

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

[Side A]

I think perhaps we should bow together in prayer. (Clears throat) Father, we seek to be loyal to thy truth and to thy word. Faithful servants of the gospel of Jesus Christ. We confess how little we know and how much more we wish we knew. We confess, father, that there are very sincere people with different views on this matter—your people, your children. And so in one sense we would tread lightly, and yet as honestly as we may. And above all I pray that wherein I speak beyond that which is your truth, that you would pluck it from the minds of the listeners. And insofar as what I have to say may be reflections of your word and your will, may it find fruitful soil. In Jesus name, amen.

The twentieth century has brought into existence perhaps—or without doubt—the most massive series of charismatic-type movements within Christianity that we have known since the early church. Percentage-wise it is not as great a percentage of the total church as perhaps the second and third century, but certainly in terms of the massive size and numbers. It has brought with it a wide variety of movements, all of which are charismatic in nature, and, uhh, there is a tremendous lack of knowledge, and lack of balance, and often lack of substance—partly because we are in a society in North America today in which subjectivism and personal feeling and sensualism is the current environment. We move in it. And it tends to affect all that we think and do, sometimes to, uhh, the detriment of that which is true, biblical Christianity, once we’re all delivered unto the saints. This afternoon I am reporting, in a sense, what I have found in some thirty-five years of intense study in the scriptures on this particular subject. I am reporting now what I have found out, as I have studied virtually all the other major charismatic movements through the history of the church—what started them? How long did they last? How effective were they? Why did they die out? And I am prepared to tell you that I am also reporting out of what I have personally seen and experienced. The first twenty-five years of my life was an intense and deeply personal involvement in a charismatic movement. I spent three years teaching in a Pentecostal Bible college, in which I was at the focal point of all that was going on around the world in charismatic circles. For my first graduate degree I did a book on the subject of the charismatic activity in the Christian church through the second century, attempting to find out what the Bible meant and how it was practiced in the early church, and also trying to find out whether they continued or whether they ceased, as some were saying. It is my intention, the lord willing, as my final major historical work to write a history of charismatic Christianity through the centuries, and have been writing pieces of it for some years now, a bit at a time. [5:02] And so it’s from that perspective that I am saying what I have to say to you today. I understand that this is being taped. I would make it clear that permission is not given to anyone to reduplicate this tape, except to get it from the offices of the Evangelical Free Church, and for only one’s personal use, not reproduction.

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

I want to begin with some general comments about the Biblical basis for charismatic activity. And we need to start with something of a definition. This term, *charismatic*, comes from a Greek word, and it is *charismata*. It is simply made English and, and, uhh, turned into an English word.

Charismata comes from *charisma*, *charisma* is root-based in *charis*, which is the word for *grace*. And in a number of places in the New Testament, four in particular—Romans chapter twelve; first Corinthians chapters twelve, thirteen, and fourteen; Ephesians chapter four, and first Peter chapter four—you have references to the charismatic gifts, or gifts of the Spirit, as they are often called. These are really gifts of grace. Gracious gifts of God to those who are believers. Gracious gifts given to all believers, says first Corinthians 12:7. Given to all believers by the Holy Spirit working in the life of that believer, and given to all believers for the body. Given to all believers essentially to minister to others the work of Christ. It is referred to as the manifestation. Now if you take a statue that someone has built and it is kept covered until the right moment when the crowd is all gathered and someone pulls the line and up goes the covering, the statue is unveiled, or manifest. Well, the work of the Holy Spirit in terms of the gifts of the Spirit are called the manifestation of the Spirit: they unveil in the life of the body corporate the very being and essence and nature and work of the divine third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit. Now the manifestation of the Spirit, says first Corinthians 12:7, is given to every Christian for the edification, for the value, for the benefit of the body corporate. First Corinthians 12:11 goes on to tell us very clearly, however, that these gifts are in the sovereign will of the Holy Spirit himself. He gives, or he withholds; he makes them manifest, or not manifest in any given assembly or any given generation or any given geographical location when, and as, he wills. It’s in no one else’s control. I would also suggest to you that when one looks at these charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit—unlike those who are working solely from the King James Bible and many, many books appeared for many, many decades talking about the “nine gifts of the Spirit”; there are not nine gifts of the Spirit, there are nine listed in first Corinthians twelve, but if you take the Greek word *charismata* and look through a Greek concordance you find that there are fifteen or sixteen references to this in the New Testament, in the passages that I have described for you. Also, you very soon come to realize that the word is used for both the activity—the manifestation, the gift—and for its operation in the sense of office and role. And it’s used interchangeably in that way. [10:00] In Romans chapter twelve it talks about the *charismata*, and then goes on to proceed to talk about ministry and various other things that have to do with offices or workings (??) in the church. I might also suggest that in my judgment as you analyze the lists of gifts in the various portions of the New Testament you come to the conclusion—I don’t think you can help but come to that conclusion—that the lists are not exhaustive! That Paul is just throwing out—or Peter—are (sic) just throwing out lists of names that come to him as he’s writing along. He’s not saying, ‘This is the totality of them’, he’s saying, ‘This is what they’re like, here’s a list of them, here’s some of them,’ and in one list you get a group of, uhh—uhh, offices like apostles and—and evangelists, and—and prophets, and—and pastors and teachers; and in another list you get some gifts and you get gifts mixed with

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

ministers (sic), and then you get some more that weren’t in first Corinthians twelve, and, uhh, then you get some like, uhh—uhh, first Corinthians fourteen talking about prophesying as being the same thing as exhorting for exhortation, and then you go over to Romans chapter 12 and he speaks of exhortation as a gift by itself, distinct from prophesying. So in one case it’s all one and in another case it’s pulled apart and separated—in other words, these things are not fine-line tuned (??); they are not very descriptively precise! And I think that is a tremendously important thing to understand. Some of them have no New Testament example anywhere that I can find—and this is something that I searched in the second century; if I found out how a particular gift was being operated in a church in the second century, then I might look back in the New Testament, and even though it doesn’t say so I might find it functioning—uhh, a New Testament example of how it functioned. There were many of the gifts that I could not find any examples, either in the second century or in the New Testament of how they actually operated; somehow they never bothered giving us a description. Well, you see how imprecise that makes it. Oh, in one sense it’s very precise: in one sense these are gracious gifts of the Holy Spirit, in one sense they manifest the Holy Spirit. But no boundaries are put on as to how, or who, or how many. And I think we have run into all kinds of difficulty because we have misunderstood that point specifically.

A second observation I’d make in terms of this Biblical basis for charismatic gifts is not only their definition—of what they are, how they function in that sense—but I think I would like to say something about (pauses) this: when you come to first Corinthians twelve and it begins to talk about the *charismata*, it does so under a general heading at the beginning of the twelfth chapter of, “Now, concerning spiritualities,” or spiritual things—he doesn’t say spiritual gifts. He says—and he doesn’t use the word *charismata*, he uses the word, *pneumatikum*—“Now, concerning just spiritual things, my brethren, I would not have you ignorant.” And then eventually he focuses in not only on spiritual gifts, but a number of other things that have to do with the spiritual operation of the body in a healthy, uhh, New Testament church. But it is clear that all of the new spiritual gifts have essentially spiritual attributes. But I would suggest to you also a principle that is found repeatedly in scripture, uhm, in, in, the general operation of scripture, and the New Testament, what has often been called the economy of miracle. Oh, sure, there are individual works that talk about these things that I have done you shall do and greater things than these, and so on. [14:58] But when you begin to search the New Testament very carefully, you find that miracles were not handled loosely, or lightly, or as part of one’s general operational life like eating and drinking, or coming together in fellowship, and so on. That miracles were miracles. That miracles were very, very carefully handled and understood. Uhm, if you actually go through the New Testament, even in the life of Paul, and take the number of years he lived and the number of miracles he performed, and where and how many, and how long the stretches he went without any miracles, you suddenly begin to get a little different picture merging. Oh, yes, the miracles where there. Oh, yes, they authenticated certain things. But there was a great deal of care about the whole business. Uhm, for example, there were all kinds of apocryphal writings about the miracles of Jesus and the miracles of Paul and the

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

miracles of James and the miracles of Peter, that, uhh, floated around the second century—the early part of the second century—which the Christian church carefully—although they tried to claim to be scripture—said, “No, this is not God’s word. These are not legitimate.” Why not? I’ll give you one illustration in the Acts of Peter—a particular document floating around—: it was a story about Peter and a couple other disciples going on a missionary trip, and as they went along the road they came to a place where they would stop overnight that would be sort of like a wayside hotel, and when they went into this place they went up to the room where they would be given hospitality for the night, and, uhh, one of the people who were accompanying Peter sort of looked under what today would be the bedclothes, and there they found them: bedbugs. All kinds of ‘em. Well, they were on the lord’s work, and they had traveled all day, and they were weary. And they knew that they needed a night’s rest very, very badly. So they had a little conference with Peter about the bedbugs. And Peter went to the bed and spoke to the bedbugs, and he said, more or less, “Dear bedbugs, we are the servants of the lord. Now, we need a night’s rest, and we need it badly. I ask you, will you kindly leave us alone for the night.” And he cast the bedbugs out of the bed, and they all streamed out of the bed and lined up in rows along the wall on the floor, and they all climbed into the bed, and had a good night’s sleep. And as they left the room the next morning, they thanked the bedbugs and they all scurried back into the bed. Well? It was a story of a miracle. It did not get into the scriptures. (Audience laughs) Why? Why not? Because there are a set of characteristics about miracle in the scripture. They are not used lightly. They are used very carefully. They have ethical overtones. They are not just for the benefit of the individual—they are for the service of God in some special way, they are under the sovereign control of God. There are a whole set of criteria that apply to what is a legitimate miracle in the New Testament. Uhm, for example, we have to answer the question, “Why did Jesus go down to the pool and there find one man out of all the sick?” True, he couldn’t get into the pool, but there were others who couldn’t get in either. He healed the one and he left the rest. Now there may have been hundreds of people there, but only one percent—one half of a percent, one quarter of a percent—that he touched. And the rest he didn’t. There was a reason for what he did, and this was in the divine plan of God, as to what happened, and why it happened, and for what reason it happened. It’s very important for us to understand something about the economy of miracles.

And that leads me then to a third point as we look at this whole business of the charismatic activity in the scriptures. It leads me to this question, “Well, what about at least the more sensational?” Now you can’t say the more supernatural, because they’re all supernatural, they’re all manifestations of the Holy Spirit. [20:02] That makes all of them, helps (??) whatever, admini—they’re all supernatural. Well, then what about this business that some of the *more* supernatural somehow or other ceased at some point because the Bible was complete, perhaps? Well, there are some very fine theologians and biblical exegetes who present that case. And I tried to weigh it very carefully—personally, I don’t buy it. Uhm, I’ll tell you why I don’t buy it—uhm—for one thing, as a person who tries to deal with the whole nature of scripture and the hermeneutics of scripture, and defends scripture for what it is as a revelation of God with God in control of the who and when, I find it simply incredible that large chapters of the New Testament

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

refer to the taking care of, and handling and ordering of gifts that were going to cease to exist before the church hardly got started. And for the next two-thousand years are virtually irrelevant. That became a hermeneutical problem for me—a very great hermeneutical problem. I found it extremely difficult to negate only the more obviously miraculous based on some rather strange exegesis of first Corinthians thirteen, using usually not the primary meaning of Greek words but secondary meanings. That gave me all kinds of difficulty. And thirdly, I discovered that if the apostles had been told and so recorded in scripture that gifts like healing and so on were to cease with the, uhh,—or prophesying and so on—were to cease with the completion of the New Testament, somehow not one of the apostles and not one of the students of the apostles and not one of their students in the next half century ever understood it that way. It seems to me incredible such a change, if it were going to take place that it should have such tremendous importance to the Christian church somehow failed to get communicated. And as I analyzed and I read, I think every sentence, every word that was written, uhh, from the documents that we have from the second century, I found that the teaching of 1 Corinthians 13 that suggests that certain gifts would cease when that which is perfect—namely scripture—would come, was not so interpreted by any exegete that I could discover in the early church. None of them ever heard of that exegesis. It sounds to me rather like a rationalization for a problem that has come in later. Secondly, I did not find as I searched in the second century and on into the third century—I did not find that they ceased. They did not cease. They continued to be part of the life of the church in the second century, and a considerably extensive part of the life of the church. Although not nearly as great as many contemporary charismatic movements would make it. I can find no trace of the degree that is there presently. It would have to be considered a much moderated expression, even in the early part of the second century. These are observations. They are taken for what they were. They are what I have discovered as I went along.

A fourth point that I would make on these preliminary observations: I find a lot of rather silly argument going on about whether there is such a thing, after one’s saved, as a baptism of the Holy Spirit. I mean, after all, when we are baptized, the New Testament in 1 Corinthians 12 makes it very clear that every Christian is baptized by the Spirit into the body of Christ. That is part of what it means to become a Christian. Then what are we talking about experiences—an experience or many experiences—of being baptized by the Holy Spirit—don’t these people know what they’re talking about? Well maybe it’s alright to talk about fillings of the Holy Spirit. Well, I really find that all kind of silly. Number one, Luke and Acts were written by the same person. [25:00] Luke talks about “He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit in power.” The references to that baptism of the Holy Spirit tie in exactly with what he’s saying in Acts 1:8 when “You shall be filled with the Holy Spirit and be witnesses unto me.” And then it goes on to Acts 2 and they’re all filled with the Holy Spirit, which is clearly identified with what he talks about in Luke as the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But then, amazingly, he goes on in the fourth chapter and the same group were all filled a second time with the Holy Spirit. So it clearly was not being baptized into the body of Christ. The problem comes around this word *baptism*—which is a Greek word, baptizo—which simply means being totally submersed in, being totally

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

filled with, being totally overwhelmed by, being totally submerged into or placed into—of course you can talk about being totally placed into the body of Christ by the Holy Spirit when you’re saved. But you can also talk about being totally filled with the Holy Spirit sometime in your experience, or a continuing point in your experience, or repeated points in your experience, and so we get all hung up about things that in fact don’t make any difference at all. And so I say to you, I don’t think we should get hung up about that. Of course one is baptized into the body of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit when they’re saved. But of course there can be fillings or baptisms or whatever you want to talk about in the Holy Spirit for particular tasks or duties—uhh—and continuously or repeatedly or whatever, because you have examples of all of it in the New Testament.

Fifth and last of these general observations that I would make is this: that as I studied the New Testament itself and then I studied what was a tremendously massive re-invigoration in the second and third centuries of prophesy in the church, orthodox New Testament prophecy had nothing to do with the great prophets and apostles who wrote the scriptures—and they knew it. New Testament prophecy and the prophets of the Old Testament—it’s, it’s a total mistake to confuse those things. Paul said, “Prophecy is for exhortation and edification of the body of Christ.” Nowhere in the New Testament do I find New Testament prophets in the church having any of their re—their prophecies ever recorded or becoming part of scripture. Nowhere in the second century within orthodox Christianity—while there was much New Testament prophecy or kinds of prophecy going on—no one ever dreamt of recording it or turning it into revelation. It was not intended for such. It was nothing more than a preacher getting up and feeling led by the Holy Spirit to speak in a certain way, and that was considered prophecy. But it was allowed for the members, too, (coughs) and when they came together they were to bring a song or a prayer, or a doctrine or a word of exhortation or something to somebody else, and if the Holy Spirit pressed that upon them, they were to do it as unto the Lord. But no one ever gave it an infallibility or a sense of revelation—nobody ever recorded it for subsequent generations or other people. It was an immediate thing, an immediate awareness of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the lives of his people. Nothing more! It was not greatly unlike the sharing that took place in fellowship prayer meetings in our services years ago, when people cared for one another and talked to one another and prayed for one another and did things together. It—it wasn’t intensely supernaturalistic in some extraordinary way—but it was real, and it was the presence of the Holy Spirit. Well, we can get all hung up about that, then, because we simply didn’t know what it was all about, so often. Any concept of New Testament prophecy being identified with continued revelation was not orthodoxy. In fact, if you move into the very earliest part of the second century into pastors at uhh, uhm, Ephesus, like, uhh, Ignatius or Polycarp—those who were, those who may have heard personally the apostle John in their lifetime. [30:07] And when you look at them in the second century they’re all described as pastor-prophets. They were considered unfit for the pastoral ministry if they were not prophets, if they did not have a prophetic ministry, if they had not been called directly by the Holy Spirit, if they were not sensitive to the Holy Spirit enlightening them from the Word as they ministered the Word.

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

Okay. Now let me go to the early church, then. I think I wanna move from these preliminary, general, sort of biblical, uhh, observations about the charismatic, and wanna move into church history and talk about charismatic movements—what has happened? What do they look like? Well, of course in the early church, in the very earliest church, and you can get it in, uhh, in uhh, a variety of documents, in the very earliest church coming right out of the New Testament period, uhh, you did not have established congregations—you had little groups of people meeting at homes and so on. And, uhh, only here and there, particularly where there was a strong Jewish element did you have something of an established congregation, and they took on very strongly Hebrew orientation and liturgy and elders like the elders in the synagogues and, and—and so on, and of course they characterized the church much like they had characterized the synagogue. Uhh, but as you moved out and the church grew and there were a handful here and a few there and a few there, they didn’t have pastors and established trained people leading them and so on. What you’ve got a lot of itinerant ministry. And you had itinerant prophets, now by prophets they simply meant people gifted by the Holy Spirit to encourage the brethren in exhortation and edification. And you had itinerant evangelists who had—who moved about with particular skills and reaching those who—and, and talking to, and winning—those who were bringing to decision??, those who were on the verge of becoming Christians. And uhh, you had itinerant apostles. And apostles, uhh, the word *apostle* is—this is unlike where they made distinction from the twelve—but, uhh, *apostle* is simply the Greek word *apostelo*, which means ‘one who is sent’, and as they moved into the, into the Roman world, into the Latin world, the Latin word that it comes from is *mission*, ‘a sent one’, or, uhh, *Mittere – Mitto – Misi – Missum*, if you know your Latin, uhh, which is the term for *missionary*. What is an apostle? He’s a missionary. They moved out into new areas with particularly, uhh, missionary type—they were sent from a, a gathering of God’s people like Paul and Barnabus were sent, and out they went to all over the place. Well, very quickly what happened is that churches grew, uhh, the itinerant ministry weakened, and the—the, elders and the pastors within the congregations as they moved they chose the prophets as their pastors, uh, they had teachers—the teachers did much of the catechizing, and out of it came most of the great theologians of the late second, uh, middle and late second century—were those who taught the new converts in the church. But they were also a kind of pastor-teacher. So you had pastor, teacher, prophet, all merging together in the work of the one—the one or ones—who were leading the, uh, the congregation, and the other two that remained in tact(??) were missionaries who were set out and evangelists who had certain very special gifts that moved about in the churches.

But all that’s there in Ephesians 4 still exists! It still functions. Has always functioned. Carrying on the full range of activity that God intended in the New Testament and has described in the New Testament. Well, as you move into the second century, by the time you get to about the year 150. Now 150: John dies around the year, well, in the 90’s probably, the last of the apostles. You’ve got sixty, seventy years—sixty, seventy years, those days when people didn’t live as long as they did (sic) now, that’s about three generations, getting into the fourth generation, you take any movement—Wesleyan movement, any revival movement, any

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

denomination—that hits into its fourth or fifth generation and things start going pretty cold. [35:14] Passing on the faith to the third generation is a major problem, and when you get to the fourth and fifth, and those who were converted in the 50’s and 60’s, into the sixth generation or more, things were getting pretty remote and pretty cold. And all kinds of problems were emerging in the church. What you had is a state of semi-spiritual stagnation emerging. And in the, uhh, latter half of the second century the first major revival in the church took place. In the history of the Christian church. And it was a revival against, uhh, cold formalism in the structures of the church that were developing and stifling—it seemed—the life of the church, and a revival against worldliness. And the two went hand in hand. This revival of the latter part of the second century was called Montanism. Now that’s a misnomer. It was called Montanism because they followed a pattern that enemies usually follow, which is to find in a movement the most radical, extreme, craziest person you can find, and then brand the whole movement after him, and so by virtue of association—though others may disavow any connections with him—uhh, by association you destroy the whole thing. They played that off on us when we started the Believers Church when we got started and they took people like Thomas Müntzer in the sixteenth century, a wild-eyed crazy fanatic and called him a Baptist and made everyone—Free Church, Believers Church, Baptist—all like this crazy Müntzer. And for about three centuries, uhh, the result was persecution for believers’ churches—free churches, uhh, of which the Free Church of Canada is a part of the movement. Well, okay, the same thing happened. It’s true that in Frigio(??) in one of the little provinces of Asia Minor which is today Turkey, on one of these hotbeds of early Christianity. Uhh, a guy by the name of Montanus came along who claimed to be the incarnation of the Holy Spirit and he had two prophets—prophetesses—uhh, Priscilla and Aquilla, and these two prophetesses began with all kinds of prophecies and so on of a very spectacular and remarkable nature that the church hadn’t seen before, and they were scratching their head, didn’t know what to make of it, it became very excessive, and that—that heretical charismatic was branded for the whole revival of the charismatic movement. People forget that the great church historian Tertullian, who taught many of the things that we stand for, was himself a Montanist. But nobody ever refers to them as the followers of Tertullian. They refer to them as Montanists. Uh, and yet Tertullian is one of the great Latin church fathers. But, uh, what happens there in the second century is this, and it’s extremely important, because Montanism died in the late third century; it died by falling into serious heresy, its life was short-term, and it burned out. And the next group, the Melchiorites, that I’m going to talk about, in the sixteenth century, went into serious heresy, was short-term, and it burned out. The Irvingites in the nineteenth century in England went into heresy, and were short-term, and burned out. And so there is a pattern here of danger, danger, there are red lights flashing whenever charismatic movements arise, because there is a whole pattern here in the church.

But what about this big revival in the second—the late second and early third century? Well, it’s a little different. Uh, I soon discovered as I researched this, that within the Christian church at the time there were really those who, who reject everything to do with the revival, partly because of their worldliness—and then there were those who were much more careful. There

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

were those who rejected Montanus, and there were those who wrote letters, including acts, decrees of synods of churches in Asia Minor, in Greece, as far away as Gaul in Southern France there are records of letters going which say “Be careful, be careful, what Montanus is doing is wrong—this is not biblical, this is not true to the church, but be careful that you do not wipe out the legitimate with the illegitimate. Be careful.” [40:15] You can read it over and over again. And as I read it, I discovered how they distinguished between heretical charismatic and orthodox charismatic, and it’s all there, in the second century. And this is what they said—this may be new to almost all of you—, they said: “Don’t stamp out that which is of God and that which is spiritual. That which is not of God will follow this pattern: one, Paul clearly taught that the prophecy is subject to the prophet.” That means that the prophet has to know what he said, has to be responsible for what he said, has to be willing to take his licks if what he said is not quite accurate, has to admit that he was the one who was saying it, even if he sensed the movement of the Holy Spirit in his life—or perhaps in doing it—but he was subject to the prophet. If he was prophesying in a trance that was paganism and that was heretical. That is nothing other than spiritualism—spiritism. So the first sign of heretical charismatic was that those who prophesied went into a trance. The second follows right in line with it, because they were doing it right in the Montanists’ section: if they speak as if they were a channel and speak in the first person, saying, “I, The Lord, speak unto you this is what I am saying unto you,”—that is not right. They may say, “This is what I understand the Lord to be saying to you,”—but they cannot put it in the first person! That is paganism. And there were lots of cults, there were lots of sects of paganism around in that time in the second century, as there are today, who could do that and duplicate it. As spiritualist mediums can do today, including speaking in tongues and other kinds of things, which they do. The third that was laid down as sign of that which was orthodox is that whatever was said—whether in tongues; with interpretation, which is nothing more than, Paul says, prophecy, but a little bit more spectacular for a particular reason, or what is directly prophecy—uhh, for edification always and uplift and encouragement and exhortation only, it must—even though it is of that nature—it must be subject to scripture and subject to the judgment of the community and the elders of the community. Now what they were saying is this: the Holy Spirit was by our Lord Jesus Christ not commissioned to speak of himself, or to create new religion, but only to speak and to witness to Jesus Christ. Now the only Jesus Christ we know is the Jesus Christ of Scripture. The Holy Spirit is not to add to scripture, the Holy Spirit is not to invent new religion, the Holy Spirit is to enhance what is in scripture. The Holy Spirit is only to bring to mind within the individuals what is already there and which they know or should know. So it no way adds to expand tricks(??) changes. It remains under the control of Christ, under the control of his—(audio cuts off at 44:26)

...There was a distinction made before the end of the second century based on the Montanist revival of the later part of that century, a clear distinction made within the churches of Christ between orthodox charismatic and heretical charismatic. And the heretical was that which was done in a trance and so claimed a supernaturalism about itself that made the individual not

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

responsible for what he did. It was things done in the first person, which then gave it an authority that it had no right to have. [45:05] And thirdly, it was not then subject to the scriptures alone, but led—as it did in heretical Montanism—to continual revelation, to new teachings, to new truths, and so on, which were leading people away from the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

Well, let me move on. I might add that Montanism was more than the minority of—of the heretical Montanists. In fact, there are many historians that estimate who by the early part of the third century as much as half of the total church in the Roman Empire were Montanists in sympathy. Which is why I say that it was the biggest charismatic movement—next to the twentieth century—that we’ve had.

Okay. Sixteenth century, something about the Melchiorites. This is based on the teachings of a chap (sic) called Zwickau Prophets, who came to the city of Wittenberg when Luther was starting the Reformation, and wanted to propagate a charismatic—a very, very ultra-heretical charismatic—kind of Christianity. And, uh, a chap, a Reformer, by the name of Thomas Müntzer bought into it and became its leader, and on his death, uh, another chap by the name of Melchior Hoffman picked it up and carried it further. And, uh, Melchior Hoffman’s teachings, he got together with a couple by the name of Leonard and Ursula Jost, who claimed to be prophets and prophetesses. And they got into prophecy, the prophecy was recorded and given a weight equal to Jeremiah or Isaiah or others, uh, it lead them into believing that they were establishing a Last Day/Latter Reign-movement, which would bring into existence a hundred-and-fourty-four thousand super apostolic preachers who would do all the miracles that the apostles ever did and more, and through this hundred-and-fourty-four thousand the whole world was going to be converted. Under, uh, under two of their number, who claimed to be the two witnesses of Revelation 11, uh, a chap by the name of John of Leiden and another called John Matthys, uh, they called for the establishment of the New Jerusalem in a city in North Germany, which they took control of by force, called the city of Münster. And there they set up the Kingdom of David, the restored Kingdom of David under king John, and then they moved into polygamy, and immorality, and all kinds of things that were very, very messy, and uh, on with their continued revelations and prophets and prophecies and charismatics and miracles and healings. The signs and wonders authenticate what? Since the signs and wonders can be used and were used by groups that were fatally flawed and terrible heretics—but they had the signs and the wonders. That in itself tells us nothing. Anyway, this group ended up in such a mess as you would not believe, that discredited the whole movement and it died in the sixteenth century. In fact it took an ex-Catholic priest by the name of Menno Simons to come along and pick up the pieces, the wreckage, and create out of the wreckage of that heretical, distorted, wild charismatic movement to create the beautiful people we call the Mennonites. Based on Menno Simons and his teachings. And I might add that the teachings of Menno Simons are virtually identical to the teachings of the Evangelical Free Church of Canada. Uh, in the nineteenth century—and I must, I must just hurry along with this—but in the nineteenth century you had the rise of another group very similar to the ones to the Montanist group, to the heretical Montanist group, to the

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

Melchiorites, to the Irving—the Irvingites in the nineteenth century. They had some, uh, they were somewhat more moderate, they tried to recreate a distinct apostleship and a number of other things, they had an emphasis on prophecy. [50:04] Uh, I might add that there is pretty clear evidence now, this is a little embarrassing, but there is clear evidence now that, that Darby picked up his particular, his particular brand of any moment(??) coming of Jesus Christ from a lady by the name of Margaret, who was an Irvingite prophetess in a meeting that he attended and she was predicting the coming of the lord Jesus Christ back in the 1820’s. And, uh, he thought that it was so sure that it was bound to happen that he attempted to create a theology built on that prophecy, and uh, a number of things have emerged from that.

But I want to move on very quickly to the beginning of the twentieth century, 1906 or a little earlier in Topeka, Kansas or some little Bible institute but the connections are not all that clear, uh, a chap who also had some connections with the Irvingites, a chap led a revival in a storefront mission in Los Angeles, uh, in 1906, that gave birth to the modern Pentecostal movement. And out of that rather amazing movement that began in 1906 and spread, within two or three years to virtually every country in the world. Out of that has come all kinds of various brands of Pentecostalism. It began with a strong emphasis not on prophecy, but on tongues—speaking in tongues. Uh, they had a tremendous kind of spiritual experience, upheaval, as the revival got started and it seems like everybody who went, they came from all over Canada and the United States, Europe and from Norway, Sweden and England and, and uh, all rushed down there to California to see what was going on—California starts lots of things. (Muffled laughter) And, uh, they rushed down there to see what was going on, and everybody who got in on this blessing seemed almost automatically even though they didn’t know what it was all about and certainly didn’t go seeking it. (52:23) They all started speaking in strange tongues and all kinds of healings were taking place and uh, as one analyzes the movement what one finds is that—is that, uh, that it certainly had a significant role to play, because by the end of the nineteenth century, the great protestant denominations and their seminaries and, and, uh, theological training schools were all collapsing before liberal theology and a cold formalism and a cold intellectualized rationalism. It was in fact leading the Christian church right out of faithfulness to the word of God and Jesus Christ to a denial of the supernatural and into a kind of Christianized Humanism based far more on a social Darwinism than on the Bible. And it seems that in one sense what happened is that God—and I’m giving this a very positive light to throw in some negatives(??)—but God took a batch of people, most of them lay people without a great deal of education or whatever—although there were some very well-educated people who came too, Lutheran pastors and others, Methodist pastors—and took these men, and simply so engulfed them in the power of his Spirit that they without any further ado, without even having been able to think it through rationally, simply accepted the supernatural and so denied the whole liberal movement. And this led to a revival of evangelism. These people became evangelists, leading people to Christ in tent meetings and so on and all over the place. And vast numbers of people were converted, were saved.

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

Now, uh, the tongues-healing movement, then, had its background in this (inaudible) road not by accident but coinciding with the great rationalism at the beginning of the century. I believe that Pentecostalism has survived perhaps longer than any group except Montanism, because it became doctrinally orthodox. At the beginning of the first fifteen years of the movement it was not. All kinds of things flowed back and forth, in and out, heresies emerged, and groups split off because of the heresies. But a few leaders emerged who were firmly grounded on the Word of God and on historic orthodox Christianity. Such as in Canada, Dr. J. Eustace Purdie, who was an Anglican minister, who uh, ah, was sympathetic to the movement. [55:02] And I think back in 1925 was chosen—though he remained an Anglican minister—was chosen to head up as principle their first Bible Institute, in Winnipeg—Western Bible College. He headed it for twenty-five years. And uh, few years ago when I did a study of this only about five, six years ago, every one of their six Bible colleges in Canada, the president of that Bible college had been trained by Dr. J. Eustace Purdie, who was a Reformed Anglican. Who gave them a catechism, who gave them orthodoxy, who decreed that the Bible had to be the sole, inerrant authority within the movement. Uh, they had some odd doctrines, like: you weren’t baptized in the Holy Spirit unless you spoke in tongues, according to Acts 2:4, written into their statement of faith, some weirdo things like that, uh, that really can’t be proved by scripture. And, uh, but nevertheless, they were orthodox. They were Evangelical. They were winning people to Jesus Christ. They had set themselves and rooted themselves firmly during the twenty-five years that he was there. He kicked out groups that had all kinds of signs and wonders and claimed to be the renewal of the real while they were going stale, but went on into libertarianism, into free love, into all sorts of, of movements. Into, uh, Unitarianism, uh, and they were one after another under his leadership kicked out of the major denomination. Now, that same major denomination, the time came when their Bible college in Kenya, their Bible college in uh, in uh, Formosa, their Bible colleges in Hong Kong, their Bible college in Trinidad, their Bible college in about six other areas of the world—all the presidents, all were trained by this same guy. The presidents of three of the major schools in the United States in the Assemblies of God were all trained by Dr. J. Eustace Purdie, they all used his notes, which are as orthodox as Bancroft, or Strong, or, you name it, uh, Berkhof—closer to Berkhoff, probably(?). Uh, as a result, that movement has not gone down the drain like Montanism and Melchiorism and Irvingitism and so on, and has become a massive worldwide movement for Evangelism and missionary work. Uh, and accepted into the National Association of Evangelicals, and all the rest of it. Because, uh, one doesn’t have to be right about everything to be uh, uh, to be, uh, used of God. Uh, Moody didn’t know everything and Wesley didn’t know everything and Spurgeon didn’t know everything, but God still used them—and neither did Luther. Uh, or Calvin, for that matter. Um, so you have that situation. But the current twentieth century charismatic movement has spawned some (pause) new things, which somehow have been discontent with old-line Pentecostalism in a variety of ways, uh, one after another. And I’d like to spell some of them out for you. In the nineteenth—these mostly have come since World War II—in the 1940s, a group broke away, in fact in Saskatchewan, from a college, from Pentecostal Bible Institute in Saskatchewan at Saskatoon, in around 1946, under the leadership of two teachers in that institution, called Hawtin and Hunt,

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

went up to a place called North Battleford and established the Sharon Star movement with their Sharon Star literature, and they called themselves the Latter Rain movement. Well, we’ve heard that term before, over and over and over and over and over again. Of course Joel 2 talks about the latter rain and everybody wants to identify themselves with the latter rain, the last big revival before the lord comes, a special elite, elect people of God—and they’re it, hurray! [59:13]

[End Side A]

[Side B]

So they all become Latter Rain-groups. Unfortunately, it doesn’t last too long. This particular Latter Rain-movement, however, reestablished—they decided they were going to reestablish—all the gifts of the Spirit. The Pentecostals were too much on tongues with a little bit of prophecy maybe, and a little bit of healing, and somehow it missed all the rest—the other six. See, they didn’t know there were more than that. But the other six were missing. And so they wanted to reestablish the other six. And, uh, so they also turned, uh, and Hawtin and Hunt became the new prophets and apostles. They had the power to discern who (sic) others should be prophets, and by laying hands on them and giving them the gift of prophecy, or the gift of this, or the gift of that, and they in turn went out from there and, uh, great revivals took place and great tent meetings and people came from all over the world, signs and wonders broke out all over the place, and uh, they also believed that these prophecies would add to the scriptures and it moved into continued revelation, and it moved into problems of morality even in the home base in North Battleford, and it moved into all kinds of difficulties. But that thing shot out from there all over North America. There were prophets moved(??) on the highways and byways, they were down into Detroit to Madam Biels(??) great church there, they were down into Portland into the wings of healing ministry that was coming out of there on the new television program, uh, they were into Glad Tidings in Vancouver, uh, they were down through California where it all picked up steam, and this was an (sic) heretical movement. That was the first wave, and the Pentecostals kicked them out. But boy, did they have signs and wonders—so watch it.

A second movement that appeared—that was in the forties—appeared in the fifties. And it appeared out of something that was established that was called Full Gospel Christian Businessmen Association. And, uh, this was a lay movement of, uh, many old, mainline Pentecostal lay people, who were in business, who had many friends who were not, uh, Christians, or who were Christians who were Anglicans or Lutherans or whatever, and they wanted to reach out to this group and so under the leadership of DuPlessis and a few others, they created what is now an ecumenical—charismatic ecumenicalism. The idea gained ground that, uh, through this movement, God was going to choose out of all the major denominations—Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, and so on—that special group of people who were going to be specially filled with the Holy Spirit and who were to become part of the new charismatic elite—they even came in to a partial rapture theory, where, uh, they, they would be caught up first in the rapture, or a little further down the line, half-way through the tribulation or whatever—and a lot of that was, not typify everybody, but a lot of it was preached and believed, and uh, this

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

movement gained ground, and some very significant Anglican, both laymen and eventually pastors, and Lutheran pastors, and in Ann Arbor and a couple of other places, Notre Dame in Indiana, at the Catholic charismatic groups broke out and spread from there all over the place to Montréal and through, uh, through Canada to various Catholic charismatic groups, and most of it had its roots in this Full Gospel Christian Businessmen Association, but also a good bit of it picked up pieces and bits out of the Latter Rain/Sharon Star movement as well. And some bits and pieces of that got in, just enough to embarrass sometimes, old-line Pentecostalism, who didn’t quite know how to handle it. That was the second wave. The big danger with it, of course, is the ecumenical aspects—the assumption that if a person is a Catholic or a Lutheran or whatever, and has some sort of a speaking in tongues experience or some ecstatic religious experience, that they were in the elite, without any concern for what they believed doctrinally. They might even have some very serious questions about how you properly get saved. [5:00] They might still believe that salvation is based upon a priest pronouncing absolution in the confession. Or they might very well believe that they still pray to, uh, the virgin Mary, to intercede on their behalf. Or they might have very real doubts that the Bible is really the Word of God. Or they might even have some doubts that Jesus was really God in the flesh. And yet somehow this ecumenism was assumed, that it would draw them all together. I remember the first time—I shouldn’t say this, but I have heard it—I remember one of the first times Maines(??) had well-noted major Lutheran pastor on his program, whom he thought was a great Evangelical, and he was talking to him, and all the things were coming out right, and Maines(??) was reaching up to it and says, “Well, brother,” he says, “Tell me, when did you become a Christian?” He of course wanted the audience, the radio-land and television to hear—the chap said, “When I was baptized.” (Audience laughs) And uh, Maines says, “Oh, well, when were you baptized?” He says, “As a baby.” (Laughs) (Audience laughs) If ever you saw a host (laughs) d-drop through the floor, it was at that moment. But, you see, the chap claimed some charismatic experience. Now, I wouldn’t say the chap wasn’t a Christian, he probably didn’t know when he became one, and he was certainly fouled up theologically, and he certainly wasn’t going to help other people come to the Lord Jesus Christ with that fouled-up theology, but I wouldn’t say he wasn’t a brother. He didn’t know when he became a Christian, and probably loved the Lord Jesus with all his heart, he probably became a Christian, uh, much, much later—but that’s neither here nor there. (Laughs) (Audience laughs) This charismatic ecumenism is a very dangerous thing.

The second, uh, third point—the third wave was in the sixties. The forties, the Sharon Star-people; the fifties, the Full Gospel ecumenical charismatic movement, with a lot of intellectual respectability brought to it. The Anglican charismatics and the Catholic charismatics, and the, uh, Lutheran charismatics were not holy rollers(??), like early Pentecostals were known for. You didn’t have wild meetings and shouting and hollering, and, and—oh, they danced in the Spirit, but very decorously(??). (Audience laughs) Uh, you, you, didn’t get people falling over in a trance, dead—flat on their backs. And, uh, healing was very intellectually mounted, and all this so that a great deal of intellectual respectability was brought into the charismatic movement at that time, quite unlike the Sharon Star-movement, which was very unlike early 1920s

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

Pentecostalism. Uh, the third post-Pentecostal movement was the Jesus-people in the sixties. This coming right out of the flower-children, the youth rebellions, the communes, and so on, and the, uh, again the Sharon Star-people and again some of the old-line Pentecostals moved into their ranks, and as disillusionment set in—as it did, with the capability of creating this sort of flower-world of sweetness and light and peace, and uh, and all that was involved in it—as the disillusionment set in, they were open to, uh, being drawn into Christianity and the Jesus-movement emerged as a sort of halfway house, long-haired. Uh, and much of the present gospel rock music I would say, ninety, eight-five, maybe ninety percent of the current gospel rock movement is charismatic, it is virtually all come out of an off-growth of the Jesus People-movement. And of course they were—they knew nothing else, they were raised in this. It was their lifeblood, it went along with the drugs. And they just, they carried it through with different objectives. Uh, it’s rather unfortunate, in my judgment, that this very immature form of worship should become increasingly the norm, for what should be much more mature, established Christianity. It’s like reverting to infancy. But that’s, that’s happened. Um, anyway, I’m not going to say anything more about that, except that another one has appeared—well, more than one—The Way has appeared, coming out of Bill Graham(??) things, but most recently a group that is beginning to emerge in the West Coast and British Columbia in particular, I understand it hasn’t gone into the East much yet, but under the leadership of a new guru by the name of John Wimber. [10:05] And it’s called The Vineyard. And, uh, I’m not in a position to give a depth-analysis of the Vineyard, except it is a movement of the late eighties. I have, uh, I went—interestingly, I prepared this topic before I went to one of their services, I have not changed anything I said in the talk as a result, because it absolutely amazed me that everything I’ve predicted would happen at the Vineyard, happened exactly as I predicted. The analysis was accurate one hundred percent. I knew what they were going to do before I went. I had experienced it all in my own life at one time or another. It was nothing new that I saw functioning there, although the style was different. And what’s happened with the Vineyard is that you have a combination: some things out of the Latter Rain movement, a great emphasis—well, you have a combination of this, you have a combination of its leadership really coming out of the ecumenical Full Gospel kinds of things, this intellectualized kind of charismatic, where all Anglicans and Presbyterians—Wimber himself, I think, has a Presbyterian background—and, uh, and what you—and this is very much a part of one aspect of Fuller Seminary—and what you have is that whole thing, that whole charismatic movement, tied to John Wimber’s church growth principles, which intellectualizes and rationalizes a great deal of the methodology of the Vineyard. I talked to several of the leaders of the movement, because what I was trying to find out was this: Okay, you’re coming along and you’re gathering great groups of people together very, very fast, and you’re planting churches of your own all over the place now—why are you doing this? “Why,” I would say to them, “there is a range of Pentecostalism now all the way from very heretical to very, very conservative, with about fifteen to twenty different shades and shadows in-between, uh, where do you come in? Can’t you find any of those groups you can fit in already? What’s new, what’s distinctive? Why is it that you have to create a new movement, now? What are you doing that’s different? What do you say about yourselves that’s unique?”

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

And I had a hard time getting answers. That disturbed me a little bit. But as I dug a little deeper, these are the things—and I will not say for sure, although they are the literature that I’ve got and I have read, and even those in support of it seem to verify what I’m saying—what I see the Vineyard movement beginning, and they have started a couple of years ago here in Langley and already have three, four hundred people meeting on a Sunday, they have huge gatherings and John Wimber comes, and a thousand pay a hundred bucks a piece to take some sessions with him, and, uh, another church is starting in Surrey, and another church is starting in White Rock, and another church is starting in, in Abbotsford, and, and people are flowing out of not only Mennonite and Free churches, but also out of other Pentecostal churches, uh, to go there, and I say: What’s happening? What’s going on here? What’s behind all this? What is it that is your uniqueness? And what I discover at the forefront in the long haul is this must be real because I see more miracles taking place. They are happening—things are really happening. And that becomes the justification—“well, don’t they happen somewhere else?” “Yes, but not as much.” And so what I begin to see there is a restoration of signs and wonders. A restoration to a point of high priority of signs and wonders. In fact, I asked, “Well, what’s different about your signs and wonders than all the other Pentecostal groups’ signs and wonders?” “Oh, nothing, really, except that we have normalized it—signs and wonders should be part of the everyday life and everyday experience of all the Christians, of all the members of the congregation. Not a few gifted people or, or, whatever, even; in the past it has been only gifted people who have special gifts of healing, but everybody should be able to get in on the act.” Well, that’s a bit of a distinctive. [15:00] I said, “Well, uh, what makes it possible, do you think, for you to have more signs and wonders than others who have great faith and who believe that everybody should be healed if they—and they don’t actually say that in Vineyard, they are much more careful; but in others they say everybody should get healed and it’s atonement, healed in the atonement, and everybody, there should be no sickness and so on, they don’t say that. But some Pentecostal groups have. And some who aren’t Pentecostal have. Like some dual line(??) Missionary Alliance people. Um, and I said, “Well, why should you expect more signs and wonders than these people who have this great faith in signs and wonders?” And the answer that I got back was that it’s tied in part to the name, Vineyard—Vineyard has to do with the fruits of the Spirit, the vine and the branches, and uh, it has something to do with the life in the vines, etcetera. In other words, what I see happening here is some sense that what hinders the working of the Holy Spirit even in the lives of other charismatic churches is sinfulness. And so the revitalization to normalcy of the full range of the gifts of the Spirit, including signs and wonders, is tied to some sort of holiness, some sort of restoration of holiness. Now they may have a point for us to ponder here. But how they go about getting this holiness, which includes correction of one another in a variety of ways that give me—that sends chills up and down my spine, is something else. Uh, but the first is this restoration of signs and wonders. The second is that it seems to me the movement is tied to a great deal of seeming informality that is related especially to a renewed emphasis on music and worship. Uh, this music and worship which is part of Vineyard, is (audio lapses) early days of the Pentecostal movement in the 1920s and earlier (audio lapses) goes back into the Latter Rain movement in the forties, when—and I’ve been there when it happened—when you

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

get large crowds of people—maybe in a big church or a tent or whatever—and they’re praying out loud and then all of a sudden they had what they called the angel choir. And the angel choir would be (assumes sing-song voice) somebody would start praying here and somebody would start praying here and the other person would pray here and the other person would pray here in a higher voice, and then they’d add another and another and another and then they would keep this up, and before long, like the great, white wave, uh, of uh, the Canucks, that thing would spread across the whole audience and you would have a kind of spontaneous angel choir that would be singing. And then, out of this, later on, they would add words to it, or each would sing their own words. But out of this, eventually, came a form of music that is virtually what is in all of the choruses that are being sung. Very harmonic, uh, very smooth, very, almost sentimental, uh, they have added—the same people—have written the words to these choruses, and the choruses began to emerge—I learned many of them years and years ago—uh, and these choruses began to emerge. And the choruses, you see, are simply formalizations, standardizations of this heavenly choir, what they talked about. And that has become very standard in the worship pattern, the worship pattern of the Vineyard, for example, were these choruses. And they are beautiful—it’s not rock music. It is, uh, it is, uh, variations on kind of things we used to do with Spirit of the Living God / Fall Fresh on Me, and so on. Very, very beautiful. Very, very meaningful. I might add this is one of the—I think this is one of the most positive sides of the movement, is the restoration of meaningful worship, and the opportunity for meaningful worship. It’s intense. There is an intensity about it—they’re not playing at religion. Uhhhm, most of them are not playing at religion. It was surprising how many were chewing wads of gum, and how many others were doing a number of other things, like you might get at a, at a, uh, baseball park, but most of them were very, very intent, and very, very sincere, and very deeply involved in the worship that was taking place. [20:13] It’s intensely subjective, it is emotional, and it is repetitious. It goes on and on: they will sing without stop for thirty, thirty-five, maybe even forty minutes. Without stop. Just going from one to the next. Uh, one thing that I would say about this, though, is that you look at the quality of words that’s in there—they are directed not simply little ditties about one another in Christian experience; they are directed to God in worship. That’s something very important for us. That is a factor that is not necessary—that is not a heretical charismatic factor. That is a factor of spiritual reality that can get lost in our services if we’re not very, very careful. You can sing good old hymns the same way, with the same intensity and the same beauty, uh, and the same involvement, um, some of the great ones are born out of that. It is not unlike some medieval chants. But, uh, this is, this is a factor, as I tried to evaluate the Vineyard.

A fourth thing—a third thing. First was the signs and wonders’ prominence, which I have problems with; the second was their worship, which I find, uh, very, very real, the only problem I have is carrying it on too long, and carrying it on with a lot of repetition—the songs themselves tend to repeat over and over and over again—and there is a certain hypnotic aspect to that kind of repetition that, uh, that may be okay for spiritual worship, but can also put on a façade of spiritual worship when it’s not really there, and create something, uh, a bit dangerous as well.

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

The third thing, and this is the one that I found most disturbing, very much of what happened is tied to something called the restoration of the word of knowledge. And the word of knowledge is that members of the congregation seem to receive a direct telephone call from God along the line, which says not a spiritual impression, but which gives information. Which says, “somebody in this room has a, uh, sore knee—if that somebody will come to the front and be prayed for they can be healed. The Lord has revealed to me you have a sore knee.” Uh, somebody else in this room has an arthritic condition. If that person will come forward, the Lord is prepared to heal him. Now that’s information. That’s word of knowledge—that’s information. From God. About somebody else—about their physical condition, or about their spiritual condition. And that is extremely dangerous. That can lead to all kinds of neuroses, that can lead to all kinds of damage, that can lead to all kinds of distortions. And furthermore I say, there isn’t one ounce of evidence in the New Testament, there isn’t one ounce of evidence in the early church that that’s what the word of knowledge is at all. Who told them that’s how the word of knowledge works? Where did they get that information? When does God start telling someone else what’s wrong with me? Or that I have sin in my life and I’d better straighten it out? I don’t find that in the New Testament church—I don’t find it in the second century church, either. That is an extremely dangerous thing. One of the problems with it is that it carries with it an aura of authority. For example, if somebody by a word of knowledge has apparently—seemingly—identified a sickness, and said that God has given that and that person comes forward and doesn’t get healed! Then what? Who’s wrong? The person who didn’t come forward? The person who had the word of knowledge? Who checks up on it? Who tests? Who determines whether the healings really took place or not? [25:00] You see, this leads me to, uh—oh, I might add this one last thing about the Vineyard that there is much less emphasis on tongues than there is in old-line Pentecostalism. And there is a lot of emphasis on the cell group. It’s not just the Sunday service—it’s the fifteen or twenty small cell groups that are operating through the week, in what much of what the Vineyard really is takes place, and what it’s worth.

Uh, I want to summarize this by talking to you a little bit about the dangers, about the kinds of heresies that can emerge from charismatic movements in general. One is that charismatic movements through the course of their history have tended towards an excessive eschatological imminence—not just that Christ may come at any time, but that Christ is just about to come. And that thing has raised its intensity. And with it all kinds of control factors can come, when people are, are being urged and convinced that it’s just a matter of moments—could just be any moment—that Christ is going to come—not that he might, but that he is going to come. Uh, then you can get all kinds of actions and reactions. And it is part of every major charismatic movement, that heightening of eschatological imminence, which has not been true—the Lord did not come. It is led—it led the sixteenth-century Melchiorites to date some. In 1528 first, 1533 secondly—it has done so through various other times through the history of the church. Secondly, the charismatic may—and may not always, there is an orthodox, in my judgment—but the charismatic tends to lead towards an

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

obsession with the sensational gifts, which then leads to a reaction to say that they don’t exist and shouldn’t exist at all. The sensational gifts are usually tongues, prophecy, healing, and knowledge. Usually without much evidence or understanding of what any of them really mean. They’re made too important. And they are made so important that their followers become credible—they become credulous. Is that the right word? I’m not sure. But you can have people like this Popoff that they have now revealed, uh, they have proven beyond a shadow of doubt, that went about his audience telling this person has this sickness, and he was always dead right, they had these sicknesses, and then he’d pray for the ones that the Lord had told him had these sicknesses, and then they discovered he had a little hearing aid in his ear, and his followers in the front who were screening these people were communicating to him on walkie-talkies, and they picked it up and got the communications. This has been written up in, uh, News Week or something like that. But the point is that the charismatic people wouldn’t hardly believe it after it was proved! They had become so given to credi—to accepting as credible anything! Had been so heightened to demand the miracle, that they lost their ability for godly judgment! That’s dangerous! And as you study the charismatic movements you find that these things come in cycles of emphasis. You get a second coming, a hyper-second coming immediacy emphasis, and it sweeps along for five or ten years but you can’t sustain it, and then comes a big wave of tongue-speaking that goes for six, eight, ten years and you can’t sustain it, and then comes the healing and miracles, and that goes for eight or ten years, but eventually people wise up and you can’t sustain it, and then they go to prophecy and word of knowledge, and that produces the guru kind of control which can develop where—(audio cuts off). Sometimes it runs into the conflict because it also heightens your tendency to believe the Bible, and then there’s a tension. If you are an orthodox Christian it can heighten doctrinal correctness. It only heightens, it doesn’t tell you what is right and what is wrong. What is true doctrine must come from the hard study of God’s word alone. [30:01] Mormons speak in tongues. Islamic whirling dervishes speak in tongues. In Paul’s day there were pagan sects that spoke in tongues. He knew it, that’s why he writes at the beginning of first Corinthians twelve: “Look, not everybody that has this ecstatic experience—even a Christian—unless they confess that Jesus Christ is Lord,”—and boy, that meant something—“by the Spirit.” That’s what he’s talking about. That’s why he begins the whole section with those words in verses three and four of first Corinthians twelve. Again kinds of heresies, continued revelation—watch it! The problem with charismatic Christianity lies in that like the, uh, moviegoers, or actors, or theatre actors and so on is that you draw people to excitement and the vigour, and then it begins to go stale, but your spirituality is determined by the excitement, so you have to create something new to get new excitement again, and then something new, and something new. And the gurus then themselves—almost without being aware of it—begin to push to innovation and innovation becomes heresy. And eventually they begin to propound new things and new things. Unless there are controls in place. And as you look at the whole movement of Pentecostalism—which is now some 80 years old—you discover as you look at the whole movement, and you look at it worldwide, that one of the primary weaknesses is that they have never produced Bible teachers. Where are the commentaries that they have written? Where are their great Bible teachers? Where do they hold their Bible

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

conferences? Their people wouldn’t sit under that kind of teaching for any length of time because they have become so electrified that nothing is spiritual unless it’s sparking all the time. But you can’t study the Bible hard and keep it sparking all the time. And so hard Bible study is considered a formality in coldness. Sometimes it is. But that’s, you know, you look at it as a historian, you look at the long term character of the movement that’s eighty years old, and you look at the previous charismatic movement, and the same truth follows: they did not produce Bible teachers, and they are not producing Bible teachers.

The fifth way, I would say, in terms of these dangers of the movement—there’s a problem with the emotional highs. That doesn’t mean we shouldn’t have emotional highs. But if every Sunday has to be an emotional high and in the midweek one as well, what you get is a rollercoaster kind of Christian experience, in which you have tremendous spiritual vigour one day, and then almost like the people who have performed on stage have tremendous problems which lead into drugs—they have problems handling their lives the next day, or two days after, when the tremendous spiritual vitality isn’t there, and they’re facing everyday life, kids are giving them a hard time, uh, and their hubbies are giving them a hard time or, or whatever, and down everything goes. And their life becomes one of contradictions, and that is extremely unhealthy. Um, and lastly, I think we have a tremendous problem with this sense of Latter Rain superiority. When the spirit of Christ is at work and is bringing Jesus Christ and his spirit to the foreground, you will have a spirit of humility. Humility. I say that without question, without fear of contradiction. You see, if I read the New Testament correctly, I believe—I personally believe that speaking in tongues can still happen. I don’t think it’s in foreign languages—I think it’s in a heavenly language, it is often private, uh, interpretation, it isn’t translation, there isn’t even the same word in the Greek. [35:00] It’s simply giving the sense of what they feel is being said in the room. Because that’s what prophecy is—it’s not “I, the Lord, say unto you”, never was, and never was intended for that. So it’s, it’s, uh, when you get it in its right perspective it’s no big deal really. Uh, and in fact tongues itself, if I understand the apostle Paul correctly—and I think I do—, while he doesn’t eliminate it and forbids to speak in tongues, he said it’s clear that it’s the least of all the gifts. Or prophecy, or whatever, even in the lists that he gives it’s way down at the bottom etcetera. Well, that means that it has value for some people, but very often it’s people who are emotionally immature. Uh, it’s not a sign of superiority for a Christian. It’s a sign of God giving you what you need, but it certainly doesn’t put you on a person on a pedestal! Um, I’m concerned with this Latter Rain-superiority concept creating divisiveness in churches. I can’t imagine Christ’s spirit creating division in churches made up of people who are born again, who are his fellow children. Uh, I can’t, I can’t imagine that kind of thing taking place. Um, some of the gifts are totally misunderstood. The exaggeration of the miraculous without legitimate human control even in place. You see, you can say: “But people really get healed, doesn’t that mean God is in it?” In the heretical movements people got healed! I’ve been to St. Joseph’s in Montréal and seen all the crutches of people who crawled up their hands and knees to pray to this St. Joseph and to father-whatever-his-name-is up at the top of it and they’ve been healed. You go to Lourdes in France and they’ve been healed. You talk to Christian Science and they’ve been healed. You talk to

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

Mormons and they’ve been healed. You talk to Unitarians and they’ve been healed. Healing can take place in all kinds of ways. You can get healed by going to a Seventh Son of a Seventh Son and something that’s not even religious and get healed. Not all the time, but a certain number. Nobody can explain it. Doctors can give some people sugar pills and they get healed. Other people have cancer badly and they don’t know what to do, and ninety-nine out of a hundred will die—it’s terminal, they say they’re terminal. And without any religion, a week later the person is healed, the cancer disappeared, they can’t figure out why. But suppose you were in this setting and it happens. You automatically assume that they were healed because somebody prayed for them. Well, I’m not suggesting that real healings don’t take place. I’m suggesting, however, that in a state of intense gullibility we simply cannot use signs and wonders. Jesus told his twelve, when they came back from their first missionary journey, and they said, “Lord, o boy, the demons in everybody are subject to us and we can heal people, isn’t this wonderful?” And he wouldn’t get excited at all. He says, “Ah, come on, now, that’s not what’s important.” Others came to him and said, “Give us a sign, give us—” And he’d say, “No, no way. The sign is the sign of my resurrection, death and resurrection—that’s the sign that’s important.” You see, if we get hung up on signs and wonders, the devil gets us into an (sic) position of accepting something as evidence he can duplicate. And then we’re in danger. What he can’t duplicate is not the sign of a miracle—what he can’t duplicate is “Let men see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven.” Or: “This is religion [inaudible]”, that men—that Christians—take care of the aged and the widows and so on, and show love, and keep themselves unspotted from the world. What is the sign? What are the wonders? What are the things that are the legitimate tests of true Christianity in the New Testament? It’s goodness of life which breaks down the opposition of the enemy, and it is purity and holiness of life, which he cannot duplicate.

Now I suggest to you—and I must conclude, because it’s supper time—I hope that you have understood that this has not been an attack. [40:01] And your response to groups like The Vineyard is not, in my judgment, to attack. That is to create an overreaction on our own, that throws out the baby with the bathwater. But our response should be to be guarded. Our response should be very, very careful. Our response should be to help our people to understand that their Christianity grows through careful, direct teaching from Scripture based on the creation of godliness. In fact, true lifestyle evangelism is not mobs coming to the flashing light of healings and signs and wonders. It’s coming to the light of good works and godliness of life—that’s what Jesus taught. But I think we should also be careful that we do not have some serious weaknesses in our understanding and practice and personal lives in relation to the presence of the Holy Spirit in experience in our lives and in our worship. Our congregations need more input and sharing. Our congregations need warmer worship with a more real sense of the Holy Spirit’s reality and vitality that they can draw on after a week of fighting battles out there in the world, and sense the power of God in their midst. And our people need more zeal to reach out to others and to accept them and incorporate them directly into the family. And we could use a little more faith and optimism, too. And we sure need a clear, strong sense of divine mission. I mean, people in a group like that believe God’s in it, that God wants them to do something. And they have a

Aud. 33

Side A Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics”

Side B Ken Davis – “Values & Perils of the Charismatics” (con’t)

feeling and excitement and intensity about what they believe God wants them to do. If we cannot cultivate in our congregations a sense that we have divine task, a divine mission, a divine purpose for that local church and we cannot communicate that with excitement to our membership, then we’re in trouble. (Sound of train in background) And it’s my firm belief that while we need to be seriously on guard that we have some shortcomings of our own that we could learn from—and let’s get on our knees, this we need to remember, that up to this point say, The Vineyard, is that some charismatic groups have become clearly and definitely heretical. Up to this point I do not believe The Vineyard has become heretical. I think that they’re making some mistakes, I think they’re playing around with some wildfire. I think they’re in some very dangerous ground on a few things. I think that there is a danger they could, or some of the congregations could lead their people astray under local leadership. But up to this point it seems to me they are clearly committed, born-again Christians, and as such brothers and sisters in Jesus Christ. We’ve got problems, they’ve got problems. We don’t need their problems, they don’t need ours. (Laughs) (Audience laughs) Hopefully if we learn not to take their problems, they will learn how to get rid of them. And maybe we won’t have to have all these separate groups that seem to spring up all over the place, and still get the job done to the glory of God. Thank you very much. (Applause) [44:06]

(Tape lapses back to audio already heard starting at 27:53 for approximately 15 minutes)

[End Side B]