

West Side Baptist Church and The Free Grace Institute

www.DoctrinePastor.com



BASIC CHURCH HISTORY

A two credit hour course. The student must carefully read these notes then answer the questions in the student workbook at the end. For additional credits the student can read *the Pilgrim Church* by E. H. Broadbent and the two additional articles.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This will be an overview of the major people, events, and doctrines in the development of the Christian Church up to the modern age as presented by Dr. Robert Dean. This is a short teaching series given at his church and serves as an introductory overview of the history of Christianity. The website for Dean Bible Ministries is www.deanbible.org where the student can access the audio teaching of this series if desired. An overview of church history by Todd Kennedy is also included.

Dr. Robert Dean

Is the Pastor-Teacher of Houston Bible Church

Additional extra credit readings:

The Pilgrim Church (two credits)

One credit for the following

The Marrow Controversy

The Apostolic Fathers: Key Issues in Their Understanding of Grace

Student name:

History of Christianity—1

In Acts 1:8 as the Lord Jesus Christ is preparing to ascend to heaven he told His disciples: “but you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth.” Jesus told the disciples that they would start off as witnesses in Jerusalem, then they would expand their influence into the province of Judea. From there they would go into Samaria and then to the uttermost parts of the earth.

That was 2000 years ago. How did that happen? The book of Acts only tells us about the next 30-40 years. By the end of the book of Acts we find Paul in Rome, but what happened after that? How did the gospel get from there to here?

From 100, the end of the apostolic period, to about 600 AD what happened in that period was incredible because Christianity explodes into the world. In 100 they had no idea of a canon of Scripture. The New Testament had been written, it just had not been completely circulated and brought together in a canon. The word “canon” means a rule or a standard. The canon was developed over a period of years. It took about 200 years before the New Testament was really brought together and recognized as the 27 books of the New Testament that we have today. By 600 there was the 27-book canon and it had also been translated into other languages besides Greek. In 100 there was no hierarchy, there was only a very informal church structure in the groups that were scattered throughout the empire. By 600 there is a formal structure and a hierarchy who looked to the bishop in Rome or the patriarch in Constantinople as the final authority. In 100 there are no creedal/doctrinal statements, no technical theological vocabulary outside that which was in the New Testament. They had no word for Trinity, no word for the hypostatic union, no concepts for describing certain theological and doctrinal concepts other than just those words that are used in the New Testament. By 600 there are several formal creeds and a technical theological vocabulary. In 100 they believed in a literal interpretation of the Scriptures and they were pre-Millennial. By 600 they no longer believed in a pre-Millennial return of Christ and they no longer believed in a literal 1000-year reign of Christ; they based that on an allegorical method of interpretation. So we can see that there were a lot of changes in that 500-year period. What took place to bring about those changes and in many way a decline in Christianity away from the truth of the New Testament?

We are going to cover the church from the ancient church to the Reformation church. The ancient church covers that period from the time of Christ’s resurrection and the institution of the church on the day of Pentecost to 600 AD. The Medieval church covers the period of time from 600 AD to 1500 AD, and the line shows that there was a steady decline, a deterioration within not only the institutional church but also the doctrine of the church. This when there was the rise of Roman Catholicism. Then there was a reformation in 1500, the beginning of the Reformation church.

The ancient church is made up of three periods: the apostolic age from AD 33 to 100. We will begin with the age of the apostolic fathers, from 100-150. These were called the apostolic fathers because they were closely related to the apostles. Some of these men such as Polycarp and Papias were disciples of the apostle John. In around the early fourth century a man by the name of Eusebius of Caesarea was the first

church historian. He had access to a lot of documents that we don't have access to any more and so through him we know of Polycarp and Papias and others who were closely associated with the apostolic fathers.

Who were they? Who are they? What did they write? What was their theology? The term "apostolic fathers" refers to not only what they wrote but who they were. There was Clement of Rome who was the Bishop of Rome, not simply the pastor of Rome. By this time there were several different congregations in Rome. In this period of time divisions began to occur between the local pastors and the bishop. One of the things we will look at in the development of the church is the development of different views of church government. The New Testament talks about "elders," which is really a Jewish term for the leader of the congregation, "bishops" – Greek word EPISKOPOS [e]piskopoj] – a term that came from a Greek background for the leader of a group, and "pastors." By the late first century elders and pastors were beginning to be used synonymously. Even though, as Eusebius tells us, the bishops and elders were synonymous in the apostolic period, by this time as a result of the writings of Ignatius a distinction began to be made between elders and bishops. So in a town there might have been several different congregations and of those eventually one man would rise to the surface, and that man would be the bishop who would oversee the work of those several congregations in that area. Because of his authority this doctrine was called the doctrine of the monarchical bishop—monarchy having to do with rulership. The bishop became a separate office set over the local pastors and elders.

Clement was the third Bishop of Rome and the Roman Catholics claim that he was the third pope, although that term "pope" is not used in any literature until into the seventh century. Polycarp who was a disciple of John was martyred, burnt at the stake in Rome in 154 AD. Papias was another disciple of John. Hermas another who wrote a writing called "The Shepherd," a very devotional work which was read in churches and almost treated as authoritatively as New Testament writings. Then there was Ignatius, also a disciple of John; he was bishop of the church at Antioch. He was the one who developed the doctrine of the monarchical bishop in order to provide unity—that is what they were trying to achieve here, unity against opposition. He was arrested in Antioch and as he was taken to Rome he writes letters to seven different churches along the way—Ephesus, Philadelphia, Colosse, some of the same ones that are in the New Testament, and they are very valuable writings for learning about the nature of the churches and the Christians at that time. He was thrown to the lions in the Coliseum.

Other writings during this time include the Epistle of Barnabas, Second Clement which was written by Clement of Rome to the church in Corinth, the Epistle of Diognetus, and the Didache [Teachings] which was the teaching of the twelve and it is a manual for church discipline, what goes on in church worship services—liturgy, communion, baptism, fasting, as well as instruction on what do with practical problems such as false teachers and discipline within the local church.

What was their theology? The thing that amazes many people today is that they expect to go back to these people who studied at the feet of the disciples to find answers to the questions we have, to find clarification. But what we find is just the opposite.

They are very confused. One word that describes their theology is “vague.” They had fallen away from the doctrines of the apostles. They had no battles to fight. We become crisp and clear in our thinking and we have to argue with somebody and defend our position, but when no one is attacking us, no one is asking us tough questions, then we just go with the flow. That is one reason why over the years many Christians say why is learning doctrine, why is learning theology and the Bible so difficult? Why do I have to develop all this vocabulary and learn all of this? Because over the years people ask difficult questions, such as about the nature of evil, questions about predestination, questions about how a person is saved and what the relationship of works to faith is. To answer those questions we have to think and to develop the vocabulary to explain those and it took hundreds of years to do that. In the apostolic fathers there was none of that. Their thinking wasn’t stark, their writings were very devotional, and they simply used biblical terminology without really thinking through what it meant.

When it came to the Scripture they had no understanding of the New Testament canon. They quoted from the writings of Paul and of John but they also quoted other writings that are not in the New Testament. They viewed them all with the same level of authority but they did not look at them with the same level of authority as the Old Testament. When they talked about God they viewed God as monotheistic, God as one, and they also viewed Jesus Christ as God the Holy Spirit as God; but they didn’t have an understanding of the Trinity. They spoke of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit without really thinking through what that meant. When they spoke of Christ they believed that He was fully God and fully man but they didn’t put it together. They would just talk about the humanity of Jesus and the deity of Jesus but they didn’t think it through.

In salvation they tended towards legalism. They believed that baptism washed away a person’s sin. They began to lose the concept of grace and grace began to get clouded. In their view of the church they began to talk about the “catholic” church. The term “catholic” simply means universal. That is why when we talk about the Roman Catholic church that is distinct from the catholic church. We are all members of the catholic church, the universal body of Christ, but we are not part of the Roman Catholic church. One thing that is important is that in their view of prophecy they were pre-millennial, but it was not thought through in detail. Remember that the key word for this period is “vague.” Their theology and theological terminology is not technical, it is just very vague; they just review and restate the phrasing of Scripture.

After the apostolic age came the age of the apologists. The term “apologist” doesn’t mean that they were apologizing. It came from the Greek term APOLOGIA [a)pologia], a legal term meaning “defense.” From this time they had to defend Christianity from the attacks from outside the church, from various pagan groups such as the Gnostics and others who were attacking the Christians, and there were all kinds of false rumors about Christianity. Christians, they said, were cannibals because of Jesus’ words at the last supper—“This is my blood” and “this is my body.” They were accused of atheism and anti-patriotic because they would not worship the emperor of Rome. That is what caused many of the persecutions.

Who were the apologists? The main ones were: Justin Martyr. In his view in trying to understand the Trinity he went into the error called subordinationism. A major question throughout the period from about 150-250 was what was the relationship between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit? One of the options

which was called subordinationism is that the Father is God and the Son and the Holy Spirit are not quite on the same level as the Father. There are various views of subordinationism. Justin Martyr's error was that the Son was God but not quite as fully God as the Father.

Irenaeus was another. He was born in Asia-Minor and was appointed as bishop of Lyon. He was famous for fighting the Gnostics who were some of the most vitriolic and prolific opponents of Christianity at this time. Irenaeus wrote five monumental books against the Gnostics. Tertullian was another. He is considered the founder of Latin or western theology. He lived in North Africa, was a lawyer by trade so he is very precise in his writings. He developed a couple of terms that we use today: Trinitos to describe the relationship between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; they are a Trinity. He is also the first man to coin the phrase "hypostatic union." Nevertheless, even though he used those words he viewed the Son as something less than the Father. He was also famous for being the first one to articulate the view called traducianism. This is the view that life begins in the womb, that at the moment of conception the soul is already present in the womb. The interesting thing about Tertullian's view of the soul is that he viewed the soul as material. This is the root of the error in his argument.

Origen is another well-known and brilliant man during this time. He lived from 185-253. He was born in Alexandria and he was very ascetic. One of the characteristics of this entire age was asceticism.

Asceticism tends to emphasize a high degree of morality as a means to spirituality, and it also emphasizes self-denial. Origen is important to use because he changed the nature of Christianity in many ways. He was considered by many to be a heretic. He was the first to shift to an allegorical view of interpretation. He said that Scripture really operated on three levels. Just as we would talk about a trichotomy of body, soul and spirit he thought that there were three levels of meaning to the Scriptures. The body would represent the literal meaning, the soul would be a figurative meaning, and then he would also have a higher level of spiritual meaning based on allegory.

Ultimately the meaning of Scripture was a spiritual meaning. It divorced it from the literal meaning of the text. It is from Origen that we owe a shift that covers the entire Middle Age period from literal, historical, grammatical interpretation of the Scriptures to an allegorical or symbolic meaning of the Scriptures. With that we began to lose a pre-millennial view of prophecy and shift to an amillennial view, that Christ is already reigning over the church, that the kingdom is spiritual and not earthly or physical. So in many ways Origen is the one who causes the church to decline even further in terms of its theology. In his understanding of the atonement, of how Christ died and the significance of it and the redemption (paying a price) Origen taught that the price was paid to Satan; so this is origin of what is called the ransom to Satan theory of the atonement—Christ's death was to free us from Satan as opposed to buying us out from the slave market of sin and His death being the satisfaction to God.

What were they defending against? If we can understand this we can understand a lot of things that are going on today. One of the first things they dealt with was Gnosticism. When we look at the theological threads they were twofold. There were those outside the church and those inside the church. Outside the church they fought with Gnosticism, Monarchianism and Neo-Platonism. Inside the church they fought

against legalism, Marcionism and Montanism. We have elements of these today. To understand the fight they had then is to understand the fight we have today. We fight with the legalists, those who want to say that salvation is through works, obedience to the law. Those who deny that salvation is by faith alone in Christ alone.

Marcion was one of the earliest liberals and rationalists in the church and was the first person to try to put together a canon of the New Testament. The only books he wanted to keep were the ones written by the apostle Paul and a little bit of Luke. All of the others, he said, were tainted by that terrible Old Testament God and tainted by Judaism. He was anti-Semitic. By using reason as his ultimate authority he began to cut up the Scriptures—just like the 19th century liberals would. When Marcion did that the church had to say wait a minute, is he right or is he wrong?

For the first time the people in the church began to think about having a canon of Scripture. They began to think about what was authoritative and what was not authoritative. At the same time they were being persecuted. They would die for the book of Romans but they did not want to die for the Shepherd of Hermas, so they had to make a decision. What is Scripture and what is not? Then there were the Montanists; they were the early Pentecostals.

Outside the church there was Gnosticism. Gnosticism is always difficult for people to understand. In Gnosticism there was an ultimate god who created all these secondary spirit beings that were called aeons. Then there was a kind of secondary god or deity, often identified as Jesus Christ, a good god. The first god was evil, the second was identified as good. Gnosticism really blends with mysticism. The goal in life is for the person to somehow merge himself into or with the deity. There he experiences a higher life. The only way to do that is through a secret knowledge [GNOSIS/gnowsij] which they learned through mystical means. They believed in a dualism, that in the universe there is an ultimate principle of good and an ultimate principle of evil that are constantly warring together. In their view of dualism there was the good and the evil: the good is spirit and matter or the material is evil. In Christianity we have a doctrine that matter is good—God created the heavens and the earth—“It is good.” So when Gnosticism affected Christianity material things became not quite as good, and when that is merged with an emphasis on asceticism you begin to go into self-denial of anything material; you begin to emphasize the value of poverty and become anti-material—it is not good to collect things, you need to give away things and do away with things and live in poverty. It affects marriage. Marriage is good because it solves the morality problem but it is even better to be a virgin, better to be celibate. The only real value in marriage is that it produces offspring, and then they should be virgins and they should be celibate. So marriage is downplayed, sex becomes associated with evil because it is associated with the body, and you begin to emphasize celibacy, especially among the clergy. Poverty become a value, a spiritual benefit.

Another of the errors of Gnosticism was that if evil is associated with matter then Jesus Christ could not have truly taken on flesh, because if He took on flesh he would have become sin. This became known as Docetism. Docetism comes from the Greek word DOKEO [dokew] which means to seem. It only seems as if Jesus was flesh, He wasn't really flesh.

The effect of all of this, the dangers from outside the church, was to force the church to begin to determine what was Scripture, what was the canon, as well as to determine what they believed doctrinally. So they began to develop certain creeds.

Marcion was also affected very much by the rationalism and mysticism of Gnosticism. He identified the “evil” God with the Old Testament God and saw Him as a punishing and evil God. He identified the “good” God with Jesus Christ. So he had two God’s, two Messiah’s, each of them sent a Messiah. He said evil is physical and salvation is freedom from the material and begins at baptism; Christ was the one who showed the way. So they had to have an aesthetic view of Christ. Ultimately Marcion was a rationalist who was trying to take away from Scripture. He thought only ten of the books in the New Testament were authoritative.

The church always fights two battles. On the one hand she fights rationalism. Rationalism seeks to take away. On the other hand she fights mysticism. Mysticism says God speaks directly to every individual and you look inside for special spiritual knowledge. Mysticism always wants to add to revelation. In the middle we have true revelation, orthodoxy. Montanists and the charismatics are mystical; they want to add to Scripture. Marcion and the 19th century and present day liberals want to take away from Scripture.

The church at this time emphasized three things: the canon of Scripture, creedal statements which were short, distinct doctrinal statements, and church authority in the form of the bishop. The development of the bishop was to unite the Christian community. They developed a doctrine of apostolic succession. In order to join a church you had to affirm the three. They developed the canon of Scripture. There were three periods of time in the development of the canon. There was the period of circulation from 70-170 AD. This was the time when Paul had written letters to the church at Corinth, the churches at Ephesus and Philippi and Thessalonica.

They might have carried the letters back and forth to one another. Some churches had portions of the New Testament but they didn’t have all of it. These letters began to be circulated, copied and passed on by other churches. The second period was the period of separation, from about 170-303. This was when they began to separate out.

Certain of these documents were to be authoritative and others weren’t. They began to make distinctions between, say, the Shepherd of Hermas which they would read for devotional purposes, but it wasn’t as authoritative as Paul’s writings. The criteria they used to recognize the authority of New Testament writings was first of all its quality in terms of its doctrine. Did it agree with what had been taught or were there problems with it? A second part of the quality had to do with the internal agreement. Did it agree with itself, or were there contradictions within the document? Did it have the testimony that it was indeed written by God through men? A third criterion was its use in worship. Was it valuable and used by the churches in worship and was it widely read? And last and the most important, was it related to an apostle? Did it have apostolic authority?

By 367 Athanasius who was the bishop of Alexandria, in his Easter letter, he mentioned a 27-book canon. That was the first time in history that anybody isolated the New Testament to the 27 books, the same 27 books that we have today. At the Council of Carthage and the Council of Hippo these same 27 books were affirmed and ever since that time there was no dispute. All of the churches recognized those 27 books and no others as the New Testament.

Theologically in relation to the Trinity there were some problems understanding how the Trinity related. One view was dynamic Monarchianism. This view taught that God was eternal but at some time in the past he had created man. Christ was created as a human being but because of His goodness He was elevated to the level of deity and He would live forever. This viewed God as the ruler in the Godhead and Jesus has assumed deity. In other words, it is used of His adoption. Usually it is put at the time of His baptism by John the Baptist: at that time He was adopted by God the Father and was given deity. This was declared to be heretical. Dynamic Monarchianism led to a subordinationism, which was wrong.

A second view was called Modalism. Modalism sees that there is one God who puts on different masks. One mask is the Father and to the Jews of the Old Testament He appeared as the Father. The second mask they used was that of the Son. He came to earth and appeared as a son. Another time He came as the Holy Spirit. They were the same person but appeared differently. They don't see them as three distinct personalities. This is also known as patripassianism—patri = father; passion = suffering. In this view it was the Father who suffered on the cross. Modalism was declared heretical.

Ultimately, to understanding the Trinity we must realize that on the one hand there was the error of dynamic Monarchianism or subordinationism. That was an error. Then there was the view of modalism. Tritheism, or three Gods, would emphasize the three personalities but it would sacrifice their unity. So what is left in the middle? What is left in the middle is what we believe: God is one in essence but three in personality. How that really works out and what it really means is a mystery that we don't fully understand.

The age of the apostolic fathers was characterized by vagueness; the age of the apologists was characterized by defense. If we are vague in our theology we are going to have trouble when we are trying to defend ourselves. What is necessary in order to defend what you understand? 1 Peter 3:15 Peter said that all of us should be ready to give and answer for the hope that is in us. The Greek word that he uses there for giving an answer is APOLOGIA [a]pologia]. We are always to be ready to give a defense for what we believe. The age of the apologists blended into the next age, the age of the theologians.

There are four important men: Athanasius who was the bishop of Alexandria, Augustine who was the bishop of Hippo and perhaps one of the most influential theologians in all of history—both Protestants and Roman Catholics go back to Augustine. Protestants look to Augustine for his views on sin and grace; Roman Catholics look to Augustine for his views on the church. Pelagius was a British monk and a heretic who was in opposition to Augustine. Jerome not only translated the Vulgate but he was also very important in the development of monasticism and asceticism. The basic controversies that we run into

here during this time are twofold. Two key questions: a) Who was Jesus before He came? What was His relationship to the Father in eternity past? Was He less than God or equal to God? b) What was he when He came? The solution offered in the town of Alexandria created a controversy that upset the entire Roman Empire. In the early fourth century, near the turn of the century, something radical happened in history. For the previous 150 years the church was the enemy.

They were the outcasts, the slaves, of the Roman Empire. But right around 300 as Constantine was battling for the throne to become the emperor, he came to do battle at Milvian Bridge. He claimed that in the clouds he saw a cross and heard a voice saying, “By this sign you will conquer.” At that point Constantine claimed that he trusted Christ as his savior and became a Christian. From that point on the empire recognizes Christianity, makes it legal, and this had the beginning of a false idea of a Christian nation. All of the terrible things that happened through the next thousand years, all through the Middle Ages—all of the persecutions and inquisitions— are all the result of trying achieve this false concept of a Christian empire.

When Constantine became emperor one of the first things he had to deal with was a major doctrinal controversy in the church, known as Arianism. Arius was the pastor of a church in Alexandria. He taught that in eternity past God had always existed, but there was a time in eternity past when Jesus was begotten, and then other creatures were created and Christ is recognized at His baptism by John the Baptist. Arius was one of these people who had a wonderful, winsome personality. He was a musician and he wrote popular songs that were sung throughout the empire. He wrote a little ditty that was sung all over the empire, that there was a time when Christ was not, i.e. Christ was not eternal.

He was opposed by Athanasius. Athanasius was a deacon in the church at Alexandria at this time. Later he was a bishop. Constantine called for a church council, to bring in all the pastors in the empire, and they met at a small town outside of Constantinople called Nicea. There were three parties represented: the Arian party who taught that there was a time when Christ was not, the Athanasian party that taught that Christ was eternal, most of everybody else didn't understand what the real issues were. And that is something we will always notice in most churches. Whenever there are these kinds of problems there is always the two groups that really oppose each other and then most of the people don't really understand what the doctrinal issues are all about. Finally, the from pressure from Constantine they came to a decision in favor of Athanasius. Arianism was declared a heresy. Incidentally, Arianism is seen today in Jehovah's Witnesses. Once again, there is nothing new. If we understand what went on in the early church we understand today. They wrote the Nicene Creed:

We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, of all that is, seen and unseen.

We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father [from the essence of the Father] , God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made [or, created], of one Being with the Father.

So they affirmed the full deity of Jesus Christ. That brought on the second question: What was Jesus when he came? In other words, after Jesus came the Bible says he is God, and He is

human. But how does the humanity and the deity relate in Christ. The first solution was Appollinarianism.

Appollinarius taught that every human being had three parts: a body, a soul, and a spirit. Christ had a human soul and a human body but He had a divine spirit. What is the problem with that? He is not fully human, is He? He is only partially human and partially God. So Appollinarianism was rejected because they knew that a savior had to be fully man to die on the cross for us. That led to the next solution by a man named Nestorius He taught that Christ had a divine nature and a human nature, but as he explained it there was a moral unity between the two but not an organic unity. So they were really two unrelated persons. So Nestorianism was said to be heretical. A third solution to the problem of who Jesus was when He came was Eutychianism. Eutyches taught that He had a divine nature and a human nature, but that they were so mixed together that it was one nature but a third person, not distinct.

We believe that Jesus is fully God and fully man, unmixed but united in one person forever. This was finally articulated at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 where they wrote:

Therefore, following the holy fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body; of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin; as regards his Godhead, begotten of the Father before the ages, but yet as regards his manhood begotten, for us men and for our salvation, of Mary the Virgin, the God-bearer; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence, not as parted or separated into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten God the Word, Lord Jesus Christ; even as the prophets from earliest times spoke of him, and our Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us, and the creed of the fathers has handed down to us.

History of Christianity—

2

The period of the ancient church was a time of theological definition, a time of defining what they believed and what they understood the Scripture to mean. Beginning in 600 and the medieval church there would be a time of darkness that would descend upon the church, and then a time of restoration in the Reformation church. The first period we have been looking at, the period of the ancient church, was divided into four periods: the period of the apostolic age—33-100, the period of the apostolic fathers—100-150, the age of the apologists—150-300, and the age of the theologians—300-600. We are now in the middle of this last period, the age of the theologians.

There were three great questions that they needed to answer during this time. First, who was Jesus before He came? That was the area of controversy. Arius taught that there was a time when Christ was not. The answer to Arianism was formulated in the Nicene creed. But that did not win the battle. Athanasius just after that was appointed bishop of Alexandria. Five different times in his life he was exiled. The trouble with Nicea was that it was an ecumenical council called by the authority of the emperor.

As we all know political power shifts and changes and when political power lies behind theological decisions then when that political power shifts the theology shifts. Through the coming years after Constantine died and as those theologians who had the ear of the emperor changed the theology changed. For a while Arius's theology would come back into power and domination and then it was rejected again. Each time Athanasius would be exiled—five different times. Finally in the Council of Constantinople in 381 victory was secured for the truth, that Jesus Christ was eternal along with the Father.

The second question that they had to answer was: what was Jesus when He came? That was the issue of the hypostatic union. How does the deity and humanity of Christ relate? Finally they articulated in the fact that they were merged but not mixed, it was a union of the two persons, the two substances, humanity and deity—the hypostatic union of Christ, that He was fully God, undiminished deity, and completely man or true humanity.

The third question was: what did Jesus do when he came? This was the Pelagian controversy, it involved an understanding of the doctrine of sin and grace, it involved the nature of man and an understanding of what faith truly is. It answers the question, how is a man saved? Does regeneration precede faith or does it come after faith? How can a spiritually dead man even understand the gospel? If he cannot understand the gospel how can he be regenerated without already being saved? Is redemption chiefly a work of God or chiefly a work of man?

Augustine was the bishop of Hippo which is in Carthage in North Africa. He fought a number of theological battles. He argued very strongly that man has free will and it is because of man's exercise of his free will or volition that sin or evil entered into the universe. Man used his will to disobey God and that is how evil entered the universe. Then when he came into controversy with Pelagius he said something that we might have a little difficulty with. That is why we must understand his view on free will first. What he believed was that before the fall Adam had free will, he had a choice between good and evil. He could choose to eat or not eat the fruit. Once he chose to eat the fruit he no longer had complete freedom, could no longer choose to do absolute good or perfect righteousness. All he could do because he was a sinner, a spiritually dead unregenerate man, was choose to do sin—no matter how good it was in relative terms it was still sin. Therefore after the fall man no longer has complete free will. Only work of God upon his heart—common or efficacious grace—could bring about salvation. Augustine's doctrine of regeneration in terms of Romans chapter five was that before salvation he will only choose evil, he cannot choose good, but after man is saved, because of regeneration and the

indwelling Holy Spirit, he now has the ability to perform good. So true freedom is once again restored to man after regeneration. That is Augustine's view on the will.

Let's see how this is played out within the context of the controversy. Augustine taught that Adam's sin affected the entire human race so that everyone was guilty. The effect is not simply a disease, not just that man was weakened by sin, but that it is a defect; man is born with a nature that can do nothing but sin. Infants are morally, spiritually and physically corrupt. Augustine did not teach this on his own but in response to this British monk named Pelagius who came down from England to Rome and began teach his false doctrine. Pelagius taught that each man is born innocent as Adam when he was first created, that Adam's sin had no consequence on anybody but Adam. Adam's fall affected no one. Against that Augustine taught that man was born spiritually dead and that Adam's sin affected the entire race. Pelagius taught that every man had a completely unhindered will, the power to will and to do perfect righteousness; man was absolutely free.

Augustine said that man's freedom was restricted because he was spiritually dead and blinded to truth. Regarding grace Pelagius taught that man had the ability to will and to do without any help from God; man could save himself. It was possible in Pelagius's theology for a human being, because he hadn't been affected by human sin, to make good decisions and never sin. Augustine taught that as far as grace is concerned that there was an inward, secret, wonderful and efficacious act of God upon a man that wooed him to salvation. It is not a forcing but it is a love, a wooing to salvation.

Regarding predestination Pelagius taught that God chose men because men chose God. Augustine said that predestination is based on God's love because in eternity past God specifically chose who would be saved and who would not. What Augustine is basically saying is that everybody deserves Hell; nothing demands that God save anybody, so God chose to save a few. In Augustine's theology he held to a doctrine called double predestination: some were predestined to salvation and those would trust Christ as their savior; that God chose some for heaven and some for Hell. That is extreme Augustinianism. Pelagius's doctrine was that you were a sinner because you sinned. Augustine taught that you sinned because you were born with a sin nature, and you were a sinner. Pelagius taught that Adam was created mortal and that he would have died no matter whether he had sinned or not; he taught that Adam's sin only injured Adam and affected no one else; he taught that the law would save as well as the gospel; he taught that there were men before the time of Christ who lived without sin; he taught recently born infants are in the same neutral state as Adam, so they could live to; he taught recently born infants are in the same neutral state as Adam, so they could live to perfection; he taught that the whole of mankind is not did not die in the fall of Adam, nor does it resurrect in the resurrection of Christ; he taught that man if he would could live without sin; he taught that un-baptized infants would be automatically saved; he taught that the rich who were baptized would have no merit, nor would they inherit the kingdom of God if they did not renounce their possessions; he taught that sin consisted of individual acts, not in a constitutional problem or a sin nature.

In a solution to this controversy at the Council of Ephesus in 431 Pelagianism was condemned as heretical. Historically it is this that creates a shift to Roman Catholicism. The two extremes: Augustine

taught that salvation is totally and causally of God. He believed in double predestination. Pelagius taught that salvation was totally and causally of man. John Cassianus came along with his development and understanding. He said that salvation originates in God but preceded by man. Man's volition therefore returns to its significant place. Each person must believe in Christ and although God originates salvation man believes in Christ. He also denied predestination of the unbeliever. That became standard dogma from 529 on.

Then another view came along which emphasized a cooperative work between man and God: salvation originates in man and proceeds by man and God. That is clearly wrong. Salvation originates ultimately in God and the foreknowledge of God. This led to a works salvation: that man and God cooperate together, putting the emphasis on human works. It is semi-Pelagianism that slowly begins to work into the church. Even though in terms of the creeds semi-Augustinianism was adopted it began to be watered down, emphasizing human works. The result was Roman Catholic theology.

Now we come to the second period in the church, the age of the medieval church—600-1500. There was a time of decline organizationally and morally, as well as to some degree theologically. In our perspective the whole period is a decline theologically. So when there are ups and down it has to do with the church in terms of power and authority, and the morality of the church as opposed to their theology. There is a decline from 600-950; there is a resurgence from 950-1200. One of the signs of it was when Henry II was emperor of the Holy Roman Empire is forced to come crawling on his knees before the pope for forgiveness. That shows the power that the popes had by 1200 AD. Then it began to decline again until it is just in a tremendous mess both theologically and morally by 1500, which necessitated the Reformation under Martin Luther.

Four A's to remember: Augustine, Anselm, Abelard, Aquinas—four of the key people in the middle ages in Roman Catholic theology.

The period of the medieval church really begins in 600 with Gregory the Great. To back-track a little, in the previous two or three centuries five major cities dominated Christianity in the Roman Empire. Jerusalem by virtue of its position in that it was where Christ was crucified. There was Antioch in Syria, the first place where believers were called Christians and where Paul and Barnabas were sent out as missionaries. Then there was Alexandria in Egypt which became a major center of theology and theological development, and it was very influential in sending missionaries out throughout North Africa. There was Constantinople as the capital of the Roman Empire, then there was Rome. In the Roman Empire Rome was the seat of the emperor until Constantine. Constantine moved the capital of the empire to Constantinople. The empire as the hordes of barbarians were constantly coming in waves invading the Italian peninsula and eventually Rome was sacked, the western Roman Empire fell into decay and dissolution. This was the situation at the time of Gregory the Great.

He was born into an aristocratic family in Rome. During his upbringing he was given legal training, not a theological training. He was trained to work within the political environment of Rome. The emperor appointed him to be the mayor of Rome. As such he excelled in administration. At that time he was a

believer, his gifts were not overlooked by the church in Rome and he was appointed a deacon. He was sent as an ambassador from Rome to Constantinople as a representative of the church in Rome not only to the emperor in Constantinople but was also a representative to the patriarchs in Constantinople. By this time differences were developing between the eastern church and the western church; that which was mostly Greek and that which was mostly Latin. While he was there Gregory recognized that the true task for the west does not lie in unity with the east, he did not like what they were doing. He began to draw away from them. He returned to Rome at the age of 50 when he was a rather balding man, a very frail man, he was appointed to be the bishop of the church. He was a very humble man and did not want to be the bishop of the church in Rome but he accepted the position. They primarily wanted him because of his administrative ability, and he was the first man to function as a pope. He calls up armies, he delivers people.

Over the two or three hundred years prior to this time many noblemen, wealthy people died and had left their lands to the church, hoping they would get a little more forgiveness from God. The whole idea of penance had entered into the church by this time and people thought they could buy some extra divine forgiveness and grace. So the church had become fairly wealthy. Gregory administered all of those lands, received a lot of revenue from those lands, so when the people had suffered from the plagues and the floods he was able to distribute money to people, and his prestige and power grew. When the barbarians again sought to invade it was Gregory, not the emperor, who called up the army and went out to protect Italy and defeat the enemy. So he began to operate not just as a religious leader but as a secular leader. He had a conflict with John IV, the patriarch of Constantinople, who wanted to assume the title "Universal Bishop." Gregory fought him on that; Gregory did not want to be the pope. He was a humble man but he used his position as a powerful pope, so he was really the first true pope.

Theologically he is very significant. He had a semi-Pelagian view of man. He believed that Adam's fall weakened man but it didn't destroy him; he was sick but it was not a defect. What does that mean? If man is sick and it is not a defect then man can do something to cooperate with God. So works comes into the Roman church. Baptism remits sin. How are you saved? By baptism into the church because man cooperates with God. He introduced the whole concept of confession. What do you do about post-salvation sin? You have to do penance. You pray to the saints; he introduced the concept of the intercession of the saints. Of worshipping holy relics, purgatory, the mass and transubstantiation. Transubstantiation is at the core of Roman Catholic theology. This was introduced by Gregory but it does not dominate the western church.

Many people ask when Roman Catholicism began. It is a tough question to answer. In terms of a system, the church and the power of the pope, it begins with Gregory, but it is not until the 12th century when all of this works theology is finalized that the Roman Catholic church officially adopts a works view of salvation.

In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in the early church they saw it as a sacrifice of praise to God. This is clear from Clement of Rome, the Didache and Justin Martyr, the apostolic fathers. During the next

period of time it was viewed as a sacrifice that was both sacrificial and praise. This appeared in the writings of Iranaeus, Origen and Cyprian. The seed-bed is transubstantiation as found in their writings. By the time of the Middle Ages Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, it is a sacrifice that is sacrificial praise, and meritorious. See how it changes from just a sacrifice of praise to a sacrifice that is sacrificial praise and meritorious. You gain merit before God from the Lord 's Table by partaking in the elements.

So Gregory is important because of his administration gifts and how he organizes the western church, and also for the heretical doctrines such as transubstantiation, purgatory, prayers for the saints and his works-oriented salvation that he introduces into the church.

The second thing that happened in the Gregory period was that papal authority was expanded by two important documents that surfaced. Many years later they were discovered to be forgeries but were unknown to be forgeries at this time. The Donation of Constantine is a donation of land that supposedly goes back to Constantine that includes the Vatican. Much of central Rome, according to this document, was given to the pope. Secondly, the Isidorian Decretals were supposed to give the bishop of Rome supreme authority over the church in the west. It was these documents, as well as the things that Gregory did, through which the Roman church became a central power and laid the power base in western Europe.

Physically they began to grow. The major loss during this time was in North Africa. Mohammed had lived and died by now and the Islamic hordes had expanded across the Middle East and North Africa. North Africa was lost to the Christian church, an area where there had been a strong Christian church. At the same time there were missionary expansions that take place throughout Europe. In Britain there was a Celtic church affected by missionaries in the early first century. They had their own traditions and their own theology. By the fifth century there was a young man by the name of Patrick whose father was a deacon in the Celtic church. Patrick was captured by Irish pirates and hauled off into slavery in Ireland. While in Ireland he was mistreated but he developed a love for the people in Ireland. He finally escaped from Ireland, made his way back to receive some theological training, and went back to Ireland as a missionary. His theology was Celtic, not Roman. The Romans have adopted him as their saint but he did not have a Roman theology or a Roman view of salvation. He had a grace-oriented view of salvation and he established a strong church in Ireland that sent missionaries out throughout the rest of Europe. [He is the Patrick of St. Patrick's Day.]

After Patrick died [in A.D. 461] and within a century later from the strong church in Ireland was sent forth one of the men who was related to the king who had the name of Columba. He was a string-headed young man and at one time got into a disagreement with his cousin who was the king of Ireland, and he raised his own army in northern Ireland and attacked and defeated the king. He felt so guilty afterward (he was a priest) because of the loss of so many lives in that battle that he decided to become a missionary and try to save as many souls as had been killed in the battle. He left with some of those he had trained to a small island called Iona. There he established a monastery that was well known for the next 150 years because they sent missionaries throughout the northern part of England. They sent

missionaries down into Britain and they eventually clashed with Roman missionaries coming up from Rome. Eventually Roman theology won over Celtic theology and the British Isles became Roman.

Two missionaries were sent forth from the Celtic area. A man named Willibrord went to the Dutch and another man by the name of Boniface who worked with Willibrord for a while among the Frizians and then went to Saxons in Germany where he had a very difficult time. But he was a very bold and courageous man. They worshipped a number of different nature gods.

What Boniface did was come with an axe to a huge tree that they worshipped and he chopped it down. They all thought he would die immediately, and he didn't. So he chopped up the tree and took all the lumber from the tree and built a church. That was the first church among the Germans. Boniface is considered the apostle to the Germans. He is also important during this time because he came back, and Charles Martell is now the king, and Charles Martell's son, Pepin the Short, is now the king of the Franks. When Charles Martell died Pepin the Short was crowned king of the Franks by Boniface. This was important because due to this the church was assuming more and more power, empirical power over the rulers, of the state, and they began to see this terrible idea of the church ruling over the state.

Through all of these missionaries the church expands and grows, and through this time more controversies developed. The first was the Filioque controversy. In one of the ancient creeds is the statement: "We believe in God the Father, the Holy Spirit and the Son, and the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father." At the Synod of Toledo they wanted to add the phrase that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son. The eastern church had a view of the truth that once you wrote it, it could never be changed again. They almost elevated it to the position of Scripture. The eastern church became so upset by the addition of this clause at the Synod of Toledo that it was one of the major reasons that there was a split between the east and the west [the eastern church is the Eastern Orthodox Church]. That would eventually come about in the tenth century, at which time the Roman pope excommunicated the patriarch in Constantinople who returned the favor and excommunicated the pope in Rome. To this day both churches have excommunicated each other. This was a period of decline within the western church.

Then there was a period of resurgence and the Roman church grew. During this time as the Roman church grows they incorporate the northern European countries and send missionaries up into the north. One of the motives of the Vikings was to send out the gospel. They sent out colonists to Greenland and to Iceland, among whom were Eric the Red and his son Lief Ericsson. When Lief Ericsson came back to Scandinavia he met a German warrior who had a red cloth painted on his tunic. He asked him what the significance of the cloth was and the German soldier witnessed to him and told him the gospel, then led Ericsson to the Lord. Ericsson then returned with troops to Iceland and established a church. He led many people to the Lord there in Iceland and then left to go to North America where they tried to establish a colony, but it never really took root at that time.

During this period of the development of Rome its political power increased. The investiture struggle was whether the king received his power from the church or on his own. Finally the pope gets the

power to invest and he is all ready to invest bishops, and there was an authority difference between the pope and the state. The state finally gets a little more authority during this time but the state is not allowed to get to appoint or give any power to bishops. That was reserved for the pope.

The next point is the division of the church. This is where they lose a lot over issues like when Easter should be observed, the whole issue of papal authority, the Philotes clause as well as celibacy. In the eastern church pastors were to be married but bishops were to be celibate. Because of these differences the east split from the west in 1054, and then the high point is under Innocent III. The first thing that took place during their increase of power was the crusades, which were horrendous. Their desire was to win back militarily the Middle East. Many Europeans were making pilgrimages. They got special forgiveness from God if they went to the Holy Land and visited the place where Christ was crucified and the empty tomb, and there were being taken captive and murdered and robbed along the way by the Muslims. So the pope called for a crusade against the Muslims to take back Jerusalem. That began about 1071. There were really eight crusades, each of them is more tragic than the previous one, and some of them never got anywhere. In one of them they ended up not even making it to the Middle East because they captured Constantinople. By doing so they weakened the defenses of Constantinople and for about 100 years the Muslims were able to defeat and take Constantinople. The worst of the crusades was the children's crusade where they thought that the spiritual influence of children would easily give them the power to run the Muslims out of the Middle East. So like the Pied Piper they went throughout Europe calling for children to come with them on this wonderful crusade and that God's power would go before them like it went before the Egyptians at the parting of the Red Sea. They marched down to the toe of the boot of Italy and the Mediterranean didn't split. So they finally hired some ships to take them across the Mediterranean. They fell in with thieves who took the children, loaded them on the boat and took them to Egypt and sold them all into slavery in North Africa.

Then there was the rise of scholasticism. This was the development of monasteries in Rome. They become the seats of learning. They were the only place where there were books. From the monasteries many went out to teach into the local schools associated with the cathedrals. Those cathedral schools eventually became major centers of learning which then developed into universities. As the Muslims were invading from Turkey the Greeks were leaving and taking with them many ancient manuscripts that had been lost. Europeans had no knowledge of them for centuries. They brought with them ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, of Plato and Aristotle, and there was a resurgence of learning and knowledge in the west.

Two people of note during this time were Anselm, the first person to really set forth a theology of the substitutionary view of the atonement. In Anselm's view God is righteous, sin is man's problem; man needs a substitute to die in his place, and that is why Christ died, to pay a penalty—not to ransom man from Satan but to pay the penalty for man.

The next great figure in this period was Abelard. He is really important for a number of reasons. Because of his teaching methods in the cathedral schools it was really Abelard that is the founding father of the whole university system. He instituted a whole system of dialectic and question and answer in the

classroom. He is also known for the love side in his life. He fell in love with the daughter of a man he was tutoring. She became pregnant. The uncle got mad at Abelard because of that and with some of his men went after him and emasculated him. Abelard then went into a monastery and had no more love interest after that. He is best known because he said that man's need was more a moral impetus; he wasn't a sinner, he just needed a moral push. So Christ died just as a good example. So Abelard introduces the example view of Christ's death.

The other important movements at this time were the rise of monasticism, the rise of the various orders within the Roman Catholic church—the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Augustinians; these are their missionaries, teachers that go out; all beggars. From them an education system was established throughout Europe. All of this brings the Roman church to the pinnacle of its power during the twelfth century. Then things began to decline. It was almost a tragedy as the nations and the kings, especially in France, wanted to keep their power over the pope. They kidnapped the pope and for seventy years the pope had to live in France. The papacy was under the power of the French king. To try to come out of that they tried to appoint another pope who was not influenced by the French. Now there were two popes, and they both had the keys to the kingdom!

This went on for several years and then they said neither of these were popes and they appointed a third one. But the two they wanted to resign so they ended up with three popes. Finally they were able to fire all the popes and they instituted the College of Cardinals which appointed another pope and tried to bring some order into this collapse that had occurred within the church.

Ultimately and theologically what we find here in this time, in summary, is that man is viewed as a sinner but he could help God. He does not have a defect; he is simply sick, not dead. So man works with God, there is cooperating grace. Thomas Aquinas taught that life began at birth, it didn't begin at conception. This is known as creationism. The soul is imputed to the new-born baby at the time of birth. In his writings Aquinas said: "It is [can't hear the word used] to believe that the material introduced the immaterial, that the mortal introduced the immortal. How can the physical produce a soul or a spirit?" In spite of Aquinas's reasoning for that the Roman Catholic church has rejected his views on that particular point. But Aquinas taught that the church imparts grace, you are only saved in the church, and that submission to the pope is necessary for salvation. After you are saved, if you sin, you must perform penance and also buy indulgences for people who have already died.

The picture we have by 1500 is of a church upon which the dark cloud of legalism had descended, Christian people by name who are dominated by superstition and slavery to legalistic concepts. It introduced not only the idea of heaven and hell, which are biblical, but a third concept of purgatory. In their interpretation of Scripture when Jesus Christ died on the cross He secured a treasury of merit that was placed on reserve. That was done by grace; God freely gave that to Jesus Christ. If one was a Roman Catholic and believed that by participating in the seven sacraments, such as baptism, infant baptism, the mass, penance, celibacy, entering into priestly orders, it was done by faith. So when we talk to a Roman Catholic we must understand that they have twisted word meanings. When we say we are saved by grace through faith they will say yes, because they understand that they are saved by

grace; but they earn grace by going to the sacraments. When they participate in the sacraments by faith then God credits to their account some of Christ's merit. When they eventually accumulate enough of Christ's merit then they have salvation. But they never know whether they have enough merit or not to be saved. So if they die and have not accumulated enough merit then rather than going to heaven they go to purgatory. To get out of purgatory, to work their way up to eventually going to heaven, they have to be prayed for by the saints, those good believers who have already gone to heaven, and they have to have masses said for them by their friends, relatives and neighbors on earth.

Another way of getting out of purgatory was for people to purchase indulgences. An indulgence was a means of pursuing a person's release from purgatory. In 1517 a Dominican came to a town called Wittenberg. There he was selling indulgences, a papal fund raising technique, for the pope to get enough money to build St Peter's Basilica in Rome. He had a little phrase he would tell the people: "As soon as the coin in the coffer rings, A soul from purgatory springs." As he went through the streets chanting this little ditty people would come out and take of money they did not have and could barely afford and would buy indulgences to release their loved ones from purgatory. A young priest by the name of Martin Luther became quite angry over that, and as he thought things through he made it an issue for debate.

Who was Luther? Where did he come from? What was his background? Luther was born to German parents; his father was a miner; his parents were very strict Roman Catholics and instilled a discipline into young Martin. They also instilled in him a fear of the Lord. They drilled him with the whole doctrine of the wrath of God and as he grew up he was very much afraid of God. In young Martin's mind God was an awesome majesty and he was terribly afraid of offending. When he was a young man, although he was on track to go to university to be a trained lawyer, one day he was overtaken by a storm and in his fear that he would be struck by lightning he swore to St Ann that she would deliver him from the storm that he would become a monk. In 1507 he became a priest and in 1511 he earned his Ph D. In 1512 he joined the faculty at the University of Wittenberg where he began to teach the New Testament. As happens so often throughout the history of Christianity, when men are forced to get into the text of Scripture, true reformation and revival breaks out; for it is the Word of God that must always be the central focus of the church of God. It is the Word of God that teaches us how to live, teaches us about who God is and His holiness, teaches us about our sinfulness and our need for grace, and that man on his own can do nothing to earn salvation but that God has freely given it to us, that He sent His Son to die on the cross for us and by believing in Him we can have eternal life. During this time as Luther studied more and more he became more impressed with his own sinfulness. As he studied the Gospel of John and he read about how God the Father darkened the skies and forsook the perfect Jesus on the cross Martin could not understand how if the Father forsook Him then how could he ever have a relationship with this awesome, majestic God. And under the burden of his own sinfulness as he came to study Romans and Galatians he came to a saving knowledge of the doctrine of justification by faith.

In the Roman system justification is not a one-time event. In Protestantism we are taught that when we trust Christ as our savior God imputes to us the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ. On the basis of

our present possession of the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ God then is able to declare us just—not because we haven't sinned, not because we are perfect; it is because we possess the righteousness of Jesus Christ. That is called a legal or forensic justification. It is a legal act; it is not experiential in the sense that we feel anything. But in Roman Catholic theology, because you receive the merit of Christ gradually each time you participate in a sacrament, justification does not take place at a point in time but it is a process. So in Roman Catholicism justification and sanctification are synonymous, they go together, they are linear, they take your entire life, and you never know whether you have arrived. As Luther studied Romans and Galatians he came to an understanding that we are justified by faith alone. And we define faith as simply mental assent or belief in something; it is a sense of trust. It is not commitment as in lordship salvation but it is an assent to the truth.

In the year 1517 on October 31st Martin Luther went to the church at Wittenberg and upon the door he nailed a list of 95 points or theses for public debate. They had to do with this whole issue of the sale of indulgences and earning one's way to heaven. As a result of those debates that followed in the coming years it looked like there would be a split from Rome. That was not Luther's original intent. He intended to reform Roman theology back to the doctrines of sin and grace that had been taught by Augustine. By 1528 he was threatened with excommunication. This forced him to escape in the night. Then in 1520 the pope issued a bull and Luther was excommunicated. This created an uproar in northern Germany. This area of Germany was under the dominion of Charles V who was the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, which was not really holy, Roman or empire. Now there was rebellion among his princes because some of those German princes were following Luther and others were not. All of this brought the Roman Catholic church in and there was tremendous turmoil. It was up to Charles V to quiet the rebellion so he brought Luther to the town of Worms. There, after the trial, Martin Luther made his famous statement in conclusion, "My conscience is captive to the Word of God; this is where I stand. So help me God, I can do no other."

In those three years Luther came first of all to an understanding of justification by faith alone and the slogan was *Sola Fide*—"by faith alone." Then he came to the realization that the only authority for the Christian life was not the papacy, not the Roman Catholic church, but the Word of God. So the second slogan was *Sola Scriptura*—"Scripture Alone." This is where Luther stood. Though he was excommunicated and threatened with execution. He was given a short stay of execution to visit with his family. On his way back to Wittenberg his friends kidnapped him and spirited him away to a castle where he was kept in isolation for a year to protect him from the troops of the pope. While he was there he translated the entire New Testament from the Greek into German, and that is still the primary New Testament translation that the German people use today.

After 1520 it was clear that there was a split between the followers of Luther and the Roman Catholic church. The movement was organized between 1521 and 1530. During this time Luther was identified with various other factions that were going on. One of the factors that led to this whole Reformation and created an environment for this was that the original text of the Greek New Testament had been recovered and was being published, and they were becoming spread widely among scholars. Once they got the original text then they could get to the truth in a more clear fashion and more quickly.

Erasmus of Rotterdam was one of the leading humanists at this time and the humanists were also seeking a reformation in the Roman Catholic church, but they didn't want to break away. They also had some rather false theology in terms of putting man as an ultimate authority or reason as an ultimate authority over the Scriptures. So Luther had to separate himself from the humanists, and then there were also various radical groups that had sprung up. There was also a peasant revolt. There was tremendous turmoil in Europe at this time. The peasants used the political turmoil as an excuse to rebel against the legal authorities and they wanted to use Luther as a justification for their revolt. Luther quickly turned his back on them and distanced himself.

By 1530 Philip Melancthon who was a brilliant theologian, a young man who associated with Luther, wrote a doctrinal statement for Luther called the Augsburg Confession. To this day in the conservative or traditionalism churches, not those who have been affected by Protestant liberalism of the 19th century, still affirm the Augsburg confession.

Luther was a very interesting man. He was given to enjoy life. Like most Germans he really enjoyed his beer. In fact, he wrote the great hymn *A Mighty Fortress is Our God* on a napkin in a tavern while he was down there having his afternoon brew. As he grew older, his biographer says, he became an irascible old man: petulant, unrestrained and, at times, positively coarse. What we see in this is that the men that God uses who have been great in church history are not always the kinds of wonderful people that we expect pastors and Christian leaders to be.

Luther's successor in the Lutheran movement, the real theologian of the movement, was Philip Melancthon. He developed and articulated the theology of the movement. In Lutheran theology Christ is at the very center. Martin Luther understood that man was totally depraved and that there was nothing man could do to save himself. Sin was not just a sickness it was a constitutional defect. Man was not spiritually sick, he was spiritually dead. Because man was spiritually dead he could do nothing to save himself or to make himself favorable. Justification, therefore, was by faith alone in Christ alone. The only authority for the Christian was to be the Word of God. Luther's view of the sacraments, though, was what caused him to be different from the other reformers. Luther taught a view of the Eucharist was one that didn't come fully to what is now a Protestant view; he taught what was called consubstantiation. In that he said that the elements do not become the blood and body of Christ but the blood and body of Christ are nevertheless with the elements.

Luther and Lutheranism began the Reformation. Four or five years after Luther broke with Rome the German-Swiss Reformation began. This took place in the north central part of Switzerland near the town of Zurich. In Switzerland the government is based on cantons. A canton is something like a county and there are five or six in Switzerland. Each canton would decide what the religious orientation was for everybody there. Remember this was still a time when the church and the state are identified. When one came baptized as an infant they became a viable member or citizen of the state. Infant baptism was also a sign of loyalty to the civil powers.

In Switzerland Zwingli thought that the best way to attack the problem of the need for reform in the Roman church was to carry the debate before the government and the cantons. He had been a priest and he debated Catholics before the city fathers in 1523 and defeated them in debate. After that the city fathers voted and decided that Zurich would follow Protestant doctrine. But they weren't exactly clear about what all that meant. Remember, these men didn't know where they were going. They couldn't look at what they were doing from our perspective. Too often when we are critical of the theology of Luther or Zwingli or Calvin we ought to compare it to being critical of Henry Ford's Model T compared with a modern vehicle. As time went on the entire canton swung to Zwingli's support. Zwingli believed that Scripture was the only and ultimate authority for the Christian life. The center of Zwingli's theology was the sovereignty of God. Therefore he held to a double predestination; he goes back to Augustine for his theology. He believed that parents who were elect secured the salvation of their infants through infant baptism. So he transfers infant baptism over into Protestantism much as Luther did.

We believe that both in Lutheranism and the Reformed churches that they would have had a fuller break on the baptism issue if it hadn't been confused with the political orientation. They needed the support of the civil authorities to make their break successful and so they couldn't go all the way, they could only go part of the way and they felt it was more important to secure the doctrine of justification by faith than to go all the way. That really wasn't the way they reasoned but they could only go so far. Where they were strong was in the doctrines of salvation. In other areas they were weak but they were beginning to develop. Their view of justification was the same as Luther's. Zwingli's difference with Luther was his view of the Lord's Table. Zwingli went back to the early church view that it was simply a memorial to what Christ had done on the cross.

Unfortunately in the ebb and flow of political power things began to go against Zwingli and they went into a military conflict. Zwingli was a fairly good military leader and he organized his troops and went against the Roman Catholics. They were defeated but in the process Zwingli was killed. His successor was Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575. He was the one who led the merger of Zwingli's followers with Calvin's followers. The theology of Bullinger was very similar to that of Zwingli. He believed in the authority of Scripture alone and he rejected the authority of the Roman church. He believed in the authority and inspiration of the Bible—*Sola Scriptura*. He, too, emphasized the sovereignty of God. That is the key point of what comes to be called Reformed Theology. Like Zwingli he held to double predestination; Luther did not. He began to emphasize, though, the idea of covenants, that God is into a covenant with man. This isn't the biblical idea of covenant as when we talk about the Abrahamic, Mosaic, Noahic, Davidic, and New covenants; this is the theological concept of covenant. This was the German-Swiss reformation.

At the same time that Bullinger is bringing order to the German-Swiss Reformation a young man flees from heresy. He has made friends with a man by the name of Nicolas Cop [sp?] who was heavily influenced by Luther's writings. Cop was very critical of the Roman Catholic church, the abuses of the papacy, the immorality of the papacy, and on All Saints Day (November 1st) he and his young friend John Calvin were forced to flee incognito from Paris. Calvin was a kind of shy retiring kind of

man, a man who much preferred to be in the background, preferred to be a scholar, and who himself claimed that he was by nature antisocial and shy. Again, we see that the leaders of the Reformation were not men with winning personalities who would be voted the most likely to succeed or be most popular. These are men who have come to a knowledge of the truth and teach the truth. The emphasis is always on content, not on presentation.

Calvin escaped from France and ended up in Geneva. While he was in Geneva he ran into a friend by the name of William Farel. Farel had been influenced by Luther and the Protestant Reformation in Strasbourg. He had come down to Geneva to teach these Reformation principles to the people in Geneva. When he met Calvin he said, "Calvin you need to stay here in Geneva and to develop the work here." That was too much for Calvin, he wanted to retreat and not be in the limelight. But Farel said, "If you don't stay here in Geneva, and if you don't take over this work, then God will curse you for the rest of your life." That made Calvin stand up and take note and he decided to stay in Geneva. He organized the church, he was a tremendous administrator. He was a very dour man and he established a very rigid system for the town. He was too much for the leaders in Geneva, he tried to push the Reformation too far. Zwingli had taken it slowly, getting the approval of the leaders and was very successful. Calvin's view of theology seemed a little harsh to the people, he hadn't brought them along slowly enough, and after three years they disenfranchised him and ran him out of town. He retreated to Strasbourg where he spent time studying under the influence of Martin Butzer. Butzer, previously a Roman Catholic priest, had come under the influence of Martin Luther and then had come to Strasbourg to bring the Reformation there.

Calvin now studies under Farel. Then he is persuaded by Farel and Butzer to go back to Geneva and try all over again. While there he attempted, and during his life, was successful in establishing a Christian city. It was a very rigid city with very little freedom of thought for those who were not Christians. Although Calvin himself had a certain level of compassion and is too often painted in very harsh strokes we must remember this was a hard time. Throughout Europe the church and the state are identified together. The Roman Catholics are burning people at the stake and hanging people for heresy just as much as the Protestants are. So when people want to criticize Calvin for some of the decisions that were made in Geneva they fail to understand in the light of what was going on at that time. Calvin was just a product of his own time. His major influence, though, was as an educator and an exegete of the Scriptures. He was a phenomenal organizer. He organized the church and the city government. There he established the Geneva Academy which is where many men came from all over Europe, especially England, and studied and learned. It was the theological seminary of the time. It trained Reformation leaders, sending them out all over Europe, taking Reformation doctrine and bringing about and securing the Reformation in those areas.

Calvin's theology was unique and very logical due to his training as a lawyer. He stressed the sovereignty of God, the total depravity of man, and that Adam's sin was imputed or reckoned to his account. If Adam's sin was reckoned to man's account then everyone was hopeless and no one could save themselves. Man could not, would not and does not want God. He emphasized unconditional election, that God chose who would be saved but there were no conditions. He didn't choose them

because of their works, He didn't choose them because He foresaw faith, he didn't choose them for any reason other than His own will which He has not revealed to us. Calvin also held to double predestination, as Augustine, Zwingli and Bullinger did. He held to irresistible or efficacious grace, that the Holy Spirit brings people into salvation, not against their will, but along with their will. He emphasized the perseverance of the saints—really the perseverance of Christ for the saints—for eternal security. Once a person trusts Christ as savior Christ will persevere in keeping his salvation and it cannot be lost. He held to a Presbyterian form of government.

In his view of the Lord's Table Calvin held to a spiritual presence. His view was different from Luther's view and different from Zwingli's view. But as the French and the German-Swiss elements of the Reformation merged together the memorial view took over. First there was a German-Swiss Reformation under Zwingli. Then there was a French-Swiss Reformation under Calvin. These two merged together and produced what has come to be called The Reformed Faith. So there was Luther developing Lutheranism in Germany and the Reformed Faith in Switzerland and in France. The Reformed Faith, in turn, is responsible for developing the Scottish Reformed Church, the Dutch Reformed Church; they heavily influenced Puritanism in England, out of which comes Congregationalism and Presbyterianism. Also there was the development in other countries other Reformed churches. In France they were called Huguenots. All of these groups go back theologically to the Reformation in Switzerland, to Zwingli and Calvin. As Calvinism spread throughout Europe it became entrenched in these areas.

As the system developed it came into conflict in the early 1600s over the whole issue of election and predestination. In Holland a theologian by the name of Jacob Arminius developed his own system of theology. He had problems with Calvin's view of predestination and election and he and his followers put forth five basic principles: a) Election was based on God's foresight of who would believe and who would not; it was not based on the foreknowledge of God; b) Christ died for everyone—unlimited atonement; c) Man's will was totally neutral. That goes back to the Pelagian heresy in the 5th century that Adam's death didn't affect anybody else's will; d) Grace is totally resistable; e) He was a little ambiguous on perseverance but his followers said that you could lose your salvation.

Over against that system of theology the Calvinists articulated their view that man was totally depraved and could do nothing on his own apart from a work of God's grace to save himself. Election therefore was unconditional and not based on any merit on his own but totally on God's grace. Christ died only for those He intended to save. Irresistible grace, which meant that once the Holy Spirit moved on those whom God intended to save they really could not resist it. God would secure that which He intended and salvation was secure. That is known as five-point Calvinism, easily remembered by the acronym TULIP: Total depravity, Unconditional election, Limited atonement, Irresistible grace, Perseverance of the saints.

Within about 30 years a man teaching in a theological seminary in France came up with another view of Calvinism where he rejected limited atonement and in its place put limited atonement, i.e. that

Christ died for everyone. That is called four-point Calvinism. That was the view that was held by Dallas Theological Seminary.

Another thing that happened in the development of Calvinism was a theologian by the name of Johannes who developed what is called Covenant Theology. Covenant theology is not based on the biblical covenants but on two theological covenants: a covenant of works that God had with Adam from the creation to the fall; then from the fall on it is a covenant of grace. Covenant theology holds to the five points of Calvinism, puts the salvation of man as the central theme of Scripture rather than glorification of God. It is opposed to dispensational theology. Covenant theology still holds to a literal view of interpretation in almost every area of theology but when it comes to prophecy it still holds to an allegorical view of interpretation which leads them to an amillennial view of the second coming of Christ.

The Anabaptists. When Zwingli was teaching his Bible classes in Zurich he had two or three key men under him, one by the name of Conrad Grebel. Grebel came to Christ in 1521 in one of Zwingli's Bible studies and became one of Zwingli's assistants. But the problem that Grebel had with Zwingli was that Zwingli wasn't pushing as fast as Grebel thought Zwingli ought to go. Why was Zwingli going slow? He wanted to have the support of the political powers. Grebel wanted to go fast and said there should be a separation of church and state. Remember Luther, Zwingli and Calvin all had systems that identified with a united church and state. Grebel came along and said it doesn't matter the authorities say, obedience to God is greater; there must be a separation between church and state.

So Grebel and two other men met together and they also came to an understanding that even though they had been baptized as infants they needed to be baptized again once they had trusted Christ as savior. This shows again that infant baptism was not related only to Christianity but also related to the state and to citizenship. What they saw in the teaching of Scripture was that once a person comes to a knowledge of Christ, his symbolic statement that he has trusted Christ and that he is a new creature in Christ is that he then becomes baptized. Because they were baptized again (by sprinkling) they were called Anabaptists [ana = re]. Because of this political orientation in relationship to baptism, baptism being viewed as being an act of good citizenship and loyalty to the civil powers, after they held their baptism services that was viewed not only as theological heresy but also as an act of a traitor. Men were brought to trial. While Grebel died of the plague in 1526 his two friends were arrested. One wanted to be immersed so they drowned him; the other burned at the stake.

Many of the Anabaptist martyrs, because of their view of separation of church and state, were viewed as heretical. It was a concept totally foreign to society at that time. Their missionaries were untrained men. In Lutheranism and Reformed theology they had a strong tradition of trained pastors. Anabaptists didn't live long enough to train at a seminary, they were martyred at early ages so their leaders tended to be untrained. One of the most well-known was a man by the name of Menno Simons, a rather pietistic man who emphasized the holiness of God and personal holiness, and had a tendency toward self-righteousness. He became the leader of a group that eventually migrated into the Dutch area, and his followers were called Mennonites. One particular group in England of

Anabaptists, Puritans who had separated from the Church of England and then come to an Anabaptist view of baptism, fled from England to Holland for safety. While they were in Holland their children were growing up and weren't learning anything about England or English history the people were discouraged because they were living away from their homeland. They finally heard about the "new world." They made contact with businessmen back in England, arranged the finances to purchase two ships, and those groups (some didn't make it) under the leadership of Pastor John Robinson, arrived in Massachusetts. They were called pilgrims. They were not puritans because the Puritans held to a covenant theology and infant baptism. The pilgrims were Anabaptists.

The theology of Anabaptists was basically the same as the reformers in all areas except for three: they believed in believer's baptism, separation of church and state, and most of them held to a pre-millennial return of Christ.

History of Christianity—4

Now we look at the next stage of the Reformation, the English Reformation and its transference across the Atlantic Ocean into colonial America. Unlike the German Reformation under Luther and the German-Swiss reformation under Calvin and Zwingli, the English Reformation is spearheaded by the monarch. The others were spearheaded by men who had studied the Scriptures and wanted to return to the truth. The English Reformation was spearheaded by Henry VIII. The occasion for the Reformation was basically Henry's inability to produce a male heir through his first wife Catherine of Aragon. This troubled Henry greatly because Catherine had a daughter he knew that only once before had England had a queen, and that was many centuries before and she had fomented and caused many rebellions and instabilities within the land. So he did not want to die with the only heir a woman. He wanted to solve the problem and have a male heir but as time went by and as he grew older, close to forty and the biological clock was ticking, Henry was getting more and more worried. Not only that but he began to rationalize the whole situation. He wanted to justify a divorce and he petitioned the pope in Rome for permission to get a divorce. He had to get permission from the pope to marry her, so now he appealed to the new pope in order to have the marriage annulled.

Also he was getting a little excited about one of the maids of Catherine of Aragon, a beautiful young lass by the name of Ann Boleyn. Although kings have never had any trouble satisfying the lusts of the flesh if the lusts of his flesh was satisfied and Ann produced a male heir he would not have solved the problem, he had to marry her. Cardinal Wolsey who was the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the English church, would not go along with Henry's divorce and the pope wouldn't go along with it either. Charles V was the henchman of the pope and the leader of the Holy Roman Empire at that time and his aunt was Catherine of Aragon, the wife of Henry VIII. So the pope will not grant a divorce to Henry VIII.

Well there's more than one way to skin a cat. Henry decides that since there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction in England anyway with Roman Catholicism—they had begun to read Martin Luther's writings in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge—and priests had begun to drift away from it as they were influenced by the Reformation writings on the continent, he took advantage of that and said

they would just split off from Rome. He took advantage of an ancient English law that said they shouldn't have any involvement with a foreign power and he interpreted that to mean the pope to justify his break from Rome, all to get a divorce and to marry a beautiful young lady who had caught his fancy so that he could have a male heir. He carried it out and the English church separated from the Roman Catholic church, but they maintained a Roman Catholic theology. The only difference was that their allegiance was no longer to the pope in Rome, it was now to Henry VIII as the head of the church and to the Archbishop of Canterbury who was the spiritual head of the church.

When Henry died he was succeeded by his son, Edward VI, the son of his third wife Jane Seymour. His second wife, Ann Boleyn, produced one heir, a woman who would be Elizabeth the Great. Under Henry, after the break with Rome came, because Wolsey hadn't gone along with him he fired him and Wolsey left to go back to the continent. Henry replaced Wolsey with a man named Thomas Cranmer. He became Archbishop of Canterbury and played a very important role in the development of the Anglican church. Also Henry finally gave in to allow English translations of the Bible to be printed and spread around England.

The English translation has an important heritage. In the fourteenth century a man by the name of Wycliffe who was a priest and teacher at Oxford and Cambridge began the early break. He was called the morning star of the Reformation although as far as can be determined he didn't understand the doctrine of justification by faith alone, but he did understand the importance of Scripture being the ultimate authority, and the final authority wasn't the church, wasn't the pope in Rome. He insisted that the people should have Scriptures in their native language so that they could read them and he began to translate the Scriptures into English. His followers would then go with the copies of Scriptures and spread them out in the towns and they would go preaching the gospel from town to town—preaching salvation.

Wycliffe was then replaced in this line in the early 1500s by William Tyndale. When Henry made his break with Rome Tyndale had begun translating the Bible, making a better translation of the English Bible, but he was burned at the stake before he was able to publish it. In 1526, the same time that Henry made his break from Rome, before he really had his act completely together and the Reformation in England had gone very far, Tyndale was burned at the stake. His Bible translation was then published by Miles Coverdale. A few years later a man by the name of John Rogers translated the Bible again and used both Tyndale's and Coverdale's works, and that was published as the Matthew Bible. Not long after that Henry finally succumbed to the pressure and allowed a Bible translation to be made that would be read among the people, but at first only the aristocracy could have their own Bible and read it; the common people could not, but it just took a few years before that, too, was rescinded.

When Henry died Edward VI took his place on the throne and he had been raised a Protestant. Ann Boleyn had been a Protestant. When Henry came in Protestant theology finally had its heyday; it came into power. Cranmer wrote the first Book of Common Prayer which outlined the worship services in the English churches. He also wrote the 42 Articles, the document which laid out all the doctrine and practices of the Anglican Church. In 1553, before the Reformation had really become grounded in

England, it was unfortunate that Edward died. He was succeeded by his sister Mary who had been raised in France as a Roman Catholic. When she returned she executed a purge of Protestants in England. One of the victims of her purge was Thomas Cranmer. He was at first severely tortured to recant of his faith and all that he had done. He finally recanted under the pressure of the torture so that he would not be burned at the stake. His inquisitors said that he had waited too long and were going to burn him at the stake anyway. So he recanted of his recantation. They led him out into the field at Smithfield where they burned over 300 martyrs during Mary's reign. As they tied him to the stake he stood on the pile of wood and as the flames mounted he held out his hand, the hand that he had signed the recantation with, and held it into the flames, and said, "This hand is no longer worthy of my body for it denied the Lord." As he stood there he sang hymns to God while his hand burned off and his soul went to be with the Lord. Because of the large number of Protestants Mary martyred she became known as "Bloody Mary." She died in 1558. She was only on the throne for five years and was succeeded by her sister, Elizabeth.

Elizabeth, although raised a Protestant, did not really have any inclination one way or the other regarding theology. She wanted peace in the kingdom more than anything else, so she instituted a merger, a new way of the church. It was institutionalized under the Act of Uniformity in 1559. It was a church that would be Episcopal in its government, Protestant in its theology, and Roman Catholic in its ritual. Many of the doctrinal statements that are made in the Act of Uniformity are written in such a way that both Protestant and Roman Catholic could be happy. The result was a church that brought about religious peace in England at that time. But remember that during this time a number of the people who had fled to the continent because of the persecution under Mary—pastors, theologians and teachers—had been trained in that wonderful seminary in Geneva under John Calvin and Theodore Beza. That school in Geneva functioned as a training ground for the grassroots Reformation throughout Europe. When those men returned to England under Elizabeth they were dissatisfied because the Reformation did not go far enough. They wanted to purify the church of all Roman ritual. That is the definition of a Puritan. A Puritan was not somebody who was dour, who didn't want to have fun, who hated liquor, hated cards, hated any kind of happiness or joy. That is not why they were called Puritans. They weren't out there trying to purify everybody of sin. They were Puritans because they wanted to purify the English church of Roman ritual and purify their theology.

This brought the Puritans into conflict with the king. For the next fifty years there were a number of conflicts in Parliament. As the Puritans grew and their pastors went out throughout England to preach in the churches and won the people's hearts to the Lord the Puritans set about having a political goal. The theology of the Puritans is the same as Calvin's theology. Toward the end of this century they began to apply that all the way across the board where they become pre-Millennial. In the middle of the century they were mostly amillennial but they began to work out ... Once they came to a literal interpretation of the truth that led to a recovery of justification by faith alone. Once you recover justification by faith alone you begin to recover the doctrines of the Christian life. By combining literal interpretation and working it out into other areas of doctrine you begin to recover the truth. In the early part of the century they were fighting and killing each other and being martyred over justification by faith alone, and over transubstantiation and other doctrines related to salvation. So people weren't concerned about prophecy, about other aspects of theology. The main fight was over soteriology. But by the end of the

century where there was a certain amount of peace and the fact that the Protestants had become accepted and their worship legalized, especially in England, they began to work out the implications of a literal interpretation of Scripture in other areas of theology and they recovered pre-Millennialism.

By the turn of the century, the early 1600s, Elizabeth died and she was succeeded by James. She did not have a successor related to her so they went to get her cousin in Scotland, James VI of Scotland. He became James I of England. Because of the pressure from the Puritans he finally succumbed to allow a new version of the Bible to be translated. However, the Puritans never liked the King James Version. The Bible that they brought with them was called the Geneva translation which had been the most popular translation in England up to the KJV. It really took about 100 years before the KJV became popular.

The Puritans were basically separated into three groups: first the Congregationalists, then the Presbyterians—these differed in their view of church government, and then the third group called the Separatist Puritans. The Congregationalists and the Presbyterians stayed within the Anglican Church; the Separatists left the Anglican church because the Reformation did not go far enough for them, they wanted a more biblical role. Through this entire time conflict after conflict erupted between the crown and the Puritans until ultimately under Charles I open rebellion breaks out. Oliver Cromwell was not only a good theologian but he was also a brilliant military man. He started off simply as the leader of a militia group from his area of England but after the first battle in which the Puritans were defeated he came back and took his particular group, disciplined and trained them over and over again in a very rigorous way, so that the next time they went into battle it was his unit that held ground and allowed victory to be brought to the Puritans. As a result of that Cromwell was elevated to the command of the Puritan forces, ultimately defeating Charles I and the roundheads in battle. As a result of that Charles I was executed. That set up the period known as the Protectorate in which basically there was exchanged the rule of the king for the rule of a dictator— Oliver Cromwell. After a while the people became very dissatisfied with that and they revolted against the Puritans after Cromwell died and they returned James II from the continent, the son of Charles, to take over and restore the crown.

The important development during this time, the entire civil war period, was that the Puritans called the Westminster Assembly, probably the greatest collection of theologians and scholars that the world has ever seen. They passed out a doctrinal statement that became the foundational doctrinal statement for all Congregational and Presbyterian churches. They held to a literal interpretation of Scripture in every area except for prophecy where they continued to maintain and allegorical interpretation and hermeneutic. They held to an amillennial return of Christ, although that changed by the end of the century. They insisted upon preaching. They knew that the focus of Scripture was to get it out to the people so they emphasized training pastors so that they would go out and teach the Scriptures to the people in their language. They insisted on a trained clergy and they had an emphasis on a very simple form of worship. The focus was simply on singing hymns and praising God and then learning God's Word. God's Word was always given the prominence in their worship. They would read from it and then teach from it. That was the reason the saints were to gather. They didn't gather for fellowship; they didn't gather for social intercourse; they didn't gather to have a good time or to go through rituals. They gathered for one reason: to learn God's Word. They held to a covenant theology.

The English Puritans were amillennial. Later they began to lean towards a post-millennialism and a pre-millennialism in the late 17th century. Jesus Christ, the Scripture says, will reign for a thousand years. The pre-millennialist says that Jesus will return to the earth to set up that kingdom. The amillennialist says that there is no literal 1000-year kingdom; it is spiritual, we are in it today and Christ is reigning in heaven. The post-millennialist says that the church brings in the Millennium and when that has come to fruition Jesus will return after the Millennium. Unfortunately today, as in the time of the Puritans, when Christians are post-millennial they think that the role of the church is to reform the political system in order to have a perfect environment so that Christ can come back. When the Puritans tried this they failed under Cromwell. Prior to this in America the Puritans had fled persecution because they were dissatisfied with James I and Charles I. Thirty-thousand Puritans fled to Massachusetts where they were going to set up a perfect kingdom. They were going to have a Christian nation. By the end of the century it failed. Whenever there is one segment of Christians trying to set up a Christian nation the result is that anyone who disagrees with them theologically becomes a heretic and a criminal. It is only when you have a consensus of Christians that allow for a complete diversity of religious expression that we have true religious freedom. The role of the church is evangelism and teaching the Word of God. The Puritans lost that. They were evangelical in their doctrine but they had a political agenda.

What were the Roman Catholics doing during this time? At first, while they took it seriously, they didn't think it would have the impact that it had. But within twenty to thirty years, by 1530, they began to wake up. They realized that they were losing massive amounts of territory and with that territory they were losing a tremendous amount of money. Money always gets people's attention. They began to try to recover that land. One of the means through which they did that was the development of a group called the Jesuits. They became the pope's storm troopers. Through the Jesuits and the military might of the French kings and the Holy Roman Empire they began to recover land. They went into a major military conflict called the thirty years war which finally ended in 1648. Also at the same time, from 1643-53, the Roman Catholic church sat down and dogmatized every area of its belief in reaction to what the Protestants had taught. That took place at the Council of Trent. That did not have a major revision until Vatican II which took place under Pope John XXIII around 1962, 63.

When the thirty years war ended it pretty much finalized the line of division between Protestant Europe and Roman Catholic Europe. For people who don't think that theology makes a difference, take a look at a map sometime. Visualize in your mind which countries are Roman Catholic and which countries are Protestant. Where did freedom break out? In Protestant countries. Freedom did not break out under the slavery of legalism in France, in Spain, in Italy. Freedom broke out in northern Germany, in England, and it transferred to the North American continent. Mexico, Central America and South America were left untouched by true freedom. It will not work in a framework of legalistic theology. As Paul states in Galatians it is only when we understand grace that we can have true freedom. So it is only in the context of Protestant theology that men have the ability and the framework of thinking, the ideas that can lead and develop and produce a truly free society.

Christianity in colonial America

How in the world, people ask, did we get so many groups and denominations? There are hundreds of denominations in America and all kinds of different beliefs. You can get whatever flavor you want to make you happy, but the goal really is not for us to be happy and comfortable, the goal is for us to get the truth and to find the truth. We can't say that everything is true because the Bible says there's only one way to heaven. Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man comes to the Father except by me." So Christianity is radically different from everything else. And because Christianity is radically different from everything else every other religious group is always out to destroy the true biblical expression of Christianity. When our founding fathers came over to this country from Europe they understood that. Their desire was to establish a society where there could be a free expression of Christianity that would not be suppressed by governmental power, or by another religious power. Too often when we talk about the separation of the church and the state we think it is to protect the church from the state. A lot of times in the history of its development it was to protect one expression of Christianity from other Christians, not necessarily to protect them from the state, although in a lot of situations the church and state have been united together. Now we find ourselves with all of these denominations. Where did they come from?

In 1517 was the first denomination, which was Lutheran. Lutheran churches were identified with the state, so that there were Swedish Lutheran churches, German Lutheran churches, Dutch Lutheran churches, and there were even Polish or Hungarian Lutheran churches. When those people came over to America they brought their church with them. So where there might be three or four national Lutheran churches in Europe when those people came over to the US they didn't merge as one Lutheran church, they maintained their distinction. So there were three or four different Lutheran churches in the colonies at that time. Then in 1520 there were the Reformed churches—Dutch Reformed, German Reformed, French Reformed. The Scots developed the Presbyterian church and the Congregational churches. When all of those groups came over to the colonies they came and maintained their diversity. Later the Anglican church came over and there were English Baptist who split from the Anglican church, so there were English Baptists and Anglicans. When the English came over they first settled at Jamestown. They were Anglicans, so the colony established was primarily an Anglican colony. But there were also Anabaptist groups. By 1700 in the colonies there were already twenty to thirty different denominational groups. By the end of the 1700s there were new American denominations that were developing such as the Episcopal church which split from the church of England.

The origin of the American denominations

Who were the Pilgrims? They were English Separatists, the Puritans who didn't feel that the reformation had gone far enough in the Anglican church so they separated themselves from the Anglican church. Theologically they were the same as the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians but in terms of their ability to conform to the Anglican church they wouldn't do it, so they left. One group under John Robinson became very discouraged and dissatisfied and when the opportunity came for them to come

to America they left on the Mayflower. Their goal was Virginia but they were blown off course and they landed at Plymouth on Plymouth Rock, and there in the middle of winter in the harsh cold they established their colony. More than half died of starvation and disease during that first winter. If it hadn't been for some friendly Indians who came and taught them how to plant and gave them some seed and helped them through that first winter they would not have survived.

The second group who came over were the Puritans. As a result of the problems with James I and Charles I many Puritans began to leave for Massachusetts 1630. They were going to establish the new Israel. Their whole goal was theological. They were fed up with Europe which had been grounded in all of that Roman theology and all the problems of false doctrine and the Anglican church and the Roman church and so the Puritans were now going to come over to the new world and start over, and show Europe how it should have been done all along. Once these groups came over the Presbyterian, Congregationalists and Separatists Puritans merged together for a while and they all became Congregationalists. The major leaders were men like John Cotton, Richard Hooker, etc. With the exception of John Cotton all the American Puritan leaders were pre-millennial in their theology.

They all believed that Jesus would come back before the Millennium. Hooker and John Davenport split away from Massachusetts because they rule was too authoritarian and they established a democracy in Connecticut. Roger Williams came to Baptist convictions about relationship of the church to the state. Only for a short time did he have Baptist convictions about Baptism, the main sticking point was the separation of church and state. He went down and founded Rhode Island.

Anglicanism was firmly planted in the southern colonies. Virginia and the Carolinas originally had charters from the king and were Anglican in their orientation. But before long the Scots-Irish began to migrate and they settled all up and down the coast, but primarily the Carolinas and Virginia. While these were primarily Anglican during the late 1600s and most of the 1700s they were peopled by a mass migration of Scots-Irish Presbyterians who came in there.

Though all churches became Congregational in America the Presbyterians soon began to separate out and merge with Dutch Reformed groups, German Reformed Groups and French Huguenot groups. Later with the tremendous influx of Scots-Irish Presbyterians the first presbytery was organized by Francis McKenny in 1706. So that introduced the Presbyterian church to the US. The Roman Catholics came over. The Talbots were given a charter for Maryland and that was the refuge for Roman Catholics. Before long though it became a haven for many other groups. By this time there were a number of different religious persuasions and denominations developing in Europe. Quakers, Moravians, Mennonites and Dunkers. When people came over to America and had freedom of expression then what happened when two people disagreed was they just started a new denomination. That is what led to the multiplication of denominations.

By the end of the 1700s Puritanism began to decline in Massachusetts. During the entire century the Puritans had tried to enforce Christianity. It worked well with the first generations that were regenerate. But what about the children that weren't. When membership of the church and citizenship

became the same then all of a sudden the next generation which didn't know the Lord necessarily and didn't understand truth, what part did they play in society? That created a number of problems, they had to make certain compromises, and before long the whole society began to break down. The final death knell of the Puritan dream came during the Salem witch trials. The Salem witch trials began the daughters of a pastor in Salem Massachusetts were bored during the winters. The family had a slave who had come from Jamaica. While down there she had been involved in some voodoo and the children began to encourage her to tell them about what went on at home. As they heard these stories the children began to mimic them. There probably some demonism that went on but the basic issue with the girls was that they just used this as a time of fun. They began to accuse anybody and everybody that they had some kind of grudge against of witchcraft. By the time the hysteria ended nineteen men and women had been hung for witchcraft or burned at the stake. As a result of that the Puritans lost their intellectual respectability.

After the decline of Puritanism in the early 1700s the nation went through a dry spell spiritually. There wasn't much interest in spiritual things. Orthodoxy had been cold and dead so that as long as you affirmed the doctrinal statement everything was okay. Nobody was preaching the need for regeneration, or very few were. Then in the late 1730s and 1740s it seemed that the Spirit of God began to move again in the nation and there was what was called the first great awakening. This was the first major revival in America. It was sparked in the colonies by the preaching of a tremendous theologian and pastor in Northampton, Massachusetts by the name of Jonathan Edwards. He was a rather dour-looking man, rather thin, a brilliant man who has been called perhaps the greatest American theologian and philosopher. By the time he was twelve years old he had completed the normal training of any New England child. He had been studying Greek and Hebrew since he was four or five years old. When he graduated from high school aged thirteen he knew Latin and Hebrew and then went on to college and seminary. When he preached his sermons he wrote them out in longhand and then stood in the pulpit and read them to his people. To us we would be bored to death. But what happened one day when he was visiting another church in another part of Massachusetts he preached a sermon, "Sinners in the hands of an angry God." He said every sinner deserves hell, and he pictured it as dramatically as the lake of fire, as God dangling a spider over the flames of hell. He said God is totally just in sending every sinner into the flames of hell, but in God's love He will redeem some. And as he read this sermon people became very concerned about their salvation status. People fell on their faces on the floor weeping because they recognized their need for the savior; they realized their lost state. A tremendous revival began to sweep through the nation. Pastors and preachers in all the different denominations began to see results like this.

As a result of these people coming to know the Lord they needed pastors. So William Tennant started a little training center in his home to train pastors. Eventually it became known as the College of New Jersey and then in the latter part of the 19th century it changed its name to Princeton. Also during this time Dartmouth was founded. It was founded to take the gospel to the Indians. Yale was founded. Other schools were all founded to train the clergy. All these schools that we now think of as hotbeds of liberalism were originally founded on the basis of a sound evangelical theology to train pastors and

missionaries to take the gospel to people and to teach them the Scriptures from the original languages. This was the time known as the great awakening.

Of course, that started a division because as soon as somebody stood in the pulpit and preached the gospel, and people got emotional when they realized how sinful they were and their need for Christ, the old dour anti-emotional crowd that didn't know Christ, that didn't believe in regeneration, and did not believe in the need for a personal faith in Jesus Christ, immediately began to criticize the new movement. Among the Congregationalists there was a split between the new lights, those who favored the revival, and the old lights, those who were too afraid that it might lead into excess and saw no need at all for evangelism.

In England the same thing happened. There it took place with two brothers, John and Charles Wesley. They were brought up in a home where their father was a pastor. There were about 19 children born to John and Susannah Wesley. Susannah Wesley was a woman who drilled her children in the stories of the Scriptures, but she also told them stories about missionaries because she wanted them to grow up thinking that their responsibility was not just to take the gospel to their neighbors and their friends but to take the gospel to the whole world. She wanted them to think of the world as their parish.

At that time because the doctrines of regeneration were not being taught in the Anglican Church John and Charles Wesley grew up never really understanding the gospel. But they had a hunger in their hearts to know God. They went to Oxford where they met other men who had the same desire to know God and to be sound, solid biblical Christians. They ran into a man named George Whitfield who was one of the first in this group, called The Holy Club, to come to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

Whitfield, rather than preaching in the pulpits of the Anglican churches which had been taken over by a cold, dead orthodoxy would go out into the streets where he would preach the gospel to the masses. It was the beginning of open air evangelism. He was a stocky barrel-chested man. When Benjamin Franklin heard him speak he said that he stood at the edge of a crowd that he estimated to be about twenty thousand and he could hear Whitfield clearly. He was probably the greatest evangelist the English-speaking people have ever known. When he came to America he and Edwards both preached throughout the New England and middle colony areas and were responsible for hundreds and thousands of people coming to know the Lord.

Back in England John and Charles Wesley continued to try to find the truth. Wesley very disturbed and had a very strong religious inclination. He desired to be a missionary and still did not know Christ. He decided to be a missionary and come to the colonies. On his way over he met some Moravians who emphasized the personal walk with the Lord, the personal need to know Jesus Christ. They explained the gospel to Wesley but he still didn't understand it. He came over to Georgia and worked for a while but ran into a few conflicts. A young lady he was very interested in married someone else. He continued to pursue her a little bit, there was nothing immoral there but he just couldn't break away from her. Her husband filed charges against him and he had to flee the colonies in disgrace and return to England. One day in England he went to a Bible class where they were going to begin reading Martin Luther's

commentary on Romans. As they read Luther's preface to the book of Romans Wesley writes that he felt his heart was strangely warm, and he came to understand that Jesus Christ had died for him.

That lit a fire in John Wesley and he began to preach all over England. He would get on his horse, pack his Greek New Testament in his saddlebags and off he would go from one town to the next. He and Whitfield were partners in this whole enterprise but they disagreed theologically over the issues related to election and predestination. Whitfield did not want this to be a divisive issue. He was a very strong Calvinist. There are many people who think that five-point Calvinists can't be missionaries or evangelists; yet Whitfield believed that Jesus died only for the elect, but no one knew who they were so he had to go out and explain the gospel to the entire world so that the elect would believe. Wesley was semi-Arminian. He believed that you could reach perfection in this life; he had some very unusual beliefs.

When Whitfield came to America on his second tour he pleaded with Wesley not to make an issue out of election and predestination because it would split the movement that they were beginning. But Wesley was too hard-headed, like many pastors are, and that was all he talked about the whole time Whitfield was gone and when Whitfield came home the movement was split. That is where we see the true character of Whitfield. Rather than making an issue out of their different leanings he faded into the background to preserve the unity of the movement. That movement in the next generation separated itself out from Anglicanism and became known as Methodism.

At the same time that there was a tremendous movement of the Spirit throughout America there was also a tremendous movement in the world that would affect the colonies and us today that would take it away from the Scriptures. That was a movement called the Enlightenment. In essence the Enlightenment was a shift to human reason. It, too, was a rebellion against the authoritarianism of the pope. Those who followed Scripture rebelled against the authority of the pope and moved to the authority of Scripture. Those who rejected Scripture moved to the authority of human reason. Reason became the ultimate authority. The founder of the philosophical system of rationalism was Rene Descart. He was, in many ways, one of the first modern thinkers. He said, "I think, therefore I am." His thinking was the starting point of his system. After a few years of the influence of Descart another system of philosophy developed called empiricism. John Locke was one of the most foremost empiricists, although he was also a believer but he was heavily influenced by the system of empiricism. Both systems produced a number of writers who developed political theory that had a tremendous impact in the US. The Enlightenment in its most radical form found its expression in the French Revolution; in its moderate form it merged with a lot of Christian principles and it had tremendous impact on the thinking in the US.

The impact of the modern Enlightenment in Scotland

In Scotland it produced a school of thinking called the Scottish Common Sense School of Philosophy. That impacted a man by the name of John Witherspoon who was a pastor in Scotland. He came over to the US and was invited to succeed Jonathan Edwards as the president of Yale. Then he was at Princeton.

At Princeton he taught men like James Maddison and many others who were writers and signers of the Constitution of the US. Witherspoon had a greater affect (although he signed only the Declaration, not the Constitution) than any other thinker upon the writers of the Constitution. But the influence of the Scottish Common Sense view of philosophy and its merger with Christianity set up a unique theological system that dominated Princeton University for the next 120 years.

History of Christianity—5

As sincere as a lot of Christians are today their desire to preserve a Christian heritage in this country is almost misguided. What they are trying to do is impose almost a Christian way of life upon the nation. Also at the same time we see through the New Age movement and influence in Christianity a rise of mysticism, as well as a moral reaction among a lot of Christians to immorality that is going on outside the church. Any time in church history when there is a moral reaction to the immorality in the surrounding culture there is a tendency to go into legalism. So we have the same sort of dynamics taking place today with the rise of legalism, mysticism and the desire to have a so-called Christian nation. As we will see, there is really no such thing as a Christian nation because nations don't go to heaven. All we have is a nation that is influenced by the systems within that nation.

The Enlightenment was a time in western civilization when there was a rediscovery of human reason. It was fundamentally a look to reason as the ultimate authority in man's life and affairs. There are four areas of authority that people look to in their life: a) For knowledge they look to authority. This can be some kind of a traditional church authority or it can be through the authority of Scripture; b) through reason, their own thinking, their own ability. That provides the starting point for all knowledge. When reason takes over then reason becomes the criteria for judging any claims to truth. In the Enlightenment when reason became the criterion what happened was that miracles, the supernatural, the acts of God is Scripture, were thrown out because they didn't seem reasonable or rational to the human mind; c) Empiricism or experience. While these are a tremendous base for scientific study they don't arrive at absolute truth; d) Mysticism. This is built on intuition. How do you know it is true? Because I just have this gut level feeling that it is true. Often mysticism is irrational or even anti-rational. It will criticize any use of reason or logic in understanding Scripture. This is what we find going on today, especially in charismatic and Pentecostal circles—the sense that I am going to pray about it and let God speak to me directly from His Word, and somehow I am going to know what He says without going through the process of grammatical analysis, exegesis, historical study, etc. that allow us to use the reason that God gave us to understand the Scripture. Reason, then, is used under the authority of Scripture, not to judge Scripture. Experience is then used to help understand Scripture but not as the authority for judging Scripture. Mysticism is always the reaction to rationalism in history—always an overreaction. Reason and empiricism ultimately lead to skepticism. When people are left with no hope then they try to find hope apart from reason. That is what mysticism is. It becomes anti-reason, anti-rational, anti-logic. The end is the same as rationalism or empiricism and it never leads to truth; and when it becomes an authority within the church it always leads to destruction of Christianity—true, biblical Christianity.

In the 19th century the major movement attacking from within the church was religious liberalism. The modern liberal wants to take away from Scripture. He wants to use human reason as the ultimate authority to take away from the authority of Scripture. In the early church the Montanists claimed to be the mouthpiece of the Holy Spirit. They were the early mystics. In the Montanist movement there was a false emphasis on the Holy Spirit and on the continuation of revelation, and on experience of God. The result was that they thought revelation continued and they sought to add to Scripture. These are the basic trends and dynamics that go on throughout history. The rationalists seek to take away from Scripture, based on human reason, and the mystics and the experience-oriented people want to add to Scripture based on their experience, on the thought that they have some sort of special communication from God.

What was the background to religious liberalism? In the late eighteenth century a man by the name of Immanuel Kant, one of the most influential philosophers in all of history came on the scene and wrote a book called *The Critique of Pure Reason*. In this book he was trying to solve the problem of how we come to know truth. Was it through the use of reason? Was it through the use of experience? Was it through the use of some kind of external authority or mysticism. In his conclusion he said that all knowledge can be divided into two realms. One realm he called the numinal realm. In the nominal real there is universal knowledge about God, knowledge about eternity, knowledge about spiritual things. In the lower level was the realm of phenomena. According to Kant you could only know the lower level. Imagine a two-storey house with an upper and a lower level. How do you get from upstairs to downstairs? In Kant's system there is no staircase. You don't know what is going on upstairs. There is no way man can know universals, know anything about God or eternity or the spiritual because you can't experience them sensually. All we can do is guess that it is up there. So with Kant there was a shift in knowledge. Upstairs was the realm of universals and divine revelation would provide objectivity. You could have objective knowledge that was true regardless of anyone's experience. Downstairs was subjective truth, truth as you experienced it, truth as you see it, truth as it plays out in your particular life and experience.

After Kant true objective knowledge is no longer thought to be possible among intellectuals and philosophers. This is why it was called the Copernican revolution of thought. Copernicus said that the solar system did not rotate around the earth but that everything revolved around the sun. So there was a shift in the central focal point of the solar system. With Kant the central focal point of truth shifted. It was no longer out there in the realm of objectivity; now the only way I know truth is by what I experience to be truth. This had tremendous ramifications. Theologically it meant that man could only know God by doing his duty. He can't know God directly; he can't know anything objective about eternity; he can't know absolute truth about spirituality or universal truth. All he is left with is the concept of moral duty, and that became the essence of religious meaning.

Influenced somewhat by Immanuel Kant as well as by his own background of pietistic Christianity is another German theologian by the name of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834). He is considered the father of modern religious liberalism. What he did was merge Calvinistic ideas of sin and the will and shifted them. Truth now was known and validated through experience and feeling. If you want to

summarize Schleiermacher's theology with the word "feeling" that is how you come to know God. This was played out through the years as a firm based for the theology of love as opposed to objective theology of Christianity grounded in the justification work of Jesus Christ.

A little later on came Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855). He was the father of Christian existentialism. When Kant's philosophy is played out in life and you can't have objective truth you can't live, because you have to live as if there is objective truth. "Upstairs" is what gives meaning and definition and value to what is "downstairs." If you don't have universal concepts, if you don't have God, if you don't have objective truth about spirituality and about eternity then you have no meaning to the everyday affairs of life. All you are left with is a myriad of details with no unifying factor. There is no meaning and value left in life. Kierkegaard said this leads to skepticism, and if you push it far enough it leads to despair because there is no hope. Hope is based only on experience and feelings. Kierkegaard that the role of faith is that we just have to believe that these things exist. If there is no objective reality there we can't believe the tomb is empty because there is no objective reality there, that doesn't make sense. Human reason cannot validate the miracles claimed in the Scriptures. Human reason cannot validate the resurrection because we've never seen it. Therefore that must have been myth. That is the conclusion they come to. They must have thought that up just to somehow substantiate the claims they wanted to make about Jesus. So we have to have meaning and value and definition in our life; we have to live as if there is some God, some ultimate value, some ultimate truth. So we just have to have a leap of faith. We just believe it is true regardless of all the reason or any other evidence; we have to live as if it is true.

What then is the result of the influence of their thinking?

1. First of all there was a rejection of objective truth. The intellectual elite of the day who are controlling the seminary classes and colleges and university classes in Europe rejected the notion that there is objective truth. The Bible begins to be just another human book that tells the story about how people learned about God. It doesn't tell objective truth about God's revelation to man but of men and women's experience in learning about God. See the shift? It no longer talks about objective truth, now it just talks about experiences. Therefore truth begins to be relative.
2. Secondly, Christianity is redefined in terms of morality and social action. This is important. We see the same trend taking place in evangelicalism today. It is imperative that our sermons and Bible classes end up teaching people how to live the Christian life. Application is vital and necessary. But one of the trends today is to go so far with the application emphasis but the exegesis and sound theology are no longer discussed in detail in Bible classes and sermons. When all you have is application with the doctrine and the theology and exegesis behind it then all you are teaching in morality. Christianity begins to be reduced to nothing more than moral principles. Spirituality is more than morality. Anything that an unbeliever can do is not spirituality. Unbelievers can be extremely moral and upright people, but that is not spirituality. The impact is to lead the church into social action, crusades and a post-millennial theology which views the church as God's mechanism for bringing in the Millennium.

3. In liberal theology God became the father of all men—the universal fatherhood of God. What do the Scriptures teach? Jesus said to the Pharisees, “You are of your father the devil.” John 1:12 says, “But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, {even} to those who believe in His name.” He becomes our Father only when we put our faith and trust in Jesus Christ as our savior.
4. They held to universal salvation. These all flow together. If God is the Father of all men we then have universal salvation. The atonement is not understood as a substitutionary atonement where Christ died instead of us, but as an example to show how much God loves us. So love—feelings, then take the central focus in liberal theology.
5. Jesus is no longer undiminished deity and perfect humanity who died on the cross in our place, but He is simply a good man who showed the way through His example.
6. The optimism of liberalism was dealt a death blow by World War I because they thought they were on the verge of bringing in the kingdom and when they saw all of the destruction and devastation of modern warfare they knew it wasn't so. So 19th century liberalism lost its strength but it continued to be felt.

What went on in American church history?

There are three periods in church history: the colonial era, the time up to 1787; the national era from 1787 to the end of the civil war in 1865; the modern era. The colonial era was governed primarily by a Calvinistic view of life. Even if a person was not a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ Calvinism was so dominant that it shaped the way he looked at life. After the revolutionary war they began to shift from a God-centered look at life and the world to a man-centered look at life and the world. It shifted to an Arminianism. Theology became man-centered. This lasted up until the civil war when it shifted from an Arminianism which was a man-centered Christianity to liberalism which was a secular view where God was no longer a vital part of the picture.

The national era: What took place in the years 1789 to the civil war with regard to the church? There were some negative trends that developed. There was the rise of Unitarianism. When the Pilgrims came over in 1620 and the Puritans came in 1630, they merged together to form a congregational church. As Congregationalism continued in the 1700s there was a split-off of Presbyterianism. In the Congregation denomination there was a split in the first great awakening between the new lights who favored the revival because they saw the biblical emphasizes on the necessity of regeneration while the old lights did not see the necessity of evangelism and regeneration and they continued on their course. By the late 1700s Unitarianism developed from old life Congregationalists. The intellectuals became enamored with the rationalism of the Enlightenment and they merged that with what was known as the New England theology. The New England theology developed as the fire of the revival of the great awakening died out. The theology slipped into error. They began to deny the total depravity of man, the necessity of substitutionary atonement; they shifted to a moral view of the atonement and shifted away

from the need for personal faith in Jesus Christ. They merged that thinking with Enlightenment rationalism and Unitarianism developed. Unitarians believe that there is only one God, Jesus was a man, the references in the Scripture to the Holy Spirit were just of a spirit of God. They do not believe that man is necessarily a sinner, Jesus is simply a good man, the atonement was an example for man, and the Bible is simply a moral guide book, not divine revelation to man.

Unitarianism took its official stand at Harvard in 1805 when a Unitarian named Henry Ware was appointed to the chair of divinity. It was an endowed chair; it was always to be given to a Calvinist. Unitarianism then combined a little later on in history with the transcendentalism of Emerson and with the moralistic, legalistic theological of the evangelicals to produce the crusader mentality of the abolitionism which led up to the civil war.

The next thing that happened at this time in history was what is called the second great awakening. The Congregationalist split was between new lights and old lights; the Presbyterian split was between old sides and old new sides. They merged back by the beginning of the 19th century and then they would split again into old school and new school. By the turn of the century Enlightenment thinking was dominating American universities. From 1790 up to 1800 evangelical Christians in the US thought that the country would never recover.

There was skepticism on the college and university campuses, a denial of the supernatural, a rejection of the inspiration of Scripture, sermons that had been plentiful only a decade before were no longer taking place on the campuses; there was a lot of drunkenness on the campuses. But then a true revival began called the second great awakening. Timothy Dwight who was the president of Yale began to preach a series of messages against Deism. (Deism was the view that God simply created the universe and wound it up much like a clockmaker would wind up a new clock, and then He left it, and God is no longer involved in the affairs of man. It leaves out the imminence, the presence of God in everyday affairs and only emphasizes the transcendence of God) Students began to recognize that they were sinners and needed Christ as their savior. His chapel messages were extremely popular and there was standing room only.

At the same time other pastors around the country were preaching and the Holy Spirit began to move in people's lives in ways that had not occurred for thirty or forty years before and tens of thousands, perhaps more, were coming to know the Lord all up and down the eastern coast. In the west some of these men who were saved in these revivals decided they had the gift of evangelism and they hopped over to the mountains. They began to have tent meetings in the rural areas of Kentucky, Tennessee and Ohio. This was a time of national expansion. They were spread out. They would work hard but they would have opportunities to come together—sometimes as many as 25,000 people. Those kinds of revival were full of emotional excess.

Back in the east it was marked by a solid theology. The Presbyterians split into an old school and a new school. The old school maintained their distinction on the inerrancy of Scripture, the affirmation of original sin, of substitutionary atonement, and they believed in evangelism. New schoolers were

influenced by the England theology which denied original sin and held to an exemplary view of the atonement. Old schoolers held to orthodoxy and they controlled the theological faculty of the seminary at Princeton. It was that faculty under Charles Hodge, his son A. A. Hodge and his son Casper Hodge, along with Benjamin Warfield towards the end of the century that defined and maintained historical orthodoxy. Old school Presbyterianism was the bastion of historical orthodoxy in the US during this time.

Also at this time was the rise of one of the first truly American revivalists. His name was Charles Finney. He came from an area known as the burned-over district because it had had so many revivals. This period also produced Joseph Smith who founded Mormonism. Finney was not one of the greatest evangelists of our time because he did not believe in the gospel of Jesus Christ. He held to an Arminian view of man: that man cooperates with God in salvation; he held to a moral view of the atonement, he denied original sin and total depravity, he denied biblical regeneration, he taught perfectionism and that faith was a work. We cannot believe a man who believes those things, if that was what he believed for salvation, that he was saved. Yet he had a tremendous impact throughout the north during his time. Finney's theology was typical of the abolitionist theology before the civil war. In fact, the seminary he founded was the hotbed of abolitionism. It was not the evangelical theology of Charles Hodge who hated the abolitionists. It was not the orthodox theology of the old school Presbyterians that produced a movement in the US to do away with slavery. While Charles Hodge and men of that stripe did not approve of slavery they were not the extremists of the abolitionists. The abolitionists thought that if they could not get this problem solved through peaceful means then anything was okay to solve the problem. The end justified the means. The abolitionists used a lot of violence and stirred up the emotions of people, and that produced the civil war in this country. In England, on the other side of the Atlantic where true evangelicals spearheaded the movement to do away with slavery there was no violence. It was a very peaceful transition.

Finney was one of the most influential men in this whole period.

Finally, it was during this time that there was the rise of various cults—Mormonism, Seventh Day Adventism, Jehovah's Witnesses and Christian Science.

In summary, for the second great awakening was the development of certain other denominations such as the Cumberland Presbyterians, the Disciples of Christ who then merged with other groups and became the Church of Christ, which again split in 1906. The theology of that awakening was very Arminian and it produced the reasoning of two social reform movements: the abolition movement and the temperance movement. The emphasis of this theology was on morality, not spirituality. Morality was defined in terms of legalistic do's and don'ts. Because the movement and not evangelical it had a strong impact on the abolition movement and it created the context for the civil war. As the US faced the civil war the slavery question impacted all of the denominations. Just prior to the civil war the Presbyterian church split into the northern Presbyterian church or the Presbyterian Church of the USA and the southern Presbyterian church which was the Presbyterian Church of the CSA.

After the civil war it became the Presbyterian Church in the US and the northern church became the United Presbyterian Church of the USA. They merged in the early 1980s to become the Presbyterian Church of the USA. Because of the impact of liberalism splinter groups had left both of those denominations over the years. The southern Presbyterian church did not go liberal in its theology until post-WW2. The northern church went liberal in 1927 and due to a power play the conservatives were taken off of the board of directors and removed from the faculty at Princeton seminary. At that time Princeton went liberal and the northern church went liberal. Out of those developed the Orthodox Presbyterian church in 1937, the Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelic Synod in 1965, Bible Presbyterians in 1956, Presbyterian Church of America in 1982.

The same kind of thing happened among the Baptists. The American Baptists like to trace their origins back to Roger Williams. Remember the distinctions about a Baptist is that they believe in believer's baptism, post-salvation baptism, usually by immersion, and the separation of church and state. In 1844 due to the fact that several of the delegates to the National convention, and those who wanted to be missionaries came from slave-holding families in the south, the northern Baptists in their self-righteousness could no longer put up with that, so they split into southern Baptists and Northern Baptists. Southern Baptists have maintained their theological conservatism to this present day, having only recently had a reversal trend toward liberalism, and the conservatives have won out—such that just beginning last year some of the moderate liberal southern Baptists have split off and are beginning to form their own denomination. Among the northern Baptist church which went liberal at the turn of the century, it had several groups that split off in order to maintain a conservative theology. In 1932 the Greater Association of Regular Baptists formed. Then in 1947 the Conservative Baptist Association formed. In 1950 the Northern Baptists changed their name to the American Baptist Convention.

After the Civil War we move into the modern era, from 1865 to the present. At the beginning of this era there was the great conflict known as modernist-fundamentalist controversy. The issue is between liberalism and conservatism. As the denominations sent the flower of their youth off to Europe to war, when they returned they had rejected the conservative theology they had grown up with and they brought back a theology that denied the supernatural, denied that God had spoken in Scripture, denied miracles, denied substitutionary atonement, and denied the inerrancy of Scripture. There were various heresy trials that went on at the end of the 19th century and gradually the impact of liberal theology was such that the major denominations lost out and were swung over to a liberal theology. The conservatives, though, responded to it. One response was the Bible conference movement which emphasized themes such as prophecy. One of the trends of the 19th century was the development of Dispensationalism from Darby in England. Darby was a Plymouth Brethren and as he put together in his thinking a literal interpretation of prophecy which led to a pre-millennial view, and a realization that there was a distinction between Israel and the church. As he merged those together he suddenly realized that if there is a distinction between Israel and the church, and the Tribulation is Daniel's seventieth week—which is for Israel—then the church is not going to be in the Tribulation. That led him to a recognition and a recovery of the pre-Tribulation Rapture doctrine, a hallmark doctrine of Dispensationalism.

Prophecy was one of the major subjects covered in the Bible Conference movement. They had several meetings in the Niagara area. These were called the old Niagara conferences which went on every other year from 1868 to 1900. They spawned a group of conferences called the Northfield conferences. D. L. Moody was one of the speakers, C. I. Scofield, Arno Gaebelein. Louis Sperry Chafer, the founder of Dallas theological Seminary, was influenced by those movements. These conferences focused not only on the spiritual life but on what was called the Keswick doctrine of the higher life. Keswick theology taught that at the cross you were saved, but at some point afterward there was a second work of grace or time of rededication, at which time you went into a higher level of spirituality. It has an emphasis of yieldedness and presenting yourself to God, a walking the aisle sort of thing, plus their views on prophecy had a heavy impact on 19th century fundamental conservative evangelicalism.

A second development that was part of the response of the conservatives was the Bible Institute movement. Out of the Bible conferences came the realization that there needed to be conservative theological training for pastors and missionaries because the major seminaries they had been sending men to were going liberal. Great evangelists came out of this period, such as Moody, Billy Sunday and Rodney Gypsy Smith; they all followed the pattern of Finney. Finney's theology, remember, denied that the problem of man was original sin—man is sick but not dead. His will needs to be emotionally motivated. Finney said: How can we do that? Well, I know. After we preach a long sermon where everybody is getting truly tired and their mental defenses have broken down, then will have an emotional appeal and then continue to sing songs, 23 verses of "Just As I Am," and have people walk the aisle. The whole idea of an aisle-walking invitation originated under the false theology of Charles Finney. They had all sorts of different gimmicks that they would use and which have been improved upon by 20th century evangelists. But is where the root of those practices go back to. All of the evangelists up to Billy Graham have all followed in the pattern set by Finney.

Major literature published at this time included the Scofield Reference Bible which popularized Dispensationalism, and the twelve volumes *The Fundamentals* which helped rally the support of conservatives. They were facing a battle and were losing the major denominations. The fundamentalist-modernist controversy came to a head in the early 20th century, especially in the 1920s. The term "fundamentalism" was originally coined in 1920 by Curtis Lee Laws who was the editor of the Baptist *Watchman Examiner*. It describes a moderate conservative who opposed the modernist. The original historical meaning of the term was somebody who believed in the fundamentals of the faith: the virgin birth of Christ, then resurrection and deity of Jesus Christ, the substitutionary atonement, the literal second coming of Christ to the earth, and the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible. If you believe those things then you are a classic fundamentalist, although the meaning of that term has change somewhat.

The egg on the face of the conservatives was the Scopes trial. The issue was that John Scopes who was a biology teacher in Tennessee was brought on trial for teaching evolution. Tennessee had passed a law saying it was illegal to teach evolution in the classroom. Scopes was a test case. Although the jury gave the victory to the creationists and the conservatives, Clarence Darrow's defense of Scopes pointed out the backward anti-intellectual slant of most fundamentalists, and they became a laughing stock. It cost

them a tremendous amount to get the victory but it cost them a tremendous amount of support in the process.

By 1925 liberals controlled the northern Baptists, by 1927 the liberals controlled the northern Presbyterians, the Church of Christ had become dominated by liberals, Unitarianists were merging with universalists, and there were very few sound fundamental, orthodox denominations left. In this context there was the rise of Dallas Theological Seminary in 1923. Dallas Seminary, Westminster Seminary and a few others were the bulwark and carried the torch of orthodoxy into the 20th century. Since that time there have been a number of different shifts and transitions.

Liberalism was viewed as a failure by WW 1. A European by the name of Karl Barth who was claimed a liberal was so devastated by the destruction of WW 1 that he rejected liberalism and came part way back to conservative orthodoxy. His view is called neo-orthodoxy. In neo-orthodoxy, which dominate many of the old liberal denominations, pastors will talk about atonement, trust in Christ, regeneration, the Bible is the Word of God, using the historical terminology; but what they mean by it is something different from what you and I mean by it. Liberalism has broken up into various different schools of thought across the spectrum of liberalism since then.

Among fundamentalism, by the 1930s they had split into a more militant fundamentalism, represented by Bob Jones, John R. Wright, and Paul McIntyre. Their very legalistic emphasis is on a lot of external Christian behavior rather than spirituality of the heart. Moderate fundamentalists, then, split by the 1950s into evangelicals and neo-evangelicals. The issue here is inerrancy. The evangelicals held to inerrancy; neo-evangelicals did not. Today we have a sort of a modern fundamentalist evangelicals who are represented by Dallas Theological Seminary, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary (Oregon), Reformed Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Covenant Seminary (Mississippi), and Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia). Billy Graham, Karl Henry, would be representative of the broad sector of the evangelical position.

The greatest threat to the church today is from the mystic wing of the Pentecostals. Pentecostalism has its historical roots in the theology of John Wesley. Wesley taught a perfectionist view of the Christian life. In the 1840s a Methodist Sunday school teacher by the name of C.D. Palmer was dismayed by the fact that Wesleyanism / Methodism was losing converts. During the early part of the 19th century with the second great awakening the churches were exploding. But what happened? Everybody started moving west and the churches began to get smaller. It looked like they were losing their impact. The worst thing we can do when we start losing members of a church is to ask: What are we doing wrong? We may not be doing anything wrong.

People may be simply rejecting the truth, there may be an economic catastrophe causing people to move, etc. So she went back and studied Wesley and in her interpretation of Wesley she said: "We got salvation at the cross but we didn't get it all. There needs to be a second work of grace. When you receive that second work of grace then you are elevated into a state of perfection." By perfection she did not mean that Wesley meant a state of absolute sinlessness but that you no longer commit sins of

knowledge. You won't commit sins that you know about because you have been elevated in almost a mystical fashion by the Holy Spirit to the state of perfection. The impact of this was that it developed into "holiness theology"—holiness is the goal of the Christian so we have to achieve the state of perfection. It is a two-step view of the Christian life. You don't get it all at the cross, you get it in two steps: 1 gets you salvation; 2 gets you sanctification. This is the double work of Christ.

The second work of salvation then came to be identified with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Traditionally evangelicalism, and biblically, the baptism of the Holy Spirit takes place when the Holy Spirit identifies the person with Jesus Christ and unites him with Christ at the moment he is saved; it is not a secondary work; it doesn't come after salvation. What they did was split it out from salvation so that there were two works. When the Pentecostals came along they identified the baptism of the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues. How do you know if you have received this second work of grace, the baptism of the Holy Spirit?

You speak in tongues. On January 1st 1901 Agnes Osmond spoke in tongues in Topeka, Kansas. The pastor there went down to Houston where he got a convert by the name of William Seymour, a black man with very little education, who then went to LA and that is where the Pentecostal revival really took off. He had people speaking in tongues all over the place and the whole Pentecostal movement sprung out of this revival in Los Angeles. That developed into the idea that there was one work of grace evidenced by the tongues, and that was articulated by the Pentecostals in 1914. In 1958, 59 they invaded the denominations. In the beginning, whenever they spoke in tongues they left the denomination and started their own. Some particular Pentecostals did not believe in the Trinity, they were Unitarian Pentecostals. A large number of Pentecostals don't believe in the Trinity, they are called "Jesus only" Pentecostals.

In 1958, 59 there was the neo-Pentecostal movement and the Charismatic movement, at which time they entered the denominations. Then by the 1980s they began to look more and more like Bible church people. They didn't jump up and down, they didn't get into a lot of extremism, they no longer said that speaking in tongues was evidence of Baptism of the Holy Spirit, they began to deemphasize tongues and emphasize prophecy and healing instead. This new movement was called the third wave or the Vineyard movement and it is having a tremendous impact among Bible churches. A number of men who went to Dallas Seminary are now pasturing Vineyard churches. This influence of mysticism on the church is working inside for authority rather than deriving principles is one of the greatest threats to true biblical Christianity today.

The History of the Church

1. The Apostolic Period, AD 30-100.
 - a. Review of the apostles James, Peter, Paul, and John. See Bible Survey.
 - b. Missionary expansion in Acts. See Chronology of Acts.
 - c. The New Testament canon was written. See Bible Survey.
 - d. Persecution was local and sporadic until c. 250. Nero (r. 54-68), Domitian (r. 81-90).
 - e. Church organization in the first century (elder = overseer = Pastor/Teacher, local. See doctrines.) was different from the church which soon developed (overseer over elders).
 - f. Beginning, foundation, documentation, spread of church.
2. The Post-Apostolic Church and the Struggle for Survival, AD 100-313.
 - a. Persecutions and the martyr complex. Causes: exclusiveness in political, religious, social, economic life. Edict of Milan (Constantine, 313).
 - b. Doctrinal and philosophical controversies. Ebionites, Gnosticism, Marcion (c. 150), Manichaeism, Neoplatonism, Montanism (Montanus c. 150), Monarchianism.
 - c. Doctrinal developments. Monarchical bishop, primacy of Rome in dignity and honor by 250, then in jurisdiction and authority. Formation of canon (c. 175). Theology proper and Christology beginning to be thought out and formulated.
 - d. Important persons of this period. Fathers, Apologists, Polemicists. Clement of Rome (c. 95), Ignatius (d.c. 110), Polycarp (d.c. 155), Tertullian (c. 150-240), Justin Martyr (c. 100-166), Irenaeus (b.c. 120), Cyprian (c. 200-258), Origen (c. 185-254).
3. The Imperial Church Consolidates and Expands, AD 313-590.
 - a. The political scene and some emperors. Constantine (r. 306-337) legalized Christianity. Theodosius (r. 379-395) made it illegal to depart Nicene faith.
 - b. Church councils. Nicea in 325, essence and trinity. Constantinople in 381, restate Nicene and add Holy Spirit. Ephesus in 431, Nestorian/Pelagian. Chalcedon in 451, the Person of Christ.

c. Canon of New Testament was officially closed by the end of the fourth century. In the East Athanasius Easter letter (367) lists all 27 books. In the West through Jerome and Augustine at two African councils (Hippo 393, Carthage 397) and then ratified by the Roman bishop.

d. Doctrinal developments. Theology proper, Christology, Anthropology, Donatist.

e. Monasticism. Stages: Asceticism, hermit life, cloister life, orders. Poverty, celibacy, obedience. Misunderstood priorities in Christian Way of Life.

f. Missions. Migrations of peoples. Ulfilas (c. 311-383) to Goths. Martin of Tours (c. 316-396) to Burgundians. Clovis, king of Franks (d. 511), to Franks. Soldiers, merchants to British Isles. Patrick (c. 389-461) to Ireland. Columba (c. 521-597) to Scotland.

g. Important persons. Arius (d. 336), Athanasius

(c. 296-373), Jerome (c. 340-419), Augustine (354-430), Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260-340), John Chrysostom (347-407). Leo the great, Bishop of Rome from 440-461, preeminence of Roman Bishop as Peter's successor, administrator, enforced church uniformity, protected Rome.

4. The Rise of the Church Empire and Its Missionary Expansion, AD 590-800.

a. The growth of the papacy and its relationship to the Holy Roman Empire. Leo I (p. 440-461). Gregory the Great

(p. 590-60), true pope in fact, maintained Roman bishop had jurisdiction over whole church, conflict with Eastern bishops, civil duties, great doctor of Roman Catholic Church in moral theology. RC Franks (Charles Martel, 689-741, Pepin the Short, 714-768, Charlemagne, 742-814. Charlemagne controlled France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, and Spain) and popes cooperated to defeat the Barbarians and rule Europe. Charlemagne crowned Emperor of the Romans by Pope Leo III on 25 December 800. Reestablished the old Roman Empire in the West.

b. Missionary expansion. Islam (Mohammed, 570-632). Expansion in British Isles resulted in Whitby (663) and Roman Christianity. Germany (Boniface 680-754).

c. Doctrinal controversies. Monotheletic (690), Saint and Image Worship (787), Filioque (9th), Adoptionism (9th), Predestinarian (9th), Eucharistic (9th and 11th).

5. Movements within the Church and Between the Church and State, AD 800-1054.

a. The Holy Roman Empire. Charlemagne died 814. His son, Louis the Pious ruled 814-840. Sons of Louis the Pious divided the kingdom in Treaty of Verdun (843). Charles the Bald (France), Louis (Germany), Lothair (Central Corridor). Treaty of Mersin (870), Germany. Otto I (912-973), a German king and emperor

of Saxon dynasty. Crowned Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in 962 by Pope John XII. Holy Roman Empire extended from 962-1806.

b. Feudalism. System of government based upon land. Manor, lord, feudal knight, serf, priest. Beneficial to society. Church entered feudalism.

c. Decretals and Transubstantiation. Decretals are papal letters with the force of law. False Decretals were forgeries used in 9th – 11th centuries to strengthen papal supremacy. Transubstantiation developed by Radbertus in 831.

d. Separation of Roman and Greek Church, 1054. Began in 330 with Constantine.

e. Monastic reform began in Cluny, Eastern France in 910.

6. Papal Supremacy and the Rise of Scholasticism,

AD 1054-1305.

a. The rise and fall of papacy. Hildebrand became Pope Gregory VII in 1073. College of Cardinals, dictatus papae, Investiture Struggle. Innocent III (1161-1216) was zenith of papacy. Henry IV (1077), Philip (1200), John (1213) were goats. Boniface VIII (1274-1303) low point, Clericis Laicos (1296), unam sanctum (1301).

b. The Crusades, 1095-1291. Holy wars against enemies of the cross to recapture Palestine for Christianity. Seven major crusades. Religious failure. National changes.

c. Scholasticism. An intellectual movement to strengthen faith by reason through rationalizing theology. Rationalize, arrange existing content. Roman Catholic Church. Summa Theologica. Universities c. 1200.

d. Sacraments. Developed in 12th-13th centuries. Contain and cause grace. Baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, ordination, marriage.

e. Monastic reform. Reform, new orders (Dominicans), military monasticism.

f. Lay reform. External forces of reform, Albigenses, Waldenses.

7. Preliminaries to the Reformation, AD 1305-1517.

a. Roman Catholic Church. Abuse of authority and power, Babylonian Captivity (1309-1377), Great Schism (1378-1417), decline in clergy and spiritual life.

b. The Renaissance and Humanism. The period of accelerated transition from medieval to modern life in Europe (14th – 16th centuries). Humanism was the rebirth of classical learning within this transition.

Northern (Erasmus) and Southern (Petrarch). Involved classical learning and languages, man centered, secular, individualistic world view. Emphasized confidence in human nature and education, theological skepticism, natural religion.

c. Mysticism. Movement by man to experience presence of God. Subjective experience without objective authority. Faith active. Minimized Bible Doctrine.

d. Forerunners of Reformation. John Wycliff (1329-1384), Jan Hus (1373-1415), William Savonarola (1452-1498). Bible the central force.

e. Other factors. National consciousness, printing press (John Gutenberg c. 1456), world exploration.

8. The Reformation and the Counter Reformation,

AD 1517-1648.

a. Causes. Indirect causes were political, economic, intellectual, moral, social, and theological. Direct cause was sale of indulgences in Germany. Albert of Mainz. Johann Tetzel.

b. German, Martin Luther (1483-1546), 95 theses, 31 October 1517 in Wittenberg, Heidelberg, Augsburg, Leipzig, Worms, Wartburg, Wittenberg. Diets of Speyer, German Bible. Katherine Von Bora (1525). Strong leader, student, writer, preacher, Bible, faith, priesthood. Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560). Theologian. Wrote Lutheran creeds.

c. German Swiss. Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531). Priest, patriot, student. Zurich. Disputations. Second Battle of Kappel. Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575). Pastor.

d. French Swiss. John Calvin (1509-1564). Universities of Orleans, Bourges, Paris, Lawyer. Basal, Geneva. Student, thinker, exegete, theologian, writer, teacher. Institutes (four editions), commentaries. Reformed Theology. TULIP. Theodore Beza (1519-1605). Good exegete, theologian.

e. Anabaptist Tradition Conrad Grebel (1498-1526), Felix Manz (1498-1527), George Blaurock (1491-1529), Menno Simons (1496-1561). Maligned, three disputations in Zurich, many martyrs. Bible, faith, believer's baptism, gathered church. Separation of church and state, many pacifists. Some radicals (Munster). Most moderate.

f. English Reformation. Lollards, William Tyndale (1494-1536). Henry VIII (r. 1509-1547) wanted male heir. Edward VI (r. 1547-1553), Book of Common Prayer, 42 Articles. Mary Tutor (r. 1553-1558), Roman Catholic, martyrs. Elizabeth (r.1558-1603), Settlement of 1559, 39 Articles, Church of Middle Way. Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556). Church of England. Puritans.

g. Roman Catholic Counter Reformation. Internal/ external. Authority of Pope, orthodox, change moral and religious life. Spain (Ximenes c. 1436-1517). Theologians, reforming orders (Jesuits, Ignatius of Loyola

1491-1556, authorized 1540), reforming popes (Paul III, p. 1534-1549). Index, inquisition writing, anti-Protestant. Council of Trent (1545-1563), official Roman Catholic theology and papal authority.

Todd M. Kennedy, 1980

Student Workbook

The student should read the above text at least twice before completing this workbook. The student will be evaluated by not only the accuracy of the answers but also the completeness of the answers. Once completed the questions, with the student's answers, are to be submitted for evaluation. This can be done electronically. This workbook is written by Pastor-teacher David Pearson.

1. According to Acts 1:8 the disciples would first be witnesses in _____ then in _____ and finally in _____.

2. Which book of the Bible is the history book of the early church? _____

3. This book covers about how many years? _____

4. In reference to the Bible, what does the term "canon" mean?

5. True or false: The Church in A.D. 100 had the complete canon of Scripture. _____

6. True or false: By the year 600 the Bible had been translated into several languages _____

7. By the year 600 Dr. Dean notes several differences, other than that of the canon, which had occurred in the Church since A.D. 100. List the five main ones below:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

8. About how long was it before the 27 books of the New Testament were recognized as they are today? _____

9. The Church began in what year? _____

10. The Ancient Church period covers the period from:

11. The Medieval Church period is from about: _____

12. What are the three periods of the Ancient Church:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

13. What were the two main declines in the Medieval Church?

14. "In this period of time divisions began to occur between local pastors and the bishop." Explain.

15. Who was Clement of Rome?

16. Write the correct letter in this space: _____. The word "pope" was first used:
- A. In the Bible
 - B. By Clement of Rome
 - C. In the seventh century
 - D. In the second century
 - E. None of the above
17. Who was Polycarp?
18. Who was Papias?
19. What book did Hermas write that a devotional work and almost treated as authoritative as New Testament writings?
20. Who was Ignatius?
21. What is the *Didache* (teachings)?
22. True or false: When we go back to the writings of the early church writers we find great clarity in Bible Doctrine _____
23. What is the word that describes their doctrine? _____
24. Why does the author say this happened?

25. What did these early men believe about Jesus Christ?
26. Fill in the blank: In salvation they tended toward _____
27. What did they believe about the ritual of water baptism?
28. The term "catholic" simply means _____
29. In prophecy they were _____
30. What does the term "apologist" mean?
31. Why did some pagans accuse the early church of being cannibals?
32. Why were they accused of atheism and being anti-patriotic?
33. The apologist Justin Martyr went into the error of subordinationism. Explain.
34. Who was Iranacus?
35. Tertullian is considered the founder of _____

36. What are two terms that Tertullian developed that are still used today?

_____ and _____

37. How did Tertullian view God the Son, Jesus Christ?

38. Origen was born in the city of _____ and lived from A.D. _____ to A.D. _____

39. Origen was an ascetic. Define asceticism as Dean states it.

Allegorizing is searching for a hidden or secret meaning underlying but remote from and unrelated in reality to the more obvious meaning of a text. In other words the literal reading is a sort of code, which needs to be deciphered to determine the more significant and hidden meaning. In this approach the literal is superficial, the allegorical is the true meaning. Roy B. Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation* (Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communications, 1991). 29.

40. What were the three levels of meaning Origen claimed to find in Scripture?

41. What is the problem with allegorizing the Scriptures?

42. The proper method of Bible interpretation is literal, _____,

43. Why is Marcion considered one of the earliest liberals in the church?

44. Define the key elements of Gnosticism:

45. In what way did Gnosticism affect Christianity?

46. Yes or no: Did the Gnostics believe Jesus took on true humanity (human flesh)? _____

47. Define Docetism:

48. Rationalism seeks to do what to the Bible?

49. Define mysticism and why is it dangerous to biblical faith:

50. Place a check on all that are true: The process whereby the canon of Scripture was developed included:

Did it agree with what had been taught – the quality of doctrine

Did it agree with itself or were there contradictions

They had visions from the Holy Spirit that revealed which were those to be accepted

Did it have apostolic authority

There was a big meeting where they threw out any book they did not like

The Pope decided

Was it used in the churches and widely read

51. Who was the first man to mention the 27 books of the New Testament that we have today?

52. This was affirmed at the Councils of _____ and Hippo.

53. Define dynamic Monarchianism.

54. Define Modalism

55. The proper Trinity definition: God in one _____ but three in

56. The age of the apostolic fathers was characterized by _____; the age of the apologists by _____.

57. Why is it important to be clear and accurate in your theology?

58. The next age in the church is the age of the theologians. Who are the four important men that are pointed out?

1. _____ 2. _____

3. _____ 4. _____

59. What is important about the Emperor Constantine?

Constantine's edict of toleration (for Christianity) in 313, is of lasting importance because it exhibits the experiment on a large scale of the union of Church and State. Could the Church, by union with the world, save it? As long as the Church had remained separate it had a powerful witness in the world, and was constantly drawing converts into its holy fellowship. When, however, already weakened by the adoption of human rule in place of the guidance of the Spirit, it was suddenly brought into partnership with the state, it itself became defiled and debased. Very soon the clergy were competing for lucrative positions and for power as shamelessly as court officials, while in congregations where a godless element predominated the material advantages of a profession of Christianity changed the purity of the persecuted churches into worldliness. E. H. Broadbent, *The Pilgrim Church*, Gospel Foilo Press, 2009, p.46

60. Define Arianism

61. Who is Athanasius and why is he doctrinally important?

62. What religious group still believes in Arianism today? _____

From www.churchhistory101.com

The Council of Nicea - 325 AD

There are many erroneous things said and written about the famous Council of Nicea. For example, it was not:

- the beginning of the "Catholic Church"
- when Christianity decided Jesus was divine
- when the New Testament was made official

Here is the important thing to remember: the Church was attempting to bring clarity to the issue of exactly how the nature of Jesus was related to the nature of the Father. This had always been simply stated as in John's gospel, "In the beginning was the Word. The Word was with God and the Word was God" - Logos theology. The problem was always in the explanation.

63. What is Appollinarianism and what is wrong with it?

64. What is Nestorianism and what is wrong with it?

65. The Bible states and we believe that Jesus is fully _____ and fully _____, unmixed but united in one person _____

66. This was affirmed at the Council of _____ in A. D. _____

67. The ancient church is divided into four periods. List them with their time periods:

68. What were the three great questions answered during the age of the theologians?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

69. The third one (above) seeks to answer the question, "How is a man _____," "Is it chiefly a work of _____ or a work of _____?"

70. True or false: Augustine of Hippo believed in man's free will before the Fall _____

71. Complete the sentence: "Augustine's doctrine of regeneration in terms of Romans chapter five was that before _____ he will only choose _____, he cannot chose _____, but after man is saved, because of regeneration and the indwelling _____, he now has the ability to _____ good. So true _____ is once again restored to man after _____. That is Augustine's view on the _____."

72. Explain what Augustine taught in reference to the fact that Adam's sin affected the entire human race as explained by the writer.

73. Compare and contrast the teaching of Augustine with that of Pelagius

74. In this controversy Augustin held to a doctrine called "double predestination." Explain.

Not a single passage of Scripture in either the Old or New Testament expresses or teaches the notion that God unconditionally selected or arbitrarily picked out certain individuals for possession of eternal life and/or that He unconditionally chose some for eternal destruction. Contrarily, the Scripture deliberately and unequivocally teaches that God legitimately offers eternal life freely to any person who believes in Christ for it without any discrimination based on supposed selection unto salvation but not others in eternity past. The teaching that He did so, however, is the very foundation upon which the Dortian Calvinist system of soteriology is based.

Confronting Calvinism, Dr. Anthony Badger, 2013, p. 109

Note: It is from Augustine that Calvinism gets its erroneous ideas on unconditional selection otherwise known as predestination. I highly recommend Badger's book!

75. John Cassianus said that salvation originates in God but is preceded by man. Explain.

76. True or false: salvation is a cooperative work between God and man (note: faith is not a work!)

77. True or false: The cooperative works-salvation teaching led to Roman Catholic theology _____

78. What are the dates for the medieval church? _____

79. The four "As" to remember for this time frame are:

A. _____ C. _____

B. _____ E. _____

80. In the previous two centuries five cities dominated Christianity in the Roman Empire. These are – include why:

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

D. _____

81. Who was Gregory the Great (pick the main highlights)?

82. How did the idea of “penance” bring money into the Roman church?

83. The first true Pope is _____

84. Why is it significant that he was semi-Pelagian?

85. What other doctrines did Gregory introduce into the church?

86. The early church saw the Lord’s Supper as a sacrifice of _____ to God.

87. How did the writings of Irenaeus, Origen, and Cyprian change this correct understanding?

88. What did Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas teach about the Lord’s Supper?

The Roman Catholic false doctrine of Transubstantiation

The Roman Catholic Church teaches that once an ordained priest blesses the bread of the Lord's Supper, it is transformed into the actual flesh of Christ (though it retains the appearance, odor, and taste of bread); and when he blesses the wine, it is transformed into the actual blood of Christ (though it retains the appearance, odor, and taste of wine). From www.gotquestions.org

89. What two documents, that proved to be forgeries, surfaced in the time of Gregory and what is their significance?

90. Who was the fifth-century missionary Patrick and what was his view of salvation?

91. Who built the first church among the Germans? _____

92. Why is it important to know that the priest Boniface crowned Pepin the Short as king of the Franks?

93. What happened as a result of the Synod of Toledo?

From Wikipedia

The East–West Schism is the break of communion between what are now the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches which began in the 11th century.

There had long been ecclesiastical differences and theological disputes between the Greek East and Latin West. Prominent among these were the issues of the source of the Holy Spirit ("Filioque"), whether leavened or unleavened bread should be used in the Eucharist, the Pope's claim to universal jurisdiction, and the place of Constantinople in relation to the Pentarchy.

In 1053, the first step was taken in the process which led to formal schism. Patriarch of Constantinople Michael Cerularius ordered the closure of all Latin churches in Constantinople. According to the historian John Bagnell Bury, Cerularius' purpose in closing the Latin churches was "to cut short any attempt at conciliation".

From www.christiantimelines.com

In 638 (six years after Muhammad's death), the Muslim leader Omar entered Jerusalem, and the city became Muslim. In 1099, the Christian Crusaders from Europe captured Jerusalem. In 1187, the Muslim general Saladin captured Jerusalem. In 1192, Richard the Lion-Hearted attempted to capture Jerusalem, but failed. In 1275, Marco Polo stopped by on his way to China. In 1517, the Ottomans [Muslims] gained control of Jerusalem. In 1917, the British gained control of Jerusalem.

94. There were _____ "Christian" Crusades. They began about the year _____

95. The Children's Crusade happened in the year 1212. What was it and what happened?

96. What is significant about Anselm's theology?

97. What is significant about Abelard; include an explanation of his moral influence theory.

98. What did Thomas Aquinas teach about the church and salvation?

99. By 1500 the church had descended into _____

100. Roman Catholics will say that one is saved by faith through grace, but what do they mean by this?

101. Explain the Roman Catholic idea of purgatory:

102. True or false: an indulgence was a permission slip to visit the Pope in Rome _____

103. What was built in Rome as a result of the selling of indulgences? _____

104. The Reformer Martin Luther was born in what country? _____

105. What happened to him in 1512?

106. In his study of what two books in the Bible did he come to a saving knowledge of the doctrine of Justification by faith?

A. _____ B. _____

107. What is the difference between legal or forensic justification and the Roman Catholic belief?

108. What did Luther do on October 31, 1517 and why?

109. What did Luther come to realize was the authority for the Christian life? _____

110. True or false; Luther translated the entire New Testament from Greek into German _____

111. What was one of the key factors, in reference to the Bible, that led to the Reformation?

112. What famous hymn did Martin Luther write? _____

113. Who was the real theologian of the Lutheran movement? _____

114. How do the Roman Catholic transubstantiation and Lutheran consubstantiation differ?

115. True or false: Luther and Lutheranism began the Reformation Movement _____

116. What began four or five years after Luther's break with Rome?

117. In this timeframe the church and the state are identified with each other. What did this mean about infant baptism?

From www.religionfacts.com

Who was Ulrich Zwingli?

Ulrich Zwingli (1 January 1484 – 11 October 1531) was a leader of the Reformation in Switzerland. Born during a time of emerging Swiss patriotism and increasing criticism of the Swiss mercenary system, he attended the University of Vienna and the University of Basel, a scholarly center of humanism. He continued his studies while he served as a pastor in Glarus and later in Einsiedeln, where he was influenced by the writings of Erasmus.

In 1518, Zwingli became the pastor of the Grossmünster in Zurich where he began to preach ideas on reforming the Catholic Church. In his first public controversy in 1522, he attacked the custom of fasting during Lent. In his publications, he noted corruption in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, promoted clerical marriage, and attacked the use of images in places of worship. In 1525, Zwingli introduced a new communion liturgy to replace the mass. Zwingli also clashed with the Anabaptists, which resulted in their persecution.

118. True or false: Zwingli held to the doctrine of double predestination _____
119. What was Zwingli's view of the Lord's Supper?
120. The successor to Zwingli, after his death, was _____
121. The key doctrinal point of emphasis in Calvinism is the _____ of God
122. True or false: When Heinrich Bullinger emphasized the covenants it was *not* the same as the Noahic, Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic, Land, and New Covenants _____
123. John Calvin, in 1534, escaped from what country? _____
124. Calvin stayed and worked mainly in what Swiss city? _____
125. Calvin stressed the _____ of God, the total _____ of man, and that Adam's sin was _____ to his account.
126. Describe Calvin's idea of unconditional election to salvation
127. Check all that apply: Calvin taught
- _____ double predestination
 - _____ God elected people to salvation because He foresaw their faith
 - _____ irresistible grace
 - _____ purgatory is real
 - _____ transubstantiation
 - _____ the perseverance of the saints (if one is really saved they will persevere to the end of life)
 - _____ God chose some people for salvation based solely on His own will
 - _____ a spiritual presence in the Lord's Supper
 - _____ a Presbyterian form of government
 - _____ the Church and the State should cooperate together
 - _____ television was from Satan

128. The main two doctrines over which developed conflict in the 1600s were _____ and _____

129. List below the five basic principles that Jacob Arminius and his followers developed in response to the Calvinist doctrines of predestination and election:

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____
- D. _____
- E. _____

130. The Calvinists held to (and still do today) to five points. List them below with explanation given:

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____
- D. _____
- E. _____

131. Define Covenant Theology.

132. True or false: Covenant Theology is opposed to Dispensationalism _____

The term "Anabaptist" means "baptized again." They repudiated infant baptism and believed – as is biblical – that only those who are old enough become believers were to be baptized. When a person who had been baptized as a baby became a believer they would baptize the person again, thus the term. Because of the close association of the church and the state, baptism also was an act of loyalty to the state; to baptize again was considered an unpatriotic act.

133. An early Anabaptist leader was Conrad Grebel. He thought that Zwingli was not pushing far enough and fast enough in the Reformation. Why was Zwingli moving so slowly?

134. "Conrad Grebel came along and said it doesn't matter what the _____ have to say, _____ to God is greater. There must be a separation between _____ and _____."

135. What were the Anabaptists considered after they held their baptism services?

136. After Grebel died in 1526, what happened to his two friends who were Felix Manz and Michael Kirshner? By the way, this was done by the Calvinists in Zurich, Switzerland with the cooperation of the state (see pages 90-91 of *The Pilgrim Church* in the FGBI printed edition).

137. Because the Anabaptist leaders were martyred at early ages they tended to be _____

138. Who was Menno Simons and what group goes by his name?

139. The Pilgrims who came to America were not Puritans because the Puritans held to _____ theology and _____ baptism and the Pilgrims did not.

140. What were the three main points of Anabaptist theology as given in the notes?

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

141. The English Reformation was spearheaded by the English Monarch _____.

142. Summarize why this King broke with the Roman Church.

143. When the break came they maintained Catholic Theology but the head of the new Church (the Church of England or Anglican Church) was _____

144. Who replaced Wolsey as the Archbishop of Canterbury? _____

145. Who is John Wycliffe and why is he important?

146. Who is William Tyndale and why is he important?

147. Edward the VI, King of England from 28 January 1547 to his death on 6 July 1553, was raised as a _____ and not a Roman Catholic.

148. Following his death his sister _____ came to the throne and she was raised as a _____ and despised the Protestants.

149. Why was she called "Bloody Mary"?

150. Her sister Elizabeth instituted a new way of the church. What was the Act of Uniformity of 1559?

151. Why were the men who returned to England after studying under Calvin and Beza called

"Puritans? Because they wanted to _____ the Church of _____

152. "By combining literal interpretation and working it out in other area of doctrine you begin to

recover the _____"

153. True or false: As far as Bible prophecy goes, many of these men eventually came to a

premillennial understanding _____

154. What Bible translation happened under James I of England? The _____

155. What are the three groups of Puritans? _____,

_____, _____.

"Roundhead" was the name given to the supporters of the Parliament during the English Civil War. Also known as Parliamentarians, they fought against King Charles I and his supporters, the Cavaliers (Royalists), who claimed absolute power and the divine right of kings. The goal of the Roundhead party was to give the Parliament supreme control over executive administration.

Most Roundheads appear to have sought a constitutional monarchy, in place of the absolutist monarchy sought by Charles I. However, at the end of the Civil War in 1649, public antipathy towards the king was high enough to allow republican Roundhead leaders such as Oliver Cromwell to abolish the monarchy completely and establish the republican Commonwealth.

England's many Puritans and Presbyterians were almost invariably Roundhead supporters, as were many smaller religious groups such as the Independents. However many Roundheads were Church of England, as were many Cavaliers.

Source: Wikipedia

156. Who was Oliver Cromwell and why is he important to English church history?

(The English) Parliament...abolished the episcopacy in 1643 and commissioned the Westminster Assembly, composed of 151 English Puritans. To secure Scottish aid in the war, Parliament accepted the *Solemn League and Covenant* of 1638 and added eight Scottish Presbyterians to advise it on the polity and creed of the national church. The group held 1,163 daily sessions between 1643 and 1652. The *Directory of Worship* along Presbyterian lines was completed in 1644 and accepted by both the Scottish and English Parliaments in 1645, The *Form of Government*, which advocated presbyterian polity for the national church, was completed by 1645 and adopted by Parliament in 1648. The Calvinistic Westminster *Confession of Faith*, the assembly's most important work, was completed by 1646 and adopted by the Scots in 1647 and by the English in 1648. Thus the state church of England was a Calvinist Presbyterian church by 1648. The Longer and Shorter catechisms were also completed by 1647. Earle E. Cairns, *Christianity Through the Centuries*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1981, p.p 340-341

157. What was always given prominence in Puritan worship?

158. They held to a literal interpretation of the Bible except for _____ where they held to an _____ interpretation.

159. Define Premillennialism, Amillennialism, and Postmillennialism:

Premillennialism _____

Amillennialism _____

Postmillennialism _____

160. What was the political agenda of the Puritans when they came to America?

161. True or false: the Catholic Church fought a war to recover land and the revenue from the territory that had become Protestant _____

162. What does the writer say is important about the division of Europe between Protestant and Catholic?

163. The first denomination was the _____ established in _____

164. In 1520 there were the _____ churches; _____ Reformed, _____ Reformed, and the _____ Reformed.

165. The Scots developed the _____ Church and the _____

166. The English _____ split from the Anglican Church (about 1612)

167. Who were the Pilgrims?

168. The second group that came to America were the _____ (1630)

169. They wanted to establish a new _____. Their whole goal was _____

170. The Presbyterian, Congregationalists, and Puritans formed together into the _____ church in the United States

171. Roger Williams came to Baptist convictions about the separation of Church and State and then founded the US colony of _____
172. True or false: The first introduction of the Presbyterian Church into the United States was in 1906 _____
173. The US colony of Maryland was at first primarily a place for _____
174. What was the “death knell” of New England Puritanism? _____
175. What happened in America in the late 1730s and 1740s?
176. Write out some things you have learned about Jonathan Edwards:
177. William Tennant started what college, for what reason, and by what name is it known as today?
178. Yes or no: John and Charles Wesley grew up understanding the gospel _____
179. The writer states that _____ “was probably the greatest evangelist the English-speaking people have ever known.”
180. John Wesley is said to have become a believer while in a Bible class where they were reading Martin Luther’s commentary on _____

181. What were the main doctrinal differences between George Whitfield and John Wesley?

182. The movement started by John Wesley became known as _____

183. What is the name of the movement that would take away from the Scriptures?

184. They sifted from the Scriptures as the source of authority to human _____ as the source of authority. This became known as "Rationalism"

185. The founder of philosophical rationalism was _____

186. Who founded Empiricism? _____

The Basis of Knowledge

	SYSTEM	STARTING POINT	METHOD
Autonomous Systems Of Perception	RATIONALISM	Innate ideas Faith in human ability.	Independent use of logic & reason
	EMPIRICISM	Sense perceptions External experience; Scientific method; Faith in human ability	Independent use of logic & reason
	MYSTICISM	Inner, private experience; intuition Faith in human ability	Independent, Nonlogical, nonrational, nonverifiable.
Divine Viewpoint	REVELATION	Objective revelation of God	Dependent use of logic and reason

Chart from Robert Dean at www.deanbible.com

187. List the four areas of authority that people look to in their life and give a brief definition. The chart above will help but also refer to the notes:

- A. _____

- B. _____

- C. _____

- D. _____

188. True or false: Rationalism, Empiricism, and Mysticism are a help and a blessing to the church

189. The movement of the 19th that was attacking from within the church was

190. The modern liberal wants to take away from _____

191. Immanuel Kant wrote the book _____

192. True or false: according to Kant a person can only know things on the level of experience _____

193. True or false: according to Kant one cannot really know anything about God, eternity, or spiritual truth _____

194. Who is considered the father of modern religious liberalism? _____

195. According to him “_____” is how you come to know God

196. Soren Kierkegaard is called the father of what philosophical system? _____

197. True or false: Kierkegaard taught that the role of faith is just to believe that truth exists, we live as if it is true, even though is really just a myth _____

198. What impact did the teaching of these men have on the Bible as objective truth?

199. The influence of these men led Christianity to be redefined in terms of _____ and social action.

200. "Spirituality is more than _____"

201. In liberal theology God becomes the _____ of all men. This is called the _____

202. Another result of this thinking was _____ salvation: all people go to heaven

203. In their thinking Jesus "is simply a _____ who showed the way by His example."

204. What brought an end to the optimism of liberalism and why?

205. List the three periods of Church history in America:

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

206. What is Unitarianism?

207. What is Deism?

208. The revival that broke out in around 1790 is known as the Second

209. True or false: many of the revivals, especially in the western part of the United States, were full of emotional excess _____

210. What was the main differences between the Old School and New School Presbyterians?

Old School _____

New School _____

211. One of the first truly American revivalists was _____

212. What are some of the main problems with his doctrine?

213. During this time periods several other cults rose up. List them:

A. _____ C. _____

B. _____ D. _____

214. The Second Great Awakening “was very _____ and it produced the reasoning of two social reform movements: the _____ movement and the _____ movement.” NOTE: the first dealt with the slavery issue, the second with the drinking of alcohol.

215. True or false: During or as a result of the Civil War several church denominations split into northern and southern denomination _____

216. The modern church era extends from _____ to modern times

217. True or false: the result of the modernist-fundamentalist controversy was that most American denominations became very conservative and, among other doctrines, affirmed the inerrancy (absolute truth) of Scripture _____

218. John Darby in England (in the 19th century) was a major developer of dispensational theology. Some of the highlights of this system are:

219. The Bible Conference Movement strongly emphasized what biblical doctrine? _____

220. What are some of the points given about Keswick theology?

221. "A second development that was part of the response of the conservatives was the _____ movement." NOTE: the Free Grace Bible Institute stands in this tradition.

222. The Scofield Reference Bible popularized _____

223. The historical meaning of the term "fundamentalist" was one who believed in the fundamentals of the faith which include:

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____
- D. _____
- E. _____

The Scopes Trial, from Answers in Genesis www.answersingenesis.org

The Scopes trial¹ took place during a hot July in 1925 in the little town of Dayton, nestled in the Cumberland Mountains of Tennessee. In a time when modern court trials can drag on for months or even years, it is amazing to consider that the Scopes trial lasted only 12 days (July 10–21)—including the selection of the jury!

The leadership of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in New York City initiated the Scopes trial. The ACLU became alarmed over “antievolution” bills that were being introduced in the legislatures of 20 states in the early 1920s. These bills were all very similar and forbade public schools to teach the evolution of man but generally ignored the evolution of anything else.

The ACLU hoped that a test case might overthrow these bills or at least make them unenforceable. They chose to pursue their case in Tennessee, where the state legislature had unanimously passed the Butler Act. This act declared that it shall be “unlawful for any teacher in any of the Universities, Normals, and all other public schools of the state which are supported in whole or in part by the public school funds of the State, to teach any theory that denies the story of the Divine Creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals.”

At the time of the trial, some probably thought, What have the age of the earth, the days of creation, and Cain’s wife got to do with this trial? But actually, Darrow understood the connection—the same connection that these questions have to the Ten Commandments controversy (and general loss of Christian morality) today.

While in the witness box, Bryan, who stood for Christianity, couldn’t answer the question about Cain’s wife, and admitted he didn’t believe in six literal creation days but accepted the millions of years for the earth’s age.

That’s when Darrow knew he had won, because he had managed to get the Christian to admit, in front of a worldwide audience, that he couldn’t defend the Bible’s history (e.g., Cain’s wife), and didn’t take the Bible as written (the days of creation), and instead accepted the world’s teaching (millions of years). Thus, Bryan (unwittingly) had undermined biblical authority and paved the way for secular philosophy to pervade the culture and education system.

Sadly, most Christians today have, like Bryan, accepted the world’s teaching and rejected the plain words of the Bible regarding history. Thus, they have helped the world teach generations of children that the Bible cannot be trusted in Genesis. After years of such indoctrination, a generation has now arisen that is also (logically) rejecting the morality based on the Bible. Today, with, for example, the removal of the Ten Commandments from public places, we are seeing the increasing elimination of the Christian foundational structure in the nation.

224. What is the importance of a literal interpretation of the Creation history in Genesis (from the above)?

225. Karl Barth's doctrinal view is called _____

226. True or false: The neo-orthodox will use the same doctrinal terms conservatives use but they mean something different in their definition of the terms _____

227. The emphasis in many fundamentalist circles today "is on a lot of _____ Christian _____ rather than spirituality of the heart."

228. Evangelicals hold to the doctrine of _____ but neo-evangelicals do not

229. What is the greatest threat to the church today?

230. True or false: Pentecostalism is rooted in the teachings of John Wesley _____

231. What did the Sunday School teacher C. D. Palmer teach after studying Wesley?

232. What is the goal of "holiness theology"?

233. The idea of a second work of salvation came to be identified with the _____ of the Holy Spirit.

234. In addition to making this a secondary work, they identified this baptism with _____

in _____

235. Agnes Osmond spoke in tongues (so-called) on what date? _____

236. True or false: Under William Seymour the Pentecostal Movement took off _____

237. True or false: "Jesus Only" Pentecostals firmly believe in the Trinity _____

238. True or false: The neo-Pentecostal Movement and Charismatic Movement are strongly influenced by mysticism _____

On New Year's Eve 1901 a woman student named Agnes Ozman asked for hands to be laid on her that she might receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit and she suddenly broke out in "tongues." They initially thought was Chinese and later they said she could speak Bohemian.

These early Pentecostals believed properly that the spiritual gift of biblical tongues was a spontaneously spoken human language even though they were wrong as to its original purpose and to its being a current spiritual gift.

It was only later after they discovered that no one was speaking anything but gibberish and then they changed their doctrine and called it a "heavenly prayer language" and the "language of angels." In other words, they changed their doctrine to fit the experience! They just knew this was from God so they went to the Bible and did a little "proof texting" to validate their experience rather than letting the Bible examine and correct their experience. This false teaching on tongues being a "prayer language" and the "tongues of angels" continues today in Pentecostal and Charismatic circles.

239. From the above - True or false: The true biblical gift of tongues is where a person spontaneously spoke a known human language _____

For more information on the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements please refer to the study on Spiritual Gifts parts one and two in the curriculum of the Free Grace Bible Institute

240. Write below what you consider the most important things you have learned from this study on Basic Church History.

For one additional course credit did you read the two articles and provide a brief statement of learning? _____

For two additional course credits did you read *The Pilgrim Church*? _____