

THE CHURCH PLANTING PARADIGM: A FOREWORD

Eastern Region Church Planting Retreat
Alton Bay, New Hampshire
March 21-23, 2017

Steve Brown

BICS | Lenox, Massachusetts / March 5, 2017

Introduction

Two titanic theological storms have buffeted, bruised and yet burnished the Advent Christian Denomination.

One turbulence blew in early when the Arian Christian Connexion people pollinated the Millerite movement and took flower in the formation of the denomination in July, 1860.

The Connexion viewpoint was a majority position at the beginning of our history. Consequently, non-Trinitarian theology officially took root in our movement. It would vex the Denomination into the present era. Although the cleavage is mostly behind us in the churches, we could see an official and final resolution of the issue--if the NAE Statement on the Trinity is adopted at the June Triennium. Should that happen, it would end 157 years of official ambiguity on the nature and deity of Christ and the person of the Holy Spirit assiduously maintained in the Declaration of Principles.

Dr. David A. Dean's assessment is instructive:

"Christian Connexion influence has continued to the present day. It appears in a number of recognizable attitudes: stress upon the individual's right to interpret the Scriptures himself, belief in the basic clarity of Scripture, a tendency to express doctrine exclusively in biblical terminology, fellowship and cooperation among brethren of different doctrinal positions, emphasizing Christian character and conduct above

doctrine, and searching for a theology which will strike the common man as reasonable.”¹

The embedded Arianism in Connexion theology reveals the failure of the founders to establish the Denomination on a sound hermeneutical foundation. I reference this issue to illustrate that interpretive presuppositions and methods are antecedent to doctrinal formation, orthodox or not. Theological polarities within this movement have often been the result of a defective hermeneutic in Advent Christian DNA.

A second storm nearly split the Denomination in two. At the General Conference in Montreat in 1964, the delegates considered the question of the inspiration of Scripture. The controversy had been brewing for several years primarily from within the theological faculties of Aurora College and Berkshire Christian College.

That cleavage became intense at “The Cleveland Conference” held in March of 1962. Dr. Moses Crouse and Dr. Oral Collins presented papers which delineated the differences. Crouse advocated a dynamic, “incarnational” view of inspiration while Collins held that the inspiration of the Bible meant that it was authoritative and infallible in all that had been written by the authors, down to their very words.²

¹ David Dean, “The Trinity in Advent Christian History,” *Alpha and Omega*, (Henceforth Publications, Lenox, MA), p. 36.

² A very helpful treatment of the Inspiration controversy at Montreat is found in Chapter 6 of a book written by Robert Mayer entitled *Adventism Confronts Modernity: An Account of the Advent Christian Controversy over the Bible’s Inspiration*, (Pickwick Publications, Eugene OR, 2017), His book is available here: <https://smile.amazon.com/Adventism-Confronts-Modernity->

Concurrently, debates over the doctrine of inspiration raged between the publication and Christian education arms of the Denomination. The entire issue came to a head in Montreat due to complaints from the Eastern and Southern Regions about the content of Sunday School curricula. The solution to the controversy led to the adoption of an amendment of the Declaration of Principles, Article 1 which formerly read:

Article I: We believe that the Bible is the Word of God *containing* a revelation given to man under Divine supervision and providence; that its historic statements are correct, and that it is the only Divine standard of faith and practice (emphasis added).

The amended Article adopted at Montreat read:

Article I. We believe that the Bible is the *inspired* Word of God, being in its entirety a revelation given to man under divine inspiration and providence; that its historic statements are correct, and that it is the only divine *and infallible* standard of faith and practice (emphasis added).³

Officially, at least, the doctrine of inspiration was settled even though there were significant remaining tensions given that nerve endings were exposed and sides were drawn, inevitably so, considering what was at stake. Whether minds were changed, however, is an entirely different matter.

Controversy-Inspiration/dp/1498295266/ref=sr_1_fkmr0_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1488719914&sr=8-1-fkmr0&keywords=Adventism+Confronts+Mordenity+Mayer

³ <http://acgc.us/wp-content/uploads/PDF/Publications/This%20We%20Believe.pdf> (accessed 2/2/17). The new statement itself was a compromise in that a proposal to insert the word “inerrant” in the first part of the statement was deleted. See Mayer, chapter 6.

The point again is the importance of the meaning of biblical writers as a matter of first importance before we draw up our statements of faith or systematic theologies. With these two theological conversations virtually settled, it is clear that the challenge facing us in establishing our churches is not about the *nature* of Scripture but the *meaning* of Scripture. It is this issue to which we now turn.

Be of the Same Mind

When Greg invited me to write this paper, we discussed the matter of coming to “one mind” on the matter of the apostles’ program for planting and establishing the church. Is this possible? I am reminded of the old canard about the Jews: if three of them have a debate, the outcome is four opinions. Advent Christians show the same tendency.

Yet, Paul exhorted the Philippian church to “complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind” (2:2). So what did he mean? Was his encouragement meant to create absolute binding theological precision on matters of doctrine and practice? Yes and no. The terms he uses, “the same mind” and “one mind”⁴ suggest in the first instance that we consciously work toward a

⁴ τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε **φρονέω**^a: (derivative of the base φρον‘thoughtful planning,’ 26.15) to employ one’s faculty for thoughtful planning, with emphasis upon the underlying disposition or attitude—‘to have an attitude, to think in a particular manner.’ Louw-Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains (2 Volume Set.)* United Bible Societies 1865 Broadway, New York, 1989.

and σύμψυχοι. **σύμψυχος** *súmpsuchos*; gen. *sumpsúchou*, masc.–fem., neut. *súmpsuchon*, adj. from *sún* (4862), together, and *psuchḗ* (5590), soul. Joined together in soul or sentiment, unanimous (Phil. 2:2). It signifies community of life and love.

common mindset, or way of looking at things, a mutual understanding as a foundation for thinking alike. In the second case, he asks them to think in a similarity of mind and spirit, sort of a blending of soul and sentiment in the truth.

However, Paul is not suggesting that our thinking should be content light, but rather that it unite thought and feeling derived from our common relationship to Jesus in community informed by “the Gospel of Christ” (1:27) “for the sake of Christ” (1:29). This one-mindedness is already ours by virtue of our union with Christ:

Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus (2:5).

Thus, we do not create one mindedness as much as we are to embrace it and appropriate it in the humility modeled by the Lord (2:5-11). At once, Jesus is the content and focus of our worldview as well as the source of power to implement all that He teaches us through the Apostles.⁵ On this basis we could work toward one-mindedness.

I would add one more observation. Paul goes on to exhort the Philippians to “work out their own salvation” (v. 12). I take him to mean something like this: the church (the church in Philippi), energized by the resurrected Christ living among them and the Gospel in terms of its all-encompassing worldview, now has the responsibility to apply

⁵ For a valuable resource on the matter of apostolic intent in the New Testament and the writings of Luke in particular, see “Acts: The Questions of Historical Precedent,” chapter 6 of Fee and Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All It's Worth*.

His truth and power in their historical situation. In other words, the church must work out theological solutions in her cultural context.

So, if we are to become one-minded in our cultural context in the particular matters of church planting and establishing, we must seek biblically principled solutions to 21st century challenges in New England. We must work out the solutions informed by prior principles.

How do we do that? I think we begin with a fresh look at the meaning and the significance of the apostolic witness. That is the hermeneutical challenge this paper seeks to make.

Meaning and Significance

Dr. Walter Kaiser, the now retired president of Gordon-Conwell, is a famous exponent of determining the meaning of the text directly from the author. He wrote:

“No definition of interpretation could be more fundamental than this: To interpret we must in every case reproduce the sense the Scriptural writer intended for his own words. The first step in the interpretive process is to link only those ideas with the author’s language that he connected with them. The second step is to express those ideas understandably (Kaiser’s emphasis).⁶

⁶ Kaiser, “Legitimate Hermeneutics,” chapter five taken from *Inerrancy*, edited by Norman L. Geisler, copyright 1979 by Zondervan, Grand Rapids, p. 118.

To many pastors, this may seem axiomatic, but let's not be hasty. Postmodern linguistic theory disconnects the author from his meaning and assigns it to the reader or hearer.⁷ To do so makes knowledge relative and, thus, throws the truth intentions of the author over the side in favor of a "dynamic" reading. It was this impulse that fueled the crisis over inspiration in Montreat.

Throughout Kaiser's work he gives credit to E. D. Hirsch for engaging in the modern battle to restore the author to his intention statements. Hirsch made a distinction between meaning and significance.

*"Meaning is that which is represented by a text; it is what the author meant by his use of a particular sign sequence; it is what the signs represent. Significance on the other hand, names a relationship between that meaning and a person, or a conception of a situation."*⁸

Our present task is to let the Apostles speak through their own words before we develop implications, design strategies and develop "task forces" for implementation. This is why it is advisable to filter the BILD model through a hermeneutic driven by a commitment to determine the truth intentions of the Bible's authors/ Author before we attempt to move forward to plant, establish and re-establish churches.⁹

⁷ Robert McQuilkin analyzes this problem in "The Impact of Postmodern Thinking on Evangelical Hermeneutics" in *JETS* 40/1 (March 1997) 69-82.

⁸ E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967, p. 8.

⁹ The meaning of the text must take priority over our statements of faith and systematic theologies. This is why we should decide if the Church-based Theological Education paradigm of BILD rests on the teaching of the Apostles.

Kaiser builds off Hirsch's basic insight. He suggests three rules to follow if we are to be "valid interpreters."¹⁰

First, the Bible is to be interpreted by the same rules as other books--before the postmodern takeover of linguistic theory.

A text should not be liberated from its author. I was privileged to be in the last class of students taught by Dr. James Nichols. He was famous for telling us to "take the Bible as it reads." What he meant was at once simple and profound: the figures of speech, the genres, the poetry, and the various literary devices were employed by the writers to convey an intended meaning. That truth intention can be discovered by ordered analysis. The Bible is unique in that it explicates the truth of God, but it should be approached as any other book in terms of how that truth is to be understood. That it is inspired does not uncouple its authors from the meanings of their own words.

Second, the principles of interpretation are as native and universal to man as is speech itself.

While the Bible is the revelation of God to man, He chose to convey His meaning to us through the conventions of ordinary language. By design we are created to receive ideas and truth through speech and conversely to convey our thoughts by the same means. This is simply part of the design built into our nature as human beings. What

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 119. These rules apply to general interpretation of all texts. For example, the current battle over the appointing of a justice to the Supreme Court is being fought over the meaning of the Constitution.

proper hermeneutics does is simply study and assemble the underlying conventions of speech and shape them for the purpose of study and reflection. Thus, we need grammars, lexicons and the like to get a close to the original language of the writers (They would be needless had we been born at the time Scripture was written.) Why? Because interpreting is something we all do. We just do it better in our native language.

Third, our personal reaction and application of an author's words is secondary to the meaning of her words.

There is, of course, a relation between what an author writes and what her readers understand. We come again to the difference between meaning and significance. Assigning significance is the responsibility of the reader(s) in that he/they must decide how the author's meaning is to be applied in cultural contexts.

I remember a seminary discussion about BILD's tagline "The way of Christ and his Apostles" borrowed from Roland Allen, the former missionary to China in the first half of the 20th century. There was a loud objection on the part of some professors over the use of "the." To them it seemed narrow and limiting. The debate surfaced the tension over meaning and significance in interpretation. It is BILD's philosophy that in the book of Acts, Luke laid down the principles for church planting for the centuries ahead.

Thus, he intends for us to discern “THE” way of the Apostles. In that sense Roland Allen’s original insight was an embedded marker in Luke’s two books.¹¹

The professors believed that what Luke meant us to see was the history of “a” way of Christ and the Apostles. By that understanding Luke-Acts is primarily descriptive, not prescriptive.

There is a big difference. And it is exactly on this issue we would be wise to focus our hermeneutic inquiries.

Consider the exhortation of Dr. Kaiser:

“I affirm with all the forcefulness I can muster, that our generation needs a whole hermeneutical reformation. The current crisis regarding the doctrine of Scripture is directly linked to poor procedures and methods of handling Scripture. This crisis has shown little regard for traditional ecclesiastical or theological categories, for it has spread like a plague among liberal and evangelical scholars alike. As a partial corrective for this astonishing situation, I urge that talk *about* the Bible be modified to this extent: that evangelicals in particular get equally busy identifying the *meaning* of the text itself – the meaning the original writer of Scripture intended – before we go on to name the relationships between the meaning and ourselves, our country, our day and our conception of things; that is, before we consider the *significance* of the text for us.¹²

¹¹ Roland Allen, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul’s or Ours*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962, pp 3-9.

¹² Kaiser, op. cit., p. 147 (emphasis his).

Conclusion

There is no need to rehearse the rules of interpretation here. I suggest we immerse ourselves in the model exemplified by Dr. Kaiser.¹³ I believe the same crisis he identified nearly 40 years ago is still with us in spades.

Is it time for Eastern Region leaders to take a fresh look at the Bible? If so, let it be with the goal of determining the intent of the original authors, especially in the matters before us. If we focus together on the meaning of the Bible, perhaps Paul's exhortation to "be of the same mind" can be achieved.

Should we take up this challenge, the Region could emerge from the swamps of theological fragmentation to expand our witness with new determination empowered by the Lord Himself.

¹³ See the appendix for articles by Kaiser that lay out his interpretive approach to the Bible.

Appendix 1*

“THE ESSENTIAL KAISER”

“The Single Intent of Scripture” by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., chapter nine taken from *Evangelical Roots: A Tribute to Wilbur Smith*, edited by Kenneth Kantzer, copyright 1978 by Thomas Nelson Inc., Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee.

“The Need for Reformation in Hermeneutics,” delivered by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. at the 1997 BILD International Conference in Phoenix, Arizona, February 20, 1997.

“The Theology of the Old Testament” by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., taken from *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Volume 1, Introductory Articles*, Frank E. Gaebelein, General Editor, J. D. Douglas, Associate Editor, copyright 1979 by The Zondervan Corporation Grand Rapids, Michigan.

“Theological Analysis,” chapter six taken from *Toward an Exegetical Theology: Biblical Exegesis for Preaching and Teaching* by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., copyright 1981 by Baker Book House Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

“Putting It All Together: The Theological Use of the Bible,” chapter 11 taken from *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning* by Walter C. Kaiser Jr. and Moisés Silva, copyright 1994 by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., and Moisés Silva, published by Zondervan Publishing House, Academic and Professional Books, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

“The Task of Preaching and Teaching from the Old Testament Today,” chapter 3 taken from *Preaching and Teaching from the Old Testament: A Guide for the Church* by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., copyright 2003 by Walter C. Kaiser Jr., published by Baker Academic, a division of Baker Book House Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

“The Art and Science of Expository Preaching,” chapter 4 taken from *Preaching and Teaching from the Old Testament: A Guide for the Church* by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., copyright 2003 by Walter C. Kaiser Jr., published by Baker Academic, a division of Baker Book House Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

“Legitimate Hermeneutics” by Walter C. Kaiser Jr., chapter five taken from *Inerrancy*, edited by Norman L. Geisler, copyright 1979 by the Zondervan Corporation, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

*This document was compiled by BILD International and distributed to students in a DMin program offered through Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in 2008.