

# Challenges to a Lutheran Ecclesiology in the Folk Churches

## A Norwegian Perspective

Rolf Kjøde

FEET (Fellowship of European Evangelical Theologians) had a conference on “The Reformation, its Theology and its Legacy” in Lutherstadt Wittenberg in August 2016. In addition to some more profound keynote addresses, a number of short presentations talked about the Reformation in different parts of Europe and its relevance today. As for Scandinavia, Swedish theologian Rune Imberg first gave a wider historical presentation. Thus, his paper functioned as background perspectives for the reflections in my own paper.

The Scandinavian churches were profoundly impacted by the great revivals sweeping across our countries in the 19th century. Sociologically speaking these revivals were parts of a movement from below in society, which also fuelled a widespread process of democratisation. As part of their spiritual power, they set a new agenda in the churches. As for Norway, they influenced the state church profoundly in its ecclesiology. The centre of gravity moved from the public ordained ministry and towards the priesthood of all believers, which released the lay people. At the same time, the split between the confessing believers and the silent majority of baptised church members grew. There may not be a direct link of cause and effect between these factors, because the breakthrough of modern secularism also happened simultaneously in society.

However, it is likely that the different impulses at the time to some extent were interconnected.

At the 500 years anniversary of the Lutheran Reformation values and structures of society have changed far more radically. Secularisation, which still was in its early years 150 years ago, is today a leading influence in society. Secular humanism and a pluralist mind-set have largely replaced a biblical worldview. However, still the old state churches, even though most of them have partly loosened their ties to the state, have kept a remarkably high percentage of membership of the populations. They are in decline, but the trends have been relatively slow.

In the early 1970es in Norway, both politicians and some church leaders started coining the church as *folk church*. (All Scandinavian languages share the word *folk*, which is the same as we find it in German *Volk*, meaning the people of the nation.) Before this, the term had not been very common. From the political side they preferred *state church* and never accepted the idea of the *free folk church* in the early 20th century.<sup>1</sup> Leading groups in the church, especially on the low church and revivalist wing, have been sceptical to an emphasis on the term *folk church* all the way.

According to Birger Løvlie things started to change in the 1970es.<sup>2</sup> *Folk church*

became a key word both among politicians and in the official Lutheran state church. Attitudes altered. According to Løvlie they changed in the church in order to share common ground with the political leadership and thus gain results of increased freedom for the church. Professor and later presiding bishop Andreas Aarflot became a main defender of the folk church idea, but also one who actively coined it, because he was concerned about the political pressure on ecclesiology. He explained its character as folk church in teleological terms and not in ontological terms.<sup>3</sup> However, he also developed an ecclesiology with a heavy emphasis on the open praxis of baptism as a primary sign of the church.<sup>4</sup> Politically this became a basis for democratisation of the church, which was decisive when the ties to some extent were loosened between state and church in 2008.

A similar adaptation of the folk church concept seems to have happened even earlier and in different ways in Denmark and Sweden. As for Denmark Nikolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig has meant a lot for the very strong link between the Folk Church, as the name is, and the nation. He also was a central person in fighting for freedom within the church, which has left its special mark on the Folk Church in Denmark. In Sweden, bishop Einar Billing during the first half of the 20th century introduced an ecclesiology about the folk church as a territorial means of “forgiveness for sins for the Swedish people”.<sup>5</sup> Later prof Gustav Wingren developed Billing’s ideas with a specific emphasis on creation theology.<sup>6</sup> His ideas seem to have had a heavy impact on the Scandinavian folk church ideology today, even though in a further developed way. This seems to be clear from some of the leading voices in the Norwegian debate, not least pro-

fessors Jan Olav Henriksen and Sturla Stålsett.<sup>7 8</sup>

The strong secularisation and the increasing pluralist reality and mind-set of the Scandinavian societies have made it necessary to ask about the future of the folk church. The contributions from Henriksen and Stålsett underscore this important reality, and at least Henriksen is partly and initially in his article very critical to the folk church term. Professor at Harvard and bishop of Stockholm, Krister Stendahl, provocatively stated already in 1986 as he saw the impacts this development in society brought upon a shrinking folk church, “When the *folk* had disappeared, the theologians declared the church a *folk church*”.<sup>9</sup>

There has been a wide ecclesiological debate in the Scandinavian churches in light of changes in society over the last decades. Quite a lot of this has focused primarily on sociological changes, probably intending to help the churches to handle their current crisis with declining membership and less impact on society and people. A number of books and publications, though, have also focused on the deeper questions of theology. To what extent are the reflections on the church in the 16th century applicable to the church in the 21st? Is there a relevance for today? I shall try to give some insights with two perspectives from the current theological debate in Norway and Denmark. First, let us try to clarify what the heritage of the Lutheran Reformation says about the church.

### 1) Elements of a Lutheran ecclesiology

What are the key elements in a Lutheran ecclesiology? The Norwegian professor and church historian Andreas Seierstad wrote in 1949 about the three basic Reformation principles. The formal princip-

le is about *Sola Scriptura* and the material principle about *Sola Fide*, *Sola Gratia*, *Solus Christus*. The third principle according to Seierstad is the church principle, the rediscovery of *the priesthood of all believers*, which in his opinion is fundamental for the evangelical Reformation in the 16th century.<sup>10</sup>

When reading only the Augsburg Confession, this does not become immediately clear. This should be understood in light of its intention to bring an appreciation for the Reformation movement at the Diet of Augsburg. However, the CA articles present a foundation for thinking biblically about the church, with its emphasis on how the sinner is justified by faith alone (CA IV). It continues to see how the external Word brings this faith to humans (CA V). This faith, received by the Spirit through “*ministerium verbi et sacramenti*” calls us to bring forth good fruit and the necessity of good deeds as we follow Christ (CA VI). On this background, the church is “the assembly of saints in which the Gospel is taught purely and the sacraments are administered rightly”. Unity of the church consists of agreement concerning the doctrine of the Gospel (CA VII). The reformers were fully aware of the status of the church as always containing both true believers and hypocrites, regardless of the church order, even though they underscored that the real “church is, properly speaking, the assembly of the saints and those who truly believe” (CA VIII).<sup>11</sup>

Even though written in a mild tone, CA thus gives very critical signals towards the ordinary Roman Catholic understanding of the church. With Martin Luther, this became clear through his programmatic writings in 1520, when he clearly rejected the authority of the papacy. We can probably read his clearest visions

for the church in *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*, where he clarifies his understanding of the priesthood of all believers. In my opinion, Martin Luther stood by his early discoveries throughout his whole ministry. This comes to expression both in his *German Mass* (1526), in his *Large Catechism* (1529) and in the *Schmalcald Articles* (1537). While proposing a third mass, which – he says – is for the future, he calls this “a truly evangelical order” because it consists of “those who want to be Christians in earnest and who profess the gospel with hand and mouth”.<sup>12</sup> In accordance with his writings in 1520, he brings in the personal, confessed faith as a mark for the true church. In his *Large Catechism*, he calls the church a *little holy group*, a strange name when knowing about the monopoly of the church institutions. “I believe that there is on earth a little holy flock and community of pure saints under one head, Christ. It is called together by the Holy Spirit in one faith, mind, and understanding. It possesses a variety of gifts, yet is united in love, without sect or schism.”<sup>13</sup> In 1537 he expresses the famous words that even a child at seven knows what the church is: “holy believers and “the little sheep who hear the voice of their shepherd””, referring to John 10, 27 where this listening to and personal knowledge of Jesus implies following him.<sup>14</sup> The church consists of the baptized and believing followers.

We have spent some paragraphs looking into this, because one central doctrine in a modern folk church theology in the Nordic countries places the entire and only emphasis on baptism as the sign and basis for understanding the church. Many quote Luther saying, “Whoever comes out of the water of baptism can boast that he is already a consecrated priest”, indica-

ting baptism alone as the basis for the priesthood of the believers and as the full ordination of the Christian.<sup>15</sup> It seems like a misreading though, to put all the emphasis here. We must understand these words from the context in which they occurred, namely his protest against the ordination of priests to become something spiritually different from and elevated above what all Christians receive in baptism. With the reformers, baptism and faith were inseparable, and so were faith and the obedience of faith in a holy life and discipleship. “Baptism alone” is not a Reformation teaching; “faith alone” is. It is the deep problem for modern folk church ideology that it ignores this biblical and Reformation theology in its effort to become all-embracing.

In the following paragraphs, we will introduce two different challenges concerning Lutheran ecclesiology. First, we will use the ideas from the Reformation to challenge the (post-) modern folk church ideology. Then we will send one challenge back from our own age to the Reformation, thus pointing to a deficiency in the Lutheran ecclesiology, which seems obvious in a post Christian age.

## 2) What kind of a folk church?

The times of Reformation were relatively monocultural. The Lutheran confessions were worked out in this environment. The agreement from Augsburg 1555 determined the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio*. The faith of the King should be the faith of his people. A concept of the folk church has thus deep roots, and this is so in all sorts of historical churches. However, we must ask if the folk church concept as it appears today is compatible with the ecclesiology of the confessions of the Reformation. We must also ask whether the heritage from the Reforma-

tion gives us a broad enough basis for grasping the challenges of the church in our secular societies today.

The *folk church* concept is, as Luther also commented on the *church*, “a blind and indistinct word”. Those who tend to use it often do not share common ground in their understanding of it. Danish theologian Hans Raun Iversen presents five different understandings (according to Wolfgang Huber) that are partly in conflict with each other.<sup>16</sup> When Friedrich Schleiermacher and Romanticism coined the first use of it, folk church would imply that the church was church *by and through* the people, and not by the king or the state. Later in the 19th century, the inner mission by Johan Wichern talked about it as the church *to* the people. This missional intention has been a common understanding for many revival movements who remained within the state churches in Scandinavia. In the 20th century, Schleiermacher’s ideas got a new application through the tight connections between one specific people or race and the church. The Nazi ideology politically embraced this. The dominating political model over the post-war decades has been the common understanding between church leaders and politicians that the church should be church *for* the people by delivering its rites and ongoing service to the people. Swedish Einar Billing talked about this as the clearest expression of the Gospel as the folk church through its pan-local ministry was God’s constant presence of grace and forgiveness, without any terms or conditions. This model has been followed by a fifth one pointing to the church as church embodying the common morality.

In the church elections in Norway September 2015, the big public issue was the question about same sex marriage. The



underlying issue though, was about who the church is. The two dominant fractions of the church were (and are) deeply split on the nature of the church and the understanding of the Gospel. The leading voice of the party called *Open Folk Church*, Sturla Stålsett, goes so far as to open up the understanding of the church also to consist of its non-members, because the church is for “the other”, for the “marginalised” and “oppressed”. The church, according to Stålsett, is for the Greek *demos*, ordinary people with the right to decide through democracy, and for the Latin *plebs*, those without public rights, regardless faith, confession and disciple-ship.<sup>17</sup> As he uses these two ancient words and the Greek *ethnos*, he does not at all mention the Greek word that actually is used in the New Testament about the covenant people of God, *laos*. That is peculiar but understandable in light of Stålsett’s avoidance of all identification of the church with the confessing believers following Jesus.

Theologians and church leaders holding on to classical Reformation theology are a minority in all the Nordic folk churches, tending to stand in strong opposition not only on the same sex marriage question, since this is only the top of the iceberg. Underneath dominates the larger questions, such as postmodern hermeneutics, the idea of eternal universalism in salvation, a low understanding of the uniqueness of Christ and a Gospel reductionism or antinomianism. Several warnings have been expressed against ending up in what Dietrich Bonhoeffer warned about, the cheap grace. In all these areas, this new theology breaks down the Lutheran distinction between Law and Gospel at a fundamental level and gives very little room for a call to repentance and a holy life, as that might offend people, specifically

those marginalised and oppressed in society, such as females, children, sexual minorities, people of non-Christian faith and religions, indigenous people etc.

Many theologians in the Scandinavian churches love to quote the German theologian and martyr Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s statement “church for others”. We find this with professor Stephanie Dietrich in her article about the folk church as *sanctorum communio*, written in the book *Folkekirke nå*.<sup>18</sup> Neither she nor any other contributors in the book, who take Bonhoeffer for the benefit of their folk church defence, mention Bonhoeffer’s very strong emphasis on *Nachfolge*, which is the title and the content of his most famous book. There is not a trace of *The Cost of Discipleship*, to mention the English title of Bonhoeffer’s very influential work. It is hard even to imagine that anyone can make use of Bonhoeffer in ecclesiology without placing *Nachfolge* in the centre. It is only when the church, understood as the disciples, carries the cross of Jesus Christ that it is able to become church for others. With a cheap grace, we are just like others and not for others. “Cheap grace is the preaching of forgiveness without requiring repentance, baptism without church discipline, Communion without confession, absolution without personal confession. Cheap grace is grace without discipleship, grace without the cross, and grace without Jesus Christ, living and incarnate.”<sup>19</sup> This seems rather to be the opposite language to most folk church ideologies during the last decades.

The theologically classical side of the Lutheran folk churches of Scandinavia has a huge task ahead in understanding and applying the ecclesiology in the way of the Reformation. The core discovery of Martin Luther was about justification by faith alone, with implications for the

understanding of the Christian faith far beyond Lutheran confessional boundaries. Together with this, and following the necessary break with the Catholic body (whether they were expelled or left voluntarily at first hand), the reformers laid a new foundation for ecclesiology. This is very relevant for us to look at afresh, as we from a biblical stand and perspective face even more serious challenges to the faith than they did then.

Our concluding remark here is that the dominating folk church ideologies with the emphasis solely on baptism and without a call to faith and discipleship hardly is compatible with the ecclesiology from the Lutheran Reformation. In many respects, this seems to go back to the identification of the church and the nation and its people since Schleiermacher and the Romanticism, but parts of it even go so far back as to the Augsburg Settlement in 1555. However, the identification of church and people numerically and in terms of cultural and confessional identification was far more obvious both in the 16th and in the 19th century than it is today. It is hard to see how this identification of the church and the people of the nation is at all possible in a secular and pluralist society without violating the basic understanding of the church as we see it within the Reformation theology.

### 3) The missional nature of the church

In the previous paragraphs, we have used basic Reformation ecclesiology to ask critical questions to current folk church ideologies. In this paragraph, we will turn the focus around and ask for one possible deficiency in the early Lutheran heritage, the missional nature of the church.

The Reformation emphasis as we find it in CA is entirely on the *congregatio* – without losing the *communio* from the

old creeds – of the believers. We are aware that the understanding of the missional character of the church was weak during the period, and the Reformation did not address it to any large extent. However, it might be possible to say that the rediscovery of the priesthood of all believers carried this missional aspect as a seed, which came to blossom in the Pietistic movement, e.g. with the Moravians. Professor Ingmar Öberg also gives evidence for some mission approach with Martin Luther.<sup>20</sup>

Lutheran ecclesiology has been a focus area with a number of Scandinavian bishops and theologians with a more classical position on theology. Professor and presiding bishop in Norway for a number of years, Olav Skjevesland<sup>21</sup>, the current bishop in Bergen, Halvor Nordhaug<sup>22</sup>, and professor Harald Hegstad<sup>23</sup> have all contributed to this discussion. All three have ended up with a traditional defence for a folk church concept. Professor Oskar Skarsaune, on the other side, has been far more critical of the remaining Constantine mind-set of the folk churches.<sup>24</sup> As for the missional character of the church, this has gained very little interest in the ecclesiological contributions from Skjevesland and Nordhaug. However, it is a central concept with Hegstad.<sup>25</sup>

One very active and current contributor to the debate about the missional aspect of the Lutheran church is the Danish theologian Jeppe Bach Nikolajsen.<sup>26</sup> Nikolajsen has studied the ecclesiological questions while looking at two influential theologians, Lesslie Newbigin and John Howard Yoder. They have both made major contributions to the rethinking of classical ecclesiology in the midst of modernity – or the post-Constantine era. This post-Constantine critique is strong with American theologians like Yoder and

Stanley Hauerwas, both widely read by younger theologians in Scandinavia. Some of their thoughts can be traced back in a European setting to the radical church critic from Søren Kierkegaard and maybe also to Dietrich Bonhoeffer's demanding call to the Confessing Church in Germany during the 1930'ies.

In his book *National kristendom til debat*, Nikolajsen as editor has invited a number of Scandinavian academics, also those with a more critical approach to the post-Constantine critique.<sup>27</sup> Two of his own contributions in the book emphasise the necessity for the whole church – also for the folk churches – to rediscover her missional intention and nature. He refers to what he calls the primary critique of the church by the great missiologist Lesslie Newbigin, saying that she ceased understanding herself as a missional fellowship in her Constantinian context.<sup>28</sup> In his own concluding remarks, Nikolajsen raises a number of questions as to whether the Lutheran ecclesiology and the missional ecclesiology might be integrated. He calls this an unsolved (“uavklaret”) question. He is in no doubt, though, that it is necessary to further develop a Lutheran ecclesiology, which takes missional perspectives seriously.<sup>29</sup>

As the Scandinavian churches are about to leave their long-lived privileges of the Constantine period, the churches now are in profound need of finding a new self-understanding. In Scandinavia, we have had many contributions over the last 20 years on topics related to being a missional church, among whom Nikolajsen is a leading academic voice today. One lead motif is to talk about the church more as a *movement* than as a place or gathering or a community. The church is dynamic more than static. The understanding of the church is less institutional and

more relational.

Two important international contributors to the debate have been Michael Frost and Alan Hirsch.<sup>30</sup> The movement motif originates from the Bible, with exodus and pilgrimage as metaphors for the people of God, and not least Christ sending his disciples to the world, which he loves. Focus is less on our mission or the mission of the church and more on mission as *Missio Dei*, understood as God sending the Son and the Spirit and the Church for the salvation of the world. The concept of *Missio Dei* originated from the International Mission Council meeting in Willingen in 1952. It has developed a lot since then, in different directions. Late missiologist David Bosch notes that *Missio Dei* changes the order between church and mission, saying, “There is church because there is mission, not vice versa.”<sup>31</sup> Mission is God's movement to the world; the church is viewed as God's instrument for that mission. It is not that the church has a mission but that God's mission has a church.

One central model for rethinking the missional church in a post-Christian – and thus, also post-Constantine – world, is from late anthropologist Paul Hiebert. He introduced the dual concepts of church as *bounded sets* and as *centred sets*.<sup>32</sup> Should the church be defined by clear limits of belonging or not belonging, membership rolls or demand identification with a certain number of faith statements? This, says Hiebert, is the model of bounded sets. Alternatively, we can see the church from a clearly defined centre and content and invite people to go towards this centre. We should not focus on defining the exact borders of the church but develop a liquid ecclesiology, as Pete Ward has called it.<sup>33</sup> Hiebert found this model more likely in a typical

mission situation, when discipleship must be learned afresh as a distinct life from the majority culture. The Gospel and Our Culture Series forwarded his ideas with special address to a Western culture.<sup>34</sup> The contributions by Frost and Hirsch indicate a further radicalisation and anti-institutionalism with a sharp critique of the established Western church systems. From an evangelical Lutheran perspective, they fall short on a number of biblical hallmarks of the church, such as the centrality of preaching and the means of grace. This has also been characteristic for the American emerging church movement (around the millennial shift) with its positive attitudes to the post-modern mind-set. The movement has met necessary critique from evangelical theologians and leaders.<sup>35</sup>

I have mentioned these impulses from a wider and mainly evangelical arena to give us a glimpse of some challenges to the Reformation heritage, which are demanding for the current generation of church leaders. In Scandinavia, as in other European countries, there is a fast growing interest in church planting and on how the church can manage to bring fresh expressions of her faith. I find this deeply in line with the revitalising work of the Reformation. This is a positive trend in many churches, but also in networks or independent initiatives of plan-

ting outside any established church bodies. Even parts of the relatively state bound Church of Norway have brought in resources from the Anglican focus on *Mission Shaped Church*.<sup>36</sup>

#### 4) Final remarks

We certainly find important and relevant elements in the Reformation theology on the church, but we also need to rediscover sides of the biblical story, which can help us to grasp the very different situation after 500 years. The revival movements were strong in Scandinavia 150 years ago and helped the churches to adjust to a shift in culture and society without giving up the biblical message as we have it from the Reformation. The cultural and societal changes are far more profound in our days. Much more now than 150 years ago the folk churches are under severe threat, both from societal changes and from a postmodern mind-set from within theology. From a biblical and Reformation point of view, the way ahead for the church should not be that of full cultural adaptation. Rather, she should go to her sources – prayer and God’s Word – like the reformers taught us, and seek deeply to understand our times, like those “from Issachar, men who understood the times and knew what Israel should do” (1 Chron 12, 32).”

#### Notes

1. Vidar L. Haanes, ”Bidrag til forståelse av folkekirkebegrepet i Norge”. In Stephanie Dietrich, Hallgeir Elstad, Beate Fagerli og Vidar L. Haanes (eds), *Folkekirke nå* (Oslo: Verbum, 2015) 42-43
2. Birger Løvlie, *Kirke, stat og folk i en etterkrigstid* (Oslo: Luther, 1996) 269-273
3. Andreas Aarflot, *La kirken være kirke* (Drammen: Cappelen, 1990) 208-209. *Teleological*, from Greek: *telos*, meaning goal, fulfillment. *Ontological*, from Greek: *ontos*, meaning being, identification.
4. *Ibid.*, 215 (see also the following pages of the chapter for a deeper understanding of his thinking)
5. Hallgeir Elstad, ”Folkekyrkjeomgrepet – opphav og utvikling. Tysk og nordisk kontekst”. In *Folkekirke nå*, 27-29
6. *Ibid.*, 30
7. Jan Olav Henriksen, ”Sekularisering som folkekirkenes tvetydige betingelse”. In *Folkekirke nå*, 166-178
8. Sturla Stålsett, ”Folkekirke i et livssynsåpent samfunn: kirke for alle? Økende tros- og livssynsmangfold som utfordring til Den norske kirkes selvforståelse”. In *Folkekirke nå*, 205-213



9. Krister Stendahl, "De nordiske folkekirkenes fremtid". In Kjell Ove Nilson (ed), *Folkekirken i Norden*, (Uppsala: Nordiska ekumeniska institutet, 1986) 140
10. Andreas Seierstad, "Luther og det ålmene prestedømet". In Andreas Seierstad, Leiv Aalen and Reidar Kobro (eds), *Korsets ord og troens tale, festskrift til O. Hallesby* (Oslo: Lutherstiftelsen, 1949) 103-117
11. All quotes from CA following Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (eds), *The Book of Concord* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress Press, 2000) 43
12. Martin Luther, "The German Mass", in Ulrich S. Leupold (ed), *Luther's Works – Liturgy and Hymns I* Vol 53 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress Press, 1965) 63f
13. *The Book of Concord*, 437f
14. *The Book of Concord*, 324f
15. Martin Luther, "To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate", in James Atkinson (ed), *Luther's Works – The Christian in Society I* Vol 44 (Philadelphia PA: Fortress Press, 1966) 129
16. Hans Raun Iversen and Eberhardt Harbsmeier, *Praktisk teologi* (København: Forlaget Anis, 2014), s. 61-62
17. Sturla Stålsett, "Kirke i et livssynsåpent samfunn: kirke for alle?" In *Folkekirke nå*, 205-213
18. Stephanie Dietrich, "Folkekirken som sanctorum communio: Innspill til nytenkning i lys av Bonhoeffers teologi og Barmenerklæringen". In *Folkekirke nå*, 48-59
19. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (London: SCM press LTD, 1959) 36
20. Ingmar Öberg, *Luther och världsmissionen* (Åbo: Åbo Akademis kopieringssentral, 1991)
21. Olav Skjevesland, *Levende kirke* (Oslo: Luther forlag, 1984); *Huset av levende steiner* (Oslo: Verbum, 1993)
22. Halvor Nordhaug, *En kirke for folket* (Oslo: Luther forlag, 2006)
23. Harald Hegstad, *Folkekirke og trosfellesskap* (Trondheim: Tapir, 1996); *Den virkelige kirke*, (Oslo: KIFO Perspektiv/Church Research Perspectives, 2009)
24. Oskar Skarsaune, "Kirkens konstantinske fangeskap – ser vi slutten?" In *Dansk Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke* (Vol 38: No 3, 2011) 19-30
25. Hegstad, 61-86, with special emphasis on 73-77
26. Jeppe Bach Nikolajsen, *Redefining the Identity of the Church* (Oslo: 2010)
27. Jeppe Bach Nikolajsen (ed), *National kristendom til debat* (Fredericia: Kolon, 2015)
28. Jeppe Bach Nikolajsen, "Den konstantinske kirke. Leslie Newbigins ambivalente kritik". In *National kristendom til debat*, 185
29. Jeppe Bach Nikolajsen, "Aktuelle utfordringer for den lutherske teologi". In *National kristendom til debat*, 271-272
30. Michael Frost and Alan Hirsch, *The Shaping of Things to Come. Innovation and Mission for the 21st-Century-Church* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 2003)
31. David Bosch, *Transforming Mission* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1991) 389-393
32. Paul G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Books, 1994/1998) 107-136
33. Pete Ward, *Liquid Church* (Eugene OR; Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2002)
34. Darrell L. Guder (ed), *Missional Church* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1997)
35. Dan A. Carson, *Becoming Conversant with the Emerging Church* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 2005)
36. Graham Cray et al, *Mission Shaped Church* (London: CHP, 2004)