latter’s throne, R. A. Torrey is
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\footnote{111 ibid., 174-181.}
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referred to as “the evangelist of the age.” Kenyon also gave a vivid description of his own reaction after having read a biography of Charles Cullis, the founder of the faith-cure movement:

I cannot describe to you the emotions that stirred my heart as I began to read it. I went into it chapter after chapter until I came to some of his great battles. I lived with him in his fights; I knew what it meant. It was like a soldier, who having just gone thru a severe engagement, is reading the field notes of the other parts of the battle.¹¹⁴

In the biographical introduction we have already touched upon Kenyon’s two or three years as an indifferent agnostic who again “heard from God” when he attended A. J. Gordon’s church in Boston. We also find quite a few references to Gordon in Kenyon’s literature.¹¹⁵ One more of the faith-cure exponents, A. B. Simpson, is described by Kenyon as having “done more than any living man to spread the knowledge of the believer’s privileges in Christ.”¹¹⁶ Simpson even had Kenyon come and preach in his church, Gospel Tabernacle in New York City, during Kenyon’s years in Spencer, Massachusetts.¹¹⁷

A European who strictly speaking does not belong in the Holiness tradition is the German Plymouth brother, George Friedrich Müller (1805-98). Inspired among others by August Herman Francke’s work among orphans in Halle,¹¹⁸ Müller felt called to establish a similar work in Bristol, England, 150 years later. Müller’s orphanage was operated by faith in God that He would provide the financial needs.¹¹⁹ Müller was known as a man of prayer and faith, and many were inspired to established similar orphan homes patterned after Müller’s work in Bristol.¹²⁰ His extensive missionary tours during 1875-92 led him not only all over Europe, but to the U.S., Africa, Asia, and Australia and contributed greatly to making his work even more known.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ Joe McIntyre who pastors Word of His Grace Fellowship in Kirkland, Washington, found a newspaper clipping in one of Kenyon’s personal Bibles announcing him to preach in Simpson’s church. McIntyre too, like Dr. Dale Simmons is working on a book on Kenyon. [McIntyre’s E. W. Kenyon and His Message of Faith: The True Story appeared in 1997 on Creation House Publishers.]
¹¹⁹ ibid., 124.
¹²⁰ ibid., 342-59.
¹²¹ ibid., 246.
Also Kenyon knew Müller, who “did more for the Church than will ever be known this side of the Judgment; thousands have been helped to trust in the Unseen Father God by his victories of faith.” Kenyon himself “received his first inspiration to trust by reading the life of Müller.” The fact that Kenyon’s first introduction to “faith teachings” came via Müller is not inconsistent with Kenyon’s obvious roots within Higher Life/faith-cure theology. In 1875 Müller decided to “follow up the revival work of Mr. Moody and Mr. Sankey.” Moody’s revival meetings in Great Britain became his real breakthrough as an evangelist, but he was naturally incapable of remaining in order to offer more thorough Bible teaching for his many converts: “Mr. Müller accordingly followed these evangelists in England, Ireland, and Scotland, staying in each place from one week to six, and seeking to educate and edify those who had been led to Christ.” That Müller appealed to Higher Life advocates is also apparent through the fact that A. J. Gordon’s close friend Arthur T. Pierson “had been led to undertake the production of a memoir of Mr. Müller for American readers,” the result being the book George Müller of Bristol. By comparing Müller’s articles, which can be found in Kenyon’s Reality magazine with the latter’s own teaching, the similarities are striking. Both claim that we as believers have “our standing in the Lord Jesus” and that this standing “remains unalterably the same as far as God is concerned.” This is what Kenyon would call our legal place in Christ. Müller writes further that we have an experimental [Kenyon: “vital”] fellowship ... with the Father and with His Son, which consists in this, that all which we [Kenyon: “legally”] possess in God, is brought into our daily life, enjoyed, experienced, and used. This experimental fellowship, or partnership, allows of an increase or decrease in the measure in which faith is in exercise, and in which we are entering into what we have received [legally] in the Lord Jesus.

But Müller was not the only one among the Brethren whom Kenyon admired:
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126 George Müller, “Fellowship,” Reality, March 1909, 71. The very first reference to “legal” and “vital” with regard to man’s union with Christ in Kenyon’s newsletter is related to Robert Cameron’s sermon “Coming of the Lord.” Cameron was the editor of the magazine Watchword and Truth. (“The Bible Conference,” Bethel Trumpet, June 1902, 120.) Cameron’s magazine had prior to that published an article with identical title, which in turn had been “reprinted from a tract by one of the [Plymouth] Brethren” (Kenyon, “Editorial Notes,” Bethel Trumpet, Jan. 1902, 80).
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, in a new way to the searcher. These men loved the Word. Just as the Christian Church and the Disciples of Christ, the Brethren’s aim was not only renewal, but restoration of New Testament church life. This was to take place through “a Biblical lifestyle, theology, and ecclesiology.” Theologically it was not only their ecclesiology, but also their eschatology which differed from traditional churches. Darby divided the biblical history into 7 different dispensations where God’s dealings with His people differed according the various dispensations. The Brethren’s dispensationalism in particular appealed to young Kenyon as it had to several of the former leaders of Higher Life/faith-cure like Moody, G. Campbell Morgan and A. J. Gordon. Just as Darby, who claimed that all 7 dispensations had been “ruined at the outset by man’s sin or disobedience, and the aim of God in each particular dispensation [to establish a mode of relationship with man] was never, therefore, brought to fruition,” even so Kenyon also seemed to believe that they all ended with God’s judgment. However, Kenyon’s dividing into dispensations seem more in accordance with C. I. Scofield’s modification of Darby’s model.

The Brethren’s understanding of the Book of Revelation’s description of the 7 churches in chapters 2-3 as a prophetic picture of the history of the Church, is also reflected in Kenyon’s writings.
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In his later years, however, Kenyon seems to have rejected traditional dispensationalism.

**Kenyon’s dispensationalism**

In his published books he distinguishes between the way God deals with the unregenerate Jews under the Old Covenant and the New Covenant believers in Christ. The Jews were not born again and only enjoyed a limited form of fellowship with the Lord.\(^{136}\) The period after the day of Pentecost when the church was born--after the new creation was made available--Kenyon terms “the dispensation of the Holy Spirit” or “the dispensation of the recreated human spirit.”\(^ {137}\) Of course Kenyon was also unable to accept the traditional interpretation among dispensationalists that the so called extra-ordinary workings of the Spirit had been “confined to the apostolic age” or “put over” into some later dispensation:\(^ {138}\)

> 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 absolutely refutes the entire teaching of those who would put the power of the Name of Jesus over into the kingdom period.\(^ {139}\)

**Christian mysticism?**

Another “school” which seems to have influenced both Higher Life and young Kenyon is Quietism. The Christian mystics claimed that the soul could have communion and union with the Lord without going through priesthood or sacrament as mediators. Higher Life exponent Arthur T. Pierson claimed that “the increased personal holiness that inundated various streams of late nineteenth-century evangelicalism led many to gravitate toward the writings of the mystics.”\(^ {140}\) Another Higher Life advocate, T. C.
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\(^{138}\) Kenyon, *Two Kinds of Life*, 103. Consider also *The Hidden Man*, 61.
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Upham published a biography of Madame Guyón (37 editions). Both Gordon and Simpson read Quietist literature, and the latter recommended it “as embodying spiritual principles necessary for cultivating an interior life devoted to an intimate knowledge of God.”

Kenyon has quotes from Molinos, Thomas á Kempis and William Law (who again was influenced by Jacob Böhme.) It is not certain that Kenyon’s roots can be traced directly to the mystics, though. Due to rather negative references in his books I am more inclined to believe that the mystics’ influence on Kenyon came via faith-cure leaders such as A. J. Gordon and A. B. Simpson. Kenyon wrote:

> The faith problem is becoming very acute. Waves of unbelief are sweeping over the church. Many of our leaders have been swept into the whirlpool of modernism. Earnest thinkers are seeking for a solution. The greater percentage of the devotional writings of the past century are from the pens of the mystics. Today there is a demand for a definite, well defined path that the bewildered minds of this troubled age may find their way into the realm of faith.

Kenyon apparently found that the mystics leaned too much on subjective experiences rather than on the plain Word of God.

Theological roots: Faith-cure or mind-cure?

Due to the many occurrences of criticism of Unitarianism, Universalism, Christian Science and New Thought in Kenyon’s writings, combined with
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his positive identification with the evangelical Higher Life/faith-cure movement and our previous comparison of the latter’s theology vs. that of New Thought, it is natural also to examine Kenyon’s theology in the light of these two movements. This examination will be limited to those aspects which have been touched upon by McConnell in his attempt to identify the teachings of Kenyon with those of New Thought.

**Epistemology**

_Dualism?_

Kenyon’s epistemology, according to McConnell, had obvious parallels both to Christian Science and to New Thought: “The doctrine of Revelation Knowledge exhibits the radical dualism of the metaphysical cults.”150 McConnell interprets Kenyon to say that all knowledge is being communicated via “two mutually exclusive sources.” Sense knowledge comes “from the physical realm below,” while revelation knowledge is received “from the spiritual realm above.” Neither of the two forms of knowledge has any value for or can benefit from the other.151 McConnell interprets Kenyon to say that so-called sense knowledge and revelation knowledge lack a common ground and that God’s revelation to man _always_ has to bypass the physical.

McConnell’s claim that Kenyon distinguishes between “the two kinds of knowledge” is a valid one. Because of man’s spiritual death, God’s ideal fellowship--from spirit to spirit--is impossible, as far as Kenyon is concerned. During the Old Covenant no human being could normally approach the presence of Jehovah except through “a divinely appointed priesthood, over a bleeding sacrifice, by dreams, by visions, or angelic visitations.”152 This was one reason why God told Moses to build a tabernacle in the wilderness. Kenyon summarizes:

> He could not dwell in their hearts, because they had not yet received Eternal Life; His Presence must be manifested to their physical senses. Their worship of Him also must be on the same level. There must be a physical dwelling place in which He will dwell, and where they shall meet Him through a physical priesthood.153

McConnell’s attempt to refute Kenyon’s “dualistic view of revelation” by correctly claiming that “biblical revelation and salvation are physical as well
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as spiritual,” however, seems to be a mere play with semantics. Although Kenyon would refer both to the Word of God and to the content of the specific knowledge God might choose to impart to His “children” supernaturally as “revelation,” it is the legitimacy of the latter use of the term McConnell attempts to refute! In fact, Kenyon would have no objections whatsoever to McConnell’s appraisal of the revelatory value of the Bible and of salvation. Both would be of the nature of which Kenyon would categorize as “physical revelation” in contradistinction to “non-physical” or “spiritual revelation.” Similarly, Kenyon would not disapprove of McConnell’s claim that “the incarnation and death of Christ are the highest forms of revelation, and both are decidedly physical in nature.” In fact, Kenyon admits that

in the Incarnation the Revelation of Christ that was given to man was given to him
on the level of the senses of his physical body...The knowledge that man possessed
of Christ during His life on earth was gained purely by his physical senses. This physical revelation [emphasis mine!] of Christ [however,] was not alone sufficient
for man’s faith in Christ as the Son of God or his understanding of Redemption in
Him.

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. However, Kenyon’s epistemology is still not as inflexible as McConnell wants it to appear. Kenyon mentions several exceptions to this “rule.” In the first place, Peter received a revelation of Christ, which was not based upon sense knowledge, prior to the day of Pentecost; in other words before the Old Covenant had been fulfilled and laid aside. Secondly, even in the New Covenant, God can still choose to reveal Himself through so-called sense knowledge:

It is almost an unknown fact that the Holy Spirit does not communicate knowledge
to the intellect, except in rare cases where one is so dense spiritually that He must
communicate with the senses. All the knowledge that natural man has, has come
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through the senses. It may be necessary that the Spirit come to man’s level (his senses) in order to deal with him. “

Although man primarily received his physical body (his senses included) in order to contact the physical world, this does not mean that sense knowledge is of no value to revelation knowledge and vice versa, as McConnell interprets Kenyon, since God is able to reveal himself through both kinds of knowledge. The fact that man’s senses and his spirit normally work within different realms, does not mean that they, ideally speaking, contradict one another: “I can see now, how Revelation Knowledge is necessary to Sense Knowledge. They should never be separated one from the other.” Unless Kenyon deals with one kind of revelation truth which is diametrically opposed to another kind of sense knowledge truth, plain logic says that the two modes of obtaining knowledge were meant to complement rather than to compete with each other.

Now, Kenyon does speak of “two kinds of truth,” particularly in relation to divine healing. It is important to point out, however, that Kenyon’s approach is not ontological, but pragmatic. His interest is not to deal with the essential nature of “truth” per se. On the contrary, he seeks to establish a doctrinal basis for the sick-ridden believer in order to enable the latter to embrace the functional truth that healing has been made available for him by faith, no matter how much the opposing voice of painful symptoms might object to this functional truth. In that sense Kenyon might speak of a legal truth based on God’s Word in contradistinction to a sensory truth, which will eventually have to yield, provided the believer’s faith in the integrity of the Word remains unwavering. The legal truth embraces exclusively what has been made available to the believer, not what he may be enjoying as a fact in practical life. In that respect, Kenyon loyal ascribes to the teachings of his predecessors in the evangelical faith-cure movement.

Sensory denial?

McConnell’s misunderstanding of Kenyon’s anthropology has influenced his interpretation of Kenyon’s epistemology. Writes McConnell: “Man [according to Kenyon] is compartmentalized into three radically distinct and mutually exclusive parts: spirit, soul and body.” Man’s basic identity is said to
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be in his indwelling human spirit, which again is the only means of obtaining revelation knowledge: “The human spirit has little or nothing to do with intellect, which can possess only Sense Knowledge.” Since God does not reveal himself to man through his senses, but only through the recreated human spirit, knowledge from man’s two “receivers” always will be in mutual conflict one with the other. In order to deal with revelation knowledge and thereby act in faith—which according to Kenyon (as McConnell understands him) is identical with “acting upon the Word independent of any sense evidence,” the New Covenant believer will actually have to deny knowledge derived through his physical senses. In order to believe what the Bible says about healing by the stripes of Jesus, the believer will have to deny the reality of his actual physical symptoms.

McConnell’s claim that the spirit has little or nothing to do with the intellect, however, is a misrepresentation of Kenyon’s actual teachings. “Revelation knowledge” is not a term applied exclusively to reflect the insight being communicated by God directly to man’s reborn spirit. Primarily God’s insight is revealed through the written Word of God, which is also termed “revelation knowledge.” In order to grasp the Word we cannot simply bypass our senses. We must read the Word or hear it preached. In order for the Word of God to have any effect in the believer, one is dependent both on sense knowledge and on revelation knowledge. Kenyon writes:

For instance, we hear someone read the Word of God. The thing that is read is weighed and measured by our intellect, but in some way, which is inexplicable to reason, it affects our spirits. It answers a need. By listening to the Word, it changes our spirit.

And although the Word is “the food on which our recreated spirits feed,” even Kenyon would not mean for the Word to remain locked up inside of man’s spirit. The Word would surely have a further task to accomplish in our soul/intellect. Kenyon would most definitely have refuted McConnell’s claim that the spirit has little or nothing to do with the intellect.
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nell’s distorted critique of his teachings where the human spirit is said to have “little or nothing” to do with intellect. In fact, Kenyon wrote:

There must be times when we can sit quietly with the Lord and the Word, and meditate upon it until the Word absorbs us, and we absorb the Word; until the Word is built into our mental processes, as well as our spirit lives, until it absolutely governs our thinking.\footnote{Kenyon, \textit{The Hidden Man}, 58. See also Kenyon, \textit{Advanced Bible Course}, 287: “If we let our minds be renewed by acting on the Word and meditating in it, our minds and spirits will come into sweet fellowship with each other.”}

As already indicated, McConnell’s invalid refutation of Kenyon’s alleged dualistic epistemology is partly due to the fact that he fails to appreciate Kenyon’s pragmatic use of the term “truth” as opposed to an ontological usage. Although Kenyon most probably would be incapable of verbally distinguishing between “pragmatic” and “ontological truth,” this does not mean that he viewed truth per se as relative and subjective instead of as absolute and objective. Hence, the apparent conflict between sense knowledge truth and revelation truth in Kenyon’s ideological system is not necessarily attributable to one truth being inferior to that of the other one ontologically. Both modes of obtaining knowledge are valid and God-given, although they seem designated to work within different “use realms.”

When the two modes of obtaining knowledge legitimately do conflict (as exemplified when the believer’s attempt to embrace God’s “legal truth” with regard to his heritage in Christ entails a struggle with his mind and with his physical senses), Kenyon offers the following explanation for the cause of this struggle. Primarily it is attributable to the fact that reborn man has not taken his (legal) position in Christ, but is still ruled by his physical senses where these were meant to be subjugated to man’s reborn spirit.\footnote{Kenyon, \textit{Two Kinds of Life}, 64-68.} As far as physical healing is concerned, in a forensic sense we are already made well by the stripes of Jesus. Even if a particular disease should remain after the prayer of faith has been given, Kenyon does not encourage the believer to deny the reality of his sickness, but to refute its legal right to persist. Holding fast to the objective/legal fact of healing by the stripes of Jesus, God will prevail and honor the believer’s confidence in His Word.\footnote{Kenyon, \textit{Jesus the Healer}, 60, 78-89.} For Kenyon this was so functionally real that he chose to consider the actual healing to be as good as accomplished. “Disease-repudiation”\footnote{Kenyon, \textit{The Hidden Man}, 99.} would surely be more accurate than the more Christian Science loaded “sensory denial” term which
McConnell introduced in his attempt to explain the nature of Kenyon’s teachings in regard to healing based on the latter’s purportedly flawed epistemology. A similar repudiation of sickness was encouraged both by New Thought and by “evangelical” faith-cure adherents.

Perfect knowledge of God?

McConnell also identifies Kenyon’s epistemology with New Thought in the sense that both “teach that perfect knowledge of God is attainable in this life.” While knowledge derived through the five physical senses may be limited and incomplete, revelation knowledge can always be relied upon. Kenyon is here put in the same category as the patriarch of the health and wealth tradition, Ralph Waldo Trine, who said: “As the human spirit opens itself to revelation, it becomes unerring, absolutely unerring, in its guidance.”

In fairness, Kenyon does refer to “perfect knowledge,” but is McConnell’s interpretation a valid one? That this knowledge does not include each and any topic, seems to be more than obvious. Kenyon admits that “we do not know the exact nature of Adam’s treason whereby Satan became his lord and lord of the human race.” Furthermore, “only God knows what he [Jesus] suffered until He has satisfied the claims of Justice.” A closer examination of the nature of Kenyon’s knowledge of God will uncover that this “perfect understanding” is limited to “spiritual things,” and even narrowed down to “all spiritual wisdom that is necessary for our growth and development so that we may know and do the will of the Father perfectly.” Also in this context McConnell exaggerates his comparison of Kenyon to New Thought thinkers, who actually did believe that perfect knowledge of God was attainable. Also, it might be pointed out that although Kenyon would view genuine revelation knowledge from God as totally reliable, this did not necessarily lead him to put a similar reliance in man’s capability of properly distinguishing between “soulish” self-deception and spiritual illumination from God.
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Classes of Christians?

Trine claimed that those who “received New Thought revelation would become the ‘saviors’ of lesser men.”\(^{180}\) Here as well, McConnell would like to find an actual dependency from Kenyon, who with his allegedly dualistic epistemology had a tendency to “create classes of Christians,” namely those who possessed revelation knowledge and those for whom only sense knowledge was available.\(^{181}\)

In fairness again to McConnell, it is quite obvious that Kenyon does distinguish between “common folk” and “spiritual giants”/“supermen.”\(^{182}\) Nevertheless, Kenyon still admits that revelation knowledge is not only available to all believers in Christ, but in fact they have actually already been in personal touch with this knowledge. The very act of being born again is, among other things, a result of our having acted on God’s revelation.\(^{183}\) By this process we were convinced of personal sin/guilt and accepted Christ as Savior and Lord. Ideally speaking, the unnecessary distinction between Christians who still walk in/by revelation and those who do not, is not due to the fact that God’s knowledge might not be available for the latter category. Rather, according to Kenyon, it is all attributable to their unwillingness to give their spirit its rightful place in regard to their intellect. When their personal views disagree with the Word of God, they neglect the revelation in the Word.\(^{184}\)

**Anthropology**

Kenyon defines man as primarily a spirit being, who possesses a soul and who lives in a physical body. According to McConnell, here again are obvious parallels to New Thought and to Christian Science, which both also claimed that the real man is spirit, not body. The main refutation of Kenyon’s anthropology seems to be directed against his dividing of man into various separable parts where the spirit receives an undue preference to the physical/bodily. McConnell correctly asserts that

\[
\text{man is an integrated being of spirit, soul, and body. The Hebrew understanding of man is wholistic; it depicts man as an organic whole, rather than merely the sum of...}
\]
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his parts. In Hebrew anthropology, the body is every bit as important to one’s personal identity as the spirit.\(^{185}\)

Nonetheless, despite Kenyon’s usage of a trichotomic pattern, his anthropology is really not as rigidly defined as McConnell wants it to appear. Notwithstanding the many references to man as a spirit being,\(^{186}\) and to the spirit as “the real man,”\(^{187}\) Kenyon at times makes it clear that man after all is “primarily”\(^{188}\) a spirit being, that “his spirit nature is his basic nature.”\(^{189}\) At other times he may even depict man as a “triune being”\(^{190}\) or a “threefold man.”\(^{191}\) As far as man’s physical body is concerned, Kenyon does claim that “God did not intend originally to ever separate man from his body...Man’s final home must be a place where he can dwell in a physical body eternally either in confinement or blissful liberty.”\(^{192}\) Be that as it may, an actual distinction between man’s three natures still remains:

Man is himself a spirit but dwells in a physical body, has an intellect through which he thinks, sensibilities through which he feels, a will through which he chooses and selects, and a spirit through which he loves God.\(^{193}\)

God created man...a spirit being and gave to him a body for the home of the spirit. Through his physical body man was to contact the outward world which was to be his home. This knowledge of this world was to come to him through the medium of his five senses. The purpose of the nervous system was never to reveal God to man; man was to know God through his spirit.\(^{194}\)

In any case, spirit, soul, and body are created by the Lord, who, according to Kenyon, desires “this threefold man...to be preserved entire without blame at
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the coming of the Lord." Even if the spirit is considered most important, that hardly means that the value of body and soul is being neglected:

Man is a three-fold being—body, soul, spirit. Man’s education should cover his whole being. To train only the physical is to make a prize fighter. To train only the mental is to make an intellectual anarchist. To train only the spiritual is to make a fanatic. But God planned to develop the whole man.

McConnell’s critique of Kenyon’s anthropology has also been directed towards the latter’s totally black description of unregenerate man’s fallen (satanic) nature because it “attributes far too much power to Satan.” In a similar way, one could hardly expect that Kenyon’s understanding of the believer’s being made a partaker of divine nature might receive any milder judgment. McConnell interprets this aspect of Kenyon’s theology in terms of reborn men being “transformed into gods.” Just like New Thought, Kenyon is accused of claiming that the believer does not differ from God in essence (quality), but only in degree. The quotation from Ralph Waldo Trine’s classic In Tune With the Infinite where the author claims that “in essence the life of God and the life of man are identically the same, and so are one,” is used by McConnell to document not only the similarities between Trine and New Thought, but also between Trine and Kenyon.

McConnell’s critique aside, according to Kenyon, we are pointing the wrong way “if [our] life is not in tune with [emphasis mine!] the Master.” Nonetheless, Kenyon’s teachings do tend to eliminate a valid distinction between the Creator God and his spiritually redeemed creatures. But this inaccuracy might just as well have had its origin in his study of the mystics. Not only is the first man, Adam, said to have been created “spiritually and intellectually, in the image and likeness of God,” both Christ and the ordinary believer are depicted as actual Incarnations: “The believer is as much an Incarnation as was Jesus of Nazareth.” It is a question, though, whether or not the unhappy quotation from the theologically untrained Kenyon is due to the fact
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that he did not understand the theological implications involved in applying the term Incarnation to the born again believer.\footnote{Kenyon’s approach is not ontological, but pragmatic. Although he did subscribe to traditional Orthodox views as far as the Trinity is concerned, his field of interest was always the practical implications for the new creation believer. In that respect, Kenyon’s interest in Christ’s Incarnation was narrowed down to Christ’s being indwelt by God. Consequently, he could say that the new covenant believer was also an incarnation, a being indwelt by God’s Spirit.}

When I say incarnated, I mean Born Again, for every person who receives Eternal Life becomes God Incarnate. God’s nature has entered into him.\footnote{Kenyon, “Incarnation,” Reality (Feb. 1914): 39.}

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.\footnote{Kenyon, Father and His Family (1916), 125.}

Just as God was united with man through the Incarnation of God the Son, Kenyon pictures the believer as a partaker of God’s own nature. Also in Kenyon’s presentation of the resurrection of Christ, where the latter is called the first born from among the dead and head of a new creation,\footnote{Kenyon, Identification, 25. Kenyon’s cryptic statements concerning “Christ [arising] to the full stature of His Godhead in the presence of the adversary” actually creates more problems than it attempts (?) to solve (Kenyon, What Happened, 69).} we look in vain for the biblical accentuation of the unique position of Christ as God over His spiritually redeemed creatures.\footnote{Kenyon also did not seem to have any clear comprehension of how the divine and human element were “intermingled” in the person of Jesus: “This may satisfy you to know that 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” (Kenyon, “The Incarnation,” unpublished sermon in Bethel Temple, Los Angeles, Dec. 29, 1925).} Still, though, Kenyon does point out fundamental differences:

God is manifest as an absolute Threeness; yet He is also an absolute Oneness. The Three are absolute One. Each is represented as God. That does not mean that each one is a part of God, but each one is God...It is not primarily three ways in which God acts, but Three modes of Being...The Word makes clear to us that the Father is first, the Son is second, and the Holy Spirit is third. It does not mean that One is first in Deity, for all are God. It does not mean that One is Greater, for all are Infinite. It does not mean that One is first in time, for all are eternal. It can only mean that the Father is first, the Son is second, and the Spirit is third in logical order.\footnote{Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 250.}
Kenyon also accentuates the Omnipotence, Omniscience and Omnipresence of God.\textsuperscript{209} Of course, God is also eternal, another unique attribute which is not shared with redeemed mankind. On the contrary, man’s preexistence is never hinted at. Man is only eternal in the sense that he was created to live for all eternity: “Man gives birth to eternal personalities, to children who will live as long as God lives.”\textsuperscript{210}

**Jesus dying spiritually?**

McConnell compared Kenyon’s understanding of the death of Christ with that of Christian Science founder Mary Baker Eddy, who wrote: “The material blood of Jesus was no more efficacious to cleanse from sin, when it was shed upon ‘the accursed tree’ than when it was flowing in his veins.”\textsuperscript{211} According to McConnell, Mrs. Eddy was referring to “the idea that God’s wrath must be propitiated by physical sacrifice as a ‘heathen conception.’”\textsuperscript{212} Also Kenyon is said to have refuted the idea that the physical sufferings of Jesus alone might redeem mankind from spiritual death. On the cross He was not only left by the Father. According to a recent critic, the logical implications of Kenyon’s views would be that Jesus “was recreated from a divine to a demonic being. At this point the Trinity was destroyed and the deity of Christ utterly demolished.”\textsuperscript{213} McConnell interprets Kenyon to say that the transformation of Jesus from “a God-man into a...satanic man” was necessary because of “man’s legal obligation towards Satan.” “In order to recapture the world, God must deal with Satan ‘justly’ by paying him a ransom.”\textsuperscript{214}

This critique, however, should be modified somewhat. First of all, Kenyon does not even hint at any judicial business proposition between God and the devil. Satan’s acquired legal right over creation was not turned over to him by God. In fact, Kenyon admits that “the Father God would never confer to His enemy dominion over His creation and man, the object of His love.”\textsuperscript{215} Secondly, although Adam had the legal right to confer the dominion of creation over to God’s enemy, Kenyon does question his moral right to act as he
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Satan is consequently depicted as a usurper both by Kenyon and by McConnell.\textsuperscript{216} The substitutionary work of Christ was no price in any negotiation between two somewhat equal “partners,” God and the devil. On the contrary, it was based on the very righteousness of God Himself. This righteousness of His is threefold and deals with man, and both Satan and God.\textsuperscript{217}

Writes Kenyon,

\begin{quote}
God cannot ignore the fact of man’s hideous transgression. That transgression must be punished and if man is restored to God, it must be upon grounds that will not pauperize man nor rob him of his self respect, but it must be upon legal grounds that will perfectly justify man in the sight of God, and give him as good a standing as though he had never sinned.\textsuperscript{218}
\end{quote}

Secondly,

\begin{quote}
God must act towards Satan on grounds of absolute justice. God must redeem man from his authority on legal grounds. Third, He must not only be just to man and to Satan, but His actions must also be according to His own righteousness. Righteousness is the very foundation of His throne, and the standard must not be lowered. There must be legal grounds on which God can justly judge humankind and compel them to pay the penalty of sin if they reject His Sin-Substitute.\textsuperscript{219}
\end{quote}

While Mrs. Eddy, who was motivated by the belief that God’s wrath did not need to be softened due to the illusory character of sin, rejected the physical sufferings of Jesus as necessary to man’s salvation,\textsuperscript{220} Kenyon viewed sin, and both God’s wrath and His claims of justice as quite real.\textsuperscript{221} Kenyon was not the first one among evangelical writers who viewed the death of Jesus as something more than exclusively physical. Mr. Henry C. Mabie, a close friend of A. J. Gordon, and Home Secretary of the American Baptist Missionary Union,\textsuperscript{222} wrote:

\begin{quote}
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\textsuperscript{217} McConnell accuses Kenyon of sacrificing the “God-ward aspect” of our reconciliation for a “Satan-ward” view of the atonement. Jesus dying spiritually is interpreted to include a price settled by Satan. McConnell correctly identifies such a view with an old theological theory termed reconciliation’s “ransom theory” (\textit{A Different Gospel}, 125-126). However, although the motif of ransom paying can also be found in Kenyon’s writings (\textit{New Creation Realities}, 54), he definitely does not identify this theory with being redeemed from the evil one through some sort of negotiation between God and the devil, where the latter settles the price.
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\textsuperscript{221} Kenyon, \textit{Two Kinds of Righteousness}, 9.
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Doubtless the spiritual death which Christ experienced, was itself the cause of the cessation of His mortal life on the cross. That death brought on His mortal dying long before His executioners expected to see Him expire.\textsuperscript{223}

Curiously enough, while on the one hand referring to Mabie as “one of the greatest teachers of the Bible in America,” Kenyon still lacked confidence in Mabie’s ability to “carry us one step beyond the physical sufferings of Christ.”\textsuperscript{224}

Kenyon himself taught the spiritual death of Jesus as early as at the turn of this century:

If the real death mentioned in the Scriptures is spiritual, and that death means an existence with Satan in hades, as real life means an existence with God in the heavens, then the great plan of Redemption becomes plain...To state the case clearly, it was necessary for Christ to meet the full penalty of sin, which is death in hades or hell with Satan...Hades is the penalty of sin, and no Redeemer could taste death unless he died spiritually, entered its dark shades, was made a partaker of its awful anguish, and then broken away from it, paralyzing [sic] its death-dealing power, actually conquering it and putting to naught its author.\textsuperscript{225}

Kenyon admits, though, that for a long time he had only been able to grasp the physical aspect of Jesus’ death. When he finally “saw” that the spirit of Jesus “became a partaker of the thing that separated man from God,” he realized he was in trouble:

I did not want to accept these things I am telling you, and for a long time I rejected them. I refused to allow my mind to accept these facts, but now I have come to see them. They have become a part of my consciousness.\textsuperscript{226}

It is impossible to refute all criticism of Kenyon’s teachings on the spiritual death of Christ. Several of his books are filled with references to Jesus being united with the adversary,\textsuperscript{227} and to sin being laid on His spirit.\textsuperscript{228} At times he even goes so far as admitting that the spirit of Jesus became “impregnated
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with the sin nature of the world,” stating that sin was not only set to His account, but that He was actually made sin. In fairness, though, Kenyon readily admits that “only God knows what He suffered until He had satisfied the claims of Justice, had been made righteous, and made a New Creation.” Besides, the term spiritual death is defined both as “the separation of man’s spirit from God” and the “nature of Satan.” When Adam sinned, his spirit went through a radical transformation. He was actually “born again” in the sense that he was made a partaker of satanic nature. He became a child of the devil. Did Kenyon believe that Jesus died spiritually according to the first or the second definition? That is not easy to determine.

On the one hand we read that spiritual death “entered the spirit of Christ” and “His spirit underwent a change. Spiritual death was laid upon it.” “He not only bore our sins, but the sin-nature itself was laid upon Him, until He became all that spiritual death had made man...He, in identification, had become so utterly one with us that He Himself needed justification when man’s penalty was paid.” Still, on the other hand Kenyon believed he had found an Old Testament prophecy about Jesus in Psalm 88, which “gives to us a picture of a righteous [emphasis mine!] man in Hell upon whom all the wrath of God lay hard. The wrath of God lay hard upon Him, because He was one with us in identification.” In another context Kenyon refers to the disciples surrounding the cross, but who were exclusively conscious of the physical sufferings of their Master: “They didn’t see demons take that beautiful [emphasis mine!] spirit and carry it away to the place where lost men are incarcerated.” According to Kenyon, Jesus’ physical death took place 3 hours after He died spiritually, i.e. when he proclaimed: “My God my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” How could Kenyon depict Jesus’
spirit as “beautiful” after it had been impregnated by the nature of the adversary? And in what sense then was Jesus united with the devil?

We have already quoted Kenyon saying that Jesus “became a partaker of its [hell’s] anguish.” Kenyon was convinced that hell was not made for man, but for the devil and his fallen angels.\(^{240}\) Does union with the enemy refer to the fact that both the devil and Jesus Himself will have to suffer in the pit of hell, albeit the adversary sometime in the future? Kenyon emphasizes suffering as the essential nature of Jesus’ three days and nights in hell,\(^{241}\) and does not say that Jesus’ alleged spiritual death caused any demonic hatred to flow from the spirit of Jesus. He also does not suggest that Jesus mentally agreed to or identified with the activities of the adversary. In this sense Kenyon gives no evidence of any transformation of the spiritual nature of Jesus.

Kenyon’s teachings of Jesus dying spiritually which in turn necessitated a being born again, have also been criticized as promoting a form of reincarnation. If Jesus was supposed to be made sin, then one of the persons in the Trinity would stop being, which actually would mean that the Triune God would cease—albeit just for a certain period (3 days and nights): “For how could God, in the person of Christ, have the nature of Satan?” And if Jesus actually was to be “reborn in hell, then a form of reincarnation is true.”\(^{242}\) Kenyon actually touches upon this problem in his refutation of those groups who claimed annihilation as the penalty of sin:

But some will say that annihilation is the penalty of sin, and that the sinner when he dies is annihilated. Well, if this be true, and if Jesus is our sin Substitute, then He must be annihilated, and, as one has said in this connection, Jesus must have been annihilated, then who was it that was raised from the dead? There would be a break in the continuity of personality, and the one who was annihilated could not have been raised from the dead for he had ceased to be, and another being must have been created who appeared as the Christ. This argument falls by its own folly.\(^{243}\)

Alluding to Kenyon’s reference to “continuity of personality” in our last quotation, it seems unthinkable that he would have believed that the eternal Son of God should have been cut off from the Triune God and have been changed to “a demoniac”\(^{244}\) or to “a demon-possessed mortal man,”\(^{245}\) as
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several critics have claimed. In fact, Kenyon seems to have believed that Jesus had to die spiritually (primarily meaning losing his fellowship with the Father) in order for His physical body to be subject to physical death. Then His spirit could separate from the body and on behalf of mankind He could suffer the God-ordained penalty in Hell:

You see, on the cross He died spiritually, a partaker of sin—not of His own volition. God laid upon His spirit our sin, and the moment He did that, Jesus’ spirit became sin. Then His body became mortal. He died spiritually so His body could die physically. A few hours after that, physical death gained the ascendancy. His spirit left his body.246

A legitimate objection to the interpretation that Jesus’ spiritual death basically included separation from the Father, however, would be that Kenyon’s description of Jesus’ “new birth” would be at variance with his teachings on the nature of the new birth experience of the ordinary believer. For Kenyon, the believer’s being resurrected from spiritual death to life in Christ was not a metaphor, but a “New Creation Reality.” If we opt for the first interpretation where Jesus did not need regeneration in a literal sense before He could be resurrected, the logical implication would be that Jesus would actually cease to be a prototype for the new covenant believer in the latter’s identification with Christ. Kenyon’s inconsistency at least indicates that this aspect of his teachings may have been less rigidly emphasized than has been perceived both by some of his followers within the Faith movement and by his modern day critics.247

**Faith**

A formula?

While the emphasis of modern Faith preachers on development of the individual’s faith level has resulted in numerous book titles beginning with *How to* or *7 steps to*, Kenyon points out that the ordinary Christian is a believer by nature. While Mark 11:23-24 is said to keynote Kenneth Hagin’s life and ministry, Kenyon claims that these words by Jesus were not addressed to
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Christians, but to Jews living under the Old Covenant. While Jesus encouraged the Covenant people under the old dispensation to believe God for the impossible, the apostle Paul seemed to take faith for granted among his New Covenant believers. Faith would operate automatically when believers were introduced to teachings on the substitutionary work of Christ and on the believer’s legal position in Christ. Kenyon writes, “Get to know your place, your rights, your privileges, and your authority. There will be no problem about faith then.” Faith is further described as an unconscious consciousness:

It is as unconscious of itself as is the faith of a little child in its mother. The child never says, ‘Now Mother, I believe your word. I know that if I ask you for a piece of bread you will give it to me.’ If it said such things it would frighten the mother. She would wonder what had happened to her child.

A spiritual law?

Kenyon’s reference to faith as a “spiritual law” has again convinced McConnell of dependence on New Thought sources. In fact, McConnell claims that Kenyon’s cosmology included a view of the physical laws of nature as having their antithesis in so called spiritual laws. These spiritual laws are said to be activated through verbal faith statements (positive or negative affirmations/"confessions"). Writes McConnell,

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’.

According to McConnell, the basis for Kenyon’s understanding of faith’s relatedness to spiritual law is a form of spiritual deism. In conformity with this view, the active upholding of the universe is not attributable to the continuing presence and wisdom of Almighty God, but rather to impersonal/spiritual principles. “A ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ confession,” McConnell continues, “is the determining factor in one’s harmony with these universal spiritual laws. Confession is the catalyst that evokes their blessings, or their curses.” Kenyon’s teachings on faith are incorrectly identified with those of Unity teacher Harriet Emilie Cady, who in fact did claim a cause-and-effect relationship between man’s mind and spiritual laws, stating: “Every

248 Kenyon, New Creation Realities, 18.
249 Kenyon, Two Kinds of Faith, 40-41.
250 Ibid., 9.
251 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 136.
252 Ibid., 138.
thought of the human mind causes an effect in the universe through the operation of spiritual laws.”253 Within such a cosmological system it follows logically that results cannot be attributed to prayer answered by a personal or almighty God. Due to McConnell’s failure to distinguish between Kenyon’s views and those of Cady, he erroneously concludes that Kenyon’s

Faith theology in principle teaches a personal God. But in practice the Faith god differs little from the god of the metaphysical cults. Both must do the bidding of the spiritual laws that govern the universe. Neither is free to disregard these laws.254

While refuting McConnell’s understanding of Kenyon’s original intent, it is important to point out that Kenyon did refer to faith both as “law” and as “force.”255 In fact, these two terms are identified with various qualities; oftentimes they even seem to be synonymous one to another. “Love is the creative force in Creation. It is the creative law,”256 Kenyon writes, linking the two, not to “faith” here, but to “love.” In another context “love” is defined as the personification of God Himself: “Love is a spiritual thing. It is above reason. It is not in the reason realm. It is God, invading the realm of the human.”257 Just as the term “love” is identified with God, the latter is also depicted as “the constructive Force in all the ages.”258 Likewise, also the Word of God is referred to as “a mighty force in the hearts of men and women.”259 Even spiritual death is termed “a substance, a force, a fact.”260

Although “force” oftentimes has reference to God, angels or evil spirits,261 Kenyon at times also has specific attributes or characteristics in mind, such as the love of Christ, hatred, fear, faith, and joy.262 What all of these characteristics have in common is the fact that they are effectual and accomplish something. Why cannot also the fact that faith is effectual and accomplishes something, according to Kenyon, be due to the fact that God sovereignty
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prevails in answer to our faith? Does it necessarily have to be due to a purported view on Kenyon’s behalf that faith in its own power is capable of obtaining the desired results?

Not only Kenyon’s usage of the term “force,” but also his reference to “law” makes sense within a more orthodox context rather than New Thought. Instead of contrasting between the physical laws of nature and so-called spiritual laws, Kenyon would rather differentiate between the former and “the unseen and unheard powers of the Spirit,”\(^\text{263}\) a possible allusion to the active operation of God in contradistinction to impersonal principles. Kenyon’s cosmological views, at times, are made unnecessarily complicated, though, due to several of his somewhat clumsy statements, such as the following: “A spiritual law that few of us have recognized is that our confessions rule us.”\(^\text{264}\) This statement seems to complicate or contradict other statements he has made. As will become apparent in the following Kenyon quotation, for instance, the term “law” is not intended to be understood within the context of a deistic world view. Writes Kenyon,

> I do not care who you are, you cannot abrogate this law, you cannot evade it. Sin guarantees heartaches, sin guarantees shame and sorrow every time...It is bound to do it, it is one of those laws that lie down deep in the human experience.\(^\text{265}\)

Here Kenyon is giving an example of the law that sin will catch up with us. 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.

What then is the context of Kenyon’s embracing this “spiritual law” that we are ruled by our confession? According to Kenyon, “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.”\(^\text{266}\) Furthermore, Kenyon states that, in his own life, actions that do not line up with his confession bring “confusion in [his] spirit.”\(^\text{267}\) On the one hand, confession is an expression of what we actually do believe.\(^\text{268}\) But on the other hand words do seem
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capable of influencing man’s spirit in both a positive and a negative way. And—according to Kenyon, faith has taken its abode in the recreated human spirit.

Since God normally acts according to the believer’s faith, it surely would not be illegitimate to interpret Kenyon to say that our confessions might both destroy and stimulate faith. This conformity to law is not anchored in a spiritual-deistic world view, but in the believer’s (or at least in Kenyon’s) personal experience. Of course, Kenyon’s approach is strictly functional. In this sense he may argue that his confessions rule him. But in an ultimate sense he would be most willing to admit that God was the one who ruled his circumstances. But then again, it would be in response to Kenyon’s verbal confessions: “When we boldly make our confession that our diseases were laid on Jesus and we hold fast to that confession, we bring God [not spiritual laws] on the scene.” From a theological point of view, it should not be necessary to dismiss the sovereignty of God within Kenyon’s ideological system just because he embraced the belief that God had declared once and for all His unalterable will to always respond affirmatively to the believer’s prayer for e.g. physical healing. The motivation for Kenyon’s confession seems neither to be to move God nor spiritual laws, but to give positive direction to one’s faith, which, in turn, is already based upon the Word of the God who uttered them. The question of whether God really has guaranteed perfect health, however, is another issue which can be legitimately debated.

The God kind of faith?

Kenyon erroneously believed that the Scriptural passage of Mark 11:23 “Have faith in God” might just as well be correctly translated from the Greek
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saying, “Have the faith of God.” God is described as “a faith God”--not only in the sense that He imparts faith to the believer, but also in the sense that faith is operative in Him, as well. The very creation came about through God’s uttering the creative words, “Let there be.” As new creatures in Christ we consequently do not have faith exclusively because “it is a normal, natural thing for a child to have faith in his parent,” but it is also because “we have God’s faith reproduced in us by His living Word, by His nature that is imparted to us.”

Kenyon’s thought seems to be that as new creatures in Christ we have been made partakers of God’s faith nature. Just as God created ex-nihilo by means of faith-filled words, Kenyon assumes that Adam, the first human being, “ruled creation by his word. His voice was like the voice of the Creator in its dominion over creation.” The second Adam--Christ Himself, also lived in this dimension: “All his works were the result of His words.” As new creatures in Him we were created in the image of God’s love and faith. “Whether you recognize it or not,” Kenyon writes, “man’s entire life, from the time he becomes conscious as a babe, until he steps off into the unknown, is a faith life; one has faith in his senses, the other in God.”

One of the characteristics of this God kind of faith is the following: “If God says it is true, it is. If He says that ‘By His stripes I am healed,’ I am...So quietly I rest on His Word, irrespective of evidences that would satisfy the senses.”

Kenyon’s understanding of the God kind of faith has been refuted by Dr. James M. Kinnebrew, among others, who first of all, based upon Heb. 11:1 and 2 Cor. 5:7, claims that the antithesis of faith is sight. Next, he declares that “A person who can see all, as God surely can, would have neither a need for faith nor any way of exercising it.” In case God were “a faith God” in the sense that the universe was made by means of faith-filled declarations, the consequence, according to Dr. Kinnebrew, would be that “there is a
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power that transcends even God, for true biblical faith is always placed in someone perceived to be greater than oneself. In whom, or what, then, could God place His faith?283

Considering the fact that Kenyon described God not only as omnipotent, but also as omnipresent and omniscient,284 it would not be unnatural to interpret him to say that God’s faith declarations were based upon faith/confidence in Himself and in His own creative ability.285 There are no evidences of Kenyon necessarily understanding biblical faith to be placed in someone of higher precedence or with greater ability than oneself. Therefore Kenyon can say that God has faith in humanity, and that people will recognize the message of the cross and be reconciled to God.286 Besides, the fact that re-born man has been made a partaker of God’s faith nature, does not seem to imply any indwelling creative ability through faith as one’s direct instrument/means. “You never think of your Faith, you only think of the need and His ability to meet it.”287 Kenyon’s reference to creative faith today has to do with several women he had known who “had organs restored that surgeons had removed through operations.”288 It is a valid question, however, whether God—or faith itself—is what the faith is placed in in order for creative miracles to be manifested through Kenyon’s followers today. We will therefore continue with a discussion of this important concept.

The object of faith

Just as with his “God kind of faith” viewpoint, Kenyon’s understanding of faith has also been criticized for being man oriented. While biblical faith is centered in God, Kenyon not only talks about faith in the Word and in the Name (of Jesus), but even faith in faith.289 As far as faith in the Word of the Bible is concerned, Kenyon carefully points out that “these pages have no power to heal,” just “when they are translated into your life and become a part of you, you utter them with lips of joy and Satan’s power is broken and diseases are healed.”290 Why is it then that the Holy Spirit responds accord-
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ing to the Word being spoken “through our lips.” Kenyon claims that God has put Himself under obligation to every Word he has uttered in the same sense by which a man of integrity is said to be one with his words: “Not only is [God] back of it, but His throne is back of His Word...This is the thing that gives faith...the integrity of the Word.” Since faith in God’s Word is based upon God’s integrity, Kenyon can also say “Faith in the Father is Faith in His Word.” In other words, so-called “faith in the Word” is nothing more than faith in the One who uttered it. Instead of faith in the Word, Kenyon might just as well have said recognition of the truthfulness of the Bible, and most of his conservative critics would have agreed with him.

As far as Kenyon’s faith in the Name of Jesus is concerned, this teaching has been refuted by Dale Simmons, among others, because it purportedly reduces the Name to a “talisman on the order of abracadabra.” Also McConnell has raised objections to Kenyon’s alleged teachings that God would necessarily answer each and every prayer of the believer. However, despite Kenyon’s claiming that the Name represents both Jesus and His works, that “the measure of His ability is the measure of the value of that Name,” and “all that is invested in that Name belongs to us, for Jesus gave us the unqualified use of His Name,” this, in fact, does not mean that the Name automatically opens up the blessings of God. As a matter of fact, Kenyon mentions several restrictions to the value of the Name’s use:

- 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.
- We know that prayer cannot change God’s purpose, in any ordinary sense of the word. Prayer may accelerate God, or stir Him up to come to our rescue, or enlist His cooperation and sympathy and help in a time of need.
- No one can use the Name while out of Fellowship, it is vitally important that one keep in the fullest fellowship every moment.
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To summarize, just as faith in the Word was shown to be identical with faith in the One who uttered it, faith in the Name is synonymous for recognition of the truthfulness of what the Word teaches about that Name. The critique that Kenyon’s faith in the Name is based on something additional to Christ, must be refuted as a misrepresentation of Kenyon’s teachings. Moreover, Kenyon’s strong emphasis on the Word as God’s will for the believer, actually destroys the possibility that the Name of Jesus might be (mis)used as a formulae in order for the believer to get hold of blessings one is not confident that God wants for him.

Then what about faith in faith? How can Kenyon defend this concept without embracing the doctrine that faith accomplishes something of its own, that it becomes the very means whereby the desired result might be obtained? If faith gets the job done, who needs God’s intervention? How can we reconcile “faith in faith” with the fact that biblical faith is always directed toward God? And how are we to understand Kenyon’s claim that the Lordship of the Word of God over us will create “an unconscious faith in [our] own ability to trust Him”?

It is important to keep in mind that faith, although being a product of our recreated human spirit, is still a work of the Lord. 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. 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. Kenyon’s unusual emphasis is due to the illegitimate faith many congregations placed in other ministers’ faith. Kenyon himself received letters from all over the world where people asked for his prayers. In order to correct the illegitimate practice of placing our faith in other people’s faith instead of trusting God for ourselves, Kenyon argues that the Father has no favorites. He loves to recognize His promises to all of His children. If recognition of our God-given faith, on the other hand, or
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faith in faith, as Kenyon would say, is man-centered, what then about the illegitimate kind of faith which Kenyon attempted to correct? And to Kenyon’s defense, isn’t it the latter unfortunate tendency which has permeated most evangelical revival contexts with specific emphasis on divine healing? If Kenyon’s “man-centered” teaching on ‘faith in [my] faith’ has a New Thought flavor as has been argued by McConnell, what then about the evangelical ‘faith in [your] faith’ inclination, which is even more man-centered in the sense that it refutes one’s own ability to receive from God?

**Sickness and healing**

Kenyon’s understanding of sickness and healing has naturally much in common with his teachings on faith. One important aspect with Kenyon’s view of healing, which has also been under attack, is his understanding of the very nature of sickness. He has been identified with P. P. Quimby, who among many is considered the father of the New Thought movement and who claimed that all sickness is spiritual in origin. As many see it, Kenyon’s belief that all sickness is spiritual in essence, while the physical symptoms are only effects of this spiritual cause, seems to be one of the reasons why the physical death of Jesus could not deal with man’s deliverance from sickness.

But as has already been pointed out under Kenyon’s epistemology, his approach is pragmatic, not ontological. Hardly ever is it the essential nature of sickness which Kenyon is aiming at. Consequently, it may be argued that the following Kenyon quotations may be understood not from an ontological, but from a pragmatic point of view. Kenyon writes,

> We are praying for the sick daily. Every man who is sick physically, is sick in spirit; for the moment his spirit is healed, his body becomes well...You cannot heal bodies with words, but you can heal man’s spirit with words. You heal the spirit, then the spirit heals the body. (It is the Logos on your lips that heals the spirit of sick men and women. The Word of God is the healer.)

> We have found that man is a spirit being. God’s dealings with him are through his spirit. If he is sick, his spirit must be healed. If he is ruled by sin, his spirit must be cleansed. If his mind has not been renewed, the spirit does not have liberty and freedom, and cannot manifest Christ in his life.

In fact, these quotations say more about the relationship of the spirit to the soul rather than dealing with the ontological nature of sickness. We hardly
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get any further than establishing the fact that Kenyon believed sickness first attacked the spirit of man, and next his physical body. He also claimed that divine healing always starts from the inside out, touching the spirit before the physical body.

Kenyon has also admitted to learning that

the dominant forces in the universe are spiritual...We have never realized clearly that disease and sickness head up in our spirits. The mind is not cognizant of them until the body is affected and the senses have communicated the fact to the brain. Behind all this, however, that disease had fastened itself upon the spirit before it was communicated to the body...When we speak of cancer, it is a physical thing. But our diseases are all spiritual; and they were laid on Jesus. It may manifest itself in a physical act, but behind the physical act is the spirit that directed it.  

This last quotation also says little beyond what has been stated previously. That the diseases “are all spiritual” is not meant in an ontological sense. The idea Kenyon wants to pass on, is that evil spirits are behind our physical illnesses.

Kenyon further asserts that

healing cannot be permanent in my body until my spirit is adjusted to the Word. If sickness is not spiritual, He could not have made Christ’s spirit sick with my diseases, and if my body is filled with disease, it is because my spirit is not in harmony with the Word. I am rebelling against the sickness and fighting against the pain, but I don’t fight the cause of my sickness, I fight the effect of it...Sickness is threefold, Spiritual, Mental and Physical. All are sick in spirit before they are sick in body.

In this quotation sickness is depicted both as “spiritual” and as “threefold.” With regard to its “spiritual origin,” sickness like sin, is the result of the Fall. Kenyon probably wants to convey the idea that, despite its spiritual origin, as far as our daily experiences are concerned, sickness is “threefold.” We may be attacked spiritually, mentally, and physically.

If we would recognize this spiritual origin of sickness, including the fact that we have been legally redeemed from its yoke, Kenyon claims that we would be “in harmony with the Word.” Kenyon’s declaration that he does not fight against the cause of his sickness, gives us at least two possible interpretations: (1) He does not fight the origin of sickness in the Garden, since both sin and sickness’ coming into the world are already established facts that we can do nothing about. (2) If the actual sickness is a result of Kenyon’s spirit having been attacked (in some mysterious way), the solution is still to adjust
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his spirit to the Word, not take up the fight against the very cause. Be that as
it may, the context is pragmatic. Kenyon assures his readers that healing
will “be permanent in [his] body” if he chooses to adjust his spirit to the
Word. How to maintain your health is what Kenyon is preoccupied with, not
the ontological definition of sickness.

The fact that Kenyon did not view sickness as “spiritual” only, that it is non-
physical in an ontological sense and that physical “symptoms” are unreal,
can be shown in the following quotation:

This Spiritual Death, which has reigned in the human race, has been the soil out of
which has grown the reign of sin, disease and death over man. Sickness, disease and
death in man’s physical body are but manifestation of Spiritual Death within the
spirit. If man had never died spiritually, disease and sickness would never have had
a part in man’s physical body. When Satan became the god of this world, one of the
results of his reign was the peopling of the air with disease germs so that from then
to the present time disease microbes too small to be seen with the naked eye have
been the greatest enemies of man.313

The identification of sickness with physical “disease germs” clearly separ-
ates him from Quimby, who believed all sickness to be psychosomatic in
essence. Kenyon seemed primarily to say that sin and sickness were due to
spiritual death entering Adam--and through him mankind automatically: “In
conclusion, sin and disease are twins, born of Spiritual Death. They are both
the work of Satan. Sin is a disease of the spirit; sickness, as we see it, is a
disease of the physical body.”314

As already dealt with under epistemology, Kenyon has been criticized for
encouraging “sensory denial,” according to McConnell, because the physical
symptoms are not viewed as real; they are only effects of the cause of sick-
ness. 315

Once again, McConnell fails to understand that Kenyon’s usual approach is
not ontological, but functional. In fact, Kenyon uses the word “healing” in
three mutually exclusive manners. He may refer to: (1) the actual experi-
ence of being healed;316 (2) the legal truth that healing belongs to the be-
liever on the basis of the substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus,317 (3) a faith
statement where the motivation is not solely the judicial aspect (cf. 2), but

313 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 210.
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the promises in the Word that God answers prayer. This latter use of the term is exemplified by the quotation, “It may be that after he has been prayed for, he has witnessed no healing; yet he says, ‘I am healed, because the Word declares that in Christ’s Name they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover.’” What (2) and (3) have in common is that the actual healing (1) has not yet taken place, but that it is bound to do so because of the believer’s faith in the Word. As far as the believer is concerned, healing is as good as a fact, and the believer chooses not to let himself be affected by the fact that his pain has not left him.

Kenyon’s use of the term “symptom” is not supposed to be interpreted as a denial of the reality of one’s actual disease. Only as far as the believer’s actions and attitude toward his sickness is concerned, does the term “symptom” carry the idea that his sickness is not real. Legally speaking, the believer is already healed and God will see to it that the actual sickness will have to leave. 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.

Unfortunately, Kenyon’s emphasis on genuine faith’s being characterized 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. As far as Kenyon himself was concerned, it is important to point out, though, that he in theory required that the candidate for healing have a real operative faith:

Faith is not forcing one’s self to believe, for faith, as an apple, does not ripen of itself, but stays on the tree, knowledge, feeding on its food until it is mature, mellow, and life-giving. When knowledge is mature, faith comes naturally.

I will not ask any man to trust in Him until He gets acquainted with Him. 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.

In practice, however, Kenyon’s acting on the Word, irrespective of a threatening lymphoid malignancy from which he had suffered for awhile, proved disastrous and was, as we have seen, probably the cause of his passing away.
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in 1948. At least on this occasion even Kenyon himself reversed the concept and acted on presumption instead of faith.

**Free Will Baptists**

Just as the Great Awakening had led to a separatist formation among the Congregationalists where the latter made membership dependent upon one’s being capable of pointing to a conscious conversion experience, also the Baptists had a schism where the New Lights—as they were referred to due to their emphasis on the Spirit’s illumination of the believer—criticized the regular Baptist for not maintaining equally strict requirement for new members. Many were unwilling to submit to the Calvinistic 1742 Confession of the Philadelphia Baptist Association insisting that the Bible alone should serve as doctrinal guide.

In spite of certain Calvinistic overtones among the regular Baptists, many of the first American Baptists were in fact Arminian. The Free Will Baptist denomination was founded by Benjamin Randall in the 1780s. The churches gathered in Quarterly Meetings and one Yearly Meeting. The latter was organized in 1792 in order to “exercise a general supervision over the whole denomination.” In 1827 the General Conference of Free Will Baptists was “composed of delegates from the Yearly Meetings... established with authority to discipline Yearly Meetings and Associations, but not empowered to reverse or change the decisions of the churches, Quarterly or Yearly Meetings.”

Randall’s teachings on “free grace, free salvation, free will and free communion” have since been predominant among many of the “Northern Baptists,” and in 1911 the Free Will Baptists joined the Northern Baptist Con-
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vention. At the time the former had 51 associations consisting of 1,586 local churches.\footnote{328}

It is difficult to tell which impulses Kenyon might have received through his brief period among this Baptist group. At times he reveals a rather radical view on baptism—“one’s “burial with Christ” can hardly wait:

You must put on Christ in baptism at once. This is a command; you cannot act as you wish, you must act as you are commanded by the Word. If you disobey in regard to baptism, you will lose your fellowship with God and then it is just a question of days before you are back in sin again. Do not argue over it, do it. Do it at once, and have it done.\footnote{329}

We have already touched on Kenyon’s schism with the Free Will Baptists in chapter 1. In spite of it, Kenyon often had evangelistic meetings in their churches, and his teachings do not seem to have any sting against their denomination. Apart from those aspects of Kenyon’s teachings which have been the strongest promoted among members of the modern Faith movement\footnote{330} (such as the relationship between faith and confession, healing, the Name of Jesus, and the authority of the believer), Kenyon might still be characterized a Baptist. Two of the independent churches he founded, were Baptist in name—Figueroa Baptist Church in Los Angeles and New Covenant Baptist Church in Seattle. Ruth Kenyon Housworth refers to her deceased father as “an independent Baptist.”\footnote{331} Nonetheless, Kenyon makes few references to leading individuals among not only the Free Will Baptists, but also among Baptists in general. The few that do exist (at least according to Kenyon), say more of the contrasts than the similarities between Kenyon’s teachings and traditional Baptist thought:

About 25 years ago there was a tremendous battle, and they went at it by what we call the Modernists today against the Pauline teachings. I can give you an illustration of it. Quite a number of years ago I was in evangelistic work in northern Maine, and the State Secretary of the Baptist Association met me on the train one day. I had seen him in my audiences a few times. He was traveling continuously. He dropped down in the seat by my side, and he was the most suave and cultured gentleman you ever met, and he sat there a moment, and he said, “Brother Kenyon, I

\footnote{328}{ibid., 278.}
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\footnote{330}{Writes Kenyon: “The error that has divided the family or church into sects is the fact that we have lifted some family trait or family teaching into undue prominence and neglected other facts...You have noticed again and again that the people who are making a hobby out of any teaching,... become abnormal in their lives, and are too often unlovely in their homes and injurious in their influence...The time is going to come when every doctrine will be squared to this family teaching. It will be the death blow to fanaticism and worldly conformity” (“The Household,” \textit{Reality}, Sept.-Oct. 1914, 121-22).}
\footnote{331}{Ruth Kenyon Housworth, letter to author, Jan. 5, 1993.}
have been listening to you lately, and been reading your articles in your magazine.’ I said, Yes. He said, ‘You have a wonderful personality.’ I knew he was getting ready to swallow me, because he was not the kind of man that ever paid me a compliment. And then he said, ‘Mr. Kenyon, if you will give up your notions of the first three chapters of Genesis, and your Johanian [sic] theology, and your Pauline theology, I will open all of the large churches to you.’ I said, Doctor, if I should give up what I believe about Genesis and the gospel of John and Paul’s revelation, I would be as useless and powerless as you are.

The Christian Church and the Disciples of Christ

These two groups recruited followers from various church contexts. James O’Kelly had severed his ties with bishop Francis Asbury and the Methodist Episcopal Church as early as 1792. O’Kelly’s new group called themselves the Republican Methodist Church but decided shortly afterwards just to be referred to as “Christians.”

A similar movement occurred among the Baptists in New England. Abner Jones “became greatly disturbed in regard to sectarian names and human creeds.” He founded an independent Christian Church in 1800 and was soon supported by several ministers among both Regular and Free Will Baptists. They rapidly organized independent groups all over New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. A third group originated in a revival among the Presbyterians in Kentucky and Ohio. Five leading ministers were accused of holding to a theology inconsistent with the Westminster Confession. The five broke out and established the Springfield Presbytery. They not only “repudiated the Calvinistic Presbyterian Creed, but they insisted that the Bible alone is a sufficient standard of faith and practice, declaring man-made creeds to be useless and pernicious.” They later found that the whole Presbyterian organizational structure lacked Biblical support. The Springfield Presbytery was abandoned and they took the name “Christian” as the only suitable term for a gathering of believers. Independent churches were founded from 1804 with basis in believer’s baptism, and the Bible as their only doctrinal guide. Soon the three independent groups established contact with each other, and the resulting Christian Church as a denomination thus can be dated back to 1833. In 1931 they merged with the National Council of the Congregational Churches and
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took the name General Council of Congregational-Christian Churches. This new denomination joined the Evangelical and Reformed Church in 1957 and took the name United Church of Christ.337

Barton Stone was one of the leaders of the “Presbyterian” branch of the Christian Church. He made contact with Thomas and Alexander Campbell, who had broken loose first from the Presbyterians, and later from the Baptists, in order to found the Disciples of Christ denomination. Stone took many of the Christian Church people with him and joined Campbell’s movement in 1832. What all of these groups had in common was a mutual aim at restoring the Church according to the New Testament pattern in order for all believers to be one and the traditional denominations to cease.338

Kenyon’s ministry was very much ecumenical in spirit. As an evangelist he worked among Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Free Will Baptists, and Regular Baptists. Many of his converts spent several years at Bethel Bible Institute and often had periods of practical work in churches within their respective denominations. Bethel is referred to as “undenominational, but not antagonistic to any Christian Church or organization.”339 Kenyon considered his ministry as so-called interdenominational--he had a message for the whole body of Christ and did not want to be limited by formal creeds or by unwritten traditions: “Ask God to make you bigger than your creed and as broad as the great throbbing human need.”340 “These companies will...go out as an army...of conquest, unselfish, undenominational, Scriptural workers, with no ambition to build up a sect, but simply to bring dying men to Christ.”341 In theory he might not have viewed himself too far off from several of the groups which identified with the Christian Church; as already documented in chapter 1 Kenyon briefly pastored one Christian Church in Lynn, Massachusetts. Kenyon does not mention any leaders within any of these groups, though, and I have not been able to document any doctrinal dependency from any of them. Typical for both the Christian Church and the Disciples of Christ, in addition to their aim of reaching back to the original New Testament church structure, was to remove the denominational labels so that all born again believers might simply be referred to as “Christians.” Kenyon, however, not only formed independent congregations,
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but several of these had a Baptist label—e.g. Figueroa Baptist Church in Los Angeles and New Covenant Baptist Church in Seattle.

**Summary**

Although D. R. McConnell may have treated the historical evidence fairly, due to his lack of available material on Kenyon, I disagree with the author that his “findings will bear the scrutiny of historiographical analysis.”

While both Higher Life and New Thought “differed in their definitions of the nature of the individual’s power source, the methods employed in tapping into this power and the promised results of its exercise were strikingly similar.”

We have also touched upon the founder of Emerson College, C. W. Emerson’s interaction with Higher Life advocates. One must not forget young Kenyon’s opposing the faith of one of his fellow classmates, and having a greater influence on this unfortunate person than the college’s instructors such as Emerson himself and R. W. Trine. McConnell finds it “virtually impossible that he could have attended an institution without talking, exchanging ideas, and being influenced by somebody there.”

Kenyon’s return to the Lord by visiting in faith-cure leader A. J. Gordon’s church and consciously identifying with Higher Life leaders, seriously weaken McConnell’s thesis on the “Kenyon Connection.” Kenyon might just as well have derived his theology from Higher Life sources as from cultic ones. Even McConnell feels puzzled by the fact that

it was Kenyon’s later writings that demonstrate the most concern with the use of metaphysical cults. One would have thought that the Bethel writings would have since they were closer historically to his association with Emerson College.

Kenyon’s roots seem solidly planted in an “evangelical” tradition, namely mysticism, Brethrenism and Higher Life/faith-cure. McConnell’s tracing of Kenyon’s roots to New Thought must be rejected both on a historical and a theological basis.

After having discussed Kenyon’s background, it is natural to turn our attention to the next major phase of Kenyon’s ministry—Kenyon’s influence both on his contemporaries and on generations to come. To this issue the last two chapters are dedicated.
Kenyon’s historical and theological influence

Geographical influence

In spite of the fact that Kenyon’s ministry basically covered the East Coast up to 1923, and thereafter primarily California and the state of Washington, his actual influence covered a much wider area. Even as early as at the turn of this century he held evangelistic campaigns in the Chicago area, where he on one occasion refers to successful meetings in Quinn Chapel, the largest black Methodist congregation in Chicago.1 One of Kenyon’s co-workers, Simon Wigglund, was drawn to Bethel Bible Institute in Spencer, Massachusetts due to Kenyon’s preaching in William Gentry’s congregation in Chicago.2

Kenyon was also active in Pennsylvania3 and Tennessee,4 in addition to having contacts in Kentucky.5 The biographical chapter already touched upon Kenyon’s 10 weeks in Savannah, Georgia and Mayesville, South Carolina. According to the local press in Worcester several of Bethel’s Bible School students had been recruited from South Carolina.6

In 1904 the readers of Kenyon’s new magazine Reality were asked to give financial support to McKinley Institute, an educational institution for the black population in Meadville, Virginia. Kenyon’s connections with the institution had apparently been established previous to this, as the principal
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of McKinley, professor Caleb G. Robinson writes that *Reality* was being read every month by both students and instructors.\(^7\)

Kenyon’s influence was also felt in Charles Cullis’ Boydton Institute in Virginia. One of Kenyon’s closest co-workers John H. Hartman who had held the position as “Assistant Superintendent” and “Vice President,” left Bethel after 8 years when the Educational committee of the Board of the Christian and Missionary Alliance offered him the position as superintendent at Boydton on June 1, 1915.\(^8\) Four months later, one more of Bethel’s instructors, T. P. Fletcher left Bethel and joined Harman in Virginia.\(^9\)

A third co-worker of Kenyon, George Hunter, was hooked up with the East Washington and North Idaho Baptist Convention.\(^10\) He was immediately sent to a Baptist congregation in Lewiston, Idaho—“primarily to get the work adjusted and the conditions so that the church could call a permanent pastor.” After six months Hunter’s job seems to have been completed, and he took a pastorate in the Pilgrim Congregationalist Church of Lewiston. In 1910 he was offered the pastorate of C. I. Scofield’s First Congregational Church in Dallas, where the latter held the position of “pastor emeritus.”\(^11\) Hunter arrived in Dallas in May. After a month he was “placed on the Executive Committee of the Dallas County Sunday-school Association.” In October he participated in the distribution of thirty five to forty thousand tracts\(^12\) at the Texas State Fair, among these “many of our [Kenyon’s] tracts and papers.”\(^13\)

In addition to his own influence in the New England states, Illinois, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Idaho, Georgia, South Carolina, Texas and Washington, Kenyon’s former students and instructors were active in Michigan,\(^14\) Ohio,\(^15\) Oklahoma,\(^16\) New Jersey,\(^17\) Washington D.C.,\(^18\) and California.\(^19\)
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Kenyon’s first newsletter, *The Tabernacle Trumpet*, came out in October 1898, and after just seven months it circulated within “nearly every state in the Union.” The influence of the magazine probably was not reduced as Kenyon’s ministry kept growing.

Kenyon’s interests covered more than just the U.S. He seems familiar with the church’s condition in foreign nations and refers to revival both in Norway and Ireland. His missionary zeal is evident and his newsletters were filled with news from the various parts of the world. His interests in missionary work may have been aroused due to his contacts with former missionaries. One of his closest associates, John H. Hartman, had just returned from Barbadoes when we are first introduced to him in 1902. Another “good brother,” Frank Brown, had previously been to China, and was again sent out by the Christian and Missionary Alliance in October of that same year.

Brown maintained his contact which is reflected both in *Bethel Trumpet* and in *Reality*. There was also a certain connection to Jamaica through
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missionary J. R. Jamieson, whose son Reginald studied at Kenyon’s Bible School in Spencer.29

Even though Europe was not considered a missions field, Kenyon’s newsletter nonetheless circulated in Sweden as early as 1899. It was also known in the British colonies of Nova Scotia and British Columbia (now a part of Canada).30 When Kenyon died in 1948 his newsletter Herald of Life circulated in 57 foreign nations, among these Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland.31

Africa was also reached through Kenyon’s influence:

[Geo. C.] Marston, who is soon to go to the foreign field, spoke of the work in Africa to which God has called him. He is a cast-out from the Baptist Mission board because he believes the Bible; believes in Christ as His healer and that His second coming is imminent. Praise God for men of faith. He will represent the “Tabernacle” work in Africa.32

Marston was a graduate of Gordon’s Training School and went to Africa for the first time in 1903. After a year he returned to the U.S in order to obtain funds for his newly established school for eighteen children under his care. Not unprobably it was during this period that he was introduced to Kenyon’s ministry.33 At the latter’s death both his published books and newsletter circulated in various African countries. In fact, in Nigeria alone there were approximately 2000 individuals who took Kenyon’s “Correspondence Courses”34 and sent in their responses for corrections.35

Nonetheless, it was first of all Latin America which in a missionary context was close to Kenyon’s heart. For those considering a missionary career, Spanish language was one of the many options for the students at his Bible

29 “Jamaica,” Reality, March 1914, 71.
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34 The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption; Advanced Bible Course; Personal Evangelism Course.
35 Ruth Kenyon, “E. W. Kenyon Memorial Fund,” Herald of Life, June 1948, 1. Concerning Kenyon’s influence in Africa on an even later date, consider Don Gossett’s article “African Pastors Revolutionized,” Herald of Life, April-June 1974, 1: “Everywhere I went, working with the missionaries in my crusades, I found that the men had all been ministered unto by the books of Dr. E. W. Kenyon. . . . I discovered the books of E. W. Kenyon have been there for many years, ministering strength and blessing to these dedicated missionaries, national pastors and evangelists who are being effectively used of God.”
School in Spencer.\(^{36}\) Also “a Home Worker’s Society to propagate missionary work in Central America,” was quickly established with Kenyon elected as president.\(^{37}\) Some Latin American students remained up till 2 or 3 years at Bethel Bible Institute as a preparation for later ministry work in their home countries.\(^{38}\)

Having discussed Kenyon’s geographical influence, it is natural to continue with a narrowing in to focus on which segments of Christendom have been affected by and possibly also influenced by his teachings.

**The Pentecostal Movement**

We have already touched upon Kenyon’s historical and theological roots. Since this fraction in many ways was a part of the broader Higher Life movement--which in turn might be said to be the direct predecessor of the modern Pentecostal movement,\(^ {39}\) it is natural to ask to what an extent--if any--the latter movement might have received Kenyon and vice versa.

Kenyon seems to have had ambivalent feelings towards this new movement:

> Has the gift of tongues been restored to the church? This is the question that confronted the Editor several months ago. For years he has looked for it, felt that it would be before the Lord returns...Well! the gift is restored. I have seen it many times in the last two weeks, I have been in meetings where there were many who claimed it, and, in my presence, spoke in foreign tongues...Of course there is a wave of fanaticism following the real gift. I could feel it, it seemed, at times, tho I would not criticise, but these are times when discerning of spirits is needful...I welcome this gift and bless God for every new manifestation of Him I see. It will soon take its place, and the novelty will wear off; then the value will be seen; in the meantime, see if this gift is for you; if it is, seek it.\(^ {40}\)

**Early Pentecostals and the Finished Work of Christ**

One of the movement’s earlier leaders, William H. Durham (1873-1912) pastored the Chicago North Avenue Mission when the Pentecostal revival of

---

Los Angeles began in 1906. Durham visited the Azusa Street Mission and on March 2, 1907, he received the “baptism” with tongues following. When he returned to Chicago, he took the new revival with him.41 Durham had pastored the Baptist church in Chicago since 1901, and since Kenyon ministered frequently in this area even prior to this century, it is not unprobable that they had met prior to Durham’s experience of Pentecost. Just two months later Kenyon gives Durham the following recommendation vis-à-vis the following leaders of the movement:

Rev. Durham of Chicago seems to represent the highest and most scriptural type I have met so far, among the leaders.42

Even though a man like W. J. Seymour had prophesied over Durham that the Holy Spirit would “fall” on every place where Durham preached the Word, the latter would soon become controversial even among his own ranks as an exponent of the so-called “Finished work controversy.” With the British Keswick Movement and the Christian and Missionary Alliance in the U.S. as valid exceptions, the nineteenth century’s Holiness movement stated John Wesley’s view of sanctification as a proper experience separated from one’s conversion. Wesley’s understanding was also reflected among the early Pentecostal leaders as both Seymour and Parham’s former background were Holiness. These moderated their views, however, as they viewed their “Spirit baptism” with tongues following, not as “a third work of grace but as a gift of power upon the sanctified life.”

The schism was inevitable when Durham in 1910 verbalized his understanding of Christ’s redemptive act which covered not only forgiveness of sins, but also sanctification. The latter was no separate experience from regeneration, but rather a gradual process where the believer took advantage of the benefits that had been provided for by Christ’s substitution.43

The possibility that Durham really was influenced by Kenyon, which Dale Simmons claims, is highly probable: “Since Durham’s roots were also in the Baptist tradition, it was not difficult for him to accept Kenyon’s emphasis on the Finished Work of Christ as opposed to the Wesleyan second work of grace.”44 Be this as it may, Kenyon seemed happy for the new theological shift:

These brethren have always held to the Wesleyan second work of grace theory, but recently they have seen the Finished Work of Christ. It has revolutionized their ministry. The writer can’t tell how happy he is to see the new light that is breaking in upon them...We trust that they will go on, and not only accept these first principles, but come to understand the deeper nature of the sufferings of Christ, the teachings of the Blood Covenant, and a clear conception of the Family teaching of the Scriptures, giving the Father His rightful place.45

Kenyon’s interaction with Pentecostal leaders was in no way exclusively connected with Durham. During the trial against Maria Beulah Woodworth-Etter (1844-1924) in 1913 where she was “charged with obtaining money under false pretenses in connection with the “Holy Rollers” services at Montwait Campground,”46 also Kenyon was put on as a witness for the defense. He had “attended several of the meetings and had met upon the platform but had never sat in the chair provided for patients.”47

Another Pentecostal female preacher Kenyon knew, was Foursquare founder Aimee Elizabeth Semple McPherson (1890-1944). Together with her first husband, Robert James Semple, she lived a short period in Chicago where she was ordained by pastor Durham on January 2, 1909. For several months the couple traveled with Durham and held evangelistic meetings in the northern U.S. and Canada.48 Most probably Kenyon was introduced to the young evangelist during this time as his newsletter Reality included 2 pages containing her testimony of healing for an ankle.49 During 1923 she settled in Los Angeles and established Angelus Temple, which became the mother church of her International Church of the Foursquare Gospel.50 Her understanding of the four cardinal doctrines of “Foursquare,” all of which pointed to the ministry of Jesus as “Savior,” “Baptizer in the Holy Spirit,” “Physi-

---

46 “Many Testify to Faith Cures,” The Boston Globe, Aug. 28, 1913, 1.
47 “Defence Puts on Witnesses,” Framingham Daily Tribune, Aug. 27, 1913, 4. Etter’s background was among the United Brethren Church. Around 1880 she began to pray for the sick. Four years later she joined the Winebrennerian Churches of God, where she ministered for approximately 20 years. She had no unique theology and “picked up bits and pieces” from Finney, Simpson, and Boardman. During 1912 she held a 6 months campaign in F. F. Bosworth Dallas church. “It gave Woodworth-Etter a national platform as a Pentecostal heavyweight.” During 1918 she founded an independent local church in Indianapolis, today known as Lakeview Christian Center [In 1997 known as Lakeview Temple] (W. E. Warner, “Woodworth-Etter, Maria Beulah.” In: Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 900-901).
cian and Healer,” and “Coming King,” was ascribed to divine revelation. As already documented, Kenyon left the East Coast in 1923 and served as pastor of the Figueroa Baptist Church in Los Angeles from 1927 till 1931. According to his daughter Ruth he knew McPherson and “spoke for her many times in Angelus Temple.” Beyond this, no other material has been uncovered which confirm the opportunity of mutual influence.

F. F. Bosworth and positive confession

Other Pentecostal leaders Kenyon knew, include Finis Ewing Yoakum (1851-1920), John Graham Lake (1870-1935), and Fred Francis Bosworth (1877-1958). Both Lake and Bosworth had a background in Dowie’s Christian Catholic Church in Zion City. Through Charles Parham’s meetings in Zion City during 1906 Bosworth experienced his Pentecost. Bosworth founded an independent church in Dallas in 1910 which became “a center of great revival” due to Maria Woodworth-Etter’s 6 months campaign there 2 years later. Bosworth was active within the Assemblies of God from that time on.

51 Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., “International Church of the Foursquare Gospel.” In: Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 462. McPherson’s revelation is remarkably similar to A. B. Simpson’s original teachings concerning Christ as “Savior,” “Sanctifier,” “Physician and Healer,” and “Coming King” (Nienkirchen, A. B. Simpson and the Pentecostal Movement, 2).


53 The following quotation, though, suggests that the two must have known each other during a longer period. “I heard Mrs. McPherson today. I remember all of those bitter days when she was running away from the Lord, disobeying God, and then how God took her back. What a blessing he has made her to the world!” (E. W. Kenyon, “A Love-Slave for Jesus,” unpublished sermon in Bethel Temple, Dec. 30, 1926, 6).

54 “School Notes,” Reality, July-Oct. 1912, 167. Yoakum is characterized as both “faith healer” and “social reformer.” After a personal healing in 1895 he gave up “his lucrative career” as a doctor “vowing to spend the rest of his life serving the chronically ill, poor, destitute, and social outcasts.” He frequently ministered in Holiness circles and received Spirit baptism with tongues possibly as early as 1902. Although being positive towards the emerging Pentecostal movement, he did not identify with it. This led to warnings that he “was not really Pentecostal.” Yoakum’s ministry was at its height during 1911 and 1914. Many Pentecostal leaders published his articles in their own magazines, among these Carrie Judd Montgomery in Oakland (Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., “Yoakum, Finis Ewing.” In: Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 907-908).

55 Gordon Lindsay, God’s 20th Century Barnabas (Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, Inc., 1982), 75; John G. Lake, letter to Charles F. Parham, March 24, 1927. Lake lived for a period in John Alexander Dowie’s Zion City outside of Chicago and also served as an elder in the latter’s church. After receiving his Spirit baptism in 1907, he went to Africa as a missionary the following year. After 5 years he returned to the States and settled down in Spokane, Washington, where he founded an independent local church. Lake’s teachings emphasized divine healing of the body. In 1920 he moved to Portland, Oregon, in order to found another church. His vision to establish similar “healing institutions” all over the U.S. failed due to Lake’s failing health (James R. Zeigler, “Lake, John Graham.” In: Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, 531).
denomination’s very beginning in 1914, but nonetheless he joined the Christian and Missionary Alliance 4 years later as he believed tongues to be only “one of many possible indications that a person was baptized in the Holy Spirit.” Together with his brother “Bob” he held evangelistic campaigns with particular emphasis on divine healing all over U.S. and Canada. The last 6 years of his life he spent on the missions field in Africa.\textsuperscript{56}

Kenyon “drove through” Zion City in 1908,\textsuperscript{57} and at that time it is possible that Bosworth knew him (or vice versa). As previously documented, Kenyon ministered regularly in the Chicago area at the turn of this century. It would not be unprobable either that Bosworth might have been introduced to Kenyon’s writings after moving down to Dallas. After all, Kenyon’s former co-worker George Hunter settled down in the same city the same year in order to pastor First Congregation Church. As previously stated, several of Kenyon’s tracts and his newsletter were distributed in the area. In Bosworth’s classic, \textit{Christ the Healer}, he mentions the fact that “most of the thoughts in this sermon [‘Our Confession’] I have brought together, by permission, from the writings of Rev. E.W. Kenyon.”\textsuperscript{58} Bosworth’s reference to Kenyon first appeared in the 1948 edition, though, while the book was first published as early as 1924.\textsuperscript{59} No matter when Bosworth was introduced to the ministry of Kenyon, one thing is for sure: Kenyon’s understanding of the positive confession of the Word of God vis-à-vis the new creation’s rights and privileges was shared by Bosworth at least as late as 1948.\textsuperscript{60}

We have already touched upon Kenyon’s somewhat ambivalent feelings towards the gift of tongues. The late “Ern” Baxter claimed that Kenyon admitted to me that he had spoken in tongues, although his daughter strictly denies that he had. When I asked him why he had not continued in the use of tongues, he replied that to him tongues was becoming a crutch which violated his strong teaching on “faith in the Word.”\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{56} Richard M. Riss, “Bosworth, Fred Francis.” In: \textit{Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements}, 94.


\textsuperscript{59} Simmons, “The Postbellum Pursuit,” 316.

\textsuperscript{60} Consider also Bosworth’s contributions to Kenyon’s magazine \textit{Herald of Life} in January 1949 (p. 2), March 1949 (p. 4), Dec. 1951 (p. 2), and July 1964 (p. 1). These articles were first brought to my attention by Dale Simmons in his 1990 dissertation.

\textsuperscript{61} Baxter, letter to author, Sept. 28, 1992.
Baxter’s claim is confirmed by the fact that Kenyon applied for ordination through the Southern California District of the Assemblies of God. In his application Kenyon stated that he spoke in tongues and that his teachings were in accordance with those of the Assemblies of God denomination.62

In 1914 Kenyon wrote that the gift of tongues was the believer’s “legal right,” as long as God was honored and the church was built up through the use of the gift.63 On later occasions he referred to I Corinthians’ mention of tongues signifying “linguistic ability”64 and “the ability to master many languages.”65 Whether this departure from Pentecostal theology appeared prior to or as a result of the fact that Kenyon never did receive ordination among the Assemblies of God, is hard to say. Notwithstanding, when Kenyon later referred to tongues in the traditional “Pentecostal sense,” he took his point of departure in I Corinthians 12:30 and categorically denied the gift’s universal availability as far as the believer is concerned.66

Kenyon not only critiqued the Pentecostals’ overemphasis on the gift of tongues, their very doctrines were inconsistent with his own emphasis on the Finished Work of Christ which objectively speaking covered anything the believer might have need of in this life. The Pentecostals’ erroneous belief that the disciples were “baptized in the Spirit” in the Upper Room in Jerusalem, was due to the fact that they had failed to understand that nobody could be reborn prior to the Day of Pentecost.67 By considering the disciples as born again prior to their Pentecostal experience, it might be logical (but not Scriptural!) to interpret the spiritual impartation as a new experience separate from their being regenerated. However, Kenyon interpreted John the

62 A copy of Kenyon’s application for ordination might be secured through the Assemblies of God Archives in Springfield, Missouri. It is my personal view that Kenyon’s application was turned down due to negative references to him in Assemblies of God evangelist May Eleanore Frey’s letter to Assemblies of God General Chairman John William Welch, dated Jan 31, 1925. In addition to accusing him of personal contacts with Ku Klux Klan, she was “of one thing positive”, that he – in spite of his testimony to the opposite, had not “received the Baptism of the Spirit.”


64 Kenyon, Hidden Man., 54.

65 Kenyon, New Kind of Love., 96.

66 Kenyon, Bible in the Light., 262. Kenyon’s pastoral years in Los Angeles provided the opportunity to observe the movement closely. “They may be able to speak in tongues or to perform miracles but it is not of God. To one who really knows God, there comes a shrinking, a withdrawing from it. Los Angeles has much of this. Much of it is under the guise of Christianity. In the first type you see much of autosuggestion; much of pure imitation. This oft-times becomes contagious. The whole congregation will twitch and jump when the leader speaks certain sentences. This may be demoniacal or it may be purely psychic” (E. W. Kenyon, “Whose Spirit Have You?” The Living Message, April 1929, 11).

67 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 257.
Baptist’s claim that Jesus was to “baptize in the Holy Spirit” as synonymous to being born again. John was actually comparing his own baptism where the baptismal candidate’s physical body was immersed in water with the “spirit baptism” of Jesus where He would “immerse the spirit [of man] with the Holy Spirit and out of that immersion shall come the New Birth, and man shall begin a new life.”

Notwithstanding, Kenyon still teaches a filling with the Spirit as an experience separate from spirit baptism/regeneration. This may seem to conflict with his emphasis on the Finished Work. Possibly Kenyon would counterrespond by claiming that being filled with the Holy Spirit does not cause any change of essence in man’s inner nature. Any Christian--regardless of whether he/she has “received the Spirit”--has been made a partaker of divine nature and is in a forensic sense heir to all the blessings which Christ has provided for all believers.

The purpose for being filled with the Spirit is at least twofold. One aspect of the Spirit’s ministry is to unveil the glorious Christ at the Father’s right hand: “He has revealed to us all of Christ’s ministry that could not be disclosed to the senses of man.” In other words, this is the “Pauline revelation” as expressed through Kenyon’s teachings on “who we are” and “what we have in Christ.” Another purpose for being filled with the Spirit is that unless we are filled with the Spirit and have surrendered to His Lordship, He cannot operate freely through us.

How do we receive the Spirit? Also on this issue Kenyon departs from traditional Pentecostal belief. The Spirit is received by faith--and faith alone. Faith is acting on God’s Word irrespective of “physical evidences.” After having prayed for the Spirit to come in and fill us, we act on the Word by thanking the Father for the answer. Thereafter God acts in accordance with our prayer. With reference to the Pentecostals Kenyon states that “nowhere are we taught to look upon tongues as the evidence of the fact that the Holy Spirit has filled us.” Some receive the gift of tongues through their being filled with the Spirit, and others do not. Our only “evidence” is the Word

---

69 Kenyon, *Bible in the Light*, 271.
70 Ibid., 269.
71 Kenyon, *Personal Evangelism Course*, lesson 22, 3-4.
which says, “How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?” Kenyon continues:

Not only does the scripture fail to teach that tongues is the evidence of the filling of the Holy Spirit, but to make tongues the evidence of the Holy Spirit’s filling would be contrary to God’s dealing with the New Creation. The speaking in tongues is a physical manifestation, an evidence to the senses of man. God has nowhere put a premium upon sense evidence, or ever permitted us to trust it. He is a faith God, and everything we receive from Him we receive on the grounds of faith.

According to Kenyon’s epistemology we do not base our faith in sense knowledge, but in God’s Word. Just as the latter generation of faith-cure ministers also many of the Pentecostal leaders would consent to Kenyon’s epistemology with regard to divine healing. It is natural to understand the Kenyon quotation above as a critique of the Pentecostal leader’s inconsistency: how could they receive healing by faith (irrespective of sense evidence) and at the same time claim a sense evidence (tongues) prior to being able to believe that somebody had received the filling of the Holy Spirit?

Pentecostals and authority in the name of Jesus

Pentecostals upholding the Oneness teaching are part of a movement sometimes referred to as “Apostolic” or “Jesus Only.” Back in 1913 Pentecostal minister R. E. McAlister verbalized his dissatisfaction with the Trinitarian baptismal formulae vis-à-vis the early Christians’ baptism in the name of Jesus solely. McAlister’s faith found favor with Frank J. Ewart, and through him it was accepted among several ministers within the Assemblies of God. Three years later the schism was inevitable and the new Pentecostal group was a fact. The Oneness Pentecostals deny the Trinity. Jesus is identified with the Father while the Spirit is held to be the power of God.

Ewart has been described as the movement’s “creative mind who blended beliefs which were flowing in the evangelical air with some of his own.” David Reed, who wrote his theological dissertation on the Oneness Pentecostals in America, does not seem to be in doubt that Kenyon was “widely read” among them, although Reed in his dissertation “did not make any direct link between the two.” Kenyon’s contribution had particularly to do

---

73 Kenyon, *Personal Evangelism Course,* lesson 22, 4.
74 Melton, *Encyclopedia,* 45.
75 Dr. David Reed, letter to author, June 9, 1993.
with his book *The Wonderful Name of Jesus* (1927). Nevertheless, in Ewart’s book *The Name and the Book* (1936) only one reference to Kenyon’s book is found. Reed bases his belief concerning Kenyon’s influence in part on Kenyon’s general influence with regard to “the power and the use of the name of Jesus” and—in part on the fact that Reed’s own mother, who was active within Oneness Pentecostalism, “subscribed to ... Kenyon’s radio ‘Correspondence Courses’.”

We have up till now considered Kenyon’s interaction with and influence on several leading Pentecostal ministers. Doctrinally this has basically to do with “The Finished Work” (Durham), the relationship between faith and confession (Bosworth), and the authority in the name of Jesus (Oneness Pentecostalism). It seems, however, as if there has been a one-way influence. Both Kenyon and the Pentecostal movement have their historical and theological roots within Higher Life/Faith-cure. The main difference between Kenyon and traditional Pentecostal theology is found in their respective teachings on Spirit baptism/the gift of tongues—and as far as many Pentecostal denominations are concerned—in Kenyon’s rejection of the Wesleyan understanding of “entire sanctification.”

---


78 David Reed, letter to author, June 9, 1993.

79 It may seem as if Kenyon interpreted his own ministry as the genuine continuation of the work of God that was initiated through the Higher Life movement: “He [Samuel Dickey Gordon (1859-1936)] represents that rare but vanishing class of spiritually minded men of the last generation. We haven’t any in this generation. Since the war [WWI], there has not arisen a new spiritual force, as far as we know in the church...Hardly any of those, deeply spiritual before the war, maintained their spiritual life through the war. Something happened to them...Men with that rare spiritual genius of Myers [F. B. Meyer?], and the Morgan [G. Campbell Morgan?] we used to know, Andrew Murray, Webb Peplow, and A. J. Gordon, they all belong to the other generation. They belong to that era of spiritual grace that focalized under Mr. Moody’s matchless ministry...The hunger is in the lay hearts as much as ever, but the leadership is gone. We are waiting, almost feverishly waiting for another voice [Kenyon?] to come out of the darkness and the confusion of this age of self worship. It only requires one man, but we cry “How long Oh Lord, before our Moses will come?” There must be a new message—a new emphasis placed where it has never been placed before [on the Father and His Family]” (E. W. Kenyon, “S. D. Gordon: A Tribute,” unpublished manuscript). “I have many letters asking me to head a new denomination, and saying, ‘We will all come with you.’ I recognized there was one Lord but I could not tell them. They would not understand it. I would say, ‘It is not time yet.’” (E. W. Kenyon, “The Lordship of Christ,” unpublished sermon, Dec. 30, 1926).
The Post-World War II Healing Movement, 1947-58

During the 1940s many of the next generation’s successors to Charles Cullis’ Faith-cure movement passed away:

I could not contain my grief. The faith heroes which had just passed away, began to pass through my mind as a panorama. I thought of Wigglesworth, McPherson, Pearlman, Gipsy Smith, Kenyon, Price, Dowie and others. Oh, it broke my heart...

The crowds are still sick and suffering. Whom are they now to go to in order to receive help? Who is now supposed to shake our cities and fill our large auditoriums with the magnetic power of God? 80

A new generation of faith healers were on its way, however. If Granville Oral Roberts and William Marrion Branham were the most prominent ones as the movement’s “two giants,” 81 it was still thanks to Gordon Lindsay’s Voice of Healing association that the movement gained a sense of organization and uniformity:

Lindsay was more than an advisor during the first decade of the healing revival; he was much like the director of an unruly orchestra. He tried desperately to control the proliferation of ministries in an effort to keep the revival respectable...Many of the evangelists came to resent the coercive power he exercised...By 1958, many of the revivalists believed that Lindsay’s work was over. Some told him directly that he should retire. 82

That the healing evangelists would have both historical and theological roots in the previous generation’s exponents of divine healing, is natural, but what was actually the role of Kenyon’s literature in this time frame?

“Ern” Baxter stated that Kenyon was “seldom footnoted, but widely quoted.” 83 According to the well-known charismatic leader Joseph D. Mattsson-Bozé, Kenyon exercised “a considerable influence” over many of the healing evangelists, “though not very well known himself.” 84 The two quotations above are confirmed by Gordon Lindsay, who wrote that Kenyon because of his “effort to get the faith message over, ... almost left out repentance.” Although Kenyon “like all geniuses ... was apt to overemphasize, to get a forgotten truth across,” Lindsay does not hesitate to recommend his

82 Ibid., 57-58.
83 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 28.
84 Ibid. Ironically, I found four articles by Kenyon in Mattsson-Bozé’s own magazine Herald of Faith, although permission from the Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society had not been granted: “This is Your Ministry” (June 1967, 27); “Count It Done” (June 1968, 6); “No One Need Be a Failure” (June 1968, 23); “Giving is the Basis of Receiving” (Oct. 1968, 13, 16).
teaching qualities: “His writings place a peculiar emphasis on faith, which many people [in the healing revival?] have found to be greatly helpful....His writings have great merit.”

It has also been stated--with no documentation, though--that Branham was influenced by Kenyon. The conjecture is not totally unreasonable. Although Branham’s background was Baptist, his healing ministry began in the United Pentecostal Church. We have already touched upon Dr. Reed’s belief concerning Kenyon’s influence with regard to the authority in the Name of Jesus. Nevertheless, Branham has been characterized

a relatively illiterate man, and so had not read widely...His abilities were in the realm of natural and intuitive abilities. I questioned him about many people. He didn’t know Dr. Charles Price, who had had quite a healing ministry back in the 1920’s-30’s, or any others whom I mentioned.

Branham’s interaction with such men as “Ern” Baxter and F. F. Bosworth, who in 1952 followed him “on a circuit of great revivals throughout Africa,” theoretically speaking, could have been a potential occasion for introducing him to the Kenyon literature.

Another individual influenced by Kenyon was Thomas (“Tommy”) Lee Osborn (1923- ), who began his ministry career at the age of 15. After a “discouraging year in India as a missionary” in 1945, Osborn returned to the U.S. sick and disappointed. In 1947 he again resumed the pastoral responsibilities for Montaville Tabernacle in Portland, Oregon, which he had founded around 1943. This same year he attended a William Branham meeting, which eventually led to Osborn and his wife regularly praying for the sick. Unlike many of the American exponents of divine healing Osborn has primarily ministered outside of the U.S.

---

85 Lindsay, God’s 20th Century Barnabas, 75. See also Lindsay’s reference to Kenyon and quotations from the latter’s The Wonderful Name of Jesus in Lindsay’s work Triumphant Christian Living, Reprint (Dallas, TX: Christ for the Nations, 1979), 18-20.
87 Harrell, All Things Are Possible, 32.
90 Bosworth had been a loyal supporter of Branham since January 1948 (Harrell, All Things Are Possible, 34. Consider the fact that Bosworth had articles published in Kenyon’s Herald of Life in January 1949, March 1949, December 1951, and July 1964. These articles were first brought to my attention through reading Dale Simmons’ 1990 dissertation on Kenyon.
Osborn was first introduced to Kenyon’s literature in 1944 when some of the church members gave him a copy of the booklet *The Two Kinds of Faith*. The minibook appealed to him, and Osborn soon got hold of Kenyon’s additional literature. But even though these may have established “the foundation in the Word of God,” it was still Branham who “gave a most awesome demonstration of the Word in action.” Osborn’s preaching was very much indebted to Kenyon. Oftentimes he did not preach in a traditional sense, but read chapter from chapter aloud from Kenyon’s many books. Even today, Osborn’s admiration for Kenyon is intact:

...this remarkable man, whose writings are unequaled by anyone else since Bible days. I still consider that Dr. Kenyon’s writings surpass, by far, anything that anyone else has been able to do. I have observed that many have tried to imitate his style, but it seems that God placed an anointing upon Dr. Kenyon to set forth truth in written form, that no one else in post-Bible days has been able to match.

Finally we need to mention Kenneth Erwin Hagin (1917–), first of all known as founder of the modern Faith movement. After a personal healing at the age of 17 he soon became involved in ministerial work. During 1936-38 he had pastoral responsibilities “in a little community church in Roland, Texas ... which consisted of members from various denominations, but predominantly the membership was Baptist.” During 1937 he was “licensed to preach with the Assemblies of God,” where he later pastored churches in Tom Bean, Farmersville, Talcott, Greggton and Van—all within the state of Texas—up till 1949. Thereafter followed a long period with evangelistic...
campaigns throughout U.S.. In 1966 he moved to Tulsa where Rhema Bible Training Center was established 8 years later. Several influential charismatic leaders praise Hagin as their “spiritual mentor,” among these prominent individuals such as John Osteen, Kenneth Copeland, Jerry Savelle, Charles Capps, Norvel Hayes and Frederick K. C. Price.99

Hagin claims to have been introduced to Kenyon’s literature for the first time in 1950 through fellow minister C. U. McMullen, who stated, “You preach faith just like Kenyon.”100 It has later been documented that the similarities to Kenyon are not exclusively connected with their respective teachings on faith. According to D. R. McConnell “the majority of [Hagin’s] teachings” are plagiarized from Kenyon’s many books.101 By comparing Hagin’s books and articles in his magazine The Word of Faith with Kenyon’s literature, more than 60 pages have been found to be identical, but with no reference to Kenyon as the original source.102 Hagin does admit, however, that due to his “prodigious memory, he could have quoted others verbatim and that transcriptions may have been produced without the usual credit being given to those who were quoted.”103 Unfortunately Hagin’s alleged “prodigious memory” seems completely incapable of retaining insight into original sources. In one of his publications Hagin quotes from a book he read in 1949: “It seems that God is limited by our prayer life, that He can do nothing for humanity unless someone asks Him to do it.”104 This quotation is taken from Kenyon’s book The Two Kinds of Faith,105 one year prior to

99 Kenneth Hagin, Jr., “Trend Toward Faith Movement,” Charisma, Aug. 1985, 67. See also Jerry Savelle’s 3 months of preparation for full time ministry: “For three months, I locked myself up with tapes and books by Kenneth Copeland, Kenneth Hagin, and E. W. Kenyon. They introduced me to the Word of God. Before that time, I hadn’t known anything about it. Then the Spirit of God took what these men had introduced to me and expounded upon it” (Sharing Jesus Effectively: A Handbook on Successful Soul-Winning [Tulsa, OK: Harrison House, 1982, 14]).


101 McConnell, A Different Gospel, 13.

102 Leon Stump, Metaphysical Elements in the Faith Movement, 79-114. Exclusively in his book The Name of Jesus does Hagin give credit to Kenyon for the latter’s The Wonderful Name of Jesus.


105 Kenyon, Two Kinds of Faith, 83.
Hagin’s allegedly being introduced to the latter’s writings through fellow minister McMullen.\textsuperscript{106}

Ex-faith pastor Leon Stump of Joplin, Missouri, rightfully claims that Hagin’s plagiarism of Kenyon is “conscious and deliberate,” and not due to, (1) the common inspiration of the Spirit of God, (2) his (claimed) “photographical memory,” or (3) a failure by those who edited his tapes to give proper credit to those he [erroneously] claims he credited on tape.\textsuperscript{107}

Stump has documented Hagin’s conscious plagiarism of Kenyon through Hagin’s radio tapes, on which Stump shows

\begin{quote}

beyond dispute that [Hagin] reads Kenyon’s books (apart from the existing plagiarisms in his own books which he reads) without ever acknowledging he is doing so in the least. This is also plagiarism. Hagin reads whole chapters from Kenyon, sometimes after first reading parts of his own books.\textsuperscript{108}

\end{quote}

By going over Hagin’s radio broadcasts,\textsuperscript{109} one has to agree with Stump that “Hagin takes pain to conceal the fact that he is reading from other’s materials.” One example is from June 30 1989 where Hagin begins his broadcast reading from his own book \textit{The Key to Scriptural Healing}. Without giving proper credit, he suddenly starts reading from Kenyon’s \textit{Jesus the Healer}, pp. 43-46 and you can actually hear him turn p. 45 in Kenyon’s book: “He

\textsuperscript{106} “It is likely that Hagin,...was first influenced by Kenyon indirectly. He said that, even though their doctrine was quite similar, he had never heard of the pioneer teacher until 1950. He did know Bosworth and Osborn, however; and it is feasible that Kenyon’s doctrine of confession filtered down to Hagin through one of these or through some other evangelist who had felt Kenyon’s influence...It would seem highly unlikely that a healing evangelist such as Hagin would not have been introduced to [Bosworth’s Christ the Healer] by so late a date as 1950. Had he read it, though, he could hardly have missed its author’s forthright mention of Kenyon” (Kinnebrew, “The Charismatic Doctrine of Positive Confession,” 133).

\textsuperscript{107} Stump, “My Case Concerning Hagin in Brief,” unpublished paper.

\textsuperscript{108} Stump, ibid.

\textsuperscript{109} Available through Stump.
closes his broadcast with, ‘I’d like to remind you that we, uh, have taught this week from chapter #2 in my book, The Key to Scriptural Healing...’\textsuperscript{110}

Summary

Kenyon’s actual influence on his contemporaries and his spiritual “stepchildren” seems more than apparent. Both directly through his various newsletters and indirectly through former Bible School students and instructors his message was soon spread all over the U.S. and Canada. Due to Kenyon’s missionary interests and thereby interaction with missionaries, his literature rapidly found its way to Asia, Africa and Latin America around the turn of this century. When Kenyon passed away in 1948-- and most likely earlier-- Europe and Australia were also “reached.”

In like manner we have also touched upon Kenyon’s interaction with several well-known Pentecostal leaders. Many of these were obviously influenced by some of his teachings. The next generation of healing evangelists (1947-58) apparently also benefited from Kenyon’s writings, whether they openly admitted it or not. Instead of exploring theological similarities and divergencies between Kenyon and his later “disciples” we will in the last chapter turn our attention to another issue: Kenyon’s possible influence in Europe/Scandinavia.

\textsuperscript{110} Stump, “Hagin’s Radio Plagiarism,” unpublished paper, 3. Further examples--all taken from Stump’s paper: During Dec. 19-23, 1988, Hagin reads, 96-105, 121-25 and 140-45 from Kenyon’s The Father and His Family (1964 edition). Highlights: Dec 21--Reading Isaiah 42:6, Hagin says, “You remember, in Isaiah the forty second chapter and the sika-sik, sixth verse, I believe it is, sixth verse, yeah, sixth verse, uh, God said...” Dec 23--Hagin says, “I like something that E. Stanley Jones said, and I want to read it to you...” After reading, from Kenyon’s book still, he says, “Well, I like that. I read that from, uh, the writings of E. Stanley Jones...” Dec 22--Kenyon writes, “...there is always a double prophecy, one we might call the bass in the great oratorio of Redemption...” Hagin reads, “...one we might call uh, the bass [as in fish] and the other the tenor, or whatever, uh, in other words, one is...of redemption...” March 3, 1989--(reading from Identification, 8) Kenyon writes, “In the fact of Identification we have one of the richest phases of Redemption.” Hagin gets it turned around: “In fact, let me put it this way, the fact of redemption is one of the richest phases of our identification, is one of the richest phases...of redemption; or in other words, or identification is one of the richest phases of redemption.” March 20--Kenyon writes (What Happened, p. 43) “there was not one member of the high priestly family living; neither could they find a member of the Davidic family.” Hagin has problems with this word: “neither could they find a member of the...Dav...David...uhuh...Davidic family.” June 21--Hagin personalizes and makes Kenyon’s conversation on, 78 of Jesus the Healer his own. October 25, 1990--from Kenyon’s 1964 edition of The Father and His Family. Hagin “stumbles over the word “miasma”...”--That was a sad day for the human when Satan became Emperor of the Universe and let loose that hideous uh-uh-h mismaya of hell and spiritual death.”
Kenyon’s influence in Scandinavia

In the preceding chapter we dealt with Kenyon’s influence on the American Post-World War II Healing Movement. Now the question is raised concerning the exponents for this healing revival. To what extent have they impacted our own Scandinavia, and to what extent—if any—has Kenyon’s influence been felt?

Influence via Kenneth E. Hagin and the modern Faith movement

In spite of the fact that “Hagin’s influence in Scandinavia [can] be dated to the beginning of the 1970s,” certain people preached his message even prior to that, including ex-Methodist pastor Leif Jacobsen from 1968 (when he studied theology in Sweden)—the very same year Hagin’s newsletter The Word of Faith appeared—and Mr. Sten Nilsson from 1968-69. Still it was not until the beginning of the 1980s that the modern Faith movement made any real impact in Norway and Sweden. Nilsson had introduced American Faith teaching to his young son-in-law Mr. Ulf Ekman, and during spring-time 1980 the latter left for Tulsa in order to visit Hagin’s Rhema Bible Training Center and Oral Roberts University. During August 1981 Nilsson arranged the first faith conference for pastors and spiritual leaders with “Jim” [Julius] Kaseman and Sam Whaley as main speakers. Together with Christopher Alam, Jan Wallander, and Jan Rosman among others, Ulf Ek-

2 Jacobsen, telephone interview, Nov. 3, 1992. Jacobsen was introduced to Hagin’s Word of Faith and Kenyon’s literature through an American Assemblies of God missionary to Sweden. This former missionary wishes to remain anonymous.
5 Torbjörn Aronsson, Guds eld över Sverige (Uppsala: Trons Värld Ordbild, 1992), 208-209.
6 Nilsson, Ledd av Guds hand, 282-83
man attended Hagin’s Bible School during 1981-82. He returned to Sweden after one year and soon found himself teaching at the Bible School of Södermalmstjärkan. In May 1983, the church Livets Ord was established, and in August of that same year the Bible School Livets Ord Bibelcenter was also a fact. The school was from the very beginning Sweden’s largest Bible school having approximately 200 students. The church’s publishing house outdid by far other Christian publishing houses as far as published book titles are concerned. In addition they sold around 500,000 teaching tapes during a period of 5 years.\footnote{Aronsson, \textit{Guds eld}, 219-21.}

Of the well-known Norwegian ministers, Åge Åleskjær was the first who attended Hagin’s Rhema Bible Training Center (1984-85). Prior to this he had been instrumental in founding a charismatic fellowship which had public services at Furuset (Oslo). After Åleskjær returned to Norway in 1985, it did not take long until the fellowship was turned into a local church\footnote{Based on a misunderstanding of Watchman Nee’s ecclesiology, Norwegian non-Lutheran charismatic ministers were opposed to founding independent churches prior to Åleskjær’s return. Contrary to Watchman Nee’s practice, they encouraged their followers to remain within the established denominations.} and Oslo Kristne Senter was soon Norway’s fastest growing congregation. The church has now more than 2,000 members, is the second largest congregation in this country, and seems to have had a particular mission as far as the founding of additional Faith churches in Norway is concerned.\footnote{Jacobsen and Tveit, “Trosmenighetene,” unpublished manuscript, 10.}

Long before Sten Nilsson had even heard about Hagin--back in 1961--he returned from the States with two Kenyon books he had received through a female staff worker of Frank Laubach.\footnote{Nilsson, letter to author, undated, but received July 1, 1993.} The books were untouched, however, for almost 10 years, until the name of Kenyon again came up as Nilsson’s daughter Birgitta (wife of Ulf Ekman) had come across a third book by Kenyon. Nilsson had the dust removed from the two minibooks \textit{The Wonderful Name of Jesus} and \textit{Jesus the Healer} and immediately understood that he really had missed out by not having paid attention to the books.\footnote{Nilsson, \textit{Ledd av Guds hand}, 267.} In 1972 he visited Kenyon’s printshop outside of Seattle and spoke with daughter Ruth Kenyon Housworth. Nilsson bought a complete set of Kenyon books which he began to distribute to those who showed interest. Next \textit{The Blood Covenant} was brought to his attention\footnote{Nilsson, letter to author, June 16, 1993.} and it basically turned his life upside down. “The red thread” in God’s Word which Nilsson had been searching

---

\footnote{Aronsson, \textit{Guds eld}, 219-21.}
for many years, finally was found. Theo Wolmaran’s *Blood Covenant*\(^\text{13}\) and Richard Booker’s *The Miracle of the Scarlet Thread*\(^\text{14}\) were also helpful. All three books are based on the old editor of the Sunday School Times, Dr. Henry Clay Trumbull’s book *The Blood Covenant*, first published in 1885. Also Nilsson had a book published on this same topic, *Blodsförbundet. Bibelns röda tråd*, which appeared in 1985 and was based on the four above mentioned titles.

It would hardly be an exaggeration to declare Nilsson as the one responsible for the Kenyon renaissance which to a certain degree has been felt in Scandinavian Faith circles. In addition to distributing Kenyon’s literature, he also arranged the first meetings in Scandinavia with American Faith ministers. This in turn led to the fact that both Swedes and Norwegians, who later found themselves in Tulsa attending Rhema, became more or less familiarized with Kenyon’s teachings. The Kenyon awareness which has been witnessed the last couple of years might at least indirectly speaking be attributed to Ekman’s father-in-law, Sten Nilsson.

*Influence through T. L. Osborn*

Norway’s situation is interesting in the sense that there were attempts to spread the Kenyon message even prior to the introduction of the Faith movement. Around 1960-61, after one year of evangelistic work, probably due to physical overwork, a youngster called Aril Edvardsen became seriously ill. His biblical understanding told him that God wanted to intervene with healing, but his sickness seemed to grow even worse. While in this situation he got hold of T. L. Osborn’s book *Healing the Sick*, which encouraged the readers to believe that healing was already provided for through Jesus’ substitution. Writes Edvardsen,

> Then the struggle of faith began. The symptoms were raging and told me that the sickness was growing worse...When I finally managed to base my faith on God’s Word alone, and no symptoms were capable of shattering my faith, victory was mine.\(^\text{15}\)

Edvardsen heard about the American healing revival and was able to obtain the newsletters of some of the most prominent evangelists. He also edited his own *Troens Bevis* (Evidence of Faith), which to a large extent became a

\(^\text{13}\) (Dallas, TX: Word of Faith Publishing, 1984).


channel for the American evangelists. Particularly in his own series “Mirakelvekkelsen” (The Revival of Miracles) his readers became familiarized with the most well-known evangelists and their respective ministries.  

During 1963 Edvardsen’s translated and published Osborn’s *Healing the Sick* at his private publishing house. The book not only refers to Kenyon, but quotes whole chapters from several of his books. Osborn himself had been introduced to Kenyon’s literature as early as 1944 and claims to have “a personal letter in file from Dr. Kenyon with his total permission to use anything he has.” Osborn believes parts of this letter were quoted in the earliest editions of his book—prior to the massive criticism of Kenyon’s teachings came to the surface.

A former student at Edvardsen’s Bible school in Sarons Dal (Valley of Sharon), Tom Aril Fjeld, was one of many whose interest in the unknown Kenyon was awakened through Edvardsen’s translation and who consequently obtained Kenyon’s own books. To the degree we can talk about correspondence between American Faith teaching and the message that was being preached by the more prominent representatives of the Post-World War II Healing Revival, Edvardsen’s contribution can hardly be ignored as far as introduction to Norwegian Faith teaching is concerned. Besides, Ed-

---

16 For instance David Nunn (May 1962, 12), T. L. Osborn (June 1962, 4), and Oral Roberts (Aug. 1962, 16). A series by Gordon Lindsay was translated to Norwegian, “Historien om den store restaurasjonsvekkelsen,” (The History of the Great Revival of Restoration) and introduced among others F. F. Bosworth (Feb. 1963, 6), William Freeman (March 6, 1963, 8), Lester Sumrall (April 1963, 8), and William Bramham (April 1963, 8).


18 T. L. Osborn, letter to author, Oct. 6 1992 (Consider “A Letter from Rev. T.L. Osborn,” *Herald of Life*, Jan-April 1975, 2. Here Osborn claims to have been introduced to his first Kenyon book in 1946). A Norwegian Pentecostal missionary to China, Taiwan, and Japan, Mr. Arnulf Solvoll, was introduced to Kenyon’s literature through Osborn during the latter’s campaign in Japan during 1954. Solvoll had previous to that opened a Bible School for his new converts. The students soon became involved in translating several of Kenyon’s books into the Japanese language, and Osborn promised them that they after one year of studies in these writings, they would receive financial support as native evangelists. During 1954-58, Six of Kenyon’s books were translated and published. When Solvoll returned to Norway in 1958, he contacted Mr. Kjell Ruud at “Filadelfiaforlaget” (the Norwegian Pentecostals’ publishing house) in Oslo in order to have the Kenyon writings translated also into the Norwegian language. Kenyon was already quite well known at the time. China missionaries Parley Gulbrandsen and Willy Rudolph were familiar with his teachings, but were skeptical. Ruud also showed little interest, with the result that none of the books were published (Arnulf Solvoll, personal interview, June 7, 1994).


21 Interestingly, Edvardsen included one article by Hagin in *Troens Bevis*, April 1963, 10-16 (“Bibelines vej til at modtag den Hellige Aand.”) [The Bible Way of Receiving the Holy Spirit].
vardsen was most probably the first Norwegian who translated and published parts of Kenyon’s teachings through Osborn’s book *Healing the Sick*.

Mr. Ulf Juveng was “born again” by listening to Edvardsen preaching in 1964. That same year he secured a copy of Osborn’s book. This was naturally his first “introduction” to Kenyon, and Juveng received his first Kenyon books via Birmingham Bible & Tract Depot in UK sometime during 1964-67. He translated small pieces from the various books and distributed his translations to friends and acquaintances.\(^{22}\)

Another Norwegian influenced by the Kenyon writings, Mr. Erling Thu, has a close relationship to the Welsh brothers, Bryn and Keri Jones--both with recognized apostolic ministries within the British Restoration Movement. Their church structure is not democratic, but rather certain men with extraordinary charismatic endowment are recognized as in a particular sense representing the Kingdom/Reign of God within the local churches that are committed to them.\(^{23}\)

Thu worked in Edvardsen’s “Sarons Dal” during 1966-75 and was introduced to Kenyon’s literature first indirectly through Edvardsen’s translation of Osborn’s classic, and later directly through Juveng in the late 1960s. Kenyon’s systematization of Christ’s redemption with the rights and privileges imparted to the New Creation, touched him. Thu incorporated central aspects with Kenyon’s teachings and preached in accordance with it in various Christian contexts, first primarily in Sarons Dal, then with Operasjon Ungdomsteam (various “teams of young people” who distributed tracts and literature throughout Norway), and also in various denominations he visited in this period. He distributed Juveng’s translations and gradually lent Kenyon’s American books to those of Edvardsen’s employees who were capable of reading English. When he later was introduced to Bryn and Keri Jones, he soon discovered that they also recommended Kenyon’s message and shared most of his views. After Keri’s receiving an apostolic covering over several Norwegian churches in which Thu had already worked into, central aspects of Kenyon’s teachings have taken their natural place in the churches. In addition, the message spread through teaching tapes and Christian books by other authors.\(^{24}\)

---


\(^{23}\) Erling Thu, personal interview, April 10, 1994.

Influence through the Pentecostal movement in Scandinavia

Norwegian born Tom Andresen (1909-73) of Kampen, Oslo, who at the age of 2 moved to the States with his family and took the name “Tommy” [Theodore] Hicks, is known in the charismatic world due to his large campaigns in Buenos Aires, Argentina during 1954. After having prayed for healing for the Argentine president and dictator Juan Perón, permission was granted to hold an evangelical campaign, first at the soccer stadium Atlántico (seating capacity 25,000), and later at Huracán--the country’s largest with seating capacity for 180,000 people. Hicks’ success in Argentina “gained...sustained support from the Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship International.” The Argentinian Press was far from positive, though, and accused Hicks of conscious lying, having published photos of alleged cured people—to the latter’s despair.

In June 1955, Hicks visited the yearly Pentecostal Conference in Helsinki, Finland where connections were made in order to plan a larger campaign when Hicks returned from Russia on August 26. In connection with Hicks’ campaign, the decision was made to publish one of his books in Swedish, Atomkraften i Jesu Namn (The Atomic Power in the Name of Jesus). Hicks’ “translation” appeared on the Pentecostal publishing houses Taborförlaget in Helsinki and Filadelfiaförlaget in Stockholm, Sweden in 1956. The problem, however, was that Hicks had never authored such a book. He simply changed Kenyon’s title, The Wonderful Name of Jesus, and put his own name on the front cover. He also broke up several chapters into separate units and thereby changed the original chronological sequence. I found two omissions in Hicks’ “translation,” but not one single addition. The Swedish translation is word for word identical with Kenyon’s book, meaning that the Finnish and Swedish Pentecostals must have been the first who distributed Kenyon’s message on the power of the Name of Jesus into a Scandinavian language. Considering the fact that Hicks never had the nerve to publish Kenyon’s book under his own name in the English language, it is a valid question whether the Scandinavian Pentecostals consciously participated in the fraud.

26 R. Edward Miller, Vekkelsen i Argentina (Jevnaker: Livets Forlag, [1993]), 38-42.
28 “En Huracán se comercia con el dolor y el sufrimiento,” El Pueblo (Buenos Aires), May 25, 1954, 3.
29 Tommy Hicks, Atomkraften i Jesu Namn, 3-4.
One might wonder whether in Scandinavian Pentecostal circles Kenyon’s name is more disturbing than his actual teachings. Despite Hagin’s massive plagiarisim of Kenyon’s literature, exclusively in the former’s *The Name of Jesus* he gives proper credit to Kenyon’s *The Wonderful Name of Jesus* as his source of information. Hagin’s book has been translated and published both in the Norwegian and Swedish languages. It does not exclusively deal with the authority invested in the Name of Jesus, but also touches on the so-called “JDS” teaching—that Jesus died spiritually. Considering the fact that Hagin’s book necessarily cannot go beyond the content in Hicks’ *Atomkraften i Jesu Namn*, the following quotation seems less than enlightening—to put it mildly:

Swedish Pentecostals have just completed their yearly Ministers’ Conference Week, and it is typical for the situation in Sweden that they used the first two days to debate “Livets Ord.” According to a report in the Swedish [Pentecostal newspaper] Dagen the emotions were so strong, that they not only “shouted from all over the large Filadelfia auditorium,” but “the theologians in the Ministers’ Conference grew pale and shook their heads as it was quoted from ‘Kevin’s’ teachings on redemption.” The reporter apparently referred to E. W. Kenyon, whom Kenneth E. Hagin quotes in his book *The Name of Jesus*.  

What if the Swedish “theologians” had known that Kenyon had an even more controversial publication, which really might challenge their views on redemption? I am referring to *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne*. An almost identical view has been presented in Paul Billheimer’s *Destined for the Throne*, where the author if not word for word, then at least thought for thought, has plagiarized Kenyon. Ironically, Billheimer’s book was translated into Swedish under the title *Guds Ögonsten* (God’s Apple of the Eye) and published at the Pentecostal Publishing House in Stockholm in 1980, which was 7 years prior to the above mentioned Ministers’ Conference? Did the same “theologians” grow pale and shake their hands when Billheimer’s plagiarism was published?

Also Norwegian Pentecostals have had a certain relationship to Kenyon’s teachings. In the library of the Bible school of the Filadelfia Church in Oslo I found one copy of Kenyon’s *Songs of Reality*, which was published in Chicago during 1913. The songbook had been owned by later Pentecostal missionary to Africa Ms. Hanna Veum (later Hanna Moody), who left for Chicago in 1912 in order to look after the children of a certain family.

---


Influence via the United Kingdom

When Kenyon passed away in 1948 his literature circulated not only within all the states and unions of the U.S. and Canada, but within 57 foreign countries. Whether this was due to the fact that immigrants sent the Kenyon writings to fellow Christians in their home country, is not unprobable. Kenyon often encouraged his writers to further distribute the books.\(^{30}\) It is a fact that Kenyon was known and read in Norway prior to 1948.\(^ {31}\)

In addition to those individuals who read Kenyon prior to his death in 1948, we find an unbroken chain from early in the 1940s in the UK to several Scandinavian groups in the 1970s and 80s. William Alfred Everitt (1878-1959) was brought up and converted among a group known as “The Peculiar People” in Essex. Although they were very staunch in their faith regarding healing, choosing to go to prison rather than send for a doctor, they did not accept the Pentecostal doctrine which caused a number of the brethren to leave, including Everitt himself.

In 1930 he opened a mission in Wickford (Essex) after having had services in his home. He was ordained and made the pastor of the work which continued until 1941 when the Army took over the building because of the war. In 1934 he remarried (to Mrs. Winnifred Everitt). Because of the war the Everitt family was evacuated to Gloucestershire in 1940. Everitt founded the Witness Tract Fellowship, which through a merger became The Homeland Missionary Society and International Witness Tract Fellowship. Through his tract fellowship pastor Everitt also became instrumental in distributing the American newsletter *Herald of His Coming* which he was introduced to in about 1935. When he came across Kenyon’s books around 1942--possibly through an unknown Assemblies of God pastor--Kenyon’s books and newsletter were spread through the tract fellowship, as well.

In 1946 Everitt moved to Birmingham. On July 7 of the same year he initiated the church fellowship, Homeland Assembly Hall, which he pastored until his death in 1959. The church is still in existence, but the name has been changed to Homeland Deliverance Center. Quite immediately after

\(^{30}\) The following “afterword” in Kenyon’s *New Creation Realities*, is rather typical: “You have read the book. We wonder what your reactions are. We trust it has helped you. Much new light from the Word has come. That new light has brought great joy to you, and do you not feel that you should give this to another? Write and tell your friends about it. Order several copies and lend them where you believe they will help most. Do not let this blessing die on your hands. Write today” (p. 160).

\(^ {31}\) Pentecostal missionary to Africa, Mr. Olaf Sørensen discovered the books in 1945. Interestingly, Olaf Sørensen and C. Rein Sørensen were responsible for Tommy Hicks’ campaigns in the Norwegian cities of Oslo, Stavanger, Bergen, and Trondheim during 1964 (Olaf Sørensen, letter to author, Feb. 1 1994.) Consider also “Tommy Hicks taler i Nordstrandhallen,” *Aftenposten*, July 8, 1964, 13).
arriving in Birmingham, Pastor Everitt founded the Birmingham Bible & Tract Depot, patterned after the International Witness Tract Fellowship. Although the books and magazines of Oral Roberts, T. L. Osborn and Gordon Lindsay were distributed from around 1948, Kenyon’s literature was—and is—considered the foundation. Pastor Everitt corresponded with E. W. Kenyon personally, but after the latter’s death in 1948 Ruth Kenyon took over the correspondence for her father.

At the time of Everitt’s death he had just received a large consignment of Kenyon’s books which was left to Winnifred and her stepdaughter to deal with, and more consignments afterward. Thousands of Herald of Life have been circulated and hundreds of Kenyon’s books. At one count the Everitt ministry was reaching 40 different countries with the Kenyon literature.34 In 1991 the church fellowship that was founded by Everitt began laying the foundation for its own Bible school—the Homeland Bible Deliverance Center. The school reportedly is based upon the message and teachings of Kenyon.35

Evangelist Peter Scothern got to know Pastor Everitt while the former was just a teenager. Everitt encouraged him as he was about to enter a healing ministry of his own. In about 1948 Everitt introduced him to the Kenyon writings. Scothern was excited and began to sell the literature through his own meetings. Kenyon’s books were also distributed to other European countries,36 among others Ireland, Switzerland, Denmark and Germany from the 1950s upwards.37 During the 1960s the literature also reached West Africa and South Africa.38

36 Rev. Willem G. van Dam refers to a Dutch translation of Kenyon’s The Wonderful Name of Jesus in his book Befrielse fra besetelse (Oslo: Ansgar Forlag, 1978, 37, 148). Kenyon’s book was translated by A. C. Revy and published by Kracht van Omhoog in 1959. The publishing house soon contacted Johan Maasbach’s Pentecostal denomination, however, whose publishing house, Gazon Uitgeverij reprinted the book 2 years later. Maasbach’s publishing house has since published several of Kenyon’s books: In His Presence (1969), The New Kind of Love (1973), Advanced Bible Course (1975), The Two Kinds of Life (1975), The Two Kinds of Righteousness (1977), The Two Kinds of Knowledge (1978), The Two Kinds of Faith (1978), The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption (1979), The Blood Covenant (1980), New Creation Realities (1982), and Signposts on the Road to Success (1985). All these books were translated by Loek Visser. Maasbach’s secretary Gerie van der Dussen writes in a letter dated Oct. 13, 1993: “We—I—hesitated to write you because Dr. Kenyon’s daughter has been very difficult [?] about giving permission. We just gave up and did it anyway. (Keep this in consideration please.)” It is uncertain how A. C. Revy was introduced to the Kenyon writings in the late 1950s—whether he was introduced to the literature directly via the U.S. or possibly via UK.
Another British evangelist, Mr. Don Double was converted through Scothern’s ministry in the late 50s in East Anglia. At that time Scothern was propagating the Kenyon books through his literature. Double also began to distribute the Kenyon materials and through him the more well known evangelist Harry Greenwood was introduced to the books.

As a minister of the Gospel, Greenwood visited Sweden for the first time during 1967. After a brief visit at the Baptist church in Jönköping he left for Stockholm where he met a group of young people who were involved in door to door witnessing, among whom was the later known charismatic leader Rune Brännström. More and more churches gradually began to open their doors for Greenwood, who nevertheless also began to hold his own meetings. It has been claimed that numerous people both from the Lutheran State Church and from various denominations attended Greenwood’s meetings and that probably several thousands experienced being filled with the Spirit. Greenwood’s teachings on the work of the Spirit and on how faith might release God’s blessings never broke through in Sweden although it obviously contributed to the opening up for the Faith teachings of the 80s. In fact, at Familjefesten in Ljungskile in the summer of 1983 both Greenwood and Ulf Ekman participated as speakers, and Greenwood felt that this summer’s conference was the “strongest” he had participated in during the 16 years he had visited Sweden.

Through Greenwood, Rune Brännström had been introduced to Kenyon’s literature in 1968-69. An acquaintance of Brännström soon got involved translating into Swedish Kenyon’s *In His Presence*. Copyright was not granted, though, and the translation was never published. Very few have ever read it. On the other hand, Brännström had a Swedish translation entitled “Fadern själv älskar er” (The Father Himself Loves You) in the Swedish magazine *Logos*, which Brännström was editor for. The article had been translated from Kenyon’s *The Father and His Family* (1916 edition), pp. 186-89. The same article was reprinted a couple of months later. Despite Brännström’s early introduction and concern with the Kenyon literature, he

---

39 ibid.
42 ibid., 199.
43 ibid., 216-17.
denies that this may have contributed anything to the advance of so-called “faith literature” or faith churches in Sweden.46

An elderly lady by the name of Signe Taranger from Norway also was familiar with the ministry of Greenwood.47 Probably around 1973--prior to leaving for South Africa at 80 years of age--she translated Kenyon’s The Two Kinds of Faith into Norwegian.

Indirectly through this elderly lady Mr. Svein Olav Berge (then pastor of Nytt Liv Felleskap [New Life Fellowship] in the city of Ålesund was introduced to Kenyon. During the late 70s he discovered a copy of Taranger’s private translation in the city of Skien. Soon afterwards he stumbled upon another copy of the same book outside of his hometown Ålesund. One of the members of Berge’s congregation translated pieces from Kenyon’s many books, but since copyright was not granted in spite of the fact that all the elders of the church signed the “application,” they have chosen to sell the translation within a narrow circle of acquaintances. In 1991 a complete translation of The Two Kinds of Righteousness was done.48 According to Berge the church has never majored in Kenyon, but has been positive toward certain aspects of his teachings, as it has also done with teachings of Watchman Nee, Yonggi Cho, and others.49

Only in Oslo does it seem to be legitimate to talk about a milieu almost exclusively dedicated to the teachings of Kenyon. In many ways it would be correct to say that the leading person within this “environment” was a salvationist by the name of Fredy Runar. Almost by accident he seems to have stumbled across Taranger’s translation around 1974. Apparently the book did not fall upon “the good soil” and remained untouched on his shelf. However, parts of Kenyon’s teachings were unconsciously taken in through Runar’s reading of the late William Booth-Clibborn’s sermons at the Fila-

46 Rune Brännström, personal interview, Feb. 12, 1993.
48 Ola Rønning, personal interview, Jan. 21, 1993.
50 Establishing independent churches still was not the thing to do in charismatic Norway. Instead one remained loyal (?) to the denomination one was a member of while at the same time enjoying fellowship with one’s fellow charismatic friends from other denominations in order to survive spiritually.
51 William Booth-Clibborn was the grandson of the founder of the Salvation Army. His mother established the “Army” in France. She married Arthur Sidney Booth-Clibborn. After a while they left the “Army” and lived for a time in John Alexander Dowie’s Zion City. Their son William became a Pentecostal minister. He spent 4 years among the Oneness Pentecostals, however, before he returned and embraced trinitarian theology (William Booth-Clibborn, På livet las [Oslo: Korsets Sei’r Forlag, (1928)], 28-29, 77-78).
delfia Church, Oslo in 1924. At the time Runar had not noticed the name Kenyon, that he was the author of Taranger’s translation *To typer tro*, and naturally also did not know that Booth-Clibborn had been a friend of Kenyon.

A friend of Runar, Mr. John Rognstad spent several years with Loren Cunningham’s Youth With A Mission (YWAM) organization in Norway. He traveled around the country with a team of young people for several years and became thereafter the leader of YWAM’s work in Oslo, where the house meetings in Ullevålsveien after awhile gathered as many as 120 people. In the mid 1970s they came across literature and teaching tapes by Kenneth E. Hagin, which from there was distributed among the YWAMMERS in Oslo. Also Kenyon’s books were in circulation, and the teaching being preached among them was centered around this message.

Through Rognstad, Runar was introduced to American Faith literature in 1977, primarily books by Hagin. Rognstad had prior to this introduced Kenyon’s writings to the manager of the Pentecostal Filadelfia book shop. The latter was excited and ordered a large quantity of Kenyon titles which was distributed. The first time Runar and Rognstad went to the book shop in order to buy Kenyon titles, they only found *The Hidden Man*. The book provided “names” for the things Runar had felt within but had been incapable of verbalizing. It also actualized a renewed interest in manifesting the “Jesus life” characterized by concern for the individual. Kenyon’s emphasis on the Father heart of God and Runar’s own experience of the reality of Sonship made a definite impact on him. Kenyon must have been a “God-dedicated man who loved the Lord. Jesus, The Father and concern for the individual.

---

was what he majored on, and he practiced what he taught,” declared Runar.57

Just as the interest in Hagin’s literature disappeared, Runar felt stimulated to order large quantities of Kenyon books through the Filadelfia book shop which he gave out to those who were interested.

Runar had from the mid 70s preached in FGBMFI gatherings, as well as in traditional meetings. As a staff worker at P2258 he had access to a room for public meetings and arranged these on Tuesday nights. The meetings were Runar’s initiative and soon grew popular, both among the drug addicts, various staff workers and people from the outside. The primary message was the Father heart of God, concern and respect for the individual. Runar did not focus on Kenyon himself very often. He usually just communicated those aspects of Kenyon’s teachings which corresponded with his own understanding. In addition to the Tuesday night meetings Runar was also involved in a house fellowship at Grefsen (Oslo). The style was very similar to the Tuesday night meetings, and many attended both gatherings regularly. The Thursday night gatherings at Grefsen were possibly even more informal with the opening up of spontaneous testimonies from whoever so desired in addition to Runar’s teaching and thereafter praying for people’s needs. At both gatherings the Kenyon message was basically communicated indirectly. Indeed, my Norwegian translations of the Kenyon literature circulated in both groups, but the interest for these varied from person to person.59

In spite of the fact that Hagin’s literature had been put aside to the advantage of the Kenyon titles, Runar remained neutral towards the Faith movement.60

This gradually changed as Norwegians who had lived in Tulsa during 1980-82, frequented the Runar gatherings. Most of the Norwegians had attended Tulsa Christian Center (TCC), pastored by “Bob” Daniel. Daniel’s church particularly emphasized Kenyon’s understanding of the spiritual death of

57 ibid. Runar’s intuitive feelings concerning Kenyon corresponds with those of Baxter and Kennington: “...and found him to be a very pleasant fatherly person...I recall he spoke on “The Father and His Family” with great emphasis on love...He was strong on healing in the name of Jesus and spoke much of God’s power. It needs to be said that no matter how much it is interpreted, he stands out as a very gentle and kindly man” (“Ern” Baxter, letter to author, Sept. 28, 1992). “I can remember the days when I first felt the aura of Kenyon’s personality, his saintly appearance with his hoary head, his loving fatherly way in which he dealt with others...I learned much from him which I appreciate to this day, and I wish that those who have picked up his “faith formulas” were half the man of God he was. The “formulas” work so much better when one is truly in touch with our heavenly Father.” (John Kennington, “E. W. Kenyon and the Metaphysics of Christian Science.” Unpublished manuscript, July 8, 1986). [Kennington pastors Immanuel Temple in Portland, Oregon—the same church that William Booth-Clibborn pastored while he knew Kenyon.]

58 Evangelical work for drug addicts which at the time had premises in Pilestredet 22, Oslo.

59 Finn and Signe Gundersen, personal interview, Oct. 8, 1992.

Jesus. Their main stand was the alleged sufferings of Jesus in Hades where He as man’s substitute had to be made a partaker of satanic nature and consequently would need regeneration Himself before man’s redemption would be complete.

Tulsa Christian Center was founded by Daniel in 1979. It is unclear when and how Daniel was introduced to the Kenyon writings. During Kenneth E. Hagin’s first or possibly second camp meeting in 1973 (74?) he was introduced to Leon Stump through an acquaintance, Robert Fisher. Due to their mutual admiration for Kenyon they immediately felt in one accord.

In 1975 the three of them attended Hagin’s Bible school in Broken Arrow, while Daniel’s wife Julie began one year later. While at Rhema, Daniel had a Tuesday night Bible study in his home. Many Rhema students came and liked it. Daniel became acquainted with Larry Huggins, who was Doyle (“Buddy”) Harrison’s [Hagin’s son-in-law] assistant at Faith Christian Fellowship (FCF) in Tulsa. Huggins and Daniel liked each other and cultivated a friendship. “Bob” and Julie began attending Harrison’s Faith Christian Fellowship, and Huggins asked Harrison whether Daniel could bring his Bible study with him into the church. Harrison consented.

At that time the Bible study was growing and had at its most between 100 and 200 people. Huggins liked it and encouraged Daniel. Eventually Daniel was even promoted to a position on staff in Harrison’s church. His career did not last long, though. Not many people seem to know what happened, and Daniel explained the friction as a conflict of teachings. Since Daniel aimed at spiritual development, he even publicly opposed Harrison’s materialistic prosperity message. Efforts were made to convince Daniel that it would not be right to preach against Harrison, and definitely not while being a part of the same church, but Daniel would not listen. Because of Harrison’s family relationship to Hagin, the conflict between Harrison and Daniel also affected the latter’s relationship to Rhema.

It did not take long before Daniel got his people out of FCF and started his own church. He publicly opposed both the Faith movement and its materialistic greed. According to Daniel, who developed a somewhat elitist attitude,

---

61 I was in Tulsa and phoned him July 2, 1994, but I hardly had the time to introduce myself as Daniel hung up on me before I had the opportunity to explain the reason for my telephone call.

62 Stump was immediately introduced to the Kenyon writings after his being born again through Billy Bob Hankins’ church, The Christian Center, in West Columbia, Texas in 1967. Pastor Hankins himself had been introduced to Kenyon’s books through an American missionary to Mexico who visited his church in 1954. Through this missionary contact was established between Hankins and Hagin, who visited Hankins’ church for the first time four years later (Leon Stump, telephone interview, July 1, 1994).
they did not have the “whole truth.” As Daniel became more isolated he also became anti-social. At Rhema many of the students were confused since he opposed what they were learning in school. Daniel’s friend Stump tried to convince him that his attitude was wrong. After all the Faith movement was the closest one to the very doctrines Stump and Daniel adhered to. Although Daniel and Stump majored on the believer as a New Creation and a partaker of divine nature, TCC and similar churches basically did not differ from traditional Faith churches because of doctrinal divergences, but rather because of different emphasis. The focus on “who they were in Christ” earned them the nickname “In Himers.” Some of them proudly characterized their churches as “New Creation churches.” While pastors Joe Martin (Virginia Beach) and Daniel tended to view this “In Christ” accentuation as an independent movement, both Mark Hankins and Stump, although as committed to the very teachings as the other two, wanted to cooperate with the churches that had differing views.

Stump recalls Daniel singing one of Kenyon’s poems (which Daniel had put to music) that Kenyon seemed to have dedicated to his son. Daniel did not know that Kenyon had any son and believed the song to be a message to Kenyon’s “spiritual progeny.” Viewing himself as one of Kenyon’s few children might explain one aspect of the basis for Daniel’s loyalty to Kenyon’s teachings. His ties to the message obviously had a strong emotional basis.

One basic doctrinal difference between TCC and ordinary Faith teachings is the emphasis on the believer’s already having faith (in his spirit), rather than one’s spirit having to develop or one’s indwelling faith having to grow. According to Daniel, man’s spirit was perfect and complete from regeneration—the only thing lacking, was the renewal of one’s mind/soul. In addition to Daniel’s admiration for Kenyon, he also referred to both Gustaf Aulen’s

---

63 Stump was pastor of Victory Christian Center in Joplin, Missouri. (Not only Stump, but the church as a whole, after being introduced to the contents of McConnell’s master’s thesis from 1982, no longer identify with Kenyon and the Faith movement.) Joe Martin had—and still has—a little church and his Bible school with the somewhat ambitious name of Word of Life International Bible School in Virginia Beach, Virginia. Other ministers included Mark Hankins, Wade Pickren, and David C. Cooke.


65 Kenyon, “My Laddie Mine,” Kenyon’s Living Poems, 16: “He’ll walk with you, thru burning sands, In trials be your screen. So fearless go as once I went—A lad, I walked alone; I walked the burning sands by faith, As you will when I’m gone.” (Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, 1965, 5th. ed.)

66 Stump, telephone interview, July 1, 1994.
Christus Victor\textsuperscript{67} and Paul Billheimer’s Destined for the Throne. Years later an ex-follower of Daniel wrote,

> We could not help developing an elitist view concerning ourselves at TCC. We had the “newest and best” with regard to spiritual insight available in the church of God since the days of Paul, in other words even bypassing the Faith movement.\textsuperscript{68}

A characteristic trait with many of the “In Christ” groups compared to representatives with the Faith movement was the former’s use of theological works and numerous English translations of the Bible. In the library of TCC it has been claimed that they had approximately 150-200 different versions—particularly “hard to get”/”out of print” versions were applied in order to back up Daniel’s esoteric views.

Norwegians who had attended Daniel’s church returned to Oslo and frequented both the Tuesday and Thursday night gatherings, in addition to their own “Friday group.”\textsuperscript{69} During a time they emphasized the aspects of Kenyon’s teachings they had been taught at TCC.\textsuperscript{70}

Runar was immediately conscious of a contrast and wondered how it could be possible to read identical literature and still arrive at so opposing views. The somewhat rigid presentation where the emphasis on having a valid “confession” seemed to replace Runar’s emphasis on the presence and availability of Jesus Christ. In addition, the methods/formulas which were taught as “isolated themes” instead of within the framework of having a personal love relationship with Christ, did not correspond at all with Runar’s understanding of the content of Kenyon’s message.\textsuperscript{71}

The creative Word of God was central also with Runar. Nevertheless, he did point out that God Himself had to be the initiator of the promptings we might receive concerning acting on a specific Word from the Bible, e.g. regarding healing by faith. Without living in a conscious love fellowship with Christ, the invitation to speak forth/act on the Word—e.g. “With His stripes we are healed”—easily might be understood as something purely mechanical/technical. Runar denied a literal interpretation of the statement that “The Word is creative.” Words in themselves have no creative ability. However, when God Himself by the Holy Spirit turns our attention toward certain aspects with the Word of God and inspires us to speak forth/act out that Word,

\textsuperscript{67} Original title Den Kristna Försoningstanken.
\textsuperscript{68} English translation of quotation from Torgeir Onsrud, personal interview, Feb. 13, 1993.
\textsuperscript{69} Mariann Johnsen, personal interview, Oct. 20, 1992.
\textsuperscript{71} Runar, personal interview, Nov. 26, 1992.
God will honor our faith in the sense that He will prevail in accordance with those Words we spoke forth/acted on as if the realization already were a fact. In other words, Runar never claimed that man due to his general insight into God’s objective will without being specifically led by the Spirit of God might initiate something with the motivation to move God to act in accordance with those particular promises from the Word which man based his legitimate conviction on.\(^{72}\)

Closely related to his teachings on the “creative” Word of God was Runar’s emphasis on faith as “exact knowledge.” Some people apparently misunderstood the term to include “unlimited” knowledge, but what Runar had wanted to communicate, was the fact that knowledge from God is unassailable, that it enables us to act. According to Runar faith might be characterized as a conviction given by God which is sufficient for man to act on without any risk. Instead of being vague and mystical, faith is exact knowledge that is the outcome of a relational knowledge of God Himself. It is not superficial and has nothing to do with the “push the bottom” mentality. For example, knowledge of the authority invested in the Name of Jesus has no functional significance for us unless we do not know personally the One who carries that Name. In spite of the fact that Runar did cherish Kenyon’s teaching on “revelation knowledge,” he denies every attempt to turn this term into the one and only legitimate hermeneutical key in order to understand the Word of God.\(^{73}\)

Several attempts had been made in order to obtain the permission to translate and publish the Kenyon books into the Norwegian language, and Runar was more conscious than ever of the need to establish a setting around the literature in order to avoid an enthusiasm for the new theoretical insight. Already back in 1978-79 Troens Kilde (The Source of Faith) was established -- due to among other things that Runar saw the danger that the Kenyon message might be misapplied by an overemphasis on “faith principles” disconnected from a living relationship to Jesus. Instead of having the books sold through a publishing house, he desired to distribute them directly as an extension of his own ministry -- this among other things was due to the fact that by cutting the books into various topics, it could make possible an overemphasis whereby they might easily be taken out of context.

Particularly the book *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* disturbed him. The message did not seem consistent with Kenyon’s additional teach-

\(^{72}\) ibid.

\(^{73}\) ibid.
ings. A mystical statement concerning a possible connection between man’s blood and his spirit seems utterly unfounded; nonetheless, Kenyon immediately goes from there to a description of Jesus’ identification with fallen man through the partaking of “satanic nature.” Runar has spent many hours of pondering what might have laid behind Kenyon’s interpretation of the redemption drama. Runar feels confident that Kenyon’s teachings on Jesus’ dying spiritually was not his primary concern. What he actually was aiming at, was to show that Jesus loved us so much that He was willing to pay the price “fully.”

Runar was also troubled by Kenyon’s identification of eternal life with the nature of God. According to Runar one of the results of our being born again is that God removes our fallen human nature in order for us now to be free to choose whether we want to respond to God’s will or not. We can no longer “put the blame/responsibility” on an indwelling sin nature which prevents us from doing God’s will. However, Runar could not accept the alternative interpretation that man’s spirit became a partaker of an autonomous “divine nature,” the latter being an explicitly human element in one’s spirit although in its characteristics corresponding to those of God Himself. There was still a struggle to be fought—not between spirit and flesh, but between Spirit and flesh.

The minibook entitled Poems that Kenyon loved also caused some racking of the brain. This was particularly due to poetic terms derived from Greek my-

---

74 Runar’s observation is in accordance with that of Dr. Dale H. Simmons: “I do not believe that Jesus went to Hell as a servant of Satan, neither do I believe that he became an incarnation of Satan on the Cross. Kenyon stresses these doctrines because he wants to show just how far Christ went to redeem us. Kenyon was living in an age when the liberal wing of the Christian church was presenting Jesus’ death as merely a “moral influence” intended as an object lesson on suffering love—it had no objective merit in securing anyone’s salvation. In trying to answer this, Kenyon goes too far in the opposite direction—arguing in favor of a substitutionary atonement which goes far beyond what most Christians have held over the centuries. As I indicated, throughout most of his ministry, Kenyon used these teachings in speaking to the unsaved in order to convert them. As time went on though, he began to stress more and more that Jesus became just like you and I so that we can become just like Him” (Simmons, letter to author, Aug. 10, 1991).

thology,\textsuperscript{76} which seemed inconsistent with Kenyon’s additional books. Even today Runar wonders about Kenyon’s motivation to publish the poem book.\textsuperscript{77}

Although he never accepted all of Kenyon’s teachings, Runar’s preaching was cherished by Norwegians with a former TCC background. One of the young women from TCC married an American. In 1983 this couple wrote encouraging Runar to establish an independent church which they would back and support from the U.S. This was still at a time when Norwegian charismatics simply did not “break loose” from the established denominations.\textsuperscript{78} The next year the young couple left Daniel’s church in Tulsa and became assistant pastors in Wade Pickren’s Christian Center Church in Orlando, Florida. During 1985 they moved to Norway and started an independent work in Oslo called KristusKirken (The Christ Church). The church is not in existence any longer.

Summary

Kenyon’s influence not only in the U.S., but also in our own Scandinavia is partly insurveyable. Although outsiders have been conscious of Kenyon’s literature basically due to their presence at the book tables of the Faith churches, we have also seen that Scandinavian Pentecostals and the former Troens Bevis publishing house in “Sarons Dal” have contributed to the fame of both Kenyon himself and his actual literature. Through Aril Edvardsen’s translation of T. L. Osborn’s classic \textit{Healing the Sick}, Erling Thu, among others, was introduced to Kenyon’s message. Parts of these teachings still have their natural place within the churches which Thu is actively working toward. The Kenyon message in its purest form, though, seems to have been limited to the church fellowships related to the ministry of Fredy Runar during the 1980s. None of these fellowships are any longer in existence. It would be safe to say then that Runar’s possibly enduring influence simply is

---

\textsuperscript{76} Also in his other works Kenyon refers to Greek mythology. By reading Homer’s Odyssey and Iliad Kenyon was “illuminated” to the fact that “incarnation was the basic craving of the universal man; that it was not out of harmony with human desire or tradition among the peoples” (E. W. Kenyon, “Incarnation,” \textit{Reality}, Feb. 1914, 38). “I used to read the Odyssey and Iliad every year. I read them right along; they became a part of me. The thing I liked about them was the stately rytm [sic] of Homer’s majestic mind. As I picked up the Odyssey and turned it over, it dawned on me that every hero of the Odyssey and Iliad was an incarnation” (E. W. Kenyon, “Incarnation,” unpublished sermon, Bethel Temple, Los Angeles, Dec. 29, 1925).

\textsuperscript{77} Runar’s concern is particularly directed toward \textit{The Birth of Song} (p. 17), \textit{Love’s Minstrel} (p. 20), \textit{Pain’s Pearls} (p. 21), and \textit{At Last} (p. 22). According to Kenyon’s daughter Ruth “muses,” “magic,” and “mystic sages” exclusively refer to “words commonly used in poetry of that day” (Ruth Kenyon Housworth, letter to author, June 9, 1992).

\textsuperscript{78} Runar, personal interview, Nov. 26, 1992.
traceable to individuals and that we no longer may speak of an explicit extension of Kenyon’s teachings in their purest form.
Conclusion

Scarce references to Kenyon’s life and ministry in his published books, added to the silence of family members, have contributed to the mysticism which has surrounded Kenyon among his followers. One of my first concerns has been an attempt to remove some of this mysticism. A rather thorough biographical description in chapter 1 confirmed that Kenyon not only attended the New Thought oriented Emerson College of Oratory in Boston during 1892-93, but also that his motivation had nothing to do with preparation for the ministry. Young Kenyon felt indifferent--or rather antagonistic--toward religion, and even in my introductory chapter a polemic disposition is traceable toward D. R. McConnell’s thesis concerning the “Kenyon Connection”--an historical link between New Thought and the modern Faith movement via Kenyon’s attending Emerson College. In fact, according to McConnell it was during 25-year-old Kenyon’s one year of studies at Emerson that his later theology was formed.

Nevertheless, just one month after the completion of the above mentioned school year Kenyon experienced a spiritual “breakthrough” by visiting in A. J. Gordon’s Clarendon Street Baptist Church in Boston. Kenyon soon found himself heavily involved among the Free Will Baptists, accepting a pastorate in Elmira, New York within less than a year. After approximately 25 years as president of his own Bethel Bible Institute, Kenyon broke up from the East Coast and went Westwards. He settled down in California and the state of Washington where he pastored churches in Oakland, Los Angeles, and Seattle respectively. Through his many books, in addition to his radio broadcasts from Los Angeles, Tacoma, and Seattle, Kenyon’s actual influence covered not only the U.S. and Canada. When he died in 1948 his literature circulated in 57 foreign nations.

After a brief presentation of central aspects of Kenyon’s overall teachings in chapter 2 a platform was laid for what must be said to be my primary concern--exploring Kenyon’s historical and theological roots (chapter 3) and the extent of his actual influence among both his contemporaries and later generations of Christians (chapter 4 and 5). During my work on Kenyon’s roots it was natural to take my point of departure in McConnell’s pioneer study A Different Gospel, where the author made conclusions which depended pri-
arily upon New Thought, but also upon Christian Science and the Unitarian teachings.

My exploration of Kenyon’s roots has naturally included the three above mentioned groups, as well as the evangelical Holiness/Higher Life movement, the Plymouth Brethren, Christian mysticism (Quietism), the Free Will Baptists, The Christian Church, and Disciples of Christ. I believe I have satisfactory documented that McConnell’s somewhat one-sided identification of Kenyon’s theology with New Thought, Christian Science and the Unitarians is—if not directly mistaken, then at least to a large extent exaggerated. Kenyon’s role models included first of all individuals such as Moody, Torrey, Gordon, Simpson, and Cullis—all of whom had their respective roots within the Higher Life/Faith-cure movement. That Kenyon’s theology has been linked to heterodox groups of the 19th century might be due to the surprising degree of doctrinal correspondence between these and the evangelical Higher Life movement. I am inclined to place Kenyon both historically and theologically within the latter tradition. Nonetheless, Kenyon’s early theology also has roots within the Plymouth Brethren—e.g. Darby’s dispensationalism. Furthermore, Kenyon’s teaching on faith has close similarities to Plymouth brother George Müller.

Chapter 4 and 5 are dedicated to Kenyon’s actual influence. In the U.S. we have basically dealt with the Pentecostal movement, the so-called Post-World War II Healing Movement—and its extension, the Faith movement. Kenyon had extensive contact with well known Pentecostal leaders such as Durham, Bosworth, Lake, Woodworth-Etter, and McPherson. Also at the time, younger ministers such as “Ern” Baxter and T. L. Osborn seem to have known him. Through the Post-World War II healing evangelists Kenyon’s message was communicated by both well known and lesser known individuals—among the more known ones in the U.S are Osborn and Hagin.

Already back in 1899 Kenyon’s magazine circulated in Sweden, but in spite of the fact that Norwegian ministers were familiar with the literature prior to Kenyon’s death in 1948, it was not until the mid 1950s that the latter’s message reached a broader audience in Scandinavia as a whole. Through “Tommy” Hicks’ book Atomkraften i Jesu Namn which was published by Finnish and Swedish Pentecostals in Helsinki and Stockholm, respectively, Scandinavian Pentecostals were introduced to Kenyon’s teachings in their own language. In fact, Hicks’ book was taken verbatim from Kenyon’s The Wonderful Name of Jesus—Hicks had just changed the title and replaced Kenyon’s name with his own on the front cover. Through Aril Edvardsen’s translation of T. L. Osborn’s book Healing the Sick in 1963 not only was
Kenyon’s name diligently referred to, but the book actually contained several long passages taken verbatim from a couple of Kenyon’s books.

Finally, through a comparatively unknown elderly lady, Signe Taranger, a Norwegian translation of Kenyon’s *The Two Kinds of Faith* was spread—most probably from 1973. Her translation reached a little church fellowship in Ålesund, and salvationist Fredy Runar in Oslo. Through the latter, quite a few gathered themselves together and were deeply moved by the message. As an extension of Runar’s ministry ten of Kenyon’s minibooks were translated into Norwegian during the early 1980s. Although it was in this environment that the Kenyon message was communicated in its purest form and also in Scandinavia, it is primarily through the Faith movement that the Kenyon literature has been focused on (by outsiders). Sten Nilsson discovered the books in the early 1960s. Through his son-in-law Ulf Ekman and the latter’s Livets Ord Bibelcenter in Uppsala, Sweden, Kenyon books have been accepted as required reading and translated into Swedish by members of the church. Kenyon’s books also are available through the library of Oslo Kristne Senter.

As the presentation of Kenyon’s overall theology in chapter 2 exclusively served as a rise to an historical contextual localization, I have endeavored to exclusively shed light on those aspects of his theology which have direct relevance for his roots/influence. An entire and nuanced presentation of Kenyon’s overall theology falls beyond the scope of this paper, including a dogmatic evaluation of his teachings on the basis of the biblical manuscripts. Due to Kenyon’s extensive influence in various “camps,” these are highly relevant subjects, though. A comparative analysis of Kenyon’s message vis-à-vis several of the more prominent Faith teachers is another valid subject. And—to the degree that I have succeeded in documenting the weak points in McConnell’s identification of Kenyon with New Thought—if the similarities between New Thought and certain exponents for the modern Faith movement seem more obvious than the former’s alleged similarity to Kenyon, what can this be attributed to? Might the Faith movement have absorbed impulses from additional sources: (1) misunderstanding of Kenyon’s writings combined with (2) “Connections” to e.g. Norman Vincent Peale, Robert Schuller, Glenn Clark, or Agnes Sandford? In spite of their roots

---

1 Braden, *Spirits in Rebellion*, 386.
within New Thought, each of those four have influenced large segments of the American charismatic movement in various ways. And--to what extent might the Faith movement have absorbed the message via New Thought oriented “secular approach to success” books by e.g. Orison Swett Marden, Claude M. Bristol, Napoleon Hill, or others? Furthermore, which influences might have been taken in through American culture in a general sense, or through traits such as harmony, well-being, individualism, and optimism in particular and unconsciously/consciously have been read back into the canonical writings of the Bible? An examination of all these questions, however, also falls beyond the scope of this paper.

3 Braden, *Spirits in Rebellion*, 391-396. An interesting thesis, which also falls beyond the scope of this study, is to explore the possibility whether Scandinavian Faith Teachings may have received indirect impulses via the American New Thought movement. Prior to Sten Nilsson’s introduction to American Faith teachings he participated at several of Glenn Clark’s CFO gatherings and was there introduced to leaders such as Frank Laubach, Rufus Moseley, and Lewis MacLachlan (Sten Nilsson, *Ledd av Guds hand*, 142-145, 169-80).


Appendix

What Happened From The Cross To The Throne?

A Descriptive Analysis of E.W. Kenyon’s Teachings on Identification

Kenyon’s teachings on Identification basically deal with man’s union with Christ and Christ’s union with man. This twofold union has both a legal and experiential dimension.

In order to grasp Kenyon’s logic, we’d better take our point of departure in some of the underlying premises. According to Kenyon, one of the consequences of Adam’s sin was that he died spiritually, lost his sense of fellowship with the Father and was made a partaker of an antagonistic nature which was foreign towards God. Through this act of disobedience, not only Adam, but the whole human race automatically would partake of satanic nature:

Adam, the parent of man, the head of God’s creation, had died spiritually. He had failed in his responsibility as the custodian of God’s joy. Man to whom he will give birth will possess the same nature. That Spiritual Death becomes the nature of every man born into the world.¹

Not only in a legal sense, but also experientially speaking, humanity as a whole is identified with Adam through a common indwelling spiritual death. It is this state of nature which Kenyon terms “man’s Identification with Adam.”² Kenyon further claims that “the human race was identified with Adam in his transgression.”³ This identification might be viewed from two separate aspects, a legal and an experiential one: “The legal is what Satan did to us in Adam and the vital is what Satan does in us when by nature we are children of wrath.”⁴ In a forensic sense we were all in the Garden of Eden and are consequently included in God’s judgment of Adam: “Vitally, we

¹ Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 29.
² ibid., 161.
³ ibid., 164.
⁴ ibid.
were not in the garden with Adam; but legally; his death, his bondage, his judgment [sic] and all that spiritual death made him, became ours.\footnote{ibid.}

Kenyon also claims that just as the human race automatically partook of Adam’s sin nature (through our identification with Adam) there had to be a legal ground upon which this union might be broken and man could partake of the nature of God. This is considered possible only through an Identification with Christ:

\begin{quote}
If the Lordship of Satan over the human was due to the identification of humanity with Adam in his crime of high treason, it is legally possible for the works of Satan to be destroyed by the identification of the human race with the Son of God, the second Adam.\footnote{ibid., 164-65.}
\end{quote}

Through Jesus’ substitution He not only took on Himself the penalty of humanity’s sin. But in dying spiritually he removed in a legal sense the very sin nature which had entered this world through Adam. So by receiving Christ as Lord and Savior, this Identification with Jesus Christ becomes ours both in a legal and experiential sense.

Although Kenyon, as we have already seen, applies the term Identification in four different ways—“legal” and “vital identification” with Adam or with Christ, respectively, his teachings on man’s Identification with Adam basically serve as a premise for what is his main concern—our identification with Christ. The legal side of redemption “unveils to us what God did in Christ for us, from the time He went to the Cross, until He sat down on the right hand of the Father.”\footnote{ibid., 5.} Our actual experience of what Christ legally provided on our behalf, “the vital side of Redemption,” is then “what the Holy Spirit, through the Word, is doing in us now.”\footnote{ibid.}

A key word in order to grasp the extension of Kenyon’s teachings on Identification is the preposition “with.” This word is the very key to “a long-hidden truth that is of vital importance to us”:

\begin{quote}
At once you ask, “What does Identification mean?” It means our complete union with Him in His Substitutionary Sacrifice.\footnote{ibid.}
\end{quote}

The preposition is consistently used in Paul’s epistles in order to communicate our common identification with Christ in his substitutionary work. This

\begin{footnotes}
\item[5] ibid.
\item[6] ibid., 164-65.
\item[7] ibid., 5.
\item[8] ibid.
\item[9] Kenyon, Identification, 4.
\end{footnotes}
identification is two-fold: His union with us on the cross and our union with Him in glory. Kenyon echoes Church Father Ireneus – at least superficially: “Christ became one with us in sin, that we might become one with Him in Righteousness. He became as we were, to the end that we might be as He is now.”

In order to get a better grasp of what it really means to be identified with Christ in His redemptive work, we’d better examine Kenyon’s interpretation of what Christ actually accomplished through His substitutionary sacrifice.

Kenyon divides Christ’s redemptive works into separate “steps” or “phases”, all of which in a legal sense affect the believer’s position towards both God and the enemy. This is due to the believer’s identification with Christ in Redemption: “In the fact of Identification we have one of the richest phases of Redemption.” Nevertheless, none of the respective “steps” or “phases” would have had any effect whatsoever in the believer if it had not been for the fact that they culminated in a final “step” resulting in the Father’s recognition of what Christ accomplished as satisfactory. What follows now is a chronological presentation of Jesus’ various “steps.” Through these I would like to examine Kenyon’s interpretation of what happened to Jesus and to what a degree the believer is affected by that due to his legal identification with Christ in the various phases.

**Crucified with Christ:**

The crucifixion of Jesus is explained by the fact that His earthly ministry was rejected by the Jews:

The tragedy is that Jehovah, the Blood Covenant friend of Abraham came to earth, conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary, born in a manger, welcomed by an angelic choir, grew up among His own people, yet remained a stranger to them.

They did not understand that the carpenter’s son also was the Son of God:

They crucified Him and shouted, “Let His blood be upon us.” It was Judgment Blood. It should have been the Blood that would eternally bind them to their Covenant God, in the New Covenant. They made it a Blood of Judgment, separating them from their Saviour and the Father God.
The drama of crucifixion culminated in the physical death of Jesus when the veil of the temple was rent from top to bottom. Kenyon interprets it to mean that God had put the Covenant with Israel aside:

> The Holy of Holies was no longer the home of Jehovah. He had moved out of the temple. Jesus had fulfilled the Abrahamic Covenant and the law of the Covenant. There was no need of a priesthood any longer. The high priest finished his ministry when he made the great sacrifice of the Lamb of God, who was to take away the sin of the world.\(^{14}\)

Crucifixion for Kenyon is basically associated with shame and dishonor: “The very thought of crucifixion to a Jew, and especially to a Pharisee, brought a sense of shame and horror.”\(^{15}\)

The believer’s union with Christ in His crucifixion is backed up with proof texts from Galatians 2:20,\(^{16}\) 6:14\(^{17}\) and Romans 6:6\(^{18}\) Kenyon’s commentary on these proof texts is as follows:

> When Paul said, “I have been crucified with Christ,” it meant that he had been judged, condemned, cast out, stripped naked, and nailed to the cross...When [he] identified himself with the Man, Jesus, accepted Him as His Savior, and confessed Him as his Lord, that moment he became a crucified man to the Jewish people. He became an outcast.\(^{19}\)

Man’s identification with Christ in the latter’s crucifixion primarily meant union in dishonor and suffering. Although Kenyon might basically have interpreted the above referred to proof texts as an expression of Paul’s personal experience in interaction with the Jews, it would still be natural to consider the respective Scriptures relevant as an expression of the believer’s relationship to his non-Christian environment today. Identifying with the Cross of Jesus will always include some sort of persecution.

\(^{14}\) ibid., 42.

\(^{15}\) Kenyon, Identification, 7.

\(^{16}\) “I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me” (ASV, 1901).

\(^{17}\) “But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”

\(^{18}\) “(For if we have become united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection;) knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin.”

\(^{19}\) Kenyon, Identification, 7.
Deity/Burial with Christ:

For many years Kenyon “knew” that Jesus died “twice” on the Cross although he had “no scriptural evidence of it.” He finally came across Is. 53:9 with a marginal reference to the word “death” being plural in the Hebrew language: “And they made his grave with the wicked, and with a rich man in his deaths.” Kenyon concluded that Jesus first died spiritually, then physically.

With his point of departure in John 10:18 Kenyon concluded that no one could take Jesus’ life since His physical body was “immortal.” “It was a body that could not die until sin had taken possession of His spirit,” Kenyon wrote. Jesus had the same kind of body which Adam had, a body which was subject to neither death nor to the devil himself.

Kenyon appears somewhat vague, but seems to have meant that the penalty for man’s sin in the Garden of Eden had wider implications than merely losing one’s fellowship with the Lord. In that case Adam’s (and humanity as a whole) partaking of an antagonistic-towards-God inner nature (which will eventually culminate in an eternal suffering together with the devil and his “angels”) will be more than a consequence of Adam’s high treason--man’s identification with the nature of spiritual death will actually be a part of God’s punishment. It is therefore logical that Jesus as man’s substitute will have to suffer beyond just having his fellowship with the Father destroyed: “He became one with Satan in spiritual death, to make us one with God in spiritual life.” “He partook of our spiritual death. We are utterly one with Him in that Judgment.” “He died Spiritually the moment God laid our Sin upon Him. The moment that “Him who knew no sin became sin,” [2 Cor. 5:21] that precious body became mortal, and He could die physically.

After Jesus’ spirit “was made sin” He was taken by the adversary to Hell in order to suffer the penalty of man’s union with sin for three horrible days.

20 ibid., 14.
21 “(Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again.) No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father.”
22 Kenyon, Identification, 15.
23 ibid., 16.
24 ibid., 18.
25 Kenyon, What Happened, 43.
Kenyon interprets 2 Cor. 5:21\textsuperscript{26} as if Jesus as man’s substitutionary sacrifice in a literal sense needed to be “made sin”--that He would have to be clothed with the very same sin nature with which humanity was contaminated. The believer’s identification with Christ in death and burial consequently includes, according to Romans 6:8\textsuperscript{27} and 2. Timothy 2:11\textsuperscript{28} that we are made partakers in God’s penalty of Jesus on the Cross: “If we accept Him, there can be no judgment for us.”

Kenyon further asserts:

On the basis of this identification the man who receives the Redemptive work of Christ need not go to Hell but goes free, while the man who refuses Christ’s redemption on his behalf must go there.\textsuperscript{30}

Secondly, our identification with Him on the Cross includes more than the fact that God’s penalty has been suffered legally. Our vital identification with Cross and Burial means our consciously resisting the Lordship of spiritual death:. “In the mind of Justice, we died to sin and its dominion when we died in Christ.”\textsuperscript{31}

However, Jesus was not only “made sin” for us. With his point of departure in Is. 53:3-4\textsuperscript{32} Kenyon claims that Jesus as our substitute also was “made sick” on the Cross:

He was not only made sin and separated from His Father, until His broken heart cried, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” but the diseases of the human race fell upon Him.\textsuperscript{33}

And this participation of His with sickness did not have anything to do with the physical sufferings of Jesus: “This was the spiritual side of the agony of the cross. This was when our sin and diseases were laid upon His spirit.”\textsuperscript{34}

Kenyon further concludes:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26} “Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him.”
  \item \textsuperscript{27} “But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.”
  \item \textsuperscript{28} “Faithful is the saying: For if we died with him, we shall also live with him.”
  \item \textsuperscript{29} Kenyon, Identification, 15.
  \item \textsuperscript{30} Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 170-71.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} ibid., s. 17.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} “He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and as one from whom men hide their face he was despised; and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted...Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand.”
  \item \textsuperscript{33} ibid., s. 11.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} ibid., s. 12.
\end{itemize}
For if He was made sick with our sickness, Satan has no legal right to put disease upon us, and in the Name of Jesus we can free ourselves from Satan’s power.

Just as our identification with Jesus in death and burial includes our renouncing the reign of sin, it also includes a legal and individual verdict against sickness:

Romans 6:14 “Sin shall not have dominion over you,” or literally, “Sin shall not lord it over you.” Neither shall disease and pain lord it over us. We see now that if Satan has lost his dominion, he cannot put disease upon us.

Although Kenyon’s intention most probably was never to equal sin and disease in the sense that the believer is made responsible to God in case a particular sickness did not leave him, it is nevertheless easy to misinterpret Kenyon and thereby be placed under the yoke of condemnation. Kenyon’s intention was probably to portrait God’s goodness towards the believer by showing the latter his equally potential opportunity to live a life above sickness as above sin. The message was intended as “promise,” not as “law”:

If He was made sick with our sickness, and if He put our diseases away, we need not be ruled by sickness and disease...When we recognize this, we will no longer struggle for faith, for Righteousness, and holiness, because we will know that we were nailed to the cross and died with Him.

**Made Alive with Christ**

With his point of departure in Scriptural passages such as Acts 13:33 and Colossians 1:18 Kenyon claims that Jesus, due to his state of being spiritually dead, was in need of regeneration. As our substitute Jesus had met the claims of Justice: “He had met every demand of the Supreme Court of the Universe [a metaphor for God’s own righteousness] that was against the

---

35 ibid. Kenyon’s teachings on identification exclusively deal with who we “are” (in Christ) and who we “were” (in Adam)—not with what the believer “has” in Christ (or for that matter “had” in Adam). The “have” accentuation still plays a major part in Kenyon’s general teachings, though, and is deduced as a direct consequence of his teachings on Identification. Consequently Kenyon’s way of presenting his teachings on Identification is very similar to the expressions he uses when he elaborates on his understanding of divine healing. Kenyon might say that we “have our healing” or that we already “are healed.” The context will then determinate whether it is a matter of a legal or experiential statement. Usually Kenyon speaks in a forensic sense. Through the believer’s illumination of what he legally “has in Christ,” his faith will be stimulated and he will take actual possession of his heritage.


37 “(And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers), that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that he raised up Jesus: as also it is written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.”

38 “And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.”
human race.”$^{39}$ Christ was justified$^{40}$ and was immediately given the position as “absolute monarch of the Universe”:

He was made so Righteous, that He could enter into the presence of the Father with no sense of sin or guilt or inferiority...He stood before the angelic hosts as Righteous, as pure, as though He had never been made sin....He was the master of the underworld. He was the master of Satan. As long as He was spiritually dead, filled with sin, Satan ruled over Him. But when He was made Righteous, He became the dominant master and ruler of Hell.$^{41}$

Scriptural proofs for Jesus being justified and made alive in His spirit (including His again being made a partaker of God’s life and nature) Kenyon finds in 1 Timothy 3:16$^{42}$ and 1 Peter 3:18,$^{43}$ respectively.

Kenyon finds our identification in this aspect of Christ’s redemption referred to in Colossians 2:13$^{44}$ and Ephesians 2:5.$^{45}$ We were made alive with Him. Just as Christ was justified and born again down in the pit of Hell, this same experience of regeneration is available to us through our accepting Christ as Lord and Savior. Legally all human beings are “made alive” with Christ through identification with Him in this aspect of the work of Redemption: “The ‘many brethren’ were legally identified with Him in His Birth out of

---

$^{39}$ Kenyon, Identification, s. 27.

$^{40}$ “Righteousness” and “justification” in Kenyon’s terminology are not primarily related to one’s being acquitted, but to the actual inner transformation where the essence of righteousness is being imputed to one’s nature. Kenyon’s whole teachings take their point of departure in “the Father heart of God.” Man’s being brought into existence is exclusively explained by the Father’s heart desire for fellowship. Due to the entrance of spiritual death into this world a legitimate sin consciousness prevents unregenerate man from spontaneously approaching the presence of God. The primary aim of Righteousness (in Kenyon’s terminology and understanding) is that man again shall be given the ability to approach the Father in child-like affection. Righteousness is frequently defined as “the ability to stand in God’s presence without the sense of guilt, condemnation, or inferiority.” Due to our standing as believers being made righteous we can approach the Father’s presence “as though sin had never touched us, with the same liberty and freedom that Jesus had with the Father in His earth walk” (Kenyon, Two Kinds of Righteousness, 21, 49). The legitimate consciousness of sin which prevents the non-believer from approaching the presence of God, ceases with the believer as he is informed of what it means to be made righteous in Christ. While sin consciousness kills faith’s active display, righteous consciousness inspires us with an unconscious faith in God and in His promises to us.

$^{41}$ Kenyon, Identification, 27-28.

$^{42}$ “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: He who was manifested in the flesh; justified in the spirit, Seen of angels, Preached among the nations, Believed on in the world, Received up in glory.”

$^{43}$ “Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit.”

$^{44}$ “And you, being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, I say, did he make alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses.”

$^{45}$ “Even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved).”
death into Life, but He was the first one to vitally experience it, the first-born.”

Raised with Christ

“The Resurrection of the Lord Jesus is the proof of Satan’s defeat, of man’s Redemption, and of God’s legal right to make the believer a New Creation.” Kenyon’s plagiarist Paul E. Billheimer claims that Jesus’ resurrection can be legitimated through Satan’s illegally taking Him with him to Hell:

In [Satan’s] effort to compel Jesus to rebel against His heavenly Father and transfer His allegiance to himself, Satan pushed Jesus clear up to death, “even the death of the cross.” When at last Jesus bowed His head in mortal agony and dismissed His spirit without once failing in His submission to His heavenly Father, Satan was vanquished. Since Satan’s great purpose in all that he did was to produce one small thought of rebellion against the Father, when Jesus died without yielding to that pressure, He conquered, although He died in doing so.

According to “universal jurisprudence” a murderer is guilty to die, Billheimer states. As man’s legal slave owner Satan had the right to kill whoever he wanted to which belonged to Adam’s race. In his attempts to break the life connection between Jesus and the Father, Satan killed an innocent man, the man Jesus, whom he had no legal claims on: “In so doing he committed murder and, in the court of divine justice, he brought upon himself the sentence of death.”

Billheimer reasons further:

A person under final sentence of death has no legal rights whatever. Therefore, since Calvary, Satan has absolutely no rights or claims upon anyone or anything. Whatever authority he carried with him on his banishment from heaven passed into the hands of the new Man along with the lost heritage of Adam which was restored by the TRIUMPH OF THE CRUCIFIED.

In contradistinction to Kenyon, who felt that there must be a legal ground upon which man’s identification with Adam could be put an end to, Billheimer claims that it was due to Satan’s carelessness and his breaking of judicial directions which opened up the legitimacy of Jesus’ resurrection. Seemingly without consideration of the strictly legal problem in Jesus’ three days and nights substitutionary stay in Hell as a qualification for acquittance

---

46 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, s. 172.
47 Kenyon, Identification, s. 32.
49 ibid.
50 ibid., 80.
of all the sin of the world for all times, Kenyon ascertains that Jesus’ sufferings while in the devil’s custody fully pay man’s debts towards the righteousness of God: “He was declared Righteous because He had satisfied the claims of Justice. He had met every demand of the Supreme Court of the Universe that was against the human race.”

Furthermore,

The Father had laid on Him the sins of the world. Jesus was left alone. God turned His back on Him. Satan triumphantly bore His Spirit to the Dark Regions of Hades. All the sufferings and torments that Hell could produce were heaped upon Jesus. When He had suffered Hell’s agonies for three days and three nights, the Supreme Court of the Universe cried, “Enough.” He had paid the penalty and met the claims of Justice.

The resurrection of Jesus according to Kenyon happened as a direct consequence of His first being justified and made alive “in the spirit” and thereafter having conquered the evil one in the very pit of Hell: “He triumphed over Satan. He conquered the hosts of Hell. He stripped Satan of the authority and dominion he had taken from Adam at the Fall.”

The believer also is legally an heir to this aspect of Christ’s redemption. Kenyon continues:

You were with Him when that battle took place. You were Identified with Him. Just as you were Identified with Him when He was Crucified, when He Died, when He was Buried, when He was Made Alive, when He was Justified, you were with Him in that victory over the adversary. It was your victory, not His. He did not need to fight that battle; He did it for you. When He conquered the adversary and stripped him of his authority, in the mind of the Father it was as though you had done it.

This legal participation in Christ’s victory over the evil one, has--as do the other phases of Redemption--practical consequences for the believer here and now: “It means your mastery over all the works of Satan. It means that you are expected to do the works that Jesus began.” To be more specific: “Satan cannot lord it over us any longer. Disease is under our feet.”

Our being “raised with Christ” is referred to in Ephesians 2:6 and is closely related to the last “step” which culminated with Jesus sitting down at the Father’s right hand.

51 Kenyon, Identification, 27.
52 Kenyon, What Happened, 89.
53 Kenyon, Identification, 30.
54 ibid.
55 ibid., 31.
56 ibid.
57 “And raised us up with him, (and made us sit with him in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus).”
Sat with Him

According to Kenyon Jesus died as the Lamb of God, but rose as the High Priest of the New Covenant. None of the preceding “phases”/”steps” of Redemption would have had any objective merit unless Jesus as the believer’s High Priest “took His own blood and carried it up to the Heavenly Holy of Holies and there presented it to God.”

With his point of departure in John 20:11-18 Kenyon vividly describes a meeting between Lazarus’ sister Mary and the risen Christ. In our context verse 17 is of particular interest: “Jesus saith to her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto to the Father.” Kenyon’s interpretation of that verse is, as follows:

“I am going to take my blood in to the New Holy of Holies, sprinkle it on the mercy seat just as our High Priests have been doing once a year, but mine is going to be an eternal sacrifice...When I come back, you can put your hands on me, you can touch me, you may know that I am flesh and blood, but now goodbye. I am going to my Father.” And He was gone.

He was then on His way to the Father with His own blood, the token of the penalty He had paid, and He could not be touched by human hands.

Mary is the only human being who was ever allowed to meet Jesus during the period after the resurrection, but prior to His leaving the earth in order to approach the Father in heaven with His own blood. As scriptural proof Kenyon appeals to Hebrews 9:12 and 9:24. Jesus went straight into heaven and there presented His blood before the Father:

When God accepted the blood of Jesus Christ, He signified that the claims of Justice had been met, and that man could be legally taken from Satan’s authority and restored to fellowship with Himself.

The New Covenant began functioning on the Day of Pentecost. It was not established in Heaven until Jesus carried His blood into the Holy of Holies and poured it out there as the red seal upon the document of our redemption.

---

58 ibid., 35.
59 Kenyon, What Happened, 74.
60 Kenyon, The Blood Covenant, 42.
61 “(But Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation), nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption.”
62 “For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us.”
63 Kenyon, The Blood Covenant, 42.
We are seated with Him. (Ephesians 2:6, “And made us to sit with Him in the Heavenly places.”) He is waiting for us in His Name to vitally take what legally is ours and in His Name put every enemy of ours under our feet that we might reign as kings with Him.  

After the Father having recognized the shed blood of Jesus as satisfactory and therefore legally could give eternal life to man, Jesus would 37 days later return into heaven and sit down at the Father’s right hand, the latter signifying His reigning position. Due to our identification with Christ we also are partakers of this kingly position: “When Jesus sat down, His work was finished, and He made me to sit down with Him. You see, He raised me up with Him. He seated me with Him. I am one with Him.”

Jesus’ ministry as High Priest of the New Covenant brings to an end the many “phases”/“steps” of Redemption. However, He does not remain passive at the Father’s right hand. The present ministry of Jesus includes the functions such as mediator, intercessor, advocate and surety.  

Up till now, however, we have simply ignored a vital aspect of Jesus’ Redemption. Until now man’s identification with Christ has exclusively been connected with the believer who lived during or after Jesus walked this earth. However, Redemption also includes the believer under the Old Covenant.

According to Matthew 27:52 the tombs in Jerusalem were opened as Jesus died physically, and various Old Testament saints who had died, arose. After the resurrection of Jesus three days later, they came out of their tombs and appeared to many within the city.

Kenyon claims with support in Joseph B. Rotherham’s The Emphasized Bible that the correct translation of Jesus’ promise to one of the thieves on the Cross, would be: “I say unto you Today, thou shalt be with me in Paradise.” Jesus did not go to Paradise as His spirit left the physical body:

---

64 Kenyon, What Happened, 51.
65 Kenyon, Bible in the Light, 175.
66 Neglecting the fact that the Day of Pentecost was celebrated on the fiftieth day from the first Sunday after Passover, Kenyon counts 50 days from the day of Jesus’ crucifixion instead of from His resurrection (Kenyon, What Happened, 77). The forty days during which He appeared to the disciples prior to His ascension according to Acts 1:3 consequently must be reduced with three days. Hence, 37 days.
67 Kenyon, What Happened, 81.
68 “As Mediator, He stands between lost men and God. But as Intercessor He ever lives to make intercession for saved men. He prays for them. He cares for them” (Kenyon, What Happened, 80). With his point of departure in Hebrews 7:22 Kenyon states that Jesus due to His present ministry as “surety” stands back of the New Covenant and guarantees its eternal integrity.
Paradise was a place for the Old Testament saints to await the completion of the redemptive work of Christ. They were waiting for the fulfillment of the First Covenant. Kenyon further claims that the Old Covenant saints waited for Jesus to “cash the promissory notes of the Atonement blood for the fifteen hundred years.” However, this could not be done until Jesus had been resurrected from the dead and He had presented His own blood before the Father in the “Heavenly Holy of Holies” and “the supreme court of the universe had accepted that blood and had justified the Old Testament saints.” After the Father had recognized the shed blood of Jesus as satisfactory Jesus was again free to return to the earth:

Jesus was then enabled to go to Paradise and proclaim to the awaiting saints of the Old Covenant that He had made a perfect redemption, He had cashed every one of the promissory notes of [the Old Testament] Atonement. Notice in this, that the New Covenant began to function the moment that He carried His blood into the Heavenly Holy of Holies and that He instantly became the Mediator between fallen man and the Father. He had died for the redemption of transgressions under the first Covenant. Now these Old Covenant men are to receive their eternal inheritance. They were promised it every time the High Priest carried blood into the Holy of Holies. That was a promissory note, and had gone on for fifteen hundred years. Now Jesus cashed these notes. The Old Testament Fathers were redeemed. They were in Paradise waiting for Him. The thief that died on the cross was among them in Paradise. Jesus was going to keep his promise now.

Kenyon’s scriptural proofs are basically 1 Peter 3:18-19, Ephesians 4:8-9 and Acts 1:9. According to Kenyon Jesus had no message to proclaim to the Old Testament saints prior to His blood having been presented before the Father in heaven. Kenyon interprets Ephesians 4:8-9 to say that Jesus then visited the saints in Paradise and proclaimed to them the glad tidings concerning the fact that they also were included in His work of Redemption:

---

69 Kenyon, What Happened, 60.
70 ibid.
71 ibid.
72 ibid., 72.
73 ibid., 75.
74 “Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.”
75 “Wherefore he saith, When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, And gave gifts unto men. (Now this, He ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth?)”
76 “And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up: and a cloud received him out of their sight.”
“He took these captives captive and He gave unto them gifts.” With regard to the cloud that covered Jesus from the disciples’ sight when He ascended to heaven in Acts 1:9, Kenyon claims “that the cloud was the Old Testament saints taken up from Paradise into Heaven.” These holy men of God are called “the first-fruits of His great sacrifice.”

The Old Covenant believers found themselves in a rather unique situation. During Jesus’ forty days with His disciples and even at His ascension to heaven, no one had yet “received the benefit of His substitutionary sacrifice.” No one had yet been born again. Most probably no one even knew that the Old Testament saints were just about to be taken to Heaven with Jesus in order to be with God:

Understand clearly that the Old Covenant had passed with the rent veil. The new Covenant had come into being with Jesus’ blood being carried into the Holy of Holies. But the ministry of the Holy Spirit was held up for ten days after Jesus had left them. You see the Master had to sit down at the right hand of the Majesty on High and enter into His rest. Then the Holy Spirit took up His ministry. He came on the Day of Pentecost which was fifty days after the crucifixion.

The objective (legal) side of Redemption in other words seems to have been completed at Jesus’ first entrance in Heaven as He presented His own blood before the Father just after having left Lazarus’ sister Mary outside of the tomb. Not until the day of Pentecost, however, did the believer’s legal identification with Christ also become a subjective experience which is made available to each and anybody who receives Christ as Lord and Savior.

---

77 Kenyon, What Happened, 75.
78 ibid.
79 ibid., 76-77.
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