

# CHURCH HISTORY

*G. Michael Cocoris*



# CHURCH HISTORY

*G. Michael Cocoris*

© 2010 G. Michael Cocoris

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced (in whole or in part, edited, or revised) in any way, form, or means, including, but not limited to electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or any kind of storage and retrieval system *for sale*, except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the written permission of G. Michael Cocoris, 2016 Euclid #20, Santa Monica, CA 90405, michaelcocoris@gmail.com, or his appointed representatives. Permission is hereby granted, however, for reproduction of the whole or parts of the whole without changing the content in any way for *free distribution* provided all copies contain this copyright notice in its entirety. Permission is also granted to charge for the cost of copying.

Unless otherwise indicated all Scripture quotations are taken from the New King James Version®, Copyright © 1979, 1980, 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
WHAT IS CHURCH HISTORY?.....	3
WHY STUDY CHURCH HISTORY? .....	4
WHAT ARE THE DIVISIONS OF CHURCH HISTORY? .....	5
<b>THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH</b> .....	<b>7</b>
THE START OF THE CHURCH.....	7
THE SHAPE OF THE CHURCH.....	7
THE SPREAD OF THE CHURCH.....	12
THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.....	14
THE HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES .....	14
<b>THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH</b> .....	<b>23</b>
PERSECUTION .....	23
THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS .....	29
FALSE TEACHING .....	56
SCHISMS .....	63
THE CHURCH FATHERS .....	70
THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON .....	86
DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT .....	93
CHURCH POLITY.....	100
CHURCH SERVICE.....	106
<b>THE IMPERIAL CHURCH</b> .....	<b>109</b>
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE CHURCH .....	109
THE RESULT OF BEING THE STATE CHURCH.....	111
ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.....	112
THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY .....	117
CHURCH FATHERS .....	120
NEW TESTAMENT CANON .....	137
DOCTRINE .....	141
CHURCH POLITY.....	141
CHURCH SERVICE.....	142
<b>THE DIVIDED CHURCH</b> .....	<b>145</b>
THE DIVIDED CHURCH .....	145
MONASTICISM .....	147
ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.....	151
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY .....	152
ROMAN CATHOLICISM.....	159
THE RISE OF ISLAM .....	166
HERESIES.....	168
THE GREAT SCHISM .....	169
THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.....	173
THE SEVEN MAJOR CRUSADES.....	179
UNIVERSITIES .....	181
SCHOLASTICISM .....	184
DISSENTERS.....	187
MEN OF THE PERIOD.....	190

<b>THE REFORMED CHURCH.....</b>	<b>195</b>
THE CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION.....	195
THE REFORMATION.....	197
THE REFORMERS.....	203
THE RADICAL REFORMERS.....	221
THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.....	227
CREEDS.....	228
CALVINISM AND ARMINIANISM.....	229
MEN OF THE PERIOD.....	232
<b>THE MODERN CHURCH.....</b>	<b>245</b>
THE PURITANS.....	245
THE SEPARATISTS.....	248
THE BAPTISTS.....	249
THE QUAKERS.....	254
THE PIETISTS.....	255
THE METHODISTS.....	257
RATIONALISM.....	263
THE MISSIONARY MOVEMENT.....	264
THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.....	265
THE IRVINGITES.....	267
THE KESWICK MOVEMENT.....	271
ROMAN CATHOLICISM.....	272
MEN OF THE PERIOD.....	273
<b>THE AMERICAN CHURCH.....</b>	<b>279</b>
DENOMINATIONALISM.....	279
REVIVALISM.....	290
FOREIGN MISSIONS.....	296
THE HOLINESS MOVEMENT.....	297
CHURCH MUSIC.....	299
LIBERALISM.....	313
FUNDAMENTALISM.....	319
PENTECOSTALISM.....	338
NEO-ORTHODOXY.....	360
NEO-EVANGELICALISM.....	362
THE CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT.....	375
THE THIRD WAVE.....	377
EXTREME PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATICS.....	380
MEN OF THE PERIOD.....	386
<b>THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH.....</b>	<b>401</b>
WHERE THE CHURCH IS NOW.....	401
WHERE THE CHURCH IS HEADED.....	401
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>403</b>

# PREFACE

My interest in history began early in life. In high school, history was my favorite subject. In college, I minored in history and, of course, in seminary, I took courses in the history of the church from the beginning to the present.

The study of church history should be based on an understanding of the New Testament. I have spent my adult life expounding the Bible, especially the New Testament, which is part of my preparation for examining church history.

As will be evident as you read this material, I have read books on church history in general and books on specific topics in church history in particular, such as the history of the apostles, Orthodoxy, Pentecostalism, etc. When I use a source, I put the author's name in parentheses in the text itself, not at the bottom of the page, the end of the chapter, or the end of the book.

I have had first-hand experience with many different denominations. Since my father was from Greece, I was baptized by tri-union immersion in the Greek Orthodox Church. I briefly attended a Catholic elementary school. I have also had the privilege of speaking in numerous Protestant churches, including many Baptist groups (American Baptist, Baptist General Conference Baptist, Bible Baptist, Conservative Baptist, Southern Baptist, General Association of Regular Baptist, Independent Baptist, and North American Baptist), Community churches, Union churches, and non-denominational churches. I have also spoken in Alliance, American Sunday School Union, Assembly of God, Christian and Missionary Alliance, Christian Catholic, Christian Reform, Church of God in Christ, Congregational, Congregational-Methodist, Covenant, Evangelical Free, Evangelical Mennonite, Fundamental Bible, Grace Brethren, Gospel, Lutheran, Mennonite, Mennonite Brethren, Methodist, Nazarene, and Presbyterian churches. Each of these groups has its own particular perspective. For example, there are differences between the various Baptist groups. I have spent countless hours talking to most of these church leaders about their point of view. Fellowshiping with them on a local church level has given me insights into the history and theology of these groups.

I have visited a number of historical church sites, including Jerusalem, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, sites in Europe (Erasmus' House in Brussels) and England (Wesley's House in London), as well as numerous places in the United States. I have been to Northfield MA, where D. L. Moody's face mask is on display; to the spot in Enfield, Connecticut, where Jonathan Edwards preached "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God;" to the Yale Library to see Jonathan Edwards' Bible; to Palmyra, New York, where Joseph Smith began; to Salt Lake City, where Brigham Young ended up; to Baxter Springs, Kansas, where Charles Parham's (founder of Pentecostalism) Apostolic Faith Church still exists and where I got to spend several hours talking with people in that church. I have also visited the historical Pentecostal sites in Los Angeles, such as the house on Bonnie Brae where Seymour began, the Azusa Street location, and Saint Mark's Episcopal Church where the Charismatic movement began and where I spoke with a man who was present the morning in 1962 when the Rector, Dennis Bennett, told the church about his experience.

I have listened to church history professors lecture on church history, including Dr. Bart D. Ehrman (Princeton Ph.D.), Professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel

Hill (“After the New Testament: The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers”); Dr. Phillip Cary (Yale Ph.D.), Professor at Eastern University (“The History of Christian Theology,” “Augustine: Philosopher and Saint,” and “Luther: Gospel, Law, and Reformation”); Dr. William R. Cook (Cornell Ph.D.), Professor at the State University of New York at Geneseo (“The Catholic Church: A History”); Dr. William R. Cook (Cornell Ph.D.) and Ronald B. Herzman (University of Delaware Ph.D.) Professors at the State University of New York at Geneseo (“Francis of Assisi”). Dr. Thomas F. X. Noble (Michigan State Ph.D.), Professor at the University of Notre Dame (“Popes and the Papacy: A History”); Dr. Kenneth W. Harl, (Yale University Ph.D.), Professor at Tulane University (*The Fall of the Pagans and the Origins of Medieval Christianity* and *World of Byzantium*); and Dr. Louis Markos (University of Michigan Ph.D.), Professor at Houston Baptist University (“The Life and Writings of C. S. Lewis”).

For more than a dozen years, I was the pastor of the historic Church of the Open Door in downtown Los Angeles. The first pastor there was R. A. Torrey; other notable pastors include Louis Talbot and J. Vernon McGee. While I was pastor of that church, I wrote a history of it entitled *Seventy Years on Hope Street*.

The point of all of this is that I write about church history with an enthusiasm for history in general, from an exposition of the New Testament, from experiences with many different denominations, and from exploring some of the historical sites, as well as from exposure to the academic side of church history. The result is that I am convinced that serious-minded Christians ought to know something about church history. Some of the reasons for doing so will be discussed in the next chapter.

I wish to thank Teresa Rogers for proofreading the material. It is my prayer that this material will have a practical value in your life. I trust it will clarify such issues as the formation of the New Testament, the historical understanding of critical theological issues, the origin of the denominations, etc.

G. Michael Cocoris  
Santa Monica, CA



# INTRODUCTION

Before embarking down the road of church history, we need to prepare for the trip by addressing several questions. What is church history? Why study it? What are the main divisions of the history of the church? The answers to these questions will give direction to the journey ahead.

## What is Church History?

*The Definition* According to the dictionary, “history” is “a narrative of events” or a “chronological record of events.” If *all* the events in the history of the church were recorded, it would fill not just a book or even a set of books, but a multitude of libraries—and then some. By the nature of the case, church history involves selection. What is selected is what historians determine is important.

Latourette defines church history as “the history of what *God* has done for man through Christ and of *man’s response*” (Latourette, p. xxi, italics added). The first part of his definition is a problem. The Scripture proclaims what God has done, but after the Scripture was complete, who is to say that a particular event was God’s doing? What one would say was “of God,” another would deny.

The second part of Latourette’s definition is more helpful. People’s response to the New Testament can be determined. Jesus and His apostles told followers of Christ what God wanted them to believe and do. Church history records the response of professed followers of Christ.

Church history, then, is the chronological record of what professed followers of Christ believed and did. It is the examination and interpretation of the impact of ideas, events, and people on the shape of the “church” in the past.

History includes ideas, conditions, events, and people, which involves dates and places. Understanding intellectual ideas, socioeconomic conditions, and the political environment is essential to comprehending events and people. For example, understanding the “context” of the Civil War is essential to fully comprehending Abraham Lincoln.

In the final analysis, however, the issue is the *response* of professed followers of Christ to the commands of Christ. Therefore, this trip down the road of church history will take particular note of people along the way. Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) said, “History is the essence of innumerable biographies.”

Obviously, not all the people can be covered. In 1968, the pioneer of Pop Art, Andy Warhol, said, “In the future everyone will be world-famous for 15 minutes.” The object will not be to cover all who were famous for 15 minutes. The aim is to at least give a brief introduction to the individuals who were influential in the history of the church. In his 485 page book, *A History of the Church in England*, John R. H. Moorman says, “It is notoriously difficult to pour a gallon of water into a pint pot. It is almost as difficult to compress the history of 1750 years in 400 pages. This book, therefore, can be no more than an introduction.”

*The Implication* Sometimes, the professed followers of Christ believed the truth, but unfortunately, many times people calling themselves “the church” perverted the truth.

Sometimes the church followed God's orders and many times the so-called church did not. History records the truth and the error, the obedience and the disobedience, done in the name of the church.

Thus, it is imperative to begin with what the Bible says the church is supposed to believe and do. Having set the standard of what the true church is, the history of the true church can be studied and the presence of a false church can be detected.

This approach to church is different than the one usually taken by historians. Historians try to stay objective. They report what happened as accurately as possible. Only rarely do they pass judgment on what happened. This study of church history is different. All that happened in church history should be judged by the standard established in the New Testament. As a friend of mine once said to me, "The church historian must first be a theologian" (Ron Shea). What the New Testament indicates the church is to believe and teach needs to be determined and the teachings and actions of the various groups throughout church history measured by that standard. Actually, no historian is neutral. Carey says it is better to suggest that we are hospitable, that is, we are not on neutral ground, but we are gracious as a hostess or a host to a guest.

## Why Study Church History?

Is not history dry and dull, even boring? Why study the past? Don't we need something practical for the present? A seminary graduate said, "When I took courses in church history, I was not paying attention, because I did not make the connection with what is happening today." There are benefits today in knowing what happened yesterday.

*To Better Understand Doctrine* What does the New Testament teach concerning doctrine? Throughout church history, there has been one doctrinal dispute after another. That can cause confusion, but it can also produce clarity (1 Cor. 11:17-19). Knowing church history will give you a clarity and depth of doctrine.

*To Better Understand Denominations* Why are there so many different denominations? Where did they originate?" How did they get started? Why do they differ in organizational structure, called church polity, and practices such as the church service? The answer to these questions is in church history.

*To Better Understand Detours* Obviously, as measured by the New Testament, not all denominations are right in what they believe and practice. Some have veered off the correct path. A Church History professor said, "If it is one of the duties of the historical theologian to demonstrate how the church has stood in continuity and discontinuity with the apostolic age" (Hannah, p. 23). He also said, "Knowledge of theology in its historical context and development will preserve the church from error" (Hannah, p. 11). "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it," wrote the philosopher George Santayana.

The present, practical value of knowing what happened in church history is a better understanding of what we believe, why we belong to the denomination that we do, and to avoid repeating the failure of the past. To say the same thing another way, knowing church history allows us to eliminate errors and emulate good examples. Knowing the mistakes of the past can help prevent repeating them in the present. To watch good examples informs and inspires godly decisions.

## What are the Divisions of Church History?

By definition, history involves chronology. It is a “chronological record.” Church history begins with the birth of the church and continues to the present. How is that long period to be divided? What are the divisions of church history?

History is often divided into three major parts: ancient, medieval, and modern. Sometimes that broad outline is followed in explaining what happened in church history. There is nothing necessarily wrong with that. The approach taken here, however, will use a sevenfold division of church history that focuses more on what has happened in the church.

1. The Apostolic Church (30-95) is from the birth of the church to the death of the Apostle John, the last Apostle.
2. The Old Catholic Church (95-313) extends from the death of John to the Edict of Milan (a.k.a. the “Edict of Tolerance”).
3. The Imperial Church (313-476) extends from the Edict of Milan to the fall of Rome.
4. The Divided Church (476-1517) encompasses the fall of Rome to the beginning of the Reformation.
5. The Reformed Church (1517-1648) begins with the Reformation and goes to the end of the Thirty Years War.
6. The Modern Church (1648–present) goes from the end of the Thirty Years War to the present.
7. The American Church (1494-present) starts with the arrival of Columbus (second voyage) and continues to the present.

**Summary:** Knowing the beliefs and actions of professed followers of Christ in the seven periods of church history is practical and helpful, because it gives us a better understanding of doctrine, denominations, and the detours taken in the past.

Some are bored with history and are even put off by it. Henry Ford threw up his hands, exclaiming, “History is the succession of one damned thing and after another!” James Joyce said, “History is a nightmare from which I am trying to escape.”

Be that as it may, there is a present and even future benefit of knowing what happened in the past. Seen on a bumper sticker: “He who controls the past controls the future. Dept. of History, University of New Orleans.”



# THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

The first period of church history is appropriately called “The Apostolic Church,” because it covers the lifetime of the apostles.

## The Start of the Church

When did the church begin? The “Genesis” theory says the church started in the book of Genesis. The word *church*, however, does not occur in the Old Testament one single time. The “Gospels” view claims it begins with John/Jesus/Jordan. The word church only occurs twice in the Gospels and in one of those, it is future (Mt. 16:18). The “genuine” explanation is that the church began on the day of Pentecost.

The baptism of the Holy Spirit began on the day of Pentecost. In Acts 1:5, it is still future, but in Acts 10:44-47 and Acts 11:15-16, it is past. Therefore, the baptism of the Holy Spirit must have begun between Acts 1 and Acts 10. Peter says, “The Holy Spirit fell upon them (the Gentiles in Acts 10), as upon us *at the beginning*” (Acts 11:15, italics added). That can only refer to the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). In other words, Peter is saying that the beginning of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was on the day of Pentecost.

The baptism of the Holy Spirit places people into the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13).

The body of Christ is called the church (Eph. 1:22-23).

Therefore, since the baptism of the Holy Spirit began at Pentecost and it places people into the body of Christ, which is the church, the church began at Pentecost.

## The Shape of the Church

The great debates in church history have been over doctrine, church polity (church government) and how to conduct church services. The formation of the New Testament has also been an area of discussion. Ehrman says the developments that shaped the church were the canon, the clergy, and the creed (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 185). To his list should be added the church service.

Years ago, several evangelical leaders decided to join the Orthodox Church. When I ask why, I was told that they became dissatisfied with evangelicalism and decided to reinvestigate the New Testament to see what it said concerning what the church ought to be. In order to determine what the New Testament taught, they decided to split up for six months, during which time each would study a different area of the church. The three areas were church doctrine, church officers, and church services. After six months they came back together. Independent of each other, each one had decided that the Orthodox Church had the right perspective on those three areas of the church.

Thus the question is, “What was the original shape of the church?” What constituted its Scripture? What did it believe? How was it organized? What were its practices in the church service? In the centuries after the apostolic age, these issues changed the shape of the church.

The New Testament teaches what God intended the church to believe, how the church should be organized, and how the church should conduct its meetings. Therefore, what the New Testament says about these issues needs to be established and all “churches” should be judged by the standard of the New Testament.

*Scripture* When Jesus was here, His scriptural authority was the Hebrew Scriptures. He quoted them frequently and said they could not be broken (Jn. 10:35). He said He fulfilled all the Scripture, “the Law of Moses, and the prophets and the Psalms” (Lk. 24:44), the threefold division that summarizes the complete contents of the Hebrew Scripture, which is identical to our Old Testament. So by that statement, Jesus gave His stamp of approval on our exact Old Testament. The authors of the New Testament also considered the Old Testament as God-inspired Scripture (2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1: 20-21).

What about the New Testament? In the Upper Room discourse, Jesus told the Disciples that the Holy Spirit “will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all things that I said to you” (Jn. 14:26) and “He will guide you into all truth; for He will not speak on His own *authority*, but whatever He hears He will speak; and He will tell you things to come” (Jn. 16:23). Jesus spoke this to the *disciples* and it has its primary fulfillment in the writings of the New Testament. Matthew and John wrote about Jesus’ words and Peter wrote some of the all things and things to come. Combining John 14:26 and John 16:13, Baxter makes the observation that bringing things to their remembrance is the Gospels, guiding them into all truth is the epistles and showing them things to come is the book of Revelation (Baxter, *Strategic Grasp Of The Bible*, p. 66).

God inspired Scripture (2 Tim. 3:16) by using the apostles or someone closely associated with the Apostles. Matthew and John were apostles, as was Paul. Mark wrote what Peter preached (Papias) and Luke was the companion of Paul. James and Jude were the half-brothers of Christ. What God inspired was recognized as such, because it is self-authenticating. So it was used and collected.

Even within the New Testament, there is evidence of the beginning of this process. Authors claimed public use of their writings (1 Thess. 5:27; Col. 4:16; Rev. 22:18). Paul called Luke Scripture (1 Tim. 5:18) and Peter called Paul’s writings Scripture (2 Pet. 3:15-16). At the end of the New Testament era, the apostle John wrote the last book and said don’t add or subtract from it (Rev. 22:18-19). It is more than just interesting that the next to the last book of the New Testament speaks of the faith was once delivered to the saints (Jude 3) and the last book says don’t add or subtract anything. The last book in the Old Testament says look for another (Mal. 4:5-6), but the New Testament concluded with a statement to the effect, “this is all there is. There is no more.”

So during the Apostolic age the Scriptural authority for the church was: 1) the Old Testament (Jesus approved our exact content, Lk. 24:44), 2) the apostles as long as they were alive (1 Cor. 11:39; 2 Cor. 13:10) and, 3) the God-inspired writings of the New Testament as they were being written and collected.

*Doctrine* The New Testament recognizes a body of truth called doctrine. Luke says the converts on the day of Pentecost “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine” (Acts 2:42). The Greek word translated “doctrine” means “teaching, instruction.” The apostles’ doctrine is what the apostles taught those new converts. The content is not given, but other passages provide some insight into what was taught.

John speaks about “the doctrine of Christ” (2 Jn. 9; see also 1 Jn. 2:22; 4:2). As is obvious from the passages where the expression is used, the doctrine of Christ is the belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God come in the flesh. It implies the Trinity.

In 2 Corinthians, the apostle Paul speaks about false apostles (2 Cor. 11:13), who were preaching another Jesus, a different Spirit, and a different gospel (2 Cor. 11:4). This verse indicates that the doctrinal content that concerns Paul included not only teachings about Christ and the Holy Spirit but about the gospel as well. The inclusion of teachings about the gospel implies teachings about people and their relationship to God. The gospel states that Christ died for our sins and rose from the dead (1 Cor. 15:3-4). The gospel is predicated on the teaching that people are made in the image of God, are sinful, and in need of a Savior. It also implies teachings about repentance and faith.

In Hebrews 6, the writer to the Hebrews mentions “the elementary principles of Christ” and lists six doctrines, namely, repentance, faith, the doctrine of baptisms, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment (Heb. 6:1-2). Repentance and faith are gospel truths. The doctrines of baptism and the laying on of hands, which is used in ordination, are church truths. The future resurrection and the judgments that follow are obviously prophetic truths. Therefore, from this passage it could be concluded that the doctrinal content of the New Testament includes salvation truth, church truth, and prophetic truth.

To sum up, from the New Testament point of view, the content of doctrine includes the categories of: 1) the Godhead, including the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit with a particular focus on the person and work of Christ; 2) the nature and need of people; 3) salvation; 4) the church; and 5) future things. Theologians have given these doctrinal areas technical names: 1) theology proper, 2) anthropology, 3) soteriology, 4) ecclesiology, and 5) eschatology.

It should also be pointed out that the apostolic church was plagued with false teaching. The Judaizers insisted that people had to keep the law in order to be saved (Acts 15:1-29; Gal.). False apostles preached another Jesus, a different Spirit, and a different gospel (2 Cor. 11:3-4). Some in the church at Corinth said there is no resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. 15:12). The church at Thessalonica was told that the day of Christ had already come (2 Thess. 2:1-2). Anti-Christ visited the church at Ephesus, telling them that Jesus was not the Christ (1 Jn. 2:22) and that He had not even come in the flesh (1 Jn. 4:2). It is important to note that some of these teachers of false doctrine wrote down their false teaching (2 Thess. 2:1-2). “Many” wrote gospels (Lk. 1:1). Therefore, it should come as no surprise if later, there are *documents* found that deny the teachings of the New Testament. It happened while the New Testament was being written!

In light of false doctrine, it should be noted that Paul urged believers to hold fast the traditions they had received (2 Thess. 2:15). Today the word “tradition” is thought of as that which originated apart from Scripture and is probably contradictory to the Scripture. That is not the way the word is used in the New Testament. Paul told the Thessalonians, “Stand fast and hold the traditions which you were taught, whether by word or our epistle” (2 Thess. 2:15). The Greek word translated “tradition” means “to hand over, to transfer.” The picture is that of something being handed to someone who, in turn, hands it to someone else. The implication being that the authority was not in the messenger but in someone beyond him. Paul speaks of the traditions of the fathers, which was the teachings handed down from his Jewish ancestors (Gal. 1:14), of the traditions of men, which were not

necessarily Jewish in origin (Col. 2:8) and the tradition which he delivered which could legitimately be called the traditions of God (1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:6; see also 1 Cor. 15:3-5 and 1 Cor. 11:22-24). The fact that what Paul passed on was “traditions” indicates that his teachings were not his. His teachings had been handed down to him from God and he, in turn, transmitted them to his converts. These traditions consisted of what he taught by word and by epistle (2 Thess. 2:15) and no doubt included doctrinal and practical instruction (2 Thess. 2:15; 3:6). This concept of holding on to traditions becomes an important issue in church history.

*Church Polity* What was the organizational structure of the churches in the apostolic church?

At first, the apostles were in charge (Acts 6:2). Apostles were men who had witnessed the resurrected Christ (Acts 1:22; 1 Cor. 9:1). They had been personally called by the Lord Himself (Gal. 1:1). Among the twelve apostles, Peter was the dominant figure. In the first twelve chapters of the book of Acts, Peter is the leading figure. On the day of Pentecost, he made the first official proclamation to the Jews in Jerusalem. He was also the first to introduce the gospel to the Gentiles. Nevertheless, as Cairns points out, “Despite his leadership, nothing of the hierarchical, authoritarian concept of the medieval Roman Catholic church is to be seen in the New Testament account of his activities” (Cairns, p. 80).

On the first missionary journey, Paul and Barnabas established churches and appointed elders (Acts 14: 23). In the New Testament, the words elder and bishop are used interchangeably; they refer to the same office (Titus 1:5, 7; Acts 20:17, 28). The Greek word for “elder” means “aged person” and is the word from which we get the English word “presbytery.” The Greek word translated “bishop” means “overseer, superintendent” and is the word from which we get the English word episcopal.

Each church had a plurality of elders/bishops who were *members of that congregation*, not authoritative figures from outside the congregation. The New Testament says that there were elders (plural) in every church (singular; Acts 14:23; 20:17; Jas. 5:14). The qualifications for elders are given in 1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:5-9.

These elders are bishops; they have oversight. They are responsible to see to it that the flock is fed (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2), exhorted (Titus 1:9), and, if necessary, rebuked (Titus 1:9). They are to see to it that correct doctrine is taught (Titus 1:5-9 with the “for” in Titus 1:10). They’re also in charge of finances (Acts 11:30). In short, elders rule (1 Tim. 5:18).

The New Testament also mentions deacons, a Greek word that means “servant, helper.” The qualifications for deacons are given in 1 Timothy 3:8-13. Beyond that, nothing is said about deacons. Acts 6:1-7 is a not a reference to deacons. Later in the book of Acts, Phillip, one of the original deacons, is not called a deacon; he is called one of the seven (Acts 21:8). Based on the word “deacon,” it can be concluded that they are to serve, probably in carrying out the decisions of the elders. Certainly, they are under the supervision of the elders.

What about the pastor? In the New Testament, pastor is a gift, not an office (Eph. 4:7-12). The “office” of leadership is given to the elders. Pastors exercise their spiritual gift to feed the flock from the Word. Elders (plural) rule. Some elders “labor in the word and doctrine” (1 Tim. 5:17). Each New Testament church probably had more than one teaching elder. Yet, it is also obvious from the Old Testament and the New Testament that God uses individuals (Moses, Joshua, David, Peter Paul, and Timothy). In any group, one person becomes the leader. Even a group of leaders ends up with a leader. In the case of elders,



the leader is one among equals, but the leader nonetheless (Timothy at Ephesus). Today we would call that individual the “Pastor” of a church.

Thus, the churches of the New Testament were autonomous congregations ruled by elders who had the oversight of the church where deacons served. There is no indication in the New Testament of any organizational authority outside the local church. The elders who are said to rule were members of the congregations they oversaw. There was no higher ecclesiastical or political authority over the local church. “There was no special class of priest set apart to minister a sacramental system of salvation because both the officials and the members of the church were spiritual priests with the right of direct access to God through Christ (Eph. 2:18)” (Cairns, pp. 79-80).

*Church Service* The New Testament does not say much about what happened in a meeting of the church. In the book of Acts, for example, almost all the meetings are not church gatherings and the speeches (sermons?) are not delivered in a church setting. The books of Acts does say that they met on the first day of the week and that the purpose of the meeting was to observe the Lord’s Table (Acts 20:7). Also, on those occasions, some preached. Like the Passover, out of which the Lord’s Supper originated, was a meal, so the New Testament Church had a meal with the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:17-34, especially verses 20-22, 33-34), called a love feast (Jude 12).

The one passage that describes what happened in the church meeting itself is in 1 Corinthians 14. That passage describes an open meeting where apparently any male could speak (1 Cor. 14:26, 34; 1 Thess. 4:19-22). They sang and someone (or several?) taught. In those days, someone may have spoken in tongues and, if so, Paul instructs that no more than three do so, that each of the three must speak in turn, and someone must interpret (1 Cor. 14:27). The one great rule was that everything must be done “for edification” (1 Cor. 14:26). Everything was to be done “decently and in order” (1 Cor. 14:40). The word translated “decently” means “well informed, eloquent, graceful.” Non-Christians were expected to attend (1 Cor. 14:23-25).

Other passages, while not describing a meeting of the church itself, do mention things to be done in such a gathering. Paul told the churches to read his letters to the congregation (1 Thess. 5:27; Col. 4:16). He instructed Timothy to have the men of the church pray (1 Tim. 2:1-8). Though he does not specifically say this is to be done in the “church service,” the context seems to suggest that is what he had in mind (1 Tim. 2:11-12). He also told churches to receive an offering (1 Cor. 16:2; Rom. 16:26) and repeatedly told them to greet one another (Phil. 4:21), usually saying, do it with a holy kiss (Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 16:20; 2 Cor. 13:12; 1 Thess. 5:26; see also 1 Pet. 5:14). Believers fellowshiped with one another (Acts 2:42) and exhorted one another (Heb. 10:25).

The believers in the New Testament “did not think of the church as a place of worship according to the common usage of the word today” (Cairns, p. 83). The church meeting was a simple, orderly, dignified gathering, that included singing, prayer, instruction, exhortation, a collection, and a meal with the observance of the Lord’s Table.

This constituted what God intended churches to believe, how they were to be governed, and how they were to conduct their meetings. As will be evident, throughout church history, so-called “churches” did not always follow the New Testament, God’s intended plan for the church. That should not surprise anyone. It first happened during New Testament times! Some people did not accept the inspired utterance of the apostle Paul (1 Cor. 14:36-38). The church was in danger of accepting false doctrine, even about Jesus and

salvation (Gal. 1:6-9; 2 Cor. 11:1-4; 2 Pet. 2; 1 Jn. 2:22-26; Jude). Some denied the resurrection of believers (1 Cor. 15:12). In at least one case, one man took over and ran the church (3 Jn. 9-10). The only passage in the epistles that describes the church service was written to correct what they were doing wrong (1 Cor. 14:23-26)! Beyond all these problems (as if that was not enough), there were problems with misinterpreting the Scripture, which Paul corrects in 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, and Titus.

For a detailed discussion of the topics of this section, see Philip Schaff, *History of the Apostolic Church*, pp. 433-492 and 545-86.

## The Spread of the Church

During this period, the church expanded rapidly. As it moved westward, several major cities became centers from which Christianity spread.

*Jerusalem* The church began on the Day of Pentecost, fifty days after the Resurrection and ten days after the Ascension (probably in the late spring of 30 AD). It began in the city of Jerusalem and was limited to that area for several years. At first, the church consisted of Jews. There were three classes of Jews and a group of Gentiles worshippers.

The Hebrews were pure Israelites. Their ancestors were from Palestine and their language was called “the Hebrew tongue,” which over the centuries had been changed from the classic Hebrew of the Old Testament into what has been called an Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaic dialect. The Scriptures were read in the synagogues in ancient Hebrew, but were translated by an interpreter, sentence by sentence, into the popular speech.

The Hellenists were from the Dispersion. Their ancestry was in foreign lands. After the conquest of the East by Alexander the Great, the Greek language became the prevailing tongue among all the lands east of the Adriatic Sea and to a large degree even in Rome and throughout Italy. Thus, the Jews of foreign ancestry were called “Grecians” or “Hellenists” (the word “Helen,” meaning “Greek”).

The Proselytes were Gentiles who had renounced heathenism, embraced the Jewish law, and received circumcision.

God-fearers were Gentiles who ceased to worship idols and attended the synagogue, but they were not yet circumcised and were not counted among the Jews.

The Jerusalem church consisted of a comparatively small number of believers all in one city, all Jewish, with little government (the apostles), much teaching, and fellowship. Its one defect was lack of missionary zeal. It stayed home when it should have gone abroad to other lands to other people.

When the Hellenists (Grecian Jews) in the church of Jerusalem began to complain about the distribution of funds to the poor, the apostles proposed that seven men be chosen for this service, several of whom became preachers. One of them, a man named Stephen, preached that Jesus was the Savior, not only for the Jews, but also for the Gentiles of every nation. This led to Stephen being the first Christian martyr. As a result of the persecution, which followed the martyrdom of Stephen, the church at Jerusalem was scattered abroad (Acts 8:1, 5). The church began expanding to the surrounding areas of Samaria (Acts 8:5), Damascus (Acts 9:1, 2, 31), Lydda (Acts 9:32), Joppa (Acts 9:36), and Caesarea (Acts 10:1).

*Antioch* Some believers fled 300 miles to Antioch, the capital of Syria (Acts 11:19). Antioch became the new center from which Christianity spread (Acts 11:19-18:22).

In every synagogue, a place was set apart for Gentile worshippers. In Antioch, when Gentiles heard the gospel, many trusted Christ, so a church grew up with Jews and Gentiles worshipping together as equals. When the church at Jerusalem heard that, they sent Barnabas to investigate. Barnabas, a discerning believer, approved. He even went to Tarsus, about 100 miles away, to bring Paul to Antioch to minister with him. It was at Antioch that believers were first called “Christians.”

Thus far, the only Gentile members of the church were those who sought admission, but at Antioch, for the first time, a team was sent out on an evangelistic mission to other lands seeking to convert both Jews and Gentiles. The two leaders of the team were Barnabas and Paul. Their first missionary journey was to Cypress and Galatia (modern Turkey).

The ultra-Jewish element in the church held that there was no salvation outside of Israel; hence, they said, all Gentile converts would have to receive circumcision and observe Jewish regulations. Paul and Barnabas were preaching that the gospel was for Jews and Gentiles based on faith in Christ without regard to Jewish law. Between these two parties, a great controversy arose, threatening a division. Finally, a council was held at Jerusalem to consider the question of Gentile membership (Acts 15). The conclusion was Gentiles, like Jews, are saved by faith alone. With that decision, the period of transition from a Jewish church to a church for people of every race and land was completed.

Because of the decision of the council at Jerusalem, the church was free to engage in an expanding effort of bringing the gospel to all people of every race and every land. The field of the church would now be the entire Roman Empire, consisting of all provinces bordering upon the Mediterranean Sea and also some lands outside of its boundaries, especially in the east. Its membership was increasingly Gentile and decreasingly Jewish.

Peter, James, and Paul were all outstanding leaders during this time. The last thirteen chapters of the book of Acts focus on Paul. The church moved westward into Europe with Antioch remaining the center or at least the home base of Paul. Paul took two more missionary journeys, both originating from Antioch (Acts 15:36-18:21; 18:22-22:15).

*Ephesus* Paul began his third missionary journey by revisiting the churches of Galatia. Then, instead of going northward to Troas, he went southward to Ephesus, the metropolis of Asia Minor. He stayed there for three years, longer than at any place in his journeys (Acts 18:23-20:38). Ephesus became the new center of Christianity. Directly or indirectly, Paul founded the seven churches of Asia (see Rev. 2-3). From Ephesus, Paul visited the churches of Europe, namely, Macedonia and Greece, including Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth.

Thus, during the first century, Ephesus was a major center of Christianity. Paul was there for three years and wrote the book of Ephesians to them. Timothy was ministering there when he received 1 Timothy. John ministered there, wrote 1 John and one of the seven letters in Revelation to them, and died there.

*Rome* After his third missionary journey, Paul went to Jerusalem. While worshipping in the Temple, he was attacked by a Jewish mob, rescued by Roman soldiers, and for his own safety, placed in Caesarea in a castle. He was a prisoner for two years. Then, he was transported to Rome where he was imprisoned for several more years.

The book of Acts ends with Paul in prison in Rome. From there, he wrote four of his epistles: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. After the book of Acts,

tradition says that he was released from prison and continued his travels. One tradition says he made it to Spain, which was his dream.

Evidently, Paul was arrested again and imprisoned in Rome. In 64, a large part of the city was destroyed by fire. Nero was charged with the crime. In order to clear himself, he declared that the Christians had set fire to the city and he began a terrible persecution against them. Thousands were tormented and put to death. Among them were Peter, who was crucified ca. 64, and Paul, who was beheaded ca. 68. By the way, one of the “revenges of history” is that the gardens of Nero, where multitudes of Christians were burned as “living torches” are now the seat of the Vatican, the home of the Roman Catholic pontiff and of St. Peter’s church, the largest edifice of the Christian faith.

The last survivor of the twelve apostles was John, living at Ephesus until about 100, where he died a natural death. History records no successor to the office of apostle.

## **The Fall of Jerusalem**

About 66, the Jews in Palestine who hated the Roman rule, rebelled. The Romans had a quarter of a million seasoned soldiers. The Jews were in a small province and were not trained for war. Furthermore, the Jews were divided into factions that slaughtered each other.

Vespasian, the Roman general, led a large army into Palestine, but he was called to Rome to assume the imperial throne. He left the conduct of the war to Titus, his son. After a terrible siege, made worse by starvation and civil strife within the city, Jerusalem was taken and destroyed in 70. Untold thousands of Jews were killed and thousands more were enslaved. The Coliseum at Rome was built by the forced labor of Jewish captives, multitudes being literally worked to death. By the way, in the fall of Jerusalem, few, if any, Christians perished. They took the Lord’s discourse in Matthew 24 literally and fled the city. Many found refuge at Pella in the Jordan Valley.

The fall of Jerusalem resulted in a change in the relationship between Christians and Jews, putting an end forever to any relationship between Christianity and Judaism. Up to that time, the church had been regarded as a branch of the Jewish religion, but henceforth, Jews and Christians were apart.

## **The History of the Apostles**

What happened to the apostles? Jesus commissioned the apostles to “go to all the world” (Mk. 16:15), “to the uttermost parts” (Acts 1:8). Information gleaned from the New Testament and gathered from sources outside of the Scriptures indicates that the apostles did what Jesus told them to do.

The New Testament indicates that Peter and John visited Samaria (Acts 8:14-25). Peter traveled throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria (Acts 7:31-32), including Lydda, Joppa and Caesarea (Acts 9:32-10:48), and later went to Corinth (1 Cor. 3:22; 9:5) and Rome (1 Pet. 5:13, where Babylon is used as figuratively of Rome). John probably went to Asia (Rev. 2-3) and definitely went to the island of Patmos (Rev. 1:9). The travels of Paul from Antioch through Galatia, Asia Minor, Greece, Rome, and possibly Spain are recorded in Acts 13-28 and Romans 15:28. Other than that, the New Testament records the death of

two of the original twelve apostles, Judas (Mt. 27:1-10; Acts 1:16-19) and James (Acts 12:1-2). What happened to the others? Where did they go? Where were they buried?

After the first century, various authors recorded stories, experiences, deaths and burials, removals, and reburials of the apostles. Archeology has added information. After years of research in books, libraries, and burial sites, Stuart McBirnie wrote *The Search for the Twelve Apostles*. It is an exhaustive study of the biblical, historical, and traditional records of the twelve apostles, as well as a few other leaders mentioned in the New Testament. Most, but not all, of the following material is taken from his book.

*Peter* (Corinth, Babylon, Rome) After the Lord's ascension, Peter ministered in Jerusalem (Acts 1:12-6:7). Peter and John visited Samaria (Acts 8:14). Peter traveled throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria (Acts 9:31-32).

After his arrest in Jerusalem, Peter left Jerusalem "for another place" (Acts 12:17, which was in 44). Eusebius claims that Peter went to Rome about 44, at the beginning of Claudius's reign (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 2.14.61). That, however, is unlikely. When Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, he mentioned Peter, implying that Peter had preached there, but in his letter to the Romans, while he mentions many others, he says nothing about Peter. McBirnie contends that Peter went to the city of Babylon and was there from 44-49. He points out that the tradition of Eastern churches is united that Peter went to Babylon. They trace their lineage to Babylon and to Peter (McBirnie, pp. 56-57, 62-63). He no doubt went to someplace outside Herod's jurisdiction (Rackham). At any rate, he went underground so successfully that no one to this day has discovered where he went (Bruce).

From the New Testament, it is evident that in 47, Peter visited Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) and, in 49, he was at the Jerusalem Council. Paul indicates that Peter had spent time in Corinth (1 Cor. 1:12; 1 Cor. 3:22) and was a traveling apostle whose wife accompanied him (1 Cor. 9:5). In 63 or 64, Peter wrote 1 Peter from Rome (1 Pet. 5:13, where Babylon is taken as a reference to Rome). There is a tradition that Peter went to Britain. Whether or not Peter visited England is not provable, but it is not "unlikely or impossible" (McBirnie, p. 63).

From the earliest times, tradition has been in agreement that Peter died in Rome (1 Clement 5:24). Declaring that he was unworthy to be crucified in the same position as the Lord, he was crucified upside down in Nero's circus in 64 and buried close by near Vatican Hill. Constantine built a basilica over Peter's resting-place.

In 1939, excavations under the Vatican discovered a "village" of houses and tombs dating from the first to the third centuries. Under the Papal altar, a small monument was found. (In the third century, a Roman named Gaius mentioned in a letter that he had seen a grave memorial to Peter.) At the foot of the monument was a slab under which was a grave. The grave was empty, but boxes were discovered nearby. Scribbling on a wall above the empty grave says, "Peter is within." On another wall was a recess lined with marble. A professor at the University of Rome, Margherita Guarducci, decided this recess was a niche (assuary) for someone's bones. She found a workman who seemed to remember that something had been found there years ago. In the storage room, she found bones from the assuary put there ten years before by a monsignor. She theorizes that when Constantine erected the church over Peter's grave (the first St. Peter's), he moved the bones from the grave and placed them a few feet away to protect them from grave robbers. Scholars have disputed these conclusions, but on June 26, 1968, Pope Paul VI announced that the bones

of Peter had been found. The bones are back in the niche under the Vatican hidden from public view (*National Geographic*, Dec. 1971, pp. 872-873).

*Andrew* (Greece, Russia?) The last New Testament record of Andrew has him in Jerusalem (Acts 1:13). One tradition says he went to Scythia, which is southern Russia, in the area around the Black Sea (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* III, 1, 1.). For a long time, he was the patron saint of Russia. Another tradition places Andrew in Greece. It is generally accepted that Andrew was martyred in Patras, Greece in 69. Supposedly he was crucified on a cross made in the form of an X, a type of cross now known as St. Andrew's cross. A third tradition describes Andrew in Ephesus, where, as a result of a revelation given to him, John wrote his gospel. McBirnie concludes that these traditions are complementary, not contradictory (McBirnie, p. 81).

In 336, Constantine began building a shrine to the apostles in Constantinople. It was completed by his son and consecrated about 356. It contained the relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy. A few bones reputed to be those of Andrew were transported to Scotland and buried in a place later called "St. Andrews." Today Andrew is the patron saint of Scotland and the St. Andrew's cross is the official symbol of Scotland. Andrew is also the patron saint of Russia and Greece.

Apparently, in 1210 the relics of Andrew were stolen from Constantinople and taken to the cathedral of Amalfi near Naples. In 1462, Pope Pius II transferred the head to St. Peter's in Rome and, in 1964, the Pope gave it to the Greek Orthodox Church in Patras. McBirnie feels that the relics of Andrew "have more evidence for genuineness than any of the other apostles" (McBirnie, p. 86).

*James, Son of Zebedee* (Jerusalem) James, the son of Zebedee and the brother of John, was the first apostle to become a martyr. Herod Agrippa I murdered him about 44 (Acts 12:1-2). There is a tradition that James went to Spain, but because of his early death, most scholars think that it is unlikely. Although the Spanish tradition is that James founded the church there, historians generally assign the beginning of the church in Spain to the second or third century (see McBirnie, pp. 94-104).

No doubt James was originally buried near Jerusalem. The Cathedral of St. James in Jerusalem, which is the seat of the Armenian Patriarchate, claims the head of James is buried there. (Others forcefully argue that this is the burial place of James the brother of Jesus.) Various places in Spain claim to have some of the bones of James. The almost universal practice of the fragmentation of relics in the Middle Ages makes it possible that relics of James might be at Compostela in Spain (McBirnie, pp. 104-06).

So, while it is improbably (though not impossible) that James went to Spain, it is possible that his bones may have ended up there.

*John* (Ephesus) John, the son of Zebedee and brother of James, was the author of the fourth Gospel, the epistles of John, and the book of Revelation. One tradition says John stayed in Jerusalem to care for Mary, the mother of Jesus until she died (Nicephorus, *Eccl. Hist.* 2.2). Another tradition, which is much more likely, says John moved to Ephesus and took Mary with him. To this day, there is the "house of Saint Mary" in Ephesus. There is a tomb of Mary in Jerusalem, but not one in Ephesus, although some archaeological evidence suggests there once was one there (McBirnie, p. 110).

Irenaeus (115?-202), a native of Asia Minor and a disciple of Polycarp, speaks of the teachings of John in Ephesus (Irenaeus, *v. Haer.* II, 22). Tertullian says John was with Peter

in Rome (Tertullian, *De Praescriptione*, 36). Augustine states that John preached to the Parthians, people who lived on the border between what is now Russia and Iran.

John was exiled to Patmos (Rev. 1:9; Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 18.1). Eusebius says after he was released from Patmos, John returned to Ephesus (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 20).

John's brother James was the first apostle to die. John was the last one to die. He died peacefully in Ephesus in advanced age, possibly around 100 years old (McBirnle, p. 109). There is a tomb in Jerusalem where John is supposed to have been buried. "Some relics of all other apostles still exist, but the grave of John, which is perhaps the best attested of any apostolic tomb by history and archaeology, contains no relics, nor are there any historical traces or traditions of what may have become of them!" (McBirnle, p. 110).

*Philip* (Hierapolis, France?) According to one account, after the ascension, Philip traveled to Scythia, where he preached the gospel for 20 years, before preaching at Hierapolis (McBirnle, p. 123). Evidently, Hierapolis was Philip's primary place of ministry. Papias (95-110) says he heard the daughters of Philip speaking in Hierapolis (Papias, *Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord*; McBirnle, p. 123). Hierapolis did not receive a letter from Paul or John, whereas the neighboring cities of Colosse, which is 16 miles from Hierapolis, and Laodicea, which was 6 miles from Hierapolis, did. It has been suggested that the reason for this is that Hierapolis was Philip's turf (Danielou cited by McBirnle, p. 124).

There are some strong later traditions that Philip visited France (see McBirnle, pp. 126-128 for the details), but these traditions are also debated. Hierapolis was in Galatia. It was people from Galatia who migrated to France, becoming known as the Gauls. On the one hand, it would be reasonable to assume that Philip, the missionary to the Galatians, also traveled to France to be a missionary to their kinsman. On the other hand, some claim that the tradition that Philip visited the Gauls in France is based upon a mistake that confuses Gauls with Galatia.

Polycrates (ca.130-196) says Philip died at Hierapolis (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* III. 31.3). He was pierced through the thighs and hanged upside down (McBirnle, p. 130). Philip's tomb is at Hierapolis to this day (McBirnle, p. 124). Pope John the Third (560-572) transported the body of Philip from Hierapolis to a church in Rome, which he called "The Church of the Holy Apostle." That church is still known as "The Church of the Holy Apostles." The bones of Philip and James are in a large marble sarcophagus under the altar and in a reliquary room behind it. Fragments of bones of other apostles can also be seen in the same room (McBirnle, pp. 128-129).

*Bartholomew* (Armenia) The only mention of Bartholomew in the New Testament is in the synoptic gospels (Mt. 10:3; Mk. 3:18; Lk. 6:14; and in Acts 1:13). Many have concluded that the Nathanael of John 1:45 was the Bartholomew of the synoptic gospels (Westcott; Godet; Plummer; Barclay; Morris). Later in John 1, Jesus promised Nathanael further manifestations of supernatural power, which implies that Nathanael had to remain with him. Nathanael is identified with the apostles in John 21. That seems to necessitate that he be identified with the Bartholomew of the synoptic gospels.

There are many different traditions concerning Bartholomew's travels. He is said to have preached in Hierapolis with Philip, in Armenia (in the area around the south end of the Caspian Sea, which today is divided between Iran and the Soviet Union), India and even in the northwest parts of Africa (see McBirnle, pp. 139-138 for details). The Armenian Church claims Bartholomew as its founder. The word "India" was applied by Greek and

Latin writers to Arabia, Ethiopia, Libya, Parthia, Persia, and the lands of the Medes (McBirnie, p. 140).

There are several traditions concerning Bartholomew's death. One is that he was placed in a sack and cast into the sea. The one mentioned often is that he was skinned alive and crucified upside down. Apparently, like the bones of the other apostles, the bones of Bartholomew are widely scattered today—with the larger parts of the body being in Rome (McBirnie, p. 138).

*Thomas (India)* Except for John and Peter, more is known about Thomas than almost any other apostle. "The Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church of the East" in India claims to have been founded by Peter, Thomas, Thaddeus, and Mari of the Seventy. Evidently, Thomas arrived in India no later than 49. The tradition of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church in south India says Thomas landed there in 52 and founded several churches. There is also a tradition that Thomas founded churches in northern India (McBirnie, pp. 144-148).

No written account of Thomas in India contemporaneous with him has survived. The earliest written record concerning Thomas in India is the apocryphal *Acts of Saint Thomas* written toward the end of the second century (McBirnie, p. 152, 166).

According to Indian tradition, Thomas was martyred by being pierced by a lance and buried in Mylapore, a suburb of Madras, a coastal town in India (McBirnie, p. 153, 168). His remains were moved to Edessa and later to Ortona in Italy, where they now rest (McBirnie, p. 154).

*Matthew (Ethiopia)* Some of the many traditions concerning Matthew seem to be mutually contradictory. Like the other apostles, he preached in a number of different countries. He is said to have preached in Palestine, where he spent 15 years, Ethiopia, Macedonia, and Persia. Part of the problem is there were two places in the ancient world by the name of Ethiopia, one in Africa and another in Persia. The one in Persia was off the well-traveled trade route. The tradition that says he was in the Ethiopia of Africa also says he lodged in the house of the eunuch who had been baptized by Phillip.

There are also contradictory claims concerning his death. One account says he died a natural death, while the Talmud says he was condemned to death by the Jewish Sanhedrin. McBirnie says there are too many stories of his death to be certain where he died (McBirnie, p. 182). The body of Matthew is reputed to be enshrined in the cathedral of San Matteo at Salerno, Italy (McBirnie, p. 180).

*James, Son of Alphaeus* The apostle James, the son of Alphaeus, is also called the "Less" or "Younger." He was a brother of the apostle Matthew and the son of Mary, who was Mary, the wife of one Cleopas. Not much is known about the later ministry. He is said to be the first bishop of the Syrian church.

There are several versions of His death. He is reported to have been martyred by crucifixion at Ostrakine in Lower Egypt, where he was preaching the Gospel. It has also been said that he was stoned in Jerusalem for preaching Christ and buried by the Sanctuary. A carpenter's saw is the symbol associated with him in Christian art because it is also noted that his body was later sawed to pieces

The body of James was discovered in Jerusalem and taken to Constantinople during the reign of Justinian. In 572, the body of James was brought from Constantinople to Rome and was interred by Pope John III in the church, which was first known as "The Church of the Apostles Philip and James the Less." In the tenth century, the name of the church was shortened to the "Church of the Holy Apostles."



*Jude Thaddaeus* In Matthew, Jude Thaddaeus is called “Lebbaeus” whose surname was “Thaddaeus” (Mt. 10:3), in Mark, he is called “Thaddeus” (Mk. 3:18), and in Luke, he is called “Judas the son of James” (Lk. 6:16; Acts 1:13). An early church historian (Nicephorus Callistus, Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 240) says Jude preached in Syria, Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Persia. He adds that Jude suffered martyrdom in Syria.

According to McBirnie, one of the firmest facts in all of the post-biblical Christian tradition is the association of Jude with the Armenian Church. Jude is consistently associated with one of five apostles who visited Armenia, especially Bartholomew. McBirnie says it is generally accepted that Jude was in Armenia for eight years (35-43) and that Bartholomew was there for 16 years (44-60). He adds that both are said to have suffered martyrdom in Armenia: Jude at Ardaze in 50 and Bartholomew at Derbend in 68 (McBirnie, p. 199). Another tradition claims that Jude was in Armenia from 43-66 and was joined by Bartholomew in 60. It says Bartholomew was martyred in 68 at Derbend (McBirnie, p. 200). Until this day, there is a shrine for Jude at Aztaz (Macao) and one for Bartholomew at Alpac (Bashkale) in south-east Armenia (McBirnie, p. 200).

The Church of the East in India claims that the leaven they use in the communion is made from a portion of the original bread used by Jesus at the Last Supper and was brought to the India by Jude. The problem is the bread Jesus used was not made with leaven. He was celebrating the Passover, which required *unleavened* bread (Ex. 12:15)!

McBirnie believes that Jude preached in Syria and Northern Persia. He says it is likely that Jude died in Persia and was originally buried at Kara Kelesia, near the Caspian Sea, about 40 miles from Tabriz in Iran. Later because of the threat of the Mongolian invasion Jude’s body was removed and it is not unreasonable to believe that parts of his bones are found in Rome and even in Tolosa, Spain (McBirnie, p. 206).

*Simon the Canaanite* Simon the Canaanite is also known as Simon the zealot. McBirnie examines the various traditions of Simon and concludes that Simon left Jerusalem, traveled to Egypt, went through North Africa to Carthage, and from there traveled to Spain and to Britain. The Coptic Church of Egypt claims that Simon went to Egypt, Africa, Britain, and died in Persia (McBirnie, p. 208). McBirnie places Simon’s “possible and even probable” visit to Britain in 50 (McBirnie, p. 224-225), but concludes that he was forced to leave Britain because of unsettled conditions (McBirnie, p. 231).

There is a strong tradition that Simon went to Persia in the company of Jude with whom he was martyred. There is a tradition that Simon was martyred on May 10, 61 in Britain, but McBirnie rejects that tradition because the tradition of Simon’s death in Persia is too strong (McBirnie, p. 214). Simon is said to have been “sawn asunder” and Jude was killed with a halberd (McBirnie, p. 231). According to the Roman Catholic Church, the bodies of Jude and Simon are buried together, the bones being a mingled. Parts of the bones ended up in various places in Europe

*Judas* Matthew says Judas hanged himself (Mt. 27:5), but Acts 1:18 says Judas “falling headlong, he burst open in the middle and all his entrails gushed out.” These accounts are complementary, not contradictory. The place where Judas hanged himself was filled with jagged rocks. When Judas hanged himself at the end of the branch of the tree, the branch broke and he fell on the jagged rocks (Edersheim; Alexander on Acts).

*Matthias* Matthias is the apostle who replaced Judas. He is also one of the five apostles credited by the Armenian tradition of evangelizing Armenia. The five were Jude, Bartholomew, Simon, Andrew, and Matthias. Various traditions have Matthias suffering

martyrdom in Judea, at Colchis, at Sebastopol. Also according to tradition, the body of Matthias was kept in Jerusalem until it was taken to Rome by Helena (the mother of Constantine). Later it was moved to Trier in Northern Italy, where it is today. Actually, there are parts of the body of Matthias at Rome and at Trier (McBirnie, p. 246).

*Paul* Acts closes with Paul in prison in Rome. The history of the remainder of his life must be put together from hints in the New Testament and a few statements outside of it. Apparently, he was released from his first Roman imprisonment. He anticipated that (Phil. 1:19, 25, 26; 2:24) and the Pastorals demand it. He was probably banished not *to* someplace (like John on the Isle of Patmos), but *from* someplace, namely, Palestine.

After his release from prison in Rome, in spite of his earlier expectation (Acts 20:38), Paul went to Ephesus and perhaps to other churches in the area, like Colosse (Philem. 22). He left Ephesus for Macedonia where he probably wrote 1 Timothy from Philippi in 62. As he anticipated, he no doubt returned to Ephesus (1 Tim. 3:14) and Macedonia. He then journeyed to the island of Crete, where he left Titus to continue the work (Titus 1:5). Apparently, he then traveled to Corinth, where he wrote Titus (Titus 3:13).

After meeting Titus in Nicopolis (Titus 3:12), he went to Spain as planned (Rom. 15:24-28). The *Epistle of Clement* and the *Muratorian Fragment* implied that Paul went to Spain (McBirnie, p. 281). McBirnie suggests the possibility that Paul even went to England (McBirnie, pp. 288-to 91). At any rate, after Spain (or England), he visited Greece and Asia again, more specifically Corinth, Miletus, and Troas (2 Tim. 4:13-20) and may have been arrested in Troas.

Nero, emperor of Rome from 54 to 68, was responsible for the beginning of the Roman persecution of Christians. Rumors that he was responsible for the fire that destroyed a large portion of Rome caused him to use the unpopular Christians as his scapegoat. When Paul returned from Spain, his enemies used the official Roman position against Christianity against Paul. Paul was martyred in Rome in the spring of 68.

*Barnabas* After the dispute with Paul over John Mark, nothing more is said about Barnabas in the New Testament. Tradition says that he returned to Cyprus and was killed there by Jews. It is said that John Mark secretly buried his body in a sepulcher cut from the rock outside of Salamis (McBirnie, pp. 260-61). According to Roman Catholic tradition, the wrong bones of Barnabas had been widely scattered (McBirnie, p. 262). Along with others, Conybeare and Howson believe that Barnabas wrote the book of Hebrews. If that is true, McBirnie suggests it is possible that after Paul was martyred, Barnabas may have gone to Rome until Timothy was released. If that was the case, it does not preclude Barnabas returning to Cyprus, where he was killed (McBirnie, p. 262).

*John Mark* According to a clear tradition, after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, John Mark went to Alexandria in Egypt, where there was a large Jewish population (McBirnie, p. 254). The consensus is that he was martyred in 68 (McBirnie, p. 255; see p. 256 for details). Mark's ministry and martyrdom in Alexandria has a great deal of historical support.

Mark was buried in Alexandria, but when the Arabs stormed Alexandria in 642, they stole the head of his corpse. Later it was taken to Venice. Pope Paul VI restored parts of the body of Mark to Saint Mark's Cathedral in Alexandria.

*Lazarus* There is an ancient tradition on the island of Cyprus that Lazarus fled from Jerusalem about 64. He was a bishop in Citium for 30 years. He died in Citium, but his

body was carried to Constantinople and later to Marseilles, France. Lazarus is better remembered in France than is Philip. He is regarded as the apostle of Gaul.

To sum up: obeying the Lord's command to preach the Gospel in all nations, the apostles traveled over the entire known world.

Based on his research, Gottlieb Schumacher concluded "that Matthew suffered martyrdom in Ethiopia, killed by a sword wound. John faced martyrdom when he was boiled in a huge basin of boiling oil during a wave of persecution in Rome. Miraculously delivered from death, he was then sentenced to the mines on the prison island of Patmos.

"Peter was crucified upside down on an X-shaped cross because he told his tormentors that he felt unworthy to die in the same way that Jesus Christ had. James the Just, the leader of the church in Jerusalem, was thrown a hundred feet down from the southeast pinnacle of the Temple when he refused to deny his faith in Christ. When they discovered that he survived the fall, his enemies beat him to death with a fuller's club.

"Bartholomew, also known as Nathaniel, was a missionary to Asia. He witnessed to our Lord in present-day Turkey. Bartholomew was martyred for his preaching in Armenia when he was flayed to death by a whip.

"Andrew was crucified on an X-shaped cross in Parras, Greece. After being whipped severely by seven soldiers, they tied his body to the cross with cords to prolong his agony. His followers reported that when he was led toward the cross, Andrew saluted it in these words: 'I have long desired and expected this happy hour. The cross has been consecrated by the body of Christ hanging on it.' He continued to preach to his tormentors for two days until he expired.

"The apostle Thomas was stabbed with a spear in India during one of his missionary trips to establish the church in the subcontinent. Matthias, the apostle chosen to replace the traitor Judas Iscariot, was stoned and then beheaded.

"James the Greater, a son of Zebedee, was ultimately beheaded at Jerusalem. The Roman officer who guarded James watched amazed as James defended his faith at his trial. Later, the officer walked beside James to the place of execution. Overcome by conviction, he declared his new faith to the judge and knelt beside James to accept beheading as a Christian" (quoted by Grant R. Jeffrey, *The Signature of God*. Toronto: Frontier Research Publication, 1996, which is cited by Dave Earley, *The 21 Most Effective Prayers of the Bible*. Uhrichsville, Ohio: Barbour Publishing, Inc., 2005).

**Summary:** The church began with a small group of Jews in Jerusalem, but by the end of the lifetime of the apostles, it had virtually spread over the then-known world.

The church with elders for shepherding and oversight had meetings that were simple, and evidently spontaneous, though orderly. The purpose of their Sunday gathering was to observe the Lord's Supper. In these gatherings, they read the Scriptures, prayed, taught, sang, received an offering, and greeted one another with a holy kiss.



# THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH

Although the universality of Christianity is a common idea in the New Testament, the term “catholic” never appears there. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch in the early second century, is apparently the first to use the word. He spoke of the “Catholic Church,” when he said, “Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church.” By the end of the second century, the term *catholic* was widely used of the church in the sense that the Catholic Church was both universal, in contrast to local congregations, and orthodox, in contrast to heretical groups (Shelley, p. 28; Everett Harrison, p. 93). Kuiper says that it was when the heretics begin breaking away and forming their own church that the “Great Church” from which they separated took the name “Catholic” or universal church (Kuiper, p. 38).

The Catholic Church is not to be confused with the Roman Catholic Church, which was a later development. The term “Catholic church” is used here in the sense that in the second and third centuries, the church was universal. Cairns uses the expression “Old Catholic Imperial Church” in contrast to the “Roman Catholic system” (Crains, p. 21).

Because persecution was a prominent feature during this period, it could be called the period of persecution. Besides persecution, other issues that should be considered during this period include such things as the production of Christian literature, the formation of the New Testament, the presence of heresies, the development of church polity, that is, church government, and church practices, namely, the church service.

## Persecution

Jesus told the apostles, “Remember the word that I said to you, ‘A servant is not greater than his master.’ If they persecuted Me, they will also persecute you” (Jn. 15:20). Sure enough, the apostles were persecuted. The persecution of Peter, John, and Paul are recorded in the book of Acts, as is the martyrdom of Stephen and James. The persecutions that began in the first century lasted until the Edict of Milan in 313.

*The Nature of the Persecutions* Not all the persecutions during this period were emperor-sponsored or empire-wide. Nor were they continuous, although some lasted for years at a time. Most of the time, the sword of persecution was sheathed.

During the first two centuries, there were only three officially sanctioned persecutions, one by Nero (54-58), one by Trajan (98-117), and one by Marcus Aurelius (161-180) (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 150). Until 250, persecution was local and sporadic (Cairns, p. 91). Beginning with the Roman Emperor Decius, persecution was empire-wide (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 150). “Only two imperial persecutions—those of Decius and Diocletian—extended over the empire” (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 2, ch. 2).

*The Causes of the Persecutions* There were a number of different causes of persecutions (see Cairns, pp. 87-90). One cause was religious. The Jews felt that Christians were wrong because they did not observe the Mosaic Law and the Romans felt Christians were atheists because they did not believe in the gods.

Another cause was moral. Christians were considered immoral because (it was believed) they practiced incest and cannibalism in secret meetings. They called each other “brother” and “sister” and celebrated a love feast. Since they readily admitted eating a body

and drinking blood, they were accused of killing and eating infants as a sacrifice to their god. Justin Martyr wrote, “Are our lives and customs also slandered among you? And I ask this: have you also believed concerning us, that we eat men; and that after the feast, having extinguished the lights, we engage in promiscuous concubinage?” (Justin Martyr, *Dialog.*, 10).

There was a practical cause. Christians were charged with being responsible for plagues because of their refusal to recognize the gods. In their displeasure, the gods punished Rome with famine, etc. Tertullian says that people hated Christians because “they think Christians are the cause of every public calamity and every misfortune. If the River Tiber rises up as high as the city walls, if the Nile does not rise to the fields, if the weather will not change, or if there’s an earthquake, a famine, a plague, straightway the cry is heard out, ‘Toss the Christians to the Lions!’” (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 156).

There was a social cause. Christians were a threat to the aristocratic structure of society because they taught the equality of all men.

There was an economic cause. Christians destroyed the economy when many of the citizens converted to Christianity, putting idol makers, priests, soothsayers, et al. out of business (Acts 19:27). Pliny the Younger wrote, “The contagion of this superstition (Christianity) had spread in the villages and rural areas as well as in the larger cities to such an extent that the temples had been almost deserted and the sellers of sacrificial animals impoverished.”

Then, of course, there was a political cause. Christians were said to be disloyal to the state because they would not recognize Caesar as Lord. Christians were *not* persecuted by the Roman government because they were Christians. Christians were persecuted because they refused to worship the state god. As far as the Romans were concerned, the state god made the state great. So refusing to worship the state god was a political statement of disloyalty to the state (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 150).

*The Results of the Persecutions* One of the results of persecution was the rapid spread of Christianity. Tertullian said, “The *blood of the martyrs* is the *seed of the Church*” (Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, Chapter 50).

During the first century, Christianity spread from Jerusalem to Rome. By 200, Christians were found in all parts of the Roman Empire. By 300, it is estimated that the size of the church was 5 to 15 percent of the population of the empire, which was between 50 million and 75 million (Cairns, pp. 93-94).

*The Number of the Persecutions* Latourette says that beginning with Nero in the first century and concluding with Diocletian in the fourth century, ten persecutions are usually enumerated (Latourette, p. 85). *Fox’s Book of Martyrs* lists “Ten Primitive Persecutions” (Fox, pp. 5-33). Schaff says that has been the case since the fifth century. He goes on to say that the number was suggested by the ten plagues of Egypt taken as types and by the ten horns of the Roman beast making war with the Lamb, taken as emperors. He adds, “The number is too great for the general persecutions, and too small for the provincial and local” (Schaff, vol. 2, ch. 2).

1. Nero (64). On the night of June 18, 64 AD, a fire broke out in Rome. It burned for six days and seven nights. Then sporadically flared up for three more days. Of the 14 sections of the city, 10 were destroyed (González, vol. 1, p. 33). Thousands were left homeless (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 151).

When the people suspected Nero, to avert suspicion from himself, he accused Christians of arson and ordered them punished. This persecution was confined to Rome (Kuiper, p. 8). It was the persecution that took the lives of Peter and Paul, although not necessarily at this time (Latourette, p. 85).

In 115, Tacitus wrote, “To kill the rumors, Nero charged and tortured some people hated for their evil practices—the group popularly known as ‘Christians.’ The founder of this sect, Christ, had been put to death by the governor of Judea, Pontius Pilate, when Tiberius was Emperor. Their deadly superstition had been suppressed temporarily, but was beginning to spring up again not now just in Judea but even in Rome itself where all kinds of sordid and shameful activities are attracted and catch on. First those who confessed to being Christians were arrested. Then, on information obtained from them, hundreds were convicted, more for their anti-social beliefs than for fire-raising. In their deaths, they were made a mockery. They were covered in the skins of wild animals, torn to death by dogs, crucified or set on fire—so that when darkness fell, they burned like torches in the night. Nero opened up his own gardens for this spectacle and gave a show in the arena, where he mixed with the crowd, or stood dressed as a charioteer on a chariot. As a result, although they were guilty of being Christians and deserved death, people began to feel sorry for them. For they realized that they were being massacred not for the public good but to satisfy one man’s mania” (Tacitus, *Annals*, 15:44).

2. Domitian (95). In the book of Revelation, John says that he was a “companion” in “tribulation” with the seven churches of Asia and that he was on the isle of “Patmos for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ” (Rev. 1:9). John also says that Antipas had been killed at Pergamos (Rev. 2:13). Irenaeus (d. 202), who as boy in Smyrna listened to Polycarp who had been a disciple of John, says that John received the apocalyptic vision toward the end of the reign of Domitian. Hence the conclusion there was persecution during the reign of Domitian.

About 175, Melito, bishop of the church at Sardis, wrote that Nero and Domitian alone, stimulated by certain malicious persons, showed a disposition to slander our faith” (cited by Eusebius). About 197, Tertullian said, “Nero was the first to rage with the imperial sword against this school in the very hour of its rise in Rome” and “Domitian too, who was a good deal of a Nero in cruelty, attempted it ... soon stopped ... restored those he had banished” (Tertullian, *Apol.* 5).

Eusebius wrote, “Domitian, having shown great cruelty toward many, and having unjustly put to death no small number of well-born and notable men at Rome, and having without cause exiled and confiscated the property of a great many other illustrious men, finally became a successor of Nero in his hatred and enmity toward God. He was in fact the second that stirred up a persecution against us, although his father Vespasian had undertaken nothing prejudicial to us” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.17).

One explanation for this persecution is that the Jews refused to pay a tax levied to support the Temple of Capitolinus Jupiter. Since Christians were associated with the Jews, they suffered the effects of the wrath of the emperor Domitian (Cairns, p. 91).

Hegesippus (ca. 117-189), called the Father of Church History, tells of some relatives of the Lord who were brought to Domitian. Eusebius wrote, “But when this same Domitian had commanded that the descendants of David should be slain, an ancient tradition says that some of the heretics brought accusation against the descendants of Jude (said to have

been a brother of the Savior according to the flesh), on the ground that they were of the lineage of David and were related to Christ himself. Hegesippus relates these facts in the following words" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.19). "Of the family of the Lord there were still living the grandchildren of Jude, who is said to have been the Lord's brother according to the flesh. Information was given that they belonged to the family of David, and they were brought to the Emperor Domitian by the Evocatus. For Domitian feared the coming of Christ as Herod also had feared it. And he asked them if they were descendants of David, and they confessed that they were. Then he asked them how much property they had, or how much money they owned. And both of them answered that they had only nine thousand denarii, half of which belonged to each of them. And this property did not consist of silver, but of a piece of land which contained only thirty-nine acres, and from which they raised their taxes and supported themselves by their own labor. Then they showed their hands, exhibiting the hardness of their bodies and the callousness produced upon their hands by continuous toil as evidence of their own labor. And when they were asked concerning Christ and his kingdom, of what sort it was and where and when it was to appear, they answered that it was not a temporal nor an earthly kingdom, but a heavenly and angelic one, which would appear at the end of the world, when he should come in glory to judge the quick and the dead, and to give unto every one according to his works. Upon hearing this, Domitian did not pass judgment against them, but, despising them as of no account, he let them go, and by a decree put a stop to the persecution of the Church. But when they were released, they ruled the churches because they were witnesses and were also relatives of the Lord. And peace being established, they lived until the time of Trajan. These things are related by Hegesippus" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.10. 1-8).

Eusebius also wrote, "Tertullian also has mentioned Domitian in the following words: Domitian also, who possessed a share of Nero's cruelty, attempted once to do the same thing that the latter did. But because he had, I suppose, some intelligence, he very soon ceased, and even recalled those whom he had banished. But after Domitian had reigned fifteen years, and Nerva had succeeded to the empire, the Roman Senate, according to the writers that record the history of those days, voted that Domitian's honors should be cancelled, and that those who had been unjustly banished should return to their homes and have their property restored to them. It was at this time that the apostle John returned from his banishment in the island and took up his abode at Ephesus, according to an ancient Christian tradition" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.20.9-11).

It has been pointed out that the persecutions under Nero and Domitian were not undertaken by the state; they were personal matters and established no precedent as to the conduct of the state toward Christianity. These were outbursts of individuals.

3. Trajan (98-117). For fear of an uprising against Rome, local law in Bithynia forbade all public meetings, including the gathering of the fire brigade. As a result, entire towns were burned down. About 112, Pliny the Younger, the governor of Bithynia, wrote a letter to Emperor Trajan to discuss his problems with social gatherings. He was particularly concerned that a group called "Christians," who met in secret before dark to eat food together. They sang hymns to Christ as if a God (Ehrman, vol. 1, pp. 153-154).

Pliny described his procedure in treating Christians. If a person was accused of being a Christian, he was brought before the tribunal and asked whether or not he was a Christian. If, after three such questions, the person admitted to the charge, he was sentenced to death. Trajan answered Pliny, saying that he was following the proper procedure. Christians were



not to be sought out, but if someone reported that an individual was a Christian, that person was to be punished, unless he recanted and worshiped the gods of the Romans. It was during this persecution that Ignatius was martyred (Cairns, p. 91). This was the first organized persecution, which brought Christians into the courts as defendants. The policies outlined by Trajan were followed throughout the second century and part of the third (González, vol. 1, p. 41).

From this exchange between Pliny and Trajan, it is evident that becoming a Christian was not a crime; remaining a Christian was a crime. To avoid execution, all an accused Christian had to do was recant (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 156).

4. Hadrian (117-138). Hadrian insisted that those who were innocent of the charge of being Christians should be protected. He even commanded that those be punished who brought accusations that could not be proven against alleged Christians, but he did not forbid action against real Christians (Latourette, pp. 85-86). Schaff says that Hadrian was both a friend and a foe of the church. "He was devoted to the religion of the state, bitterly opposed to Judaism, indifferent to Christianity, from ignorance of it. He insulted the Jews and the Christians alike by erecting temples of Jupiter and Venus over the site of the Temple and the supposed spot of the crucifixion. He is said to have directed the Asiatic proconsul to check the popular fury against the Christians, and to punish only those who should be, by an orderly judicial process, convicted of the transgression of the laws. But no doubt he regarded, like Trajan, the mere profession of Christianity itself such a transgression. The Christian apologies, which took their rise under this emperor, indicate a very bitter public sentiment against the Christians, and a critical condition of the church. The least encouragement from Hadrian would have brought on a bloody persecution" (Schaff, vol. 2, ch. 2.18).

It should be pointed out that the next emperor was Antoninus Pius, who ruled from 138-161. Schaff reports, "Antoninus Pius protected the Christians from the tumultuous violence which broke out against them on account of the frequent public calamities. But the edict ascribed to him, addressed to the deputies of the Asiatic cities, testifying to the innocence of the Christians, and holding them up to the heathen as models of fidelity and zeal in the worship of God, could hardly have come from an emperor, who bore the honorable title of Pius for his conscientious adherence to the religion of his fathers; and in any case, he could not have controlled the conduct of the provincial governors and the fury of the people against an illegal religion. The persecution of the church at Smyrna and the martyrdom of its venerable bishop (Polycarp), which was formerly assigned to the year 167, under the reign of Marcus Aurelius, took place, according to more recent research, under Antoninus in 155, when Statius Quadratus was proconsul in Asia Minor" (Schaff, vol. 2, ch. 2.19).

5. Marcus Aurelius (161-181). Marcus Aurelius was a devout Stoic, who was inclined to ascribe the natural and manmade calamities during his reign to the growth of Christianity (Cairns, p. 91). He decreed that the property of Christians should be given to their accusers. Since people were eager to have the property, they came forward with accusations. Persecution became virtually universal (Kuiper, p. 10). It was cruel and barbaric, the most severe since Nero. Thousands were beheaded or thrown to wild beasts, among them Justin Martyr.

With the death of Marcus Aurelius persecution came to a close. Except for the persecution under Septimus Severus, the church, on the whole, enjoyed rest from persecution for some 70 years (Kuiper, p. 11).

6. Septimus Severus (202-211). Trying to restore the decaying religions of Rome, Septimus Severus fiercely persecuted Christians. Believers in Egypt and North Africa suffered the most. In Alexandria, many were daily burned, crucified, or beheaded. Many believers regarded him as the anti-Christ. During the persecution under Severus, Hippolytus wrote a commentary on Daniel to encourage Christians faced with martyrdom and persecution. It is the earliest orthodox Christian commentary on Scripture. Interpreting Daniel as an allegory, Hippolytus teaches Christians to stand in the face of persecution like the characters in Daniel. When Origen was slightly less than 17 years old, in the persecution by Severus, his father was imprisoned and killed and the family's property was confiscated (Latourette, p. 149).

7. Maximinus the Thracian (235-238). Schaff says Maximinus the Thracian was a rude barbarian, who "gave free course to the popular fury against the enemies of the gods, which was at that time excited anew by an earthquake. It is uncertain whether he ordered the entire clergy or only the bishops to be killed. He who plundered also heathen temples" (Schaff, vol. II, ch. 2.21). Origen escaped being killed by hiding.

8. Decius (249-251). Decius was the first emperor to order a general persecution with a definite purpose of destroying the church (Kuiper, p. 12). In 250, he issued an edict that at least annually, everyone had to make an animal sacrifice to the traditional Roman gods and the "genius of the Roman emperor." Those received a certificate called a *libellus* (Cairns, p. 92). Those who did not receive the certificates were imprisoned or executed. This was the most violent persecution the church had yet faced. The Bishop of Rome (Origen), and the Bishop of Jerusalem were imprisoned, where they perished (Latourette, p. 88). Cyprian said, "The whole world is devastated." During this persecution, receiving repentant Christians who had offered sacrifices on pagan altars became an issue.

9. Valerian (257-260). The persecution under Valerian was more severe than the one under Decius. Valerian aimed at the utter destruction of Christianity. Christians were threatened with execution if they attended church meetings or even visited a Christian cemetery. Bishops were particularly singled out and were commanded to worship the old gods or be exiled (Latourette, pp. 88-89). Many leaders were executed, among them Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (Cairns, p. 92).

10. Diocletian (303-311). The persecution under Diocletian was the most severe that Christians ever experienced (Latourette, p. 90). In March of 303, Diocletian ordered the destruction of all churches, the cessation of all Christian meetings, the burning of all Scriptures, and the imprisonment of all whom persisted in their testimony to Christ. A latter edict ordered Christians to sacrifice to pagan gods or suffer death (Cairns, p. 93). Eusebius said that the prisons became so crowded with Christians that there was not enough room for criminals (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 8.6).

Persecution persisted under Diocletian's successor, Galerius, but on his deathbed, Galerius issued an edict that gave toleration to Christians (Kuiper, 12), provided they did not violate the peace (Schaff, vol. 2, ch. 25). Persecution ceased completely with the Edict of Milan (a.k.a. Edict of Tolerance) in 313.

This persecution raised the issue of the canon. If the possession of Scripture meant death, Christians wanted to be sure which books were Scripture (Cairns, p. 94).

## The Apostolic Fathers

After the apostles, men produced literary works. These early Christian authors are called “Church Fathers.” Studying what the Church Fathers wrote is called “Patristic” (from the Latin word for “father”) studies. The period of the writings of the Church Fathers is generally considered to run from the end of the first century until the sixth century and sometimes even to around the eighth century. It is often divided into the Ante-Nicene Fathers, those who lived and wrote before the council of Nicene in 325, and the Nicene or Post-Nicene Fathers, meaning those who wrote after 325. It is also common to divide this period into the Greek Fathers, those who wrote in Greek, and the Latin Fathers, those who wrote in Latin.

Some of the Church Fathers are called “Apostolic Fathers,” an expression that has been used differently. When it began to be used in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, it was used of authors who had known the apostles but lived in the generation after them (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 11). Kuiper uses the expression that way and lists them as Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas, Hermas, and two others whose names we do not know (Kuiper, p. 15). Ehrman says the expression includes eleven authors (1 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache, 2 Clement, Papias, Hermas, Diognetus, Barnabas, the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and Quadratus), but also says most of them did not know the apostles (Ehrman, vol. 1, pp. 11-13). The expression is being used here of the authors who wrote before 150 (Cairns, p. 73; Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 16).

For the most part, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers circulated separately from one another over the centuries (Erdman, vol. 2, p. 183; at one point, however, the writings of Ignatius were collected). Most of these writings were unknown and unread throughout most of church history (Erdman, vol. 2, p. 167). That changed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In 1627, the Codex Alexandrinus was discovered, which contain 1 and 2 Clement. Furthermore, there arose an interest in demonstrating the antiquity of a particular theological or ecclesiastical view (Erdman, vol. 2, p. 168).

Ehrman gives an example of an ecclesiastical debate in the 17<sup>th</sup> century that used the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. In the 1640s, the British bishops and archbishops of the Church of England were enormously powerful. A debate arose between the bishops and archbishops and the Puritans. The advocates of the established church argued that ecclesiastical offices were endowed with apostolic authority. The Puritans saw the church hierarchy as a corruption of the teaching of the apostles. In 1640, the Puritans submitted a petition to parliament designed to force the church to abandon its Episcopal System in favor of the Presbyterian model, where elders in the church would make decisions.

James Ussher was “one of the most brilliant scholars of his age” (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 178). He is the one who added up the numbers of the genealogies, and filled in the gaps by appealing to Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian records. He concluded that creation occurred at noon on October 23, 4004 BC. He was also a historian, who could read all the sources in their original languages, including Hebrew, Greek, Latin, etc. and an archbishop in the Church of England. In 1641, Ussher published a pamphlet in which he argued that the Episcopal form of government was a divinely-ordained institution. He used biblical and post-biblical reasons for such a position, including an appeal to Ignatius. As Ehrman points out, “Ignatius, of course, argues there should be only one bishop over all the churches. Well, Ussher points to this and says, ‘See, right after the New Testament, each church has

a bishop' and so this is a very ancient institution” (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 1790). John Milton, a Puritan who later wrote *Paradise Lost*, answered Ussher. At the time, he was a 32-year old and had only published one other piece of prose. Nobody had heard of him. He was seen as a young upstart who was taking on the tradition of none other than the great Ussher himself. Milton's view was that the text of Ignatius was so corrupt that the voice of Ignatius could no longer be heard. In other words, he thought that Ignatius's letters were filled with forgeries. He wrote, “In the midst therefore of so many forgeries, where shall we fix to dare say this is Ignatius? To what end then do they cite Ignatius as authentic for episcopacy when they cannot know what is authentic in Ignatius?”

The point is that in the 17<sup>th</sup>-century people began to appeal to the Apostolic Fathers to support their theological and ecclesiastical positions. In 1672 a French scholar named Cotelier published the first edition of the Apostolic Fathers. He included the writings of Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas, and the martyrdom of Polycarp.

The Apostolic Fathers discussed here are those who wrote before 150. The chronological arrangement given here is based on the content of the writing themselves. First Clement is usually considered the first book to have been written after the New Testament, but the internal evidence within the Epistle to Diognetus and the *Didache* suggests that they were written before the generally accepted date of 1 Clement. Also, there is evidence that Papias wrote early than is usually thought. The dating of the other works is that which is typically given.

## The Epistle to Diognetus

*Author* The Epistle to Diognetus was written by an anonymous author, who says of himself, “Having been a disciple of Apostles, I come forward as a teacher of the Gentiles, ministering worthily to them, as they present themselves disciples of the truth, the lessons which have been handed down” (11:1). Since the Greek word for disciple is *mathetes*, this author has been called Mathetes, which is simply the transliteration of the Greek word for disciple. Suggestions as to his identity have included Apollos, Clement of Rome, and Justin Martyr, all of which are generally dismissed as not having merit.

*Recipient* The letter is written to a man named Diognetus. He is addressed as “most excellent Diognetus” (1:1), which may indicate that he was a Roman official or a person of high status (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 137). Diognetus is said to be “exceedingly anxious to understand the religion of the Christians” and he “inquiries respecting them are distinctly and carefully made, as to what God they trust and how they worship Him” (1:1). Nothing else is known about Diognetus. Only three manuscripts exist today.

*Date* The Epistle has been dated at 117 (Westcott), between 120 and 130 (Ewald), 130 (Roberts-Donaldson), 135 (Otto; Bunsen), about 150 (Lightfoot) and even later in the third century (Zahn; Harnack). The evidence from the epistle itself suggests an early date, before 100 and possibly before 70. It speaks of Christianity as being new (1:1; 2:1). Since the author says he was a disciple of the Apostles (Diognetus 11:1; note the plural), he must have written during or shortly after their lifetime. He also speaks of the Jews making sacrifices with blood and fat and whole burnt offerings (3:5). Since when the Temple was destroyed in 70, the sacrifices ceased, this could indicate that the Epistle was written before 70. If so, this is the earliest non-canonical Christian writing in existence.

*The Epistle* The Epistle to Diognetus is an apology, which does not mean saying that one is “sorry.” It means a reason or defense (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 135). The author explains

that Christians do not worship idols like the Gentiles (2:1-5), nor do they practice the superstitions of the Jews (3:1-5). Rather, they are ordinary citizens who “follow the native customs in dress and food and the other arrangement of life” (5:4). In other words, this letter is an apology, a defense of the Christian faith.

Joel Stephen Williams summarizes what the Epistle to Diognetus says about Christian life: “It is a life of love and faith which is lived in response to the saving grace of God (9.5-10.3). ‘By loving him, you will be an imitator of his goodness’ (10.4). Only a few specifics are mentioned which give definition to the Christian life. Christians have a heartfelt love for one another (1.1). They love their neighbor and help those in need (5.11; 10.5-6). They even love their enemies (6.6). They are concerned with heavenly life, and they disregard the world and its pleasures (1.1; 6.5; 10.7). They are pure in regard to sexual relations (5.7). They do not live “according to the flesh” (5.8). They are obedient citizens (5.10). They do not fear physical death, but do fear the real death of eternal fire (10.7)” (<http://www.afn.org/~afn52344/longer3.html>, accessed 1/19/2010).

*Scripture* The author writes, “For the scriptures state clearly how God from the beginning planted a tree of life in the midst of paradise” (12:3), which is obviously a reference to the book of Genesis. He quotes 1 Corinthians 8:1, stating, “the apostle says” (12:5). Many words and phrases in the book are reminiscent of the New Testament. The author refers to “the observance of months and of days” (4:5; Gal. 4:10). He calls believers “sojourners” (5:5; 1 Pet. 1:1). He says “their citizenship is in heaven” (5:9; Phil. 3:20). When they are reviled, they bless (5:5; 1 Pet. 2:23, 39; Mt. 5:11). They are in the world, but not of the world (6:3; Jn. 17:13-14). The One who was sent was “gentle and meek” (7:4; 2 Cor. 10:1). He was sent as loving, not as judging (7:5; Jn. 3:16-17). The Son died “the just for the unjust” (9:2; 1 Pet. 3:18). God sent “His only begotten Son” (10:2; Jn. 3:16). God promised the kingdom and will give it to those who love Him (10:2; Jas. 2:5). He says, “You love Him that so loved you before” (10:2; 1 Jn. 4:19). Believers are “imitators of God” (10:6; Eph. 5:1) “He sent forth the Word, that He might appear unto the world, who being dishonored by the people, and preached by the Apostles, was believed in by the Gentiles” (11:3; 1 Tim. 3:16). The Word was from the beginning (11:4; Jn. 1:1). “The apostles say, “Knowledge puffs up, but charity edifies” (12:5; 1 Cor. 8:1). In other words, the author definitely knew 1 Corinthians and, no doubt, nine other New Testament books (Jn.; 2 Cor.; Gal.; Eph.; Phil.; 1 Tim.; Titus; Jas.; and 1 Pet.).

Thiessen says the letter contains language resembling 2 Cor. 6:8-10 (ch. v, Thiessen, p. 207), speaks of “observing months and days” as in Galatians 4:10 (ch. iv, Thiessen, p. 213), seems to allude to Philippians 3:20 (ch. v, Thiessen, p. 247), has a possible reminiscence of Titus 3:4 (ch. ix) and of 1 Tim. 3:16 (ch. xi, Thiessen, p. 254) and seems to allude to the idea in 1 John 4:19 (ch. 10, Thiessen, p. 306; Everett Harrison, p. 411).

*Doctrine* The epistle is solidly Scriptural. God “made heavens and earth and all things therein” (3:4; 7:2; 8:7). God sent His Son (7:4). The Son “in pity for us took upon Himself our sins, and Himself parted with His own Son as a ransom for us” (9:2). The author often speaks of faith, saying that God “revealed (Himself) by faith, whereby alone it is given to see God” (8:6; also 10:1, 11:5, 11:6). We are “justified, save only in the Son of God” (9:3). The Son is coming again to judge (7:6) was “promised a kingdom in heaven, and will give it to those who have loved Him (10:2).

*Church polity and the church service* are not mentioned in this writing at all.

## Didache

Eusebius mentions a book called the *Teaching of the Apostles* (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 3:25). In Greek, the word translated “teaching” is *didache*. Hence, this work is known simply as the Didache. There was no known text of it until Philotheos Bryennios discovered one in an ecclesiastical library in Constantinople in 1873 (Cairns, p. 77).

*Author* The ancient document designated as the Didache does not identify its author or its recipients. It was probably written in either Egypt or Syria.

*Date* Although some date the work in the middle of the second century (Harnack dates it after 131; Cairns in the middle of the second century, p. 77), many have argued for a date before 100. It speaks of apostles and prophets coming to minister (11:5-9). There is no mention in early literature of apostles later than in the apostolic age. Clement and Ignatius do not even mention itinerant ministers. Moreover, the Didache speaks of the twofold ministries of bishops and deacons (15:1-2).

Some say it was written between 80-90 (Bartlet; Ehrhard) and others say before 70 (Sabatier; Minasi; Jacquier). Ehrman says it appears to have been written “at the same time as or possibly even earlier than some of the books of the New Testament” (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 165). Jonathan Zdziarski, a scientist who has studied and translated the Didache dates it between 49-79 ([www.zdziarski.com/papers/didache](http://www.zdziarski.com/papers/didache), accessed 11/16/09). The dating of the Didache at 49 is probably too early, but dating it before 100, even between 80 and 90, is reasonable.

*The Manual* The Didache is a “Church manual,” which gives instructions on how to live ethical lives and conduct church practices such as baptism and the Eucharist (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 7). It can be divided into four parts. The first six chapters contrast the way of life and the way of death. The way of life is the life of love and good works. The way of death is a life of sin. The author says “If the labor of your hands has been productive, your giving will be a ransom for sins” (4:8), “you shall not murder a child by abortion nor kill them when born” (2:2), and “abstain by all means from meat sacrificed to idols; for it is the worship of dead gods” (6:5-6). The second section deals with church practices such as baptism and the Lord’s Supper (chapters 7-10). In this section, there is an almost identical version of the Lord’s Prayer from Matthew. 6:9-13, including the ending that is missing in the Critical Text (“for Yours is the power and Glory forever and ever”). The author says pray that prayer three times a day (8:11; Latourette, p. 203). The third division deals specifically with ministry (chapters 11-15). If a prophet stays three days, he is a false prophet (11:7). The fourth and final section is an exhortation to be watchful in view of the coming of the Lord with striking similarities to Matthew 24 (chapter 16).

*Scripture* There are quotations and numerous allusions to the Gospel of Matthew. For example, the author says, “Neither pray like the hypocrites, but as the Lord has commanded in His Gospel, in this way pray” (8:2). The author quotes the entire Lord’s Prayer, including the ending omitted by the modern Critical Text (8:2-7). He also states, “The meek will inherit the land” (3:7). Several times he mentions being double-minded (2:4; 4:4), reminiscent of James 1:8. There are allusions to other books of the New Testament, including slaves being told to be subject to their masters (4:11; Eph. 6:5; Col. 3:22), believers being told not to eat meat sacrificed to idols (6:3; Acts 15:29), believers being instructed that if people do not work, do not let them live with you idle (12:4; 2 Thess. 3:11-12), and prophets are worthy of their food as workmen are worthy of theirs (13:1-2; 1 Tim. 5:17).

The author admonishes his readers: “And reprove one another not in wrath but in peace as you find in the Gospel, and let none speak with any who has done a wrong to his neighbor, nor let him hear a word from you until he repents. But your prayers and alms and all your acts perform as ye find in the Gospel of our Lord” (*Did.* 15.3-4). Harrison says, “Numerous citations from Matthew are used, but without naming the source” (Everett Harrison, p. 94). Thiessen says, “It uses Matthew a good deal and Luke some” and “it knows most of our New Testament books” (Thiessen, p. 13).

*Doctrine* The Didache refers to the Trinity, saying that baptism should be “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (7:2). It says Jesus is the Son of God (9:3, 6, 10:2, 5). It also says God bestows upon us “eternal life through His Son” (10:5) and “be ready for you know not the hour in which our Lord comes” (16:3; Ehrman says the Didache teaches the end is “very near;” vol. 1, p. 174). It says that in the last days false prophets will be multiplied (16:3) and when lawlessness increases, people will hate, persecute, and betray one another (16:4). When the great deceiver will appear as the Son of God, he will perform signs and wonders and the earth will be delivered into his hands and he will do evil things which were never heard since the beginning of the world (16:4). Then the creation of man will come into fiery trials and many will fall away and be destroyed, but those who endure in their faith, will be saved from under the curse of the place (16:12). “The Lord shall come and all of His saints with Him. Then shall the world see the Lord coming upon the clouds of heaven” (16:7-8).

Baptism is to be done in the name of the Trinity in “living (running) water. But if you do not have living water, then other water; and if you are not able in cold, then warm. But if you have neither, then pour water on the head thrice in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. But before baptism, let him that baptizes and him that is baptized fast, and any others also who are able and you shall order him that his baptized to fast a day or two before” (7:2-7; see also Latourette, p. 194).

The Didache gives instructions concerning the Lord’s Supper, discussing the cup before the bread (9:1-12). The prayers to be prayed are given. It also says, “Let no one eat or drink the Eucharistic thanksgiving, but that they had been baptized in the name of the Lord for concerning this also the Lord has said, “Give not that which is holy to the dogs” (9:10-12; note: he calls the Eucharist “holy”).

The Didache says that the path of life is to first love God who created you and secondly to love your neighbor as yourself (1:1). It also says, “Do not murder children in abortion” (2:2). It says that if a prophet remains more than one day, he is a false prophet (11:4), adding that if he calls for money, he is a false prophet (11:5). It warns that not everyone who speaks in the spirit is a prophet (11:7) and whoever says in the spirit says “Give me money,” or something else, to not listen to him, but if says give to the needs of others, no one is to judge him (11:12).

Thomas F. Torrance wrote a doctoral dissertation at the University of Basel on the Apostolic Fathers, entitled *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. He says, “The plain fact is that the church of the Apostolic Fathers has but a very feeble understanding of the great truths of the gospel. It would appear that Christianity was too amazingly new and unique for them to grasp properly, for whenever they attempted to interpret it or to expound vital New Testament passages, they almost invariably lapse into some shade of Judaism or moralism. They had not grasped the new orientation of life brought about by justification through grace and the indwelling presence of Christ” (Torrance, p. 39).

Concerning the Didache, Torrance says it was “apparently designed to instruct new converts in the simple practices of the Christian way of life” and “deal surprisingly little but the main assertions of the Christian faith” (Torrance, p. 36). As far as he is concerned, it ascribes deity to Christ, but were it not for that it might well be a Jewish document, because “there are strangely wanting the great characteristics of the Gospel that God has come in person to meet the sinner on the basis of downright forgiveness, and no longer on the basis of the law.” He makes a number of other critical statements of the Didache including: “The new life in Christ is not conceived of as a gift, but something to be striven after during a period of probation in which men are subject to strict conformity to the law” (Torrance, p. 39). “The person of Christ is not central, and there is very little apprehension of the amazing love of God in salvation and election. On the contrary, God is viewed almost exclusively as the Law-giver and Judge who will reward the righteous” (Torrance, p. 40). “There is strangely little soteriology (salvation) in the Didache” (Torrance, p. 40).

Torrance is correct that the Didache does not specifically mention the details of the gospel, but this criticism misses the point of the book. It is like the New Testament book of James. The Didache does mention the gospel (11:4; 15:7), but like James, its focus is on commands to believers. In fact, the Didache’s teaching concerning the way of life and the way of death is similar to the emphasis of James on life and death (Jas. 1:12, 1:15; 5:20). Torrance is more accurate when he says that the Didache is “apparently designed to instruct new converts in the simple practices of the Christian way of life.”

*Church Polity* “Appoint for yourselves, therefore, bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men who are meek and not lovers of money, true, and approved for unto you they also perform the service of the prophets and the teachers” (15:1-2). Latourette points out that there were several bishops (Latourette, p. 117).

*Church Service* “In church you shall confess your transgressions” (4:19). “On the Lord’s own day gather yourselves together and break bread and gave thanks, first confessing your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure” (14:1).

## **Clement of Rome**

First Clement is usually considered to be the earliest surviving Christian writing after the completion of the New Testament (Cairns, p. 73), but as we have seen that is not necessarily true. It was read in the public service at the church in Corinth about 170 (Thiessen, p. 6) and was considered by some to be canonical. At the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth, the *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles* in Syria contained a section called “The Ecclesiastical Canons of the Holy Apostles.” It included a list of the canonical books in the Old and New Testaments. The list gives all our New Testament books except the book of Revelation and adds 1 and 2 Clement (Thiessen, p. 16). Only a single copy of the manuscript exists, which is now in the British Museum.

*Author* This letter opens with “The Church of God which sojourns in Rome to the Church of God, which sojourns in Corinth.” In other words, it was written by a church to a church. It has been observed that this is the first incident of a church in one place trying to control the affairs of the church in another and that church is the church in Rome (Ehrman, vol. p. 33). The fact that the church at Rome wrote to the church at Corinth does not necessarily mean that the church at Rome took it upon itself to *exercise authority* over the church of Corinth. The church of Corinth could have asked the church in Rome for help. In fact, when the church of Corinth was having trouble during Paul’s lifetime, it did



not hesitate to ask him for help (1 Cor. 7:1). It should also be noted that the church at Rome does not appeal to its own authority; it appeals to the Scripture.

The author of the letter is anonymous. Nevertheless, a single individual had to write it. That individual is said to be Clement of Rome (ca. 30-100; Cairns, p. 73). Tertullian (d. ca. 220) said the apostle Peter ordained him. Origen (185-25; *Comm. on John* 1:29) and Eusebius (324; *Eccl. Hist.* 3:16, where he says Clement “wrote in the name of the Church of Rome to the Church at Corinth.”) claim that Clement was the same Clement mentioned as a fellow worker of Paul in Philippians 4:3. Most today would deny that the Clement of Philippians 4 was the Clement of Rome. Lightfoot, the famous nineteenth-century British scholar and a recognized authority on the Apostolic Fathers, said that the tradition that Clement of Rome is the Clement of Philippians 4:3 is “less than probable” (has “no claim to acceptance”). Yet he acknowledges that the tradition that Clement was a disciple of either Paul or Peter or both is “early, constant, and definite” (J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul’s Epistles to the Philippians*, pp. 168-171).

So the Church at Corinth may have “consulted” with either the church at Rome or Clement, perhaps, because he was the surviving co-worker of their founder. At any rate, 1 Clement was written from the church at Rome to the church at Corinth.

*Date* The letter was written early. It refers to the deaths of Peter and Paul as “belong[ing] to our generation” (5:1-5). On the other hand, it is not too early because it refers to the Corinthian church as “ancient” (47:7) and speaks of some members who had been Christians “from youth to old age” (63:3). As Ehrman remarks, “Surely they were not just in their 40s!” (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 22). It should also be noted that 1 Clement was written soon after a period of persecution (1:1). If that was the persecution of Nero, the epistle was written about 68. If the persecution referred to was that of Domitian, the epistle was written at the close of the first century or the beginning of the second. A date of about 97 is the one generally accepted.

*The Epistle* First Clement is an epistle written by the church at Rome to the church at Corinth to address the problem of the dismissal of elders (1, 44; Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 6). The church at Corinth was again experiencing divisions. This time, a group of younger members rose up against some of the elders (chapter 3). The epistle insists that the lives of the elders had been blameless and that the real issue in the quarrel was simply “envy and jealousy.” It is an exhortation to repentance, humility, peace, harmony, love, etc. The basic point of the book is that the Corinthians should reinstate the elders who had been ousted (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 32).

Ehrman says it is a long letter that seems to ramble in places, but he insists that it is a unit (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 27). His analysis is that the letter goes to great lengths to show it is wrong for the leaders to be replaced by others. According to Ehrman, Clement argues: 1) The Old Testament shows that jealousy always leads to harmful actions that are opposed to God (chapter 4). 2) It was jealousy and envy that caused the martyrdom of Peter and Paul. 3) The examples of Abraham and Rahab demonstrate that God desires His people to be faithful to their calling. 4) God is not a God of chaos; He is a God of order as can be seen from nature itself (chapter 20) and such supernatural events as the regular rebirth of the phoenix at precisely 500-year intervals (chapter 25). 5) God set up an orderly way of transferring power in the churches from one generation to the next (chapter 42; Ehrman, vol. 1, pp. 21-22).

Paul is said to have been “seven times thrown into captivity” (see chapter 5; the New Testament does not list seven imprisonments). It is this passage that is the basis for the theory of Paul’s two imprisonments at Rome (Cairns, p. 74).

*Scripture* First Clement is heavily laden with quotations and citations from the Old Testament Scriptures. Large portions (much larger than anything that exists in the New Testament) are given, for example, Isaiah 53 and Psalm 51. There are also abundant references to the writings of the New Testament. In one instance, Clement says, “Most of all, remembering the words of our Lord Jesus Christ which He spoke teaching forbearances and longsuffering; for this He spoke.” He then quotes from Christ’s Sermon on the Mount (chapter 13; Mt. 5:7; 6:14, 15; 7:1, 12, 14; Lk. 16:31, 36-38). Some have argued that he is quoting from oral tradition, rather than the written Gospels, but in chapter 46 he again says, “Remember the words of our Lord Jesus for He said,” and this time records a saying of Christ recorded in Matthew 18:6, 26:24; Mark 9:42, 14:21, and Luke 17:1, 2. It is possible that Clement is quoting Matthew, Mark, or Luke, or all three. Lightfoot affirms that Clement used written Gospels (Everett Harrison, p. 93). He uses phraseology from the New Testament such as telling the Corinthians that they were “more glad to give than to receive” (Acts 20:35) and “ready unto every good work” (chapter 2; Titus 3:1) and he calls the apostles like Peter and Paul “pillars” (Gal. 2:9) of the church (chapter 5).

In 1 Clement chapter 2, there is a possible allusion to Galatians 3:1 (“an abundant outpouring of the Holy Spirit fell upon all”) and in chapter 45 to 2 Timothy 1:3 (“pure conscience”). At least twice, he seems to be alluding to the book of Romans. He says, “Of Him (that is, God) is the Lord Jesus, as according to the flesh” (chapter 32; Rom. 9:5) and “for they that do these things are hateful to God and not only that do them, but they also that consent to do them” (chapter 35; Rom. 1:32).

He clearly refers to Ephesians 4:4-6 in chapter 46, where he says, “Have we not one God and one Christ and one Spirit of grace that was shed upon us? Is there not one calling in Christ?”

Who could doubt that Clement had James 3:1 in mind when he says, “Let the wise display his wisdom not in words, but in good works” (chapter 38). The same could be said of his use of James 3:16.

Clement borrows from the book of Hebrews on several occasions. Speaking of the Lord Jesus, he says, “Being the brightness of his Majesty is so much greater than angels as He inherited a more excellent name. For so it is written, ‘Who made His angels spirits and His ministers a flame of fire,’ but of His Son the Master said thus, ‘Thou art My Son; I this day have begotten Thee. Ask of me and I will give Thee the Gentiles for Thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for Thy Possession.’ And again He said unto Him, ‘Sit Thou on My right hand until I make Thine enemies a footstool for Thy feet’” (1 Clement 36 with Heb. 1:2, 3, 4, 6, 13). He says Moses was “a faithful servant in all his house” (1 Clement 43 with Heb. 3:5). In chapter 17, he said, “Let us become imitators also of those who went about in goatskins and sheepskins” (Heb. 11:37).

In chapter 7, there is an allusion to 1 Peter, where Clement says, “Let us fix our eyes on the blood of Christ and understand how precious it is to His Father” (1 Pet. 1:19). In chapter 34, he says, “Since he forewarned us, saying, ‘Behold the Lord and His reward is before His face to recompense each man according to his work’ (Rev. 22:12).

While some of these references in 1 Clement are mere allusions to the New Testament, there can be absolutely no doubt that he knew about 1 Corinthians. In chapter 47, he said,

“Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle. What wrote he first unto you in the beginning of the gospel? Of a truth, he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos because that even then ye had made parties.” Is there not a reference to 2 Corinthians 13:18 in Clement’s statement, “Through Him let us look steadfastly into the heights of the heavens. Through Him, we behold as in a mirror His faultless and most excellent visage” (chapter 36).

There is simply no question but that Clement was familiar with the writings of the New Testament. He either quotes or alludes to Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, 2 Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, James, 1 Peter and the book of Revelation. Moreover, Clement wrote, “Take up the epistle of the blessed Apostle Paul. What did he write to you at the time when the Gospel first began to be preached? Truly, under the inspiration of the Spirit, he wrote to you concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, because even then parties had been formed among you” (1 Clement 47:1-3). Clement of Rome said Paul wrote to the Corinthians “under the inspiration of the Spirit!”

*Doctrine* First Clement seems to acknowledge the Trinity (chapter 46). It clearly acknowledges that God is the Creator and that Jesus is the Savior who shed His blood for our salvation (Chapter 6). Several references are made to the Second Coming of Christ (for example, Chapter 23).

Concerning salvation 1 Clement says, “Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious that blood is to God, which, having been shed for our salvation, has set the grace of repentance before the whole world. Let us turn to every age that has past and learn that, from generation to generation, the look has granted a place of repentance to all such as would be converted unto him. Noah preached repentance, and as many as listened to him were saved. Jonah proclaimed destruction to the Ninevites, but they, repenting of the sins, propitiated God by prayer, obtaining salvation, although they were aliens [to the covenant] of God” (chapter 7). “And Abram believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness” (chapter 10). “On account of his hospitality and goodness, Lot was saved out of Sodom when all the country round was punished by means of fire and brimstone, the Lord thus making it manifest that he does not forsake those who hope in him, but gives up such as depart from him to punishment and torment” (chapter 11). “On account of her faith and hospitality, Rahab the harlot was saved. Thus they [spies] made it manifest that redemption would flow rough the blood of the Lord to all those who believe and hope in God (chapter 12). “Let us reverence the Lord Jesus Christ, whole blood was given for us.” “How excellent and great his fear is and how it saves all those who walk in it with a pure mind” (chapter 21). “For what reason was our father Abraham blessed? Was it not because he wrought righteousness and truth through faith?” (chapter 31). “And we, too, being called by his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, nor by our own wisdom or understanding, or Godliness, or works which we have wrought, in the holiness of heart; but by that faith which, from the beginning, almighty God has a justified all men” (chapter 32). “On account of the love he bore us, Jesus Christ our Lord, gave His blood for us by the will of God; his flesh for our flesh, and his soul for our souls” (chapter 49). “Blessed are we, beloved, if we keep the commandments of God in the harmony of love, that so through love, our sins may be forgiven us” (chapter 50).

First Clement clearly teaches that Christ died for our sins and that the conditions of salvation are at least repentance and faith. Clement repeatedly makes statements that indicate he understood the doctrine of justification by faith.

There are a few statements, however, that might suggest that 1 Clement is not in doctrinal sync with the New Testament. For example, “On account of his hospitality and Godliness, Lot was saved out of Sodom” (chapter 11), “On account of her faith and hospitably Rahab the harlot was saved” (chapter 12). In criticizing 1 Clement, Torrance quotes McGiffert who says, “It is obvious that in asserting justification by faith Clement was simply reproducing Paul’s idea without appreciating what is involved and that he really agreed with other Christians of his day that salvation is only to be had by loving God and doing His will” (Torrance, p. 49).

In light of the fact that 1 Clement clearly says that justification is by faith and not by works, it is doubtful that these statements should be interpreted to mean that 1 Clement is teaching salvation by works. In fact, immediately after these statements, 1 Clement says, “Redemption should flow through the blood of the Lord to all that believe and hope in God” (12:7).

Perhaps Clement is simply teaching, as did James, that there is a justification by works, meaning a justification before men. James used Rahab as an illustration. Clement is probably following in his footsteps. These statements, then, are references to being saved from the power of sin. As theologians have pointed out, the New Testament teaches that believers have been saved by faith from the penalty of sin and are being saved from the power of sin as they walk in obedience to the Lord. Kelly concludes that 1 Clement speaks of Peter and Paul and other nameless Christians as being granted a place in heaven as a reward for the trials they endured on earth (J. N. D. Kelly, p. 460).

First Clement also says, “Blessed are we, beloved, if we keep the commandments of God in the harmony of love, that so through love our sins may be forgiven us” (chapter 50). This is said in an overall context where the author is exhorting Christians to live in peace and harmony. This may be nothing more than an echo of Jesus’ teaching that if we do not forgive others out of a heart of love, we shall not be forgiven which does not necessarily mean that a believer who is at odds with another believer will not go to heaven.

It is possible to reconcile everything Clement says with the New Testament doctrine of justification by faith. What is significant is that nothing in Clement suggests that salvation is through sacraments such as baptism or the Eucharist.

*Church Polity* Church polity in 1 Clement is basically biblical. First Clement argues that God sent Christ and Christ sent the apostles. The apostles “appointed the first-fruits [of their labors], having first proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should afterward believe” (chapter 42).

The author of 1 Clement also says that the apostles “gave instructions that when these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed them in their ministry. We are of the opinion, therefore, that those appointed by them, or afterward by other eminent men, with the consent of the whole church, and have blamelessly served the flock of Christ in a humble, peaceable, and disinterested spirit, and have for a long time possessed the good opinion of all, cannot be justly dismissed from the ministry” (chapter 44). This epistle indicates, then, that there was a plurality of leadership in the local church. Like Paul, he uses the words bishop and elder of the same office (*cf.* 44:3 with 44:5). According to him, these officers were appointed by “eminent men with the consent of the whole church” (44:3). Nothing in 1 Clement implied a single leader over a congregation or a single leader over a group of churches. “There is no trace of a single ruling bishop” (*Eerdmans’*, p. 125). Cairns calls Clement “the leading elder” (Cairns, p. 73).

Latourette comments: “The letter indicated that the bishops were appointed by the ‘apostles or afterward by other imminent men with the consent of the whole church.’ It seems to imply that the bishops were presbyters and the church at Corinth had more than one of them. If this is true, the church at Corinth did not have the oversight of a single bishop, as did the churches with which Ignatius was familiar. It may be that Clement himself, although the leader of the church in Rome, was only the chief of a group of presbyters in that city. In later lists, he is given as one of the bishops of Rome in succession to Peter, but this may be reading back into the first century the institution as it existed before the close of the second century” (Latourette, p. 117).

Bruce agrees with Latourette. In his volume on church history, he says, “Clement, it appears, was foreign secretary in the Roman church and wrote to the Corinthians in that capacity ... It looks, then, as if the church at Rome was governed by a college of bishops or presbyters as late as the time of Ignatius” (Bruce, p. 68)... “The writer of this Roman letter is generally identified with Clement, who figures as one of the early bishops of Rome in the list preserved by Irenaeus and others. But there is no suggestion that the writer of the letter is acting in any episcopal capacity. The Corinthian church, too, to which the letter is addressed, appears to have been governed at the time by a plurality of bishops and presbyters” (Bruce, *The Growing Day*, p. 67).

It is blatantly obvious that Clement used the title of “bishop” and “presbyters,” that is, elder, interchangeably and synonymously. Even a Roman Catholic scholar conceded this point (Francis Xglimm’s (?) translation of Clement). Furthermore, it is equally obvious that there was a group of them at Corinth and not a single bishop/elder (see the plural “men” in chapter 44:4). While it is true that Clement claimed that the apostles appointed elders, who afterward appointed “other eminent men,” this is far from apostolic succession, or even the sole authority of a single bishop, for Clement plainly says that this was done “with the consent of the whole church.” Thus, the picture that emerged from this letter is not that of modern-day bishopric, but the simple plurality of elders ruling a local church.

The elders did not have absolute authority. The whole point is they were being tossed out of office! Moreover, there is no pope. Peter is mentioned (1 Clement 5:4), but nothing is said of him have authority, much less being a pope. This letter describes nothing more than a *local church* (“with the consent of the whole church” in 44:3) selecting elders.

Clement is said to be one of the popes. Irenaeus (d. ca. 202) said that he was the third successor to Peter in Rome. Actually, the list of early bishops is in hopeless confusion, some making Clement the immediate successor of Peter and others placing Linus after Peter and before Clement. Still, others put Linus and Anacletus between Clement and Peter. The people at the church of Corinth did not believe that their elders ruled by divine right because of apostolic succession. After all, they deposed them! Latourette says Clement is often referred to as a bishop of Rome, but that is reading back into the first century an institution as it existed later (Latourette, p. 117).

Ehrman concludes, “The kind of church hierarchy that became ensconced in the Middle Ages, where you have priests who are in charge of the churches and bishops in charge of the priests and the pope in charge of the bishops, that kind of hierarchy slowly developed out of what was originally a quite different understanding of the church as a charismatic community” (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 50).

*Church Service* First Clement says nothing about practices such as baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

To sum up, 1 Clement reflects such New Testament doctrines as the Trinity, the death of Christ for sin, salvation by faith, the second coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead. It clearly indicates that the Church had a plurality of leaders called elders (chapters 1, 21, 41, 44, 62). In a sense, reading 1 Clement is like reading an epistle of the New Testament, in that the spirit, tone, tenor, and what it says is very much in line with the New Testament.

At the same time, there are obvious differences. Though the book is loaded with quotations from the Old Testament, those quotations are more than, and in some cases, longer than one would find or expect in a New Testament book. There is at least one outstanding case where it seems Clement is using the Old Testament in a way radically different than the authors of the New Testament. There is also the possibility that he was claiming inspiration. In chapter 63 he says, “For you will give us great joy and gladness if you render obedience unto the things written by us through the Holy Spirit, and root out the unrighteous anger of your jealousy according to the treaty which we have made for peace and concord in this letter.”

## Papias

Ehrman says Papias is one of the most interesting but least known of the Apostolic Fathers (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 71).

*Author* According to Irenaeus (115?-202), Papias was “the hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 5.33.4). Eusebius (264-340) mentions Irenaeus’ reference to Papias. Eusebius writes, “There are extant five books of Papias, which bear the title *Expositions of Oracles of the Lord*. Irenaeus makes mention of these as the only works written by him, in the following words: ‘These things are attested by Papias, an ancient man who was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, in his fourth book. For five books have been written by him.’ These are the words of Irenaeus” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 33.39.1).

Papias is called the bishop of the church of Hierapolis. It would be more accurate to call him an elder (see comments on Clement of Rome). Hierapolis is in Phrygia, 20 miles west of Colosse, 6 miles east of Laodicea and about 100 miles east of Ephesus. Papias may have known Philip, who tradition says died in Hierapolis. Papias suffered martyrdom at Pergamum.

*Date* Scholars disagree concerning the date for Papias. Some date him late. In an article entitled “The Date of Papias: A Reassessment,” Robert W. Yarborough lists the reasons for a late date and gives the evidence for an early date (Yarborough, *JETS*, volume 26, pp. 181-82). The following is a summary of that article.

Based on seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale*, which records that Papias was martyred at Pergamum about the time that Polycarp died at Smyrna, that is, 164, some concluded that Papias lived until after 160. In his book, *Supernatural Religion* (1889), J. B. Lightfoot pointed out that the reference to Papias in *Chronicon Paschale* was a mistake due to a copyist writing “Papias” for “Papyllas,” as he copied Eusebius’s work on church history (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 4.15.48). In spite of Lightfoot’s findings, Harnack and others persisted in dating Papias at 145-160. Assuming that Papias wrote to stem the current of Gnosticism, Lightfoot dated him at 130 or later, but as Schoedel concludes, there is no clear anti-gnostic polemic in Papias. Nevertheless, many have followed Lightfoot’s lead,

including Westcott, who dates Papias at 140-150, F. F. Bruce, who dates Papias at 130 or later, and Seeburg, who dates him at 125.

There is another argument for a late date. Eusebius (264-340) quotes Papias as saying, “I inquired into the words of the presbyters, what Andrew or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord’s disciples had said, and what Aristion and the presbyter John, the Lord’s disciples, were saying” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.39.4, written in 324). Eusebius himself goes on to interpret this quotation to mean that Papias speaks of an “elder John” in addition to the apostle John (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.39.4). If the elder John lived after the apostle John, Papias did not know the Apostle John, which means Papias should be dated well into the second century.

The problem with that interpretation is that Irenaeus (115?-202) says Papias heard John! Irenaeus wrote, “And these things are borne witness to in writing by Papias, the hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp, in his fourth book; for there were five books compiled by him” (Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 5:33.4, probably written ca. 180).

Yarborough resolves the problem by saying that the presbyters included the presbyter John; that is, “presbyters” is another word for the apostles. Peter the apostle called himself a presbyter (1 Pet. 5:1, where elder is the Greek word presbyter). Yarborough quotes Grant, who says, “The quotation from Papias *can* be understood to mean that Papias was a hearer of the apostle John.” Yarborough concludes, “Late date theories for Papias are nearly unanimous in denying the Papias lived early enough to associate with the apostle John, largely on the basis of the disputed interpretation of one sentence from Papias’ preface. It would be more prudent, however, to admit that Papias’ wording here is ambiguous and to look elsewhere for conclusive data on Papias’ date.”

Yarborough argues that Papias is likely to have written ca. 95-110. Five clues from ancient sources external to Papias’ writings are used to support this early date. The first is Papias’ position in Eusebius’ history. Eusebius classes Papias with young Polycarp, Ignatius, and Clement of Rome, those who were immediate successors to the apostles. In book 3 of *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius does not discuss matters later than Trajan’s reign (97-117). Book 4 opens with the twelfth year of Trajan (ca. 109). Therefore, Yarborough concludes, “Without question, Papias is viewed as flourishing before 109.”

Secondly, In *Chronicon*, Eusebius places the aged apostle John, Papias, Polycarp and Ignatius in that order in this same entry. Next to this entry, Eusebius has as part of his running table of dates the year “100,” with which he concludes the treatment of the first century. Yarborough concludes, “Unquestionably Eusebius here links Papias with the apostle John as a Church leader at the close of the first century and as a contemporary of Ignatius and young Polycarp.”

Thirdly, Irenaeus calls Papias an “ancient man.” In other words, Irenaeus considered Papias to be “a man deriving from the very primitive period—in whom was honored the connective link to the beginning” (Bauer, who date Papias late). Yarborough concludes, “The term, coming from Irenaeus ca. 180, certainly does not fit a man who lived into the middle of the second century.”

Fourthly, Irenaeus says Papias was a hearer of John. Granted, Eusebius disagrees with Irenaeus, but the rejection of Eusebius is suspect, because, among other things, Eusebius lauds Irenaeus’ reliability elsewhere (Eusebius, *Eccl. His.*, 3.23.1-4) and may have had ulterior motives, namely, a pronounced dislike for Papias’ millennial views.

Fifthly, neither Irenaeus nor Eusebius portrays Papias as an anti-gnostic witness.

Yarborough lists other arguments, such as, Papias knew Philip's daughters, who were adults and would have been in their 50s, which means that he was alive and well before the end of the first century (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.39.9). Furthermore, a comparison of the writings of Papias, Ignatius, and young Polycarp show common elements indicating that Papias wrote at the same time as Ignatius and Polycarp, namely, between 95 and 110.

*Commentaries* Papias wrote one of the earliest detailed commentaries on the sayings of Jesus (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 71). He was the author of five books entitled the *Interpretations of the Sayings of the Lord*, which, unfortunately, have disappeared, except for a few fragments that are recorded in the writings of Irenaeus (*Against Heresies*, 5:33.4; 5:36.1-2) and Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.*, 3:39.3-5, 15-16; see 3:24 for Eusebius' view).

*Scripture* Papias was the author of five books entitled the *Interpretations of the Sayings of the Lord*, which, unfortunately, have disappeared, except for a few fragments that are recorded in the writings of Irenaeus (*Against Heresies*, 5:33.4, 5:36.1-2) and Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History*, 3:39.3-5, 15-16; see 3:24 for Eusebius' view). The Eusebius section says Matthew wrote his work in the Hebrew language and Mark was the interpreter of Peter (Cairns, p. 76). Papias mentions Matthew and Mark, quotes 1 John and 1 Peter and knew John's gospel (Thiessen, p. 13).

According to Yarborough, the implications of the early date are: 1) another voice, perhaps the earliest, to the early authorship and circulation of 1 John and 1 Peter (*Eccl. Hist.*, 3.39. 17), 2) a verification of the tradition of the aged apostle John's ministry in Asia Minor (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.39.3-4), 3), an indication that Mark's Gospel comprises Peter's preaching (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3.39.15), and 4) an indication that Matthew wrote a gospel in Hebrew (G. Kittel, "Logion," TDNT vol. 4, pp. 140-141). To that list could be added that most agree Papias refers to the story of the women taken in adultery (Morris in his commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 883; he cites Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3:39, 17).

*Doctrine* Papias believed in the Second Coming, the resurrection of the dead, and the millennial reign of Christ after the resurrection of the dead when the Lord will establish a personal reign on the earth. (Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5:33.3-4, 5:36.1-2; see also Eusebius's *Eccl. Hist.* 3:39.12). Beyond that and what it implies, nothing is said of a doctrinal nature. Ehrman says that it is probably because of Papias' literal interpretation of the kingdom that Eusebius' called him "a man of exceedingly small intelligence" (Eusebius's *Eccl. Hist.* 3.39; Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 73).

*Church Polity* Although Papias refers to elders, nothing about church polity can be concluded from anything he writes.

*Church Service* Nothing is said about the church service.

## Polycarp

*Author* Polycarp (ca. 69-155) was a disciple of the apostle John. About 180, Irenaeus, who was Polycarp's pupil, wrote, "Polycarp was instructed by the apostles, and was brought into contact with many who had seen Christ" (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3.3; see also Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 4.14). Polycarp was "Bishop" of Smyrna for many years. It would be more accurate to call him an elder (see comments on Clement of Rome). In 155, when Polycarp was 86 years old, he was martyred by being burned at the stake (Cairns, p. 74). When standing before a proconsul, who told him to denounce Christ or die, Polycarp replied, "For eighty-six years, I have been his servant, and he has never done me wrong: how can I blaspheme my king who saved me?" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 4.15).



He is said to be the last survivor of those who had talked with the eyewitnesses of Jesus (Latourette, p. 85; Kuiper, p. 9).

The martyrdom of Polycarp was celebrated annually by his church at Smyrna. Their practice became a pattern for commemorating the death of the martyrs. Later the idea arose that praying to God through the martyrs was especially effective (Eerdmans, p. 80).

*The Epistle* In 110, Polycarp wrote an epistle to the Philippians (Cairns, p.75). One of the problems he addressed was that of an elder who had apparently embezzled funds from the church (Polycarp 11; Ehrman, vol. 1, pp. 17-18).

Ehrman says Polycarp wrote to the Philippians for four reasons: 1) to give them moral exhortation, 2) to provide them with a collection of Ignatius's letters, 3) to deal with the problem of false teaching in their midst, 4) to discuss the problem of embezzlement that had occurred (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 99).

Polycarp refers to Paul being at Philippi and writing them a letter (Chapter 3) and to the Apostle John, which is the only surviving reference to the apostle outside of the New Testament. He refers to Ignatius (Chapter 9) and his epistles (Chapter 13). Many have argued that chapter 13 is an interpolation.

*Scripture* In his letter to the Philippians, Polycarp often quotes directly and indirectly from the Old Testament and the New Testament. There are about sixty quotations from the New Testament, of which thirty-four are from Paul's writings (Cairns, p. 75). To be more specific, he quotes 14 books of the New Testament including Matthew, Luke, Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Peter, and 1 John (Thiel claims that Polycarp alludes to all 27 books of the NT; for his proof see [www.COGwriter.com](http://www.COGwriter.com), accessed 7/24/2010). He says, "Only, as it is said in these Scriptures, Be angry and sin not, and Let not the sun set on your wrath" (Chapter 12). The word "Scriptures" is in the plural. In other words, he is citing two passages of Scripture. The first, "Be angry and sin not," is from Psalm 4:4 and the second, "Let not the sun go down on your wrath," is from Ephesians 4:26. Polycarp called Ephesians 4:26 Scripture!

*Doctrine* Polycarp is biblical. He speaks of the "Sacred Scriptures" and immediately quotes Ephesians (Chapter 12) and exhorts them to "return to the Word which has been handed down to us from the beginning" (Chapter 7), a statement which implies the finality of the Scriptures. Christ is "the Son of God and our everlasting High Priest" (Chapter 12), Who died for our sins and rose from the dead (Chapters 1, 2, 8, 9). "For everyone who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is antichrist" (Chapter 7). Salvation is by faith (Chapter 1; he quotes Eph. 2:8). The Lord is coming again (Chapter 6). Believers must stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ (Chapter 6). Polycarp says if we live worthy of Him, we will reign with Him (Chapter 5).

Torrance says that Polycarp is "perhaps the chief depository of the primitive gospel tradition" (Torrance, p. 90). He does say, however, "In Polycarp the indication is that Christ is thought of as the pledge of righteousness which *we* must persevere to fulfill" (Torrance, pp. 92-93, italics his) and "Perseverance in the work of righteousness is, therefore, a real part of Christian salvation" (Torrance, p. 93). "Faith is not alone; it is only part of the Christian life; it is coupled with piety" (Torrance, p. 95). Torrance concludes that Polycarp had an unshakable trust in Jesus Christ, which for him was a dominant feature of the Christian life, and yet throughout, there is a wrong emphasis because of a failure to grasp

the meaning of grace (Torrance, p. 96). Could it be that Polycarp understood that perseverance was necessary for rewards?

*Church Polity* As for Church polity, he opens with the words, “Polycarp and the presbyters with him.” Later he says, “And let the presbyters be compassionate, and merciful to all, bringing back those that wander, visiting all the sick and not neglecting the widow, the orphan or the poor, but always providing for that which is becoming in the sight of God and man, abstaining from all wrath, respect of persons, unjust judgment, keeping far off from all covetousness, not quickly crediting (an evil report) against anyone, not severe in judgment, knowing that we all are under a debtor of sin” (Chapter 6, see also 5 and 11).

He also says, “I am greatly grieved for Valens, who was once a presbyter among you, because he so little understands the place that was given him (in the church). I exhort you, therefore, that you abstain from covetousness, and that you be pure and truthful. Refrain from all forms of evil” (chapter 11). Acknowledging that Polycarp does not specifically say Valens was guilty of embezzlement, Ehrman says Valens apparently absconded with church funds (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 108).

He tells the church at Philippi to be “subject to the presbyters and deacons as unto God and Christ” (chapter 5). These references indicate that the church had elders and deacons and that elders can go astray. Polycarp also makes the interesting statement: “These things, brethren, I write unto you concerning righteousness, not because I take anything upon myself, but because you have invited me to do so” (chapter 3). He goes on to say that neither he nor anyone like him “could come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul.” The significance of these statements is that Polycarp was clearly *not exercising authority* over the church, nor was he claiming to be on the same level of Paul.

*Church Service* The church service is not mentioned at all in his epistle.

After the death of Polycarp, the church at Smyrna wrote a circular letter entitled *The Martyrdom of Polycarp*. It dates his death as Saturday, February 23, before the proconsul Statius Quadratus, ca. 155-156 and gives his age as 86 on the day of his death. Except for the record of the martyrdom of Stephen in the book of Acts, *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* was considered one of the earliest accounts of a Christian martyrdom. Torrance points out that it says “martyrs ‘purchase’ everlasting life, as if it were not already purchased by the blood of Christ” (Torrance, p. 97). Some consider the Martyrdom of Polycarp to be another work of the Apostolic Fathers (Ehrman).

## Ignatius

*Author* (67-ca. 116) There is a legend that Ignatius was the little child whom Jesus picked up and placed in the midst of his disciples. González says Ignatius was probably born around 30 or 35 explains how the legend might have arisen. In his letters, Ignatius repeatedly refers to himself as “the bearer of God,” as if this were a title by which he was known. Much later, by making a slight change in the Greek text, people began speaking of him as “he who was born by God.” Hence the ledge that he was the child Jesus picked up (González, vol. 1, pp. 41-42). Theodoret, who lived several hundred years after Ignatius (ca. 393-ca. 460), wrote that Peter ordained Ignatius (*Dialogue 1, Immutabile* I. iv, 33a).

Virtually all that is known about Ignatius comes from the account of his martyrdom. On a visit to Antioch, the Emperor Trajan ordered Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, arrested. Trajan personally presided at the trial. He sentenced Ignatius to be thrown to the wild beasts

at Rome. Ignatius enthusiastically became a martyr. He died on December 20, 116. Polycarp mentions him (Phil. 9, 13) and so does Origen.

*Epistles* Fifteen epistles bear his name, but scholars considered eight of these spurious, because they contain evidence of a later time. Seven are considered genuine (Zahn; Lightfoot; Harnack). Eusebius mentions these seven (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 3:36). They were written by Ignatius on his way to Rome between 110-115 (Smith, p. 80). Six of the seven are addressed to churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, and Smyrna. One is addressed to Polycarp. There are shorter and longer versions of the writings of Ignatius. The shorter versions are generally accepted as genuine, but even these are not regarded as absolutely free from corruption. To further complicate matters, there are Latin, Greek, and Syriac versions. Unless otherwise designed, in the remainder of this article, the shorter version is used.

Ehrman says three major concerns dominate the letters of Ignatius: 1) There must be unity in the churches. 2) Unity would only come when the church is completely submissive to the bishop. 3) False teachers cause division (Ehrman, vol. 1, pp. 52-53).

*Scripture* He quotes Matthew 13:33 (Eph. 14), 1 Cor. 6:9-10 (Eph. 16), 2 Cor. 4:18 (Rom. 3), and 1 Thess. 5:17 (Polycarp 1). In Ephesians 5, he quotes, "God resists the proud" (Prov. 3:34; Jas. 4:6; 1 Pet. 5:5). He alludes to Matthew 18:19 (Eph. 5), 1 Pet. 2:5 (Eph. 9), and John 12:7 (Eph. 17). Writing to the Ephesians, Ignatius uses phrases from the New Testament book of Ephesians (*cf.* his Eph. 1 with Eph. 5:2).

In addition, in the longer version, he quotes Colossians 2:10 and 1 Timothy 4:10 (Eph. 8); John 14:6, (Eph. 9); 2 Tim. 2:24-25 (Eph. 10); 1 Pet. 2:23 (Eph. 10); Luke 23:34 (Eph. 10); Ephesians 6:12 (Eph. 13); Romans 10:10 (Eph. 15); 2 Cor. 6:14-16 (Eph. 14); 1 Cor. 1:18 (Eph. 18); Luke 6:46 (Magnesians 4); John 5:30 (Magnesians 7); 2 Thess. 3:10 (Magnesians 9). He also says Paul wrote to the Ephesians (Eph. 6).

*Doctrine* Ignatius agrees with the New Testament, but he goes beyond it. There is one God (Magnesians 8). Jesus is God (*Eph.* 7, 19) in the flesh (*Eph.* 7). He was born of the Virgin Mary (*Eph.* 18; *Smyrna* 1). He "gave Himself for us as an offering and sacrifice to God" (*Eph.* 1) and arose from the dead (*Eph.* 20). The cross is our salvation and eternal life (*Eph.* 18). "The Gospel is the perfection of immortality" (*Philadelphians* 9). "Jesus Christ died for us, in order by believing in His death you may escape from death" (*Trallians* 2). He speaks of the prophets who "placed their hope in Him and waited for Him; in whom also believing they were saved" (*Philadelphians* 5). "If they believe not in the blood of Christ, they shall, in consequence, incur condemnation" (*Smyrna* 6). "The beginning is faith and the end is love" (*Eph.* 14). "If anyone preaches the Jewish law to you, do not listen to him" (*Philadelphians* 6). "If we still live according to the Jewish law, we know that we have not received grace" (*Magnesians* 8).

Ignatius seems to think people could lose their salvation. "Do not err, my brethren. Those that corrupt families shall not inherit the kingdom of God. If, then, those who do this as respects the flesh have suffered death, how much more shall this be the case with anyone who corrupts by wicked doctrine the faith of God, for which Jesus Christ was crucified! Such an one becoming defiled [in this way], shall go away into everlasting fire, and so shall every one that hearkens unto him" (Eph. 16:1-2). "Do not err, my brethren. If any man follows him that makes a schism in the church, he shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (*Philadelphians* 3:3).

Ignatius calls the bread of communion the “bread of God” (Eph. 5, the longer version) and adds that the church is “the society where sacrifices are offered”, but there is no direct connection between the bread and sacrifice in that passage. The sacrifice could be the sacrifice of praise. In Romans, he speaks of “the bread of God, and the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ” ... “I desire to drink of God, namely His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life” (Rom. 7), but in the same passage he says, “There is within me a water that lives and speaks, saying to me inwardly come to the Father” (Rom. 7). On the other hand, he says some “abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confessed not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins and which the Father of His goodness raised up again” (Smyrna 7). He calls the bread “the medicine of immortality,” saying it is “the antidote to prevent us from dying, which causes that we should live forever in Jesus Christ” (Eph. 20, longer version).

Ignatius is fighting against Docetism (Cairns, p. 74; Smith, p. 80), the view that Jesus only seemed to have a real physical body of flesh and blood. He pushes the idea that Jesus became flesh so far that He says, “I know that after His resurrection also He was still possessed of flesh and I believe that He is so now” (Smyrna 3). He likens the one flesh of Jesus to the one Eucharist. “Take heed, then, to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to show forth the unity of His blood; one altar; as there is one bishop, among the presbytery and deacons” (Philadelphians 4). In other words, “Ignatius put a high value on the Eucharist, or communion, as a means of ensuring unity, and of stressing the reality of Jesus becoming a man” (Smith, p. 80).

In one passage, Ignatius says Jesus was “baptized by John, in order that all righteousness might be fulfilled by Him” (Smyrna 1), which is what the Scripture says, but in another passage, he says “He was born and baptized that by His passion He might purify the water” (Eph. 18), a statement not supported by the Scripture. He also writes, “Let your baptism endure as your arms” (Polycarp 6).

Torrance says Ignatius “is often very vague and at times hardly consistent” (Torrance, p. 56). Torrance points out that Ignatius calls Jesus God, that salvation has much to do with the death of Christ, and that those who have faith are saved (Torrance, pp. 57-60). Ignatius taught “vicarious atonement” (Torrance, p. 62). “The death of Christ is the full basis of salvation” (Torrance, p. 66). Torrance says that because Ignatius turns faith into faithfulness (“endurance with a view to salvation”), there is little New Testament understanding of grace (Torrance). Ignatius also had a doctrine of union with Christ through the church (Torrance, p. 73). Torrance concludes that for Ignatius grace becomes a possession that is in the church and for those united to the bishop and so to God (Torrance, p. 89).

*A Church Polity* The writings of Ignatius have created more controversy than any other document of the early church, not only because of what he said about communion and baptism, but because of what he said about church polity. Throughout his writings, he clearly teaches that each church has one bishop, elders, and deacons. For example, in his epistle to the Magnesians, he says that he was visited by names, their bishop (Damas), two elders and a deacon (Magnesians 2). He says “Your bishop presides in the place of God and the presbyters in the place of the assembly of the apostles, along with your deacons who are dear to me and are entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ” (Magnesians 6). Then he adds, “As therefore the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united to Him,

neither by Himself nor the apostles, neither do you anything with the bishop and presbyters (Magnesians 7) and, “He who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, serves the devil” (Smyrna 9).

He also says, “You are subject to the bishop as to Jesus Christ” (Trallians 2) and still in another place, “We should look upon the bishop, even as one would look upon the Lord Himself” (Eph. 6). He told the church at Smyrna, “See that you all follow the bishop, Even as Jesus Christ does the father and the presbytery as you would the apostles; and reverence the deacons, as being the institution of God. Let no man do anything connected with the Church without the bishop. Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist, which is [administered] either by the bishop or by one to whom he has entrusted it. Wherever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude [of the people] also be; even as, wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church. It is not lawful without the bishop to baptize or to celebrate a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing to God so that everything that is done maybe secure and valid” (Smyrna 7). In his letter to the Trallians, he said, “He who does anything apart from the bishop, and the presbytery, and the deacons, such a man is not pure in his conscience” (Trallians 7). In his letter to Polycarp, he wrote, “It becomes men and women who marry to form their union with the approval of the bishop that their marriage may be according to God and not after their own lust” (Polycarp 5).

According to Cairns, “He was the first to place the office of bishop in contrast with the office of the presbyter and to subordinate the presbyters or elders to the monarchical bishop and the members of the church to both. The hierarchy of authority in the church is, according to him, bishop, presbyter, and deacon. However, Ignatius did not exalt the bishop of Rome as superior to other bishops even though he was the first to use the word *catholic* (Smyrna 8). The only superiority is that of the bishop to the presbyters within each church. Ignatius believed that without this threefold order, there is no church (Trallians 3)” (Cairns p. 74).

Thus, it is apparent that several of the churches to which Ignatius wrote had a single bishop. How did this happen so close to New Testament times? Smith suggests, “He argued strongly that there should be one ‘bishop’ in charge of each congregation, in order to prevent splits in the church and to ensure that correct beliefs were preserved” (Smith in *Eerdmans’*, p. 80). Kuiper agrees, saying Ignatius considered the bishop the real defense against heresy (Kuiper, p. 21).

Clement, who wrote to the church at Corinth before Ignatius wrote any of his letters, seems to indicate that bishops were elders and that the church at Corinth had more than one of them. Interestingly, Ignatius does not mention any of the offices in his epistle to the Romans. So while some of the churches to which Ignatius wrote did have a single bishop, the church at Corinth a few years before did not. It has been suggested that his emphatic stress on the officers may be evidence that the position, which he advocated, had not yet been generally accepted (Latourette p. 117).

Ignatius does not indicate any organizational structure over the church, but he seems to assume that he has the right to write with authority to other churches. By the way, Clement wrote in response to a request from that church at Philippi. Ignatius took it upon himself to write. Ignatius concedes that he does not write as an apostle (Trallians 3, Rom. 4), but he believed he had the gift of prophecy. He wrote to the Philadelphians, “For though some would have deceived me according to the flesh, yet the Spirit, as being from God, is not deceived. For it knows both whence comes and whither it goes and detects the secrets [of

the heart]. For, when I was among you, I cried. I spoke with a loud voice: Give heed to the bishop and to the presbytery and deacons. Now, some suspected me of having known beforehand the division caused by some among you. But He is my witness, for whose sake I am in bonds, that I got no intelligence from any man. But the Spirit proclaimed these words: Do nothing without the bishop; keep your bodies as the temple of God; love, the unity, avoid divisions, be followers of Jesus Christ, even as He is of the Father” (Philadelphians 7).

Either the New Testament is the final authority or Ignatius had the gift of prophecy and God changed church polity after the age of the apostles. Even Ignatius knew he was not an apostle. In the same passage where he said to reverence the bishops as Jesus Christ, he said, “But shall I, when permitted to write on this point, reach such a height of self-esteem, that though being a condemned man I should issue commands to you as if I were an apostle” (Tellurians 3). To the Romans, he wrote, “I do not as Peter and Paul, issue commandments unto you. They were apostles; I am but a condemned man” (Rom. 4).

Smith says Ignatius “was a rather neurotic man, given to strong ideas and forceful language” (Smith, p. 80).

*Church Service* Ignatius speaks of no longer observing the Sabbath, “but, living in observance of the Lord’s Day” (Magnesians 9). He believed “that it was not lawful to baptize or celebrate a love-feast without the bishop,” “the Eucharist has to be administered either by the bishop or by someone to whom he had entrusted that function” (Latourette, p. 117). This is another step in formalizing the church service (see *Eerdmans’*, p. 126).

Clearly, Ignatius departed from the New Testament and planted seeds that later grew into doctrines held by the Roman Catholic Church. Cardinal Newman said that “the whole system of Catholic doctrine may be discovered, at least in outline, not to say in parts filled up, in the course of his seven epistles” (Newman, “The Theology of the Seven Epistles of St. Ignatius”, in *Historical Sketches*, I, London, 1890). That is reading more into Ignatius than is there. Granted, the seed thoughts are there, but that does not mean Ignatius wrote full-blown Roman Catholic doctrine. For example, Ignatius was the first to use the term “catholic church” (Smyrna 8; Cairns, p. 115), but he was only using it in the sense of universal. In fact, what he says is, “Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church” (Smyrna 8). He is not talking about an organizational structure! By looking at all the material from this time, it is obvious that churches were local congregations, each with their own governmental structure (see Kelly, p. 189). At the same time, they were aware of other churches that were part of the same movement. This is nothing more of the doctrine of the universal church.

## **Quadratus**

*Author* Quadratus was one of the first Christian apologists. Hear what Jerome said about him: “Quadratus, disciple of the apostles, after Publius bishop of Athens had been crowned with martyrdom on account of his faith in Christ, was substituted in his place, and by his faith and industry gathered the church scattered by reason of its great fear. And when Hadrian passed the winter at Athens to witness the Eleusinian Mysteries and was initiated into almost all the sacred mysteries of Greece, those who hated the Christians took opportunity without instructions from the Emperor to harass the believers. At this time, he presented to Hadrian a work composed in behalf of our religion, indispensable, full of sound argument and faith and worthy of the apostolic teaching. In which, illustrating the

antiquity of his period, he says that he has seen many who, oppressed by various ills, were healed by the Lord in Judea as well as some who had been raised from the dead” (Jerome, *Illustrious Men* 19).

*Date* Jerome said that Quadratus represents an apology (a defense of Christianity) to Hadrian. Hadrian reigned as Emperor of Rome from 117 to 138. Eusebius quotes Quadratus as saying that some who were healed were still alive, which would probably put his date closer to 117 than 138.

*Writing* The only surviving writing of Quadratus is a short passage recorded by Eusebius. “After Trajan had reigned for nineteen and a half years, *Aeliusrian* (*Hadrian was Trajan’s successor*) became his successor in the empire. To him, Quadratus addressed a discourse containing an apology for our religion, because certain wicked men had attempted to trouble the Christians. The work is still in the hands of a great many of the brethren, as also in our own, and furnishes clear proofs of the man’s understanding and of his apostolic orthodox. He himself reveals the early date at which he lived in the following words: ‘But the works of our Savior were always present, for they were genuine: those that were healed, and those that were raised from the dead, who were seen not only when they were healed and when they were raised, but were also always present; and not merely while the Savior was on earth, but also after his death, they were alive for quite a while so that some of them lived even to our day.’ Such then was Quadratus” (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.1-2).

## **The Epistle of Barnabas**

In ancient times, the Epistle of Barnabas was one of the most popular books outside the New Testament, in part because the author was thought to be the companion of the Apostle Paul (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 4).

*Author* The Epistle of Barnabas does not give us the author’s name. Nothing certain is known about the author, nothing. Several ancient writers attribute it to Barnabas of the New Testament, namely Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 2:6-7) and Origen (*Commentary on Romans* 1:24). The internal evidence, however, is regarded as going against this conclusion. The numerous inaccuracies concerning the Mosaic system argue forcefully that Barnabas, who knew better, did not write this letter. Furthermore, it contains absurd interpretations of Scripture (for an illustration, see the author’s uses of allegory below the under “Scripture”). The Epistle of Barnabas was probably written by a Christian from Alexander (Cairns p. 75). It is included in Codex Sinaiticus.

*Date* Lightfoot dated the epistle before 79 (Torrance, p. 100 fn.). It is generally dated about 130 (Cairns p. 75), because it says Jerusalem has been destroyed but will soon be rebuilt and there was some expectation that the Temple would be rebuilt around 130 (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 19). Gebhardt and Harnack dated it about 120 (Torrance, p. 100 fn.).

*The Epistle* The Epistle of Barnabas is designed to show the superiority of Christianity to Judaism (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 6). It is intended to help converts from paganism. Some Jewish Christians were trying to persuade them that the Law of Moses should be observed because it was still in force. The author argues that the life and death of Christ were completely adequate for salvation and the Christians are not bound to observe the Mosaic Law because the Mosaic covenant ended with the death of Christ (chapter 2). The last four chapters present a contrast between the two ways of life: “the way of light” and “the way of the death,” reminiscent of two ways of the Didache (Cairns p. 75).

*Scripture* The author quotes the Old Testament 119 times. He uses typology to the point that it becomes allegory (Cairns, p. 75). Allegory seeks symbolic, hidden meaning by reading into the literal meaning of the text. It distorts the meaning intended by the writer into what the interpreter wants the meaning to be (Cairns p. 482). This practice was derived from Philo of Alexandria (20 BC-50), who sought to reconcile Greek philosophy and the Old Testament by it and was later developed into an organized method of interpretation by Origen. “It has done much harm to sound interpretation of the Bible” (Cairns p. 75).

For example, the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* allegorizes the 318 servants of Abraham (chapter 9) “as a reference to Christ’s death on the cross on the basis that the Greek letter for 300 is cross-shaped and the Greek numerals for 18 are the first two letters of the name Jesus” (Cairns p. 75). He also suggests the six days of creation means that the Lord will finish all things in 6000 years, for a day is with Him is as 1000 years (Barnabas 15). The Sabbath refers to the 1000-year reign of Christ on the earth (Barnabas 15; see Ehrman vol. 2, pp. 6-7 for more examples of the allegorical method of interpretation in Barnabas). It is also interesting to note that according to Barnabas, the fatal error of the Jews was there let themselves be deceived by the literal sense of the Scripture (Kelly, p. 66).

While there are numerous references to the Old Testament, there are only a few to the New Testament. In chapter 4, the author says, “as it is written, ‘Many are called, but few were chosen’” (Mt. 20:16 or 22:14). This statement is introduced by a formula that is common for the quotation of Old Testament Scripture—‘as it stands written’ (*The Epistle of Barnabas*, 4:14)” (Everett Harrison, p. 93; see also McDonald, p. 275). In chapter 5, he says, “He came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Mt. 9:13; Mk. 2:17; Lk. 5:32). In chapter 7, he writes, “The Lord says, ‘Behold, I will make the last like the first’” (Mt. 20:16). There is a possible allusion to Colossians 1:16 (Barnabas 11). Thiessen says, “It quotes Matthew and there are echoes of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Ephesians. The writer perhaps knew 1 Peter, and certain passages reminded us of John” (Thiessen, p. 17).

*Doctrine* Despite his method of interpreting the Old Testament, the author of this epistle retains many New Testament ideas. Doctrinally, he teaches that Jesus is the Son of God (5, 12). He is “not the Son of Man, but the Son of God” (12). He says, “the Lord endured to deliver up the flesh to the corruption that we might be sanctified through the remission of sins, which is effected by His blood of sprinkling.” He then quotes Isaiah 53, “He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities: with his stripes, we are healed” (5). “Jesus rose again from the dead and when He had manifested himself, He ascended into to the heavens” (15) There are many statements to the effect that salvation is by faith including, “If He had not come in the flesh, who could men have been saved by beholding Him?” (5), “Those believing on Him shall live forever” (8, 12), “they could not be saved unless they put their trust in Him” (12; see also his reference to Num. 21:9), “What then says He to Abraham? Because you have believed, it is imputed to you for righteousness: behold I have made you the father of those nations who believe in the Lord while in uncircumcision” (13), and “having received the forgiveness of sins, and placed our trust in the name of the Lord, we have become new creatures, formed again from the beginning. Wherefore in our habitation, God truly dwells in us. How? His word of faith” (16; it in the same chapter, he says God gives us repentance). “The Lord is near and His



reward” (21; see also 8). The author refers to the anti-Christ (4). “The Lord will judge the world without respect of persons” (4).

Yet the author seems to suggest baptism is also necessary. He writes the Israelites “should not receive that baptism which leads to the remission of sins.” Later, in the same passage, he quotes Psalm 1:3-6 and says that those verses refer to “both the water and the cross. For those words imply blessed are they who, placing their trust in the cross, having gone down into the water; for he says they shall receive a reward in due time: then He declares, I will compensate them.” Still later in the same chapter, he quotes Ezekiel 47:12 and says the meaning is “that we indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up bearing fruit in our heart having the fear of God and trusting Jesus in our spirit. And whosoever shall eat of these shall live forever, meaning “whoever He declares, shall here you speaking and believe, shall live forever” (11).

He also seems to suggest that it’s possible for believers to lose their salvation, saying, “Take heed, lest resting at our ease, as those who are called of God, we should fall asleep in our sin, and the wicked prince, acquiring power over us, should thrust us away from the kingdom of the Lord” (4). “He who keeps these should be glorified in the kingdom of God; but he who chooses of these things shall be destroyed with his works” (21).

Barnabas teaches the Lord will reign on the earth for 1000 years (15:4-5; Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 18).

Torrance says Barnabas is no theologian, but he tries to give a complete account of the faith (Torrance, p. 100). Salvation is not a present reality. Believers hope to be saved. They hope they will obtain life (Torrance, p. 104). “God comes to destroy the wicked and save the pious, whom He will reward. It is not difficult to obtain to this, but suffering and persistence are the conditions of salvation” (Torrance, p. 106). “By your hands you shall work for the redemption of your sins” (19:10).

There is a statement about abortion, “You shall not slay the child by procuring abortion, nor again shall you destroy it after it is born” (19).

*Church Polity and the Church Service* Nothing is said anywhere in this epistle about church polity or the church service.

## **The Shepherd of Hermas**

The Shepherd of Hermas is one of the most popular writings of the Apostolic Fathers. It is the longest of the Apostolic Fathers and much longer than any book in the New Testament (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 101).

*Author* Origen identifies the author as the Hermas of Romans 16:14 saying, “I fancy that Hermas is the author of the tract which is called the Shepherd, a writing which seems to me to be very useful, and is, as I fancy, divinely inspired” (Origen, *Comm. on Romans Lib.* 10.31). Scholars conclude, however, that both internal and external evidence is “decisive” against an apostolic date (Westcott, pp. 196-200).

*Date* The earliest mention of the Shepherd is in the Muratorian Fragment. It says Hermas “composed the Shepherd very late in our time in the city of Rome, while Bishop Pius, his brother, occupied the chair of the Roman Church.” Pius is dated ca. 141-157 (Thiessen, p. 21). The Shepherd was probably written about 150 (Cairns, p. 76).

*The Apocalypse* The Shepherd of Hermas is an apocalypse. The Shepherd interprets visions to Hermas (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 18). The author says he had been a slave of Rhoda, a Christian woman in Rome. After she freed him, he became a rich businessman, but in the

process, he neglected his family. Consequently, his family fell into sin. He and his wife repented, but his children turned against the faith. Then Hermas lost all of his possessions. Out of his experience came this work, which is designed to call sinners to repentance. It is modeled after the book of Revelation (Cairns, p. 76).

The work is divided into three parts. The first part consists of five visions that emphasize the need for repentance in symbolic form. The second part contains twelve commandments (mandates) depicting the code of ethics repentants should follow in order to please God. The third and final section is made up of ten parables in which the main theme is the significance of repentance (Cairns, p. 77). Erdman says the theme that runs throughout the whole book is the question of whether a Christian can have a “second” chance if he or she sins after baptism. The answer is that a Christian has a second chance, but no more (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 18).

*Scripture* The Shepherd does not contain any definite quotations from either the Old or the New Testament. Westcott says that the author’s knowledge of the New Testament can only be shown “by passing coincidences of language,” but acknowledges that those occur throughout the work (Westcott p. 201). Thiessen, however, says it “seems clear” Hermas knew Matthew, Ephesians, Revelation, and maybe Hebrews and James (Thiessen, p. 22).

*Doctrine* The author of *The Shepherd of Hermas* says there is one God (chapter 32) and reflects a belief in the Trinity. He speaks of God “who dwells in the heavens and created out of nothing the things which are” (chapter 1), of the Son of God who is “older than all His creation” (chapter 98) and who cleansed people of their sins (chapter 67), and of “the Holy pre-existent Spirit” (chapter 67). The death and resurrection of Christ are never mentioned. While he does say that the elect are saved by faith (chapter 22), there are many more references to repentance. He says, “If they repent with all their heart, they shall be written in the books of life with the saints” (chapter 3). In fact, except for that one reference to being saved by faith, the whole thrust is on repentance and obedience. He writes, “Well, thinkest thou that the sins of those who repent are forgiven forthwith? Certainly not; and the person who repents must torture his own soul and must be thoroughly humble in his every action and be afflicted with all the diverse kinds of affliction” (chapter 74). “Life is for all those that keep the commandments of the Lord” (chapter 82) and “So when the Lord saw that her repentance was good and pure and that they could continue thereto, he ordered their former sin to be blotted out (chapter 120).

Furthermore, baptism is necessary. Hermas says, your life “shall be saved by water” (chapter 15), “we went down into the water and obtained remission of our former sins” (chapter 37; Torrance says, “Hermas is quite emphatic on the point that without baptism they can be no salvation,” p. 122). He also says, “But if thou do any good thing outside the commandment of God, thou shalt win for thyself more exceeding glory” (chapter 56).

After salvation, a Christian was allowed to repent one more time. Hermas writes that God swore concerning the elect “that if now that this day has been set as a limit, sin shall hereafter be committed, they shall not find salvation” (chapter 6). Seeburg notes that the chief defection of Hermas from the biblical standard is his failure “to understand grace as the forgiveness of sins extending continuously throughout the whole life.” He calls this the “moralism of Hermas” (Seeburg, p. 62). Latourette adds that for both Hermas and Tertullian the forgiveness of a major sin like idolatry, murder or adultery might be granted once after baptism but allowed only once (Latourette, p. 138). By the way, Seeburg says

that Hermas is the starting point for the Catholic distinction between venial and mortal sin (Seeburg, p. 62).

The Shepherd of Hermas taught that while it was not wrong for Christian widows and widowers to remarry, they would “gain greater honor and glory of the Lord if they refrain from doing so” (Latourette, p. 224). Latourette says, “The Shepherd of Hermas declares that it is possible to do more than God commands and by doing so to gain more abundant glory” (Latourette, p. 215).

Torrance says, “It is probably more true of the author of the Shepherd than of the other apostolic Fathers that discipline thinking in the realm of theology is conspicuously lacking” (Torrance, p. 111). He claims Hermas has “an illogical mind which finds only too much cover in the allegorical method by which he conveys his message to the church” (Torrance, p. 111). “Hermas has a general outlook, which is not very Christian.”

Torrance says that Hermas represents the beginning of what has been known in church history as ‘paganism baptized into Christianity.’ “Already there are germs of many a later Roman Catholic doctrine” (Torrance, p. 112). For example, Chapter 15 seems to indicate an idea similar to the later developed the doctrine of purgatory. Chapter 66 indicates what really amounts to a “sacrament of penance.”

*Church Polity* Hermas mentions “rulers of the church” (Chapter 6), “Apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons” (chapter 17). He also says that the test of a prophet is his life. Is he “gentle, tranquil, humble-minded,” and does he “abstain from all wickedness and vain desire of the present world”? (chapter 49).

*Church Service* Hermas does not say anything about the church service.

## **Second Clement**

Ehrman says 2 Clement is the least known and most understudied book of the Apostolic Fathers (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 38).

*Author* Second Clement was once believed to have been written by Clement of Rome, but Eusebius says Clement “has left us one recognized Epistle” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 3.16). There’s no relationship between 1 Clement and 2 Clement (Torrance, p. 126). Eusebius, who is the first in church history to mention 2 Clement, also says “it was not as well-known as the first Epistle, since ancient writers have made no use of it” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 4.23.2). It was written by an unknown author.

*Sermon* Scholars have concluded 2 Clement is an anonymous sermon (see “I read to you” in 2 Clem. 19:1), probably written in the middle of the second century. If it is a sermon, it is the earliest surviving sermon outside of those recorded in the New Testament. It seems to be directed to Christians who had been converted from paganism. It refers to their past history of idolatry (2 Clem. 1:12). It is an exhortation to repentance, but its contents are difficult to analyze.

Ehrman says the theme, the joy of salvation, is stated in the opening verses and that the author elaborates on this theme through an exposition of Isaiah 5:1, using the figurative mode of interpretation. The exposition is the basis of moral exhortation (Ehrman, vol. 2, pp. 38-40, 54).

*Scripture* He quotes Isaiah 29:13 (2 Clem. 3:5), Isaiah 54:1 (2 Clem. 2:1), Ezekiel 14:14, 20, calling it Scripture (2 Clem. 6:8), Matthew 7:21 (2 Clem. 4:2), Matthew 7:23 (2 Clem. 4:5; see Lk. 13: 26-27), Matthew 9:13, calling it Scripture (2 Clem. 2:4), Matthew 10:16 (2 Clem. 5:2), Matthew 10:32-33 (2 Clem. 3:2), Matthew 12:50 (2 Clem. 9:11),

Matthew 16:26 (2 Clem. 6:2), Matthew 21:13, calling it Scripture (2 Clem. 14:1), Mark 9:44 (2 Clem. 17:5), Luke 12:4 (2 Clem. 5:4), Luke 16:13 (2 Clem. 6:1), Luke 16:10 (8:5), 1 Corinthians 2:9 (2 Clem. 11:7) and alludes to 1 Corinthians 9:24-27 (2 Clem. 7:5) and 2 Peter 3:10 (2 Clem. 16:3). He also quotes the Gospel of Peter and the Gospel of Thomas (Ehrman, vol. 2, pp. 50-52)

*Doctrine* He mentions God the Father (see “the only God invisible, the Father of truth” in 2 Clem. 20:5) and the Holy Spirit (2 Clem. 14:3, 14:5). Jesus Christ, “being first spirit, then became flesh” (2 Clem. 9:5) is God, the Judge of (the) quick and dead (2 Clem. 1:2), and He endured suffering for our sake (2 Clem. 1:2). He saved us, when we were perishing (2 Clem. 1:4; 2:5, 2:7), when we were idolaters (2 Clem. 1:6). We had no hope of salvation except in Him (2 Clem. 1:15). “He had mercy on us, and in His compassion saved us” (2 Clem. 1:7; 3:1). “He called us, when we were not, and from not being He willed us to be” (2 Clem. 1:8). We have to believe (2 Clem. 2:3, 11:1, 15:3) and repent “(If we) repent with our whole heart of the evil things which we have done in the flesh, that we may be saved by the Lord” (2 Clem. 8:2; is this justification salvation or sanctification salvation?).

He also says things that sound as if we have to be righteous to enter the kingdom. For example, “If therefore we shalt have wrought righteousness in the sight of God, we shalt enter into His kingdom” (2 Clem. 11:7). “For, if we do the will of Christ, we shall find rest; but if otherwise, then nothing shall deliver us from eternal punishment if we should disobey His commandments” (2 Clem. 6:7). “If we keep not our baptism pure and undefiled, (how shall we) enter into the kingdom of God” (2 Clem. 6:9). “Wherefore, brethren, if we shall have done the will of the Father and kept the flesh pure and guarded the commandments of the Lord, we shall receive life eternal” (2 Clem. 8:4). “Keep the flesh pure and the seal unstained, to the end that we may receive life” (2 Clem. 8:6). “Let us therefore love one another, that we all may come unto the kingdom of God” (2 Clem. 9:6). “Therefore let us choose rather to be of the Church of life, that we may be saved” (2 Clem. 14:1). “Therefore let us assist one another, that we may also lead the weak upward as touching that which is good, to the end that we all may be saved: and let us convert and admonish one another” (2 Clem. 17:2). “Herein He speaketh of the day of His appearing, when He shall come and redeem us, each man according to his works” (2 Clem. 17:4). “Let us therefore practice righteousness that we may be saved unto the end” (2 Clem. 19:3). Perhaps some of these statements that use the word “saved” that could be interpreted as referring to sanctification salvation (see the New Testament concept of “being saved”), but not all of them. Clement understands the doctrine of rewards. He asks what compensation shall we give to Him (2 Clem. 1:5) or what fruit is worthy of His own gift to us (2 Clem. 1:6)? He says believers are rewarded if they endure. “Let us then contend that we all may be crowned” (2 Clem. 7:2). “Endure patiently in hope, that we may also obtain our reward” (2 Clem. 11:5). “We are trained by the present life, that we may be crowned with the future” (2 Clem. 20: 2).

The Lord is coming (2 Clem. 17:4), but “we know not the day of God’s appearing” (2 Clem. 12:2). The day of judgment is coming (2 Clem. 16:3, 17:6). The kingdom is coming (2 Clem. 5:5; 9:6; 11:7; 12:1, 12:2, 12:6; 17:5).

His overall point is pastoral. “So then, brethren, let us confess Him in our works, by loving one another, by not committing adultery nor speaking evil one against another nor envying, but being temperate, merciful, kindly. And we ought to have fellow-feeling one with another and not to be covetous. By these works, let us confess Him, and not by the contrary” (2 Clem. 4:3). “For I myself too, being an utter sinner and not yet escaped from

temptation, but being still amidst the engines of the devil, do my diligence to follow after righteousness, that I may prevail so far at least as to come near unto it, while I fear the judgment to come” (2 Clem. 18:2).

Torrance says that 2 Clement is lacking in insight, confused in thought, and, slipshod in expression (Torrance, p. 126). He considers 2 Clement “blatant moralism” and the least evangelic of all the writings of the Apostolic Fathers” (Torrance, p. 132). He says that except for a strong emphasis on the deity of Christ, the “more distinctive features of the Christian faith” are wanting (Torrance, p. 126). Torrance quotes such statements as, “Let us then do righteousness that we may be saved in the end” (Torrance, p. 129). He concludes that Clement does not leave any room for the doctrine of grace. “Salvation is thus made to depend entirely on the preservation and purity of the flesh after baptism. No doubt the final reward, which is also identified with Christ himself, is accounted a gifts, but it is an earned gift” (Torrance, p. 131).

*Church Polity* He mentions elders (2 Clem. 17:5), but does not say enough about them to give any insight as to his concept of who they were.

*Church Service* Ehrman says that 2 Clement indicates that in their church service they read from the Old Testament, in this case Isaiah 54, and used it as the basis of an exposition (Ehrman, vol. 2, p. 52). Clement says he read to them an exhortation (2 Clem. 19:1).

## Conclusion

The Apostolic Fathers consist of ten authors who wrote before 150. Ehrman say there were eleven. He adds the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 33). It is an eyewitness account of the martyrdom of Polycarp and as such is a valuable document, but technically, Polycarp was not martyred until 155 and, besides, it does not add to the discussion of the Scriptures, etc. So it has not been considered as on ethe the writing of the Apostolic Fathers.

Admittedly, the dating of the writing the Apostolic Fathers is an approximation at best. No two scholars agree on the same dates of each on the ten, but there is general agreement that all ten were written before 150. It is very possible that these ten authors wrote over a span of approximately 60 or 70 years. That is not much material for such a long period of time.

These ten men wrote different types of literature, including epistles, commentaries, and an apocalypse. Regardless of the type of literature produced by them, the tone of their writings is pastoral, moral, and non-polemical (Hannah, p. 33). This is in contrast to the nature of the literature written after the period of the Apostolic Fathers, which begins to be polemical.

Name	Date	Literary Forms
Diognetus	70	Epistle
Didache	80-90	Church Manual
1 Clement	97	Epistle
Papias	95-110	Commentaries
Polycarp	110	Epistle
Ignatius	110-115	Epistle
Quadratus	117	Short Passage
Barnabas	130	Epistle
Shepherd of Hermas	150	Apocalypse

2 Clement	150	Sermon
-----------	-----	--------

Cairns concludes that the Apostolic Fathers 1) use the Old Testament to teach that Christianity is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies and types, 2) were acquainted with the New Testament, 3) wrote personal and practical material (Cairns, p. 73).

Writing a doctoral dissertation with the specific purpose of finding the doctrines of grace in the Apostolic Fathers, Torrance concludes, “What took absolute precedence was God’s call to a new life in obedience to reveal truth. Grace, as far as it was grasped, was subsidiary to that. So religion was thought of primarily in terms of man’s acts for God and striving for justification, much less in terms of God’s act for man which put him in the right with God once for all” (Torrance, p. 133). It is a doctrine of salvation by works of righteousness, with grace introduced in *ad hoc* fashion as enabling power (Torrance, p. 134). “The most astonishing feature was *the failure to grasp the significance of the death of Christ*” (Torrance, p. 137, italics his).

Torrance seems to be writing from a Calvinistic point of view and thus wants the Apostolic Fathers to say more about grace that is in line with Calvinism. He is too harsh. Using his standards, the book of James would be moralism. A more detailed analysis of what they taught will appear at the end of this chapter.

## False Teaching

*False Teaching* The New Testament recognizes a body of truth called doctrine (Acts 2:42). John speaks about “the doctrine of Christ” (2 Jn. 9). The doctrine of Christ is the belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God come in the flesh (1 Jn. 2:22; 4:2). It implies the Trinity (2 Cor. 11:4). The writer to the book of Hebrews speaks of the “first principles of the oracles of God” (Heb. 5:12) and “the elementary principles of Christ” (Heb. 6:1). He lists six doctrines, namely, repentance, faith, the doctrine of baptisms, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment (Heb. 6:1-2). Repentance and faith are gospel truths. The doctrines of baptism and the laying on of hands, which is used in ordination, are church truths. The future resurrection and the judgments that follow are obviously prophetic truths. Therefore, from this passage, it could be concluded that the doctrinal content of the New Testament includes salvation truth, church truth, and prophetic truth. Jude speaks of the “faith which was once for all delivered to the saints” (Jude 3; see also 1 Tim. 4:1; Titus 1:13). Paul speaks of “sound doctrine” (Gr.: “healthy teaching;” 1 Tim. 1:10; 4:3; Titus 1:9; 2:1; also Titus 1:13). There is true teaching (Jn. 17:17; Titus 1:1). The core doctrinal teaching of the New Testament concerns Jesus (Trinity), the gospel, the church and the future.

The New Testament warns that there is teaching that is not true. It speaks of false apostles (2 Cor. 11:13) preaching another Jesus, a different Spirit, and a different gospel (2 Cor. 11:4; see also Gal. 1:6-7). The Judaizers insisted that people had to keep the law in order to be saved (Acts 15:1-29; Gal.). Some in the church at Corinth said there is no resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. 15:12). The church at Thessalonica was told that the Day of Christ had already come (2 Thess. 2:1-2). Anti-Christ visited the church at Ephesus, telling them that Jesus was not the Christ (1 Jn. 2:22) and that He had not come in the flesh (1 Jn. 4:2). The doctrines that are denied pertain to Jesus (the Trinity), the gospel, and the future.

It has been pointed out that every “second” epistle in the New Testament mentions a false teaching. In 2 Corinthians 11:4, it is another Jesus, a different Spirit, and a different gospel. In 2 Thessalonians 2:1-2, it is that the Day of Christ has come. In 2 Timothy 2:18, it is that the resurrection is past. In 2 Peter 2:1, it is a denial of the person and work of Christ and perhaps the second coming (3:3-4). In 2 John 9, it is the doctrine of Christ. While it is true that the “second” epistles do mention a false teaching, so do some “first” epistles (Col. 2:16-23; 1 Jn. 2:22, 4:1-6). When God does His work, Satan produces a counterfeit. “Whenever God erects a house of prayer, the devil always builds a chapel there” (Daniel Defoe).

What should teaching that is not true be called? Other than saying it is another or a different doctrine, the New Testament does *not* give it a name.

The word that is most often used to refer to false doctrine is “heresy,” but the New Testament does not use the word “heresy” to describe false doctrine. In fact, it does not even appear in the New Testament! (Someone has jokingly said, “A heretic is someone who does not believe what I believe.”) The word “heretic” appears once in the King James Version (see “heretick” in Titus 3:10). In that case, the Greek word translated “heretick” means “choice, opinion, faction.” It is describing a divisive person (see “divisive man” in the NKJV; “factious man” in the NASB; “divisive person” in the NIV). That word also appears in the list of the works of the flesh in Galatians 5:20. Ryrie says, “The word means a willful choosing for one’s self, which results in a party division. Heresy belongs to the works of the flesh, which can and often are performed by carnal Christians (Gal 5:20). Sometimes this may be used for good so that those who are not involved in heresy will stand out in the churches (1 Cor. 11:19). Toward a heretic the Scriptures really command a surprisingly lenient attitude—admonish twice, then ignore (Titus 3:11). Apparently, in New Testament times, the heretic was a carnal Christian who espoused error which brought factions into the church” (“Apostasy in the Church,” Charles C. Ryrie. *Bib. Sac.*, January 1964, p. 47). Later, in church history, the word “heresy” began to be used of a belief opposed to the orthodox doctrines of the church.

The other word that is used to refer to false doctrine is apostasy. The Greek word that is said to be a reference to apostasy means “to withdraw, depart.” Except for three references, it usually speaks of a physical departure of a person from one place to another (Ryrie, p. 45). In the parable of the sower, it is used of a believer (*cf.* “believe and be saved” in 8:12 with “believe” in 8:13; when people believe, they are saved), who in a time of temptation falls away (Lk. 8:13). In Hebrews 3:12, it is used of believers who depart from the living God (see “brethren” in 3:12), that is like the children of Israel in the wilderness, they refuse to do the will of God (Heb. 3:15-17). In 1 Timothy 4:1, it is used of believers who depart from the faith in that they teach celibacy and vegetarianism (1 Tim. 4:1-3). In that one place, it is used of departing from doctrine, but it is not the denial of the doctrine of Christ, the gospel, the church or the future.

Because of the New Testament terminology (or the lack thereof), this section is called “false teaching.” Church historians, however, use the term “heresy.” So it will appear in some of the material that follows. Later, when “orthodoxy” is defined, the term “heresy” comes into its own.

In the second century, the church not only had to face persecution from without, it had to fight false teaching from within its own ranks. Cairns says the internal conflicts consisted

of legalistic heresies, philosophical heresies, theological errors, and ecclesiastical schisms (Cairns, pp. 97-104).

*Judaizers* The first challenge to Christianity came from the Judaizers. The word “Judaizer” does not appear in the Bible. The idea does. To Judaize is to bring people into conformity to Jewish customs. In the New Testament, this was an issue pertaining to the Gentiles.

Christianity began as a sect within Judaism. All the early believers were Jews. Circumcision, observance of the Sabbath, and abstinence from unclean meat were ingrained in them from childhood. It was only natural that the first major conflict within the church should be over the issue of whether or not the Gentile Christians should have to observe Jews customs. Some reasoned that if Christianity were a “variant of Judaism,” Gentile converts should be circumcised in order to be accepted into the Jewish community and they should “observe all aspects of the Jewish law, including the Sabbath and the distinctions between clean and unclean foods” (Latourette, p. 120). Some of the Jewish converts insisted that Gentiles must be circumcised to be saved (Acts 15:1, 5). In other words, according to these Jewish converts, since Christianity is part of Judaism, *Gentiles must become Jews in order to be saved*.

This was the issue in Galatia that provoked Paul to write Galatians. It was the issue at the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1-29). Paul and the Jerusalem Council said it was not necessary to be circumcised. Justification is by faith, not the works of the Law (Gal. 2:16; Acts 15:7-11). The New Testament teaches that the Mosaic Law has passed away (Gal. 3:24-25; 4:10-11; 2 Cor. 3:7-11; Col. 2:14, 16-17; Heb. 8:13). It also teaches that both Jews and Gentile are saved by faith and when they trust Christ they are members of the body of Christ, the church (Eph. 2:13-18). Neither the Jerusalem Council nor the book of Galatians settled this issue.

The rapid expansion of Gentile Christianity diminished the influence of Jewish Christians. In 66, when the Jewish war broke out, the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem fled to Pella, which essentially isolated them from the Christian community. After that date, there are only “fleeting glimpses of Judaizing Christianity;” they seem to have dissolved into splinter groups, some of which often called Nazarenes (Kelly, p. 139). Paul was accused of being a Nazarene (Acts 24:5).

*Nazarenes* Who were the Nazarenes? There are no surviving writings from this group. From what was written about them many years later, it is evident that they were “perfectly orthodox in their belief that Jesus was the Son of God” (Kelly, p. 139). They did not accept an emerging rabbinic interpretation of Judaism, but they also refuse to live like Gentiles (Cary, *HCT*, p. 20). They believed “Christians of Jewish descent should observe that the Jewish laws of circumcision, Sabbath observance, and foods” (Latourette, p. 121). They accepted Paul and the validity of Gentile Christianity—for Gentiles (Cary, *HCT*, p. 20). Since they believed that Jesus was the Son of God, they were not considered a heretical group, at least at first. Cary says they were labeled as heretics in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, “when they were dying out, but not before” (Cary, *HCT*, p. 20). Since the early church considered them a heretical group, they are considered here.

Justin, who was martyred about 165, does not mention the Nazarenes by name, but he does discuss the issue of a Jew believing in Christ and keeping the Old Testament Law. When asked if someone who believed in and obeys Christ, wishes to observe Jewish institutions will he be saved, Justin says, “In my opinion, Trypho, such an one will be



saved, if he does not strive in every way to persuade other men,—I mean those Gentiles who have been circumcised from error by Christ, to observe the same things as himself, telling them that they will not be saved unless they do so. This you did yourself at the commencement of the discourse, when you declared that I would not be saved unless I observe these institutions.”

Justin goes on to say, “If some, through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given by Moses, from which they expect some virtue, but which we believe were appointed by reason of the hardness of the people’s hearts, along with their hope in this Christ, and [wish to perform] the eternal and natural acts of righteousness and piety, yet choose to live with the Christians and the faithful, as I said before, not inducing them either to be circumcised like themselves, or to keep the Sabbath, or to observe any other such ceremonies, then I hold that we ought to join ourselves to such, and associate with them in all things as kinsmen and brethren.” Then he says, “But if some of your race, who say they believe in this Christ, compel those Gentiles who believe in this Christ to live in all respects according to the law given by Moses, or choose not to associate so intimately with them, I in like manner do not approve of them. But I believe that even those, who have been persuaded by them to observe the legal dispensation along with their confession of God in Christ, shall probably be saved. And I hold, further, that such as have confessed and known this man to be Christ, yet who have gone back from some cause to the legal dispensation, and have denied that this man is Christ, and have repented not before death, shall by no means be saved” (Justin, *Dialog.* 47).

About 404, in a letter to Augustine, Jerome, said the Nazarenes, “believe in Christ, the Son of God, born of Mary the Virgin, and they say about him that he suffered under Pontius Pilate and rose again desiring to be both Jews and Christians, they are neither the one nor the other” (Jerome’s *Epistle* 79).

*Ebionites* The Ebionites taught that there is one God, who is the Creator, that the Jewish Law was the highest expression of His will, and that the Spirit came on Jesus at His baptism. They accepted Matthew and rejected Paul. They insisted there was no salvation apart from circumcision and the Law of Moses. After the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 135, they ceased to have much influence (Cairns, pp. 97-98).

*Gnosticism* The greatest philosophical heresy was Gnosticism (Cairns, p. 97). The origin of Gnosticism is obscure. It is a name given to a variety of ancient religious groups. It predates Christianity (Kelly, p. 23).

Irenaeus claims that Simon of Acts 8 was the source of Gnosticism and the Simonian sect (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 1.23.1-5; see Cairns, p. 98). Marshall correctly observes that nothing of the later legend is suggested in Luke’s story. Observing that there is no consensus concerning which sources can be relied on for information about Simonism, Meek concludes, “The quest for the historical Simon (and Helena!) is even less promising than the quest for the historical Jesus” (Meeks, p. 141).

Paul fought an incipient form of Gnosticism in Colossians and John did the same at Ephesus (1 Jn.). Gnosticism reached its peak of power about 150 (Cairns, p. 98). Christian writers such as Ignatius (*Smyrna* I, *Trallian* 9-10), Irenaeus (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.*), Hippolytus, Origen, Tertullian, and Epiphanius wrote against Gnosticism. Yamauchi says, “The Mandaean communities living today in Iraq and Iran are the sole surviving remnants of ancient Gnosticism” (Yamauchi, p. 99), but elements of it are in Christian Science (Cairns, p. 18).

In the nineteenth century, two Gnostic manuscripts of original Gnostic writers were published: *Codex Askewianus* and *Codex Brucianus* and in the twentieth century *Codex Berolinensis* was published. *Codex Berolinensis* contains *The Gospel of Mary* (Magdalene), *The Wisdom of Jesus*, and *The Acts of Peter* and *The Apocryphon of John* (a work mentioned by Irenaeus in 180). In 1945, about fifty Gnostic works were discovered near Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt. This discovery contains *The Gospel of Truth*, *The Letter of Rheginos*, (both of which some say was written by Valentinus), *The Gospel of Thomas*, *The Gospel According to Philip* (also by Valentinus), *Apocryphon of John*, and *The Revelation of Adam*. Dan Brown claims that since his fictional story in *The Da Vinci Code* is based on the Gnostic Gospels, it is based on historical facts.

Gnosticism is built on the philosophical idea of dualism, the notion that the spiritual is good and the material is evil. The highest god is spiritual and, therefore, good. From him, beings emanated who were less spirit and increasing more of matter. One of these emanations, the demiurge, had enough spirit to have creative power and enough matter to create the evil material world. According to some groups of Gnostic, the demiurge, who created this evil world, was the god of the Old Testament. Furthermore, because the matter is evil, Christ could not have taken on the human body. Some Gnostics adopted the doctrine of Docetism (from the Greek word for “appearance”). In other words, Jesus was a phantom, who appeared to have a material body. Other Gnostics concluded that Christ came upon the human body of Jesus at his baptism and left before he was crucified (Cairns, pp. 98-99).

There is a spark of divinity encapsulated in the bodies of “spiritual” individuals who are destined for salvation. The problem is that these spiritual people are ignorant of their heavenly origins. They are saved through secret knowledge (the word “Gnostic” comes from the Greek word for knowledge—gnosis; a gnostic is one who has knowledge; an *agnostic* is one who has *no* knowledge;). “Thus awakened, the ‘spirituals’ escape from the prison of their bodies at death and pass safely through the planetary regions controlled by hostile demons, to be reunited with God” (Yamauchi, p. 98). Since salvation depends solely on the knowledge of one’s ‘spiritual’ nature, some Gnostic indulged in extremely licentious behavior. They are ‘pearls’ who cannot be stained by any external mud” (Yamauchi, p. 98). Others, however, had a “radically ascetic attitude towards sex and marriage. Humans were originally unisex. The creation of woman was the source of evil; the procreation of children simply multiplied the souls in bondage to the powers of darkness” (Yamauchi, p. 98; see also Kelly, pp. 22-28).

The numerous Gnostics each had their own special doctrines (Kelly, p. 24). Saturninus believed that Christ was the redeemer, but not a material being; He only appeared to be a man (Docetism). Cerinthus taught that Jesus was merely a man upon whom “the Christ” descended as a dove and since Christ could not suffer, He departed from Jesus before the crucifixion. Irenaeus says the apostle John fled from a bath-house at Ephesus when he learned that Cerinthus was there. The most famous Gnostic teacher was Valentinus, who taught at Alexandria and came to Rome in 140 (Yamauchi, p. 100).

Marcion had one of the most influential groups (Cairns, pp. 98-99). Marcion of Pontus was the son of a bishop who became a wealthy shipowner. He was an important, though not typical, Gnostic. For him, faith is the key to salvation, not knowledge (Cary, *HCT*, p. 22). He insisted upon faith in Christ, but rejected the humanity of Jesus and the resurrection of the body. About 140, he arrived in Rome

and immediately fell under the spell of a Gnostic teacher. Marcion became the chief spokesman of Gnosticism, but he introduced his own distinctive ideas.

Marcion held that the God of the Old Testament is the author of evil, solely for the Jews, and basically vengeful, whereas the God of the New Testament is a God of grace and love for all, who disclosed Himself in His Son Jesus Christ. Jesus, however, was *not* born of a woman. He suddenly appeared in the synagogue at Capernaum as a grown man. He was not like any other man, except in His appearance (Dermot McDonald, pp. 102-03).

Marcion set up his own canon, which consisted of an edited version of the Gospel of Luke and ten letters of Paul. He may have been one of the first to call one of the canonical Gospels a “gospel” (Lee Martin McDonald, p. 325).

When Marcion met Polycarp, he asked, “Recognize us, Polycarp?” Polycarp replied, “Yes, indeed, I recognize the firstborn of Satan” (*The Martyrdom of Polycarp* 22:2). Marcion was excommunicated from the church in Rome in 144. After being expelled from the Roman church, he founded his own church, which eventually died out, because celibacy was required (Bruce, CS, p. 136).

As a result of Marcion, the church was forced to address the issue of the canon and to create a short creed as a test of orthodoxy. The office of bishop was elevated to protect purity and unity. Eventually, this led to the prominence of the Roman bishop (Cairns, p. 100). Irenaeus attacked him and Tertullian wrote five books against him. The canon of Marcion demonstrates that the books he accepted were regarded as authentic and there were other books he rejected that were also accepted as canonical by the church at large.

The Ebionites and the Marcionites were polar opposites. In contrast to the Ebionites, Marcionites rejected Judaism and the Hebrew Scriptures, believed in two separate creators and believe Jesus only appeared to have a human form (Cook, p. 11).

*Manicheanism* A man named Mani (216-76) or Manicheaus of Macedonia founded Manicheanism, which was similar to Gnosticism. According to this view the king of the light was opposed by the king of darkness, who managed to trick primitive man into becoming a being who was mangled with light and darkness. The human soul was linked to the kingdom of light, but the human body was in bondage to the king of darkness. Salvation consisted of liberating the light in the soul from the matter of his body, by being exposed to the Light, Christ. The perfected ones constituted a priestly caste for the group. Manicheans lived an ascetic life and performed rituals essential to the release of light. They placed so much emphasis on the aesthetic life that they viewed as sex as evil, thus emphasizing the superiority of the unmarried state (Cairns, p. 100; 1 Tim. 4:1-3).

It has been suggested that Manicheanism may have contributed to the development of the priestly class in the church (Cairns, p. 100). Augustine was a disciple of the Manicheans for twelve years. After his conversion he refuted it.

*Neoplatonism* According to Cairns, there are three forms of mysticism. The epistemological type emphasizes how all can know God. They think all knowledge of God is immediate and comes directly to us by intuition or spiritual illumination. Reason and even the Bible are subordinate to the inner light (the medieval mystics, the Roman Catholic quietists of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and the Quakers). The metaphysical type teaches that the spiritual essence of people is absorbed mystically into the divine being in occasional experiences in the here and now (extreme mystics in the Middle Ages and Buddhists). The

ethical and spiritual type says that people are related to God through their identification with Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Cairns, p. 101).

Neoplatonism was the brainchild of Ammonius Saccas (ca. 174-ca. 242). Origen and Plotinus (ca. 205-70) studied under Saccas. Plotinus became the leader and taught at Rome during the third quarter of the third century. From the collected writings of Plotinus, Porphyry (232-305) produced the literary statement of Neoplatonism.

Neoplatonism taught that an Absolute Being was the transcendent source of all that is and from whom all was created by a process of overflow. This emanation finally resulted in the creation of humans who are reasoning souls in a body. The goal of the universe is the re-absorption into the divine in essence, which is a process as people engage in rational contemplation and the mystical intuition to seek to know God and to be absorbed into the One from whence all came. The highest state of enjoyment in this life is the experience of ecstasy.

Emperor Julian, who was known as “the Apostate,” embraced Neoplatonism and during his reign (361-363) tried to make it the religion of the empire. During his quest for truth, Augustine embraced it for a time. It no doubt contributed to the rise of mysticism in Christianity and offered a substitute Christianity for pagans unwilling to face the high ethical demands of Christianity. In the early sixth century, it died out (Cairns, p. 101).

*Monarchianism* Monarchians emphasized the unity of God in opposition to any attempt to conceive of God as three separate persons. They were the ancient form of Unitarianism and the Jesus Only form of Pentecostalism (Cairns, pp. 102-03).

Monarchianism took on several forms. Dynamic Monarchianism maintained the humanity of Christ, claiming that the Christ came upon the man Jesus at his baptism and after his death and that the man Jesus was adopted into the distinction of three Persons in one Godhead. Paul of Samosata popularized this view. During the third century, Paul of Samosata, the bishop of Antioch, preached with “violent bodily gestures and asking for applause and for the waving of handkerchiefs. On occasion, he had a female choir sing hymns praising him” (Cairns, pp. 102-103). According to Paul of Samosata, Christ was a good man, who by righteousness achieved divinity and saviorhood.

Modalistic Monarchianism or Modalism held that there were three manifestations of the one God: God the Father (Creator), God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. In other words, God was manifested as Father in the Old Testament, as the Son, who came to redeem, and as the Holy Spirit after the resurrection of Christ. There were not three persons in the godhead, only three manifestations (one man who is a son, a brother, and a father). Modalism tried to preserve the divinity of Christ. This view was popularized by Sabellius, who wanted to avoid tri-theism (Cairns, p. 103).

As was stated at the beginning of this section, heresies existed during the first century. So it is no surprise to find heresies in the second century. As a result of false teachers in the first century, inspired letters were written (Gal., etc.) and elders were appointed (Paul told Titus to appoint elders because of false teachers in the church; Titus 1:5-14, esp. “for” in Titus 1:10). As a result of false teachers in the second century, something similar happened. According to Cairns, their presence in the second century forced the church to develop a canon of Scripture, creeds, such as the rules of faith of Tertullian and Irenaeus, and the position of bishop was strengthened by the emphasis on the office as a rallying point against heresy (Cairns, p. 104). There is evidence that a canon existed before the

controversies of the second century, but statements of faith (Apostles' Creed) and the strengthening of the office of bishop were probably results of these and other controversies.

In his book on church history, Kuiper says for a long time the churches were only loosely connected with each other. By 200, their struggle with the Gnostic and Montanist heretics did much to weld the churches into one compact whole. By then all the churches had in common: the canon of the New Testament as authoritative Scripture, the Apostles' Creed, and the Episcopal form of church government. The heretics formed little churches outside the big church, which was henceforth known as the Catholic Church, that is the universal church or the Old Catholic Church. Later from it the Roman Catholic Church was developed (Kuiper, p. 21).

Secular historians use the presences of these various heretical groups and the discovery of the gnostic gospels to teach that at the beginning, there was no one form of Christianity. Cook, a history professor, says, the belief in an early, constant, orthodox majority has its roots in the writings of Eusebius. According to Cook, the accusation of heresy was tossed back and forth among the groups and ultimately stuck on the groups that were defeated. In other words, "There was no pure unadulterated faith universally practiced at the beginning of the church" (Cook, p. 9). According to this approach, orthodoxy is nothing more than the name of the group that won.

## Schisms

During this period, several groups split from the church. The "church" began to be called the "Great Church" (Cary, *HCT*, p. 25). As was noted earlier, it was when the groups began forming their own church that the "Great Church" from which they separated took the name "Catholic" or universal church (Kuiper, p. 38). The "Great Church" rejected the groups they said was not teaching apostolic doctrine (Cary, *HCT*, p. 27). Thus the punishment was excommunication, exclusion from the communion of churches (Cary, *HCT*, p. 26).

*Montanism* One of the earliest groups to split from the mainline church was Montanism. It began in Phrygia, the region in western Asia Minor, where such cities as Ephesus, Colosse, and Laodicea were located. Schaff describes Phrygia as "the home of a sensuously mystic and dreamy nature-religion" (Schaff, 2.110). Paul planted a church at Ephesus and wrote a letter to the church at Colossae, in which he warned them against legalism (Col. 2:16-17), mysticism (Col. 2:18-19), and asceticism (Col. 2:20-23). There were also churches at Laodicea and Hierapolis. Philip's four daughters, who prophesied, were buried in Hierapolis, the capital of Phrygia (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.111).

In 172, a man named Montanus began to attract attention as a prophet (Wright, p. 74). He was joined by two prophetesses, Priscilla and Maximilla, both of whom left their husbands to serve the Lord (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.18.3). They adopted the name "New Prophecy," which described their belief that the Paraclete was still giving direct revelation. Schaff says they called themselves spiritual Christians in distinction from carnal Christians (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.110). In his later life, Tertullian joined the Montanists. He wrote a reply to the critics of Montanism called *Ecstasy*. Their opponents daubed them the "Cataphrygians," from their place of origin, the obscure region of Phrygia. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) called them Montanists.

“Montanism agreed in all essential points with the Catholic Church and held very firmly to the traditional rule of faith” (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.110). They opposed formalism and dependence on human leadership instead of the guidance of the Holy Spirit. They also opposed the rise of the bishop in the local church (Cairns, p. 102). Since they believed the return of Christ was imminent, they urged believers live a strict ascetic life (Latourette, p. 129). “Marital relations were to be abandoned in favor of chastity, fasts multiplied, and food eaten dry” (Wright, p. 74). They believed that Jesus would rule on the earth for 1000 years and that the New Jerusalem would come down out of heaven as recorded in the book of Revelation (Latourette, pp. 128-29). Schaff says, “All the ascetic, rigoristic, and chiliastic elements of the ancient church combined in Montanism.” They were not a “departure from the faith, but a morbid overstraining of the practical morality and discipline of the early church” (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.110).

A major characteristic of this group was prophecy. Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla claimed to be mouthpieces of the Paraclete, that is, the Holy Spirit (Wright, p. 74). Several aspects of their prophesying need to be noted.

What was their manner of their prophesying? Eusebius quotes a second-century source he calls “Anonymous.” Anonymous, who called the New Prophecy “False prophecy,” states that Montanus, “suddenly experiencing some kind of possession and spurious ecstasy ... was inspired and began to speak and say strange things, prophesying, as he pretended, contrary to the custom related to the tradition and succession of the church from the beginning (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.16.7). Anonymous states when some first heard Montanus prophesy, they thought he was inspired by a devil and a spirit of error. They rebuked him and forbid him to speak (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.16.8). Priscilla and Maximilla also prophesied like Montanus: “they spoke in a frenzied manner, unsuitably and abnormally” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.16.9). Tertullian says that the ecstasy of the New Prophecy is a state that “causes a person to lose control of mind and common sense” (“being out of one’s senses, *amentia*, Tertullian, *Ag. Marcion* 4.22; Westin, p. 14). Elsewhere he defines prophecy in terms of ecstasy. Priscilla and Maximilla fell unconscious when they prophesied (Kelly, p. 62).

Note that Anonymous says that what they did was contrary to the custom related to the tradition and succession of the church from the beginning. Anonymous also quotes Alcibiades, who says neither the Old nor New Testament prophets, nor the prophets who followed them (he refers to Ammia in Philadelphia and Quadratus) delivered God’s Word in this fashion (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.17.1-4). One bishop tried to exorcize Maximilla (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.18.13). Epiphanius’ unidentified source gives a fairly thorough treatment of ecstasy in biblical prophecy. Though the prophet receiving “his utterance from the Holy Spirit” said “all things vigorously,” he spoke “in control of his powers and reasoning and understanding” (Epiphanius, *Medicine* 48.3.4). He appeals to Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel in the Old Testament (Epiphanius, *Medicine* 48.3.4-10).

Andrew Daunton-Fear, a church history professor at St. Andrew’s Theological Seminary, in Manila, Philippines, has identified two types of ecstasy. In visions and out-of-body experiences, the bodily senses are dimmed, but the mind remains conscious. The mind participates in another world and is able to relate to others what it saw and heard. This is the ecstasy experienced by Paul, when he was caught up to the third heaven (2 Cor. 12) and by Peter in Acts 10 (also the visions in the Old Testament). In ecstasy, that is “possession,” the bodily senses are curtailed and usually the soul or mind is totally

suppressed. He says in this case, another entity takes over the body, controlling speech or actions. The person is in a trance (out of his mind). During the trance and afterwards there is no recollection of what has been said or done. Daunton-Fear places heathen prophets, mediums in séances and *Montanus* in this category. He suggests that Montanus' ecstasy could have come from the cult of Apollo, the Greek patron of prophecy, which was widespread in Asia Minor (A. Daunton-Fear, "The Ecstasies of Montanus," in Elizabeth A. Livingstone ed., *Studia Patristica*, vol. 17, part 2. p. 650. Great Britain: A. Wheaton & Co. Ltd., 1982 and cited by Angus Stewart in "Was the Church Right to Condemn Montanism?" located at [www.cprf.co.uk/articles/montanism.htm](http://www.cprf.co.uk/articles/montanism.htm). Accessed 2/3/11; Stewart adds that Daunton-Fear does not expressly say Montanus' inspiration was satanic, but that conclusion would agree with the church fathers).

What was the content of their prophecies? What exactly did the "Paraclete" teach? Schaff says that according to Tertullian, the ministry of the Paraclete consisted "only in the reform of discipline, in deeper understanding of the Scriptures, and in effort after higher perfection" and that it had the same faith of the Catholic church (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.111). Tertullian lists as the foremost function of the Paraclete: "to direct discipline" (Tertullian, *On the Veiling of Virgins* 1.8). To be more specific, New Prophecy gave directives regarding martyrdom, remarriage, veiling of virgins, fasts, and forgiveness by the church.

Two of the sixteen or so recorded prophecies concern martyrdom (Tertullian, *Concerning Flight* 9.4). The first reads, "Wish not to choose to die in your beds, nor in miscarriages and mild fevers, but in martyrdoms." In the preface to the second prophecy concerning martyrdom, Tertullian says, "Nearly all his (the Paraclete's) words exhort to martyrdom are not to flee," but Jesus said, "When they persecute you in this city, flee to another" (Mt. 10:23).

Concerning a second marriage after the death of one's spouse, Tertullian wrote, "For our part, a spiritual principle maintains *by the authority of the Paraclete*, which prescribes one marriage" (Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 1.29, italics added). He also wrote, "What is our heresy if we condemn second marriage [in series] as illicit, on par with adultery?" (Tertullian, *On Monogamy* 15.1). Those who married again after the death of their spouse were excommunicated (Epiphanius, *Medicine* 48.9.7). This teaching is directly opposed to the Scripture (Rom. 7:3; 1 Tim. 5:11-14).

Tertullian said that the veiling of the virgin was revealed by the Paraclete (Tertullian, *On the Veiling of Virgins* 1.11). He says they (the Catholic church) censured us 1) because we keep our own special fasts, 2) because we frequently extend fasting into the evening, 3) because we also practice the eating of dry food, stripping our diet of *all flesh* and all juice and every succulent fruit, nor do *we drink anything that has the flavor of wine* (Tertullian, *On Fasting* 1, italics added). Concerning committing a serious sin after baptism, Tertullian quotes the Paraclete: "The Church can pardon sin, but I will not do it, lest they also commit other offenses" (Tertullian, *On Modesty* 21.7). Philip Schaff concluded that they "fell from evangelical freedom into Jewish legalism; while the catholic church in rejecting the new laws and burdens defended the cause of freedom" (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.111).

The church was concerned about adding to the Scripture. Anonymous says he was hesitant to "compose a treatise" against the Montanists, "lest in any way I appear to some to add a new writing or add to the word of the new covenant of the gospel" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.16.3). He adds, "One who has chosen to live according to the gospel, can neither

add nor subtract from that word” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.16.3). Gaius attacked the Montanists for “composing new scriptures” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 6.20.3). Hippolytus’s chief complaint is the Montanists’ excessive reliance upon these three leaders: “They allege that they have learned something more through these than from the law, prophets and Gospels.... They magnify the women above the apostles and every gift of grace so that some presume to assert in them a something superior to Christ.... They attach themselves more to the speeches of Montanus than to the Gospels” (cited by David F. Wright, “Why were the Montanists condemned?” *Themelios* 2.1, September 1976. [www.earlychurch.org.uk/article\\_montanists\\_wright.html](http://www.earlychurch.org.uk/article_montanists_wright.html) accessed 2/3/11).

The Church pronounced the Montanists profane, rejected their heresy, and expelled them from the Church (Eusebius, *Eccl.* 5:16.10). Montanism “gave rise to the first Synods, which are mentioned after the apostolic age” (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.110; Wright, p. 74). Schaff says, “The bishops and synods of Asia Minor, though not with one voice, declared the new prophecy the work of demons, applied exorcism, and cut off the Montanists from the fellowship of the church. All agreed that it was supernatural (a natural interpretation of such psychological phenomena being then unknown), and the only alternative was to ascribe it either to God or to his great Adversary” (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.110).

About 230, the synods of Iconium and Synnada (in eastern Phrygia) resolved that Montanists baptisms were futile and Montanists had to be (re)baptized into the Catholic Church (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 7:7:5). “This false order of the so-called new prophecy has been abhorred by the whole brotherhood throughout the world” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* 5.18.1; 5.19.1-4). In 381, the Council of Constantinople declared that the Montanists should be looked upon as pagans (Cairns, p. 102). In 407, the Roman emperor Honorius decreed the death penalty for all Montanists, which caused them to be more closely united with other heretical movements (Westin, p. 15). “Montanist groups survived into the fifth century in Africa and longer still in Phrygia” (Wright, p. 74). “The successors of Constantine, down to Justinian (530), repeatedly enacted laws against them” (Schaff, *HCC*, 2.110). Glimpses of them were found in the Orient during the eighth century (Westin, p. 15; in Asia Minor, they persisted at least as late as 721-722).

Stewart points to a number of similarities between Montanism and modern Pentecostalism, including, 1) appeal to the same passages of Scripture (Jn. 14-16; Joel 2:28-29; Acts 2:17-18; 1 Cor. 12-14; Gal. 3:28), 2) the role of women in the church (the Montanists permitted women bishops, elders, and deacons), and 3) a high incidence of failed prophecy. He also says there are a number of differences. He writes, “Many sections of Pentecostalism show much less interest in an imminent second coming of Christ, with its resultant ethical demands. Charismaticism, unlike Montanism, has little place for strenuous ethical requirements. While the New Prophecy desired moral purity, the charismatics have less interest in obedience to laws, whether from Christ or man. Thus Pentecostal churches are not marked by strict discipline, or (often) any discipline at all. It is rather religious experiences that the charismatic seeks. Membership in charismatic churches is open to all who want to feel the presence of the Spirit. Tongue-speaking and miraculous faith-healers are elements in Pentecostalism which were unknown or of much less significance in Montanism” He concludes, “Charismaticism with its added sins of “miraculous” healings and tongue-speaking is probably the greater evil of the two movements.” (Stewart, “Was the Church Right to Condemn Montanism?” [www.cprf.co.uk/articles/montanism.htm](http://www.cprf.co.uk/articles/montanism.htm) accessed 2/3/11).



Stewart says, “It is clear that Montanism was a heretical movement.” They “were excluded *because they had another spirit*” (Stewart, italics his). John Wesley’s judgment of Montanus was that he was “one of the holiest men of the second century.” Wright says, “They were fanatics but not heretics” (Wright, p. 74). Cary says, by rejecting the Montanists, the Great Church was saying that the era of prophecy and new revelation was past (Cary, *HCT*, p. 27). David F Wright, Professor Emeritus of Patristic & Reformed Christianity at the University of Edinburgh says “The condemnation of Montanism was a decisive point in the evolution of that kind of churchly Christianity which cherished office and order and had little room to welcome the charismata” (Wright, *Themelios* 2.1, September 1976).

In the first century, Paul warned the church at Colossae against legalism (Col. 2:16-17), mysticism (Col. 2:18-19), and asceticism (Col. 2:20-23). In the latter part of the second century, the church in that same area of the world was still faced with the challenge of legalism, mysticism, and asceticism. In the first century, Philip’s four daughters, who prophesied, were buried in Hierapolis, the capital of Phrygia. In the latter part of the second century, women in that same area of the world were claiming that they were prophesying.

*Novatianists* What to do with Christians whose faith failed in the hour of persecution became an issue in the church. Even before the persecution issue, some sins were considered unforgivable. Tertullian listed the “seven deadly sins” as “idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, fornication, false witness, and fraud.” Hermas and Tertullian said one such sin might be forgiven, but only one. Callistus, bishop of Rome (217-22), appealed to Paul’s letters, the parable of the lost sheep, and the parable of the prodigal son for proof that no sin was unforgivable (Latourette, p. 138). His views were widely accepted (Smith, p. 79).

In 250, Emperor Decius ordered all citizens to perform a religious sacrifice or else face death. Many Christians were martyred because they refused, but to save their lives, some participated in the ritual sacrifice. In 251, a man named Cornelius was elected bishop of Rome. He thought that Christians who failed in persecution only needed to repent to be received back into the church.

Novatian, was “an earnest, learned, but gloomy man, who had come to faith through severe demoniacal disease and inward struggles” (Schaff, *HCC*, vol. 2, 4.58). He was a theologian of “impeccable orthodoxy” (Latourette, p. 138) and one of the first to write in Latin (Smith, p. 78). He taught that those whose faith failed during the persecution could not be accepted back into the church, even if they repented. He insisted that the only way to reenter the church was through rebaptism. Cornelius said rebaptism was not necessary, only repentance.

Cornelius was elected bishop of Rome. Schaff explains what happened next. “Novatian, against his will, was chosen bishop by the opposition. Cornelius excommunicated him. Both parties courted the recognition of the churches abroad. Fabian, bishop of Antioch, sympathized with the rigorists. Dionysius of Alexandria, on the contrary, accused them of blaspheming the most gracious Lord Jesus Christ, by calling him unmerciful. And especially Cyprian, from his zeal for ecclesiastical unity and his aversion to Novatus, took sides with Cornelius, whom he regarded the legitimate bishop of Rome” (Schaff, *HCC*, vol. 2, 4.58).

Novatian set up a rival congregation. A network of small congregations soon sprang up. They called themselves “Cathari” (pure ones) “to distinguish themselves from all other

churches, which they considered to be polluted as a result of their lenient attitude toward sinners” (Smith, p. 78). Those who joined them had to be re-baptized, as if they were joining the only true church (Smith, p. 78).

Westin says the movement became widespread, especially in Africa, where Montanists in great numbers joined forces with the new opposition movement. “In many sections, Novatianism was the predominant form of Christianity” (Westin, p. 17). It grew in both the East and the West, becoming “a separate church” (Westin, p. 17).

Novatian is believed to have been martyred in 258. The council of Nicaea recognized the ordination of the Novatian clergy (Schaff, *HCC*, vol. 2, 4.58), who were allowed to retain their rank if they returned to the Catholic church (Smith, p. 78). The council of Nicaea also “endeavored, without success, to reconcile it with the Catholic church (Schaff, *HCC*, vol. 2, 4.58). Over time, his followers were probably absorbed into the mainline churches. In Phrygia, they combined with the remnants of the Montanists. Constantine, at first dealt mildly with the Novatians, but afterward prohibited them to worship in public and ordered their books to be burnt (Schaff, *HCC*, vol. 2, 4.58).

Are serious sins forgivable? Peter denied the Lord, was forgiven, and pressed into service (Lk. 22:31-32). The man who committed gross immorality (1 Cor. 5:1-2), repented and was accepted again in the Christian community (2 Cor. 2:3-8).

Commenting on that passage in Luke, Barclay says, “Jesus said a very lovely thing to Peter. ‘When you have turned,’ he said, ‘strengthen your brothers.’ It is as if Jesus said to Peter, ‘You will deny me; and you will weep bitter tears; but the result will be that you will be better able to help your brothers who are going through it.’ We cannot really help a man until we have been in the same furnace of affliction or the same abyss of shame as he has been. It was said of Jesus, ‘He can help others who are going through it because he has been through it himself.’ (Hebrews 2:18.) To experience the shame of failure and disloyalty is not all loss, because it gives us a sympathy and an understanding that otherwise we would never have won.”

*Donatism* After 300, Donatism developed as a result of the persecution of the church by Diocletian. Donatus wanted to exclude Caecilianus from his office as bishop of Carthage because he had been consecrated by Felix, who was accused of being a traitor during the persecution (Felix had delivered Scripture to the authorities, González, p. 153.). Donatus argued that Felix’s failure during the persecution invalidated *his* ordination because he had committed the unpardonable sin. If Felix’s ordination was not valid, his ordination of Caecilianus was not valid (González, p. 153).

This argument was settled when a synod held at Rome decided that the validity of the sacrament does not depend on the character of the one administering the sacrament. Because of this controversy, Augustine wrote much on the question of the authority of the church (Cairns, p. 104).

It should also be pointed out that some claim that these splinter groups, such as the Montanists, were part of the true church, not the more “mainstream” corrupt church. There is a theory that throughout church history, there has always been a “Baptist” type of church. The popular version of this notion is given in a booklet entitled *The Trail of Blood* by B. H. Carroll. According to Carroll, there have been churches in every age that recognized Christ as the head of the church, had the Bible as the only rule of faith, practiced congregational polity, observe two ordinances (baptism and the Lord Supper), had two offices (pastors and deacons), practiced tithing, worked in fulfilling the great commission,

and were independent (separated from the state). It is doubtful that all those details can be demonstrated in every age. At any rate, Carroll lists the Montanists as part of this “Baptist” lineage.

Gunnar Westin (1890-1967), a church history professor at the University of Uppsala in Sweden, wrote a book with a similar thesis (Gunnar Westin, *The Free Church Through the Ages*; foreword by Latourette, a professor at Yale University). Westin defines a “free church” as one that consisted of people who freely accepted the gospel and were baptized, that had no relationship with any constituted authority or state, and that had officers within the church consisting of elders and deacons.

Westin says Marcionism was part of “the free church.” Many regarded it as a purified form of Pauline Christianity. Its most significant teaching was the repudiation of the close ties of the church with the Old Testament. The gospel was “something entirely distinct from the legalistic requirements of the Old Testament” (Westin, p. 10).

Westin concedes that Marcion’s sharp opposition to Judaism “misled him to take a moderate dualistic outlook regarding the Creator and the Savior—maintaining the existence of two Gods,” but he insists that Marcion’s view did not arise from Gnosticism. It was simply his rejection of the assimilation of Judaism in the church, his desire to purify the message of the church, and acceptance of Paul’s writings as the only authority for the church (Westin, pp. 10-11). As far as Westin is concerned, “The main question is whether or not he (Marcion) was a supporter of the free church concept when he left the official church to set up his own organization” (Westin, p. 11).

Westin points out that a large number of people followed Marcion when he left the church in Rome and that the movement grew rapidly, so much so that a few years later Justin Martyr wrote that it had “spread among all nations of mankind” (Westin, p. 10).

About 200, Tertullian said that Marcionites had spread over “the whole world” (see Westin p. 11 for specific areas). Even though it was outlawed as a heresy, it remained alive in small villages and concealed places for 100 years. Eventually, it was absorbed into Manicheism, a new movement. In the Middle Ages, the Marcion type of separatism was represented in the Paulician movement (Westin, p. 12).

Westin also claims Montanism was part of the Free Church movement. He argues that Montanism was a movement that sought to maintain the office of the prophet and oppose ecclesiasticism when the primitive Catholic Church became more “exclusive” (Westin, p. 12). Westin acknowledges that Montanus experienced ecstasies and probably spoke in tongues, but he insists “essential features of this revival movement were not, however, the ecstasy and the glossolalia but the emphasis on declaring the message of salvation and holiness in the light of signs of the imminent end of the world.” He says, “This major emphasis on holy living was a real contrast to the slackness and worldly conformity which, to a great extent, characterized the Church during this period. The most serious charge made by the early Episcopal-type Church was that Montanus and his two leading prophetesses, Prisca (Pricilla) and Maximilla, claimed to have received a direct revelation from God through the Holy Spirit. This concept was diametrically opposed to the conviction of an official apostolic succession, which only could come through the sanction of the Church. The Montanists congregations generally did not lay as much emphasis on ecstasy, prophecy, or on speaking in tongues as other groups in later church history” (Westin, pp. 12-13). Westin adds, “The high-sounding claims of possessing special revelational insight, the one-sided emphasis on apocalyptic types, the practice of rigorous

asceticism, as well as unbridled ecstasy, became weapons of attack in the hands of their opponents. Antagonism became sharp, and the justification of such a revival movement was drowned out in the waves of excessiveness. Consequently, the Montanists were rejected as a fanatical sect by their opponents, and on the basis of this opposition evaluation, the critique of this movement throughout history has been conclusively negative” (Westin, p. 13).

Montanists stressed that laymen are priests, who can administer the Lord’s Supper, and regarded Paul as the great authority (Westin, p. 14). The great significance of Montanism was their emphasis on salvation, the teaching of holiness, and a severe, critical attitude toward worldliness and carelessness within the Church (Westin, p. 15). The excommunication of the followers of Montanus created a “movement with autonomous characteristics, an independent fellowship” (Westin, p. 13-14).

Carroll and Westin have a point, but at this time in church history, the “catholic” church was a “Baptist” type of Free Church.

## The Church Fathers

As has been explained, the expression “Church Fathers” has been used in a number of different ways. Here the expression “*Apostolic* Fathers” is being used to designate those who wrote before 150 and the expression “*Church* Fathers” is being used to refer to those who wrote after 150. The Church Fathers covered in this section are those who wrote during the period of the Old Catholic Church. The Church Fathers who wrote during the period of the Imperial Church will be considered later.

### Justin Martyr

“Virtually single-handedly he kicked started the Christian dialog with rival philosophes and set the church on the road to an intellectually coherent account of its faith” (Hill, p. 16). “Justin was the “first to produce a new way of thinking, as a Christian, using the philosophical concepts of his day” (Hill, p. 23).

*Author* Justin Martyr (ca. 100-165) was the most foremost apologist (one who defends the Christian faith) of the second century (Cairns, p. 106; Hannah, p. 307). Details of his life come chiefly from his own writings. He was born at Shechem (now Nablus) in Palestine. As a young man, he studied philosophy. After studying under several philosophers, including a stoic teacher and a follower of Aristotle, he found a philosophy in Platonism. While walking by the sea, he encountered an older man who told him to study the prophets (Justin, *Dialog.*, 4). He saw a good deal of persecution of Christians and was impressed by the remarkable moral constancy of Christians in the face of death. When he was converted, he traveled in a philosopher’s robe, seeking to win men to Christ. He taught in Ephesus and Rome, where Tatian was one of his pupils.

Platonist found it laughable that Christians worshipped a mere human being instead of an immaterial God. They considered the Christian doctrine of a physical resurrection to be a ridiculous travesty of their own doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Since Christians refuse to honor the traditional Gods of Rome, to which every philosopher gave lip service, they were called atheists. Justin defended Christianity against these charges (Hill, p. 17).

Justin was martyred in Rome, about 165. His last words were: “We desire nothing more than to suffer for our Lord Jesus Christ; for this gives us salvation and joyfulness before His dreadful Judgment Seat” (Kuiper, p. 10).

*Date* In the first of his three surviving works, Justin says, “Christ was born one hundred and fifty years ago under Cyrenius” (Quirinius; see *First Apology*, 46). That puts his first work about 150.

*His Works* Justin’s first surviving work, *First Apology*, is addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius (138-161) and his two adopted sons. In it he urges the emperor to examine the charges against Christians (chapters 1-3), argues that Christians are not atheistic or idolatrous (chapters 4-8), discusses the morals, dogmas, and Founder of Christianity (chapters 14-60), and describes the assembly of Christians (chapter 61-67). The point of this book is that Christians are blameless concerning the charges against them and they should be freed from persecution (Cairns, p. 106).

His *Second Apology* was provoked by the summary execution of people confessing the name of Christ. It is an appendix to his first book. In it, he cites illustrations of the injustices to Christians (Cairns, p. 106).

The longest of Justin’s three surviving works is the *Dialogue with Trypho*. Trypho, a Jewish Rabbi at Ephesus, objected that Christians broke the Jewish law and worshipped a man. The first eight chapters of this work are autobiographical. After that Justin develops three ideas: the decline of the law and the rise of the gospel, the linking of the Logos with God, and the calling of Gentiles as the people of God (Justin, *Dialog.* 9-44). Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies (Cairns, p. 107).

Hill, who holds degrees in philosophy and theology from Oxford University, says Justin wrote this book in the style of Plato, showing that Christianity is a philosophy that is as rational and intellectually coherent as any other philosophy (Hill, p. 18). Hill also says Justin wrote apologetics, seeking to defend Christianity rather than write a reflected discussion of the meaning of Christian doctrine (Hill, p. 20).

Hill explains, “Justin’s most significant ideas concerned the way God relates to the world and to Christ, and they’re a good example of the Christians used concepts of contemporary thought to frame their faith” (Justin, p. 20). Using the Platonic and Stoic word “Logos,” Justin says that it existed within God as His divine Reason. Justin writes, “We call him the Logos because he carries tidings from the Father to men: but maintained that his power is indivisible and inseparable from the Father. It is just as we say that the light of the sun on the earth is indivisible and inseparable from this sun in the heavens. When it sinks, the light sinks along with it. In the same way, we say the Father, when he chooses, causes his power to spring forth, and when he chooses the makes it returned to oneself” (Justin, *Dialog.* 128). “Thus, according to Justin, what has happened in the incarnation is that the underlying reason of the universe, The Logos or Word of God, has come in the flesh” (González, pp. 55-56).

Hill insists this is not a description of what God is like, but Justin’s explanation of how God acts on the world (Hill, p. 21). Jesus is the Logos who made and governs the world today, which is different from what the Platonist taught. Justin also argues that Christians have not taken their ideas from the philosophers, but the philosophers got their best ideas from the Bible. He even says that Plato read the Old Testament, but did not fully understand it, which is why Platonism has much in common with Christianity (Hill, p. 21). “Justin goes further, however. If anyone can follow the Logos by living a rational life, then that

means it is possible to follow Christ even if one has never heard the Christian message. So Justin claims that the prophets and the philosophers who lived before Christ were Christians, even though they didn't know it" (Hill, p. 22).

In the final analysis, Justin's "theology is as abstract and timeless as the philosophy Plato: he shows little interest in the concrete and the historical, in the person of Jesus and what he did and said on the earth" (Hill, p. 23).

*Scripture* Justin Martyr refers to the "Memoirs of the Apostles," that is the Gospels and quotes Matthew 2:1 (Justin, *Dialog.* 106:4), Mark 3:16-17 (Justin, *Dialog.* 106:4), Luke 22:44, 42 (Justin, *Dialog.* 103:8), John 3:3 (Justin, *First Apology* 61:4). He does not quote, but he refers to the book of Revelation (Justin, *Dialog.* 81.4).

*Doctrine* According to Latourette, Justin taught that "the *Logos* was incarnated in a historical individual, Jesus Christ, for the salvation of men. Yet the *Logos* which had become flesh in Jesus Christ, while not different in kind from God the Father, was a second God" (Latourette, pp. 142-143).

Justin argued that the Scriptures spoke of Christ, in whom the law is set aside. The rabbi asked Justin Martyr whether Jewish converts to Christianity would be saved if they continued to keep the law. Justin replied that they would, provided they did not insist that other Christians do the same, but he warned that not all Christians shared his opinion. This is an indication that the church by this time was predominantly Gentile (*Eerdmans'*, p. 100).

Justin believed in a thousand-year reign of Christ on the earth: "Moreover also among us a man named John, one of the apostles of Christ, prophesied in a revelation made to him that those who have believed on our Christ will spend a thousand years in Jerusalem; and that hereafter the general and, in short, the eternal resurrection and judgment of all will likewise take place" (Justin, *Dial.* 81.4). He regarded the kingdom of heaven as a prize for virtuous conduct to be attained after death; its blessing would be enjoyed by those who had lived in accordance with Christ splendid precepts (J. N. D. Kelly, p. 460, who cites Justin, *First Apol.*, 14.3).

*Church Service* The writings of Justin Martyr contain the only early description of a church service. He describes what happens after someone is baptized, "But we, after we have thus washed him who has been convinced and has assented to our teaching, bring him to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled, in order that we may offer hearty prayers in common for ourselves and for the baptized [illuminated] person, and for all others in every place, that we may be counted worthy, now that we have learned the truth, by our works also to be found good citizens and keepers of the commandments, so that we may be saved with an everlasting salvation. Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss. There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen. This word Amen answers in the Hebrew language to *genoito* [so be it]. And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and to those who are absent they carry away a portion" (Justin, *1 Apol.* 65).

Justin describes the Eucharist: “And this food is called among us Eukaristia [the Eucharist], of which no one is allowed to partake, but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, “This do ye in remembrance of Me, this is My body;” and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, “This is My blood;” and gave it to them alone. Which the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same thing to be done. For, that bread and a cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn” (Justin, *1 Apol.* 66).

Pointing out the variations of the Eucharist as the described by the Didache and Justin Martyr, Latourette argues that the differences are “an indication that uniformity had by no means been obtained, but they also display striking similarities. Both, for example, speak of the rite as the Eucharist, evidence that this designation had become very widespread” (Latourette, p. 199).

Three passages, which appear one right after another, reveal several things about the gathering of believers at the end of the second century. They met on Sunday (Justin, *1 Apol.* 66). The Didache mentions “the Lord’s day” (Didache *14*), but this is the earliest reference outside of the New Testament of believers meeting on Sunday.

Based on what Justin says about the assembly of believers, it has been claimed that the gathering was “becoming distinctively ecclesiastical by the shedding of its Jewish elements, though the framework was still modeled on that of the synagogue. The domestic atmosphere of the Passover meal was giving way to formality, and a new vocabulary introduced to give a more otherworldly even transcendental character to worship. For Justin the act of communion was a ‘memorial of the passion’ of Christ. The elements of bread and wine and over which thanks had been given nourish the lives of Christians by assimilation—a thought derived from John 6. This idea played an increasing role and explanations of the Eucharist as a sacramental sharing of the divine life” (*Eerdmans*’, p. 126).

“Clearly, what has come to be regarded as a service of worship was already more or less fixed in Justin’s time. It soon became clear, as Origen implies, that the first part of the service was open to converts under instruction and probably enquirers, but the second part restricted to baptized communicants. This distinction became standard, with a clear dividing line between the two parts, particularly in the Syrian Apostolic Constitutions and later in the Chrysostom’s writings” (*Eerdmans*’, p. 128).

*Growth of Christianity* Showing the growth of Christianity, Justin says, “For there is not one single race of men, whether barbarians, or Greeks, or whatever they may be called, nomads, or vagrants, or herdsmen living in tents, among whom prayers and giving of thanks are not offered through the name of the crucified Jesus” (Justin, *Dialog.*, 117).

## Irenaeus

*Author* Irenaeus (115?-202) was brought up in Smyrna. He was a pupil of Polycarp and Papias, traveled widely, and became bishop of Lyons in Gaul (now France) in 177 (Ferguson, p. 76). He is noted chiefly for his books against the Gnostics. He died a martyr.

Eusebius cites what Irenaeus said about Polycarp. “For when I was a boy, I saw thee in lower Asia with Polycarp, moving in splendor in the royal court, and endeavoring to gain his approbation. I remember the events of that time more clearly than those of recent years. For what boys learn, growing with their mind, becomes joined with it; so that I am able to describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat as he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and the manner of his life, and his physical appearance, and his discourses to the people, and the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord. And as he remembered their words, and what he heard from them concerning the Lord, and concerning his miracles and his teaching, having received them from eyewitnesses of the Word of life, Polycarp related all things in harmony with the Scriptures” (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 5.20.5-6).

In one of his surviving works, Irenaeus wrote that Polycarp “was not only instructed by apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by apostles in Asia, appointed bishop of the Church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried [on earth] a very long time, and, when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom, departed this life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true. To these things all the Asiatic Churches testify, as do also those men who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time—a man who was of much greater weight, and a more steadfast witness of truth, than Valentinus, and Marcion, and the rest of the heretics. He it was who, coming to Rome in the time of Anicetus caused many to turn away from the aforesaid heretics to the Church of God, proclaiming that he had received this one and sole truth from the apostles,—that, namely, which is handed down by the Church. There are also those who heard from him that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath-house without bathing, exclaiming, ‘Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within.’ And Polycarp himself replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion, and said, ‘Dost thou know me?’ ‘I do know thee, the first-born of Satan.’ Such was the horror which the apostles and their disciples had against holding even verbal communication with any corrupters of the truth; as Paul also says, ‘A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.’ There is also a very powerful Epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians, from which those who choose to do so, and are anxious about their salvation, can learn the character of his faith, and the preaching of the truth. Then, again, the Church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John remaining among them permanently until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the apostles” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3.3.4).

*Writings* Two of Irenaeus’ writings survive. “*Against Heresies* consist of five books against Gnosticism. It was written about 185 (Cairns, p. 110). Book I describes the various Gnostic heresies. Book II shows their absurdity. Book III details the basis of Christian doctrine in Scripture and tradition. Book IV defends the unity of the two covenants against Marcion, and Book V discusses redemption and the hope of the world to come. *Proof of*



*the Apostolic Preaching*, is an instructional book, demonstrating that the Christian faith fulfills the Old Testament” (Ferguson, p. 76).

*Scripture* Irenaeus says, “The Scriptures are indeed perfect, since they were spoken by the Word of God and His Spirit” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 2.28.2).

Nowhere in the extant writing of Irenaeus is there a list of New Testament books, but “he had a clear notion of their identity” (Bruce, CS, p. 173). He does not list the letters of Paul, “but he evidently accepted the whole corpus of thirteen letters; the only letter he does not mention is the short letter to Philemon, which he had no occasion to cite” (Bruce, CS, p. 176). He quotes Paul 206 times (Kelly, p. 58).

Irenaeus declares that there are four gospels and no more than four. “It is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3.11.1). He goes on to name Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John and quotes from them. McDonald says Irenaeus may be the first to designate Christian writings as “New Testament” (McDonald, p. 290). He also says, “Irenaeus argued that the four canonical Gospels and other unspecified NT literature, along with an unspecified collection of OT writings, were the normative Scriptures for the churches, and he unambiguously called these writings ‘Scripture’ (see Haer. 1.9.4; 2.26.1-2; 3.1.1). Although Irenaeus promotes the necessity and authority of the four canonical Evangelists, ‘these four and no more,’ he also argues for something that no one before him claimed: the Christian message was somehow incomplete if less than four Gospels were used to articulate the Christian faith” (McDonald, p. 290). Latourette says Irenaeus even recognized some questioned portions of the Gospel of John (Latourette, p. 133).

Miller says Irenaeus makes 1800 quotations from the New Testament and recognizes the four Gospels, Acts, 13 Pauline epistles, 1 Peter, 1 John, and Revelation as canonical Scripture” (Miller cited by Baker, p. 84). Harrison argues that lack of mention of a few books is not proof of their non-canonical standing in the eyes of Irenaeus, since he does not furnish a formal list of New Testament writings (Everett Harrison, pp. 99-100).

Thus, Irenaeus accepted the Old Testament and the New Testament as Scripture (McDonald, p. 296). The fact that Irenaeus appears to acknowledge the authority of the *Shepherd of Hermas* and 1 Clement may prove nothing, “since he was writing to address specific issues (heresy), and he would naturally utilize the writings that best suited his argument” (McDonald, p. 301).

Irenaeus distinguishes “the writings of truth” from the “multitude of apocryphal and spurious writings” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3.21.2).

*Doctrine* “Irenaeus stressed the fundamental Christian doctrines that were being challenged by Gnosticism: that the world was created by one God; that Jesus Christ, son of the Creator, died to save men; that there will be a resurrection of the body” (Ferguson, p. 76). Kuiper says, “Irenaeus gave much thought to the Scriptural teaching about Christ. The beginnings of the sound doctrine about Christ are to be found in his book *Against Heresies*” (Kuiper, pp. 17-18). He developed the idea that Christ was fully man as well as fully God (Ferguson, p. 76).

Irenaeus teaches that the bread and wine and the Eucharist are the actual body and blood of Christ. Irenaeus says “He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, and said, ‘This is My body.’ And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new covenant; which the Church received from the apostles, offers to God throughout all the world, to Him who

gives us as the means of subsistence the first-fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament, concerning which Malachi, among the twelve prophets, thus spoke beforehand: ‘I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord Omnipotent, and I will not accept the sacrifice at your hands. For from the rising of the sun, unto the going down [of the same], My name is glorified among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to My name, and a pure sacrifice; for great is My name among the Gentiles, saith the Lord Omnipotent, indicating in the plainest manner, by these words, that the former people [the Jews] shall indeed cease to make offerings to God, but that in every place sacrifice shall be offered to Him, and that a pure one; and His name is glorified among the Gentiles’ (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 4.17.5; see also 5.2.3).

Irenaeus says this in the context of refuting the Gnostic and Docetic rejection of the Lord’s humanity (Kelly, p. 198). In other words, in the name of refuting a heresy, he has taken a legitimate point too far.

Perhaps this was based on a misunderstanding of John 6 where Jesus said, “If anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever; and the bread that I shall give is My flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world” (Jn. 6:51). This statement is often taken to be a reference to the Lord’s Table, but it is not a reference to the Lord’s Supper. It is addressed to “a group of disagreeable unbelievers” (Wiersbe; so also Morris). Moreover, Jesus made it clear that He was not speaking in literal terms (Jn. 6:63); He was using a human analogy to convey spiritual truth (Wiersbe). He says, “flesh,” not “body.” Every place in the New Testament where the Lord’s Table is mentioned, the word “body” is used, not the word “flesh” (Plummer; Morris). This verse is simply teaching that the benefits of His death must be appropriated by each individual which, as He has made explicitly clear, is by faith (Jn. 6:35, 40, 47). These words “cannot refer primarily to the Holy Communion; nor again can it be simply prophetic of that Sacrament” (Morris, “Additional Notes,” p. 113). This is simply a reference to “the appropriation of Christ” (Morris). Besides, the Lord’s Supper was not instituted until the night before Jesus died. Therefore, this cannot refer the Lord’s Supper; it did not exist at the time.

The fact that Irenaeus knew Polycarp, who was a disciple of the apostle John, is often used to suggest that Irenaeus’ interpretation was correct because he got it directly from the apostles (Aimee Milburn Cooper [www.historicchristianity.com](http://www.historicchristianity.com), accessed 6/19/2010). Just because a person knew someone who knew someone does not mean that person is accurate about all that was said decades before. In the late 60’s, I taught a group of men a course on how to study the Bible. Thirty-plus years later, after decades of separation, one of those men and I got together again. He told me he had not forgotten what I taught and that he probably understood it better than the others who work in the original group, but as I heard him, I realized he had forgotten or misunderstood virtually everything I said. For example, he told me that he thought I determined the interpretation of a passage by reading a number of commentaries and taking the majority opinion. Nothing could be further from the truth! Not even an immediate disciple of the teacher gets what was taught. So knowing somebody who knew somebody does not guarantee accuracy.

Irenaeus was the first theologian to try to systemize doctrine. He was Premillennial and claimed this doctrine was standard.

*Church Polity* Irenaeus is said to have taught apostolic succession. Here is what he said: “The blessed apostles, then, having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate. Of this Linus, Paul makes mention in the

Epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus; and after him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement was allotted the bishopric. This man, as he had seen the blessed apostles, and had been conversant with them, might be said to have the preaching of the apostles still echoing [in his ears], and their traditions before his eyes. Nor was he alone [in this], for there were many still remaining who had received instructions from the apostles. In the time of this Clement, no small dissension having occurred among the brethren at Corinth, the Church in Rome dispatched a most powerful letter to the Corinthians, exhorting them to peace, renewing their faith, and declaring the tradition which it had lately received from the apostles, proclaiming the one God, omnipotent, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Creator of man, who brought on the deluge, and called Abraham, who led the people from the land of Egypt, spoke with Moses, set forth the law, sent the prophets, and who has prepared fire for the devil and his angels. From this document, whosoever chooses to do so, may learn that He, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, was preached by the Churches, and may also understand the apostolical tradition of the Church, since this Epistle is of older date than these men who are now propagating falsehood, and who conjure into existence another god beyond the Creator and the Maker of all existing things. To this Clement, there succeeded Evaristus. Alexander followed Evaristus; then, sixth from the apostles, Sixtus was appointed; after him, Telephorus, who was gloriously martyred; then Hyginus; after him, Pius; then after him, Anicetus. Sorer having succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherius does now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, hold the inheritance of the episcopate. In this order, and by this succession, the ecclesiastical tradition from the apostles, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us. And this is most abundant proof that there is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved in the Church from the apostles until now, and handed down in truth” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3.3.3).

“Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church,-those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. But [it is also incumbent] to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive succession, and assemble themselves together in any place whatsoever, [looking upon them] either as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics puffed up and self-pleasing, or again as hypocrites, acting thus for the sake of lucre and vainglory. For all these have fallen from the truth. And the heretics, indeed, who bring strange fire to the altar of God-namely, strange doctrines-shall be burned up by the fire from heaven, as were Nadab and Abiud. But such as rise up in opposition to the truth, and exhort others against the Church of God, [shall] remain among those in hell (*apud inferos*), being swallowed up by an earthquake, even as those who were with Chore, Dathan, and Abiron. But those who cleave asunder, and separate the unity of the Church, [shall] receive from God the same punishment as Jeroboam did” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 4.26.2).

Paul mentions Linus in 2 Timothy 4:21, which means Linus was at Rome at the time, Paul says nothing about Linus being a leader, much less *the* leader. In fact, Paul simply lists Linus and several others, who along with all the brethren, send greetings to Timothy. Furthermore, all Irenaeus says is that the apostles appointed Linus as a bishop, which in the New Testament is synonymous with being an elder. Irenaeus does say that Linus was succeeded by Anacletus, who was succeeded by Clement, but his point is that “the churches

preserved public, standard beliefs handed down from apostolic times by the teachers in the churches” (Ferguson, p. 76).

Irenaeus is refuting the Gnostic heresy by use of Scripture and the body of related tradition. The Gnostics claimed that before Jesus ascended, He entrusted secret wisdom to a succession of teachers traced back to the apostles (normally Philip, Thomas, and Matthias). In order to counter their views, it was argued that there was a continuous teaching and teachers (bishops or presbyters) from the time when the apostles founded the churches.

The argument was outlined by Hegesippus, who said he traveled “from Palestine to Rome meeting numerous bishops and hearing the same teaching from all of them. He claimed that in every succession and city, what the law, the prophets, and the Lord preached was faithfully followed. Irenaeus, Tertullian, and others used this line of argument. Irenaeus taught that bishops in the unbroken line from the apostles were guardians and guarantors of apostolic teaching (Latourette, p. 131). As the threat of Gnosticism receded, the appeal to tradition eroded” (*Eerdmans*’, pp. 118-119).

Kelly, a church history professor Oxford, says that Irenaeus used the word “tradition” as the “original message.” It was the oral teaching of the apostles distinct from Scripture, but without any “implied contrast between it (tradition) and Scripture” (Kelly, p. 36).

Moreover, the identity of oral tradition with the original revelation is guaranteed by the unbroken succession of bishops going back to the apostles (Kelly, p. 37).

In addition, the Holy Spirit was another safeguard. The message was committed to the church and the church is the home of the Holy Spirit (Kelly, p. 37).

Kelly also insists that Irenaeus took for granted that the apostolic tradition had been deposited in written documents (Irenaeus’s statement *Ag. Her.* 3.1.1 that what the apostles at first proclaimed by the word of mouth, they afterward, by God’s will, conveyed to us in Scripture).

To sum up, oral tradition (“the original message”) was guaranteed by an unbroken succession of Bishops, Holy Spirit, and Scripture.

Furthermore, Irenaeus taught that if the Bible is taken as a whole, its teaching is self-evident (Kelly, p. 38). “The heretics who misinterpret it only do so because, disregarding its underlying unity, they seize upon isolated passages and rearrange them to suit their own ideas” (*Ag. Her.* 1.8.1, 1.9.1-4; Kelly, p. 38). Kelly concludes that a careful analysis of Irenaeus’s *Against Hersey* reveals that “while the Gnostics’ appeal to their suppose secret tradition forced him to stress the superiority of the church’s public tradition, his real defense of orthodoxy was found in the Scripture” (Kelly, pp. 38-39; *Ag. Her.* 2.35, 4). The whole point of his teaching was, in fact, that Scripture and the church’s unwritten tradition are identical in content” (Kelly, p. 39).

## **Tertullian**

*Author* Tertullian (160-220) of Carthage in North Africa was a pagan Roman lawyer, who after his conversion, became a distinguished defender of Christianity. He is considered “The Father of Latin Christianity;” he was the first major Christian author to write in Latin. He was also the first to use many of the technical words common in later Christian theological debates, such as the word Trinity.

He became a Montanist about 202 (Cairns, p. 109). He urged Christians to separate themselves from pagan amusements, immorality, and idolatry. He also urged simplicity of

dress and ornament for women (Cairns, p. 112). He argued that attendance at the games and gladiatorial contests honored pagan gods, stirred up rage, bitterness, and grief involved betting, which was too agitating to be wholesome, and that crime was not only committed but also taught (Latourette, p. 244).

He refused to become involved in political life (Cairns, p. 121). He argued that Christians should not be members of the Roman army on the grounds that it brought them under a master other than Christ, that it involved taking the sword, and that even when the armies were used for police purposes in peacetime, the infliction of punishment was necessary, which was forbidden because it was revenge. He supported this claim by pointing to the disarming of Peter (Latourette, p. 243). He was critical of the majority church until his death (Latourette, p. 129).

Tertullian is famous for saying, “What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?” Here is what he said: “He (Paul) expressly names philosophy as that which he would have us be on our guard against. Writing to the Colossians, he says, ‘See that no one beguile you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, and contrary to the wisdom of the Holy Ghost.’ He had been at Athens, and had in his interviews (with its philosophers) become acquainted with that human wisdom which pretends to know the truth, whilst it only corrupts it, and is itself divided into its own manifold heresies, by the variety of its mutually repugnant sects. What indeed has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What concord is there between the Academy and the Church? What between heretics and Christians? Our instruction comes from ‘the porch of Solomon,’ who had himself taught that ‘the Lord should be sought in simplicity of heart’” (Tertullian, *Prescription Against Heretics*, 7).

*Writings* Tertullian wrote voluminously (Latourette, p. 129). According to Ferguson, his surviving works date from between 196 and 212 and reflect three main concerns: “Christianity’s attitude to the Roman state and society; the defense of orthodox beliefs against heresy; and the moral behavior of Christians” (Ferguson, p. 111). “Tertullian’s masterpiece was the *Apology*, which argued effectively that Christianity should be tolerated. His longest work, the five books *Against Marcion*, defended the use of the Old Testament by the Christian church, and the oneness of God, both Creator and Savior. In *Against Praxeas*, Tertullian developed the doctrine of the Trinity” (Ferguson, p. 111). In the *Exclusion of Heretics*, Tertullian used an argument from Roman law to claim the Scriptures as the exclusive property of the church, against Gnostic heretics. Tertullian’s *On the Soul* is the first Christian writing on psychology. *On Baptism* is the earliest surviving work about baptism; in it, Tertullian criticized the baptism of children. In other books, Tertullian argued for a strictness in church discipline, remarriage, and fasting, which goes beyond biblical requirements; and opposed flight to avoid persecution” (Ferguson, p. 112).

*Doctrine* Tertullian taught that God is one in substance, but three in persons, a unity of substance but a trinity in form (Latourette, p. 129). He taught that in Jesus Christ, there was neither manhood without true Godhead nor the Godhead without true manhood; in Christ, two full and complete natures came together in one person (Latourette, p. 171). The Son is subordinate to the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father through the Son (Latourette, p. 146). He stated the doctrine of Christ more clearly and precisely than anyone before him had done (Kuiper, p. 18). He led the church to the orthodox view of the relationship of Christ to the Father and of the two natures of Christ to each other (Cairns, p. 137).

He taught the doctrine that later became known as original sin (Latourette, p. 177).

His work entitled *On Baptism* says baptism was to be administered by a bishops or presbyters or deacons and, in the absence of those, by a layman. Generally, baptism was administered at Easter or during the 50 days after Easter. Candidates were to prepare for baptism by prayer, fasting, vigils through entire nights, and confession of all past sins. Baptism was by thrice-repeated immersion. Before the first immersion, there was a confession of faith in God the father, before the second, the confession of faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and before the third, the confession of faith in the Holy Spirit. In some churches the candidate was baptized naked. Nothing was to be taken into the water except the person's body (Latourette, p. 194). He vigorously opposed the administration of baptism by women (Latourette, p. 195). He appeared to believe that he was describing baptism as it was generally practiced in his day, but there may not have been the uniformity he supposed (Latourette, p. 195).

He is the first to mention infant baptism, which he criticized. Apparently, the baptism of infants was common, so much so that he spoke of it as though all Christians were familiar with it. He favored deferring the baptism of infants until they knew Christ and asked for it and he also advocated that unmarried people delay baptism until they were married or until the habit of continence had been established (Latourette, p. 195). Schaff adds that "infant baptism was not yet a catholic dogma, and was left to the discretion of parents" (Schaff, *History of the Christian church* electronic ed. vol. 2.110. hereafter *HCC*).

He believed that post-baptismal sins were mortal sins (Cairns, p. 113). He listed and the "seven deadly sins" as idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, fornication, false witness, and fraud (Latourette, p. 138). He and Hermas conceded that forgiveness might be had for one such sin committed after baptism, but only one (Latourette, p. 138).

He subscribed to the perpetual virginity of Mary (Cairns, p. 160).

*Church Polity* Irenaeus taught that oral tradition, the original message of the Apostles, is assured by the unbroken succession of bishop. Concerning this succession, Tertullian said, "Let them produce the original records of their churches; let them unfold the roll of their bishops, running down in due succession from the beginning." It is his concept of tradition that needs a bit of explanation.

Kelly says that Tertullian did not differ from Irenaeus concerning the concept of tradition (Kelly, p. 39). The whole body of apostolic doctrine is either that which was delivered orally or in epistles (Kelly, p. 36). Because the apostles wrote down their oral teaching in epistles, tradition (the original message) was enshrined in Scripture. "For this reason Scripture has absolute authority; whatever it teaches is necessarily true and woe betide him excepts doctrine not discoverable in it" (Kelly, p. 39). Tertullian, however, did not confine tradition (the original message) to the Scripture. It could be found in the doctrine publicly proclaimed by the churches (Kelly, p. 40). In other words, Tertullian extended the meaning of tradition to cover what had been customary in the church for long generations (triple immersion at baptism; Kelly, p. 39).

Tertullian considered this unwritten tradition to be virtually identical with the "the rule of faith," which he preferred to Scripture as the standard when disputing the Gnostics. He interpreted the expression "in proportion to our faith" in Romans 12:6 to mean "the rule of faith," that is, a body of Christian teaching (*On Prescription Against Heretics* 12). Actually, it means "according to the measure of faith given to the prophet" (see the similar phrase in Rom. 12:3). Be that as it may, Tertullian was convinced that the "rule of faith" points to the correct interpretation of Scripture.

Kelly says, “Like Irenaeus, Tertullian is convinced that Scripture is consonant in all its parts and that its meaning should be clear if it is read as a whole. But where controversy with the heretics breaks out, the right interpretation can be found only where the true Christian faith and discipline, i.e., in the church. The heretics, he complained, were able to make Scripture say what they liked because they disregarded the *regula*” (*regula* is the rule of faith; Kelly, p. 40).

Kelly adds, “He (Tertullian) was certainly profoundly convinced of the futility of arguing with heretics merely on the basis of Scripture. The skill and success with which they twisted its plain meaning made it impossible to teach any decisive conclusion in that field. He was also satisfied, and made the point even more forcefully than Irenaeus, that the indispensable key to the Scripture belonged exclusively to the church, which in the *regula* had preserved the apostles’ testimony in its original shape. But these ideas, expounded in his *De Praescriptione* (Prescription), were not intended to imply that Scripture was in any way subordinate in authority or insufficient in content. His major premise remained that of Irenaeus, viz. that the one divine revelation was contained in its fullness both in the Bible and in the church’s continuous public witness” (Kelly, p. 41).

## **Clement of Alexandria**

*Background* To fully understand the significance of Clement of Alexandria and what he represents, a bit of background is necessary. Alexandria was a cosmopolitan center of Hellenistic culture, containing one of the greatest libraries of the ancient world. It was in this philosophical center that Neoplatonism was born. It was also in Alexandria that Philo (20 BC- 50), a Jewish philosopher who lived during the time of Jesus, used allegory to find hidden meanings in the Old Testament so he could harmonize Greek philosophy and Judaism. Pantaenus (d. ca. 200) was a Stoic philosopher, who when he was converted to Christianity, sought to reconcile Christianity with Greek philosophy. He founded the Catechetical School of Alexandria, a school to instruct candidates for church membership in the principles of the Christian faith.

*Author* Clement of Alexandria was probably born in Athens (150), lived in Alexandria (180-202), and died in Jerusalem (215). He was a contemporary of Tertullian. When he came to Alexandria about 180, he became a pupil of Pantaenus, an assistant to Pantaenus, and about 190 his successor as head of the catechetical school. When he fled to Jerusalem because of persecution, Origen assumed his position. These were the men of the Alexandrian school. Their aim was to develop a system of theology by using philosophy (Cairns, p. 110).

Tertullian scorned philosophy; Clement contended that the philosophy of the Greeks was the preparation for the gospel (Latourette, pp. 147-48). Clement based much of his ethics on what he had learned from Stoicism (Latourette, p. 260).

*Writings* Clement’s three major surviving works are the *Protreptikos* (a book urging pagans to become Christians), *Paidagogos* (a book teaching Christians the kind of conduct to be expected) and *Stromateis* (more advanced instructions in Christianity) (Latourette, p. 147). His works contain quotations from Greek pagan literature from about five hundred authors (Cairns, p. 111).

*Doctrine* Apparently, Clement did not think that Jesus was really a man, but merely in human form. He also believed every individual is free and able to respond to God (Latourette, p. 147). He forbade Christians to frequent the race course (Latourette, p. 244).

He allowed one repentance after baptism, saying that if continual repenting was allowed, Christians would not differ from those who had never been Christians, except in the consciousness of having sinned. Yet he approved of the story about the Apostle John who in his old age won to repentance a man who in his youth had been baptized and then committed many sins, even becoming a leader of a band of robbers. Apparently, Clement recognized the possibility of repentance for a multitude of sins committed after baptism (Latourette, pp. 215-16).

*Significance* The significance of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and the Alexandrian school is the development of the type of interpretation based on the supposition that the Scripture has more than one meaning. Instead of explaining the plain meaning of the text, they developed an allegorical system of interpretation that has “plagued Christianity since that time” (Cairns, p. 111). This system of interpretation grew out of the technique employed by Philo, who tried to link Judaism and Greek philosophy by finding hidden meaning in the language of the Old Testament that could be related to Greek philosophy. “Instead of being concerned with the meaning of the writer of Scripture for those to whom he was writing and its application to present circumstances, the men of the Alexandrian school were ever seeking hidden meanings. This method of interpretation has done much harm to the cause of correct interpretation of the Scripture and has resulted in absurd and often unscriptural theological ideas” (Cairns, pp. 110-11). Clement of Alexandria and Origen established wants for all the intellectual respectability of Christianity (*Eerdmans*’, p 77). They also laid the foundation for the theology of asceticism (Smith, p. 205).

## Origen

*Author* Origen (185-254) was “the greatest scholar and most prolific author of the early church” (Ferguson, p. 104; Kuiper says he was the greatest scholar of the church “up to that time,” p. 40). He was born of Christian parents. When he was sixteen, his father was martyred and the family property was confiscated. Origen himself wished martyrdom but was prevented from it by his mother hiding his clothes, compelling him to remain at home (Latourette, pp. 148-49). At the age of 18, he became the leader of the catechetical school in Alexandria, a position he held until 231 (Cairns, p. 111). During the Decian persecution, he was tortured, which so broke his health that when he was released, he died. He was 70 years old (Latourette, p. 149).

He was a great traveler and a voluminous writer, employing at times as many as twenty copyists. By one estimate, he was the author of 6000 scrolls (Cairns, p. 112). Two-thirds of the New Testament is quoted in his writings. He was the first to produce an orderly, comprehensive statement of the Christian faith (Latourette, p. 150).

Origen lived an ascetic life. Taking Matthew 19:12 literally, he had himself castrated (*Eerdmans*’, p. 80). Part of the reason he did this was to avoid the possibility of scandal in teaching women (Latourette, p. 149). At the time, he “earned considerable disapproval because he made himself a eunuch” (*Eerdmans*’, p. 215), but he and Clement of Alexandria laid the foundations for a theology of asceticism (*Eerdmans*’, p. 205).

*Works* Origen produced the *Hexapla*, which consisted of parallel columns of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, a Greek transliteration, the Greek translations by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and the *Septuagint* (Ferguson, p. 104). In this work, Origen sought to establish the text that was the correct representation of the original (Cairns, p. 112). His major work on theology, *First Principles* (231), “attempted to present



the fundamental Christian doctrines systematically: God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, creation, the soul, free will, salvation, and the Scriptures. Origen tried first to set out clearly the faith expressed in the church, and then to clarify and draw out what was only implicit in the faith” (Ferguson, p. 104). *First Principles* is the first systematic theology (Cairns, p. 112). It was in this work that he developed his allegorical system interpretation. *Exhortation to Martyrdom and Prayer* are examples of Origen’s writing on the Christian life. *Against Celsus* was his one major writing against pagan criticisms of Christianity. It has been described as a “brilliant answer” to *Celsus* (Kuiper, p. 18).

*Scripture* Origen distinguished between books that were universally recognized as Scripture (homologoumena) and those that were more or less opposed (antilegomena). In the former group, he placed the four Gospels, the 13 epistles of Paul, 1 Peter, 1 John, Acts, and the book of Revelation. In the latter category, he placed Hebrews, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, James, Jude, Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Didache, and the Gospel of Hebrews. He placed Hebrews in the latter category because he knew some churches did not accept it (Bruce, CS, p. 193). Origen himself, however, frequently cited Hebrews as canonical and he cites as Scripture all but Jude, 2 and 3 John (Thiessen, p. 11). So even though Origen speaks of books that were opposed, He himself accepts all the books of the New Testament, except Jude, 2 and 3 John. Thiessen says Souter thinks that it is possible that Origen recognized them as genuine (Thiessen, p. 18). There is no evidence that Origen personally rejected any of the New Testament books on the opposed list.

*Doctrine* Origen said his *Rule of Faith*, an outline of basic Christian beliefs, was “the teaching of the church preserved unaltered and handed down in unbroken succession from the apostles” (*Eerdmans*’, p. 80). Origen believed: 1) There is one God, the Father and the creator of all things. 2) Jesus Christ is the God-man, who was coeternal with the Father and subordinate to Him; Jesus Christ. He was born of a virgin and the Holy Spirit, died, rose from the dead, conversed with his disciples, and was, taken up into heaven. 3) The Holy Spirit is associated in honor and dignity and was uncreated. Origen distinguished the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit from one another, although they constitute a unity (Latourette, p. 150).

Origen believed in the pre-existence of souls, universal salvation, denied a physical resurrection (Cairns, pp. 112-13). He taught that all the spirits who have fallen will be restored, but will first suffer punishment to purge them from the imperfections brought by their sin. Eventually, even the devils, through repentance, learning, and growth, will be fully saved (Latourette, p. 151).

Some of Origen’s views such as human souls existed from eternity before they came into their present bodies, that all souls, including demons, will ultimately to be saved, and that beyond this present existence the growth of souls is to continue until all are perfect, proved repugnant to the Catholic Church. Controversy concerning Origen raged in the later years of the fourth century and in the fifth and sixth centuries. Eventually, the Catholic Church in regional synods in Alexandria (399), Jerusalem, and Cyprus, and perhaps in one of its general or ecumenical councils, at Constantinople in 553 labeled him a heretic (Latourette, p. 151).

*Significant* Origen tried to express the Christian faith in terms of the prevailing Platonic philosophical ideas of his time. He developed three levels of meaning of Scripture: a literal, historical meaning that corresponded to the human body; a hidden moral meaning that

corresponded to the soul; and a deeper, underlying spiritual meaning that only the more spiritually advanced Christians can understand.

Schaff says, "Origen was the first to lay down, in connection with the allegorical method of the Jewish Platonist, Philo, a formal theory of interpretation, which he carried out in a long series of exegetical works remarkable for industry and ingenuity, but meager in solid results. He considered the Bible a living organism, consisting of three elements which answer to the body, soul, and spirit of man, after the Platonic psychology. Accordingly, he attributed to the Scriptures a threefold sense: (1) a somatic, literal, or historical sense, furnished immediately by the meaning of the words, but only serving as a veil for a higher idea; (2) a psychic or moral sense, animating the first, and serving for general edification; (3) a pneumatic or mystic and ideal sense, for those who stand on the high ground of philosophical knowledge. In the application of this theory, he shows the same tendency as Philo, to spiritualize away the letter of scripture ... and instead of simply bringing out the sense of the Bible, he puts into it all sorts of foreign ideas and irrelevant fancies. But this allegorizing suited the taste of the age, and, with his fertile mind and imposing learning, Origen was the exegetical oracle of the early church, till his orthodoxy fell into disrepute" (Schaff, vol. 2, p. 521).

Kelly says that Origen regarded Scripture is a vast ocean that was impossible to fathom or even perceive, but he was sure that every line and, every word, was replete with meaning. He distinguished three levels of significance in the scripture corresponding to the three parts of human nature: the bodily, the psychic, and the spiritual. The first was the historical sense, the second, the moral sense, and the third the mystical sense, which related to Christ, the church, and the great truths of the faith. In practice, however, he seemed to use a slightly different classification composed of the plain historical sense, the moral sense, and the spiritual sense in which this text was applied to the devout (Kelly, p. 73). According to Origen, every proper name, every number, all the animals, plants, and metals mentioned in the Scripture were allegories of theological or spiritual truths (Kelly, p. 74).

Origen developed "the criteria of absurdity." When the literal sense is impossible, immoral, or absurd, the allegorical sense is required (Cary, *HCT*, p. 31). It should be pointed out that there is a typological interpretation, which is legitimate. A type is a historical person or event that pre-figures another. Melchizedek, a real Old Testament person, prefigures Christ. An allegory, which originated among pagan philosophers (Cary, *HCT*, p. 30), usually sees people and events as fictional; they are used as symbols to suggest a deeper or hidden meaning. The plain meaning of the text is ignored or denied and the emphasis is placed on the secondary sense. The wars in the Old Testament are spiritual wars against demons or one's own sins.

## **Cyprian**

*Author* Cyprian (ca. 200-258) was born in Carthage, the chief city in North Africa, and lived there all of his life. He was rich, well educated, and became famous as a teacher of rhetoric (speech). He was converted in 246 (Kuiper, p. 21). After his conversion, he dedicated himself to celibacy, poverty, and the Bible with such distinction that within two years he was made bishop of Carthage (Wright, p. 83). In 250, Cyprian left Carthage because of the persecution of the Emperor Decius. He returned in 251. Cyprian was beheaded as a martyr in 258 (Kuiper, p. 21). He was one of the "most honored of the early bishops" (Latourette, p. 89).

*Works* As mentioned earlier, in 250, Decius issued an edict that everyone had to make an animal sacrifice to the traditional Roman gods and the “genius of the Roman emperor” at least once a year or be put to death. As a result, many Christians were martyred, but some made the sacrifice. A controversy arose concerning the manner of reinstating those who had fallen from the faith under the duress of persecution.

Cornelius, bishop of Rome (251-253) thought that Christians who failed only needed to repent in order to be received back into the church. Novatian insisted that the only way to reenter the church was to be rebaptism. When Novatian lost the election for bishop to Cornelius, he set up a rival congregation. To oppose their action, Cyprian wrote *The Unity of the Church*, his most important work (Wright, p. 83; Cairns, p. 113). In this work, Cyprian defended the unity of the Church against schismatic movements in Africa and Italy, and greatly influenced the shaping of Church discipline relative to reinstating Christians who had apostatized.

*Doctrine* “There is one God, and Christ is one; and there is one Church and one Chair (one center of authority). He who is not in the church of Christ is not a Christian. He can no longer have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his mother. There is no salvation outside the church. The Church is based on the unity of the Bishops. The bishop is in the Church, and the Church is in the bishop. If anyone does not agree with the bishop, he is not in the Church” (Cyprian, cited by Kuiper, p. 21; Wright, p. 83).

*Church Polity* Cyprian made a distinction between bishop and elder. He emphasized the bishop as the center of unity and a guarantee against a schism. He gave the earliest formation of the doctrines of apostolic succession and the primacy of honor for the Roman bishop (Cairns, p. 113). He believed all bishops were equal (Wright, p. 83).

*Church Service* Tertullian mangled the Old Testament with the New Testament. His Christianity has been called “baptized Judaism.” Cyprian “mangled” Christian ministers with Old Testament priest and the Christian ordinances with Old Testament sacrifices (*Eerdmans*’, pp. 101-02). Cyprian thought of the clergy as sacrificing priests in offering of the body and blood of Christ in the communion service, which later developed into the concept of transubstantiation (Cairns, p. 113; Wright, p. 83).

*Significance* Cyprian elevated the position of bishop. He insisted that bishops were necessary to the very essence of the church and not merely administrators. He claimed, “The church is in the bishop and the bishop is in the church” (Latourette, p. 183).

It is important to note that he held that each bishop was the equal of every other bishop; no one bishop had administrative authority over any other bishop. He insisted that no bishop should “set himself up as a bishop of bishops” (Latourette, pp. 183-84). Latourette explains that from very early days, bishops wrote letters to one another concerning church matters. They tended to group themselves by the same administrative divisions of the Roman Empire. In other words, the bishops of the particular province assembled for the election of a bishop in that province (Latourette, p. 184).

Cyprian objected to the postponement of the baptism of infants to eight days after their birth (Latourette, p. 195). He also maintained that baptism by a heretic was not valid (Latourette, p. 196).

“His (Cyprian’s) influence on the later Western church was immense and largely harmful” (Wright, p. 83). It has been suggested that with Cyprian, the church ceased to be an evangelical church (250 AD).

By the way, the vestments worn by the clergy at Mass and other church services did not differ in shape or material from those ordinarily worn by the laity. Stephen, however, is said to have ordained that the vestments which had been used for ecclesiastical purposes were not to be employed for daily wear.

## The New Testament Canon

Thus far in this study of church history, the use of the New Testament writings by individuals has been mentioned. Paul quotes a saying of Jesus recorded by Luke and calls it Scripture (1 Tim. 5:18). Peter calls the writings of Paul Scripture (2 Pet. 3:15-16). Beyond the New Testament, individuals allude to, mention, and quote the writings of the New Testament. When Clement wrote to the Corinthians, he mentions Paul's epistle to them (1 Corinthians) and reflects something Paul said in 2 Corinthians. When Polycarp wrote to the Philippians, he refers to Paul being at Philippi and writing them a letter. The use of the writings of the New Testament in the writings of the early church Fathers is obvious.

The ultimate issue is not just the use of the New Testament by various individuals, it is the *collection* of the writings of the New Testament. The formation of the New Testament into one recognized volume of Scripture is called the canon. The question is, "When was the canon established?" In other words, "When were the books of the New Testament collected into one volume?"

The usual answer is that Athanasius was the first *person* to list the books of the New Testaments by name. He did that in 367. He listed all 27 books of the New Testament and included the books of the Old Testament, but excluded the Apocrypha. He was probably the first to use the term "canon" in reference to a closed collection of sacred literature (McDonald, p. 380). The Third Council of Carthage (397) is the first *council* to formally designate on a canon. That council declared that the 27 books of the New Testament and only those books were to be received as canonical.

Does that mean that the canon of the New Testament was not determined until the fourth century? No. It would be more accurate to say that the first written record that we have that *names* the books of the New Testament is from the fourth century. While there is no record that *names* the books of the New Testament before the fourth century, that does not mean the canon did not exist. It just means that no such record has survived. There is evidence that there was a collection (canon) much earlier than the fourth century.

*Recognition in the New Testament* The books of the New Testament were *recognized* as Scripture as soon as they were written. Paul called Luke's Gospel Scripture. First Timothy 5:18 says, "For the Scripture says, 'You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the grain,' and, 'The laborer is worthy of his wages.'" In this verse, he quotes "Scripture" and gives one reference from the Old Testament and another, which is only found in the Gospel of Luke. Peter called Paul's writings Scripture: "that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation—as also our beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given to him, has written to you, as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things, in which are some things hard to understand, which those who are untaught and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do also the rest of the Scriptures" (2 Pet. 3:15-16; see also 1 Thess. 5:27 and Rev. 22:18). This statement places Paul's writings on a par with the Old Testament (Everett Harrison, p. 92).

*Collection in the New Testament* New Testament statements suggest there was a collection. Paul says his letter to the Colossians was to be read in the church at Laodicea (Col. 4:16). Peter speaks of “all” of Paul’s Epistles (2 Pet. 3:15), which indicates that Paul’s epistles had already been collected. Peter wrote in 64. Thiessen says, “The process of collecting began almost immediately after the books had been written. Peter already speaks of the Pauline Epistles ‘as well known’” (Thiessen, p. 7). Pointing out that 2 Peter was not written to a single church, but to a general audience, Everett Harrison says that Peter’s statement implies a “widespread knowledge of Paul’s writings” (Everett Harrison, p. 92). Cairns says, “Apparently the epistles of Paul were first collected by leaders in the church at Ephesus” (Cairns, p. 118).

*Recognition Shortly after the New Testament* There was early *recognition* of all of the books of the New Testament. Granted recognition does not prove collection. The collection issue will be addressed next, but it is important to first note the extensive use of the writings of the New Testament.

In just the writings of Diognetus, Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius, virtually every book of the New Testament is referred to one way or another. In personally reading the writings produced by 110, I have discovered that every book of the New Testament is quoted or alluded to by them, assuming that 2 and 3 John are included with 1 John, which according to Goodspeed early writers, such as Irenaeus, did (Thiessen, p. 22).

For some of the New Testament references in the writings of the authors who wrote before 110, see the chart on the next page. It should be pointed out that what appears on the chart is not an exhaustive study. Other references from before 110 could be added, as well as many, many references in material written after 110 and before 200. The point of the chart is that every book of the New Testament was at least alluded to before 110.

## Early References to the New Testament

Early authors allude to or quote every book of the New Testament. These references show that New Testament books were considered authoritative and even inspired at a very early date. Clement (97) says, “the blessed apostle Paul,” wrote to the Corinthians “under the inspiration of the spirit” (*1 Clem.* 47). Here are some examples of allusion or quotations. This list is not exhaustive. Other references could be added.

NT Book	NT Reference	Ancient Author	Reference
Matthew	6:25	Diognetus (70)	Chapter 9
	7:1	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 2
Mark	9:42, 14:21	Clement (97)	Chapter 46
Luke	10:7	Paul (63)	1 Timothy 5:18
John	17:11, 14, 16	Diognetus (70)	Chapter 6
Acts	20:35	Clement (97)	Chapter 2
Romans	9:5/1:32	Clement (97)	Chapter 31/35
	14:10-12	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 6
1 Corinthians	Paul wrote under inspiration	Clement (97)	Chapter 47
2 Corinthians	10:3, 6:10	Diognetus (70)	Chapter 5
Galatians	2:9	Clement (97)	Chapter 5
	4:10	Diognetus (70)	Chapter 4
Ephesians	4:4-6	Clement (97)	Chapter 46
Philippians	3:20	Diognetus (70)	Chapter 5
	Study Paul’s letter to you	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 3
Colossians	1:18	Clement (97)	Chapter 24
1 Thessalonians	5:17/5:22	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 4/11
2 Thessalonians	3:15	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 11
1 Timothy	3:16	Diognetus (70)	Chapter 11
	6:7, 10	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 4
2 Timothy	1:3	Clement (97)	Chapter 45
	2:12	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 5
Titus	3:1/2:10	Clement (97)	Chapter 2/26
Philemon	20	Ignatius (110)	Ephesians II
Hebrews	1:2, 3, 4, 6, 13/3:5/11:37	Clement (97)	Chapter 36/43/17
James	3:13	Clement (97)	Chapter 38
1 Peter	1:19/4:8	Clement (97)	Chapter 7/49
2 Peter	3:15	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 3
1 John	4:2-3	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 7
2 John	May be included with 1 John	Irenaeus	
3 John	May be included with 1 John	Irenaeus	
Jude	3/20	Polycarp (110)	Chapter 3
Revelation	22:12	Clement (97)	Chapter 34

*Collection after the New Testament Granted*, “No record exists as to what church first acquired a complete Bible, or the precise date of such an occurrence” (Chafer, vol. 1, p. 92), but there is *evidence* that there was an early collection (canon).

1. Polycarp (ca. 110). Polycarp’s epistle contains about sixty quotations from the New Testaments, thirty-four of which are from the writings of Paul (Cairns, p. 75). In his book, *Early Christian Doctrines*, J. N. D. Kelly, an Oxford professor, contends that Polycarp’s citations of Paul’s epistles indicate that a collection of them existed at Smyrna (Kelly, p. 58). He adds that the numerous apparent echoes of Paul’s epistles in Clement perhaps indicates that he was acquainted with a nucleus of Paul’s epistles as early as 95 (Kelly, p. 58).

Ehrman says that part of the reason Polycarp wrote to the Philippians was their request for collection of the letters of Ignatius (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 100). Here is what Polycarp said: “Ye wrote to me, both ye yourselves and Ignatius, asking that if anyone should go to Syria, he might carry thither the letters from you. And this I will do, if I get a fit opportunity, either I myself, or he whom I shall send to be ambassador on your behalf also. The letters of Ignatius which were sent to us by him, and others as many as we had by us, we send unto you, according as ye gave charge; the which are subjoined to this letter; from which ye will be able to gain great advantage. For they comprise faith and endurance and every kind of edification, which pertains unto our Lord” (Polycarp, *Philippians* 13).

Pointing out that Polycarp was from Smyrna, Ehrman explains that Ignatius wrote four of his seven letters *from* Smyrna (Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, and Romans), sent two of the letters *to* Smyrna (Smyrna and the letter to Polycarp), and sent the seventh letter to Philadelphia which was *not far* from Smyrna. Ehrman says evidently copies of these letters were kept in the church at Smyrna and even suggests that the collection of the letters of Ignatius was originally made by Polycarp himself (Ehrman, vol. 1, p. 101).

If Christians collected the writings of Ignatius, surely they collected the writings of the Apostles, those associated with them (Mark; Luke; Barnabas, who probably wrote Hebrews), and the half brothers of Jesus (James and Jude). Granted, this does not prove that the exact 27 books of the New Testament were collected, but it does demonstrate that Christian collected spiritual writings early in the second century (110).

2. The Gospel of Truth (ca. 140). The *Gospel of Truth* was written around 140 (Everett Harrison, p. 95). Irenaeus says it was a manifesto of the Valentinian school (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.*, 3.11.9). Referring to the Scripture, Valentinus speaks of the “entire volume.” McDonald states, “The phrase *entire volume* appears to refer to a collection of Scriptures, probably the NT writings, but possibly the OT Scriptures as well. The context favors the former since Tertullian asks both Marcion and Valentinus what right they have to use the Scripture received from the Apostles (*Praescr.*, 32), which could not, of course, refer to the OT writings” (McDonald, p. 368, *italic his*). McDonald adds, “Tertullian evidently believed that Valentinus used a collection of NT writings similar to his own” (McDonald, pp. 368-369). W. C. van Unnik says, “About 140-150 a collection of writings was known at Rome and accepted as authoritative which was virtually identical with our New Testament” (cited by Bruce, CS, p. 147). Bruce, who does not subscribe to the conclusion of Unnik, says, “The treatise alludes to Matthew and Luke (possibly with Acts), the gospel and first letter of John, the Pauline letters (except the Pastorals), Hebrews, and Revelation—and not only alludes to them but cites them in terms which presuppose that they are authoritative” (Bruce, CS, p. 147).

3. Marcion (ca. 140). Marcion set up his own canon, which consisted of an edited version of the Gospel of Luke and ten letters of Paul. He may have been one of the first to call one of the canonical Gospels a “gospel” (McDonald, p. 325). According to Adolf von Harnack, Marcion established the first canon (McDonald, p. 326). In Harnack’s opinion, in reaction to Marcion and other second-century heretics, Christians were motivated to identify their sacred Scriptures (Everett Harrison, p. 108; McDonald, p. 323; for the other heretics, see Sheeley, p. 517). It was Marcion who forced the hand of the church when he set up his canon. The church simply corrected him by adding more books to his small collection. Scholars today reject Harnack’s theory (McDonald, p. xix).

Marcion’s canon produced a violent reaction in the church. Irenaeus attacked him and Tertullian wrote five books against him. As has been pointed out, the canon of Marcion demonstrates that the books he accepted were regarded as authentic” and the books he rejected were accepted as canonical by the church at large.” The church did not formulate a canon as a reaction to Marcion.

Harrison says, “Before Marcion’s time there is reasonably clear evidence of the Gospel canon and a collection of Paul’s writings” (Everett Harrison, p. 108, who points to the use of the word “Scripture” and the formulas by which Scripture was commonly introduced, for example, in Barnabas 4:14, 2 Clement 2:4, Polycarp’s *Philippians* 132; see also the discussion about Valentinus above). Harrison adds, “Tertullian and other Fathers charge Marcion with rejecting books. This in itself presupposes in the minds of these men the acknowledged position of such books in what was in fact a canon, even though it had not been published as such” (Everett Harrison, pp. 108-109). Bruce says that in light of the Nag Hammadi document, it can be argued that Marcion’s canon was “his revision of an existing canon of the New Testament writings” (Bruce, p. 148).

Bruce contends that in the debate with the Valentinians, Marcion, and others, the issue was the interpretation of the Bible. He goes on to say that the leaders of the church in essence, said, “We do not reject the Old Testament scriptures, as Marcion does; we accept them, as did Jesus and the apostles (both the original apostles and Paul). As for the scriptures of the new order, we accept not one gospel writing only, but four (including the complete text of Marcion’s mutilated *Gospel*). We accept not only ten letters of Paul, but thirteen (that is, including the three addressed to Timothy and Titus). We accept not the letters of Paul only, but letters of other apostles too. And we accept the Acts of the Apostles, a work which links the gospels and the apostolic letters, providing the sequel to the former and the background to the latter” (Bruce, CS, p. 151).

4. The Muratorian Fragment (170). The Muratorian Fragment is mutilated at the beginning. It begins in the middle of a sentence, and the first book mentioned is Luke, which the fragment calls the third Gospel. It is generally assumed that Matthew and Mark are the first two gospels that are missing. John is listed after Luke with an unmistakable reference to his First Epistle. Acts, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Romans, Philemon, Titus, 1 and 2 Timothy, Jude, 2 and 3 John, and Revelation were also included. The anonymous author rejects the epistles of Paul to the Laodiceans and to the Alexandrians. He put the Revelation of Peter in the “acknowledged” class, but he is dubious about it, saying, “Some of you do not think that it should be read publicly in the church.” He did not mention James or Hebrews, nor the Petrine epistles. The manuscript ends abruptly. Ryrie says, the Muratorian canon “omitted Hebrews, James, and 1 and 2 Peter. However, there is a break in the manuscript, so we



cannot be certain that these books were not included. This canon also rejects some other books like the Shepherd of Hermas, which did not become part of the canon” (Ryrie, p. 109).

5. Irenaeus (ca. 180). There is definite evidence that the four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John and only those four gospels were recognized as Gospels by 170. In his book *Against Heresies*, written about 180, Irenaeus referring to them by name says, “As there are four quarters of the world in which we live, and four universal winds, and as the Church is dispersed over all the earth, the gospel is the pillar and base of the Church and the breath of life, so it is natural that it should have four pillars, breathing immortality from every quarter and kindling life of men anew. Whence it is manifest that the Word, the architect of all things, who sits upon the cherubim and holds all things together, having been manifested to men, has given us the gospel in fourfold force, but held together by one Spirit” (Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*).

Ropes says the date was even earlier than that. He writes, “Probably as early in the second century the year 125, someone, in some place, or some group of persons, assembled for the use inconvenience of the churches the only four gospel books describing the life and teachings of Jesus Christ which were then believed to be of great antiquity and worthy of a place in such a collection” (Ropes, p. 103).

Westcott, an Anglican scholar of the nineteenth century who wrote an exhaustive book on the formation of the New Testament, says that from the time of Irenaeus, the New Testament was composed essentially of the same books as we have. He wrote, “From the close of the second century, the history of the Canon is simple, and its proof clear. It is allowed even by those who have reduced the genuine Apostolic works to the narrowest limits, that from the time of Irenaeus the New Testament was composed essentially of the same books which we receive at present, and that they were regarded with the same reverence as is now shown to them” (Westcott, *The Canon of the New Testament*, p. 6). Cairns says the canon was “by 175, except for a few books whose authorship was disputed” (Cairns, p. 118).

To sum up, basically, the New Testament canon was determined early. There is *evidence* that there was an early collection (canon), as early as 140, if not much, much earlier (2 Pet. 3:15 and Polycarp). Thiessen says that generally speaking from the time Irenaeus on “practically the same books” as we have in our New Testament were regarded with the same reverence that we bestow upon them (Thiessen, p. 10). Cairns says the canon was “substantially completed” by 175. Westcott says that by the end of the second century, the canon was “composed essentially of the same books as we have.”

At the same time, some of the books of the New Testament were doubted. Seven “lacked universal endorsement in the early centuries,” namely Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude and Revelation (Everett Harrison, p. 101). Hebrews was questioned in the West because of the uncertainty as to apostolic authorship (Everett Harrison, p. 101), but Jerome says it was received by the churches in the East and by all Greek writers before his day (Thiessen, p. 24). Revelation had a “solid place in the canon in the earlier patristic period;” it was “generally received throughout the church,” but during the fourth century in the East it was doubted, because of the differences between the Fourth Gospel and it was used as grounds for concluding that another John had written it (Everett Harrison, p. 101).

Thiessen suggests several reasons why some hesitated to accept these seven books. The primary issue was authorship. No one who regarded James, Peter, John, and Jude as the

authors of the books that bear their name rejected those books. Some questioned whether the books were written by those individuals. Another issue was apostleship. James and Jude call themselves “servants” of Christ, not apostles. The author of 2 John and 3 John calls himself an “elder,” not an apostle. Also, Jude was questioned because it was thought that he quoted an apocryphal book. Furthermore, the seven books were written to Christians generally or private individuals, not to specific churches. Therefore from a human point of view, no one was immediately interested in preserving them (Thiessen, p. 12).

Also, books not considered today as belonging to the Bible were disputed. The *Didache*, *the Epistle of Barnabas*, *Shepherd of Hermas*, and the *Apocalypse of Peter* were accepted mainly in Egypt. The *Didache* (Thiessen, p. 6) and the *Epistle of Barnabas* (Thiessen, p. 17) were treated as canonical by Clement of Alexandria and Origen, both of whom were from Egypt. *The Shepherd of Hermas* was regarded as inspired by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen (Thiessen, pp. 21-22). The *Codex Sinaiticus* contains the 27 books of the New Testament accepted today and also the *Epistle of Barnabas* and *The Shepherd of Hermas* (Thiessen, p. 19). *The Apocalypse of Peter* was used extensively in the East, but the Muratorian Canon mentions it with disapproval (Thiessen, p. 7). It should be noted that it was not until Origen that there was any mention of disputed books (Thiessen, p. 20).

As was mentioned earlier, Origen had a list of books that were more or less opposed, but there is no evidence that he personally rejected any of the New Testament books on the opposed list. In fact, he cites as Scripture all but Jude, 2 and 3 John and Souter thinks that it is possible that Origen recognized them as genuine (Thiessen, p. 18). Bruce says Origen “mentions all twenty-seven books of our New Testament; twenty-one, he says, are acknowledged, and six are doubtful. But among doubtful books he also reckons some which in the end did not secure a place in the canon. Like Clement of Alexandria before him, he treats the *Didache* as scripture, and he calls the *Letter of Barnabas* a ‘catholic epistle’—a term which he also applies to 1 Peter. R. M. Grant suggests that while he lived at Alexandria, he accepted the more comprehensive tradition of the church there and acknowledged the *Didache* and the *Letter of Barnabas*, together with the *Shepherd of Hermas*, as scripture, but that after he moved to Caesarea and found that these books were not accepted there he manifested greater reserve towards them. He knew 1 Clement but did not indicate if he regarded it as Scripture. He had doubts about the *Preaching of Peter*, which Clement of Alexandria regarded highly. He refers to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* and the *Acts of Paul* without at first either admitting or disputing their status as scripture; later, however, he had doubts about the *Acts of Paul*” (Bruce, CS, p. 194).

*The Text of the New Testament* This period not only reflects the *canon* of the New Testament (the collection of book), it also reflects the *text* of the New Testament (the words in the books). The vast majority of Greek manuscripts are in basic agreement. This “family” of manuscripts is called the “Traditional” text. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, two manuscripts were discovered (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) that were considered to be earlier than any known manuscript. They were from the fourth century. These became the basis for the “critical” text and modern translation, except the *New King James Version*. Scholars argue that the critical text is the “best” text and that the traditional text was a latter, edited manuscript with additions. The evidence from the first three centuries indicates that readings of the traditional text were known and used. For example, the home loss of one critical text leaves out the end of the Lord’s Prayer (Mt. 6:13) and the story of the woman

caught in adultery (Jn. 7:53-8:11), but the *Didache* contains the ending of the Lord's Prayer and both Papias and Irenaeus refer to the story of the woman taken in adultery.

## Doctrinal Development

Thus far what various individual authors in the period of the Old Catholic Church said about doctrine has been noted, especially what the Apostolic Fathers wrote. It is obvious that during this period, some moved away from some of the basic teachings of the New Testament. What were slight changes at first developed into very different doctrines than that which is taught in the New Testament? To put these doctrinal developments into focus, what was said about each doctrine needs to be traced throughout the whole period. That will necessitate some repetition of what has already been said, but that very repetition will demonstrate the doctrinal development. Before looking at doctrinal development, several observations need to be made.

Remember the standard by which everything in church history is to be judged is the New Testament. Doctrinally the New Testament speaks about "the doctrine of Christ" (2 Jn. 9; 1 Jn. 2:22; 4:2; 2 Cor. 11:4), the gospel (Gal. 1:8; 1 Cor. 15:1-5; 2 Cor. 11:4), the church (Heb. 6:2), and even prophesy (Heb. 6:2). The doctrine of Christ includes the humanity and deity of Christ and implies the Trinity. The gospel is that Christ died for sin and rose from the dead and implies that salvation is by faith (Heb. 6:1). The doctrine of the church includes baptism (Heb. 6:2) and, no doubt, the Lord's Table. Prophecy includes the resurrection and judgment (Heb. 6:2) and implies the Second Coming and the kingdom.

Also, the distinction between the way the terms doctrine, theology, and dogma are used in what follows needs to be explained. The Greek word translated "doctrine" means "teaching." It is that which is taught. In what follows, it is used of the simple doctrinal statements of the New Testament. For example, Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Here theology is that which goes beyond simple doctrinal statements. Theology attempts to systematize the truth of Scripture or delve into questions posed by scriptural statements, but not necessarily directly addressed or answered in the Scripture. For example, in what sense is Jesus the Son of God? Does that mean that at some point, He did not exist? That "theological" question and others become the issue, especially in the next period of church history, but the beginning of theology starts in the Old Catholic Church period. Dogma is the official creed of a Christian community. After the Old Catholic Church period, various Christian groups made official pronouncements about theological issues.

*The Doctrine of Christ* The doctrine of Christ implies the Trinity. The Trinity is mentioned in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, but that is about all. *The Didache* says baptism should be "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (*Didache* 7:2). Clement of Rome seems to acknowledge the Trinity (*1 Clement* 46). *The Shepard of Hermas* seems to reflect a belief in the Trinity and *2 Clement* mentions God the Father (*2 Clem.* 20:5) and the Holy Spirit (*2 Clem.* 14:3, 14:5, but Hannah says both seem to have confused the Holy Spirit with the Son (Hannah, p. 75). Apostolic Fathers refer to the Trinity at baptism, but do not discuss the relationship of the three to each other (Hannah, p. 73); they do not enter into "the speculative aspects of theology" (Hannah, p. 74).

In the latter part of the second century, the apologist answered the critics of Christianity, defending the doctrine of the Trinity (Hannah, pp. 76-77). Tertullian developed distinctive terminology for discussing the doctrine of God, including the use of

terms such as trinity, person, and substance (Hannah, p. 78). Irenaeus identifies three distinct persons in the Godhead (Hannah, p.81).

The doctrine of Christ includes the humanity and deity of Christ. *The Didache* says Jesus is the Son of God (*Didache* 9:3, 6; 10:2, 5). *First Clement* affirms that the deity and humanity of Christ, but does not speculate on the relationship between the two (Hannah, p. 112). Polycarp says Jesus Christ is “the Son of God and our everlasting High Priest” (Polycarp, *Phil.*, 12) and “everyone who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is antichrist” (Polycarp, *Phil.*, 7). Ignatius says Jesus is God (Ignatius, *Eph.* 7, 19) in the flesh (Ignatius, *Eph.* 7) and that He was born of the Virgin Mary (Ignatius, *Eph.* 18; *Smyrna* 1). Hannah says Ignatius understood that Christ was both God and man (Hannah, p. 112). Barnabas teaches that Jesus is the Son of God (*The Epistle of Barnabas* 5, 12). *Second Clement* speaks of Jesus Christ as “being first spirit, then became flesh” (*2 Clem.* 9:5) and as God, the Judge of (the) quick and dead (*2 Clem.* 1:2). Irenaeus also understood that Christ was both God and man (Hannah, p. 113).

Hannah concludes that taken as a whole, early church leaders said Christ was both God and man, but they did not speculate so was to create a rational explanation of His two natures” (Hannah, p. 115).

*The Doctrine of the Gospel* The doctrine of the gospel is that Christ died for sin and rose from the dead and implies that salvation is by faith. *The Epistle to Diognetus* says the Son “in pity for us took upon Himself our sins and Himself parted with His own Son as a ransom for us” (*Diog.* 9:2). The author often speaks of faith, saying that God “revealed (Himself) by faith, whereby alone it is given to see God” (*Diog.* 8:6; also 10:1, 11:5, 11:6). We are “justified, save only in the Son of God” (*Diog.* 9:3). *The Didache* says God bestows upon us “eternal life through His Son” (*Didache* 10:5).

Clement of Rome says Jesus is the Savior who shed His blood for our salvation (*1 Clement* 6). “Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious that blood is to God, which, having been shed for our salvation, has set the grace of repentance before the whole world” (*1 Clem.* 7). Clement repeatedly makes statements that indicate he understood the doctrine of justification by faith.

Polycarp says Jesus Christ died for our sins and rose from the dead (Polycarp, *Phil.* 1, 2, 8-9). Salvation is by faith (Polycarp, *Phil.* 1; he quotes *Eph.* 2:8).

Ignatius says Jesus “gave Himself for us as an offering and sacrifice to God” (Ignatius, *Eph.* 1) and arose from the dead (Ignatius, *Eph.* 20). The cross is our salvation and eternal life (Ignatius, *Eph.* 18). “The Gospel is the perfection of immortality” (Ignatius, *Philadelphians* 9). “Jesus Christ died for us, in order by believing in His death you may escape from death” (Ignatius, *Trallians* 2). “If they believe not in the blood of Christ, they shall, in consequence, incur condemnation” (Ignatius, *Smyrna* 6).

Barnabas says, “The Lord endured to deliver up the flesh to corruption that we might be sanctified through the remission of sins, which is effected by His blood of sprinkling.” He then quotes Isaiah 53, “He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities: with his stripes, we are healed” (*Barnabas* 5). “Jesus rose again from the dead and when He had manifested himself, He ascended into to the heavens” (*Barnabas* 15). There are many statements to the effect that salvation is by faith, including, “If He had not come in the flesh, who could men have been saved by beholding Him?” (*Barnabas* 5), “Those believing on Him shall live forever” (*Barnabas* 8, 12), “they could not be saved unless they put their trust in Him” (*Barnabas* 12; see also his reference to Num. 21:9),

“What then says He to Abraham? Because you have believed, it is imputed to you for righteousness: behold I have made you the father of those nations who believe in the Lord while in uncircumcision” (*Barnabas* 13), and “having received the forgiveness of sins, and placed our trust in the name of the Lord, we have become new creatures, formed again from the beginning. Wherefore in our habitation, God truly dwells in us. How? His word of faith” (*Barnabas* 16; it in the same chapter, he says God gives us repentance).

*The Shepard of Hermas* never mentions the death and resurrection of Christ, but he does say that the elect are saved by faith (*Hermas* 22),

*Second Clement* mentions Jesus Christ endured suffering for our sake (*2 Clem.* 1:2). He saved us when we were perishing (*2 Clem.* 1:4; 2:5, 2:7). We had no hope of salvation except in Him (*2 Clem.* 1:15). “He had mercy on us, and in His compassion saved us” (*2 Clem.* 1:7; 3:1). “He called us, when we were not, and from not being He willed us to be” (*2 Clem.* 1:8). We have to believe (*2 Clem.* 2:3, 11:1, 15:3) and repent. “(If we) repent with our whole heart of the evil things which we have done in the flesh, that we may be saved by the Lord” (*2 Clem.* 8:2).

To sum up, All Apostolic Fathers who mention salvation says Jesus died and arose and that salvation was by faith (eight of the ten do: Diognetus; *Didache*; Clement of Rome; Ignatius; Barnabas; *The Shepard of Hermas*; *2 Clement*; two of the ten, Papias and Quadratus, do not mention salvation). The *Epistle of Diognetus*, 1 Clement, Ignatius, and Barnabas even indicate that the substitutionary death of Christ is the basis of salvation (Hannah, pp. 151-152).

James Orr says, “The Apostolic Fathers are profuse in their allusions to redemption to the blood of Christ, though it cannot be said that they do much to aid us in the theological apprehension of this language” (Orr, cited by Hannah, p. 150). Hannah says that in the early period, the doctrine of salvation remained largely undeveloped (Hannah, p. 203). The Apostolic Fathers were not “preoccupied with untangling the paradoxes in the proclamation of the gospel” (Hannah, p. 203). What they said “smacks more of affirmation than explanation” (Kelley, cited by Hannah, p. 204).

It is significant that the *earliest* of the Apostolic Father do not suggest that salvation is through sacraments such as baptism or the Lord’s Table. Nevertheless, as was pointed out when describing the Apostolic Fathers individually (see the section on the “Apostolic Fathers), a few made statements that seem inconsistent with salvation by faith. What can be said about those statements?

1. The *Didache*, *1 Clement*, and *Polycarp* have been criticized for their emphasis on works (Torrance). In the first place, *they all said salvation is by faith*. Torrance is obviously criticizing them because they did not teach the doctrines of grace as taught by Reformed theology. Moreover, a case can be made that these authors were simply teaching that perseverance is necessary for reward. Like James, they taught justification by faith (Jas. 2:23) and justification by works (Jas. 2:24).

2. Passages in *The Epistle of Barnabas* and *The Shepard of Hermas* seem to suggest baptism is necessary for salvation. The author of *The Epistle of Barnabas* writes that the Israelites “should not receive that baptism which leads to the remission of sins.” Later, in the same passage, he quotes Psalm 1:3-6 and says that those verses refer to “both the water and the cross. For those words imply blessed are they who, placing their trust in the cross, having gone down into the water, for he says they shall receive a reward in due time: then He declares, I will compensate them.” Still later in the same chapter, he quotes Ezekiel

47:12 and says the meaning is “that we indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up bearing fruit in our heart having the fear of God and trusting Jesus in our spirit. And whosoever shall eat of these shall live forever, meaning “whoever He declares, shall hear you speaking and believe, shall live forever” (*Barnabas*, 11).

The author of *The Shepard of Hermas* writes, your life “shall be saved by water” (*Hermas*, chapter 15) and “we went down into the water and obtained remission of our former sins” (*Hermas*, chapter 37; Torrance says, “Hermas is quite emphatic on the point that without baptism they can be no salvation,” Torrance, p. 122).

Both of these authors say salvation is by faith (*Barnabas* 8, 12, 13; *Hermas*, 22). Hannah cites passages from the *Epistle of Barnabas* (11) and the *Shepherd of Hermas* (Parable 9.6) and sound as if baptism is necessary for salvation. Then he adds, “It is, however, certain that the sacrament did not have the ability to cleanse unless it was appropriated in faith, the Word of God’s promise and the water having an inseparable bond. That is after a person was instructed in the faith and fasted in preparation, then he or she received the outward sign of rebirth, the water, which signified the inward presence of spiritual life.” Hannah insists that the epistle of Barnabas connects the benefits of the sacrament with hearing and believing (11). The *Didache* states that a person should be baptized “after forgoing instructions” (7). So he concludes, “the efficacy of baptism was connected with the prior awareness and devoted confession of the thing signified, the forgiveness of sins through Christ. The prerequisite of receiving instruction appears to exclude the practice of infant baptism at this time in the church” (Hannah, p. 264).

3. If, in fact, Ignatius, Barnabas, and the *Shepard of Hermas* are teaching that it is possible to lose one’s salvation, then, according to the New Testament, they are wrong.

Besides the basic elements of the doctrine of the gospel, such as Christ died for sin and rose from the dead and salvation by faith, several other issues related to salvation among the Apostolic Fathers should be mentioned. Apparently, there are statements in the *Shepard of Hermas* that are seeds of what later developed into the doctrine of purgatory. Chapter 66 indicates what really amounts to a “sacrament of penance.” In other words, the further away from the New Testament in time, the more the move away from the New Testament of the doctrine of salvation.

The apologists were the first to synthesize the teachings of the church and may be called the first theologians (Hannah, p. 205). Justin martyr had a fairly developed understanding of sin and grace (Hannah, p. 205). He would say that sin has not affected the ability of people to freely choose Christ (Hannah, p. 206).

The apologist understood the meaning of the death of Christ to have been a sacrifice (Hannah, p. 152). Tertullian was the first church leader to use the term “satisfaction” in reference to the death of Christ (Hannah, p. 153). Irenaeus made an advancement “in the delineation of the atonement but putting forth its first synthetic explanation. He stressed the sacrificial nature of Christ death, the necessity of His death being connected to the character of God (the justice of God as demanding payment for evil), and the fact that the atonement was accomplished in the life and death of Christ” (Hannah, p. 155).

In the East, church leaders such as Clement of Alexandria stressed the concept of the death of Christ as a ransom for sinners and the resultant defeat of evil and oppression (Hannah, p. 155). Clement of Alexander also taught that the descendants of Adam inherited a “warped sensuality whereby we are subject the irrationality” (Hannah, p. 207). Origen denied the historicity of the fall of Adam, treating it as an analogy. In his defense of

Christianity against Gnosticism, he taught the pre-existence of the soul and the voluntary corruption of individuals (Hannah, p. 207). In other words, he taught free will.

Harnack, the famous church historian, said Origen gave more detailed attention to the significance of the death of Christ than any before him. He summarized Origen's view in four points: 1) Christ's death was a victory over demonic authorities. 2) Christ's death was a satisfaction for sin offered to God. 3) Christ's death was substitutionary. 4) Christ death was a ransom paid to the devil. The fact that the second and third points appear to be mutually contradictory has led some to argue that Origen interpreted individual text of the Bible without attempting to synthesize them (Hannah, p. 156).

The Western apologist Tertullian taught Adam was a historical figure and the human soul is created by God along with the body at conception (traducianism). He argued that every individual has a free will, but was stained with the results of Adam's sin, but he did not explain the manner of our participation in Adam's sin, nor did he hint that guilt was passed on to Adam's descendants. He waffled between freedom and inability, asserting one and then the other without explaining how both might be valid (Hannah, p. 208). Irenaeus taught that people are free to choose life or death (Hannah, p. 209).

The apologist believed that baptism was a sign of entrance into the family of God, the church. Combining the significance of baptism (rebirth) with the sign of it (water) as a single event, it was interpreted as the entrance into eternal life and church identity. Water had the function of cleansing past sins. Hannah explains that the early church leaders did not separate the significance of baptism (an invisible cleansing) from its external symbol. The two occurred simultaneously. Faith in Christ was expressed in coming to the water to receive salvation. In the early third century, Hippolytus said that prior to baptism, the recipient was asked to make a confession of faith in each person of the Trinity (Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition* 21). Faith in Christ preceded baptism. In fact, candidates went through a rigorous educational process lasting for several years before they could enter the church (Hannah, p. 269).

The earliest reference to infant baptism is found in Irenaeus's *Against Heresies* 2.22.4 (Hannah, p. 269). Tertullian, a contemporary of Irenaeus, opposed it (Tertullian, *On Baptism*, 18). The first to argue for the validity of infant baptism was Origen, who claimed it was an apostolic custom (Hannah, p. 269). Origen wrote, "The church received from the Apostles the tradition of giving baptism even to infants .... (they) knew that there is in everyone the innate stains of sin, which must be washed away through water (Origen, *Commentaries on Romans* 5:9).

*The Doctrine of the Church* Ignatius was the first to speak of the churches as catholic, that is universal, and define it using the head/body analogy (Hannah, p. 259). The apologists describe the nature of the church and as a new covenant (Justin Martyr), as children of Abraham (Irenaeus), a gathering of the saints to receive instructions from the Scriptures (Clement of Alexander), and both universal (the totality of all saints) and a local gathering (Origen) (Hannah, p. 265).

From a New Testament point of view, the doctrine of the church includes baptism and the Lord's Table. The *earliest* Fathers were aware of only two sacraments: baptism and the Lord's Table (Hannah, p. 263). The problem passages on baptism were discussed above under the section on the doctrine of the Gospel.

Ignatius calls the bread of communion the "bread of God" (Ignatius, *Eph.* 5, the longer version) and adds that the church is "the society where sacrifices are offered," but there is

no direct connection between the bread and sacrifice in that passage. The sacrifice could be the sacrifice of praise. In Romans, he speaks of “the bread of God, and the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ” ... “I desire to drink of God, namely His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life” (Ignatius, *Rom.* 7), but in the same passage he says, “There is within me a water that lives and speaks, saying to me inwardly come to the Father” (Ignatius, *Rom.* 7). On the other hand, he says some “abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confessed not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins and which the Father of His goodness raised up again” (Ignatius, *Smyrna* 7). He calls the bread “the medicine of immortality,” saying it is “the antidote to prevent us from dying, which causes that we should live forever in Jesus Christ” (Ignatius, *Eph.* 20, longer version).

Ignatius is fighting against Docetism, the view that Jesus only seemed to have a real physical body of flesh and blood. He pushes the idea that Jesus became flesh so far that He says, “I know that after His resurrection also He was still possessed of flesh and I believe that He is so now” (Ignatius, *Smyrna* 3). He likens the one flesh of Jesus to the one Eucharist. “Take heed, then, to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to show forth the unity of His blood; one altar; as there is one bishop, among the presbytery and deacons” (Ignatius, *Philadelphians* 4). In other words, “Ignatius put a high value on the Eucharist, or communion, as a means of ensuring unity, and of stressing the reality of Jesus becoming a man” (Smith, p. 80). Torrance says Ignatius “is often very vague and, at times, hardly consistent” (Torrance, p. 56).

The apologists viewed the Lord’s Table as a celebration of thanksgiving and as a real presence of Christ in the bread and the wine (Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 66; Origen of Alexandria, commentary on Matthew 11:4). According to Hannah, “The earliest Fathers in the church held an ambivalence concerning the Lord’s Table. They saw it in terms of a physical reality and a thanksgiving with what has been described as unnatural and unconcerned realism” (p. 264). As an example, Hannah cites the *Didache* 10-11 (Hannah, p. 264).

*The Doctrine of Prophecy* The doctrine of prophecy includes the resurrection and judgment, and implies the Second Coming and the kingdom.

*The Epistle to Diognetus* says the Son Who is coming again to judge (*Diog.* 7:6) was “promised a kingdom in heaven, and will give it to those who have loved Him (*Diog.* 10:2). *The Didache* mentions the Antichrist (*Didache*, 16:4) and the Second Coming. “Be ready for you know not the hour in which our Lord comes” (*Didache*, 16:3, 7-8; Ehrman says it teaches the end is “very near”). In 1 Clement, there are several references to the Second Coming of Christ (1 Clem. 23). Papias did not say much about doctrine, but he believed in the Second Coming, the resurrection of the dead, and the millennial reign of Christ after the resurrection of the dead when the Lord will establish a personal reign on the earth. Polycarp says the Lord is coming again (Polycarp, *Phil.* 6). Believers must stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ (Polycarp, *Phil.* 6). Polycarp says if we live worthy of Him, we will reign with Him (Polycarp, *Phil.* 5).

Barnabas says, “The Lord is near and His reward” (*Barnabas*, 21; see also 8). The author refers to the anti-Christ (*Barnabas* 4). “The Lord will judge the world without respect of persons” (*Barnabas* 4). Barnabas teaches the Lord will reign on the earth for 1000 years (*Barnabas* 15:4-5). According to *Second Clement* The Lord is coming (*2 Clem.* 17:4), but “we know not the day of God’s appearing” (*2 Clem.* 12:2). The Day of Judgment



is coming (2 Clem. 16:3; 17:6). The kingdom is coming (2 Clem. 5:5; 9:6; 11:7; 12:1, 12:2, 12:6; 17:5). He also says things that sound as if we have to be righteous to enter the kingdom.

Throughout the second century and into the third, all who addressed the issue were premillennial. Hannah says the earliest writers after the apostles embraced premillennialism (Hannah, p. 306). The only possible exception is Barnabas, but he is “commonly conceited by many amillennialism most neutral scholars to be premillennial” (Walvoord, p. 44). Hannah says Justin Martyr (*First Apology*, 52) and Tertullian (*Against Marcion* 3.24.3) were premillennial (Hannah, p. 307). To that list could be added Diognetus (Diognetus 10:2), Papias (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 5.33), Polycarp (Polycarp *Phil.* 5), Barnabas (*Barnabas* 15:4-5), 2 Clement (2 Clem. 5), Montanism, Justin (Justin, *Dial.* 81:4), and Irenaeus (see discussion above on each of these men).

Premillennialism was first opposed by the school at Alexandria, based on its Platonic philosophical roots and its commitment to allegorical interpretation (Walvoord, p. 46). The allegorizing method of interpreting Scripture is clearly evident in Clement of Alexandria. Origen was worse than Clement: “No doctrine was safe from his use of the allegorical method, even the doctrine of the resurrection. His method subverted the plain meaning of Scripture by a principle of interpretation so subjective that the interpreter could make what he willed from the written revelation. It was natural that one who opposed literal interpretation of Scripture in other realms should do the same in regard to the millennium” (Walvoord, pp. 44-45). Hannah says that Origen appears to have been the first to spiritualize the “future kingdom” as a “literal earthly reign” of Christ (Hannah, p. 311). In his commentary on Matthew 10:14, the kingdom is not a geographic concept so much as it is a spiritualized realm in the hearts of God’s people. Hannah adds that Origen heaped scorn on the concept of millennialism (*The Fundamental Doctrines* 2.11.2; Hannah, p. 311).f

As a result of allegorical interpretation, premillennialism began to decline. Walvoord explains, “Dionysius, who was Bishop of Alexandria in the latter part of the third century, is noted for his controversy resulting from the teachings of Nepos, an ardent premillennialist, who as bishop had taught and written with such effectiveness that whole churches were withdrawing in protest against the spiritualization of Origen. Eusebius who gives the account (Eusebius, *Eccl Hist.* 24) describes a three-day conference held by Dionysius in which the matter was thoroughly discussed with the result that the schism was healed. Nepos had died some time previous to the conference” (Walvoord, p. 45).

Other factors contributed to the rejection of premillennialism. For example, Hannah says, “Premillennialism may have suffered a loss of respectability in the Catholic church when radical, reform-minded groups, such as the Montanists, adopted it. When the church condemned Montanism for its alleged excesses, it sought to distance itself from any affinity with its teaching so as to safeguard the purity of doctrine” (Hannah, p. 307). Walvoord observes, “It is clear that the rising tide of amillennialism comes almost entirely from the Alexandrian school—in particular, from Clement, Origen, and Dionysius, all from this locality. Accompanying this change in the church was the corresponding political change under Constantine, which became effective in the fourth century. With the coming of Augustine, a new day and a new chapter in the history of millennialism was written” (Walvoord, p. 45). By the way, Dionysius of Alexandria (d. ca. 264), a pupil of Origen and

later bishop of Alexandria, denied that John the apostle wrote the book of Revelation (Hannah, p. 312).

During the period of the Old Catholic Church, doctrine became more and more the test of Christianity, especially with the rise of heresies. As has been demonstrated, the one thing that the Old Catholic Church did was defend the basic doctrines of the Christian faith. The earliest and simplest summary of essential doctrines is the Apostles' Creed. The Apostles did not produce the Apostles' Creed. Its origin cannot be traced to a single individual author (Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 1, p. 16). Many think that it began as a baptismal formula (Cairns, p. 117). Latourette suggests that it is an elaboration of the baptismal formula given in Matthew 28:19 (Latourette, p. 135).

There is some indication that it developed as a defense against Gnosticism. It has been suggested that the Apostles' Creed was developed as a reaction against Marcion. The opening statement of the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty," rules out the Marcion view that the world was the creation of the demiurge. The next phrase, "and in Jesus Christ, His son, who was born of Mary the virgin, was crucified under Pontius Pilate," etc., eliminates the teaching of Marcion, who was a Gnostic, that Christ was a phantom. It asserts that Christ was fully human. The phrase that Christ will come to judge the living and the dead repudiates the contention of Marcion that the demiurge will judge (Latourette, pp. 135-36).

The Apostles' Creed is the oldest summary of essential doctrine (Cairns, p. 117), including the doctrine of the Trinity, salvation, the universal nature of the church, and the resurrection of believers. With the exception of one or two phrases, a form of the Apostles' Creed was known to Irenaeus (ca. 170) and Tertullian (ca. 200; Latourette, p.135). They developed "Rules of Faith" that was used to distinguish true Christianity from Gnosticism (Cairns, p. 117). The form used today probably did not exist before the sixth century (Latourette, p.135).

The conclusion is that "As churches emerge throughout the Roman Empire, they did so with a degree of independence, though they all were bound together by a common faith, read various apostolic writings passed among the churches, and heard itinerants (apostles, prophets, and evangelist)" (Hannah, p. 261). The Apostolic Fathers repeated biblical phrases "with no detailed discourse on their meaning" (Hannah, p. 150). They did not attempt a synthesis in any area of doctrine (Hannah, p. 305). By and large, they reflected the doctrine of the New Testament, the doctrine of Christ, salvation, the church, and prophesy. Some of the few statements that seem to imply works are necessary for salvation, maybe nothing more than teaching that perseverance is necessary for a reward. There are a few statements in the several of the later Apostolic Fathers that seem to be saying that baptism is necessary for salvation, but those same authors say that salvation is by faith. There are phrases that could be the seeds for later development of doctrines that stray away from the New Testament.

## **Church Polity**

After the apostolic period, the office of elder changed. What began as an office of one among equals with one as a leader within a single local church evolved into a single individual with authority over churches. Here is a brief description of the evolution of elder.

*The New Testament* While the original Apostles were living, they were recognized as the unquestioned leaders of the church. The Apostles established elders (plural) as leaders within each church. The Apostles ordained elders (Acts 14:23) and toward the end of the New Testament period called themselves elders (*cf.* 1 Tim. 4:14 with 2 Tim. 1:6; see also 1 Pet. 5:1; 2 Jn. 1). During this period, the titles “bishop” and “elder” were applied to the same official (Titus 1:5, 7 and Acts 20:17, 28).

*Apostolic Fathers* The Didache (before 100) says the church should “appoint for yourselves, therefore, bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men who were meek and not lovers of money, true and approved for unto you they also perform the service of the prophets and the teachers” (15:1-2). The Didache reflects biblical teaching concerning church leadership.

Clement (95) writes that the Apostles, “preaching everywhere in county and town, appointed their first fruits when they had proved them by the Spirit to be bishops (another word for elder) and deacons unto them that should believe” (chapter 42). The apostles also taught that those they appointed should appoint others “with the consent of the whole church” (Chapter 44). Clement clearly indicates that there was a plurality of leadership *within the local church*. Like Paul, he uses the words bishop and elder of the same office (44:3 with 44:5). Nothing in 1 Clement implies a single leader over a congregation or a single leader over a group of churches (Latourette, p. 117; Bruce, *The Growing Day*, p. 67). Clement has been accused of teaching apostolic succession, but all he is saying is that elders should appoint elders to succeed them. Clement’s church polity is biblical.

Polycarp (110) tells the church at Philippi to be “subject to the presbyters and deacons as unto God and Christ” (Chapter 5). When Polycarp wrote to the church at Philippi, he said exactly the same thing Paul said about church offices when he wrote to the church at Philippi (Phil. 1:1).

By 116, at least in some churches, bishops were ruling over the churches with elders and deacons under their authority. Ignatius (110-115) teaches that each church has one bishop, a presbytery, and deacons. Ignatius put the bishop *in each church* in the place of God and the elders in the place of the apostles (Magnesian 6). The church was not to do anything without the “the bishop and presbyters” (Magnesian 7; Smyrna 7; Trallians 7). On the one hand, the bishop had some authority. Ignatius writes, “It is not lawful without the bishop to baptize or to celebrate a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing to God, so that everything that is done may be secure and valid” (Smyrna 7). On the other hand, he says, “He who does anything apart from the bishop, and *the presbytery, and the deacons*, such a man is not pure in his conscience” (Trallians 7, italics added).

So while Ignatius was the first to place the office of bishop in contract to the office of elder, he does not indicate any organizational structure *over* churches (plural). He did not exalt the bishop of Rome as superior to other bishops (he does not mention any of the offices in his epistle to the Romans). “The only superiority is that of the bishop to the presbyters within each church” (Cairns p. 74). This is similar to the way some Baptist churches operate. They have a pastor and deacons, but no one doubts that the pastor is in charge. For example, he is the only one who can baptize. Latourette thinks it is probable that what Ignatius advocated was not generally accepted (Latourette p. 117).

It has been suggested that Ignatius had one “bishop” in charge of each congregation, “in order to prevent splits in the church and to ensure that correct beliefs were preserved”

(Smith, p. 80; *Philadelphians* 7). Kuiper says Ignatius considered the bishop the great defense against heresy (Kuiper, p. 21). So to maintain unity and purity of doctrine, one bishop was over each church. The idea that elders (plural) were to preserve the unity of the church and purity of doctrine is biblical (Titus 1:5-9, Titus 1:10). Apparently, Ignatius used that idea, but he also taught that one elder should be in charge instead of a plurality of elders.

Hermas (ca. 150) mentions, “rulers of the church” (Chapter 6). Second Clement (ca. 150) also mentions elders (17:5). These comments are biblical.

*Apologist* According to Jerome, Hegesippus (ca. 110-ca. 180) wrote in five volumes, “a history of all ecclesiastical events from the passion of our Lord down to his own period.” Except for eight passages quoted by Eusebius, his works of are lost. As Hegesippus traveled from Palestine to Rome, meeting numerous bishops and hearing the same teaching from all of them, he claimed that “in every succession and city, what the law, the prophets, and the Lord preached was faithfully followed” (*Eerdmans*’, p. 118). He drew up a list of bishops from Corinth and Rome, who had succeeded one another, but his point was not that they had some kind of personal authority such as an apostle or a pope, but that they *faithfully followed the teachings of the Lord*. In refuting Marcion and the Gnostics, he appealed to the *teaching* that had been handed down in the churches through the succession of bishops.

Hegesippus’s point is well taken. *Those in line with the apostles are those who teach what the apostles taught*. That is tradition in the true sense of the term. This concept goes back to Paul. He exhorts the Thessalonians, “Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which you were taught, whether by word or our epistle” (2 Thess. 2:15). The word “tradition” means “to hand over, to transfer.” The picture in this word is that of something being handed to someone who, in turn, hands it to someone else. That which they had been taught had been handed over to them by someone who had received it from someone else; the implication being that the authority was not in the messenger but in someone beyond him. God gave the message to the apostles who, in turn, gave it to others who were responsible to give it to those beyond them (2 Tim. 2:2).

Irenaeus and Tertullian followed Hegesippus’ approach in refuting Gnosticism. They held that the succession of bishops from the time of the apostles *guaranteed the accuracy of the apostle’s doctrine*. Irenaeus argued that he knew Polycarp, who knew John the apostle.

Irenaeus (185) says the apostles gave the office of bishop to Linus and after him came Anacletus and Clement, but his point is *not that had some personal authority*, but that, “This man, as he had seen the blessed apostles, and had been conversant with them, might be said to have *the preaching of the apostles still echoing [in his ears]*, and their *traditions* before his eyes. Nor was he alone [in this], for there were many still remaining who had received instructions from the apostles” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.*, 3. 3. 3, italics added).

Irenaeus adds that the church at Rome wrote a letter (1 Clement) to the church at Corinthians “exhorting them to peace, renewing their faith, and declaring the *tradition* which it had lately received from the apostles, proclaiming the one God, omnipotent, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Creator of man, who brought on the deluge, and called Abraham, who led the people from the land of Egypt, spoke with Moses, set forth the law, sent the prophets, and who has prepared fire for the devil and his angels. From this document, whosoever chooses to do so, may learn that He, the Father of our Lord Jesus

Christ, was preached by the Churches, and may also understand the *apostolic tradition* of the Church, since this Epistle is of older date than these men who are now propagating falsehood, and who conjure into existence another god beyond the Creator and the Maker of all existing things” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.*, 3. 3. 3, italics added).

Irenaeus goes on to say that Clement was succeeded by Evaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telephorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Sorer and “Eleutherius does now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, hold the *inheritance of the episcopate*. In this order, and by this succession, the *ecclesiastical tradition from the apostles*, and the *preaching of the truth*, have come down to us. And this is most abundant proof that there is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved in the church from the apostles until now, and handed down in truth” (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3. 3. 3, italics added).

The truth is that “the *apostles* had not appointed bishops in every church, and succession-lists of bishops were seriously unreliable” (*Eerdmans*’, p. 119, italics added).

Irenaeus concludes, “Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church, those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together *with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth*, according to the good pleasure of the Father” and “to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive succession,” because they have “*fallen from the truth*” bringing “strange doctrines.” He pronounced judgment on them because “separate (from) the unity of the Church, (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 4. 26. 2, italics added).

Irenaeus is refuting the Gnostic heresy by use of Scripture and the body of related tradition. The Gnostics claimed that before Jesus ascended, He entrusted secret wisdom to a succession of teachers traced back to the apostles, normally Philip, Thomas, and Matthias (*Eerdmans*’, p. 118). To counter their views, it was argued that there was a continuous teaching and teachers (bishops or presbyters) from the time when the apostles founded the churches. The argument was first outlined by Hegesippus.

Tertullian (ca. 200) “stoutly maintained that only those churches were valid which *agreed in the teaching* that those that had been founded by the apostles and where *the faith that been kept pure by a succession of bishops* going back to the apostles” (Latourette, p. 132, italics added).

To sum up, the concept of bishop evolved. In the New Testament, the titles “bishop” and “elder” were two different names for the same office within the local church (Titus 1:5, 7). An elder was one among equals *within* a local church. One elder was a leader (1 Pet. 5:1; Timothy; Titus), but the leader was not a dictator (3 Jn. 9). This plurality of elders in each congregation is mentioned in the Didache, Clement, and Polycarp. Ignatius, however, indicates that a bishop ruled *over* a single church with elders and deacons under his authority. Irenaeus and Tertullian speak of apostolic succession, but this is a succession of the *apostolic message*, not the *apostolic authority*. Here is what some church history professor says about the evolution.

Hannah says that in the second century, there was a dramatic, though gradual, change in the structure of the church from a plurality of leadership in the churches to a single administrative head, a bishop, with elders and deacons under him (Hannah, p. 265). This change arose as the church “sought to preserve its message from attacked by electing a succession theory of truth. By this, they argued that those churches could be assured of standing in the truth proclaimed by the apostles because a genealogical tree of truth succession could be demonstrated from the apostles to the bishops” (Hannah, pp. 265 -66).

“This approach of assurance of orthodoxy was continued and developed by the apologist” (Hannah, p. 266, who cites Tertullian and Irenaeus). “Generally, the church was viewed as the sole depository of truth because it had a monopoly on the apostolic writings, apostolic oral tradition, and the apostolic faith” (Hannah, p. 266).

Westin contends that between 90 and 180, the original character of the church was maintained; that is, the method was still preaching, baptizing, and teaching. He says, “During the entire second century and even into the third, Christian churches were independent minority groups.” He adds, “During this period and until the latter part of the second century it was not possible to discover any centralized church authority, for local churches were independent, yet with a real sense of relationship with one another. As in the days of Paul, letters were directed to the local assemblies, not to any bishop or superintendent. That this policy was maintained is evident in the First Epistle of Clement.” He also points to Polycarp’s letter to the Philippians and the letters of Ignatius (Westin, p. 4).

Westin adds that there is no evidence during this period that bishops practiced as priests, such as the priest in Judaism and heathen religions. Nor is there any evidence that there was the use of an altar or any direct influence of temple worship. “Altars came into use during the early part of the third century, when churches buildings began to be erected” (Westin, p. 3). In fact, when pagans inquired why Christians did not have altars and temples, Christians replied, “Is it not better to build the temple for Him and our souls, to hallow a place for Him in our hearts?” (Westin, p. 4). “There was no rigid obligatory ritual to be observed at the communion service” (Westin, p. 5).

Westin also claims that it was not until after the middle of the second century that there is evidence of one-man leadership in a congregation. According to him, it was then that the process of centralizing the local congregations began to take place when these leaders (bishops) began to come together for synod meetings, which had their beginning during the latter part of the second century. It was also during this period that the bishop of Rome began to issue statements implying that he was the head of churches.

Carroll quotes Mosheim (1693-1755), the Lutheran church historian: “But whoever supposes that the bishops of this golden age of the church correspond with the bishops of the following centuries must blend and confound characters that are very different, for in this century and the next, a bishop had charge of a single church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its Lord, but was, in reality, its minister or servant.... All the churches in those primitive times were independent bodies, or none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. For though the churches which were founded by the Apostles themselves frequently had the honor shown them to be consulted in doubtful cases, yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is as clear as the noonday that all Christian churches had equal rights, and were in all respects on a footing of equality” (Johann Lorenz Mosheim, *An Ecclesiastical History*, vol., 1, pp. 71-72).

*Third Century* Stephen, the bishop in Rome from 254 to 257, was the first bishop to claim special authority derived from Peter based on Matthew 16:18-19. His theory prevailed in the West, but the East was never sold on the idea (*Eerdmans*, p. 119-20).

Cyprian advanced the doctrine of the church. He argued that bishops were successors to the apostles and that the unity of the church resided in the bishop’s office (Hannah, p. 266). Cyprian recognized the priority of Rome, but he refused to assent to the primacy of

Peter's successors. According to his judgment, no bishop had the right to impose his authority over another bishop. Bishops were chosen by the people, not by distant decree (Hannah, p. 267).

Cyprian was adamant that salvation is only in the church, but what he meant by that is salvation is in the apostolic truth of which the church is the depository. In there was no salvation outside the church because the church alone has the gospel. The church, the bishop, and the gospel are inseparable. "He can no longer have God for his father, who has not the church for his mother" (Cyprian, *Unity of the Church* 6). Hannah suggests that this argument emerged as a weapon against the schismatics of the day, such as the Novatians, who threaten the unity of the church (Hannah, p. 267).

Hannah sums it all up. He says that right from the start, the doctrine of the church developed rapidly (Hannah, p. 258). Churches in the West retained a plurality of leaders in the church longer than the churches in the East. Two writings from the West suggest that the leadership of the church was directed by a plurality of officers (Clement of Rome and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Hannah, p. 261). Early in the East, the terms "bishop" and "elder" were separated, creating two separate offices. In the writings of Ignatius in the East the office of bishop was separated from that of elder and was made singular, although the office of elder remained plural. In other words, a bishop presided over each church (Hannah, p. 262). "However, this was not a universal practice in the early second century" (Hannah, p. 261). Clement of Rome argued, "the church's message is true because of an unbroken heritage of succession from God through Christ to the apostles, who passed the message to the bishops" (Hannah, p. 262). "The succession envisioned by Clement of Rome appears to ban a system assuring that truth would remain in the churches; it was not about a succession of man and an office. The emphasis was upon the passing of truth (2 Timothy 2:2). Gradually the combination of Ignatius' emphasis on a single bishop in each church and Clement of Rome's teaching on the succession caused a quasiepiscopal form of government to prevail in the churches by the middle of the second century, although the churches retained their autonomy and the bishops throughout the empire viewed themselves as a confederation of equals" (Hannah, p. 263).

Cairns says persecution, heresy, and schism contributed to an expansion of the bishop's power. Ignatius, Irenaeus, and Cyprian are the ones who stressed the importance of the office of bishop. By the middle of the second century, the exaltation of the bishop soon lead to the special honored given to the bishop of Rome. Cyprian was the one who insisted that although all bishops were equal and all were in line of apostolic succession, Rome deserved special honor because the bishop of Rome was in the line of succession from Peter. By the end of the Old Catholic church period, each church had one bishop, apostolic succession was accepted, and the bishop of Rome was recognized as the first among equals. His primacy was later developed into his supremacy (Cairns, pp. 115-117).

No doubt the loss of apostolic authority made a choice of new leaders necessary. Furthermore, the church probably took its organizational model, not from the New Testament, but from the empirical government of Rome, where there was government from authoritative leaders at the top. Christianity arose and grew not in a republic where citizens chose their own rulers, but in an empire ruled by authority. Hence, a somewhat autocratic form of government (that is, the rule of bishops) arose in the churches and the church willingly submitted, being accustomed to the same rule in the state. Yet during this entire

period, no bishop claimed universal rule (a bishop above the bishops), as did the bishop of Rome did later.

## Church Service

*The New Testament* The church meeting during the apostolic period was a simple gathering. They met around a meal called a love feast (Jude 12) to observe the Lord's Table (1 Cor. 11:17-34, especially verses 20-22, 33-34). They sang, read Scripture, and someone (or several) taught.

Some try to read into the New Testament more than is there. In his commentary on Acts, Rackham states that when Luke says the prophets and teachers (Acts 13:1) "ministered" to the Lord (Acts 13:2), he uses a Greek word from which we get the English word "liturgy." He goes on to say, "They were offering priestly service to God, and in such service, the first element would be the breaking of bread and the prayers. To this day, the common name among Greek Christians for the service of Holy Communion is the Liturgy (the Service). This service was performed at Antioch by the prophets and teachers; and the *Didache* shows us how the celebration passed into the hands of 'the bishops (presbyter-bishops) and deacons.' 'Elect for yourselves,' it says, 'bishops and deacons ... for they also perform for you the service (liturgy) of the prophets and teachers'" (Rackham, p. 190). Notice how this commentator uses the *Didache* to justify the liturgy! The sacrifice mentioned in the *Didache* is the sacrifice of praise, not the Lord's Supper being a sacrifice, an idea that was developed centuries later.

*After the New Testament* There are not many descriptions of the church gathering recorded in the first several centuries after the New Testament.

In 112, when Pliny, the Younger, described what happened when Christians met. Eusebius wrote, "So great a persecution was at that time opened against us in many places that Plinius Secundus (Pliny the Younger), one of the most noted of governors, being disturbed by the great number of martyrs, communicated with the emperor concerning the multitude of those that were put to death for their faith. At the same time, he informed him in his communication that he had not heard of their doing anything profane or contrary to the laws —except that they arose at dawn and sang hymns to Christ as a God; but that they renounced adultery and murder and like criminal offenses, and did all things in accordance with the laws" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3. 33 .1-4).

Westin comments, "Even at the end of the first century, as the sources reveal, the gatherings of Christians were simple edificatory meetings. The well-known account from this period is the letter that the governor of Bithynia sent Emperor Trajan. After careful investigation, the governor had this to say: 'They maintained that their fault or error amounted to nothing more than this: they were in the habit of meeting on a certain day before sunrise and reciting an antiphonal hymn to Christ as God.' The Christians then bound themselves with an oath to maintain certain moral standards. Besides this, they declared it was their custom to meet together and 'partake of a meal.' This letter also gives evidence that the Christians came together on the Lord's Day—Sunday" (Westin, p. 6).

Justin (ca. 100-165) describes the Sunday meeting, "And we afterward continually remind each other of these things. And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of



all through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Savior on the same day rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration” (Justin, *1 Apol.* 66).

The significance of these descriptions is that they describe the kind of meeting that the believer’s in the first century had. What is not said is also significant.

The simplicity of the church meeting was eroded by the elevation of the office of bishop. Cairns points out that the emphasis on bishop, who was believed to have derived his authority by apostolic succession, “led many to think of him as the center of unity, the depository of truth, and the dispenser of the means of grace of God through the sacraments.” There was more and more of the separation between the laity and the clergy. Baptism and the Lords’ Supper came to be rites that could only be performed by an accredited minister (Cairns, p. 119).

At first, the only requirements for baptism were faith in Christ and the desire to be baptized, but by the end of the second century, a probationary period as a catechumen was added to test the reality of the experience of the convert. Tertullian opposed infant baptism, but Cyprian supported it (Cairns, p. 119).

**Summary:** During the second and third centuries, the church experienced sporadic and sometimes severe persecution, recognized the New Testament books as Scripture, formulated the Apostles’ Creed, and began to change its own structure.

During the early years of the church, it struggled with external persecution and internal false doctrine. Martyrs and apologists arose to meet the persecution from without and opposition from within the church.

The earliest building devoted to Christian use is at Dura Europos on the Euphrates River in eastern Roman Syria. It was a house that was remodeled in the 240s. Two rooms were combined to form the assembly room, and another room became a baptistery—the only room decorated with pictures. Dura was destroyed by the Sassanian Persians in 256, so the house’s use as a church was short-lived.



# THE IMPERIAL CHURCH

The third division of church history is the period of the Imperial Church. The period extends from 313 to 476. The most striking fact of this period was the recognition and even adoption of the church by the Roman government.

Scholar Kenneth W. Harl says, “The churches in existence at the time of Constantine’s conversion were largely the apostolic churches that went back to Saint Paul and the Disciples of Christ. What Constantine did, in effect, was to co-opt the bishops of those churches and create a new hierarchy within the Roman imperial system” (Harl, FOP, p. 136). Harl adds, “Constantine’s church was ... a *dramatic change* from the apostolic church that been in existence from the time of St. Paul” (Harl, FOP, p. 136, italics added). In *World of Byzantium*, Harl says, “Constantine created an *imperial church*, headed by bishops, funded by imperial revenues, and based on imperial administration” (Harl, WOB, p. 12, italics added). Truly, with the coming of Constantine, “the Church of the Catacombs became the Church of the Empire” (Ware, p. 26).

## The Development of the State Church

*The Rise of Constantine* In 308, there were six emperors—Galerius, Licinius, and Maximin in the East, and Maximian, Maxentius, his son, and Constantine in the West.

In the West, Maximian was driven out of Rome by his son and he committed suicide (309). That left Maxentius and Constantine. In 312, Constantine (ca. 274-337) crossed the Alps to defeat Maxentius. Eusebius, the first church historian, claims Constantine told him what happened. The day before the battle, Constantine and his entire army saw an image in the sky of the Christogram (the first two Greek letters of the word “Christ”). There was also a message which said, “*In hoc signo victor eiris*” (Latin for “In this sign, you shall conquer”). Constantine put the Christogram (a design showing the first two letters of the word “Christ” in Greek) on his banners and won the battle of the Milvian Bridge (Harl, FOP, pp. 4-5). On October 28, 312, Maxentius drowned in the Tiber River. This victory gave Constantine control of the western part of the empire.

In the East, the death of Galerius in 311 and of Maximin in 313 made Licinius sole emperor. Now there was one emperor in the West and one emperor in the East. Until 323, Constantine and Licinius were co-emperors, although Constantine made most of the decisions in matters of state.

*The Edict of Milan* In 313, Constantine and Licinius were together in Milan for the wedding of Constantine’s half-sister to Licinius. They issued the *Edict of Milan* (a.k.a. the *Edict of Tolerance*), which granted freedom of worship to all. It officially put an end to the persecutions of Christians.

*The Settling of a Dispute* Significantly, in 315, Constantine, the *Emperor*, single-handedly settled a church dispute. After the persecution of 303-312 came to an end, a schism arose in North Africa over the status of those Christians who had offered a sacrifice to Roman gods during the persecution. The Donatists felt that those who lapsed must be rebaptized in order to be readmitted to the church. The Caecilianists claimed confession was sufficient. When each side appealed to Constantine, he ruled in favor of the

Caecilianists (Harl, FOP, p. 138). For the first time, a secular, political figure had settled a church dispute!

*The Founding of Constantinople* In 323, Constantine defeated Licinius and had him put to death. Constantine was now the sole ruler of the Roman world. In 324, he decided to move the capital to Byzantium (modern Istanbul) and rename it Constantinople. With a great ceremony on May 11, 330, he dedicated the new city. “Constantinople was founded as a Christian city.... Constantine constructed a whole new Christian center of *imperial* palaces, *churches*, and government offices” (Harl, FOP, p. 139, italics added).

*The Council of Nicaea* In 325, Constantine, the *Emperor* (not a church leader), presided over the Council of Nicaea. The theological issue at Nicaea was the nature of the Trinity. The question was, “Was Christ the same substance as the Father (Greek: *homoousia*) or just similar (Greek: *homoiousia*)?” (Harl, FOP, p. 140). Notice that the difference between the two Greek words is the Greek letter *iota* (i). Hence, the origin of the phrase “an iota of difference.”

Constantine presided over the Council of Nicaea, but he was no “saint.” González says he had an “irascible and sometimes even bloodthirsty temperament” (González, vol. 1, p. 134). In 326, Constantine executed his eldest son, Crispus, for treason and in 327, he executed his second wife Fausta on a similar charge. He kept the position of *Pontifex Maximus*, chief priest of the pagan state religion. Believing that baptism washed away all previous sins, he delayed his baptism until just before his death. Constantine the Great died on May 22, 337. He was baptized by an Arian (see the discussion of the Council of Nicaea below), eulogized by an Arian, and his three sons had Arian tendencies (Cook, p. 16). Yet, the Orthodox Church recognizes Constantine as a saint (from Cook’s lectures).

*Becoming the State Religion* Constantine embraced Christianity, made it the dominant force in Western civilization, and created an imperial church (Harl, *WOB*, p. 10). The sons of Constantine went beyond their father. They banned pagan sacrifices and attendance at pagan temples, but in 361, Julian (332-363) ascended the imperial throne and took privileges away from the church. He restored full freedom of worship. After the short reign of Julian, rulers continued granting privileges to the church until Christianity became the state religion of Rome. Gratian, the Western Roman Emperor from 375-383, prohibited pagan worship at Rome and refused to wear the insignia of *Pontifex Maximus*.

In 380, Flavius Theodosius (379-395) issued an edict that made Christianity the exclusive religion of the state (Cairns, p. 125). The edict declared that all subjects must “steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Paul to the Romans, which had been faithfully preserved by tradition.” He also ordered that “the adherents of this faith be called ‘Catholic Christians,’ and forbade ‘heretics’ to meet in their churches” (Schaff, *History*, vol. 3, p. 142). Notice: the Imperial church is now called Catholic. In 392, the edict of Constantinople prohibited paganism (Cairns, p. 125).

Shortly after Theodosius outlawed sacrifices, and therefore pagan worship, the patriarch of Alexandria released the monks to attack the pagans who occupied the Serapeum (a temple dedicated to the god Serapis) and the Mouseion (a museum). A large Christian crowd “stormed the buildings, smashed the statues, and destroyed papyrus scrolls. The fighting spread across Alexandria. The Imperial army did nothing. Classical Alexandria was destroyed and Christian Alexandria emerged.... The pagans who witnessed this destruction were absolutely intimidated. There are reports of conversions on the spot” (Harl, FOP, p. 181).

At the close of the fourth century, the majority of Roman citizens had converted to Christianity. The separation between church and state was all but extinguished. When the political power of the emperors collapsed with the fall of the Roman Empire in 410, the church and its leaders endured as the dominant influence in Roman culture and politics. In 476, the bishop of Rome was left with political as well as spiritual power (Cairns, p. 124).

## **The Result of Being the State Church**

*Persecution Ceased* From the Edict in 313 until the Roman Empire ended, the sword of persecution was not merely sheathed, it was buried.

*Favors were Given* Constantine not only granted freedom to the church, he granted it favors as well. He issued edicts that restored confiscated property to the church, subsidized the church by the state, exempted the clergy from public service, and set aside Sunday as a day of worship (Cairns, p. 124). When he moved the capital of the empire to Constantinople, he gave the Lateran Palace to Sylvester, who was bishop of Rome from 314 to 335 (Cook, p. 16).

*Church Buildings were Restored* During the apostolic age, meetings were held in private homes and hired halls. Afterward, during times of peace from persecution, church buildings began to arise. In periods of persecution, these buildings were destroyed. All buildings left standing were now restored. Edifices began to arise everywhere. Constantine built large churches in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and in his new capital, Constantinople.

*Temples were Consecrated as Churches* Heathen sacrifices ceased, indicating that by this time, they were just a formality and no longer expressed the belief of intelligent people. In many places, especially the cities, temples were consecrated as churches.

*Churches were Endowed* Temples had been supported from the public treasury. Gradually at first, but soon more generally, public funds were bestowed on churches and the clergy. The state paid the clergy!

*Clergy Received Special Privileges* By customs which soon became law, members of the clergy received special privileges. They were free from taxation. All accusations against them were tried before ecclesiastical courts. They soon became a privileged class, above the law.

*Sunday was Proclaimed a Day of Rest* In 321, Constantine forbade courts to be held on Sunday, except for the purpose of giving freedom to slaves. On that day, soldiers were commanded to omit their daily military exercises. Sunday observance soon became general throughout the empire. The public games, however, were continued on Sunday, tending to make it more a holiday than a holy day.

*Other Results* Crucifixion was abolished. Infanticide was repressed. The treatment of slaves became more humane. Emancipation of slaves was sanctioned and encouraged.

Everyone sought membership in the church and nearly everyone was received. The forms and practices of paganism gradually crept into Christian church services. For example, some heathen feasts became church festivals—with a change of name, of course. Approximately 405 images of saints began to appear in churches, at first as memorials. Then they were revered. After that they were adored, and, finally, they were worshipped. The adoration of the Virgin Mary was substituted for the worship of Venus and Diana; the Lord's Supper became a reenactment of the Lord's sacrifice and the church elder evolved from a preacher to a priest. Ambition, pride, and arrogance replaced humility.

In the East, the state-dominated the church until it lost all energy and life. In the West, the church gradually usurped power over the state until the church controlled the nations of Europe, making it a political machine.

Cairns states that as a result of Constantine calling and presiding over the Council of Nicaea, “for the first time the church found itself dominated by the political leadership of the head of the state. The perennial problem of the relationship between the church and state emerged clearly here, but the bishops were too busy dealing with the theological heresy to think about that particular problem” (Cairns, p. 133). Cairns adds that Nicaea cost of the church its independence. “The church became imperial from this time and was increasingly dominated by the emperor. The church in the West was able to rise above this domination, but the church in the East never freed itself from the domination by the political power of the state” (Cairns, p. 135).

Cook speaks of the Romanization of Christianity. For example, the Roman Empire was divided into dioceses, which were units for administration with a city in the center. “The church mirrored the empire’s organization of dioceses” and “took up some of the trappings of pagan Rome, such as the bishop of Rome’s use of the title Pontifex Maximus,” which was the title of the chief pagan priest. Bishops began to use their authority to pressure emperors to act according to their will. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, refused to offer communion to emperor Theodosius until he did penance for the killing of a number of Christians in Greece. Ambrose also refused communion to Theodosius until he stopped using public funds for the rebuilding of the synagogue that some Christians had burned down (Cook, p. 17).

González states, “Beginning with Constantine, riches and pomp came to be seen as signs of divine favor.” He adds, “Eusebius described, with great joy and pride, the ornate churches that were being built. But the net result of those buildings, and of the liturgy that evolved to fit them, was the development of a clerical aristocracy, similar to the imperial aristocracy, and often as far from the common people as were the great officers of the Empire. The church imitated the uses of the empire, not only in its liturgy, but also in its social structure” (González, vol. 1, p. 134).

“Oh Constantine, what evil did you sire, not by your conversion, but the dowry the first wealthy father got from you?” (Dante, *Inferno*, Canto 19:115; see also Longfellow’s translation of *Inferno*, which reads, “Ah, Constantine! of how much ill was mother / Not thy conversion, but that marriage dower / Which the first wealthy Father took from thee!”).

## Ecumenical Councils

There were doctrinal dissensions during the period of persecution, but after the persecution ended, theological controversies arose between 313 and 451 (Cairns, pp. 131-33). To settle these questions, ecumenical (universal) councils of the leaders were called. At these councils, the Roman Emperor usually presided and only bishops voted. All lower clergymen and laity were expected to submit to their decisions.

Another way to say the same thing: controversies produced councils. There were seven “universal” councils. Four of these were in the Imperial period of church history and three during the next period. These were attempts to maintain the purity of doctrine and unity of the church.

Here is a summary of all seven.

1. Council of Nicaea (325) affirmed the deity of Christ.
2. First Council of Constantinople (381) asserted the humanity of Christ and the deity of the Holy Spirit. It unequivocally affirmed the Trinity.
3. Council of Ephesus (431) acknowledged the unity of the personality of Christ.
4. Council of Chalcedon (451) stated the relationship between the two natures of Christ.
5. Second Council of Constantinople (553) dealt with the monophysite dispute.
6. Third Council of Constantinople (680) condemned the monothelites.
7. Second Council Nicaea (787) dealt with the image controversy.

*Council of Nicaea (the Deity of Christ)* In 318 or 319, Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, preached on “The Great Mystery of the Trinity in Unity” (Cairns, p. 133). He taught that “God is always, the Son is always,” and the Son “is the unbegotten begotten” (Latourette, p. 153).

Arius attacked the sermon preached by Alexander. Arius was a tall, handsome, ascetic, earnestly religious, eloquent preacher, who gave the impression of being arrogant (Latourette, p. 153). He was a scholar and a popular preacher (Cairns, p. 133). In an attempt to avoid a polytheistic concept of God, he asserted that Christ was of a similar, but different, essence from God the Father (Cairns, p. 133). He maintained that “the Son has a beginning but that God is without beginning” and that the Son is not part of God (Latourette, p. 153). Alexander had Arius condemned in a synod.

When the controversy over a “theological trifle” (Eerdmans’, p. 157) threatened not only the church but also the empire, Constantine tried to settle it by writing letters to Alexander and Arius. When that did not resolve the conflict, Constantine called a synod of bishops to work out a solution. The council met in the summer of 325 at Nicaea in Bithynia (Cairns, p. 133; modern Turkey). About 220 bishops attended (Eerdmans’, p. 158) with fewer than ten from the West (Cairns, p. 133). Constantine presided over the first session and paid all costs (Cairns, p. 133).

The council of Nicaea is known as the first ecumenical council, but its “universal” status depends largely on its subsequent universal acceptance (Eerdmans’, p. 158). Furthermore, “for the first time the church found itself dominated by the political leadership of the head of state. A perennial problem of the relationship between church and state emerges clearly here, but the bishops were too busy dealing with theological heresy to think of that particular problem” (Cairns, p. 133).

There were three views at the Council of Nicaea (Cairns, pp. 133-34).

Arius (ca. 250-336) insisted that the Son was a created creature. He did not exist from all eternity, but had a beginning (Cary, HCT, p. 37). He was of a *different essence* or substance than the Father (Cairns, p. 133). “He did not possess by nature or right any of the divine qualities of immortality, sovereignty, perfect wisdom, goodness, and purity” (Eerdmans’, p. 156). Arius allowed that the Son was called “God” by grace and “was sinless and unchangeable in practice, if not by nature” (Eerdmans’, p. 157). To support his arguments he used such passages as John 17:3 (“the only true God”), 1 Timothy 6:16 (“alone possesses immortality”), Colossians 1:15 (“firstborn of all creation”), and the Septuagint version of Proverbs 8:22 (“the Lord created me at the beginning of his work”) (Eerdmans’, p. 157).

Athanasius (ca. 295-373) insisted that Christ existed from all eternity and was of the *same essence* as the Father, although He had a different personality. The Son is eternally begotten from the Father. His key argument was that God the Father is an eternal Father and, therefore, was never without a Son (Cary, *HCT*, p. 38). Athanasius argued that if Christ were less than that, He could not be the Savior. Christ was coequal, coeternal, and consubstantial (of the same substance) with the Father.

Eusebius of Caesarea (264-340) proposed a compromise that combined the ideas of Arius and Athanasius. According to Eusebius, Christ was not created out of nothing as Arius had insisted. He was begotten by the Father before time. He was of a *similar essence* as the Father. González says, “Eusebius never fully understood what was at stake. For him, the peace and unity of the church were of prime importance” (González, 1, p. 131).

The orthodox view that insisted on the unity of the essence of the Father and the Son, won and became supreme throughout the church, both East and West. It stated that Christ is “one in essence” with the Father. He is God in the same sense as God the Father, “true God from true God, begotten not made, one in essence with the Father” (Ware, p. 30).

It should be noted that the original form of the Nicene Creed is not exactly the form that is widely used today. The original form stopped with the phrase “and in the Holy Spirit” and added a section condemning Arius’ views. The present Nicene Creed was approved at Chalcedon in 451 (Cairns, p. 134). Some claim that the Council of Nicaea created the doctrine of the Trinity. The Council did not invent the doctrine of the Trinity; it explained it (Hannah, p. 24).

The Council of Nicaea also prioritized bishops. By Cyprian’s time, it was customary to hold local councils, attended by all of the bishops within a province of the Roman Empire. This type of council normally met in the provincial capital under the presidency of the bishop of the capital, who was given the title *Metropolitan*. Then, the scope of the councils included bishops from not one, but from several civil provinces, which tended to assemble in the chief cities of the empire, such as Alexandria or Antioch. The bishops of the great cities began to acquire an importance above all the provincial Metropolitans (Ware, p. 24). The council of Nicaea decided that the three great centers were Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch (Canon VI). In addition, it declared that the see (jurisdiction) of Jerusalem would be given the next place in honor after the other three, but it would be subject to the Metropolitan of Caesarea (Canon VII; Ware, p. 30).

Arianism did not simply disappear. Arius and a few others refused to sign the Nicene decision (Kuiper, p. 31). From 325 to 381, there was bitterness and contention over this issue (for details, see the discussion of Athanasius below). By 327, Emperor Constantine began to regret the decisions made at the Nicene Council. He granted amnesty to the Arian leaders and exiled Athanasius. During numerous exiles, Athanasius continued to be a vigorous defender of the Nicene Council against Arianism. At one point, Athanasius said it was “Athanasius against the world.”

The semi-Arians taught that the Son is of *like* substance with the Father (*homoiousia*), as opposed to the outright Arians, who taught that the Son was not like the Father. So the Son was held to be like the Father but not of the same essence as the Father.

The Cappadocian Fathers worked to bring these semi-Arians back to the orthodox cause. Cappadocia is a region that was visited by Paul. It is in modern Turkey. The Cappadocian Fathers were Basil the Great (330-379), who was bishop of Caesarea, Basil’s brother Gregory of Nyssa (c.330-395), who was bishop of Nyssa, and a close friend,



Gregory of Nazianzus (329-389), who became Patriarch of Constantinople. Gregory of Nyssa was “the thinker,” Gregory of Nazianzus “the orator,” and Basil “the man of action.” In their writings, the Cappadocian Fathers made extensive use of the (now orthodox) formula “one substance (*ousia*) in three persons (*hypostaseis*).” Thus, the classic summary of the Trinitarian doctrine, three persons in one essence (Ware, p. 31). The Cappadocian Fathers influenced the council at Constantinople and are respected in both the East and the West.

*The First Council of Constantinople (the Humanity of Christ)* In 381, the Council of Constantinople decreed that the decision of the 318 bishops at Nicaea “shall not be set aside but shall remain dominant.” “The council approved an expanded and edited version of the Creed of Nicaea” (Cary, HCT, p. 38). It affirmed that the Holy Spirit is God, even as the Father and the Son are God. He “proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and together glorified” (Ware, pp. 30-31). Thus, the Council of Constantinople affirmed the Council of Nicaea and added the concept of the Holy Spirit so that it, more than the Council of Nicaea, defined the Trinity.

The Council of Constantinople condemned the Apollinarian heresy (Cairns, pp. 135-36). Apollinarius was bishop of Laodicea, a good friend of Athanasius, and a leading champion of orthodoxy (Cairns, p. 135). In an attempt to avoid an undue separation of the human and divine natures of Christ, he said that Christ had a true body and soul but that His spirit was replaced by the *logos*, the divine element. Furthermore, the *logos* dominated the passive element of the body and the soul. In other words, he stressed the deity of Christ and minimized His true manhood. To say the same thing another way, Apollinarius claimed that on earth, Jesus was not man, but God alone in human form. Others contended that Jesus Christ was a union of God and man, deity and humanity in one nature. For example, Gregory of Nazianzus said, “Remaining what He was, He became what He was not.” In other words, He retained all the divine attributes while taking up human attributes. He did not just assume a human body; He assumed a human soul as well as a human body (Cary, HCT, p. 41).

The Council of Constantinople condemned the teaching of Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople (341-360), who taught that the Holy Spirit was a servant on the level with angels and a creature subordinate to the Father and the Son, which was a denial of the deity of the Holy Spirit (Cairns, p. 135). This was also known as Pneumatomachianism.

The Council of Constantinople altered the Sixth Canon of Nicaea, making Constantinople, now the capital of the Empire, second after Rome and above Alexandria. “The bishop of Constantinople shall have the prerogatives of honor after the bishop of Rome because Constantinople is New Rome” (Canon III).

At the Council of Nicaea, Athanasius emphasized the unity of God, the Father and the Son are one in essence (*ousia*). At the Council of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzus (a.k.a. Gregory the Theologian), Basil the Great, and his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa stressed the threeness of God. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three persons (*hypostaseis*). Thus, the classic summary of the Trinitarian doctrine is three persons in one essence (Ware, p. 31).

Gregory of Nyssa described the theological arguments in Constantinople at the time: “The whole city is full of it, the squares, the marketplaces, the crossroads, the alleyways; old men, money changers, food sellers: there all busy arguing. If you ask someone to give you change, he philosophizes about the Begotten and Unbegotten; if you inquire about the

price of a loaf, you were told by way of replied that the Father is greater and the Son inferior; if you ask, ‘Is my bath ready?’ the attendant answers that the Son was made out of nothing” (Ware, pp. 43-44).

*Council of Ephesus (the Unity of Christ)* According to Apollinarius, when Jesus was on earth, He was not man, but God in human form. In contrast to that view, Nestorius so distinguished the humanity of Christ and the deity of Christ that he was in danger of teaching that two persons coexisted in the same body. Cyril of Alexander insisted on the unity of Christ rather than the diversity of His humanity and deity (Ware, p. 32). The issue is the unity of Christ’s deity and humanity. Was Christ God in the form of a man, but *not truly man* (Apollinarius), *God and man coexisting* in one body (Nestorius), or was the *divine and human united* in one body (Cyril of Alexander)?

There were other issues. For example, Nestorius refused to call Mary the “Mother of God,” insisting that she should be called “Mother of Christ” or “Mother of Man,” since she was only the mother of Christ’s humanity, not His deity (Ware, p. 32). Cairns says Nestorius did not like Mary being called *theotokos* (God-bearer), because it unduly exalted her. He wanted for her to be called *Christotokas* (Christ-bearer), arguing that she was only the mother of the human side of Christ (Cairns, p. 136). Cyril answered, “The Word was made flesh” (Jn. 1:14). He argued Mary is God’s mother, for she “bore the Word of God made flesh.” What Mary bore was not a man loosely united to God but a single undivided person who was God and man at the same time (Ware, pp. 32-33). The Nestorians did not accept the decision of the Council of Ephesus.

The feelings were so strong that the sessions themselves were not always conducted in a dignified manner. Furthermore, some supported their cause by questionable means. For example, Cyril of Alexandria bribed the court and terrorized the city of Ephesus with a private army of monks. It is said they did this because they cared about the Christian faith and that perhaps disorder was better than apathy. At any rate, orthodoxy recognizes that the councils were attended by imperfect men, but they contend these imperfect men were guided by the Holy Spirit (Ware, p. 44).

The Council of Ephesus deposed Nestorius, condemned Nestorianism, and proclaimed Mary the Mother of God. In other words, the Council of Ephesus rejected the idea that the deity and humanity of Christ existed in two distinct natures and were not united in a single personality.

Eventually, those who rejected the conclusions of the Council of Ephesus moved East, first into Persia and later into China. There are Christians in the East today who regard themselves as Nestorians (Cook, p. 20).

In the process of grappling with these concepts, the Council of Ephesus said, “When He (Christ) became united to His flesh, He made it also to be life-giving, as also He said to us: ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood.’ For we must not think that it is flesh of a man like us (for how can the flesh of man be life-giving by its own nature?) but as having become truly the very own of Him who for us both became and was called Son of Man.” The idea that Christ had “life-giving flesh” was later used to explain the Eucharist. Christians partaking of the Eucharist were consuming the life-giving flesh of Christ. Such a notion, of course, is backward. The soul gives life to flesh; the flesh does not give life to the soul (Cary’s lectures on Augustine).

*Council of Chalcedon (Natures of Christ)* In reaction to Nestorianism (two persons coexisting in the same body) and pressing further Cyril’s point (the unity of Christ),

Eutyches insisted that there was not only unity, but a single nature (the two natures of Christ, the human and the divine, were fused into one nature, the divine). This is known as Monophysitism (Gr. mono = single + physis = nature). In Monophysitism, the humanity of Christ became so fused with His divinity as to be swallowed up in it like a drop of water in the ocean (Ware, p. 33). Opponents of Monophysitism said this was a denial of the full humanity of Christ, a charge which the adherents of Monophysitism denied. In 449, another Council was held at Ephesus, which was not accepted by the church at large. At this Council, Dioscorus and Eutyches pressed Monophysitism.

In 451, the Council of Chalcedon condemned Monophysitism. It held that Christ was “complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man,” having “two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation.” These two natures were harmoniously together in one person, with one essence (Cairns, p. 136). The Council of Chalcedon described the hypostatic union as the “two natures of Christ, human and divine.

The concept of the hypostatic union of the divine and human natures in one person is “probably one of the most difficult concepts to comprehend in theology” (Ryrie, p. 250). Many modern scholars think that the difference between the Monophysites and the Chalcedonians is basically one of terminology, not theology. In other words, each side uses different terminology, but ultimately they are upholding the same truths (Ware, p. 36-37).

The Monophysite controversy disturbed the peace of the Eastern empire until the middle of the sixth century. Monophysites still exist in the Coptic churches of Egypt, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Turkey, Armenia, and Russia.

The Council of Chalcedon also established the Pentarchy, whereby five sees, that is, jurisdictions, were held in particular honor and an order of precedence was established among them. In order of rank, they were Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The bishop in each of these cities received the title of Patriarch. Between them, the five Patriarchs had jurisdiction over the known world, except for Cyprus, which was granted independence and has remained self-governing ever since. All five bishops shared equally in the apostolic succession (Ware, pp. 33-35).

While the Orthodox churches do not accept papal authority (see the Vatican Council of 1870), they believe that among the five Patriarchs, a special place belongs to the pope. They use the word “primacy,” not “supremacy.” As far as the Orthodox churches are concerned, the pope is the first bishop of the church, but he is first among equals (Ware, pp. 35-36).

The Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon were watersheds in the history of Orthodoxy. The Arians were gradually reconciled, but to this day, the Nestorians do not accept the decision of Ephesus and the Monophysites do not accept Chalcedon’s conclusions.

In the final analysis, the view of the Trinity that prevailed was basically that of Athanasius, as elaborated and refined by the Cappadocian theologians, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa (Erickson, p. 335). The orthodox formula protects the Trinity from Modalism and tri-theism (Erickson, p. 336).

## **The Pelagian Controversy**

The controversies and councils discussed so far were problems in the Eastern Church. Christology was not a problem in the West, because such leaders as Tertullian had led the

church to the orthodox view of the relationship of Christ to the Father and of Christ's two natures to each other. Furthermore, the Western church was not as concerned with metaphysical theology. The Greek mind was more philosophical and the Roman mind was more practical (Cairns, p. 137).

There was, however, a controversy in the West. It was over the nature of man and how man is saved. "Was man to be saved by divine power only, or was there a place in the process of salvation for the human will?" (Cairns, p. 137). In general, the East believed in the freedom of the will and the ability of individuals to do what God commanded. For example, the great Eastern preacher John Chrysostom insisted that people could choose to do good and that when they did, grace would come to their aid to reinforce their efforts to do what God commanded. In the West, however, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Ambrose taught original sin. For example, Ambrose taught that because of the sin of Adam, all of his descendants came into the world tainted with sin. He said, "Adam perished and in him we all perish." Ambrose believed that God's grace begins the work of salvation and when grace initiates it, people cooperate (Latourette, p. 177). Augustine went beyond Ambrose (Latourette, p. 177).

*Pelagius* In his autobiography entitled *Confessions* (398), Augustine prayed: "Give what You command: command what You will." About 400, Pelagius (ca. 360-ca. 420), a British monk and theologian, came to Rome. He objected to Augustine's view, feeling that it led to moral listlessness, that people had sufficient free will to perform their duty, and that they should exert themselves to do so (Latourette, p. 180). He believed that each person is a separate creation of God, uncontaminated by the sin of Adam. Therefore, since people do not inherit the original sin of Adam, they have the power to choose good or evil. They are "free to cooperate with God in the attainment of holiness and can make use of such aids to grace as the Bible, reason, and the example of Christ. Because there is no original sin, infant baptism is not an essential element in salvation." The universality of sin is explained by the weakness of human flesh rather than by the corruption of the human will by original sin (Cairns, p. 137).

At this point in church history, "infant baptism was a given, since it was widely understood that it washed away original sin." So for Pelagius to say that people are a separate creation of God, who are born *without original sin*, and, therefore, they *do not have to be baptized as infants to take away original sin*, was "shocking" (see the article at <http://clark.wscal.edu/pelagianism.php>, accessed 5/23/2014).

*Augustine* In reaction to Pelagius, Augustine, the bishop of Hippo, taught that since Adam was the head of the race, his sin affected the whole human race. As a result of the Fall of Adam, all inherit sin. All are totally depraved and unable to exercise their will in order to be saved. Augustine said that through the sin of the first Adam, "the entire mass of our nature was ruined and fell into the possession of its destroyer. And from him no one—no not one—has been delivered, or ever will be delivered, except by the grace of the Redeemer" (Latourette, p. 177). The sin inherited from Adam, not only makes all humans *guilty* of Adam's sin, it *corrupts* their nature (Cary, HCT, p. 45). Thus, all are totally depraved and unable to exercise their will in order to be saved. Mankind is free, but only free to sin. Humans *are not free to turn to God* (Latourette, p. 178).

Since all men share Adam's sin, all deserve judgment. Because of His mercy, however, God has predestinated some to salvation and He has predestinated others to punishment, which their sin deserves. Augustine taught "double predestination." Later, Augustine

taught that people cannot even pray to receive the gift of grace, unless grace is prevenient, which means it comes before, causing their will to come to faith (Cary, HCT, p. 45).

“Salvation can come only to the elect through the grace of God in Christ. God must energize the human will to accept His proffered grace, which is only for those whom He has elected to salvation.” Regeneration is exclusively the work of the Holy Spirit (Cairns, pp. 137-38). Infants should be baptized to wash away the guilt of Adam’s sin. Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are necessary to salvation.

Also, by His grace, God gave them the gift of perseverance so that even though they commit sin, they will repent. “Eventually those to whom perseverance has been assigned will not be able to sin” (Latourette, p. 179). In other words, Augustine believed in predestination, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints (Latourette, p. 178). Furthermore, “no one can here certainly know, so Augustine taught, whether he is among the elect” (Latourette, p. 179).

Cairns makes the interesting observation that before his conversion Augustine had found his will helpless to extricate him from the morass of sin in which he found himself because of his sinful nature (see also Latourette, p. 177). Pelagius, however, a “cool, calm individual, had known nothing of the struggle of soul through which Augustine had gone before he was saved. Hence, Pelagius was more willing to give the human will a place in the process of salvation” (Cairns, p. 137).

*Outcome* In 418, a synod in Carthage came out against Pelagianism, and in 431, the Council of Ephesus condemned it (Latourette, p. 180), but “neither the Eastern nor the Western churches ever fully accepted Augustine’s views” (Cairns, p. 138).

John Cassian (ca. 360-ca. 435), a monk from the East, proposed a compromise position by which the human will and the divine will cooperate in salvation. He taught that humans are sinful because of the Fall and that their wills are weakened but not totally corrupted. “Therefore, people can cooperate with grace in the process of salvation” (Cairns, p. 138). He declared that God wanted all, not merely some, to be saved.

“The view of Cassian was condemned at the synod of Orange in 529 in favor of a moderate Augustinian view” (Cairns, p. 138). At the same time, it also condemned the teaching that some are predestined to evil. Nor did it speak of people being totally depraved by Adam’s sin. It said that because of sin, free will is so inclined and weakened that “no one is able to love God as he ought, or believe in God, or do anything for God which is good, except the grace of divine mercy comes first to him.” It also ascribed more to baptism than did Augustine. Augustine held that baptism is essential to the remission of sins, but the synod of Orange declared that through the grace received in baptism all “can and ought, by the aid and support of Christ, to perform those things which belonged to salvation of the soul if they labor faithfully.” In other words, because of the grace received in baptism, all, not merely the elect, can by their work and the aid and support of Christ be assured of salvation. The human will was not so impaired by Adam’s fall that healed by grace and aided by Christ, it cannot achieve salvation. This is semi-Augustinianism and a view of baptism, which was to characterize Roman Catholicism in succeeding centuries.

*The Resurgence* Twentieth-century liberal thought is a resurgence of the Pelagian idea that man can achieve salvation by cooperation with the divine will. The issue is “whether Christianity is a matter of morals or religion; man’s free will or God’s grace; character development by culture or by a conversion that makes such development possible; a matter of man’s rational powers or God’s revelation. The church has always been closer to

Augustine's view than to that of Pelagius or John Cassian, although the views of the medieval church on this point were similar to those of the semi-Pelagians who followed John Cassian" (Cairns, p. 138).

*Conclusion* As has been pointed out, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers were practical. In reaction to the heresies of the latter part of the second century, some authors mentioned "doctrinal" issues. It was not until the fourth century that "theological" formations were made and formalized. Cairns says, "Most of the major controversies were ended by 451, but they left a definite impact on the Christian church. The unity of the church was preserved but at the expense of the freedom of spirit that was so characteristic of the early church. Christians were now in possession of authoritative statements regarding the sense in which the Scriptures were to be interpreted on major doctrinal issues. But there were also some disadvantages that must be considered. The emphasis on the theological led to a danger that people might be orthodox in faith but not live up to the ethical implications of that faith. Creed and conduct must always go hand in hand. It was also sad that many Christians felt that the church might properly resort to violence and persecution in its attempt to keep the faith pure. The emperor as an arbiter of the differing viewpoints at councils was able to assert the power of the state in religious matters and end the separation of church and state" (Cairns, p. 138).

## Church Fathers

Some of the most well-known and influential Christian leaders before the Reformation lived during this period, including Athanasius, Jerome, and Augustine.

### Athanasius

*His Life* Athanasius (ca. 296-373) defined the doctrine of the Trinity. The time and place of his birth are unknown. It is often said that his wealthy parents provided for his theological education in the school of Alexandria (for example, Cairns, p. 134; Latourette, p. 154; González argues, however, it is likely that he was a member of the lower classes in Egypt, vol. 1, p. 173). Because he was short and had a dark complexion, his enemies called him "the black dwarf" (González, 1, p. 173).

At the Council of Nicaea, when Athanasius was just over 30 years old, he defended what became known as the Orthodox view of the Trinity. He was a deacon of the church at Alexandria at the time. "His personality, preaching, and writings did more than anything else to achieve victory for the Nicene position. His zeal made him uncompromising—even harsh—in dealing with opponents, and slow to recognize good in those with whom he disagreed" (Eerdmans', p. 136).

In 328, he became bishop of Alexandria. When Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, was on his deathbed, it was assumed that Athanasius would be his successor, but Athanasius fled to the desert. After the death of Alexander, and against his wishes, Athanasius was made bishop of Alexandria (González, 1 p. 175). Although he was not a monk, the way he lived his life reflected their ideals of discipline and renunciation (González, 1, p. 147, 174). Athanasius was exiled from Alexandria numerous times.

After the Council of Nicaea, in an attempt to destroy Athanasius, Eusebius of Nicomedia and other Arian leaders circulated rumors that he dabbled in magic and was a

tyrant over his flock. He was accused of killing Arsenius, the bishop of a rival group, and cutting off his hand to use it in a magic ritual. Constantine ordered him to appear before a synod meeting at Tyre to answer the charges against him. After listening to the charges, Athanasius brought a man into the room covered in a cloak. After making sure that some of those present knew Arsenius, Athanasius uncovered the face of the man revealing that it was Arsenius. Waiting until the assembly insisted on proof that the Arsenius' hand had not been cut off, Athanasius uncovered one of Arsenius' hands. When someone shouted, "it was the other hand!" Athanasius uncovered the man's other hand and demanded: "What kind of a monster do you think Arsenius was? One with three hands?" The assembly broke out in laughter (González, 1, pp. 175-76).

Eusebius of Nicomedia had a great deal of influence in Constantine's court. So, Athanasius decided to go to Constantinople in order to present his case to Constantine, but he found it impossible to gain a meeting with the emperor. One day when Constantine was out for a ride, Athanasius jumped in front of the emperor's horse, grabbed its bridle and would not let go until he had been granted a meeting with the emperor. The incident convinced Constantine that Athanasius was a dangerous and impulsive fanatic. Thus, later when Eusebius of Nicomedia told him that Athanasius had boasted he could stop the shipment of wheat from Egypt to Rome, Constantine banished Athanasius to the city of Trier (González, 1, p. 176; this was 335-37; Trier was in part of Gaul that is modern-day Germany). Having been baptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia, Constantine died and was succeeded by his three sons, who decided that all exiled bishops could return to their jurisdiction.

When Athanasius returned to Alexandria, the Arians claimed that he was not the legitimate bishop. Gregory, the rival "bishop," had the support of the government. When Athanasius was not willing to give Gregory the church buildings, Gregory decided to take them by force. To avoid further violence, Athanasius decided it was best for him to leave the city. Because the authorities blamed him for the disorder, when he reached the port, he was refused passage because the governor had forbidden it. A captain smuggled him out of the port and took him to Rome (González, 1, p. 176; he was in Rome 339-46).

A synod in Rome declared that Athanasius was a legitimate bishop of Alexandria and Gregory was the usurper. When Constantine II died, Constans became the sole emperor in the West and he asked his brother Constantius, who ruled in the East, to permit Athanasius to return to Alexandria. Arriving in Constantinople, Athanasius received a hero's welcome. For approximately the next ten years, Athanasius had time to write a number of treatises against Arianism (González, 1, p. 177).

Constantius, the emperor in the East, was an Arian, who felt he needed to rid himself of Athanasius, the champion of the Nicene doctrine. As long as Constans, his brother, lived, Constantius tolerated Athanasius. In 353, when Constantius ruled the whole empire, he unleashed his pro-Arian policy, forcing many bishops to accept Arianism. He even forced a number of bishops to sign a condemnation of Athanasius. When the governor of Alexandria used military force to try to capture Athanasius, he fled to the desert, where he lived among the monks for the next five years (González, 1, p. 178). After his return, when the Roman emperor Julian wanted to remove Athanasius from Alexandria, Athanasius again sought refuge among the monks in the desert. Even after he returned from that exile, he fled one more time to live among the monks in the desert (González, 1, p. 180).

In the midst of all of this, in 362, a synod in Alexandria affirmed Athanasius' view that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were "one substance." He did not live to see the final victory of orthodoxy. In 381, the orthodox view of the Trinity was ratified by the Second Ecumenical Council gathered at Constantinople (González, 1, p. 179).

*His Works* Most of Athanasius' writings opposed Arianism. In *On the Incarnation*, he said Christ "was made man that we might be made divine." He insisted that if Christ was less than God, He could not be the Savior. His *Life of Antony* did much to promote monasticism. In *Letter to Marcellinus*, he introduced the devotional use of Psalms, which Christians have adopted ever since (Eerdmans', p. 136).

*Significance* Athanasius' preaching and writings did more than anything else to achieve victory for the Nicene position. His Easter Letter (367) is the earliest witness to the 27-book New Testament canon (Eerdmans', p. 136). He is credited with the introduction of monasticism to the West during one of his exiles from Alexandria (Cairns, p. 154).

## Eusebius

*His Life* Eusebius (ca. 265-ca. 339; Cairns, p. 143) is the "Father of Church History." He is known as "Eusebius of Caesarea" not because he was born there, but because he spent most of his life there and served there as bishop. He had a gentle and agreeable disposition (Cairns, p. 143).

Eusebius was a student of Pamphilus, who had studied in Alexandria under Pierius, a famous teacher who was carrying on Origen's work in that city. Pamphilus came to Caesarea, where he worked in Origen's library (González, 1, p. 129). "He was a keen follower of Origen" (Smith, p. 17).

In 313-14, Eusebius was made bishop of Caesarea. Later he became a close friend of the Constantine. Constantine personally told Eusebius about his vision concerning conquering in the name of the cross (Latourette, pp. 91-92). "His (Eusebius') political ideas helped to create the Christian Empire of Byzantium" (Smith, p. 17).

In 325, at the council of Nicaea, Eusebius was given a place of honor at the right hand of Constantine. He disliked the quarrel engendered by the Arian controversy and preferred a compromise between Athanasius and Arius (Cairns, p. 143). In 335, he supported the banishment of Athanasius at the Council of Tyre (Smith, p. 17).

*His Works* Eusebius was a voluminous writer. He had access to the excellent library at Caesarea and the imperial archives (Cairns, p. 143), as well as traveling far and wide to collections of documents regarding Christian origins (González, I, p. 130).

Eusebius wrote *Ecclesiastical History*, which covered the period from the time of Christ to the Council of Nicaea. It was initially completed in either 303 or 311, but he later added to it in order to bring the story up to 324 and the final triumph of Constantine. He dealt with the succession of bishops from apostolic times, the heresies, the sufferings of the Jews, and the persecution and martyrdom of Christians. He recorded traditions about the New Testament writers. He preserved extracts from otherwise lost works. "Much of his history is told by means of long quotations from previous writers. As a writer, Eusebius was neither utterly credulous nor very critical. He does not stuff his work with improbable miracles, but accepts most of his sources at face value" (Smith, p. 17). Eusebius also wrote the *Chronicle*, a history from the time of Abraham until 323, and the *Life of Constantine*.

*His Significance* Eusebius was not the first church historian (Hegesippus and Julius Africanus were before him, but only fragments of their works survive), but he was the first



to attempt a history of the church on a grand, comprehensive scale. He set the pattern for future church historians, and was used extensively by later writers, such as Jerome and Bede (Smith, p. 17). In places, his writing is little more than a collection of facts and has a rambling style. Yet, "Eusebius is our best source of knowledge concerning the history of the church during the first three centuries of its existence, but scholars regret that he did not make careful footnotes of his sources of knowledge after the manner of a modern historian" (Cairns, p. 143). "It was Eusebius who collected, organized, and published practically all that is now known of many persons and episodes in the life of the early church. Without him, knowledge of the early history of Christianity would be reduced by half" (González, 1, p. 130).

González, makes the observation that "the scheme of history that Eusebius developed led him to set aside a fundamental theme of early Christian preaching: the coming Kingdom of God. Although Eusebius does not go as far as to say so explicitly, in reading his works one receives the impression that now, with Constantine and his successors, the plan of God has been fulfilled. Beyond the present political order, all that Christians are to hope for is their own personal transference into the heavenly kingdom. Since the time of Constantine, and due in part to the work of Eusebius and of many others of similar theological orientation, there was a tendency to set aside or to postpone the hope of the early church, that its Lord would return in the clouds to establish a kingdom of peace and justice. At later times, many groups that rekindled that hope were branded as heretics and subversives, and condemned as such" (González, 1, p. 134).

## **Ambrose**

*His Life* Ambrose (340-97; Cairns, p. 145) came from a family high in imperial circles. His father held a high government position. He received a classical education in law for a political career and became a provincial governor in northern Italy, residing at Milan (Cairns, p. 145). Later he became bishop of Milan. He read widely, especially the Greek theologians (Eerdmans', p. 140). He was a man of strong character and an impressive preacher (Latourette, p. 96). He became famous as a politician, preacher, hymn writer, and church administrator. He died on Easter Sunday, April 4, 397 (González, 1, p. 193).

González tells the story of how Ambrose became the bishop of Milan. In 373, when the Arian bishop of Milan died, the peace of the city was threatened. The election of a successor could easily have turned into a riot because both Arians and Orthodox Christians were determined that one of their number would be the next bishop. In order to avoid a riot, Ambrose, the governor the city, attended the election. Tempers had already begun to flare when Ambrose spoke. A child in the crowd cried, "Ambrose, bishop." The cry caught the fancy of the crowd, which began to cry, "Ambrose, bishop; Ambrose; Ambrose!" He tried to dissuade the crowd; he even tried unsuccessfully to escape the city. When it became clear that the Emperor liked the idea and would be displeased if Ambrose refused, he agreed to be made bishop of Milan. Although he was preparing to become a member of the church, he had not been baptized. Moreover, he had to go through the various levels of ministerial orders. All of this was accomplished in eight days. He was consecrated bishop of Milan on December 1, 373 (González, 1, pp. 189-90). He gave up his political position, distributed his money to the poor, and began an intense study of the Scriptures and theology (Cairns,

p. 145). He became one of the best theologians in the Western church (González, 1, p. 190).

Ambrose was an able preacher, but his preaching was marred by his allegorical method of interpretation. His preaching was instrumental in bringing Augustine to the knowledge of Christianity that later resulted in his salvation (Cairns, pp. 145-46). His writings mainly concerned Christian practice (Eerdmans', p. 140).

In 384, he was the leading spokesman against the petition to have the altar of the goddess Victory restored to the Senate House in Rome. His influence prevented the restoration (Eerdmans', p. 140).

In 385, when Justina, the mother of Emperor Valentinian II, tried to take over one of the churches of Milan for Arian worship, Ambrose organized a sit-in that made her give up the idea (Eerdmans', p. 140).

When some overzealous Christians in the small town of Callinicum burned a synagogue, Emperor Theodosius decided that they should be punished and rebuild the synagogue. Ambrose protested, insisting that a Christian emperor should not force Christians to build a Jewish synagogue. After several stormy interviews, Ambrose prevailed. The arsonists were not punished and the synagogue was not built. "This was a sad precedent, for it meant that in an empire calling itself Christian, those whose fate was different would not be protected by the law" (González, 1, p. 192).

In 390, the commander of Thessalonica was killed by rioters (Cairns, p. 145). Knowing the temperament of Theodosius, Ambrose went to him and counseled moderation. Theodosius seemed to be convinced. Then he decided to make an example of the city. When he sent out the word that the rioters had been forgiven, they all gathered at the circus to celebrate the imperial pardon. Theodosius then ordered that they be slaughtered. Some seven thousand were killed. As González tells the story, the next time Theodosius went to church, the bishop met him at the door, raised his hand and said, "Stop! A man such is you, stained with sin, whose hands are bathed in the blood of injustice, is unworthy, until he repents, to enter the holy place and to partake of communion." Theodosius repented (González, 1, p. 193).

*His Teachings* Ambrose taught that because Adam sinned, all of his descendants came into the world tainted with sin. All are born with sin. He said, "Adam perished and in him we all perish." He believed that God's grace begins the work of salvation and that when grace has initiated it, a man cooperates through his will (Latourette, p. 177).

He said that slaves might be superior in character to their masters and even be freer than their masters (Latourette, p. 246). He also taught that there was such a thing as a just war (Latourette, p. 244). He claimed to have received visions telling him where the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius were buried (González, 1, p. 125).

*Significance* Ambrose completed the overthrow of Arianism in the West (Eerdmans', p. 140). Ambrose did much to encourage early monasticism in the West (Eerdmans', p. 140).

Ambrose was the first church leader to use his office successfully to coerce civil rulers (Eerdmans', p. 140). He refused to offer communion to Theodosius until he did penance for the killing of Christians in Greece. Later he did the same thing until Theodosius stopped using public funds for the rebuilding of the synagogue some Christians had burned down (Cook, p. 17).

Ambrose was the first to introduce community hymn-singing in the church, which he did during the sit-in against Justina, and at least four Latin hymns are correctly credited to him (Eerdmans', p. 140). He "composed hymns which he taught his flock to sing" (Latourette, p. 208).

Ambrose had a great influence on Augustine. On April 25, 387, Ambrose baptized Augustine (Latourette, p. 97).

## **John Chrysostom**

*His Life* John Chrysostom (347-407, Cairns, p. 141) was born into a wealthy aristocratic family at Antioch. Although she was widowed at age 20, his mother, Anthusa, refused to remarry in order that she might devote all of her time to her son's education (Cairns, p. 141). The pagan orator Libanius, who was John's teacher, said of his mother, "God, what women these Christians have!"

Cairns describes him: "He did not always possess tact; but he did have a courteous, affectionate, kindly nature. Though he was a giant in moral and spiritual stature, he was short and thin. His emaciated but pleasant face, wrinkled forehead, bald head and piercing bright eyes made a lasting impression on his hearers" (Cairns, p. 142).

*His Ministry* For a while, Chrysostom practiced law, but in 368, he was baptized. When he told his mother he intended to be a monk, she made him promise that he would never leave her as long as she lived. His solution to the tension between his desire to be a monk and the possessiveness of his mother was to turn their house into a monastery. He lived there with three like-minded friends until she died (374). Then he joined the monks in the mountains, where he spent four years learning the disciplines of monastic life and two more practicing it in complete solitude (González, 1, p. 195).

After six years as a monk, he returned to Antioch (380), where he was ordained a deacon and shortly thereafter a presbyter. His fame as a preacher was soon widespread throughout the Greek-speaking church. When the bishopric of Constantinople became vacant in 397, the emperor ordered John to be taken to the capital city to occupy that prestigious position, but his popularity in Antioch was such that the authorities feared a riot and kept the imperial decree secret. They invited him to a small chapel on the outskirts of Antioch and when he arrived, they ordered him into a carriage; they forcefully took him to the capital. He was ordained Patriarch of Constantinople early in 398 (González, 1, p. 196).

Constantinople was a rich town given to luxury. "The former monk was still a monk" who could not "tolerate the manner in which the rich inhabitants of Constantinople sought to wed the gospel with their own luxuries and comforts." He began with the clergy. Some priests, who claimed to be celibate, had "spiritual sisters." Other members of the clergy had become rich and lived in luxury. Chrysostom ordered that the "spiritual sisters" be moved out of the priests' houses, that the priests live an austere life, and that the church finances be put under a system of detailed scrutiny. The expensive items that adorned the bishop's palace were sold in order to feed the hungry. In his preaching, he also took on the pomp and the folly of the powerful (González, 1, p. 196).

"His efforts to raise the moral climate of the capital met strong opposition. His enemies joined forces: the Empress Eudoxia, stung by his attacks on sin in high places; local clergy who found John too strict, and Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, jealous of a churchman from Antioch at the capital. They had John deposed at the 'synod of the Oak' in 403. The

Emperor accepted the decision and exiled him. The people of Constantinople rioted in support of their bishop; the Emperor was frightened by the response and recalled John the next day. John's brave, tactless preaching angered Eudoxia again, and his enemies tried to banish him once more. The Emperor ordered him to cease his official church duties, which he refused to do. While gathering catechumens [converts receiving training in doctrine and discipline] for baptism, he was driven out of the church by soldiers, and blood stained the baptismal waters. This exile (404) ended in his death in 407. His remains were brought back to Constantinople in 438 and buried in the Church of the Apostles" (Eerdmans', p. 191).

Cairns says Chrysostom was banished by Eudoxia because he had denounced her extravagant dress and because she had placed a silver statue of herself near St. Sophia, where he preached (Cairns, p. 141).

*Significance* John Chrysostom was known as "golden-mouthed" because he was a matchless orator. He was the greatest preacher of his day and an expository preacher. He preached in the Church of St. Sophia to great multitudes. "His sermons must have often lasted for an hour or more" (Ware, p. 32). "His insights into the meaning of the Greek Bible and skill in applying it practically to his hearers are the enduring contribution of his hundreds of surviving sermons" (Eerdmans', p. 191). About 640 of his homilies still exist. Most of his homilies and sermons are expositions of Paul's epistles. In his expositions, he kept the context in mind, sought to discover the meaning of the author, and made a practical application of that meaning to the problems of the people of his day. "Even reading of the cold print gives one some idea of his oratorical ability" (Cairns, p. 142).

Ware says, "A man of strict and austere life, he was inspired by deep compassion for the poor and a burning zeal for social righteousness. Of all the Fathers, he is perhaps the best-loved in the Orthodox Church and one whose works are most widely read" (Ware, p. 32). "He was and still is hailed as the greatest pulpit orator the Eastern Church ever had" (Cairns, p. 142).

Quotes from John Chrysostom: "The potency of prayer has subdued the strength of fire; it has bridled the rage of lions, hushed anarchy to rest, extinguished wars, appeased the elements, expelled demons, burst the chains of death, expanded the gates of heaven, assuaged diseases, repelled frauds, rescued cities from destruction, stayed the sun in its course, and arrested the progress of the thunderbolt. If there were no tribulation, there would be no rest; if there were no Winter's translation, there would be no summer. The rich man is not one who is in possession of much but one who gives much. Poor human reason, when it trusts in itself, substitutes the strangest absurdities for the highest divine concepts. Slander is worse than cannibalism."

"For John Chrysostom, a pulpit was not simply a podium from which to deliver brilliant pieces of oratory. It was rather the verbal expression of his entire life, his battlefield against the powers of evil, his unavoidable calling that eventually led to exile and to death itself" (González, 1, p. 194).

One other thing about Chrysostom should be noted. He is one of the outstanding examples of the Syrian School of Antioch. This was a school of thought pertaining to the interpretation of the Bible. Forerunners include Lucian (d. ca. 312) and Dorotheus (d. ca. 300). Diodore of Tarsus (379-394), Bishop of Antioch, is said to have written commentaries on the epistles and a treatise on the principles of interpretation (Gilbert, cited by Ferguson, pp. 10-11). He also started a class to train young men in the principles of

sacred exegesis (Macgilvray, cited by Ferguson, p. 10). Diodore's theology is difficult to reconstruct because what is known is based on inferences made from statements by his students. His contemporaries viewed him as a supporter of the Council of Nicaea. Later generations accused him of being a Nestorian and a Universalist.

In contrast to the allegorical school of Alexandria, which denied the historicity of Old Testament events, Chrysostom believed that the genuine historical character of the Old Testament must be recognized or its spiritual significance would be marred. The superstructure of doctrine must be built on the rock of historical interpretation (Chase, cited by Ferguson, p. 23). Chrysostom saw the importance of historical background in determining the meaning of Scripture (Ferguson, pp. 24-25). He was also mindful that the Scripture must be interpreted in context (Ferguson, pp. 25-26). In his expositions, Chrysostom also took notice of grammatical details (Chase, cited by Ferguson, p. 28).

Eventually, the Syrian School ceased to exist in Antioch, but its principles of interpretation had an immediate influence as well as a long-range impact. For example, in his early days, Jerome was a convinced allegorist. His commentary on Obadiah was thoroughly allegorical. He was influenced by the Syrian School to more literal exegesis (Buttrick, cited by Ferguson, p. 37), although he was not consistent. While a link between the Syrian School and the Reformers cannot be demonstrated, there is no doubt that the Reformers held to the same principles of interpretation (Ferguson, p. 43).

González suggests that a comparison between Ambrose and Chrysostom is an indication of what would happen to the churches in the East as compared to the West. "Ambrose faced the most powerful emperor of his time and won. Chrysostom, on the other hand, was deposed and banished. From then on, the Latin-speaking church of the West would become increasingly powerful as it filled the vacancy left by the crumbling empire. In the Greek-speaking East, on the other hand, the emperor would last another thousand years." González adds that Theodosius would not be the last emperor in the West to be humbled by a Latin-speaking bishop, and John Chrysostom would not be the last Greek-speaking bishop banished by an eastern emperor (González, 1, p. 200).

## **Jerome**

*His Life* Jerome (347-420, Cairns, p. 144) was a translator and commentator. He has been called the "most learned of the Latin Fathers." Jerome was born in a small town in northeast Italy and studied classical disciplines (Demarest, p. 188). In 360, he was baptized in Rome and, for the next several years, wandered about as a student in various cities of Gaul (Cairns, p. 144). While he journeyed through Gaul, he became convinced he should live an ascetic life (Demarest, p. 188).

He also visited Antioch. In 374, he had a dream criticizing his preoccupation with secular learning. In his dream, at the final judgment, he was asked: "Who are you?" He answered, "I am a Christian." The judge responded: "You lie. You are a Ciceronian" (González, 1, p. 201). As a result, he withdrew to the desert near Antioch to live an ascetic life. He mastered Hebrew and transcribed biblical manuscripts (Demarest, p. 188), "but he never ceased reading and imitating the style of the classic pagan authors" (González, vol. 1, p. 202).

González says. "Although he is known as 'Saint Jerome,' he was not one of those saints who is granted in this life the joy of God's peace. His holiness was not humble, peaceful, and sweet, but rather proud, stormy, and even bitter." González adds, "Those who suffered

his sharp attacks were not only the heretics of his time, as well as the ignorant and hypocritical, but also John Chrysostom, Ambrose of Milan, Basil of Caesarea, and Augustine of Hippo. Those who disagreed with him were “two-legged asses” (González, 1, p. 201).

The way González tells the story, “He (Jerome) was also obsessed by sex. Upon retiring to the monastic life, he hoped to be rid of that burden. But even there, he was followed by his dreams and by memories of dancers in Rome. He sought to suppress such thoughts by punishing his body and by an exaggeratedly austere life. He was unkempt and even came to affirm that, having been washed by Christ, there was no need ever to wash again. And yet, that did not suffice. To fulfill his mind with something that would take the place of the pleasures of Rome, he decided to study Hebrew” (González, 1, p. 202).

In 380, after being ordained at Antioch, Jerome studied with the Eastern theologian Gregory of Nazianzus in Constantinople.

In 382, he became secretary to Damasus, bishop of Rome. It was Damasus who suggested that Jerome make a new translation of the Bible (Cairns, p. 144). Although Jerome never had any close friends and was obsessed with sex, he became friends with a group of wealthy and devout women who lived in the palace of a widow. One of them was a scholarly lady named Paula, who, with her daughter, would play a role in the rest of Jerome’s life. These and other women became his devoted disciples, some of whom became accomplished students of Hebrew and Greek (González, 1, p. 202).

Jerome, a man not known for his tact, made enemies among the leaders of the church in Rome. In 384, when Damasus, the bishop of Rome, died, Jerome lost his staunchest defender. The new bishop, Siricius, had little use for Jerome’s scholarship. When one of Paula’s daughters died, Jerome’s enemies, whom he had criticized for their comfortable life, claimed that her death was due to Jerome’s demanding discipline. Jerome decided to leave Rome for the Holy Land, or, as he said, “from Babylon to Jerusalem.” Paula and her daughter Eustochium also went to Jerusalem, but by a different route (González, 1, pp. 203-204).

In 386, after visiting Egypt, Jerome arrived in Palestine, where he and Paula decided to devote themselves to the monastic way of life and give themselves to study. With her wealth, Paula and Jerome founded two monastic houses in Bethlehem, one for women under Paula’s supervision and another for men under Jerome’s oversight. Jerome pursued his study of Hebrew to translate the Bible. He also taught Latin to the children of the neighborhood and Hebrew and Greek to the women in Paula’s house (González, 1, p. 204).

When Paula died in 404, Jerome felt alone and desolate. Jerome died in 420.

*His Works* Jerome translated the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament into Latin, a work commonly called the *Vulgate* translation (after the Latin word *vulgata*, which means “commonly used”). Damasus wanted a Latin version to replace the confusion of corrupted “Old Latin” then in circulation. At first, Jerome translated the Greek version of the Old Testament (the *Septuagint*) and the Greek New Testament to prepare fresh Latin translations of the Psalms, other Old Testament books, and the Gospels. Later, he translated the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. In all, it took him 23 years (382-405) to complete his revision of the Latin Scriptures (Demarest, p. 188).

Jerome’s work was not well-received at first. Some demanded to know who had given him authority to tamper with Scripture. Many believed that the Septuagint was inspired. So when Jerome published a version that disagreed with the Septuagint, they felt that he

did not respect the inspired Word of God. For example, Augustine wrote, “I pray you not to devote your energies to translating the sacred books to Latin unless you do as you did earlier in your translation of the book of Job, that is, adding notes that show clearly where your version differs from the Septuagint, whose authority has no equal.... Besides, I cannot imagine how, after so long, someone could find in the Hebrew manuscripts anything which so many translators did not see before, especially since they knew Hebrew so well.” In his reply to Augustine, Jerome implied that Augustine was simply a young man seeking to make a name for himself in criticizing his elders. Jerome praised Augustine’s learning, but he subtly indicated that he was doing Augustine a favor by not pursuing the controversy, “for a debate between the two of them would be an unequal contest” (González, 1, pp. 204-05).

Jerome wrote commentaries on most of the Bible. Because of his use of Hebrew and Greek, his familiarity with Palestine, and his knowledge of early church writings, his comments on Scripture are of considerable significance. “Although he avoided the unrestrained use of allegory of many contemporaries, he commended a threefold interpretation (finding historical, symbolic, and spiritual senses), which resulted in numerous arbitrary and mystical explanations. Jerome’s commentaries on Scripture were prepared in great haste. His exposition of Galatians was written at the rate of a thousand lines per day, and his Matthew commentary was completed within a fortnight. His exposition of Scripture leans heavily on Jewish tradition and also involves extensive quotations of numerous authorities of the early church. Quite often, Jerome’s comments are indistinguishable from those of other interpreters. Nevertheless, Jerome ranks with Origen and Augustine as early biblical interpreters of the first order (Demarest, pp. 188-89).

Jerome wrote *De Viris Illustribus (On Illustrious Men)*, after the model of ancient biographers. It contained biographical sketches of Christian writers and their work from the time of the apostles to his day. He championed the aesthetic life with his pen (Cairns, p. 145). He translated into Latin several works by Greek theologians, and “engaged in one controversy after another with merciless passion” (Demarest, p. 189).

*Significance* The *Vulgate Bible* was eventually accepted as the authorized Latin version of the Western church. Although the text of the *Vulgate* became corrupted during the Middle Ages, in 1546, its supremacy was reaffirmed by the Council of Trent (Demarest, p. 188). Until recently, it was the only official Bible the Roman Catholic Church since the Council of Trent (Cairns, p. 144).

Farrar said of Jerome: “The great hermit of Bethlehem had less genius than Augustine, less purity and loftiness of character than Ambrose, less sovereign good sense and steadfastness than Chrysostom, less keenness of insight and consistency of courage than Theodore of Mopsuestia; but in learning and versatile talent he was superior to them all” (Farrar, cited by Demarest, p. 189).

## **Augustine**

*His Life* Augustine (354-430) was Bishop of Hippo, North Africa. He was a polemicist, philosopher, theologian, preacher, and bishop. Harnack said that Augustine was “the greatest man whom, between the Apostle Paul and Luther the Reformer, the Christian church has possessed” (Harnack, cited by Warfield, p. 306). Latourette wrote, “No other single Christian thinker after Paul was to influence so profoundly the Christianity of the

Western European peoples,” but he did not have much influence in Eastern Christianity (Latourette, p. 174). *Time* magazine called him “the second founder of the faith” (*Time*, September 29, 1986, p. 76).

Augustine was born in Tagaste in North Africa (modern Algeria) in 354. His father was a pagan who was later converted, and his mother, Monica, was a fervent Christian who was sometimes an overwhelming mother in the life of her only son (González, 1, p. 208). He was educated in the local schools, where he learned Latin, but hated Greek so much that he never learned to use it proficiently (Cairns, p. 146).

When he was 17, Augustine went to Carthage to further his education. Although he did not neglect his studies, he enjoyed the many pleasures of the city. He took a concubine, who bore him a child in 372. He studied rhetoric, the purpose of which was to speak and write eloquently and convincingly. Truth was not an issue; that was left to the philosophers (González, 1, p. 208).

As part of his studies, Augustine had to read Cicero, a philosopher. In reading Cicero, Augustine concluded that proper speech and style were not sufficient; one must seek truth. “Cicero converted him to love the divine wisdom; but he was repelled by the Bible’s apparent barbarity” (Eerdmans’, p. 198).

In 373, in his search for truth, Augustine became a student of Manichaeism (González, 1, p. 208; Cairns, p. 146). According to Manichaeism, there are two principals in each person. One is “light,” which is spiritual and the other is “darkness,” which is the body. Salvation consists of separating the two elements and preparing one spirit to return to the realm of light. Proponents of Manichaeism practiced asceticism, celibacy, poverty, vegetarianism (Vance, p. 48), and intense devotion to Christ (Eerdmans’, p. 198). It taught that since any new mingling of the two principles is evil, believers must avoid procreation. Manichaeism claimed to be eminently rational. It ridiculed the teachings of Christianity, particularly the Bible (González, 1, pp. 208-210). Augustine spent nine years as a “hearer” without actually joining the ranks of the “perfect.” He always had doubts and eventually decided to carry on his quest for truth in different directions (González, 1, p. 210). He distrusted their claims to demonstrate the truth by rational means (Eerdmans’, p. 198).

Disillusioned, Augustine went to Rome. In 384, he went to Milan, where he became a Neo-Platonist, which was a philosophy with religious overtones. Through a combination of study, discipline, and mystical contemplation, Neo-Platonism sought to reach the source of all being. The goal was the ecstasy that one experiences when lost in such contemplation (González, 1, p. 210).

Neo-Platonism helped solve one of the philosophical problems Augustine had with Christianity, namely the origin of evil. His mother taught him there was one good God, but he saw evil around him and in himself. If God is supreme and good, he could not create evil. On the other hand, if all things were created by God, He could not be good. Unlike Manichaeism, Neo-Platonism taught there is only one principle, and all reality comes from it through a series of emanations, like the concentric circles that appear on the surface of the water when hit by a pebble. The realities that are closer to the One are superior, and those that are more removed from it are inferior. In other words, evil does not originate from a different source (dualism), but consists simply in moving away from the One. This perspective helped Augustine move toward Christianity because a single good being was the source of all things, and yet there was evil in the world (González, 1, pp. 210-11).



Monica insisted that Augustine listen to Ambrose. Ambrose helped Augustine resolve the second problem he had with Christianity, that is, the barbaric nature of the Old Testament. From Ambrose, Augustine discovered that Christianity could be eloquent and intelligent and he also learned that the difficult stories of the Old Testament could be treated as allegories (Eerdmans', p. 198).

Augustine's intellectual difficulties with Christianity had been solved, but he still had other problems. He did not want to be a lukewarm Christian. If he became a Christian, he would devote his entire life to it. He was also convinced that would make him give up his career in rhetoric, his ambitions, and every physical pleasure. This last requirement seemed most difficult. He prayed, "Give me chastity and continence; but not too soon" (González, 1, p. 211).

In 385, Augustine was converted. In his *Confessions*, he describes his conversion: "I probed the hidden depths of my soul and wrung its pitiful secrets from it, and when I gathered them all before the eyes of my heart, a great storm broke within me, bringing with it a great deluge of tears ... For I felt that I was still enslaved by my sins, and in my misery, I kept crying, 'How long shall I go on saying "Tomorrow, tomorrow?"' "Why not now? Why not make an end of my ugly sins at this moment?"

"I was asking myself these questions, weeping all the while with the most bitter sorrow in my heart, when all at once I heard the sing-song voice of a child in a nearby house. Whether it was the voice of a boy or girl, I cannot say, but again and again, it repeated the chorus, 'Take it and read, take it and read.' At this, I looked up, thinking hard whether there was any kind of game in which children used to chant words like these, but I could not remember ever hearing them before. I stemmed my flood of tears and stood up, telling myself that this could only be God's command to open my book of Scripture and read the first passage on which my eyes should fall. For I had heard the story of Antony, and I remembered how he had happened to go into a church while the Gospel was being read and had taken it as an instruction addressed to himself when he heard the words, 'Go home and sell all that belongs to you. Give it to the poor, and so the treasure you have shall be in heaven; then come back and follow me.' By this message from God, he had at once been converted.

"So I hurried back to the place where Alypius was sitting, for when I stood up to move away, I had put down the book containing Paul's Letters. I seized it and opened it, and in silence I read the first passage on which my eyes fell: 'No orgies or drunkenness, no immorality or indecency, no fighting or jealousy. Take up the weapons of the Lord Jesus Christ; and stop giving attention to your sinful nature, to satisfy its desires.' I had no wish to read more and no need to do so. For in an instant, as I came to the end of the sentence, it was as though the light of faith flooded into my heart and the darkness of doubt was dispelled" (Augustine, *Confessions* 12).

Monica persuaded Augustine to dismiss his concubine of many years. His baptism was delayed until 387 "by a lengthy religious and philosophical pilgrimage, described in his *Confessions*" (Eerdmans', 198). His baptism was by immersion (Vance, p. 49).

Soon after that, Augustine and his mother set out to return to Africa. On the way, Monica died. On returning to Africa in 388, he formed a monastic community for study and contemplation at Tagaste, his hometown, and began to write (Eerdmans', 198).

In 391, on a visit to Hippo, he was ordained as a presbyter against his will (González, 1, p. 212). In 396, he became Bishop of Hippo, a position he retained until his death on August 28, 430 (Latourette, p. 174).

“Hippo’s half-pagan Catholics and stubborn Donatists rapidly turned him from the confident humanism of a Christian Neo-Platonist to a more biblical and pessimistic view of human nature, society, and history. The *Confessions* were an early fruit of this new outlook; *The City of God* a more mature one” (Eerdmans’, p. 198).

*His Writings* Many of Augustine’s first writings, which were refutations of Manichaeism, dealt with the authority of Scripture, the origin of evil, and free will. Manichaeism taught that everything was predetermined and that people had no freedom. Augustine championed the freedom of the will. According to him, circumstances may influence decisions, but the will is free to make the decision. The freedom of the will explains the existence of evil. The will was created by God and is good, but since the will is free, that is, capable of making its own decisions, it can make bad decisions, which is what both angels and people did (González, 1, p. 213).

Augustine also wrote to refute Donatism. Donatism declared that ordination conferred by unworthy bishops was not valid. Augustine insisted that the validity of any rite did not depend on the moral virtue of the person administering it. The Western church has agreed with Augustine through the centuries (González, 1, p. 213).

In dealing with Donatism, Augustine developed his theory of a just war. For a war to be just: 1) The purpose must be just; war is never just when its purpose is to satisfy territorial ambition or the mere exercise of power. 2) A just war must be waged by a properly instituted authority. 3) Even in the midst of violence, the motive of love must be central (González, 1, p. 214).

Augustine wrote his most important theological works against Pelagius. While visiting Rome in 405, Pelagius heard a passage from Augustine’s *Confessions*: “Give what you command and command what you will.” Pelagius was incensed, feeling that this made people mere puppets in the hand of God (Vance, p. 51). Pelagius agreed with Augustine that God gave people free will and that the source of evil is in the will, but he concluded that this meant people always have the ability to overcome their sins. Augustine argued that the power of sin takes hold of the will so that people cannot simply exercise their will to get rid of it. The most they can accomplish is to struggle between willing and not willing, which does little more than show the powerlessness of our will against itself. “The sinner can will nothing but sin” (González, 1, p. 214).

González describes Augustine’s view: “Before the Fall, we were free both to sin and not to sin. But between the Fall and redemption, the only freedom left to us is the freedom to sin. When we are redeemed, the grace of God works in us, leading our will from the miserable state in which it found itself to a new state in which freedom is restored so that we are now free both to sin and not to sin. Finally, in the heavenly home, we shall still be free, but only free not to sin. Again, this does not mean that all freedom is destroyed. On the contrary, in heaven, we shall continue to have free choices. But none of them will be sin” (González, 1, pp. 214-15).

Augustine applied this to the decision at conversion. People are not free to decide to accept grace. In conversion, God takes the initiative. Furthermore, when God initiates grace, it is irresistible grace. God gives it to those who have been predestined. The Western Church rejected Pelagianism, but Augustine’s views were not widely

accepted. Augustine “was accused of being an innovator. In southern France, where opposition to Augustine was strongest, Vincent of Lerins argued that one should believe only what has been held ‘always, everywhere, and by all.’ Many contested Augustine’s view that the beginning of faith was in God’s action rather than in a human decision. These opponents of Augustine’s doctrine of predestination have been called, somewhat inexactly, ‘Semi-Pelagians.’ Through a process that took almost a century, Augustine was reinterpreted so that theologians came to call themselves ‘Augustinian’ while rejecting his views on irresistible grace and predestination. In 529, the Synod of Orange upheld Augustine’s doctrine of the primacy of grace in the process of salvation but left aside the more radical consequences of that doctrine” (González, 1, p. 215).

Thus it was Pelagianism that provoked Augustine “to develop further his doctrines of the fall and original sin, as both corruption and guilt, the necessity of grace to free will in turning to God; and the predestination and perseverance of the ‘fixed number of the elect’” (Eerdmans’, p.198).

It should also be noted that while the debate between Augustine and Pelagius centered on the questions of free will and original sin, Augustine’s initial opposition to Pelagius was over infant baptism. Pelagius said that Adam’s sin had no effect on his posterity. It is only a relationship to the human race that is a bad example. Therefore, children are born innocent. Although he did not deny the need for infant baptism, he denied that it washed away original sin. Augustine believed children were born with original sin and that baptism was necessary for the remission of sins (Vance, pp. 51-52).

Augustine’s two most famous works are *Confessions* and *The City of God*. *Confessions*, which he wrote soon after he became bishop, is his spiritual autobiography as well as a meditation on human nature, as seen in him (Latourette, p. 175). The genre is unique in ancient literature (González, 1, p. 215).

His other most significant work is *The City of God*. In 410, when the city of Rome was sacked by the Goths, the pagans charged that the city fell because Christians had abandoned the gods that made Rome great. *The City of God* was Augustine’s answer to that charge. It is a comprehensive philosophy of history that contrasts the Greek view that sees history as a series of cycles endlessly repeating themselves and the biblical view that maintains that history has a beginning and a culmination (Latourette, pp. 175-76). From the fall of Adam, two cities existed, one earthly and the other heavenly. The earthly city was formed by the love of self and pride. The heavenly city was dominated by the love of God even to the point of contempt of self. People enter it here and now and it is represented by the church. As the heavenly city grows, the earthly city will fade away (Latourette, p. 176).

*His Beliefs* Augustine believed the Apocrypha was Scripture and the Septuagint was inspired. He even requested that Jerome translate the Old Testament from the Septuagint instead of Hebrew. He believed in the allegorical method of interpretation, equating the church with the kingdom of God (Vance, p. 53).

Augustine believed in the Trinity. His explanation of the Trinity is summarized in seven statements: 1) the Father is God, 2) the Son is God, 3) the Holy Spirit is God, 4) the Father is not the Son, 5) the Son is not the Holy Spirit, 6) the Holy Spirit is not the Father, 7) There is only one God (Cary, HCT, pp. 36-37).

Augustine believed in double predestination, the predestination of the elect and of the reprobate (Vance, p. 56). He believed in baptismal regeneration. Infants who are not

baptized go to hell, but they go to the outskirts of hell, where they receive a lighter punishment (Vance, p. 55). He was the one who gave the doctrine of purgatory its first definite form (Boettner, *Immortality*, p. 135, cited by Vance, p. 56).

At first, Augustine believed in free will, but later, he changed his view and made faith the irresistible gift of God given to the elect (Vance, p. 57; see Warfield p. 39, where he says, “Not even at his death had perfect consistency been attained in his teaching”). The grace of regeneration could be lost; only those who are regenerated and persevere, or in whom, after loss, the grace of regeneration is restored, are finally saved. People cannot know for sure if they are predestined or saved (Vance, p. 57).

Augustine believed that justification meant making a person righteous. Anderson points out that Augustine’s scant knowledge of Greek cause him to mistranslate “justification” as “to make righteous” instead of “to declare righteous” (Anderson, p. 31). Anderson goes on to say, “Augustine saw justification (the making of righteous character) as a life-long effort, where as (sic) Luther understood that one could be ‘declared righteous’ in God’s court in a moment of time” (Anderson, p. 32).

Anderson adds, “He (Augustine) was convinced that the character of Christ needed to be infused into the character of the sinner from regeneration at water baptism (usually of infants) until death in order for the person to be ‘made righteous’ (justified) enough to enter God’s heaven. Even the vast majority of God’s elect would not pass muster, so they would be consigned to purgatory until the final vestiges of sin could be eliminated from their character. Only then would they march confidently to heaven’s gate. So, for Augustine, *justification was a lifelong process*. In fact, purgatory was a provision of God for those in whom the process had not been completed” (Anderson, p. 32; italics added).

Cary put it like this: Augustine does not teach justification by faith alone (Cary, *HCT*, p. 47). For Augustine, spirituality is a journey toward God. Faith is the beginning of the road. Love, which is the desire for union with God, is the “engine” that drives us along the road. Salvation is at the end of the road; it is happiness (beatitude or bliss), which is seeing God in your mind (intellectual vision). Understanding and enjoying God is what heaven really is. We can only travel this road successfully by the inward help of God’s grace. Faith and love are both gifts from God. We earn merit by grace and become worthy of God. Thus, the “order of salvation” is from faith to love to happiness (Cary, *Luther*, vol. 1, pp. 11-12).

Augustine believed that one could be regenerated but not be one of the elect. The difference is the elect persevere (Anderson, p. 34).

Augustine held a high view of the Catholic Church. He believed the Scriptures because the church said they were true. In fact, he said that he would not have believed them had the church not declared them to be true. He believed the bishops were the successors of the apostles. He maintained that the Catholic church was the body of Christ and that outside of it, there was no salvation (Latourette, p. 175). Augustine wrote, “The Catholic Church is the body of Christ, of which He is the head and Savior of His body. Outside this body, the Holy Spirit gives life to no one, seeing that, as the apostle says himself, ‘the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given on to us;’ but he is not a partaker of the divine love who is the enemy of unity. Therefore they have not the Holy Spirit who are outside the Church” (Augustine, *On the Correction of the Donatists*, 11. 50). He believed that the church is the kingdom of God on the earth (Warfield, p. 313).

He was the first to define the sacraments as visible signs of an invisible grace. The sacraments include baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, marriage, and ordination. The Lord's Supper became the spiritual presence of Christ's body and blood (Vance, p. 55). Mary was sinless and should be worshipped (Vance, p. 55).

Augustine thought that sex was always shameful and, if not for the purpose of procreation, it was sinful. He accepted polygamy over monogamy if it was solely for the purpose of procreation (Vance, p. 56).

*His Significance* Augustine was significant in his own day. In 430, when Augustine died, the Vandal invaders were besieging the city of Hippo. "Living amid the shocks and disruptions of the disintegrating Roman Empire, Augustine taught Christians to endure the world, where evil reigns invincibly, and to seek the peace of the heavenly city. He stood at the close of the creative era of Latin Christianity" (Eerdmans', p. 198).

Augustine's teachings were significant during the Middle Ages. "His work was not forgotten among the ruins of a crumbling civilization. On the contrary, through his writings, he became the teacher of the new age. Throughout the Middle Ages, no theologian was quoted more often than he was, and he thus became one of the great doctors of the Roman Catholic Church" (González, 1, p. 216). Warfield points out, however, that "the most amazing variety of doctrine, almost every conceivable subject, throughout the Middle Ages, and later in the Church of Rome, has sought support for itself and some saying or another of his; and both sides of almost every controversy of appeal with confidence to his teaching." Warfield adds, "but the Church of Rome, whose whole history since the Second Council of Orange (529) has been marred by the progressive elimination of Augustinianism from its teaching, is still able to look upon him as the chief doctor of the church, upon whom its fabric is especially built" (Warfield, pp. 309-10).

Augustine was one of the creators of the Western monastic tradition (Vance, p. 56). F. F. Bruce said, "Much of Augustine's doctrine of the church leads on to the medieval identification of the kingdom of God with the visible ecclesiastical organization (with the corollary of papal supremacy over secular governors, in view of the supremacy of the city of God over the earthly city)" (Bruce, forward to Forster and Marston, *God's Strategy in Human History*, p. vii, cited by Vance, p. 56).

If not the founder, Augustine was at least the forerunner of the Roman Catholic Church. Schaff called him "The principal theological creator of the Latin-Catholic system as distinct from the Greek Catholicism on the one hand, and from evangelical Protestantism on the other" (Schaff, *History*, vol. 3, p. 1018). Warfield said that in Augustine is found "the seed out of which the tree that we know as the Roman Catholic Church has grown." Warfield goes on to say that concerning the doctrine of the church, which Augustine transfigured, he became "in a true sense the founder of Roman Catholicism, and thus called into being a new type of Christianity." Quoting Reuter, Warfield said, "The idea of the church became the central power in the religious feeling" and "an ecclesiastical activity, in a fashion which has remained unknown to the East" (Warfield, p. 312; see also Warfield's comment on p. 321).

Augustine was also "the favorite theologian of the great Protestant reformers of the sixteenth century" (González, 1, p. 216). Of course, the Protestants who claim him claim his doctrine of grace was the doctrine of Paul before it was the doctrine of Augustine (Warfield, p. 321). Thus, Augustine, variously interpreted, has become the most influential theologian in the entire Western church, both Protestant and Catholic

(González, 1, p. 216).

How can both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism appeal to Augustine? Warfield explains that there were two children struggling in the womb of Augustine's mind. Warfield says Augustine's "doctrine of the church he had received whole from his predecessors, and he gave it merely the precision and vitality which ensured its persistence. His doctrine of grace was all his own." Warfield goes on to say that Augustine's doctrine of grace is that "sinful man depends for his recovery to good and God entirely on the free grace of God; this grace is therefore indispensable, prevenient, irresistible, indefectible." Warfield concludes that for the Reformation, Augustine's doctrine of grace was just the ultimate triumph over Augustine's doctrine of the church (Warfield, p. 322).

The influence of Augustine on history and Christianity has been called "incalculable" (Vance, p. 39).

## Leo I

Leo I, a.k.a. Leo the Great, was Bishop of Rome (440-461), one of the church's earliest great administrators, a notable preacher, and the first bishop of Rome to make extensive use of Matthew 16:19 as a reference to the Pope (Eerdmans', p. 176).

In an edict issued in 445, Valentinian III, the Western Roman Emperor, recognized Leo's spiritual supremacy in the West (Cairns, 159). In 451, in a letter to the Council of Chalcedon, Leo I said, "Peter speaks through Leo" in his lectures on the history of the Catholic Church, Cook says Leo saw himself as Peter's successor, but at this point, the claim was jurisdictional, rather than doctrinal (Cook, p. 19). Cook adds that toward the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, Gelasius I made a distinction between papal authority and imperial power that was later used to justify papal assertions of the leadership of the Christian world (Cook, p. 19).

In a theological controversy involving Dioscorus I, the Bishop of Alexandria, and Flavian, the Bishop of Constantinople, Leo wrote a long letter, known as the *Tome*, supporting Flavian's view of the human and the divine nature of Christ. Leo set forth the view which had been clearly stated by Tertullian and was generally held in the West that in Jesus Christ there was neither manhood without true Godhead nor the Godhead without true manhood, that in Him two full and complete natures came together in one person, "without distracting from the properties of either nature and substance" (Latourette, p. 171). In 449, at the Council of Ephesus, Dioscorus refused to let the *Tome* be read, deposed Flavian, excommunicated Leo, and appointed an Alexandrian priest in his stead. In 451, however, at the Council of Chalcedon, Leo's *Tome* was approved and a creed was adopted that incorporated its views (Latourette, p. 171).

In 452, Leo persuaded Attila the Hun to turn back from Rome. In 455, when Gaiseric and his Vandals came to sack Rome, Leo persuaded them to save the city from fire and pillage, but he had to agree to allow the city to be sacked by the Vandals for two weeks. The Romans credited Leo with saving their city from complete destruction (Cairns, p. 159). This was the beginning of the bishop of Rome acting as a civil ruler (Eerdmans', p. 176).

Leo has been called the first "pope" in the modern sense of the term (González, p. 1, 242). González points out that in the theological controversies of the time, Leo's opinion was not generally accepted simply because he was the Bishop of Rome. "It took a politically propitious moment for his views to prevail. Since those controversies took place mostly in the East, Leo's intervention, although significant, was powerless in the face of

the imperial opposition and was accepted only when those in power agreed to it” (González, 1, p. 243). González goes on to say that Leo was able to exercise authority in the city of Rome due to his personal gifts and the political situation of the time when civil authorities proved incapable of performing their duties, but Leo was convinced that Jesus made Peter and his successors the rock on which the church was to be built and, therefore, the Bishop of Rome was Peter’s direct successor and head of the church. Leo’s writings contain all the traditional arguments that would be repeatedly mustered in favor of papal authority (González, 1, p. 243).

Cairns says, “Even if we do not consider Leo the first pope, it is fair to say that he made the claims and exercised the power of many later incumbents of the Roman bishopric. Gelasius I, pope from 492 to 496, wrote in 494 that God gave both sacred and royal power to the pope and the king. Because the pope had to account to God for the king at the judgment, the sacred power of the pope was more important than the royal power. Hence, rulers should submit to the pope. Perhaps such power was useful in this early period in dealing with the barbarians, but later it led to corruption within the Roman Church itself” (Cairns, p. 159).

## New Testament Canon

Some of the Church fathers discussed and debated which books should be in the New Testament.

*Eusebius* Like Origen, Eusebius distinguished between the *homologoumena* and the *antilegomena*, but divided the latter into those merely disputed and those actually spurious. In other words, he had three categories: the recognized, the disputed, and the spurious. Under the recognized, he lists the four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of Paul, 1 John, 1 Peter, and Revelation. Under those merely disputed, he mentions James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. Under those actually spurious, he lists the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, Barnabas, the Didache, and perhaps Revelation. He lists Revelation under both the disputed and the spurious category!

Here is what Eusebius says: “At this point, it seems reasonable to summarize the writings of the New Testament which have been quoted. In the first place should be put the holy tetrad of the Gospels. To them follows the writing of the Acts of the Apostles. After this should be reckoned the Epistles of Paul. Following them, the Epistle of John, called the first, and in the same way, should be recognized the Epistle of Peter. In addition to these should be put, if it seems desirable, the Revelation of John, the arguments concerning which we will expound at the proper time. These belong to the Recognized Books [*homologoumenois*]. Of the Disputed Books [*antilegoumenon*] which are nevertheless known to most are the Epistle called of James, that of Jude, the second Epistle of Peter, and the so-called second and third Epistles of John, which may be the work of the evangelist or of some other with the same name. Among the books which are not genuine [*nothois*] must be reckoned the Acts of Paul, the work entitled the Shepherd, the Apocalypse of Peter, and in addition to them the letter called of Barnabas and the so-called Teachings of the Apostles [Didache]. And in addition, as I said, the Revelation of John, if this view prevails. For, as I said, some reject it, but others count it among the Recognized Books. Some have also counted the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in which those of the Hebrews who have accepted Christ take a special pleasure. These would all belong to

the disputed books, but we have nevertheless been obliged to make a list of them, distinguishing between those writings which, according to the tradition of the Church [lit., ecclesiastical tradition], are true, genuine, and recognized [scriptures] [*aletheis kai aplastous kai anomologemenas graphas*], and those which differ from them in that they are not canonical [*ouk endiathekous*] but disputed, yet nevertheless are known to most of the writers of the Church, in order that we might know them and the writings which are put forward by heretics under the name of the apostles containing gospels such as those of Peter, and Thomas, and Matthias, and some others besides, or Acts such as those of Andrew and John and the other apostles. To none of these has any who belonged to the succession of the orthodox ever thought it right to refer in his writings. Moreover, the type of phraseology differs from the apostolic style, and the opinion and tendency of their contents are widely dissonant from true orthodoxy and clearly show that they are the forgeries of heretics. They ought, therefore, to be reckoned not even among spurious [*nothois*] books but shunned as altogether wicked and impious” (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.25.1-7).

*Observations* First, to sum up: during the third and fourth centuries, some doubted Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. Origen reports that some doubted some books, but he himself accepts all the books of the New Testament, except 2 and 3 John and Jude, and there are scholars who think it is possible that Origen recognized them as genuine. There is no evidence that Origen personally rejected any of the New Testament books on the opposed list. Eusebius lists James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude as disputed, not spurious. For some reason, Eusebius fails to mention the book of Hebrews and he puts Revelation in both the disputed and the spurious categories. *Thus, in some quarters, there were some questions about seven books: Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation.* These books lacked “universal endorsement” (Everett Harrison, p. 101).

Second, there were different reasons why these “doubted books” were questioned.

Hebrews was questioned because of its authorship (Everett Harrison, p. 345). There is, however, early and abundant evidence for it. For example, Clement of Rome (95 AD) quotes it copiously and several first-century authors cite it (Thiessen, pp. 297-298).

James was perhaps questioned because it was written to Jewish believers and contained little that would appeal to the “speculative mind of Greek Christian” (Tenney, p. 427). The Muratorian Fragment omitted it. Eusebius classified it as “disputed” but quoted it as Scripture (Eusebius, *Commentary on the Psalms*). Mayor quotes early authors beginning with Clement of Rome and concludes that James “was more widely known during the first three centuries than has been commonly supposed” (Mayor, pp. lii-lxviii).

Second Peter was questioned because of its difference in style from 1 Peter. Jerome says the hesitancy of some to accept 2 Peter was because it was so different from 1 Peter (Jerome, *Epistle to Hedibia*, 120; see also Tenney, p. 427). Even Calvin was unsure of 2 Peter (Tenney, p. 428)! Lumby says, “It is almost inconceivable that a forger, writing to warn against false teachers, writing in the interest of truth, should have thus deliberately assumed a name and experience to which he had no claim” (Thiessen, p. 288). Could it be that some reject this letter because it rejects them?

Second John was questioned perhaps because there were not many early quotations or even definite allusions to it. Irenaeus attributes 2 John 11 to John, the disciple of the Lord (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* I. xvi. 3) and assigns 2 John 7-8 to the Apostle John (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.*



III. xvi. 8). Origen says some doubted it, but he does not seem to reject it (Everett Harrison, p. 422).

Third John was questioned probably for the same reason as 2 John. The evidence for it is less than for 2 John, but as has been mentioned, Goodspeed claims that the early writers included 2 and 3 John with 1 John, which is what Irenaeus did (see Thiessen, p. 22).

Jude was questioned for several reasons. Eusebius lists it as a disputed book, but in another place, calls it spurious because not many ancients made use of it (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II. xxiii. 25). Jerome says some rejected it because of its supposed reference to the book of Enoch (Jerome, *Lives of Illustrious Men*, ch. 4). On the other hand, Tertullian considered Enoch Scripture, because of Jude's use of it!

Thiessen explains: "Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine, and the Church Fathers generally held that Jude quotes from several apocryphal books. It was on this ground that they long rejected it. It was held that at vs. 9 the writer quotes from the Assumption of Moses and at vs. 14 f. from the Book of Enoch. Philippi vigorously denied this, saying that Jude merely wrote from oral tradition, and this is possible. The fragment of the Assumption of Moses that has come down to us is broken off before the burial of Moses is reached, and we really cannot tell what followed in the part that is missing. There is a great similarity between Enoch 1:9; 5:4 and Jude 14 ff. Moorehead admits the possibility of a quotation in both instances. With regard to the Book of Enoch in particular, he says: 'Granting such quotation, that fact does not warrant us to affirm that he endorses the book. Paul cites three Greek poets: Aratus (Acts 17:28), Menander, and Epimenides and the apostle adds, 'This testimony is true' (Tit. 1:13), but no one imagines he means to say the whole poem is true.' So Jude cites a passage from a non-canonical book not because he accepts the whole book as true, but this particular prediction he receives as from God.' This seems to us to be a satisfactory solution to the problem" (Thiessen, pp. 294-295).

Revelation was not questioned at first. Harrison points out, "John's Apocalypse had a solid place in the canon in the earlier patristic period, being questioned only by the sect known as the Alogi, but generally received throughout the church. The failure of writers in the East during the fourth century to include it in the New Testament may be assigned to the influence of the criticism of Dionysius of Alexandria, who argued the great differences between the Revelation and the Fourth Gospel as ground for concluding that another John must have written the Apocalypse. Influenced by Dionysius, Eusebius felt that it was wise to put the book not only among the acknowledged writings (*homologoumena*) but also with the non-genuine, saying that some reject it" (Everett Harrison, p. 101).

Baker says, "By the end of the fourth century, the doubts associated with these seven books were removed and all were accepted as canonical" (Baker, p. 85).

*Athanasius* In 367, Athanasius listed the twenty-seven books of the New Testament as the ones God was obviously using.

*Others* Jerome (340?-420) and Augustine (354-430) also listed the 27 books of the New Testament.

*Councils* It was not until the close of the fourth century that any council discussed the canon of the New Testament (Thiessen, p. 25). In 397, the Third Council of Carthage was the first council to make a decision concerning the canon. It demanded that nothing be read in the church under the title of divine Scripture except the "canonical" books. It listed the present 27 books of the New Testament as being canonical (Thiessen, p. 26). Also, in 451,

the Council of Chalcedon formally recognized the same New Testament as Christians use today.

It should be noted that these men and councils did not formulate the canon; they merely formally recognized what God had already done. They did not choose the books to form the Bible; they merely stated publicly what the churches had accepted for some time. No precise date can be given for the full recognition of the present New Testament, but the New Testament was substantially completed by the year 175 (Cairns, p. 118).

Yet Hannah says that there was a general agreement concerning most of the books of the New Testament, but there were different lists of canonical books through the centuries. He goes so far as to say the number of books in the canon was an issue that did not receive a definitive resolution until the credal formulas of the Reformation in the 16<sup>th</sup> century from Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant perspectives (Hannah, p. 36). In other words, there was debate about some of the books for a long time, but there is also no doubt that the canon was substantially completed by 175, if not before.

*The Development of Tradition* In the section on the Old Catholic Church, it was pointed out that Irenaeus taught that oral tradition was the oral transmission of the original message of the apostles. Tertullian agreed with Irenaeus. He did not confine tradition to the Scripture. It could be found in the doctrine publicly proclaimed by the churches (Kelly, p. 40). In other words, Tertullian extended the meaning of tradition to cover what had been customary in the church for long generations (such as triple immersion at baptism; Kelly, p. 39).

In the fourth century, as a result of development in the church's institutional life, the basis of tradition became "broader and more explicit" (Kelly, p. 41). Basil of Caesarea (ca. 329-379) used the liturgical custom of baptizing in the threefold name as a pivot in his argument for the coequality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son (Kelly, p. 45).

Kelly says there was a "growing tendency, in the fourth century, to appeal to the orthodox fathers of the past, as individuals or assembled in councils, as custodians and interpreters of the church's traditions. In the fifth century, the practice was greatly expanded, explicitly and even formally recognition being given to the authority of the succession of venerated teachers" (Kelly, p. 48). Cyril of Alexandria (ca. 376-444) even claimed that the Holy Spirit spoke through the fathers (Kelly, p. 48).

Theodoret the Antiochene (ca. 393-ca. 458) speaks of the orthodox faith as having been transmitted "that only by the apostles and prophets, but also by those who interpreted their writings—Ignatius, Eustathius, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, John and all the luminaries of the world—and also by the holy fathers who before these assembled at Nicaea" (Kelly, p. 49). He also explained that "the Holy Spirit inspired the fathers to elucidate the darker passages of Scripture" (Kelly, p. 49). Kelly insists that this does not indicate that the fathers were being treated as authoritative on their own right. As great as was the respect paid to the fathers, "there was no question of their being regarded as having been access to the truth other than those already contained, explicitly or inexpressibly, in Scripture." Kelly cites Theodoret, who said, "I yield obedience to the Holy Scriptures alone" (Kelly, p. 49).

Kelly says the result of this long evolution was codified in the middle of the fifth century by Vincent of Lerins, who said that Scripture "is sufficient and more than sufficient," but because it is susceptible to such a variety of interpretations, we must have recourse to tradition. This "norm of ecclesiastical and Catholic opinion" is to be identified with "what has been believed everywhere, always and by all" (Kelly, p. 50). Vincent seems

to allow for the organic development of doctrine analogous to the growth of the human body from infancy to age, but according to him this development, although real, must not result in the least alteration to the original significance of the doctrine being considered (Kelly, p. 51).

## Doctrine

During the imperial period, a number of doctrinal issues arose, but the two greatest were Arianism (the Trinity and deity of Christ) and Pelagianism (the freedom of the will).

*The Trinity* Because Gnosticism denied the humanity of Christ, the doctrinal issue in the first several centuries of church history was the person of Christ. Prior to the imperial period, Tertullian insisted that the Trinity consisted of the unity of essence in three personalities. The council of Nicaea (325) put that concept of the Trinity in a creed.

*Freedom of the Will* (Pelagianism) Pelagius taught that people have the power to not sin. At first, Augustine held to free will. Later he changed his view (for details concerning the view people believed prior to Augustine, see Vance, p. 42).

## Church Polity

After the apostolic period, the office of bishop changed. What began as a plurality of elders (a.k.a. bishops) within one church evolved into a single individual with authority over several churches. Here is a brief description of the evolution of elders into bishop.

Over the first several centuries, the church increasingly centered around the bishops, who were regarded as successors to the apostles. Cyprian insisted that the bishops were not just part of the administration function of the church; they were necessary to the very existence of the church. He said, “The church is in the bishop and the bishop in the church.” He also held that each bishop was the equal of every other bishop and that while a bishop might admonish another, none had administrative authority over any other. He declared that no bishop should “set himself up as a bishop of bishops” and that a bishop “can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another.” Latourette says, “The bishops tended to group themselves by the administrative divisions of the Empire, and for the election and consecration of a bishop the bishops of a particular province assembled” (Latourette, pp. 183-84). Latourette adds that by the close of the fifth century, the Western Church and the Roman state had become “so intimately associated that the latter had placed an impress upon the former which was to prove indelible” (Latourette, p. 183, 188). The Roman emperor was the *Pontifex Maximus*, the chief priest of the cults officially acknowledged by the state. When the emperors adopted Christianity, they insisted upon having similar power in the church (Latourette, p. 184).

“In 390, Ambrose, as Bishop of Milan, remonstrated with the Emperor Theodosius for a massacre which the latter had ordered in Thessalonica and excluded him from the Church until he had proved his repentance by the acts prescribed for penitents” (Latourette, p. 184).

Gradually the bishops in the larger cities began to exercise authority over the bishops in their vicinity. In 341, the Council of Antioch decided that in each province, the bishop in the chief city should have precedence over the other bishops in the province. The “archbishop” was to take no common action without the agreement of the other bishops in

his province. Each bishop had authority in his own diocese to ordain elders and deacons and to settle disputes, but he was “not to undertake anything further without the bishop of the metropolis,” nor was the latter “to undertake anything further” without the consent of the other bishops of the province. There was even further organization. Latourette explains, “Any bishop might have under him what was called chorepiscopoi, appointed by himself, to supervise the churches in villages and rural districts. The chorepiscopus had been ordained to the episcopate and could ordain those in the subordinate ranks of the clergy—readers, sub-deacons, and exorcists—but not presbyters or deacons” (Latourette, p. 185). The bishops in the chief cities had positions of outstanding prestige. These cities were Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and, particularly, Rome. Eventually, these bishops were called Patriarchs. As the centuries passed, the Church of Rome and its bishop became increasingly prominent.

In his work known as the *Tome of Leo*, Leo I, Bishop of Rome (440-61), insisted that the authority Jesus gave to Peter is passed through to his successor, the bishop of Rome. This doctrine was approved by the Council of Chalcedon, which also elevated Constantinople to a position equal to that of Rome. Leo declined to recognize Constantinople as being equal to Rome (Latourette, p. 186).

In 494, Leo’s successor, Gelasius, declared that the Church of Rome was over all other churches because of the authority Jesus gave to Peter and because of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul in Rome (Latourette, p. 187).

Latourette observes that the history of the church was “chronically punctuated by dissension, often bitter and between outstanding leaders in the church. Bishops, synods, and councils employed emphatic language in condemning individuals and the views from which they differed. *Never was there a single organization that was comprehensive of all who professed themselves Christians. By the close of the fifth century, several rival bodies were in existence, each regarding itself as representative of true Christianity and most of them calling themselves Catholic and denying that designation to the others*” (Latourette, pp. 187-88, italics added). He adds, “This church, to be sure, was several churches rather than one” (Latourette, p. 188).

## Church Service

González says that until Constantine’s time, the church service was relatively simple. At first, Christians gathered in private homes. Then they gathered in cemeteries, such as the catacombs. By the third century, buildings set aside for church services began to be used. The oldest church building the archaeologists have found is Dura-Europos, which dates to about 250. It is a fairly small room decorated with simple murals (González, 1, p. 125).

Kelly says that during the third century, the liturgy acquired “a considerable measure of fixity” (Kelly, p. 44). Elaborate catechism instruction (a question and answer format) that preceded baptism came into regular use (Kelly, p. 44).

**Summary:** During the imperial church period, the church went from being persecuted to being politically accepted and even politically involved.

Here is one way to get a brief overview of the first five centuries of church history. The Apostolic Fathers (90-150) wrote pastoral material to edify. The apologists (150-250)

wrote polemical material to defend the truth and refute false doctrine. For example, Irenaeus wrote against the Gnostics. The next group could be called the expositors (325-460). They wrote to explain. Jerome was the translator. Ambrose was the preacher. Athanasius and Augustine were the theologians.

The imperial period of church history witnessed a radical change: “the persecuted church became the church of the powerful” (González, 1, p. 134). Speaking concerning this period of church history, Cook points out, “At its beginning, Christianity was among the minority, a persecuted religion, and at its end, Christianity was the majority and officially favored religion of the Roman Empire” (Cook, p. 15).

William Jones (1763-1846), a historian, summarizes the results of the imperial edicts and decrees of the unholy alliance between church and states: “The scriptures were now no longer the standard for Christian faith. What was orthodox and what heterodox was, from henceforth, to be determined by the decisions of fathers and councils; and religion propagated not by the apostolic methods of persuasion, accompanied by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, but by imperial edicts and decrees; nor were gainsayers to be brought to conviction by the simple weapons of reason and scripture, but persecuted and destroyed” (William Jones, cited by Vance, p. 47).

The church drifted away from the Scripture. For example, Anne Rice grew up a Catholic and became a successful novelist. At one point in her adult life, she became an atheist. In 1998, she returned to Catholicism. Twelve years later, she announced that in the name of Christ she was leaving organized religion. She gave many reasons, including issues such as gay rights, feminism, birth control, and same-sex marriage. She also said, “I also found that I can’t find a basis in Scripture for a lot of the positions the churches and denominations take today, and I can’t find any basis at all for an anointed, hierarchical priesthood” (Mitchell Landsberg, “Leaving Christianity in the Name of God,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 7, 2010, p. AA4). Notice she said, “I can’t find a basis in Scripture for a lot of the positions the churches and denominations take today.” That is not new.

To complicate matters, people today don’t know what their church teaches. For example, in the fall of 2010, the Pew Forum on Religion in Public Life released a study that, among other things, revealed that “four in 10 Catholics misunderstood the meaning of the church’s essential ritual, incorrectly saying that the bread and wine used in Holy Communion are intended to merely symbolize the body and blood of Christ, not actually be them” (Mitchell Landsberg, “Nonbelievers Top Religious Knowledge Survey,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 28, 2010, p. AA2).



# THE DIVIDED CHURCH

The fourth period of church history is the longest, spanning the length of the Middle Ages, which lasted 1,000 years. It extends from the fall of Rome (476) to the fall of Constantinople (1453) or the beginning of the Protestant Reformation (1517), roughly from 500 to 1500. The formal division between the Eastern and Western churches did not take place until 1054, but the East and the West drifted apart long before that. Early in this period, the Bishop of Rome claimed universal jurisdiction over the whole church. But the Eastern church never accepted that.

## The Divided Church

The major characteristic of this period was the division between the Greek East and the Latin West. At first, there were just differences. Those differences developed into an estrangement between the two. Finally, there was a formal schism in 1054. A number of factors contributed to the ultimate, formal division.

*The Political Division* When Christianity was founded, the Roman Empire was unified. That unity gradually disappeared. The division of the Roman Empire began with Emperor Diocletian (284-305), who instituted a division of authority. In 324, Constantine moved the capital to Constantinople. In 375, Theodosius completed the separation. From that time, the Roman world was divided into East and West, separated by the Adriatic Sea. The Eastern Empire was known as Greek, the Western as Latin, from the prevailing language in each section. The division in the church followed the political division.

One illustration of the political division between East and West took place in 800. On Christmas day, the pope crowned Charles the Great (Charlemagne), King of the Franks, Emperor. Charlemagne sought recognition from the ruler in Constantinople but without success. Believing in the unity of the Empire, the East considered him an intruder and the papal coronation as an act of schism within the Empire (Ware, p. 53).

The political division affected the unity of the church. When Charlemagne was refused recognition by the Byzantine Emperor, he retaliated by charging the Byzantine church (the Eastern Church) with heresy for not using *filioque* (Latin: “and from the Son,” explained below) in the creed and he refused to accept the decisions of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Ware, p. 54).

*The Language Distinctions* By the year 450, there were few in the West who could read Greek and after 600, it was rare for people in the East to speak Latin (Ware, p. 53). The lack of a common language made communication more difficult. They could not easily read each others’ writings. Mistakes in translation made the problem worse. For example, Charlemagne only knew about the decision of the Seventh Ecumenical Council through a faulty translation, which seriously distorted its meaning (Ware, p. 54).

*The Customs Differences* The East and the West developed different customs, which were formulated into laws. Some of these differences developed early.

A controversy arose in the middle of the second century over the dating of Easter. The churches in the East insisted that Easter should be celebrated on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan, the date of the Passover, regardless of the day of the week on which it fell (Polycarp). In 162,

Anicetus, the bishop of Rome, declared that Easter should be celebrated on the *Sunday* following the 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisan. In 190, when Victor, the bishop of Rome, excommunicated the churches of Asia, Irenaeus rebuked him for his pretensions to power. The issue was not settled until the Council of Nicaea in 325 when the western viewpoint was adopted (Cairns, p. 103).

In the West, priests were forbidden to marry. In the East, marriage was not only sanctioned but it was required for the priests to be married.

In the West, the churches allowed images, while the Greek churches would not allow statues, only pictures, in their churches.

In the West, unleavened bread was used in communion, whereas in the East, common bread was used. As a protest against the Jewish observance of the Sabbath day, the practice of fasting on Saturday arose in the West but never in the East. (Later, the Roman Catholic feast day was changed to Friday, the day of the Lord's crucifixion. Recently, even that was abolished.)

*The Papal Disagreement* In the East, there was a strong sense of equality of all bishops. The Eastern Church acknowledged the Bishop of Rome as the first bishop of the church, but saw him as the first among equals. The Eastern Church was willing to grant to the pope *a primacy of honor*, but not the universal supremacy he claimed he had. In the West, however, Rome came to be regarded as *the* apostolic jurisdiction, the center of authority. This was a disagreement over the organization of the visible church (Ware, p. 57).

*The Doctrinal Debate* Augustine (354-430) is said to have "prepared" the way for the division between the eastern and western churches (Reuter, cited by Warfield, p. 307). As Warfield explains, "It was Augustine who imprinted upon the western section of the church the character so specific as naturally to bring the separation of the churches in its train" (Warfield, p. 307). In other words, Augustine's ideas and doctrines influenced the West, but not the East. For one thing, he wrote in Latin and his works were not translated into Greek (Cary, lectures on Augustine).

Early in this period, there was a doctrinal difference that caused a schism between the East and the West. The Acacian Schism (484-519) was a 35-year rift between the East and West over the doctrine of Monophysitism, the idea that Christ had only one nature: divine. Monophysitism was condemned at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, but many still held the doctrine, especially in Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Faced with a severely divided empire, Emperor Zeno turned to Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, for help. Acacius was a vocal supporter of orthodoxy. He drafted a letter of union, known as the Henoticon, in which he endorsed the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople, but he made no mention of the decrees of Chalcedon. That deliberate omission was a concession to Monophysitism. In 482, Zeno published the document and deposed all bishops who refused to go along with the compromise. In 484, Felix, the Bishop of Rome, called a synod which excommunicated Acacius. Thus, the Acacian Schism began. During the schism, one of the emperors in Constantinople supported the antipope Laurentius.

In 518, Emperor Justin, a staunch supporter of orthodoxy, John, Patriarch of Cappadocia, and Hormisdas, Bishop of Rome, reached reconciliation. As part of the reconciliation, a confession of faith known as the Formula of Hormisdas and written by Hormisdas was signed by the bishops in the East. On March 28, 519, the reunion of the churches was ratified. Thus, the Acacian Schism came to an end.



The Acacian Schism was the first step down the road that led to the ultimate schism in 1054. Even the unity established by the signing of the Formula of Hormisdas was soon shattered. Emperor Justinian (527-565) had a wife named Theodora (497-548), who was an avowed Monophysite. Justinian tried to find a formula that would not overtly violate Chalcedon while reconciling the Monophysites. His attempt failed (Noble, pp. 14-15).

In the seventh century, Emperor Heraclius (610-641) looked for a formula of reconciliation. His theologians came up with the doctrine of Monothelism (Christ had two natures, but since He is a single person, He has only one will) and Pope Honorius (625-638) accepted it, but it was condemned in the East and the West. When Pope Martin I (649-655) called a church council to refute Monothelism, he was arrested, brutalized, and led to Constantinople, where he was mistreated until he died (Noble, p. 15). Eventually, Monothelism was condemned at the Third Council of Constantinople (680).

Emperor Justinian II (668-685) called the Quinisext Council, which issued many decrees that Pope Sergius I (687-701) refused to accept (Noble, p. 15). For example, the Quinisext Council forbade the depiction of Christ as a Lamb. So Sergius I introduced into the Roman Mass the Syrian custom of a chant addressed to the Lamb of God (this part of the Mass is called the *Agnus Dei*).

In 726, the Byzantine Emperor Leo III (717-741) began to campaign against icons (Greek: image; a religious work of art, usually a painting). Some of his followers, called iconoclasts, began to destroy them. When the popes condemned iconoclasm (the breaking of religious images), Leo stripped the papacy of revenues from southern Italy and the western Balkans and transferred the allegiance of bishops in those areas to Constantinople (Noble, p. 15). In 787, the Council of Nicaea, the Seventh Ecumenical Council, upheld the use of icons. “The dispute defined Orthodox ritual and widened the divide between Catholic and Orthodox churches” (Harl, WOB, p. 74).

The principle difference between East and West was the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The Council of Nicaea (325) said the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father. Later (at least since the 8<sup>th</sup> century), the West added “and from the Son” (“*filioque*” in Latin). When the East refused to recognize Charlemagne as the Emperor, he retaliated with the charge of heresy against the Eastern Church, denouncing them for not using “*filioque*” (“and from the Son”) in their Creed (Ware, p. 54). It was not accepted by the popes until 1014. Mighty debates were held over that one word. Books in untold numbers were written and blood was shed in bitter strife.

Other factors could be mentioned. The Latin approach was more practical, whereas the Greek approach was more speculative. When thinking about the Trinity, the Western church started with the unity of the Godhead, but the Eastern church began with the threeness of the Persons. When reflecting on the crucifixion, the Western church thought primarily of Christ as the Victim, whereas the Eastern Church thought of Him as the Victor (Ware, p. 56).

## Monasticism

There were no monks or nuns in the early church. Christians lived as families. Except for keeping apart from idolatrous associations, they integrated into society. “None of the earliest Christians appears to have lived as a hermit or in an ascetic community” (Eerdmans’, p. 204).

When Christianity became dominant in the empire, the wickedness of the world not only crept into the church, it became prevalent. When they could not escape the world in the church, many withdrew from the world. Either alone or in groups, they lived in seclusion, seeking to cultivate their spiritual life by meditation, prayer, and ascetic habits.

In his book on Orthodoxy, Ware points out that when the church became established and was no longer suffering persecution, the idea of martyrdom did not disappear but took other forms, such as the monastic life. He says that monastic living was often regarded by Greek writers as an equivalent to martyrdom (Ware, p. 22).

Monasticism has its roots in the period of the Imperial Church, but it flourished during the period of the Divided Church. First, there were hermits. Then, there were monks who lived in communities housed in buildings known as monasteries.

*Anthony (ca. 251–ca. 356)* The monastic spirit began in Egypt, where it was fostered by the warm climate, the many caves in the hills along the banks of the Nile River, and the Nile itself, which made small gardens possible. Anthony is considered the founder of Monasticism. The chief source of information concerning him is a book written by Athanasius.

Anthony was born in Egypt into a Christian family. He was a shy fellow who disliked school and never learned to read or write (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 393). When he was 20 years old, his wealthy parents died and left him their possessions. Also, at the age of 20 (Cairns, p. 152), he was deeply impressed by what Jesus told the Rich Young Ruler, namely, “Sell whatever you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow Me” (Mk. 10:21). Anthony sold his property, gave the money to the poor, said farewell to his family and friends, and lived alone. In 269, Anthony became a monk, a word which means “alone” (Cook, p. 29). He first lived near his home. Then he lived in a tomb. Later he moved to an abandoned fort and finally resided on a mountain (Houghton, p. 28).

When Anthony was 35, he decided to live in absolute solitude. He lived in an abandoned fort for 20 years without seeing anyone. Food was thrown to him over the wall. He refused to see visitors, but eventually, would-be disciples began living in caves and huts near him. Thus a colony of ascetics was formed. They begged Anthony to be their guide in the spiritual life. About 305, he emerged from solitude. He was not emaciated. Rather, he was vigorous in body and mind.

For five or six years, Anthony devoted himself to the instruction and organization of a group of monks. Then he again withdrew, spending the last 45 years of his life in seclusion. This time he would see those who came to visit him. On two occasions, he visited Alexandria, once to preach against Arians.

Anthony lived until he was 105 years old. At his request, his grave was kept secret, lest his body become an object of reverence. His sermons consisted of instructions on the duties of the spiritual life, in which warfare with demons occupied the chief place. (Most of this material came from [www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org) accessed 8/19/10.)

Multitudes followed Anthony’s example, but he never organized them into a community. Each lived the ascetic life of a hermit in his own cave (Cairns, p. 152). From Egypt, the spirit spread over the Eastern Church, where millions opted for the monastic life. At this point, it was individual asceticism. Athanasius’ book on the life of Anthony is the first biography of a saint (Cook, p. 29).

*Simeon (ca. 390-459)* After having lived buried up to his neck for several months, a Syrian monk named Simeon lived on a pillar. Actually, he built several, each higher than the other. The last one was 60 feet high and 4 feet wide (Kuiper, p. 45). He lived on pillars for thirty-seven years. Between the fifth and twelfth centuries, thousands in Syria lived on pillars. They were called Stylites, that is, “pillar-saints” (“*stylos*” is the Greek word for pillar).

*Pachomius (ca. 290-346)* Pachomius lived with a hermit for 12 years. Then in 323, he founded the first monastery. It was at Tabenniesi in Upper Egypt (Harl, p. 35) on the east bank of the Nile River. Soon several thousand monks in Egypt and Syria were under his control. Simplicity of life, work, devotion, and obedience were hallmarks of his organization (Cairns, p. 153). Before his death, Pachomius supervised the establishment of the first monastic communities for women (Eerdmans’, p. 206). “Pachomius created the basic framework which was followed by all later monastic communities” (Eerdmans’, pp. 206-07). He was the first monk to write an ascetic rule for a monastic community (Cook, p. 29).

*Basil of Caesarea (ca. 330-379)* Basil popularized communal monastic living. He also gave it a more utilitarian emphasis, insisting that monks work, pray, read the Bible, and perform good deeds. “He discouraged extreme asceticism” (Cairns, pp. 153-54).

*Athanasius (ca. 296-373)* During one of his periodic exiles from Alexandria, Athanasius introduced monasticism to the West. Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine wrote in favor of it, which helped to popularize it within the Roman Empire (Cairns, p. 154).

*Benedict of Nursia (ca. 480-ca. 542)* About 500, shocked by the vice in the city of Rome, Benedict of Nursia, although he belonged to an aristocratic family, moved to the mountains east of Rome to live as a hermit in a cave. About 529, he established the monastery of Montecassino, which survived until it was destroyed in World War II. Benedict has been called “the greatest leader of Western monasticism” (Cairns, p. 154). His sister, Scholastica, founded a similar community for women (González, 1, p. 239).

About 540, Benedict wrote a book entitled the *Rule* that determined the shape of monasticism for centuries. Rather than extreme asceticism, it called for strict discipline without undue harshness. Rather than living on bread and water, as many of the monks in the desert did, Benedict prescribed that monks should have two meals a day, each with two cooked dishes and, at times, fresh fruit and vegetables, as well as a moderate amount of wine every day. Each monk was to have a cover and a pillow. They were to obey “without delay” the *Rule* and the abbot. The abbot (Latin for “father”) was the head of the monastery. The monks gathered for prayer and Bible reading eight times a day. They read the Psalms so that they could cover the entire book in a week. Consequently, most monks knew the Psalter by heart, as well as other portions of Scripture (González, 1, pp. 239-41).

At first, the monastic spirit grew slowly in Europe, but during the Middle Ages, the number of monks and nuns increased enormously. As their settlements grew in size and in number, some form of organization and government became necessary. In time, the great orders arose.

*The Benedictines* Benedict of Nursia founded the Benedictines in 529. It is the earliest of the orders. This order became the greatest monastic community of Europe. It required obedience to the head of the monastery, poverty (that is, no possession of property by the individual), and personal chastity. This order was active in industrial works. Monks cut

down the forest, drained the swamps, tilled the fields, and taught the people many useful arts. Many of the later orders were branches or outgrowths of the Benedictines.

*The Cistercians* The Cistercians arose in 1098, aiming to strengthen the Benedictine discipline, which had grown somewhat lax. Their name came from Citeaux in France, where the order was founded by St. Robert. In 1112, it was strengthened and reorganized by Bernard of Clairvaux. During the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, more than 1000 Cistercian monasteries were established in Europe (Cook, p. 46). This order gave great attention to art, architecture, and especially literature, copying ancient books and writing new books.

Cook says, “Bernard was arguably the most important church leader in the first half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, involving himself in French politics, theological disputes, and Crusades. In many ways, the Cistercians were the first religious order: they had a constitution, a method of governing chapters, and uniform regulations. Bernard was also one of the most important Catholic thinkers” (Cook, p. 46). Cook goes on to speak about Bernard’s mysticism, his influence in developing veneration for the Virgin Mary, and his emphasis on the humanity of Christ. In his *Divine Comedy*, Dante chose Bernard to be his final guide to heaven (Cook, p. 46).

When Bernard of Clairvaux was dying, monks spoke to him of his merits. His response was, “Holy Jesus, Thy wounds are my merits” (Ironsides, p. 44).

*The Knights Templar* In 1119, the Knights Templar was formed. It was a religious order that was part monastic and part military. Members took the monastic vows of charity, poverty, and obedience and carried out some liturgical duties, but most of their work was military. Their primary duty was to ensure the safety of Christian pilgrims. Bernard was largely responsible for their official acceptance by the church. They became the *de facto* bankers for pilgrims to the Holy Land. They also became wealthy and corrupt. In 1312, they were disbanded by Clement V (Cook, pp. 46-47).

*The Franciscans* Francis of Assisi (1181-1226) founded the Franciscan order in 1209. From Italy, they spread rapidly over all of Europe and became the most numerous of all orders. During the Black Death (a plague that swept through Europe in the fourteenth century), more than 124,000 Franciscan monks perished while ministering to the dying and the dead.

*The Dominicans* Dominic de Guzman (ca. 1170-1221), a Spanish priest, founded the Dominicans in 1216. He was convinced that the heresy problem could be solved if priests were educated and preached Catholic doctrine clearly and persuasively (Cook, p. 62). This order differed from other orders in that the Dominicans were preachers who strengthened the faith of believers and opposed heresies. Later, they persecuted heretics. The Dominican order extended into all the countries of Europe. Thomas Aquinas was a Dominican.

The Benedictines are given to service in schools and churches. The Franciscans dedicate themselves to the relief of suffering. The Dominicans focus on theological and ministerial studies. The Jesuits, who came later, served in the field of education, although the various fields overlap considerably (Boettner, p. 58). I

*The Results* There were good results from monasticism. Monks gave hospitality to travelers, the sick, and the poor. The modern hotel and hospital grew out of the monastery. They promoted agriculture, water control, and the building of roads. The libraries of the monasteries preserved many ancient works of literature, both secular and Christian. Monks copied books and authored books (for example, Thomas à Kempis wrote *The Imitation of*

*Christ*). They taught and established universities, preached the gospel, converted incoming barbarians, and became missionaries (see Cairns pp. 154-55).

There were also bad results. Monasticism degenerated. It lost its early fervor, lofty aims, and strict discipline. The growing wealth of the monasteries led to lax discipline, luxury, idleness, and open immorality. In some cases, monks destroyed pagan temples, harassed and even murdered pagans and heretics (Eerdmans', p. 208).

Originally, monasteries were supported by the labor of the occupants. Later, work ceased and they maintained revenues by constantly increasing property and by contributions extorted from families, rich and poor. Their real estate was exempt from taxation, which was eventually an unsupportable burden on society. Their excesses led to their extinction. By the opening of the Reformation, monasteries had fallen so low in the estimation of the people that they were universally suppressed and monks were compelled to work for their own support.

## Ecumenical Councils

As was pointed out in the discussion of the Imperial Church, there have been seven ecumenical (universal) councils. Four were held during the period of the Imperial Church and three were conducted during the period of the Divided Church. To review:

1. Council of Nicaea (325) affirmed the deity of Christ.
2. First Council of Constantinople (381) asserted the humanity of Christ and the deity of the Holy Spirit. It unequivocally affirmed the Trinity.
3. Council of Ephesus (431) acknowledged the unity of the personality of Christ.
4. Council of Chalcedon (451) stated the relationship between the two natures of Christ.
5. Second Council of Constantinople (553) dealt with the monophysite dispute.
6. Third Council of Constantinople (680) condemned the Monothelites.
7. Second Council of Nicaea (787) dealt with the image controversy.

For an explanation of the first four councils, see "Ecumenical Councils" in the previous period. Here is a brief explanation of the last three.

*Second Council of Constantinople (Natures of Christ)* This council sought to explain the Council of Chalcedon. They reinterpreted the decrees of Chalcedon from an Alexandrian point of view, attempting to explain how the two natures of Christ unite to form a single person (Ware, p. 37).

*Third Council of Constantinople (Wills of Christ)* The Monothelites argued that although Christ had two natures, since He is a single person, He has only one will. The Sixth Ecumenical Council, also held at Constantinople, replied that if Christ had two natures, He must also have two wills. Since manhood without a human will would be incomplete, the Monothelites, like the Monophysites, impair the fullness of Christ's humanity. Since Christ is true man as well as true God, He must have a human will as well as a divine will (Ware, p. 37).

Cairns says disputes concerning the wills of Christ (Did He have both a divine and human will? If so, were they equal or was one subordinate to the other?) were settled with

the assertion that the two wills of Christ exist in Him in a harmonious unity in which the human will is subject to the divine will (Cairns, p. 136).

*Second Council Nicaea (Icons)* The Iconodules vigorously defended the use of icons in the church. The Iconoclasts (icon-smashers) were suspicious of any religious art which represented human beings or God. They demanded the destruction of icons. The issue was deeper than art. It involved the character of Christ's nature, the Christian attitude toward matter, and the meaning of redemption (Ware, p. 38).

The first phase of the iconoclast controversy opened in 726 when the Byzantine Emperor Leo III (717-741) began attacking icons. It ended in 780 when Empress Irene suspended the persecution. In 787, the Seventh Ecumenical Council met at Nicaea and upheld the use of icons. The Council declared, "To those who reject the Councils of the Holy Fathers and their traditions which are agreeable to divine revelation, and which the Orthodox Catholic Church piously maintains, anathema! Anathema! Anathema!" (Ware, p. 39).

The second phase of the iconoclast controversy was started by Leo VI in 815 and continued to 843 when icons were reinstated, this time permanently by Empress Theodora. The final victory of holy images was in 843 and is known as "the Triumph of Orthodoxy." It is commemorated on "Orthodox Sunday," the first Sunday of Lent (Ware, p. 39).

It should be pointed out that Orthodox churches' dogma is based on the ecumenical councils from the First Council of Nicaea (325) to the Second Council of Nicaea in 787. Roman Catholic dogma embraces the initial five Ecumenical Councils as well as the findings of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), Vatican I (1869), and Vatican II (1962-1965). Lutheran theology embraces the historic ecumenical creeds as well as the Augsburg Confession (1530) and several other Lutheran symbols, such as the Formula of Concord (1560). Reformed theology is enormous, embracing the ecumenical creeds and numerous other creeds (for example, the Helvetic Confessions, the Belgic Confession, the findings of the Synod of Dort, the Westminster Confession, and the Savoy Confession) and catechisms such as the Heidelberg Catechism. The Free Church traditions (such as the Baptists) prefer not to speak of dogma, although they have developed doctrinal statements (Hannah, pp. 21-22).

## **The Development of the Papacy**

(For a more detailed discussion of this subject, see G. Michael Cocoris, *Roman Catholicism*.)

*Peter* Roman Catholicism claims that Peter was the first pope and that from Peter to the present, there has been an unbroken line of succession of popes. They base their claim on Jesus' words to Peter in Matthew 16:18, "And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock, I will build My church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." They argue that the word "Peter" means "rock" and Jesus said He was going to build His church on the rock. Therefore, the church is built on Peter.

The problem with that interpretation is there are two different Greek words for rock. The one that is translated "Peter" refers to a small stone. When Jesus said He would build His church on a rock, He did not use the Greek word that is translated "Peter" (small stone). Instead, He uses another Greek word which refers to a massive boulder (it is the word Jesus uses in Matthew 7:12 when He says, "The wise man built his house on a rock"). Also, in

the Greek text, Peter (stone) is masculine and rock (boulder) is feminine. Therefore, the rock on which Jesus built the church is not Peter. The rock is the truth which Peter had just articulated, namely, Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of the living God. The rock is not Peter's person; it is Peter's confession.

*Apostolic Succession* Roman Catholicism also claims that there was an unbroken line of succession of popes from Peter to the present. Early church history does not support such a claim. It was not until the latter part of the second century that the idea of a line of succession from the apostles was proposed and when it was, it had nothing to do with apostolic *authority*. The point was that there was a succession of *bishops* in Rome who preached the apostolic *message*.

Irenaeus (ca. 185) says the apostles gave the office of *bishop* to Linus and after him came Anacletus and Clement. He goes on to say that Clement was succeeded by Evaristus, Alexander, Sixtus, Telephorus, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Sorer and Eleutherius (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3. 3. 3). His point was not that these men *had apostolic authority*, but that they handed down the *message* of the apostles (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.*, 3. 3. 3). He says, "By this succession, the *ecclesiastical tradition from the apostles*, and the *preaching of the truth*, have come down to us. And this is most abundant proof that there is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved in the church from the apostles until now, and handed down in truth" (Irenaeus, *Ag. Her.* 3. 3. 3, italics added). Tertullian (ca. 200) "stoutly maintained that only those churches were valid which *agreed in the teaching* that those that had been founded by the apostles and where *the faith that been kept pure by a succession of Bishops* going back to the apostles" (Latourette, p. 132, italics added).

In other words, these earlier authors were not saying that there was a succession of popes (no such thing as a pope existed at the time) with apostolic authority. They were claiming that there was a line of succession of *bishops* (not "popes") in Rome who had preached the truth and that the true churches were those that agreed with that *teaching of the apostles*.

By the way, the accuracy of their list of bishops has been questioned. One author says the "succession-lists of bishops were seriously unreliable" (*Eerdmans'* p. 119). Boettner says it is simply not true that a list of the bishops of Rome can be drawn up with certainty. He points out that little or nothing is known about the first ten men on the so-called list of popes and of the next ten, only one is a clearly defined figure in history. He states, "The fact of the matter is that the historical record is so incomplete that the existence of an unbroken succession from the apostles to the present can neither be proved nor disproved." He adds. "There is not a scholar anywhere who pretends to show any decree, canon, or resolution by any of the ecumenical councils which attempt to give pre-eminence to any one church. *The first six hundred years of the Christian era know nothing of any spiritual supremacy on the part of the bishops of Rome*" (Boettner, p. 126, italics his).

If the papacy is not based on Matthew 16 and there was no unbroken line of popes, where did the office of pope originate? The notion of a pope evolved over hundreds of years. To trace the development of the papacy, let's start with the New Testament itself.

*The Establishment of Elders (bishops)* In the New Testament, each local church had bishops (plural) and deacons (Phil. 1:1). Another name for a bishop was elder (Titus 1:5, 7). Therefore, in the New Testament, "bishop" and "elder" were two different names for the same position. An elder (bishop) was one among equals *within a local church*. One elder was a leader (1 Pet. 5:1; Timothy; Titus), but the leader was not a dictator (3 Jn. 9).

The bishop was not over the elders; the bishop was one of the elders. Note carefully: in the New Testament, *each church had a plurality of elders who exercised oversight over their local church.*

Shortly after the last book of the New Testament was written (Revelation in the year 95), Clement in Rome wrote to the church at Corinth (97). That letter indicates that the church at Corinth had elders. This plurality of elders in each congregation is also mentioned in the Didache (ca. 80-90) and by Polycarp (110).

*The Elevation of Bishops* Sometime later, the organization and governance of the church changed slightly. Ignatius (116) indicates that a bishop (singular) was *over* a single church with elders and deacons under his authority. In other words, instead of elder and bishop referring to the same position, those two words now referred to two different positions. At this point, *the bishop was from within the church and he was over that church.* The structure was something similar to a church today, where there is a pastor over deacons.

About 185, heretics claimed that the apostles had conveyed what Christ taught intermingled with extraneous ideas. Irenaeus insisted that the apostles accurately transmitted what they had been taught by Christ. He also claimed that the apostles had appointed bishops as successors to whom they had committed the churches and had, thereby, undoubtedly passed on what had been entrusted to them by Christ. These bishops had, in turn, been followed by others in an unbroken line, thus guaranteeing the apostolic teaching. Furthermore, he hints that if he had the space, he could give lists of all the bishops of all the churches, but he only singles out the church in Rome, which he says was founded and organized by Peter and Paul (Latourette, p.131). Irenaeus was talking about apostolic succession, but this is the succession of the *apostolic message*, not the *apostolic authority*.

Thus, early in the second century, the office of bishop was elevated over elders *in each local church* (at least in the writings of Ignatius). By the end of the second century, the office of bishop rose to prominence because of the need to maintain the purity of doctrine and unity. At first, all bishops were equal and all were in line of the apostolic succession of bishops from Christ and the apostles (Cairns, p. 116).

*The Election of Archbishops* During the early part of the third century, the bishops in a Roman province met in *local* councils. No doubt, one bishop presided over the meeting of the bishops. Somewhere along the line, the bishops of several Roman provinces got together in a *regional* meeting. They tended to meet in the major metropolitan cities of the Roman Empire. The chief bishops of these metropolitan cities were called metropolitans. The metropolitan bishops were also called archbishops (Latourette, p. 185; see also Kuiper, who says that in the time of Charlemagne, metropolitan bishops were customarily called archbishops, pp. 75- 76). These archbishops came to be looked upon as of higher rank than the bishops of smaller churches (Kuiper, p. 39). They had the preeminence (Latourette, p. 524).

“Even today, people are inclined to think that the man who holds the pastorate in a prominent city church is perhaps, because of his position, just a little more important than his fellow ministers in the country” (Kuiper, p. 76).

As a result of the organization of the Roman Empire arranged by the Roman Emperor Diocletian (244-311), Alexandria and Antioch were chief cities in the East. So the Bishop of Alexandria became the chief bishop of all the bishops in Egypt. The Bishop of Antioch became the chief bishop of the rest of the bishops in the East (Syria, Asia Minor, and



Greece). The Bishop of Rome was the chief bishop of the West. At this point, there were three archbishops: Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. Those bishops had the most prestige.

*The Emphasis on the Bishop of Rome* In his book *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus (ca. 185) said that every church must agree with the church in Rome (Kuiper, p. 41), because it taught what the apostles taught. He did not teach succession of *apostolic authority*.

Cyprian (ca. 255), bishop of Carthage, emphasized the bishop as the center of unity and a guarantee against a schism. He gave the earliest formation of the doctrines of apostolic succession and the primacy of *honor* (not authority) for the Roman bishop (Cairns, p. 113), but he believed all bishops were equal (Eerdmans', p. 83). He insisted that no bishop should "set himself up as a bishop of bishops" (Latourette, pp. 183-84). The bishop of Rome deserved special honor because he was in the line of succession from Peter (Cairns, p. 116), but no one bishop had *administrative authority* over any other bishop.

Noble, the University of Notre Dame professor of history, distinguishes between Peter the person, the Petrine idea, and the institution of the papacy. He concedes that the traditions concerning Peter the person cannot be proven (but then he adds that they cannot be disproven either). The Petrine idea is the notion that there is a Petrine office (Noble, p. 1). Noble says Stephen I (254-57) insisted that he held the "chair of Peter" in succession to Peter. "This assertion inaugurated the idea that each pope is Peter's successor" (Noble, p. 9).

Stephen I and Cyprian lived at the same time. Therefore it is safe to say that in the middle of the third century, there was a notion that the bishop of Rome was the successor to Peter, but that is vastly different from the institution of the papacy. It is one thing to say that even though the Bishop of Rome is one among equals, he is the successor to Peter (bishops in other localities where apostles had visited claimed that they were the successor to that apostle). It is another thing to say that the Bishop of Rome has *administrative authority* over the other bishops (an idea that developed much later). For example, Fabian, Bishop of Rome (236-50), "had little power or wealth" (Harl, p. 72). Remember, there is no evidence inside or outside of the New Testament that Peter held any "office" in Rome.

The city of Rome was a contributing factor in the rise of the papacy. It was the capital of the Roman Empire, which made it a place of utmost importance. Moreover, for Christians, a number of significant things happened in Rome that put the focus on it. Paul wrote his longest and most important book to the church in Rome. The earliest persecution of Christians by the Roman state occurred in Rome (64 AD). Both Peter and Paul were martyred there. After the close of the New Testament, the church at Rome wrote a letter to the church at Corinth, urging them to maintain unity (1 Clement).

In 325, the Council of Nicaea prioritized bishops. It decided that the three great centers were Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch (Canon VI), which were the three greatest cities in the Roman Empire. In addition, it declared that the see (jurisdiction) of Jerusalem would be given the next place in honor after the other three, but would be subject to the Metropolitan of Caesarea (Canon VII; Ware, p. 30).

In 330, Constantine made Constantinople the capital of the Roman Empire. The Council of Constantinople (381) altered the Sixth Canon of Nicaea. It made Constantinople second after Rome and above Alexandria. "The bishop of Constantinople shall have the prerogatives of honor after the bishop of Rome because Constantinople is the New Rome" (Canon III). Damascus (366-388) and later Gregory the Great (590-604), Bishops of Rome,

refused to confirm this canon. Nevertheless, Constantinople grew by favor of the emperor, whose centralizing policy found help in the authority of his court bishop.

The acceptance of equality among the bishops began to break down after 395 AD. In that year, the Roman Empire split into two separate empires, East and West. The Western Empire was ruled from Rome and the Eastern (Byzantine) Empire from Constantinople.

In 402 Innocent I, Bishop of Rome, made it a rule that no important decision could be made by the churches *in the West* without the knowledge and approval of the Bishop of Rome. The next Bishop of Rome, Zosimus, said that no one had the right to question a decision made by the Church of Rome.

*The Endorsement of Patriarchs* In 451, the Council of Chalcedon established Patriarchs, who exercised authority over a wider area than the metropolitans (Latourette, p. 524). Five sees (jurisdictions) were held in particular honor and an order of precedence was established among them. In order of rank, they were Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Between them, the five Patriarchs had jurisdiction over the known world, except for Cyprus, which was granted independence and has remained self-governing ever since. All five bishops shared equally in the apostolic succession (Ware, pp. 33-35).

Thus there were five patriarchs: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The Eastern Empire included the jurisdictions of four of the five Patriarchs of the Church. In the Western Empire, however, there was only one Patriarch, the bishop of Rome, who, therefore, became *de facto* head of the Church in the Western Empire.

*The Exaltation of Rome* Between 313 and 450, all bishops were equal “in rank, power, and function,” but with Leo I (440-61), a.k.a. Leo the Great, the Bishop of Rome, the Roman bishop began to claim supremacy over other bishops (Cairns, p. 157). In an edict issued in 445, Valentinian III, the Western Roman Emperor, recognized Leo’s spiritual supremacy in the West (Cairns, 159).

Leo I refused to admit the Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which gave Constantinople jurisdiction over Asia Minor and Thrace and gave it second place after Rome. He used Matthew 16:19 as a reference to Peter (Eerdmans’, p. 176) and in a letter to the Council of Chalcedon, he said, “Peter speaks through Leo.” Cook says Leo saw himself as Peter’s successor, but at this point, the claim was jurisdictional rather than doctrinal (Cook, p. 19).

In a theological controversy involving Diosurus, the Bishop of Alexandria, and Flavian, the Bishop of Constantinople, Leo wrote a long letter known as the *Tome*, supporting Flavian’s view of the human and the divine nature of Christ. Leo set forth the view which had been clearly stated by Tertullian and was generally held in the West that in Jesus Christ there was neither manhood without true Godhead nor the Godhead without true manhood, that in Him two full and complete natures came together in one person, “without distracting from the properties of either nature and substance” (Latourette, p. 171). In 449, at the Council of Ephesus, Dioscorus refused to let the *Tome* be read, deposed Flavian, excommunicated Leo, and appointed an Alexandrian priest in his stead. In 451, however, at the Council of Chalcedon, Leo’s *Tome* was approved and a creed was adopted that incorporated its views (Latourette, p. 171).

Leo I was not only a Bishop of Rome, he also got involved in politics. In 452, he persuaded Attila the Hun to turn back from attacking Rome. In 455, when Gaiseric and his Vandals (a Germanic tribe) came to sack Rome, Leo persuaded them to save the city from

fire and pillage, but he had to agree to allow the city to be sacked by the Vandals for two weeks. The Romans credited Leo with saving their city from complete destruction (Cairns, p. 159). This was the beginning of the bishop of Rome acting as a civil ruler (Eerdmans', p. 176).

Many non-Catholic historians call Leo the Great the first "pope" in the modern sense of the term (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 87), but as González points out, in the theological controversies of the time, Leo's opinion was not generally accepted simply because he was the Bishop of Rome. "It took a politically propitious moment for his views to prevail. Since those controversies took place mostly in the East, Leo's intervention, although significant, was powerless in the face of the imperial opposition and was accepted only when those in power agreed to it" (González, p. 243). González goes on to say that Leo was able to exercise authority in the city of Rome due to his personal gifts and the political situation of the time when civil authorities proved incapable of performing their duties, but Leo was convinced that Jesus made Peter and his successors the rock on which the church was to be built and, therefore, the Bishop of Rome was Peter's direct successor and head of the church. Leo's writings contain all the traditional arguments that would be repeatedly mustered in favor of papal authority (González, p. 243). Cairns says, "Even if we do not consider Leo the first pope, it is fair to say that he made the claims and exercised the power of many later incumbents of the Roman bishopric." If Leo I was the first Pope (see below for the fact that he was not), a pope was excommunicated!

In 494, Gelasius I (492 to 496) wrote that God gave both sacred and royal power to the pope and the king. Because the pope had to account to God for the king at the judgment, the sacred power of the pope was more important than the royal power. Hence, rulers should submit to the pope. "Perhaps such power was useful in this early period in dealing with the barbarians, but later it led to corruption within the Roman Church itself" (Cairns, p. 159). Cook says the distinction between papal authority and imperial power was later used to justify papal assertions of the leadership of the Christian world (Cook, p. 19).

In 519, the Acacian Schism (484-519), a schism between the East and West over the doctrine of Monophysitism (Christ had only one nature, a divine nature) was settled. As part of the settlement, 2500 Eastern bishops signed the Formula of Hormisdas. Among other things, it said, "I consider the holy churches of God, that of Old Rome and of New Rome (Constantinople), as one and the same church, the see (jurisdiction) of Peter the Apostle and the episcopal see of Constantinople as one and the same see.... I agree with the pope's profession of doctrine and censure all whom he censures" (Noble, p. 14).

By 590, the idea that Peter had been given "ecclesiastical primogeniture" over the other apostles and that his superior position was passed on from him to his successors, the Bishops of Rome, was generally accepted (Cairns, 158). The Bishop of Jerusalem lost significance after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 135 AD. The Bishop of Ephesus lost prestige when Asia was torn by the Montanist schism.

*The Establishment of the Papacy* So, who was the first pope? The word "pope" is not found in the Bible. It comes from the Latin *papa*, meaning "father." Even though Jesus forbade His followers to call any man "father" in a spiritual sense (Mt. 23:9), for centuries, the term was used of all priests and in the Eastern churches, it is used of the priest to this day (Boettner, p. 125). The term came to be used of bishops as a title of honor. As one of the bishops, the Bishop of Rome was called the pope "nearly 200 years before the title was limited to his office" (Chamberlin, p. 14).

Eventually, it came to be used exclusively of the Bishop of Rome as the universal bishop. In that sense, it “was first given to Gregory I by the emperor Phocas, in the year 604. This he did to spite the Bishop of Constantinople, who had excommunicated him for having caused the assassination of his predecessor, emperor Mauritius. Gregory, however, refused the title, but his second successor, Boniface III (607), assumed the title, and it has been the designation of the Bishops of Rome ever since” (Boettner, p. 125).

The title “pontiff” comes from two Latin words (*pons*, bridge and *facere*, to make) and means “bridge builder.” In pagan Rome, the emperor was the high priest of the religion. He was the bridge or connecting link between this life and the next. Four Caesars before Constantine used the title “Pontifex Maximus” (greatest bridge maker) to describe themselves as the head of all pagan religions. Damascus, Bishop of Rome (366-83), adopted the name to himself (378). Cook, who is a Roman Catholic and professor of history at the State University of New York at Geneseo, says bishops “took up the trappings of pagan Rome, such as the bishop of Rome’s use of the title Pontifex Maximus” (Cook, p. 17).

Boettner says the papacy began with Gregory I in 590. Boettner quotes two church historians, a Protestant and a Roman Catholic. Professor A. M. Renwick of the Free Church College in Edinburgh, Scotland, says, “His brilliant role set a standard for those who came after him and he is really the first ‘pope’ who can, with perfect accuracy, be given the title. Along with Leo I (440-461), Gregory VII (1073-1085), and Innocent III (1198-1216), he stands out as one of the chief architects of the papal system” (Renwick, *The Story of the Church*, p. 64). Philip Hughes, a Roman Catholic scholar, says, “In a very real sense, he (Gregory I) is the founder of the papal monarchy” (Hughes, *A Popular History of the Catholic Church*, 1947, p. 75).

To summarize: The idea of a pope evolved. At first, there were elders. Then there were bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, and finally, a pope.

Here is a summary of the evolution of the papacy.

- In the 1<sup>st</sup> century (in the New Testament), each church had a plurality of elders (a.k.a. bishops).
- In the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, a bishop from within a church was elevated over the elders in that church.
- In the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, an archbishop presided over the meeting of bishops in a region.
- About 255, the earliest formation of the doctrines of apostolic succession and the primacy of *honor* for the Bishop of Rome appeared.
- In 325, the Council of Nicaea prioritized the bishops giving the greatest honor to Rome, followed by Alexandria and Antioch, which were the three greatest cities of the Roman Empire.
- In 451, the Council of Chalcedon established patriarchs who exercised authority over a wider area than archbishops. Five jurisdictions were held in particular honor (Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem). All five bishops shared equally in the apostolic succession. The Bishop of Rome was the first among equals.
- Leo I, Bishop of Rome (440-61) refused to admit the Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which gave Constantinople jurisdiction over Asia Minor and Thrace and second place after Rome. In a letter to the Council of Chalcedon (451), he said,

“Peter speaks through Leo.” He saw himself as Peter’s successor and referred to Matthew 16:19. Leo’s opinion, however, was not generally accepted simply because he was the Bishop of Rome. In fact the Council of Ephesus (449) excommunicated him!

- After 590, the idea that Peter was over the other apostles and that his superior position was passed on to his successors, the Bishop of Rome, was generally accepted.
- At first, the word “Pope” (Latin: “father”) was applied to all bishops as a title of honor. In 604, the Roman Emperor Phocas gave Gregory I, Bishop of Rome, the title of Pope as the universal bishop. Gregory refused the title.
- In 607, Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, assumed the title of pope and it has been the designation of the Bishop of Rome ever since.

Although Leo I (ca. 450) has been called the first pope, Gregory I (604) is generally regarded as the first pope.

*The Expansion of the Power of the Papacy* The real growth of papal power took place during the Middle Ages. The pope became not only the “universal bishop” or head of the church, but also ruler over the nations, above kings and emperors. The culmination of papal power was between 1073 and 1216 (a period of about 150 years), when the papacy stood in well-nigh-absolute power not only over the church, but over the nations of Europe.

## **Roman Catholicism**

When did Roman Catholicism begin? The answer to that question depends on the *definition* of Roman Catholicism. Roman Catholicism teaches that there are seven sacraments, one of which is transubstantiation, but so do the Orthodox Churches. What distinguishes Roman Catholicism from all other churches is the *Roman* papacy (there is a church in Egypt that also has a pope). Therefore, by definition *Roman Catholicism is a church headed by the pope in Rome.*

Roman Catholicism claims that Peter was the first pope and, therefore, Roman Catholicism began with Peter, but as we have seen, Peter was not the first Pope. Gregory I was the first pope (see above: “The Development of the Papacy”). Therefore, Roman Catholicism began with Gregory I in 604.

Gregory was not only the first Bishop of Rome to be given the title of pope in the sense of universal bishop, but he was also a prolific writer whose works were very influential throughout the Middle Ages and in Roman Catholicism. He was a disciple of Augustine, but he did not follow Augustine exactly. He did not accept Augustine’s doctrine of predestination and irresistible grace. He was more concerned with the question of how people are to offer satisfaction to God for their sins. He thought this was done through penance, which consists of contrition, confession, and the actual punishment or satisfaction for sin. To that must be added the absolution of the priest, which confirms that God has granted forgiveness. Those who die in faith and in communion with the church but without offering satisfaction for their sins go to purgatory. The living can help the dead out of purgatory by offering Masses in their favor. Gregory believed that in the Mass, Christ was

crucified anew, a notion which eventually became established dogma in Roman Catholicism (Gregory, I, p, 247).

What follows is a brief history of Roman Catholicism from its beginning in the Middle Ages to the Reformation.

*Papal Growth* During the Middle Ages, Roman Catholicism became enormously powerful—politically—in Europe. Constantine set the stage when he moved the capital of the Roman Empire to Constantinople, leaving a power vacuum in Rome. When he left Rome, he gave the Lateran Palace to the Bishop of Rome. After 476, there was no Emperor in the West. As a result, there was no Roman administration to provide justice, defense, and other government services. Frequently, the local bishop provided some of these services (Cook, p. 26). In the process, as people gave money and land to the church, it began to accumulate wealth (Cook, p. 27). Since kings were interested in who controlled the land, which in the case of the church was bishops and abbots of monasteries, they used their power and influence and even made appointments to these offices. “The accumulation of wealth and power primarily came out of a power vacuum left by the end of the Roman Empire” (Cook, p. 27).

*The Papal States* A relationship between the Frankish kings and popes changed the Roman church forever (Cook, p. 40). In 755, threatened with an attack from the Lombards, a group of barbarians, Pope Steven III (752-57) crossed the Alps in the middle of the winter to appeal to Pepin (ca. 714-768), King of the Franks, for help. He did not just ask for protection; he asked for land.

The pope showed Pepin the *Donation of Constantine*, a document that declared that Constantine had given the land to the pope (Chamberlin, p. 15). The *Donation of Constantine* was later proven to be a forgery. It was written in the Latin of the eighth century. The quotations from Scripture were from the Vulgate Bible, which was not translated until 400. It contained a letter supposedly written by Victor, Bishop of Rome in 200, to Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, who lived in 400 AD.

Pepin accepted *The Donation of Constantine* at face value, waged two campaigns against the Lombards, and made a treaty that gave the pope the territory he requested. As a result, the Papal States were created (Chamberlin, p. 17), which lasted until 1929.

That changed everything. “The chair of St. Peter became a prize of the greatest families of Rome and its neighborhood, creating a more insidious danger of the papacy than that which the Byzantines and the Lombards had threatened ... Now that the bishop of Rome held not only the keys of heaven but also the keys of more than a score of cities, each with its revenues, the attraction of the office was considerably magnified” (Chamberlin, p. 17).

*Papal Power* In 799, a rival faction drove Pope Leo III out of Rome. When Leo appealed to the Frankish king Charlemagne (Pepin’s son), Charlemagne reinstated Leo in Rome. On Christmas Day, 800, Leo placed the crown on Charlemagne’s head, naming him “emperor” (Cook, p. 40). For the first time since the Roman Empire, most of Western Europe was united.

Cook sums it up: In the fourth century, the church became involved with secular authority (remember Constantine). After the collapse of the Roman Empire in the West, bishops found themselves with secular power. The church became wealthy, especially in landholdings. “Secular rulers needed some control over the administration of the church’s wealth—meaning they needed to influence or even control the selection of bishops and abbots. In the 8<sup>th</sup> century, the Pope became the secular ruler of the Papal States and the

papal office became embroiled in local, political quarrels” (Cook, p. 49). At times, the papal office devolved into “a plaything of local nobility” (Cook, p. 49). With its wealth and power, the papacy became a prize for Roman noble families. “Monasteries and bishoprics often fell into the hands of men from the ranks of warriors” (Cook, p. 42).

The culmination of papal power was between 1073 and 1216 (about 150 years), when the papacy held virtually absolute power not only over the church but over the nations of Europe.

Gregory VII (1073-1085), better known as Hildebrand, ruled at the zenith of papal power. Cook calls him one of the most important popes in the history of the church (Cook, p. 51). He reformed the clergy by (temporarily) ending simony (the purchase of church offices), lifting the standards of morals, and compelling the celibacy of the priesthood. He freed the church from the domination of the state by putting an end to the nomination of popes and bishops by kings and emperors and by requiring all accusations against priests or involving the church to be tried in ecclesiastical courts. He made the church supreme over the state.

When the Emperor, Henry IV, summoned a synod of German bishops and compelled them to depose the pope, Gregory retaliated with excommunication and absolved all the subjects of Henry IV from their allegiance. Henry was powerless under the papal ban. In January of 1077, the Emperor stood for three days with bare feet before the pope’s castle in Northern Italy to make his submission and receive absolution. He got it, but no sooner did Henry regain power than he made war on the pope and drove him out of Rome. Hildebrand died soon after in exile.

Innocent III (1198-1216) declared in his inaugural discourse, “The successor of St. Peter stands midway between God and man; below God, above man; judge of all, judged of none.” In one of his official letters, he wrote that to the pope “has been committed not only the whole church but the whole world,” with “the right of finally disposing of the imperial and all other crowns.” Innocent III chose Otto of Brunswick to be the emperor. Brunswick publicly acknowledged that he wore the crown “by the grace of God and the apostolic see.” Later Innocent III deposed Otto for his insubordination!

Innocent III assumed the government of the city of Rome, making rules for its officers, with himself as their supreme lord; thus, in effect, establishing a state under direct papal government. He compelled Philip Augustus, the king of France, to take back his wife, whom he had divorced. He excommunicated King John of England, compelled him to surrender his crown to the papal legate, and to receive it again as the pope’s subject. In the exercise of autocratic power, Innocent III is regarded as the greatest pope.

In 1215, Innocent III convened the Fourth Lateran Council. Among other things, this council defined the Eucharist in terms of transubstantiation, made annual confession and reception of the Eucharist mandatory for all Catholics, and imposed restrictions on the Jews (Cook, p. 58).

Boniface VIII (1294-1303) had a conflict with Philip IV of France over taxing the clergy and putting a bishop on trial. In the process, Boniface uttered what has been called one of the most famous papal pronouncements of the Middle Ages, the *Unam Sanctam*, which declared that every human being was subject to the pope (Cook, p. 59).

*Papal Exile* In 1309, a French Cardinal became Pope Clement V. When the French king, Philip IV, blocked Clement’s journey to Rome, Clement settled in Avignon, France. As a result, between 1309 and 1377, the popes resided in Avignon. This period has been

called the “Babylonian Captivity of the Church.” Since, by definition, the pope is the Bishop of Rome, the relocation made him an absentee bishop (Cook, p. 77). The papacy was in exile!

*Papal Schism* In 1377, Pope Gregory XI returned to Rome and soon thereafter died. A Roman crowd demanded a Roman pope, or at least an Italian pope. The cardinals, almost all of whom were French, elected an Italian bishop, Urban VI. When Urban, who did not always seem to be “well-balanced,” did not treat the cardinals as they thought they should be treated, they left Rome and announced that the election of Urban was invalid because it was done under threat from the Roman crowd. They then elected a French cardinal, Clement VII, and headed back to Avignon. Now there were two popes (Cook, p. 78). In 1408, both sides agreed to convene a council in Pisa to resolve the situation by electing a new pope. They did. So now there were three popes. “For decades, two and, sometimes, three men each claimed to be the legitimate pope” (Noble, p. 51; see Noble pp. 52-55 for details; for example, in 1409, the council declared Benedict XIII and Gregory XII excommunicated as heretics). This has been called the “Great Schism.”

More recently, when Pope Benedict XVI resigned and Pope Francis was elected to replace him, there were two popes for the first time in hundreds of years. Speaking to reporters, Pope Francis joked, “The last time there were two or three popes, they didn’t talk among themselves and they fought over who was the true Pope!” (*Los Angeles Times*, August 22, 2013, p. A3).

In 1414, John XXIII (pope #3) convened a council in Constance, Germany. When John realized the council did not favor him, he fled. Eventually, the council deposed all three claimants and with the election of Martin V, the Great Schism came to a close. The Council of Constance also declared that councils are superior to popes in matters of faith, morals, and schisms, condemned the reformer Jan Hus to death for heresy, and decreed that councils should become a regular part of the governments of the church, meeting once per decade (Cook, p. 79).

In 1431, the Council at Basel stated the existence of purgatory and the dogma of seven sacraments. In 1460, Pius II decreed that it was execrable (“extremely bad;” his word) to believe that papal decisions could be appealed to a council (Cook, pp. 79-80).

*Papal Corruption* “During the period of history known as the Middle Ages, many of the popes were guilty of nearly every crime in the category of sin. Twenty-nine of those who held the office at one time or another are now said to have obtained it by fraud or otherwise to have been unfit for it and are now listed as ‘anti-popes’” (Boettner, p. 251).

Stephen VII (896-97) had the corpse of his predecessor (Formosus) exhumed, dressed in a papal robe, propped up in the throne he had occupied in life, condemned, stripped of his papal robe, and had the three fingers of benediction on the right hand hacked off. The corpse was then hurled to a yelling mob in the streets, who threw it into the Tiber River. A group of fishermen retrieved it and gave it a decent burial. The corpse of Formosus was degraded to put down his faction and render it powerless (Chamberlin, p. 20). Six centuries later, Cardinal Baronius, the first of the great papal historians, concluded that such a monster had been unleashed against the church to show the supernatural strength of its foundation (Chamberlin, p. 21).

Sergius (904-11) had a mistress, who shortly after puberty had a son by him! The son became Pope John XI (931-35). He was not much more than twenty years old when he became pope (Chamberlin, p. 25).



John XII (955-63) established the custom of a papal name. He was in a Roman prince who, when he became pope, combined his political and spiritual offices and took the papal name John XII. "It was an expression of his dual role, for he employed the name Octavian in his capacity of prince and the name John in that of pope" (Chamberlin, p. 42). He was charged with turning "the Lateran (palace) into a brothel; that he and his gang violated female pilgrims in the very basilica of St. Peter; that the offerings of the humble laid upon the altar were snatched up as casual booty. He was inordinately fond of gambling, at which he involved the names of those discredited gods now universally regarded as demons. His sexual hunger was insatiable—a minor crime in Roman eyes" (Chamberlin, pp. 43-44). When Otto of Saxony became king in Germany, remembering Charlemagne's coronation, he wanted the Bishop of Rome (John XII) to crown him lord of Europe (Charlemagne p. 46). On February 2, 961, he was crowned by John XII and the Holy Roman Empire came into being, tying Italy and Germany together in a marriage that would continue for 900 years (Chamberlin, p. 49).

After John XII crowned Otto, Otto marched into Rome and John fled Rome. Otto summoned a synod to consider the situation. The charges brought against John XII were such things as: he had been paid to ordain bishops and he had "copulated with Rainer's widow, with Stephana, his father's concubine, with the widow Anna, and with his own niece" (Liudprand, *Deeds of Otto*, chapter X, cited by Chamberlin, p. 56). The synod formally deposed John XII and elected Leo VIII. As soon as Otto left Rome, John returned to Rome, where he summoned a synod. He then punished those who had made specific accusations against him. "One had his tongue torn out, his nose and fingers cut off; another was scourged; the hand of a third was hacked off. Loyalty being thereby reinforced with terror, John sent about overturning the decrees of the synod. Louis VIII, who had fled to Otto as soon as John returned, was excommunicated" (Chamberlin, p. 60). As Otto was still marching back to Rome, news came that John had been violently killed by a political assassin.

Benedict IX (1032-46) was elected Pope—at the age of fourteen (Chamberlin, p. 66; the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says he was 20). The *Catholic Encyclopedia* says that Benedict IX was "a disgrace to the chair of Peter." Chamberlin says that under Benedict IX, "It seemed that John XII was again in the chair (of Peter), with rape and murder again a commonplace, the remaining wealth of the papacy again squandered in brothel and banquet room (sic) and the upkeep of private armies" (Chamberlin, p. 70).

Once when Benedict was absent from Rome, another baron-prelate appeared as pope: John, Bishop of Sabine Hills. He took the name Sylvester, rule for three months, and fled when Benedict was returning to the city (Chamberlin, p. 70).

Benedict IX wanted to get married, but the girl's father insisted that Benedict could have his daughter only if he resigned from the papacy. Benedict was prepared to do that, but he was not prepared to forgo the loss of income. To solve the problem, he sold the papacy itself to his grandfather Giovanni Gratiano for 1500 pounds of gold (Chamberlin, p. 71). Gratiano took the papal name Gregory IX. "Three months after Giovanni Gratiano had purchased the papacy, three popes ruled in Rome, each powerless to eject the others, each claiming the unique possession of the keys of heaven" (Chamberlin, p. 73).

Boniface VIII (1294-1303) had his predecessor imprisoned. In 1292, the cardinals elected a hermit pope (Celestine). Under the guidance of Benedict Gaetani, Celestine abdicated the papacy. The conclave elected Benedict Gaetani pope; he took the name

Boniface VIII (Chamberlin, pp. 77-86). Boniface gave orders that Celestine, an old man, be arrested and imprisoned. Boniface practiced simony (the buying and selling of a religious office) and nepotism. He had a real love for family. “On the news of the death of his brother and his nephew, he burst into bitter and indiscreet lamentations, cursing the God who had brought these things on him” (Chamberlin, p. 95). Boniface was a ruthless, cruel man. One of his contemporaries said he “reigned most cruelly and fomented warfare,” Another said Boniface was “haughty, proud, violent” (Chamberlin, p. 108). The author Dante hated Boniface. In his *Divine Comedy*, he dragged Boniface through hell, purgatory, and paradise to be condemned before Peter.

Concerning sexual immorality, Boniface said there is no more to going to bed with women and boys than rubbing one hand against another. Concerning immortality, he said a man had as much hope of survival after death as a roasted fowl on the dining table. Chamberlin says it is difficult to assess his beliefs, but these clever remarks show an indifference, or even skepticism, to the religion he professed. “The God that the world saw him worship was the God of power” (Chamberlin, p. 111).

Urban VI (1378-89) was said to be a raging tyrant—by his own secretary (Chamberlin, p. 140)! His first address to the cardinals was abusive. He yelled at one to shut up, called another a liar, another a fool, and described another as a bandit (Chamberlin, p. 142). His behavior grew steadily worse, culminating in a physical attack on a cardinal (Chamberlin, p. 143). At one point, he had six of the cardinals arrested and, after three days of “examination,” gave orders that they be “put to the question,” in other words, tortured (Chamberlin, pp. 150-154). Another cardinal excited Urban’s suspicions so that the cardinal was “murdered on the spot in the sight of his horrified companions, his body was dumped casually by the roadside, and the party moved on” (Chamberlin, p. 154).

Pope Innocent VIII (1484-92) even had his gender questioned! The accusation was quashed by the vicious satire: “Why do you seek witnesses to prove whether Cibo (Innocent VIII) is a man or woman? Look at the number of his children—surely proof. Justly may Rome call this man ‘Father.’” Innocent VIII was the first pope to openly acknowledge his illegitimate children. He also loaded them with riches (Chamberlin, pp. 167-68).

Rodrigo Borgia, who became Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503), was immoral before he became a Pope. When he was a cardinal, the pope wrote Borgia a letter in which he accused him of being at a six-day party where “the most licentious dances were indulged in, none of the allurements of love were lacking, and you conducted yourself in a wholly worldly manner. Shame forbids the mention of all that took place—not only the acts themselves, but their very names are unworthy of your position. In order that you might be given free rein, the husbands, fathers, brothers, and kinsman of the young women were not admitted.... All Siena is talking about this orgy.... Our displeasure is beyond words.... A cardinal should be beyond reproach” (Chamberlin, p. 161). Also, before he was pope, Alexander was said to be the second richest man in the College of Cardinals, a group that included the richest men in Europe. He got richer by issuing pardons. “When someone protested at his wholesale distribution of pardons for the most hideous crimes, one of which included the murder of a daughter by the father, he retorted easily, ‘It is not God’s wish that a sinner should die, but that he should live—and pay’” (Chamberlin, p. 167).

Alexander VI’s “election was the result of simony” (he bought the office! Chamberlin, p. 181; Boettner, p. 251). He once boasted that he had sacks of gold enough to fill the

Sistine Chapel. He obtained the vote of a cardinal, who was a hard bargainer, by offering him the lucrative office of vice-chancellor and a payment in cash as well, which was delivered on four mule-loads of bullion, gold according to some reports, silver according to others. "The college went through the motions of election, praying to the Holy Ghost for guidance ... and shortly after daybreak on the morning of August 11, the name of Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia was taken from the urn" (Chamberlin, pp. 170- 71).

Once Alexander was in office, his contemporaries began to picture him "as a man little removed from a monster." One scholar at the time (Francesco Guicciardini) said of him, "He was possessed by an insatiable greed, an overwhelming ambition, and a burning passion for the advancement of his many children" (Chamberlin, p. 173). Speaking of his children, when he was a young man, he began an affair with a woman named Giovanna dei Cattanei, nicknamed Vannozza, who bore him four children, including the infamous Lucrezia Borgia. (He had had at least three other children by other women before he met Vannozza!) He provided Vannozza with three successive husbands, each of whom gladly gave her his name in exchange for the comfortable living provided by her lover. In 1486, when she married her third and last husband, Alexander immediately broke off the relationship with her that had lasted for nearly a quarter of a century (Chamberlin, p. 174). In 1489, a beautiful young girl named Giulia, who was perhaps 16, married the son of Alexander's cousin and, about the same time was added to the lengthy score of Alexander's mistresses. Alexander was 40 years her senior. The wits of Rome called Giulia "Christ's bride." One of Alexander's first acts as pope was to make Giulia's brother a cardinal.

After one of Alexander's sons was murdered (the murderer was never discovered), he decided to reform the church. The proposed reforms included the condemnation of simony in all of its forms, the dismissal of all concubines within ten days, frugality among the cardinals, etc. The reforms were never carried out. Chamberlin remarks that had Alexander done some of these reforms, Martin Luther, a neurotic 14-year-old, would probably have lived and died a faithful Augustinian monk (Chamberlin, p. 190).

At one point, Alexander added nine new cardinals. Chamberlin remarks that most of them were men of doubtful reputation, but all paid handsomely for their office (Chamberlin, p. 199). Chamberlin also says that Alexander "could and did murder, but that was for political, not personal, reasons" (Chamberlin, p. 198).

In his book, *The History of the Popes*, Ludwig Pastor, the Roman Catholic historian, says that Alexander VI lived the immoral life of a secular prince of his day, both as a cardinal and as pope (Pastor, V, 363; VI, 140), that he obtained the papacy by the rankest simony (Pastor, V, 35), and that he brought the office into disrepute by his unconcealed nepotism and lack of moral sense (Pastor, VI, 139). When the Florentine friar Girolamo Savonarola urged that he be deposed, Alexander had him condemned as a heretic, hanged, and publicly burned in 1498 (Boettner, p. 251).

Leo X (1513-21) was made an abbot at age 8 and a cardinal at age 14 because of his father's influence with the pope. The pope, however, insisted that he wait at least three years before taking a place in the College of Cardinals (Chamberlin, p. 211). Gold purchased his positions (Chamberlin, p. 212).

Leo's love for classical scholarship was so strong that, in many ways, it seemed that he cherished it at the cost of Scripture, absorbing the skepticism of the humanists and their learning. When Cardinal Pietro Bembo quoted from the Gospels, Leo said, "How very profitable this fable of Christ has been to us through the ages" (Chamberlin, p. 223).

When Leo discovered a plot to kill him involving some of the cardinals, he had one cardinal arrested and tortured (Chamberlin, p. 236). He created 31 new cardinals. Each paid for the privilege.

Luther, who had visited Rome in 1511, later wrote, "I dashed like a madman between one church and another, believing all their filthy nonsense. I even read a dozen masses and was very sorry that my mother and father were still alive, for I would gladly have redeemed them from purgatory with these masses." He also wrote, "If there is a hell, then Rome is built upon it and this I heard at Rome itself. Tiberius, the heathen Emperor, even if he were a monster such as Suetonius writes of, is nevertheless an angel in comparison to the present court to Rome" (Chamberlin, pp. 245-46).

The corruption continued. On October 23, 2013, Pope Francis suspended Bishop Franz-Peter Tebarta-van Eist of Germany because of his lavish lifestyle. The renovation of his church-owned residence ran over budget to cover \$620,000 worth of artwork, \$1.1 million in landscaping, and last-minute design renovations. The total was \$42 million, all of which was billed to the Vatican and German taxpayers (in Germany, those who identify themselves as churchgoers on their tax form pay a tax to the state that is used to cover government-administered religious expenses; the German government collects more than \$6 billion a year for the Catholic Church). The European media dubbed him the "Bishop of Billing." This is not an isolated case. Matthew Schmaiz, a professor at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester Massachusetts said, "In many parts of Asia and Africa, Catholic bishops live lifestyles of great luxury while the laity live in poverty. Catholic bishops often have cars and drivers, air-conditioned homes, and servants" (Carol J. Williams. "Bishop in Germany known for living large is suspended." *Los Angeles Times*, October 24, 2013).

The contemporary pedophilia among American Catholic priests has been well-documented.

## The Rise of Islam

*The Explanation* The Eastern half of the Roman Empire was greatly affected by the rise of Islam. The name Islam means "submission," that is, obedience to the will of God. Followers of Islam are called Muslims. Their holy book is the Koran, a series of messages communicated to their prophet, Mohammed, through the angel Gabriel. They were collected after the death of Mohammed.

The five pillars of Islam are: 1) There is no God but Allah, and Muhammad is his messenger, 2) pray five times per day, 3) give to charity, 4) fast during the holy month of Ramadan, and 5) take a pilgrimage to Mecca

*The Establishment* Mohammed was born at Mecca in Arabia in 570. As a child, he was sickly, suffered from epilepsy, and was orphaned. His uncle took him into his home and took him on a business trip to Syria, where Mohammed was introduced to Jewish and Christian settlements, which made a deep impression upon him.

At age 25, he entered the service of Khadijah, a rich widow, and ran her husband's trading business. Soon Khadijah and Mohammed were married (she was 14 years older than he was). In the trading business, he became better acquainted with Judaism and Christianity and concluded a new religion was needed. He conceived the idea that he was

the messenger of God, who had to warn his people they would only escape condemnation by giving up their idols and turning to the one supreme God (Allah).

When he was 40 years old, Mohammed spent a month in solitude in a mountain cave near Mecca. He claimed that while he was there, he saw visions and received messages from heaven. He acknowledged that Moses and Jesus were prophets, but claimed he was the greatest prophet of all. He denied that Jesus was the Son of God, because God could not have a son. Mohammed also denied the virgin birth, the resurrection, and ascension of Christ.

Thus, in 610, at the age of 40, he began his career as a prophet. He attacked the idolatry of his people, but they ridiculed his ideas. In 622, because of persecution, he fled from Mecca to Medina. That is the year “one” in the Mohammedan calendar. Eight years later, having brought scattered Arabian tribes together under his authority, Mohammed conquered Mecca, destroying 360 idols on that day. At first, he relied on moral influences to spread his religion, but later, he changed his method to military conquest. To those who resisted, the alternatives were tribute or death. In 632, when he died, at the age of 63, leaving no sons and one daughter, he had become the accepted prophet and ruler throughout Arabia.

*The Expansion* Teaching that he was the last prophet and that he was sent with a sword, he taught that those who promulgate his faith were not to enter into arguments or discussions but slay all who refused to obey. He taught that prayer leads halfway to God, fasting leads to the gate of heaven, and alms open the door, but engaging in holy war gives actual entrance into heaven (Houghton, p. 36).

After Mohammed’s death, a vast empire was built by the sword. In 637, Caliph Omar conquered Jerusalem and built a mosque (later named the Mosque of Omar) on the site of the old Jewish Temple. Declaring that no books other than the Koran were needed, Omar also destroyed the library in Alexandria, Egypt, which contained the greatest literary treasures of the ancient world. Thousands of churches were destroyed or converted into mosques.

Within fifteen years of Mohammed’s death, his Arab followers had taken Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. Province after province of the Greco-Roman Empire was seized. Within fifty years, all that was left was the city of Constantinople and Mohammedans almost took it. All the lands of the earliest Christianity became subject to Islam. When Christians submitted, their worship was permitted under restrictions.

Within one hundred years of Mohammed’s death, Islam’s conquered territory extended eastward beyond Persia into India, westward as far as Egypt, and included all of northern Africa and the greater part of Spain. Their capital was at Bagdad on the Tigris.

Islam tore away province after province from the Greek emperors of Constantinople until its final extinction. It also brought the Eastern Church to subjection, almost to the point of slavery. The reason that was possible is that the Eastern church, unlike the Western, had long ceased missionary effort, had lost its energy, and was inclined to speculation, rather than moral or spiritual effort.

*The End* Islamic conquest in Western Europe ended in southern France by Charles Martel, who rallied the discordant tribes under the leadership of the Franks and won a decisive victory at Tours in 732. Had it not been for the Battle of Tours, all of Europe might have been Mohammedan and the crescent would have replaced the cross.

## Heresies

During this period of church history, a number of heretical churches existed. Westin observes, “The unifying element among all of these heretical groups that were opposed to the church during this period was the emphasis on the difference between the material and the spiritual world, a concept which had its roots in Gnostic dualism of the earlier centuries” (Westin, p. 25). What is interesting about all of these groups is their reaction to the “official” church at the time.

*Paulicians* In the seventh century, a man from Armenia named Constantine founded a group that came to be known as Paulicians. As the story goes, someone gave him a copy of the New Testament. From the Gospels and the epistles, he came to know about salvation in Christ, shared the good news with others, and formed a group of believers in 660. Regarding himself as the restore of pure Christianity, Constantine adopted the name Silvanus (a disciple of Paul). They flourished until 872.

Paulicians were accused of being Gnostics and quasi-Manichaeans. They taught that the evil God of the Old Testament created the world and the flesh, while the good God created the soul and the spirit. Christ was born of the good God; He passed to His mother’s body like water through a pipe, deriving nothing from her flesh. To them, both His birth and His death were unreal; He was a teacher (Latourette, p. 299).

Paulicians called themselves Christians, but their enemies gave them the name Paulicians. They accepted most of the New Testament, observed the Eucharist, and the *agape* (the Love Feast), but they rejected the honors paid to Mary, the invocation of the saints, icons, incense, candles, and all material symbols (Latourette, p. 300).

In a chapter entitled “Free Church Movements as Heresies,” Westin writes, “The characteristic of the Paulicians was stress on a holy life. They believed in separation from the normal Christian populace, who were satisfied with the ceremonies of the church as well as other religious forms. They had their own preachers and opposed the special consecration of ministers and the system of the church hierarchy. It has been stated that they even minimized the sacraments. From one point of view, this is correct, for they laid all their emphasis on the inner life and not on material things. They clarified this by saying that they worshipped God alone, not material things. They opposed the use of the symbol of the cross, church buildings, clerical vestments, and the celebration of the Mass” (Westin, p. 24).

*Cathari* In the 12<sup>th</sup> century, a group called Cathari (“pure”) flourished in northern Spain, southern France, and northern Italy. They were also found east of the Adriatic among the Slavs. Southern France was a particularly fertile area for such a group because of the unusual corruption of the Catholic Church. Clergy were luxury-loving, illiterate, profane priests, who compiled indecent books, permitted immodest songs to be sung in the church, tolerated simony (buying and selling sacred benefits), and clergy concubinage (Latourette, p. 453).

The Cathari believed that there were two eternal powers, one good and the other evil. The evil power created the visible world and the good power created the spiritual world. They rejected parts of the Old Testament, believing that they were the work of the devil. They held to the New Testament, especially the Gospel of John. Since they believed that flesh was evil, according to them, Christ could not have had a real body or died a real death. Therefore, they had no use for crosses or crucifixes. There were slight differences among

them, but all maintained that there were two churches, one good (theirs that was of Jesus Christ) and one bad (Rome) (Latourette, p. 454-55).

The Cathari believed that the forgiveness of sins and entrance into the kingdom of the good power was obtained by the “perfect.” Admission to the “perfect” was by a kind of spiritual baptism called “consolation.” If the perfect were unmarried, they must remain unmarried. If married, a husband and wife must separate and the man must never again so much as touch a woman. They did not eat meat, milk, or eggs because these were fruits of reproduction (Latourette, p. 454).

The Cathari had a simple church service. They read from the Scripture, heard sermons, and shared a common meal. They were ardent missionaries (Latourette, p. 455). Westin says, “They emphasized the spiritual; consequently, they had little use for the ordinary sacraments, including the Lord’s Supper” (Westin, p. 26).

*The Inquisition* The Medieval Inquisition was a series of inquisitions, including the Episcopal Inquisition and the Papal Inquisition. In 1184, the Episcopal Inquisition was established by the pope in response to the Cathari in southern France. It was called “episcopal” because it was administered by local bishops. In 1234, Pope Gregory IX established the Papal Inquisition. It was placed largely in the hands of a new preaching order, the Dominicans. They used torture (Cook, p. 55). The Dominicans and the Franciscans set up courts, became judges to inquire into the beliefs of those who were charged with drifting from Roman Catholicism, and instructed them in orthodox doctrine. If they persisted in their heresy, they were handed over to civil authorities because heretics not only violated church law, they violated civil law as well. The secular authorities applied the punishment, including burning at the stake. In 1252, Innocent IV sanctioned the use of torment to extract truth from suspects.

## The Great Schism

*The Slow Drift* As was mentioned earlier, several factors led to the formal split between the Eastern church and the Western church, including 1) political division (Rome versus Constantinople), 2) language distinctions (Latin versus Greek), 3) customs differences (the dating of Easter, the celibacy of the priests, the use of images, etc.), 4) papal disagreement (honor versus supremacy), and 5) the doctrinal debate (the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father versus the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son). Over many years, the Eastern church and the Western church “drifted apart, until an occasion arose when they made a formal break in relations” (Kuiper, p. 90).

*The Formal Schism* The principle difference between East and West was the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The Council of Nicaea (325) said the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father. The West added, “and from the Son” (*filioque* in Latin).

Where and when this addition was made is not certain. It seems to have originated in Spain as a safeguard against Arianism. In 589, at the third Council of Toledo, the Spanish church inserted it in the creed. From Spain, the addition spread to France and from France it spread to Germany, where it was adopted by the Council of Frankfurt (794), but Rome did not accept it at that time. It was not until 850 that the Greeks objected. Their objections were that the Ecumenical Council specifically forbade any change and that it is heresy to say that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son (Ware, pp. 58-59).

Ware says four incidents contributed to the transition from estrangement to schism.

The first incident occurred in 863. It was a dispute between Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Pope Nicholas I (858-67). Because the previous patriarch (Ignatius) had been exiled by the Emperor, some considered Photius a usurper. In 863, Pope Nicholas agreed with them. He recognized Ignatius as the Patriarch of Constantinople. This was more than a dispute over who should be the Patriarch of Constantinople. It was a dispute over papal claims. Nicholas saw the disputes between Ignatius and Photius as an opportunity to enforce his claim of universal jurisdiction. He believed that he had absolute power over the churches in the East and the West. In 865, he wrote a letter in which he said the pope is endowed with authority “all over the earth, that is, over every church” (Ware, pp. 61-62).

The people in the East were willing to allow appeals to Rome. The Council of Sardica (343) stated that if a bishop was under a sentence of condemnation, he could appeal to Rome and the pope could order a retrial. This retrial, however, was not to be conducted by the pope in Rome, but by the bishops of the province adjacent to that of the condemned bishop. In other words, Constantinople realized that Nicholas was going beyond the terms of the Council of Sardica (Ware, p. 62).

The dispute included not only papal claims but also the *filioque* clause. Missionaries from the West (Germany) and the East began work among the Slavs. When they began to work in the same land, they found themselves in conflict because they operated on widely different principles. The Latin missionaries attacked the Greek missionaries because of their views of married clergy, rules of fasting, and above all the *filioque* clause. In 867, Photius wrote an Encyclical Letter to the other Patriarchs of the East denouncing the *filioque* clause and charging those who used it with heresy. Then he summoned a council to Constantinople, which declared Pope Nicholas excommunicated, calling him a heretic (Ware, pp. 62-64).

In the same year (867), Photius was deposed. Ignatius became Patriarch and communion with Rome was restored. In 869-70, another council was held at Constantinople, known as the ‘Anti-Photian Council.’ It reversed the decisions of 867 and anathematized Photius. Later, the West reckoned it as the Eighth Ecumenical Council.

Then, in 869-70, the Council requested that the emperor resolve the status of the Bulgarian Church and he decided that it should be assigned to Constantinople. From 870, the German missionaries were expelled and the *filioque* clause was heard no more in Bulgaria.

Meanwhile, Ignatius and Photius were reconciled to one another and when Ignatius died in 877, Photius succeeded him as Patriarch! In 879, another council was held in Constantinople. It withdrew all condemnations of Photius and the decision was accepted by Rome! So Photius ended up being recognized by Rome and being the ecclesiastical master of Bulgaria. In Photius’ later years (877-86), communion between Constantinople and the papacy remained unbroken. The schism was outwardly healed, but the two great differences over papal claims and the *filioque* clause were not solved (Ware, pp. 62-63).

The second incident occurred in 1009. In that year, Pope Sergius IV sent a letter to Constantinople, which may have contained the *filioque* clause. The Patriarch of Constantinople did not include the new pope’s name in the Diptychs, the list kept by each Patriarch that contained the name of other Patriarchs, living and departed, whom he recognized as orthodox. The omission of the pope’s name was tantamount to a declaration of not being in communion with him. After 1009, the popes named did not appear on the



list. In 1014, for the first time in Rome, Pope Benedict VIII used the *filioque* clause. The occasion was the coronation of Emperor Henry II. Later in the eleven century there was a revived claim to the universal jurisdiction of the pope (Ware, pp. 65-66).

The third incident occurred in 1054. It all started when some of the Greek churches in Italy were forced to conform to Latin practices. Michael Cerularius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, demanded that the Latin churches in Constantinople adopt Greek practices, such as the use of leavened bread instead of unleavened bread in the Eucharist. The Greeks likened yeast in bread to the soul in the body. The soul gives life. So the “living bread” of the Eucharist must have yeast. The Latin churches used unleavened bread because that is what Jesus used in the Last Supper. In 1052, when the Latin churches in Constantinople refused to comply, Cerularius closed them (Ware, p.66).

In 1053, with a more conciliatory attitude, Cerularius wrote to Pope Leo IX, offering to restore the pope’s name in the Diptychs. In 1054, Leo sent three legates to Constantinople to settle the disputed questions. The chief legate was Humbert, which was an unfortunate choice, because he and Cerularius were both men who had an intransigent temper. The first meeting between Cerularius and the legates did not go well. The legates thrust a letter from the Pope to Cerularius and left without the usual salutation. After that, Cerularius refused to have any further dealings with the legates. Humbert lost his patience. He laid a Bull (an official document from the pope) of Excommunication against Cerularius on the altar of the church. Among other charges, Humbert accused the Greeks of omitting the *filioque* clause from the creed. Humbert returned to Rome. Cerularius and his synod retaliated by anathematizing Humbert, but not the Roman church. Humbert described the whole incident as a great victory for Rome (Ware, pp. 66-67).

Ware describes what happened. “One summer afternoon in the year 1054, as a service was about to begin of the church of the Holy Wisdom (St. Sophia) at Constantinople, Cardinal Humbert and two other legates of the Pope entered the building and made their way up to the sanctuary. They had not come to pray. They placed a Bull of Excommunication upon the altar and marched out once more. As they passed through the western door, the Cardinal shook the dust from his feet with the words: ‘Let God look and judge.’ A deacon ran out after him in great distress and begged him to take back the Bull. Humbert refused and it was dropped in the street” (Ware, p. 51).

This event in 1054 is usually said to be the schism (formal division) between the Greek Eastern and the Latin Western churches (Kuiper, p. 98).

The fourth incident was the Crusades. Ware says that although the schism between East and West is usually marked by the incident in 1054, the relationship between East and West was still friendly after it. The ordinary people were largely unaware of what had happened. “It was the Crusades which made the schism definitive: they introduced a new spirit of hatred and bitterness, and they brought the whole issue down to the popular level” (Ware, p. 67).

In 1098, Antioch was captured by the Turks. In 1099, Jerusalem was taken. The problem was that in both Antioch and Jerusalem, the Latin Crusaders set up Latin Patriarchs! At first, the people of Palestine accepted the Latin Patriarch as their head, but at Antioch, the Greek population was unwilling to recognize the Latin Patriarch. From 1100, a schism existed at Antioch. After 1187, the situation in the Holy Land deteriorated. Two rivals, a Latin Patriarch at Acre and a Greek Patriarch at Jerusalem, divided the Christian population. “When two rival bishops claimed the same throne and two hostile

congregations existed in the same city, the schism became an immediate reality in which simple believers were directly involved” (Ware, p. 68).

In 1162, many of the Latin residents of Constantinople were massacred in a riot by the local Greek inhabitants (Ware, p. 70).

To make matters worse, in 1204, when the Crusaders captured Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade, they sacked the city. They destroyed the altar in the Church of the Holy Wisdom and set prostitutes on the Patriarch’s throne. The French Crusaders of Angers sang, “City of Constantinople, so long ungodly,” as they carried home the relics which they had stolen. Ware says, “Eastern Christendom has never forgotten those three appalling days of pillage” and “Christians in the west still do not realize how deep is the disgust and how lasting the horror with which Orthodox regard actions such as the sacking of Constantinople by the Crusaders” (Ware, p. 69). Ware quotes Runciman, “The Crusaders brought not peace but a sword; and the sword was to sever Christendom” (I. S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*, p. 101) and adds, “The long-standing doctrinal disagreements were now reinforced on the Greek side by intense national hatred, by a feeling of resentment and indignation against western aggression and sacrilege. After 1204, there can be no doubt that Christian east and Christian west were divided into two” (Ware, p. 69).

The conclusion is that a number of factors led to the Great Schism between the East and the West, but in the final analysis, the differences were doctrinal—the *filioque* clause and the papal claims (Ware, p. 70).

*Attempts at Reunion* In 1204, the Crusaders set up a Latin kingdom at Constantinople, but the Greeks recovered their capital in 1261. After that, there were two important attempts at a reunion.

A reunion council was held at Lyons in 1274. Michael VIII, the Emperor of Constantinople (who reigned 1259-1282), was motivated by a threatened military attack (the support of the papacy was desperately needed) and by the desire for Christian unity. The orthodox delegates agreed to recognize the papal claims and to recite the Creed with the *filioque* clause, but it was rejected by the overwhelming majority of clergy and laity in the Byzantine church. The Emperor’s sister said, “Better that my brother’s empire should perish than the purity of the Orthodox faith.” The Lyons agreement was formally repudiated by Michael’s successor and Michael himself was condemned for his apostasy. He was denied a Christian burial (Ware, p. 71).

After that, the East and West grew further and further apart. In the West, the traditional approach to Christianity was replaced by Scholasticism, the synthesis of philosophy and theology. Western theologians employed new categories of thought, a new theological method, and new terminology, which the East did not understand. The East continued to use the ideas and language of the Greek Fathers of the fourth century (Ware, p. 71). In the East, there were also theological developments connected chiefly with the Hesychast Controversy, a dispute which involved the doctrine of God’s nature and the methods of prayer (see below under the topic of “The Orthodox Church”).

A second reunion council was held at Florence in 1438-39. The Emperor John VIII (who reigned 1425-48), Patriarch of Constantinople, and a large delegation from the Byzantine Church, as well as representatives from other Orthodox Churches, attended. The Greeks knew that their only hope of defeating the Turks was gaining help from the West. The agreement they reached was that the Orthodox accepted the papal claims, the *filioque*

clause, and the Roman teaching on purgatory. The Greeks were allowed to use leavened bread and the Latins were to continue to employ unleavened (Ware, p. 80).

Western Europe celebrated, but when many of the eastern delegates returned home, they revoked their signatures. The agreement was not even proclaimed publicly in Constantinople until 1452. Only a small fraction of the clergy and people ever accepted it. The Grand Duke Lucas Notaras remarked, "I would rather see the Moslem turban in the midst of the city than the Latin mitre." The military help from the West was also small. On April 7, 1453, the Turks began to attack Constantinople. The Byzantines maintained a hopeless defense for seven weeks. "In the early hours of May 29<sup>th</sup>, the last Christian service was held in the great Church of the Holy Wisdom. It was a united service of Orthodox and Roman Catholics, for at this moment of crisis, the supporters and opponents of the Florentine Union forgot their differences. The Emperor went out after receiving communion and died fighting on the walls. Later the same day, the city fell to the Turks, and the most glorious church in Christendom became a mosque. It was the end of the Byzantine Empire. But it was not the end of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, far less the end of Orthodoxy" (Ware, pp. 80-81).

Athenagoras, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Pope Paul VI removed this mutual excommunication on December 7, 1965 (Cairns, pp. 203-206).

## The Orthodox Church

Unless otherwise noted, the following material is taken from *The Orthodox Church* by Timothy Ware. Ware (b. 1934) is one of the best-known Orthodox theologians. He was educated at Oxford University and joined the Orthodox Church in 1958. In 1966, he was ordained a priest, became a monk, and received a new name of Kallistos. He has taught Eastern Orthodox studies at Oxford University (1966-2001) and has been a bishop (Bishop Kallistos). He wrote *The Orthodox Church* in 1963.

*A Description* Orthodoxy is not just a kind of Roman Catholicism without the pope; it is distinct from any religious system in the West (Ware p. 10). According to Ware, the present fragmentation of Christendom occurred in three stages, at intervals of roughly 500 years. The first stage came in the fifth and sixth centuries when the "lesser" or "separated" eastern churches divided from the main body of Christians. These churches fell into two groups, the Nestorian church of Persia and the five Monophysite churches of Armenia, Egypt, Syria, Ethiopia, and India. As a result of this division, Orthodoxy became restricted to the Greek-speaking world. The second separation came in 1054 when the main body of Christians was divided into Western European churches (the Roman Catholic Church) and the Byzantine Empire churches (the Orthodox Church of the East). The third separation was between Rome and the Reformers in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century (Ware, pp. 11-12).

From the Orthodox point of view, as a result of the first division, orthodoxy became restricted on its eastward side and, as a result of the second separation, orthodoxy was limited on its western side. Ware also points out that the three divisions coincide with cultural divisions, namely the three cultures of the Semitic, the Greek, and the Latin (Ware, p. 12). In 1863, the Orthodox Church expanded to the north (Ware, p. 13). "As the Byzantine power dwindled, these newer churches of the north increased in importance, and on the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453, the Principality of Moscow was ready to take Byzantine's place as the protector of the orthodox world" (Ware, p. 13).

Today there are four ancient Patriarchs of self-governing churches: Constantinople (3,000,000), Antioch (450,000), Alexandria (250,000), and Jerusalem (60,000; these are Ware's 1963 figures). Under these four Patriarchs, there are eleven independent churches, including the Russian Orthodox, the Romanian Orthodox, the Greek Orthodox, etc. There are other self-governing, but not yet independent, churches.

"The Orthodox Church is thus a family of self-governing churches. It is held together, not by a centralized organization, not by a single prelate wielding absolute power over the whole body, but by the double bond of unity in the faith and communion in the sacraments. Each church, while independent, is in full agreement with the rest on all matters of doctrine, and between them all, there is a full sacramental communion" (Ware, p. 15). No one in orthodoxy is equivalent to the pope in Roman Catholicism, but the patriarch of Constantinople is known as the 'ecumenical' patriarch. He has no right to interfere with the internal affairs of other churches. He is similar to the Archbishop of Canterbury in the worldwide Anglican communion. "The Orthodox Church is a federation of *local*, but not in every case *national*, churches. It does not have as its basis the political principle of the State Church" (Ware, pp. 15-16, italics his).

Orthodoxy claims to be universal. In their view, the word "orthodoxy" has a double meaning of "right belief" and "right worship." In other words, "they regard their Church as the Church which guards and teaches the true belief about God and which glorifies Him with right worship, that is, *as nothing less than the church of Christ on earth*" (Ware, p. 16, italics his).

*The Beginning* In a chapter entitled "The Beginnings," Ware says the history of the Christian church began with the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles at Jerusalem during the feast of Pentecost (Ware, p. 20). "The Christian church in its early days was distinct and separate from the state" (Ware, p. 19). "Within an astonishingly short time a small Christian community sprang up in all the main centers of the Roman Empire and even in places beyond the Roman frontiers" (Ware, p. 20), but this was particularly true in the eastern part of the empire, an empire of cities (Ware, p. 21).

As can be seen from the letters of Ignatius, by the end of the first century, the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons was widely established. "This determined the administrative structure of the primitive Church. The basic unit was the community in each city, governed by its own bishop; to assist the bishop, there were presbyters, or priests, and deacons. The surrounding countryside depended on the Church of the city" (Ware, p. 21).

"Ignatius laid emphasis upon two things in particular, the bishop and the Eucharist; he saw the Church as both hierarchical and sacramental. 'The bishop in each Church,' he wrote, 'presides in place of God.' 'Let no one do any of the things which concern the Church without the bishop.... Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be, just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church.' And it is the bishop's primary and distinctive task to celebrate the Eucharist, 'the medicine of immortality'" (Ignatius, *Magnesians* 6:1; *Smynaeans* 8:1-2; Eph. 20:2; Ware, p. 21).

"People today tend to think of the Church as a worldwide organization, in which each local body forms part of a larger and more inclusive whole. Ignatius did not look at the Church in this way. For him, the local community is the Church. He thought of the Church as a Eucharistic society, which only realizes its true nature when it celebrates the Supper of the Lord, receiving His Body and Blood in the sacrament. But the Eucharist is something that can only happen locally—in each particular community gathered round its bishop; and

at every local celebration of the Eucharist it is the *whole* Christ who is present, not just a part of Him. Therefore each local community, as it celebrates the Eucharist Sunday by Sunday, is the Church in its fullness” (Ware, p. 21, italics his).

“The teaching of Ignatius has a permanent place in Orthodox tradition. Orthodoxy still thinks of the Church as a Eucharistic society whose outward organization, however necessary, is secondary to its inner, sacramental life; and Orthodoxy still emphasizes the cardinal importance of the local community in the structure of the Church. To those who attend an Orthodox Pontifical Liturgy, when the bishop stands at the beginning of the service in the middle of the church, surrounded by his flock, Ignatius of Antioch’s idea of the bishop as the center of unity in the local community will occur with particular vividness.

“But besides the local community, there is also the wider unity of the Church. This second aspect is developed in the writings of another martyr bishop, Saint Cyprian of Carthage (died 258). Cyprian saw all bishops as sharing one episcopate, yet sharing it in such a way that each possesses not a part but the whole. ‘The episcopate,’ he wrote, ‘is a single whole, in which each bishop enjoys full possession. So is the Church a single whole, though it spreads far and wide into a multitude of churches as its fertility increases.’ There are many churches but only one Church; many *episcopi* but only one episcopate” (Ware, pp. 21-22).

*Councils* “Orthodoxy has always attached great importance to the place of councils in the life of the Church. “It believes that the council was the chief organ whereby God has chosen to guide His people, and it regards the Catholic Church as essentially a *conciliar* Church.... In the Church, there is neither dictatorship nor individualism but harmony and unanimity; men remain free but not isolated, for they are united in love, in faith, and in sacramental communion. In a council, this idea of harmony and free unanimity can be seen worked out in practice. In a true council, no single member arbitrarily imposes his will upon the rest, but each consults with the others, and in this way, they all freely achieve a ‘common mind.’ A council is a living embodiment of the essential nature of the Church” (Ware, p. 23).

“The first council in the Church’s history is described in Acts xv. Attended by the Apostles, it met at Jerusalem to decide how far Gentile converts should be subject to the Law of Moses. The Apostles, when they finally reached their decision, spoke in terms which in other circumstances might appear presumptuous: ‘It seemed right to the Holy Spirit and to us ...’ (Acts xv, 28). Later, councils have ventured to speak with the same confidence. An isolated individual may well hesitate to say: ‘It seemed right to the Holy Spirit and to me;’ but when gathered in council, the members of the Church can together claim an authority that individually none of them possesses.

“The Council of Jerusalem, assembling as it did the leaders of the entire Church, was an exceptional gathering, for which there is no parallel until the Council of Nicaea in 325. But by Cyprian’s time, it had already become usual to hold local councils, attended by all the bishops in a particular civil province of the Roman Empire. A local council of this type normally met in the provincial capital, under the presidency of the bishop of the capital, who was given the title *Metropolitan*. As the third century proceeded, councils widened in scope and began to include bishops not from one but from several civil provinces. These larger gatherings tended to assemble in the chief cities of the Empire, such as Alexandria or Antioch; and so it came about that the bishops of certain great cities began to acquire an importance above the provincial Metropolitans. But for the time being nothing was decided

about the precise status of these great sees. Nor during the century itself did this continual expansion of logical conclusion: as yet (apart from the Apostolic Council), there had only been local councils, of lesser but no ‘general’ council, formed of bishop from the whole Christian world and claiming to speak in the name of the whole Church” (Ware, pp. 23-24, italics his).

The Orthodox often called themselves “the church of the seven Councils” (Ware, p. 43). Ware says the seven General Councils fulfilled a double task. First, they clarified the organization of the Church, crystallizing the position of the five Patriarchates. Secondly, they defined once and for all the Church’s teaching upon the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, namely the Trinity and the Incarnation. Ware points out that all Christians agree that these doctrines are “mysteries” which lie beyond human understanding and language. The Councils did not imagine that they had explained the mysteries; they merely sought to exclude certain false ways of speaking and thinking about them. To prevent heresy, they “drew a fence” around the mysteries (Ware, p. 28).

Ware goes on to explain that these councils were motivated by a very practical issue—salvation. He says, “Man, so the New Testament teaches, is separated from God by sin, and cannot through his own efforts break down the wall of separation which his sinfulness has created. God has therefore taken the initiative: He became man, was crucified, and rose from the dead, thereby delivering humanity from the bondage of sin and death. This is the central message of the Christian faith, and it is this message of redemption that the Councils were concerned to safeguard. Heresies were dangerous and required condemnation because they impaired the teaching of the New Testament, setting up a barrier between man and God, and so making it impossible for man to in full salvation” (Ware, p. 28).

Each heresy undermined some part of the affirmation that Christ must be fully God and fully man. Arianism taught that Christ was less than God. Nestorianism claimed that Christ was two persons instead of one, God and man. Monophysitism a.k.a. Monothelitism said Christ was not truly man. The first two councils affirmed that Christ must be fully God, thus the Trinity. The next four councils affirmed that Christ was fully human and that the Godhead and manhood were united in a single person. The seventh council defended the use of icons, which ultimately concerned the incarnation and man’s salvation (Ware, pp. 29-30).

*Salvation* In the Orthodox Church, salvation is the process of deification. Deification is not an instantaneous event; it is a process by which the individual gradually forms an ever-deepening unity with God and grows into a more perfect Christ-likeness. It is the process of becoming God-like (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 438). They say Christians share in the divine glory (Jn. 17:22-23). Ware says the Greek Fathers took texts such as John 17:22-23 in their literal sense and thus spoke of man’s deification. They argued that if man is to share God’s glory, he must be “perfectly one” with God, which means in effect, man must be “deified.” In other words, man is to become by grace what God is by nature. Athanasius said the purpose of the incarnation was that “God became man that we might be made God” (Ware, p. 29).

*Icons* One of the distinctive features of Orthodoxy is the use of icons. Orthodox churches are filled with them. Orthodox adherents prostrate themselves before them, kisses them, and burn candles in front of them. Ware gives the following explanation for them (Ware, pp. 40-43).

Icons are not idols. An icon is a symbol. The veneration shown to images is not directed to the stone, wood, or paint, but to the person it depicts. Orthodox believers insist that they do not worship icons, “but *reverence* or *vindicate* them” (Ware, p. 40, italics his).

Icons are part of Orthodox teaching. “He who lacks learning or leisure to study works of theology has only to enter a church to see unfolded before him on the walls all the mysteries of the Christian religion” (Ware, p. 41).

Icons have doctrinal significance. Icons are not just permissible; they are essential because they safeguard the proper doctrine of the incarnation. The very fact that God became a man makes depicting God possible. To repudiate all representation of God is to fall into the kind of dualism. Repudiation regards matter as defilement and wants religion free from all contact with that which is material. It thinks that which is spiritual must be non-material. Thus this is not a controversy about religious art, but about the incarnation and salvation. “The orthodox doctrine of icons is bound up with the orthodox belief that the whole of God’s creation, material as well as spiritual, is to be redeemed and glorified” (Ware, p. 42).

*Monasticism* Ware says monasticism has played an important part in the religious life of orthodoxy (Ware, pp. 45-48; “the best way to penetrate Orthodox spirituality is to enter through the monastery,” Ware, p. 45). As has been pointed out, the monastic life first emerged in Egypt at the start of the fourth century (with Anthony of Egypt) and spread rapidly across Christendom. When persecution ceased and Christianity became fashionable, monks became martyrs in an age when martyrdom of blood no longer existed.

According to Ware, monasticism has taken three chief forms, all of which appeared in Egypt by 350 and are still found in the Orthodox Church today.

The first form of monasticism is men being hermits, leading a solitary life in huts, caves, tombs, branches of trees, or on the tops of pillows. The great example is Anthony of Egypt, the father of monasticism.

The second form of monasticism is men living a communal life under a common rule and in a regularly constituted monastery. The pioneer was Pachomius of Egypt (286-346), who was the author of a ruling later used by Benedict of Nursia, a saint revered by the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches. Placing a social emphasis on monasticism, Basil, one of the Cappadocian Fathers, urged religious houses to care for the sick and poor, maintain hospitals and orphanages, and work directly for the benefit of society at large. As a general rule, however, in Orthodoxy, a monk’s primary task is a life of prayer.

The third form of monasticism is a semi-eremitic (hermit-like) life, that is “the middle way” where instead of a single highly organized community, there is a loosely-knit group of small settlements with each settlement containing between two and six brethren living together under the guidance of an elder.

One of the oldest monasteries is Saint Catherine’s, at the base of Mount Sinai, founded by Emperor Justinian (527-65). From the time it was founded to the present, it has had an unbroken history. Since the 10<sup>th</sup> century, one of the chief Orthodox monasteries has been Athos in Northern Greece. It contains a number of “ruling” monasteries, a number of smaller houses, and hermit cells. One of the ruling monasteries alone has produced over 25 Patriarchs and over 144 Bishops.

*Mysticism* The roots of the Hesychast Controversy began with eastern mystical theology (see Clement, d. 215; Origen of Alexandria, d. 253-4; Gregory of Nyssa, d. 4<sup>th</sup> century; and Evagrius of Pontus, d. 399). There are two trends in mystical theology: the

“way of negation” and the “way of union.” The way of negation (apophatic theology) speaks of God in negative terms. Since God cannot be apprehended by man’s mind, human language is always inexact. Therefore, it is less misleading to use negative language about God. For example, God is infinite and incomprehensible. At the same time, it is possible to have a true mystical union with God, the way of the *hesychasts*. The name hesychast comes from the Greek word “hesychia,” which means “quiet.” In silence, the hesychasts devote themselves to inner recollection and secret prayer. Using the language of negative theology, they claim “an immediate experience with the unknowable God, a personal union with Him who is unapproachable” (Ware, p. 73).

Orthodoxy often talks about the “Prayer of the Heart.” Ware explains what they mean: “When a man begins to pray, at first he prays with the lips, and has to make a conscious intellectual effort to realize the meaning of what he says. But if he perseveres, praying continually with recollection, his intellect and his heart become united: he ‘finds the place of the heart,’ his spirit acquires the power of ‘dwelling in the heart,’ and so his prayer becomes ‘prayer of the heart.’ It becomes something not merely said by the lips, not merely thought by the intellect, but offered spontaneously by the whole being of man—lips, intellect, emotions, will, and body. The prayer fills the entire consciousness and no longer has to be forced out but says itself. This Prayer of the Heart cannot be attained simply through our own efforts but is a gift conferred by the grace of God” (Ware, p. 74). Ware goes on to say that when the Orthodox talk about “Prayer of the Heart,” they usually have in mind one particular prayer, namely the Jesus Prayer, which is the constant repetition or remembrance of the name ‘Jesus.’ Eventually, this became crystallized into a short sentence known as the Jesus Prayer: “Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me.”

By the thirteenth century, the Jesus Prayer became linked to physical exercises designed to assist concentration. Breathing was regulated in time with the Prayer and a bodily posture was used: head bowed, chin resting on the chest, eyes fixed on the place of the heart. This is “the Hesychast method of prayer.” It was considered a help to concentration. They acknowledge that there are no techniques automatically leading to the mystical state. Ware observes that “there are interesting parallels between the Hesychast ‘method’ and Hindu Yoga or Mohammedan Dhikr; but the points of similarity must not be pressed too far” (Ware, p. 75 fn.).

Saint Symeon, a New Theologian (949-1022), is considered the greatest of the Byzantine mystics. He speaks of a vision of Divine and Uncreated Light. “The Hesychasts believed that this light which they experienced was identical with the Uncreated Light which the three disciples saw surrounding Jesus at His Transfiguration on Mount Tabor” (Ware, p. 75).

In the middle of the fourteenth century, hesychasm was attacked by a learned Greek named Barlaam the Calabrian. He charged that hesychasm was wrong to speak of an immediate experience of God because any such experience is impossible, their bodily exercise was a materialistic conception of prayer, and their claim to attain a vision of the Divine and Uncreated Light was gross materialism. He argued that God can only be known indirectly (Ware, pp. 75-76).

Gregory Palamas (1296-1359), Archbishop of Thessalonica, defended the Hesychasts. He claimed that the doctrine of man allowed for the use of bodily exercises in prayer and that the Hesychasts did indeed experience the Divine and Uncreated Light of Tabor. He argued that by taking on a human body, Christ made the flesh an inexhaustible source of



sanctification. (Remember: the emphasis on man's body lies behind the orthodox doctrine of icons.) Therefore, the Hesychasts are not guilty of gross materialism; they remain faithful to the biblical doctrine of man as a unity. The whole man—body and soul—prays.

To explain how man knows God, Who by nature is unknowable, Gregory developed the distinction between the essence and the energies of God. We cannot know the essence of God, but we can know the energies of God. Furthermore, this divine energy is nothing else than the grace of God which is not just a gift, but a direct manifestation of God, the personal confrontation between creature and Creator (Ware, pp. 76-78). "When we say that the saints had been transformed or 'deified' by the grace of God, what we mean is that they have a direct experience of God Himself. They know God—that is to say, God in His energies, not in His essence" (Ware, p. 78). The light that is seen is not a material light, but it can be seen with the physical eye, as was the light seen by the disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration, because when man is defied, "his bodily faculties, as well as his soul, are transformed" (Ware, p. 78).

Gregory's teaching was confirmed by two local councils held at Constantinople in 1341 and 1351. Ware says, "Although (they were) local and not Ecumenical, yet (they) possess a doctrinal authority in Orthodox theology scarcely inferior to the Seven General Councils themselves. But western Christendom has never officially recognized these two councils, although many western Christians personally accept the theology of Palamas" (Ware, p. 76).

Nicholas Cabasilas, a contemporary of Gregory Palamas, was a lay theologian who wrote a *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, which became a classic Orthodox work on the subject. "For him, the mystical life is essentially a life in Christ and a life in the sacraments. There is a danger that mysticism may become speculative and individualistic—divorced from the historical revelation in Christ and from the corporate life of the church with its sacraments; but the mysticism of Cabasilas is always Christocentric, sacramental, ecclesial. His work shows how closely mysticism and the sacramental were linked together in Byzantine theology" (Ware, pp. 79-80).

*Comparison* Roman Catholics believe the pope has supreme authority and he is infallible; the Orthodox believe the pope does not have supreme authority; he is "first among equals" and he is not infallible. Roman Catholics use an unleavened wafer in communion; the Orthodox use unleavened bread. Roman Catholics do not allow priests to be married; the Orthodox allow priests to marry before they are ordained. Roman Catholics believe in purgatory and the Stations of the Cross; the Orthodox do not. Roman Catholics believe Mary was born without original sin; the Orthodox do not. Roman Catholics tend to depend on intellectual speculation. The Orthodox are considered to be very mystical and depend on spiritual practices. They also have differences in the calculations of the days pertaining to Easter and Christmas.

## **The Seven Major Crusades**

Beginning in the fourth century, multitudes made pilgrimages to the Holy Land (Houghton, p. 54). Around 1000, when the coming of Christ was almost universally expected, the number of pilgrimages vastly increased. At first, the Muslim rulers of Palestine favored these pilgrimages, but later, the pilgrims suffered oppression, robbery, and sometimes, death. Throughout Europe, there arose a cry to free the Holy Land from

Islamic control. The result was crusades that lasted from 1095 to 1291. There were many expeditions called “crusades,” but there were seven major crusades.

*The First Crusade (1095-1099)* Alexius, the Emperor of Constantinople, requested aid from the western church against the Muslims who were threatening his kingdom. In 1095, Pope Urban II called on the knights of Western Europe not just to aid the eastern empire but the rescue the holy places from Islam (Cairns, pp. 220-21). The pope promised the forgiveness of sins to all who participated in the crusade (Houghton, p. 54). The response was overwhelming. “It has been estimated that nearly a million people took part in the activities associated with the First Crusade” (Cairns, p. 220).

In 1096, the preaching of Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless aroused thousands of peasants to march on Palestine. On the way, they practiced war against the infidels, killing thousands of Jews (González, I, p. 293). Unfortunately, this unorganized and undisciplined mass of men was either massacred by the Turks or taken prisoner and sold as slaves. This is considered to be the prelude to the first organized effort of the first crusade (Cairns, p. 221). It is estimated that 40,000 participated in this effort.

In the spring of 1097, the first organized group of crusaders arrived at Constantinople. It consisted of 275,000 of the best warriors from every land in Europe. They took Nicaea, Antioch (1098), and Jerusalem (1099). They ransacked Jerusalem, killing all of the defenders and many of the citizens. Women were raped and infants were thrown against walls (González, I, p. 296).

They established a kingdom on feudal principles and wanted to make Godfrey, their leader, king. He refused the title, but after his death, his brother Baldwin took the title. The kingdom of Jerusalem lasted until 1187. The Knights Templar was organized to provide protection for the pilgrims and to fight the Muslims.

*The Second Crusade (1147-49)* Later, the Muslims recaptured the city of Edessa. In 1146, Bernard of Clairvaux preached the Second Crusade into existence (Cairns, p. 221). As a result of his preaching, Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany led a great army to rescue the holy places, but this crusade proved to be a failure. In 1187, the Muslim leader Saladin recaptured Jerusalem. The kingdom of Jerusalem came to an end, although the empty title “King of Jerusalem” was continued long afterward.

*The Third Crusade (1189-1192)* The fall of Jerusalem aroused Europe to the Third Crusade, which was led by three kings, Frederick Barbarossa of Germany (1123-1190), Philip Augustus of France (1165-1223), and Richard I, “the Lionheart,” of England (1157-1199). Hence, this crusade is known as the Kings’ Crusade.

On the way to Palestine, Frederick accidentally drown. After a quarrel with Richard, Philip Augustus returned home, and all the courage of Richard did not avail to bring his army to Jerusalem, but he obtained a treaty with Saladin, by which the Christian pilgrims gained access to Jerusalem (Cairns, p. 221).

*The Fourth Crusade (1201-1204)* Having failed to retake the Holy Land, the Crusaders made war on Constantinople. They not only captured it, but they also plundered it and set up their own rule over the Greek empire. From 1204 to 1261, the Eastern empire was subject to the pope. This crusade helped to weaken the Eastern Empire and deepened the hatred between Eastern and Western Christians (Cairns, p. 222).

There were other crusades, including the Children’s Crusade (1212) led by two boys, named Steven and Nicolas, who were not yet in their teens! They supposed that the purity of their lives would bring them success in contrast to the failure of their sinful parents. On

the way to Palestine, many perished and the rest were sold into slavery in Egypt (Houghton, p. 56).

*The Fifth Crusade (1228)* The Emperor Frederick II, although excommunicated by the pope, led an army to Palestine and obtained a treaty whereby Jerusalem, Jaffa, Bethlehem, and Nazareth were ceded to the Christians. Since being under the pope's ban, no Roman ecclesiastic would crown him, Frederick crowned himself King of Jerusalem (González, I, p. 297). From that, the title "King of Jerusalem" was held by all the German emperors and afterward by the emperors of Austria until 1835.

Nevertheless, through the quarrel between the pope and the emperor, the results of the crusade were lost. In 1244, Jerusalem was retaken by the Muslims (Eerdmans' p. 270) and remained under their control until the Six-Day War (1967).

*The Sixth Crusade (1248-1254)* Louis IX of France made his invasion by way of Egypt and although at first successful, he was defeated and taken prisoner by the Muslims. At an immense price, he was ransomed (Houghton, p. 56) and went on to Palestine, remaining there until 1252.

*The Seventh Crusade (1270-1272)* Louis IX and Prince Edward Plantagenet of England, afterward King Edward I, undertook a crusade by way of Africa. Louis died at Tunis, his son made peace, and Edward returned to England to become king; so this, generally regarded as the last of the crusades, accomplished nothing (Houghton, p. 56).

*The Consequences of the Crusades* The Crusades failed to free the Holy Land from the domination of the Muslims. In 1291, the Crusade era came to an end with the fall of Acre to the Muslims (Cairns, p. 222). The Crusades lasted for two centuries and cost Europe nearly five million lives (Houghton, p. 54).

Nevertheless, after the Crusades, pilgrims were protected by the Turkish government and persecution ceased. There were also political, social (the code of chivalry among knights), economic, and religious results. For example, the Crusades were a great impulse to trade. The West gained knowledge of the wealth of the Orient, including its carpets, silks, and jewels. The Crusades weakened feudalism because many of the knights and nobles who went on the Crusades sold their land to peasants and wealthy middle-class townsmen to raise money for the Crusades and many of those knights and nobles never returned home. The middle class, between the lords and the serfs, arose and grew. The atrocities committed by the Crusaders are talked about in Muslim countries to this day.

## Universities

*The Forerunners* About 425, Martianus Capella, a pagan author, wrote *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury*, which was an allegorical account of the marriage of Mercury (an intelligent pursuit) and Philology (the love of words). One of the wedding gifts Mercury gave to his bride was seven maids (representing the seven liberal arts). In ancient times, the liberal arts comprised the education that was worthy of "free" people as opposed to slaves. The first three of the seven liberal arts were known as the *trivium* (Latin: "three ways"), while the last four were called the *quadrivium* (Latin: "four ways"). The trivium included grammar (reading and writing), dialectic (logic), and rhetoric (public speaking). The quadrivium contained the study of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy (astrology).

During the sixth century, a Christian educator and writer, Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus (Cassiodorus for short), promoted the seven liberal arts for the education of Christians. He saw the seven liberal arts as the means to help develop an understanding of the Scriptures. This model was used in monastery schools (Cairns, p. 240).

Charlemagne (742-814) ordered all monasteries and cathedrals to establish a school to provide free education to all intellectually qualified boys. The objective was to train priests, who would be leaders in the Empire and in the local communities. Charlemagne's death and war prevented his plan from being fully developed. Some schools, however, were established. The curriculum consisted of the trivium and the quadrivium. It trained the priests to read and write (grammar) and to speak publicly (rhetoric). It also taught them geometry (for the architecture of churches), astronomy (to calculate the date of Easter and other sacred festivals), and music.

By the 1000s, some schools expanded their curriculum of the quadrivium to go beyond the training of priests. "While one might be best known for law and another from medicine, normally theology was an honored subject in them all" (Latourette, p. 496).

In 1079, Pope Gregory VII issued a decree mandating the creation of cathedral schools for the training of the clergy. Gregory's decree ultimately led to the proliferation of educational centers which evolved into the universities of medieval Europe.

*The Structure of the Paris Schools* Dr. Lynn H. Nelson, Professor Emeritus of Medieval History at the University of Kansas, describes what happened in the schools in Paris. Qualified teachers formed the faculty of an institution's school. Some instructors resided in the monastery (professors) and some resided outside of the monastery (associate professors). The professors also hired assistants (assistant professors) who might someday become professors. Students hired to teach the basic subjects in the grammar school were called instructors.

Professors offered a series of lectures (a course) in which they would read from a text (an important book), so the students could copy down the words. Then the lecturer offered explanations of the text while the students made notes in the wide margins they had left for that purpose. Notes referring to other works relevant to the passage were put at the bottom (foot) of the page, a practice that has survived as the modern footnote. When the course of lectures was completed, the student's copy of the text and his notes of the lecturer's commentaries were then in his textbook.

Students could attend any courses they wished from any teacher in any of the various schools in Paris since all that mattered was whether they could satisfy the Chancellor that they were competent. The district in Paris that became the center of learning was known as the Latin Quarter since the people living there spoke and studied in Latin.

When the student felt ready, he appeared before the chancellor to be examined. If approved, he was given a diploma, an official document that permitted him to preach or teach in the diocese of Paris (Nelson, [www.vlib.us/medieval/lectures/universities.html](http://www.vlib.us/medieval/lectures/universities.html) accessed 9/10/2013).

*The Origin of Universities* Nelson also explains the origin of the university. He says, "One day in the Autumn of 1200, a German student decided to throw a bit of a party in his apartment for some of his friends and sent his servant, a ten-year-old boy, down to the corner tavern to get his large wine-jug filled. The tavern owner gave the boy sour wine and, when the boy complained, the bartender and some of the barflies beat the kid up and threw him out into the street along with his broken jug. Why? I don't really know. Perhaps it was

because the German emperor had stirred up the English to start a long and bloody war with France. Or maybe it was because the barkeep liked the students' money, but not the students.

“In any event, the boy dragged himself back to his master, and the student and his friends went down to the tavern and beat up everybody before they went home with a large jug full of decent wine. The barkeep asked the provost to punish the students, and the provost gathered his men, together with a number of volunteers, and blocked all of the streets into the Latin Quarter. They then went hunting for the German student, slapping people around as they went. A number of masters and students were irritated by this, took to the streets, and a pitched battle ensued. The provost and his men finally withdrew, but not before they had killed five students, including the German student who had started it all, and who happened to have been the prince-bishop elect of Liege (in what is now Belgium).

“The chancellor refused to help the master and students of the Latin Quarter, so they barricaded the streets leading into the Latin Quarter, and the masters held a meeting that night. They decided to organize themselves into a union, or, as it was called in the Latin of the time, a *universitas*. Since their students were studying in order to become masters themselves, the union included the students as more or less junior members. The next day, representatives of the union went to the king of France and announced themselves as spokesmen for *The University of the Masters and Students of Paris*.

“They demanded a number of corporate rights, privileges, and protection from the king. When the king asked what they would do if he decided to say no, they replied with the famous words, ‘*Then we shall shake the dust of the streets of Paris from the hems of our gowns.*’ In effect, they were threatening to leave and to do their teaching elsewhere. King Philip realized that Paris would lose much of its attractiveness and he would lose a considerable amount of taxes if the masters, students, and all of the people who provided services to the Latin Quarter were to leave, so he agreed to protect the members of the *Universitas*” (Nelson, italics his).

Nelson adds, “They gained powers—the right to establish the curriculum, the requirements, and the standards of accomplishment; the right to debate any subject and uphold in debate any subject; the right to choose their own members; protection from local police; the right of each member to keep his license to teach as soon as he had been admitted to full membership; and others.”

Studies in the trivium curriculum led to a bachelor's degree, and further study in the quadrivium curriculum led to a master's degree, which was essential to becoming a teacher. Continued study led to a doctorate in law, theology, or medicine. Students began their studies as early as age 14, although they usually entered the university when they were between 16 and 18. Exams were oral, comprehensive, and public. During the course of the exam, the student had to defend a thesis against teachers or students (Cairns, p. 241). “By 1400, there were over seventy-five European universities” (Cairns, p. 240).

González sums up the development of universities well when he says, “From monasteries, which usually existed apart from the centers of population, theology moved to Cathedral schools, that is, to schools connected with churches that had bishops—and therefore usually in cities. Then it centered in universities, which were vast associations of scholars gathered in principal cities” (González, p. 312). He adds, “Universities were in part the result of the growth of cities” (González, p. 315).

## Scholasticism

*Its Definition* Scholasticism was a theology with its own particular methodology that developed in the “schools” (González, I, p. 311). “The data of revelation were to be organized systematically by the use of Aristotelian deductive logic and were to be harmonized with the newly rediscovered philosophy of Aristotle” (Cairns, p. 231). The schoolmen violently disagreed among themselves, but they all used logic to examine the links and implications of ideas (Eerdmans’, p. 278).

Modern science uses inductive logic. It makes observations and experiments and then draws conclusions. Scholasticism used deductive logic and emphasized the syllogism. It started with a general truth (a passage from the Bible, the fathers, the councils, or the pope), which was not proven but taken for granted, and from that, they drew conclusions (Cairns, pp. 233-234).

There were three schools in scholasticism (Cairns, pp. 234-239). Realism was based on Plato’s concept that universals or ideas exist apart from particular things (the idea of “chairness” and a particular chair). Plato insisted that man must look beyond this life for ultimate reality (see Absalom and Lombard below, as well as Augustine). Moderate realism was based on Aristotle’s concept that universals had an objective existence, but they do not exist apart from individual things (see Abelard and Aquinas below). Nominalism was based on the concept that general ideas have no objective existence outside of the mind (William of Ockham).

*Its Rise* Scholasticism developed between 1050 and 1350. It was first found in the cathedral and monastic schools and later in the universities. It dominated the curriculum of the universities. After 1050, it replaced the fathers as the main guardians of the truth. As “father” (as in “church fathers”) had been the term of honor, so “doctor” became the title of honor (Cairns, p. 231).

The major reason for the rise of scholasticism was the revival of the philosophy of Aristotle. In the twelfth century, a Latin translation of Aristotle’s philosophy by William of Morebeke (1215- 1286) began to appear in Western Europe (Cairns, p. 233).

### Anselm

*His Life* Anselm (1033-1109) was born in northern Italy, educated in an abbey, elected prior of the abbey, and, in 1093, became Archbishop of Canterbury (Cairns, p. 234). As archbishop, he was in conflict with King Rufus and his successor King Henry I for the liberty and authority of the church. He was exiled more than once. As archbishop, he also encouraged regular church synods, enforced clerical celibacy, and suppressed the slave trade.

*His Theology* Anselm has been called the father of scholastic theology (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 395). He held to the Augustinian idea that faith must be primary and the foundation for knowledge (“I believe in order that I may know”). He used reason to verify faith.

In his book *Monologion*, Anselm uses an inductive argument to prove the existence of God. He argues from effect to cause. Man is the effect. Since infinite regression is unthinkable, the cause must be the One we call God. This is a form of the cosmological argument for God (Cairns, p. 234).

In his book *Proslogion*, Anselm uses a deductive argument to prove the existence of God. He argues that everyone has an idea of a supreme being. Because no greater idea than that of God as the perfect Supreme Being can be conceived, God must exist in reality. This is known as the ontological argument for the existence of God (Cairns, pp. 234-235). He was the first to put forward the “ontological argument.”

In his book *Why God Became Man*, Anselm developed a theory of the atonement. As a result of man’s sin, he is in debt to God, who demands payment of the debt or satisfaction by punishment. Only God can satisfy the payment that was needed. Hence, salvation calls for the work of a God-man. By His death on the cross, the God-man, Jesus Christ paid the debt. Thus man is free from the obligation (Cairns, p. 235).

*His Significance* Anselm has been called “a second Augustine.” He is considered the greatest theologian between Augustine and Aquinas (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 395). His view of the atonement ended the patristic view of the atonement as a ransom paid to Satan and dominated orthodox thinking until the time of Thomas Aquinas in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. The Reformers used his satisfaction theory of the atonement in constructing their own theology (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 395).

## **Peter Abelard**

*His Life* Peter Abelard (1079-1142) was a native of Brittany. As a young man he studied with some of the most respected theologians of his day. He became convinced that he knew more than his teachers. He arrogantly challenged and quarreled with them on a variety of subjects. He finally withdrew to set up his own lectures, which drew large numbers of students. His reputation grew until he became known as Paris’s brightest intellectual star (Eerdmans’ p. 280).

In 1115, at the age of thirty-six, Abelard agreed to tutor Heloise, the teenage niece of Fulbert, a canon of Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris. Abelard and Heloise had a son named Astrolabe. “To pacify her irate uncle, Abelard agreed to marry Heloise secretly. (This was possible since he was at this time only in minor orders, which permitted him to take a wife, though this practice was frowned upon for those in his position)” (Eerdmans’ p. 280).

When rumors circulated, Heloise agreed to retire to a local convent to prevent further damage to her lover’s reputation. Fulbert considered this an evasion of responsibility. He hired a band of thugs to castrate Abelard. Abelard became a Benedictine monk and resumed his teaching, but once again became involved in controversy (Eerdmans’ pp. 280-281).

In 1121, the Council of Soissons condemned his views on the Trinity. For the next twenty years, he moved from place to place, followed by a large number of students. Around 1136, he returned to Paris, where he enjoyed renewed popularity and wrote several important works. During this last period in Paris, Bernard of Clairvaux accused him of teaching heretical ideas. In 1141, several statements from his writings were condemned at the Council of Sens. He decided to appeal to the pope, but died on his way to Rome (Eerdmans’ p. 281).

*His Theology* Abelard made greater use of Greek philosophy, particularly Aristotelian logic, than Absalom. He wrote *Sic et Non (Yes and No)*. In it, he dealt with 158 theological questions. He showed that various authorities, including the Bible and ancient Christian authors, did not agree on the answers to these questions. Eventually, this method was adopted by scholasticism. An author posed a question and then quoted authorities who seem to support one answer and other authorities who seem to support another. They went

beyond Abelard, however, in that they offered a “solution” to show how it was possible for all the authorities quoted to be correct (González, p. 314).

Abelard was a moderate realist, who believed that reality existed first in the mind of God, then in the here and now, and finally in the mind of man (Cairns, p. 237). In contrast to Augustine and Anselm, Abelard held to the idea that “I know in order that I may believe” (Cairns, pp. 237-238). He did not believe the death of Christ was to satisfy God but to impress man with the love of God so that he would be morally influenced to surrender his life to God, a view of the atonement known as the moral influence theory (Cairns, p. 237).

*His Significance* Abelard helped to make Paris one of the intellectual capitals of Europe, was the major Christian thinker of his period and was one of the pioneers of Scholasticism. He wrote poems, hymns, and an autobiography (Eerdmans’ p. 281).

## **Peter Lombard**

*His Life* Peter Lombard (1100-ca, 1160) was a pupil of Abelard (Eerdmans’, p. 275). He was Bishop of Paris (Eerdmans’, p. 285) and a theology teacher at the University of Paris.

*His Significance* Lombard wrote *Four Books of Sentences*, which was one of the most popular scholastic works of its day (Eerdmans’, p. 278). It became a theological textbook for the rest of the Middle Ages (Cook, p. 69). The *Sentences* concerned the Trinity, the Incarnation, the sacraments, and eschatology. It emphasized the seven sacraments which were accepted as authoritative at the Council of Florence in 1439 (Cairns, p. 235).

## **Thomas Aquinas**

*His Life* Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) was born into a wealthy noble family in Aquina, Italy. When he was five, he was sent to the abbey of Monte Cassino. He stayed there until he was fourteen, when he went to the University of Naples. Impressed by his Dominican teacher, he entered that order. Angered by his decision, his family “tried to dissuade him by tempting him with a prostitute, kidnapping him, and offering to buy him the post of Archbishop of Naples. All of these attempts were unsuccessful and he went to study at Paris, the center of theological learning” (Eerdmans’, p. 288). He also studied in Cologne. When he was a student at Cologne, because of his silence, he was given the nickname of “dumb ox,” but his teacher, Albertus Magnus, said, “This ox will one day fill the world with his bellowing.” In 1252, he returned to Paris, where he spent the rest of his life teaching there and in Italy.

*His Works* The works of Aquinas fill eighteen large volumes. He wrote commentaries on most of the books of the Bible and on Peter Lombard’s *Sentences*, discussions of thirteen works of Aristotle, and a variety of disputations and sermons. “His two most important works are the *Summa Theologiae* and the *Summa Contra Gentiles*. Together they represent an encyclopedic summary of Christian thought, the first based on revelation and the second designed to support Christian belief with human reason. Both works use Aristotelian logic in unfolding the connections and implications of revealed truth” (Eerdmans’, p. 288). *Summa Theologiae* consists of 3000 articles (Cairns, p. 237).

*His Theology* Following Aristotle, Aquinas emphasized that all human knowledge originates in the senses. His famous “Five Ways” are proofs of God’s existence by reasoning based on what can be known from the world. “He believed in the realm of natural philosophy, comparable to modern science, man by the use of reason and on the logic of



Aristotle could gain such truths as those of God's existence, Providence, and immortality. Beyond this realm, concerning such ideas as the Incarnation, the Trinity, creation in time, sin, and purgatory, man could only get truths through faith in God's revelation in the Bible as interpreted by the Fathers and the councils" (Cairns, p. 237).

According to Aquinas, man's will is bent by sin, but not completely determined to evil. Thus, he broke with Augustine, who believed the human will is helpless to help man move toward God. He believed the seven sacraments were channels of grace instituted by Christ and justified indulgences by emphasizing the availability of the extra merits of Christ and the saints (Cairns, p. 238).

In 1277, the University of Paris condemned some of his statements. Duns Scotus and William of Ockham criticized him for not recognizing that reason and revelation often contradict one another. "Years later, however, Thomas's work gained prominence in Roman Catholic thought, which it has retained to the present time. At the Council of Trent (1545-63), the Roman Catholic reformers used the works of Aquinas in drafting their decrees; and in 1879, the pope declared Thomism (Aquinas's theology) eternally valid" (Eerdmans', p. 288).

*His Significance* Thomas Aquinas was called "Universal Doctor," "Angelical Doctor," and "Prince of Scholastics." He was the greatest scholastic theologian of the Middle Ages (Cairns, p. 233) and is recognized as one of the greatest theologians of all time (González, I, p. 319). Like Augustine, Aquinas influenced both Catholicism and Protestantism. In 1323, he was canonized as a saint. *Summa Theologiae* became the classic exposition of Roman Catholic theology. At the same time, it is been said by evangelicals that *Summa Theologiae's* "basic view of God, of Christ, and even of salvation is so Calvinistic that it would shock most evangelicals, that they would take the time to study the angelic Doctor" (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 396).

During the 16<sup>th</sup> century, both Catholic (Erasmus) and Protestant (Luther) thinkers mocked certain elements of Scholastic thought. Scholasticism did not have a great deal of practical application and it "could and did sometimes degenerate into arid academic debates and made much ado about little" (Cook, pp. 70-71).

## Dissenters

*Waldensians* In 1176, Peter Waldo (ca. 1140-ca. 1218), a wealthy merchant in Lyons, France, went to a theologian to ask about the way to heaven. He was given the injunction of Jesus to the rich young ruler to sell what he had and give it to the poor (Latourette, p. 451; González says Waldo heard the story of a monk who practiced extreme poverty, González, vol. 1, p. 302). Waldo sold his possessions, provided for his wife and children, distributed the rest of the property among the poor, and began baking his daily bread (Latourette, p. 451). His two basic principles were "The Bible is the only conclusive authority in faith and action for the Christian and the Bible in the vernacular coupled with the interpretation of Bible doctrines is the greatest need" (Westin, p. 28). From a study in the New Testament, he concluded that he, like the apostles, should preach in the city and countryside, taking no purse with him. He attracted followers, who called themselves the "poor men of Lyons" (Latourette, p. 451).

When the Archbishop of Lyons forbade them to preach, they appealed to the pope, who gave them permission, provided they were supervised by the local bishop. When they found

that restriction hindered their work, they asked the Third Lateran Council (1179) for authorization to preach, but they were denied it. They persisted in preaching and in 1184, the pope excommunicated them (Latourette, pp. 451-52). They then preached even more zealously (Eerdmans', p. 315). Waldo "assumed the title of bishop and declared himself to have spiritual authority to ordain presbyters and deacons and to administer the sacraments according to the Word of God" (Westin, p. 28).

Waldo himself faded from the picture, but the movement he founded increased in membership to survive both medieval and modern persecution. The Waldensians organized their own church and eventually claimed to be the true church. At the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, they had infiltrated practically all of Europe except for Britain and had become one of the most widespread persecuted movements (Eerdmans', pp. 315-16). They have been called "one of the most remarkable opposition movements against the medieval church" (Westin, p. 27).

They memorized large portions of Scripture, went about two by two, and lived on what was given to them by those who heard them preach. They held that women and laymen could preach, that laymen were as competent as priests to hear confession, that, if necessary, any layman might minister the Eucharist, that every lie is a deadly sin, and that all taking of human life is against God's law (Latourette, p. 452). The hallmark of the Waldensians was missionary preaching in the local language with a strong emphasis of the New Testament (Eerdmans', p. 316). They "richly supplied their messages with Bible quotations" (Westin, p. 29).

They were opposed to "the Mass, purgatory, the hierarchy, the property holdings of the church, priesthood, pilgrimages, saint worship," etc. (Westin, p. 27). They rejected the Catholic feast days, festivals, and prayers as man-made practices not based on the New Testament. They also rejected taking oaths (except under special circumstances) and prayers for the dead. They reasoned that if people were in heaven, they had no need of prayer and if they were in hell, they were beyond hope (Eerdmans', p. 316). They criticized prayers in Latin, derided church music, and held that sacraments administered by unworthy priests were invalid (Latourette, p. 452).

From 1211 to 1214, the Waldensians were burned at the stake in France and Germany. There were martyrs in Italy, but the Waldensians in northern Italy withdrew to the Alps to escape extermination (Westin, p. 30).

During the Protestant Reformation, they accepted Reformed theology and became Protestants (González, vol. 1, p. 302). "In 1979, the Waldensian Church was federated with the Italian Methodist Church. The two churches maintain their separate identities but are joined in a single synod. In 1990, the Waldensians-Methodist churches entered a covenant with the Baptist churches in Italy" (<http://globalministries.org/mee/partners/the-waldensian-church-italy-1.html>, accessed 9/24/2013). About 35,000 Waldensians still exist in northern Italy (Cairns, p. 227).

Finucane says, "In taking upon themselves the role of the church, by expounding the Bible, they shared a trait common to many other medieval dissenters" (Eerdmans', p. 315).

*Lollards* John Wycliffe (ca. 1328-84), "The Morning Star of the Reformation," had a brilliant mind, undaunted courage, a silver tongue, and great skill with the pen (Houghton, p. 65). He studied and taught at Oxford University for the better part of his life (Cairns, p. 251). During his studies at Oxford, Wycliffe came under the sway of an influential

Augustinian theologian, Thomas of Bradwardine, who taught justification by faith and warned against depending upon works (Westin, p. 31).

In 1376, he wrote *Of Civil Domain*. In it, he argued that God gave the *use*, but *not ownership*, of property, to church leaders as a trust to be used for His glory. If the church leaders failed to fulfill their function, it was proper for civil authority to take the property from them and give it to someone who served God acceptably (Cairns, pp. 251-52). In 1377, his views were condemned by the pope (Eerdmans', p. 338). Wycliffe denounced the pope as "the proud, worldly priest of Rome, the most accursed of clippers and purse-curvers (robbers)" (Houghton, p. 66). In 1379, he attacked the authority of the pope by insisting that Christ, not the pope, is the head of the church (Cairns, p. 252).

Wycliffe asserted that the Bible, not the church, is the sole authority for believers and that the church should model itself after the pattern of the New Testament (Cairns, p. 252). To support his views, Wycliffe made the Bible available to people in English. Since he did not know Hebrew or Greek, he made his translation from the Latin version (Houghton, p. 67). In 1382, the English translation of the New Testament was finished (Nicolas of Hereford translated most of the Old Testament into English). This was the first English translation of the whole Bible (Cairns, p. 252).

Wycliffe opposed transubstantiation, claiming Christ was spiritually present in the Eucharist and was apprehended by faith (Cairns, p. 252). He held that the church consisted of God's chosen people who did not need a priest to mediate with God for them. In 1382, the church authorities forced Wycliffe and his followers out of Oxford (Eerdmans', p. 338). In other lands, he would have suffered martyrdom, but in England, powerful nobles protected him. He was allowed to retire to his parish at Lutterworth, where he remained undisturbed as a priest.

Wycliffe's followers became known as the Lollards, a derogatory nickname given to those without an academic background. In 1395, the Lollards were an organized group with their own ministers. They believed that the main task of the priest was to preach and that the Bible was to be made available to everyone in his own language (Eerdmans', p. 338). They became numerous, but under Henry IV and Henry V, they were persecuted and finally extinguished.

The Roman Catholic Church hated John Wycliffe. In 1415, the Council of Constance ordered that his bones be dug up and refused reburial. This order was carried out in 1428, when the Bishop of Lincoln burned Wycliffe's remains and scattered his ashes on the Swift River (Houghton, p. 68).

The Wycliffe Bible Translators organization, founded by Cameron Townsend, takes its name from John Wycliffe.

*Hussites* Jan Hus, often referred to in English as John Huss (ca. 1373-1415), was rector of the University of Prague and pastor of the nearby Bethlehem Chapel (González, I, p. 348). When Richard II of England married Anne of Bohemia, students from Bohemia (Czechoslovakia) traveled to England to study. When they returned home, they took Wycliffe's ideas with them. About 1409, Hus adopted Wycliffe's ideas (Cairns, p. 252), especially freedom from papal authority.

In his book *On the Church*, he defined the church as the body of Christ and said Christ is the only head of the church. He stressed the role of Scripture as the authority in the church and elevated preaching to an important place in the church service. He condemned the corruption of the clergy, criticized people for worshiping images, criticized the church

for withholding the cup from the people during communion, and condemned the sale of indulgences (Eerdmans', p. 330).

In 1411, Hus was excommunicated by the pope (González, I, p 349). In 1415, he consented to appear before a council of the Roman Catholic Church at Constance on the border of Switzerland. He received a pledge of safe conduct, but it was violated on the principle that "faith was not to be kept with heretics." Hus was condemned and burned at the stake in 1415.

Hus' death aroused the national feelings of the Czech people, who established the Hussite church in Bohemia until the Habsburgs restored the Roman Catholic Church in 1620 (Eerdmans', p. 330).

About 1450, some of Hus' followers formed the United Brethren (Bohemian Brethren). From that group, the Moravian church, which still exists, developed. The Moravians influenced John Wesley (Cairns, p. 253).

## Men of the Period

### Gregory I

*His Life* Gregory I (540-604), often called Gregory the Great, was born into one of the old, noble, wealthy families of Rome. He was given a legal education to fit him for government service, but he became a monk. After his parents died, he used the fortune he inherited to build seven monasteries in Italy. In 578, he became the ambassador to Constantinople for the Bishop of Rome. In 586, when he returned to Rome, he was made Abbot of St. Andrews' monastery, which he had founded after his father's death. In 590, he was chosen to be Bishop of Rome (Cairns, p. 167).

Gregory was a humble man who thought of himself as the "servant of the servants of God." He was instrumental in winning the English to Christianity. His greatest accomplishment was expanding the power of the Bishop of Rome. Although he declined the title of pope, he exercised all the power and prerogatives of later popes. He exercised care over the churches of Gaul, Spain, Britain, Africa, and Italy (Cairns, p. 167).

*His Title* When John the Faster, the Patriarch of Constantinople, claimed the title of "ecclesiastical" or universal bishop, Gregory objected. He was willing to accept a coordinated status for the patriarchs of the church, but he was not willing to have anyone take the title of universal bishop.

In 602, Phocas became the new emperor in Constantinople. The Bishop of Constantinople excommunicated him for having caused the assassination of his predecessor. In 604, in order to spite the Bishop of Constantinople, Phocas acknowledged the Bishop of Rome as the "head of all the churches." Gregory did not accept the title of "universal pope," which even the Patriarch of Alexandria wanted to give him (Cairns, p. 167). Gregory's second successor, Boniface III (607), assumed the title, and it has been the designation of the Bishops of Rome ever since (Boettner, p. 125).

*His Work* As a result of his excellent work as an administrator, Gregory made the Bishop of Rome one of the wealthiest in the church of his day. Legend claims he was the inventor of the Gregorian chant. He was a good preacher whose sermons were practical messages that stressed humility and piety, but they were also often marred by an excessive use of allegory. He wrote a commentary on the book of Job, which is filled with allegory.

He also wrote *The Book of Pastoral Care*, which deals with pastoral theology. Over 800 of his letters are extant (Cairns, p. 168).

*His Theology* “Gregory was also an outstanding theologian. He ranked with Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine as one of the four great doctors of the Western church. He laid the groundwork of the theology that was held by the Roman church throughout the Middle Ages until Thomas Aquinas formulated his *Summa*. He believed that man was a sinner by birth and choice, but he softened Augustine’s view by asserting that man did not inherit guilt from Adam but the only sin, as a disease to which all were subject. He maintained that the will is free and that only its goodness had been lost. He believed in predestination, but limited it to the elect. Grace is not irresistible, he believed, because it is based on both the foreknowledge of God and, to some extent, the merits of man. He upheld the idea of purgatory as a place where souls would be purified prior to their entrance into heaven. He held to verbal inspiration of the Bible, but, strangely, gave tradition of place of equality with the Bible” (Cairns, p. 169).

González says Augustine *suggested* the possibility that purgatory was a place of purification for those who died in sin, where they would spend some time before going to heaven. What was conjecture for Augustine became a certainty for Gregory. He affirmed the existence of purgatory and gave impetus to the development of the doctrine (González, I, p. 247).

*Significance* Gregory I is generally regarded as the first pope. “Of the approximately 180 bishops of Rome between Constantine the Great and the Reformation, none was more influential than Gregory the Great... The Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons and the victory of Roman Christianity over the Celtic church were the long-term result of Gregory’s missionary policy.... Gregory’s prolific writing resulted in the production of a basic textbook for training the medieval clergy, increased the popularity of allegorical interpretations of the Bible, and interest in saint’s lives – the truly popular Christian literature of the Middle Ages. He gave to the early medieval Catholicism its distinctive character, stressing the cult of saints and relics, demonology, and ascetic virtues. Finally, Gregory confirmed the authority and hierarchy of the papacy and the church, and he proclaimed the ‘Christian Commonwealth’ in which the pope and the clergy were to be responsible for ordering society” (Eerdmans’, p. 220). González says Gregory was one of the ablest men to ever occupy the position that is now called pope (González, I, p. 244).

Gregory somewhat changed the Mass, which showed a “growing tendency to consider the Communion as a sacrifice of Christ’s body and blood each time it was performed. He also emphasized good works and the invocation of the saints in order to get their aid. It may safely be said that medieval theology bore the stamp of Gregory’s thought.... Later successors built on the foundation that he laid as they created the sacramental hierarchal system of the institutionalized church of the Middle Ages. He systematized doctrine and made the church a power in politics” (Cairns, p. 169).

## **Bernard of Clairvaux**

*His Life* Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) was born near Dijon to a noble French family. When he was twenty-one, he entered the monastery of Cîteaux, the center of the Cistercian order. In 1115, at the age of 25, he founded a new monastery at Clairvaux, which became one of the most famous centers of the Cistercian order (Cairns, p. 224).

His desire was to lead a life of prayer and self-denial. He was a mystic devoted to the contemplation of the humanity of Christ (González, p. I, p. 299). He preached 86 sermons to his monks on the Song of Solomon, which is an example of the emerging mysticism of Western monasticism. “He emphasized God’s love and believed that Christians come to know God by loving him. Bernard preached that physical love, which was natural to man, could be transformed by prayer and discipline into a redeeming spiritual love, the passion for Christ” (Eerdmans’, p. 260). He was a mystic, but he was also a practical man.

*His Work* Bernard of Clairvaux was first and foremost a monk. He became a famous preacher and his fame forced him to intervene as an arbitrator in many political and ecclesiastical disputes (González, I, p. 282). When there were two claimants to the papacy, “Europe would have been divided in its allegiance to them had it not been for the decisive support of Bernard of Clairvaux for Innocent II” (González, I, p. 307), whom he considered morally more worthy. He also scolded the rest of Europe into doing likewise (Eerdmans’, p. 260).

He wrote a rule for the order of Knights Templar. He condemned the scholastic rationalism of Peter Abelard. In 1146, he promoted the Second Crusade (Cairns, p. 221).

*His Significance* Bernard was the most influential Christian of his age. He bridged two worlds: the age of feudal values and of the rise of towns and universities. He was the first of the great medieval mystics, and a leader of a new spirit of ascetic simplicity and personal devotion. His mystical tendencies produced such hymns as “Jesus, the Very Thought of Thee,” and “O Sacred Head, Now Wounded” (Cairns, p. 224). Only twenty years after his death, he was canonized as St. Bernard. Luther said, “If there ever lived on earth a God-fearing and holy monk, it was St. Bernard of Clairvaux.”

Although the Middle Ages are often associated with scholasticism, this was also an era of a more affective and contemplative experience and thought. Mysticism seeks an experience with God rather than just knowledge of God. There several variations. *Via Negativa* sets aside reliance on the senses or the quest for knowledge (“One must clear the mind of any knowledge of or attraction to the created world to know God,” Cook, p. 73). After 1200, a form of mysticism arose, which was more positive about the material world as a path toward experience of God. There have also been Jewish, Muslim (Sufism), and Buddhist mystics (Cook, p. 72). The Brethren of the Common Life was influenced by a variety of mystical strains. One member of that group, Thomas à Kempis, wrote *The Imitation of Christ*. “The brethren educated the great humanist Erasmus and influenced late medieval German piety—and hence Martin Luther” (Cook, p. 75).

## **Francis of Assisi**

*His Life* Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) was born in Assisi, Italy. His father was a wealthy cloth merchant and his mother was French. He grew up loving fancy clothes and parties (Cook and Herzman, p. 12). In 1202, he became a knight, was captured, and held for ransom for a nearly year. While waiting for his father to pay the ransom, he became seriously ill and reported later that he began to receive visions from God. He was released in 1203 and returned to Assisi.

Back in Assisi, Francis’ father’s business did not satisfy him. He began disappearing to be alone to pray. While praying at the church of San Damiano, he reportedly heard the voice of Christ, who told him to rebuild the Christian churches. To raise money to rebuild the Christian church, he sold some of his father’s merchandise. His father was furious and

dragged him before the local bishop. When the bishop told Francis to return his father's money, he stripped himself naked in the town square and gave his clothes back to his father, declaring that God was now the only father he recognized. The Bishop of Assisi wrapped Francis, who stood there naked, in his own cloak. Francis then lived among the lepers. Others began to follow his lead (Cook and Herzman, p. 13).

In 1209, Francis heard the reading of Matthew 10:7-10, where Jesus sent His disciples to preach, taking nothing for them. Based on that message, he combined preaching and poverty (González, pp. 302-303).

Also, in 1209, Francis received approval from Pope Innocent III for a new order, which came to be known as the Franciscans (Cook and Herzman, p. 16). In 1212, a society for women, the Poor Clares, began when Clare, an heiress of Assisi, was converted and commissioned. In 1219, he made an unsuccessful attempt to convert the Sultan of Egypt (Eerdmans' p. 264). On October 3, 1226, at the age of 44, Francis died in Assisi. In 1228, Francis was canonized by Pope Gregory IX (Cook and Herzman, p. 16).

*His Work* Francis founded the Franciscan order. He felt that three besetting sins were pride, greed, and "complexity" (Cook and Herzman, p. 18). So he drew up the rules for the order, which included poverty, chastity, and obedience with emphasis on obedience to the pope (Cairns, p. 225). Humility was the antidote for pride. Poverty was the antidote for the expanding money economy, and simplicity was the antidote for the growing complexity of society (Cook and Herzman, p. 19). He called his associates "Friars Minor" ("lesser brothers") (Eerdmans' p. 264). According to the rules, they were to be "without personal belongings." They were to "possess nothing, neither a house, nor a place, nor anything. But, as pilgrims and strangers in this world, serving God in poverty and humility, they shall continually seek alms and not be ashamed, for the Lord made himself poor in this world for us" (Eerdmans' pp. 266-267). The rules also say, "I strictly charge all the brethren not to hold a conversation with women so as to arouse suspicion, nor to take any counsel with them" (Eerdmans' p. 267).

*His Significance* Francis is revered by many as one of the most Christ-like figures who ever lived (Eerdmans' p. 264). G. K. Chesterton called Francis "the only Christian" (Cook and Herzman, p. 34). Englishman William of Ockham was a member of the Franciscans. Ockham ideas concerning the nature of reality had an influence on the spiritual development of Luther (Cairns, p. 225).

Since Jesus said that the apostles were to preach to all creatures, Francis preached to the birds. He believed that God had allowed him to communicate to them. His sermons to them were his way of showing his reference for all of creation (Cook and Herzman, p. 22). He is the patron saint of ecologists—a title honoring his boundless love for animals and nature.

In 1224, Francis reportedly received a vision that left him with the stigmata of Christ—marks resembling the wounds Jesus Christ suffered when he was crucified, through his hands, and the gaping lance wound in his side—making Francis the first person to receive the holy wounds of the stigmata. (Some believe that his wounds were actually symptoms of leprosy, not proof of a miracle.)

## **Savonarola**

*His Life* Ginolamo Savonarola (1452-1498) was born in Ferrara, Italy. He studied humanism and medicine, but renounced these pursuits to become a Dominican in 1474. He

served in several northern Italian cities (Eerdmans', p. 334). 1490, he was assigned to Florence, where he tried to reform both state and church (Cairns, p. 253).

*His Work* Savonarola was a preacher of reform. Like an Old Testament prophet, he preached against the social, ecclesiastical, and political evils of his day, attracting great multitudes to the cathedral. At one point, he became the governor of the city (Houghton, p. 73). "He initiated tax reforms, aided the poor, reformed the courts, and changed the city from a lax, corrupt, pleasure-loving place into a virtual monastery" (Eerdmans', p. 334).

Savonarola was convinced that luxuries were vanities. He instituted periodic "burnings of vanities." People placed their vanities, such as dresses, jewelry, wigs, ostentatious furniture, etc. on a fire in the main square of the town (González, I, p. 354). They also tossed in "cards, dice, costumes used in carnivals, and licentious books and pictures" (Houghton, p. 73). "These great bonfires came to take the place of the carnival, which had been banned" (González, I, p. 354).

"Having reformed Florence, he next denounced Pope Alexander VI and the corrupt papal court" (Eerdmans', p. 334). He called the pope "the Antichrist" and Rome "the harlot Babylon" (Noble, p. 66). He was excommunicated by the pope, imprisoned, condemned, tortured, hanged and his body burned in the great square of Florence.

*His Significance* "Savonarola became a hero to many of the early Protestants, even though he retained a catholic theology. They saw in his opposition to the papacy a useful example for them to follow" (Eerdmans', p. 334). "Luther regarded Savonarola as a pioneer of the Reformation, but it is clear that his work was largely confined to the reform of public morals. It had no link with the reform of doctrine which began, though not in Italy, about twenty years after his death" (Houghton, p. 74).

**Summary:** During the period of the divided church, the papacy was established, Roman Catholicism evolved and developed, Islam began, universities were founded, and the church, which was divided from the beginning of the period, formally split in 1054.

The Middle Ages are sometimes referred to as the "dark ages," but that does not mean that the light of the gospel was extinguished, even among some in Roman Catholicism. In his lectures on the history of Christian theology, Professor Cary says that during the Middle Ages, "A good priest would often hold a crucifix before the face of the dying and urge them to trust in Christ rather than worry about their inadequate moral life" (Cary, *HCT*, p. 79).



# THE REFORMED CHURCH

The fifth division of church history is the period of the Reformed Church. The Reformation was a religious reform movement that resulted in the creation of *national* Protestant churches (Cairns, p. 277). It began with the nailing of the 95 Theses on a church door (1517) and ended with the Thirty Years War (1618-1648).

## The Causes of the Reformation

“The causes of the Reformation were not simple but were complex and multiple” (Cairns, pp. 277-278). The *political factor* was that the new centralized European states were opposed to the concept of a universal church that claimed jurisdiction over nations, and the *economic factor* was the papal attempt to get more money out of Germany (Cairns, p. 281). Such an environment made the establishment of national churches possible. Beyond those general factors, there were several specific causes of the Reformation.

*The Awakening of the Renaissance* One of the forces producing the Reformation was the Renaissance, the awakening of Europe to a new interest in literature, art, and science. For example, there was a new interest in the Scripture, Greek and Hebrew, and a search for the foundations of faith. The fall of Constantinople flooded Italy and Europe with scholars whose views differed from those in the West. The manuscripts those scholars brought with them alerted Western scholars to the changes that had taken place in the copying and re-copying of the New Testament. The Greek text of the New Testament could now be compared with the commonly used Latin Vulgate. When that was done, it was obvious that it was necessary to return to the sources of the Christian faith and this would result in a reformation of existing doctrine and practices (González, II, p. 7).

*The Invention of Printing* In 1455, when Gutenberg discovered that books could be printed from moveable type, the first book printed was a Bible. Before that books could be circulated only as rapidly as they could be copied by hand. Now they could be disseminated much faster. A Bible during the Middle Ages cost the wages of a working man for a year. Now they could be produced at much less expense.

The invention of printing provided a vehicle for the coming Reformation (González, II, p. 10). Luther was the first to make full use of printing and to write with the printed page in mind (González, II, p. 15). The press brought the Scripture to common use. When people read the New Testament, they soon realized that the papal church was far from the New Testament ideal. The teachings of the Reformers were set forth in books and pamphlets and circulated by the millions throughout Europe.

*The Conditions within the Church* Cook points out how different the Renaissance Catholic Church was from apostolic times, or even the age of Augustine. It had a hierarchy headed by the pope with a bishop over a diocese, a great deal of wealth, and a great deal of secular power (Papal States). The clergy were separated from the laity in lifestyle, the legal system, and haircuts. Parish priests were all but illiterate. The laity took communion once a year and they only partook of the bread (Cook, p. 85). The *de facto* message of the church was to conform to the rules, be nice, and if you were still lacking, you would be treated

with mercy. “The popes (and cardinals and bishops) at Luther’s time were often worldly and morally corrupt” (Cook, p. 86).

The monasteries were also corrupt. The growing wealth of the monasteries led to lax discipline, luxury, idleness, and open immorality. Many of the convents were filled with iniquity. Each new order was an effort for reform, but its members eventually dropped to lower and lower levels of conduct.

By the time of the Reformation, negligence, ignorance, absenteeism, and sexual immorality were widespread among the clergy and taken for granted by the people. Many priests lived in open sin or kept concubines (Cairns, p. 281). Worse yet was the papal protection and promotion of abuses. Corruption is one thing; sanctioning corruption is quite another. Machiavelli, a political writer, said that the nearer one got to Rome, the more corruption one found. In 1510, seven years before his public protest, Luther was shocked by what he saw when he visited Rome. Incidentally, Luther reckoned that things began to go extremely wrong with the church in the eighth century.

*The Selling of Indulgences* The immediate cause of the Protestant Reformation was the abuse of the indulgence system in Germany. That was the straw that broke the camel’s back. Eleven wax seals, dated March 2, 1471, were found in Rome granting absolution of 100 days to all the faithful who went to church on certain holidays and donated money so prayer books, etc. could be purchased.

In 1514, Archbishop Albert (1490-1545) also wanted to be the Archbishop of Mainz. Because canon law forbade one man from holding more than one office, he had to pay to hold both offices. Needing the money to build St. Peter’s Cathedral in Rome, Pope Leo X was willing to grant a dispensation, provided that Albert paid a large sum of money in addition to the regular fees. Leo suggested that Albert borrow the money from a wealthy banking family in Augsburg, and he issued a papal bull authorizing the sale of indulgences in Saxony as security, guaranteeing that Albert would repay the loan (Cairns, p. 282). Johann Tetzel, a Dominican monk, used high-pressure methods to sell indulgences, even for the gravest of sins. The price was determined by one’s income. Kings might have to pay high fees; indulgences were free to the destitute (Cairns, p. 283).

It was believed that Christ and the saints had achieved so much merit in their lives that the excess merit was laid up in a heavenly treasury of merit on which the pope could draw on behalf of the living. This idea was first formulated by Alexander of Hales in the thirteenth century. In 1343, Clement XI declared it to be dogma. In 1476, Sixtus IV extended the privilege to souls in purgatory, provided their living relatives purchased indulgences for them (Cairns, p. 282). Apparently, there were people in Germany who were prepared to buy indulgences for sins they had not yet committed (Houghton, p. 84).

So, “The great basilica [St. Peter’s] that is now the pride of Roman Catholicism was one of the indirect causes of the Protestant Reformation” (González, II, p. 21).

*The Commitment to Scripture* The Reformers wanted to go back to the Bible in order to counter the claims of Thomistic theology that salvation was a matter of grace obtained through the sacraments dispensed by the hierarchy (Cairns, p. 282).

It should also be pointed out that years before the Reformation, some saw the need for change in the church. Men and movements during the Middle Ages were forerunners of the Reformation. Leading the list would be Peter Waldo and the Waldensians, John Wycliffe in the Lollards, and Jan Hus and the Hussites. To that list could be added William Tyndale and Girolamo Savonarola.

## The Reformation

The Protestant churches (Lutheran and Reformed) have their differences, but there are five common principles of Protestantism.

1. *Sola Scriptura* (Latin: Scripture alone) is the doctrine that the Bible contains all the knowledge necessary for salvation and the spiritual life, as opposed to the creeds, tradition, and the pope.

2. *Sola Fide* (Latin: faith alone) is the belief that justification is by faith alone. It asserts that based on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, God declares sinners righteous solely through faith, excluding all works. Christ's righteousness is imputed by God to the believing sinner, as opposed to infused or imparted.

3. *Sola Gratia* (Latin: grace alone) is the teaching that salvation is solely by the grace of God. The church had affirmed the doctrine of *sola gratia* at the Council of Orange (529), but the Reformers contended that the view of Roman Catholicism was that the means of salvation was a mixture of reliance upon the grace of God and confidence in the merits of one's own works.

4. *Solus Christus* (Latin: Christ alone) is the idea that salvation is through Christ alone and that Christ is the only mediator between God and man.

5. *Soli Deo Gloria* (Latin: Glory to God alone) is the conviction that everything is to be done for God's glory to the exclusion of mankind's self-glorification and pride.

Cary explains the first three as: Scripture alone without additional revelation, faith alone without works, and grace alone without human merit (Cary, *HCT*, p. 80).

*Germany* The birthday of the Reformation is generally considered to be October 31, 1517. At noon that day, Martin Luther nailed a parchment containing 95 theses on the door of the Wittenberg Church (Houghton, p. 84). Nearly all of them were related to the sale of indulgences. Nailing the theses on the door of the Castle Church was like putting a notice on a bulletin board. It was a notice that Luther wanted to debate these issues.

In June of 1520, after many controversies and the publication of pamphlets that made Luther's ideas known throughout Germany, his teachings were formally condemned and he was excommunicated by a bull of Pope Leo X (bull is a Latin word for "seal;" the name was applied to any document with an official seal, in this case, a papal decree). On December 10, 1520, at the Wittenburg gate, before professors, students, and people, Luther burned the bull, as well as copies of the laws and canons enacted by Roman authorities.

In 1521, Luther was summoned to appear before a Diet (council) meeting in the city of Worms. Luther's friends warned him that he might meet with the fate of Jan Hus, but Luther went anyway. Charles V, the new emperor, promised to protect him. On April 18, 1521, as Luther stood before the Diet, he said could retract what he had written except what was disproved by Scripture or reason ending with, "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. God help me." Charles was urged to seize Luther, but he permitted Luther to leave Worms.

While traveling home, Luther was arrested by the soldiers of Elector Frederic and taken to the castle of the Wartburg for his safety. During his stay, he translated the New Testament into German. The Old Testament was not completed until several years later. After a year, he returned to Wittenberg.

Germany was divided over the Reformation. The southern princes followed Rome, while those of the north followed Luther. In 1529, the second Diet at Speier declared the Roman Catholic faith the only legal faith. Lutheranism was forbidden in states where it had

not become dominant. It was allowed, however, in the states already Lutheran. The six rulers who followed Luther and representatives of 14 free cities read a *Protestation*. From then on, they were known as Protestants (Cairns, p. 295).

The Diet of Augsburg (1530) approved the Augsburg Confession, which was written by Melancthon with Luther's approval. It became the official creed of the Lutheran Church. After the Reformation under Martin Luther, the national church that was formed in Germany and in the Scandinavian countries took the name of Lutheran.

In 1535, the Wittenberg faculty began to ordain ministers (Cairns, p. 295). The Peace of Augsburg (1555) gave Lutheranism legal equality with Roman Catholicism in Germany (Cairns, p. 296). The Peace of Augsburg was based on the principle that each prince determined the religion of his people. "If the ruler was Catholic, his people were to be Catholic; if Protestant, his people were to be Protestant" (Houghton, p. 96).

From the Peace of Augsburg (1555) to the publication of the *Book of Concord* (1580) there were doctrinal controversies within Lutheranism, including Antinomianism, that is, the place of the Law in the preaching of the gospel (for details, see G. Michael Cocoris, "Antinomianism," at [www.insightsfromtheword.com](http://www.insightsfromtheword.com)), the Majoristic controversy (the contention by George Major that even though salvation is by faith alone, good works are an important part of salvation), the nature of the Lord's Supper, and whether or not the human will is able to cooperate with grace and salvation. These disputes resulted in an emphasis on correct doctrine, an emphasis that led to a cold, scholarly orthodoxy. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Pietistic movements arose as a reaction to this strong intellectual emphasis (Cairns, p. 297).

Universal compulsory elementary education had its early beginnings in the efforts of Melancthon, who set up a school system in Germany so that people might read the Bible in the vernacular. He was also interested in secondary schools as well as university education (Cairns, p. 296).

*In Switzerland* In Switzerland, the Reformation started in Zürich with a man named Zwingli. He started the "Reformed" tradition. The name "Reformed" comes from the phrase "the church reformed according to the Word of God." The Reformed tradition was more thorough in breaking with Catholicism and the sacramental practices of Lutheranism. The Reformed tradition includes John Calvin, a second-generation reformer who was the theologian of the movement, the Puritans, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, and some Baptists (Cary, *HCT*, p. 80).

Zwingli first began to draw attention to himself by preaching against the notion that a pilgrimage to the shrine of the Virgin Mary could not avail for salvation and declaring that he found nothing in the New Testament to support such a practice. By the time he became a priest in Zürich (1518), he had reached conclusions similar to those of Luther (González, II, p. 47). The Reformation in Zürich was put into effect by government action. It was organized and soon became more radical than that in Germany. Its progress, however, was hindered by a civil war between the Roman Catholics and Protestants in which Zwingli was slain in 1531. When Zwingli was killed, Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) became his successor in Zürich (Cairns, p. 303). In 1549, the Zwinglian forces merged with the Calvinistic forces in the Reformed churches of Switzerland (Cairns, p. 303).

In Geneva, the Reformation was established by Guillaume Farel (1489-1565), "a redheaded, hot-tempered, strong-voiced, prophetic individual." Soon after 1521, he accepted Luther's discovery of the doctrine of justification by faith. In 1532, he began his

work in Geneva (Cairns, p. 311). On May 21, 1536, the General Assembly of Citizens passed the Edict of Reformation. Realizing that he needed help from someone with more organizing ability, Farel urged Calvin, who had stopped in Geneva one night on his travels, to help him. Because of his love of the life of a student and a writer of theology, Calvin tried to decline the invitation. Farel told him that the curse of God would be on him if he did not stay in Geneva to help. Calvin later confessed that stricken by fear, he decided to stay (Cairns, p. 311).

*In Scandinavia* At the time of the Reformation, the Scandinavian kingdom consisted of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, all under one government. The Scandinavian kingdom received Luther's teaching early. In Denmark, Frederick I (1523- 1533) publicly favored the Reformation and made Hans Tausen (ca. 1494-1561) the royal chaplain. Tausen did in Denmark what Luther did in Germany. He was greatly helped by the publication of the Danish translation of the New Testament (1524) and by the fact that the common people were disgusted with the corruption of the clergy and the sale of indulgences. In 1539, Lutheranism became the state church of Denmark and Norway, which was dominated by Denmark (Cairns, p. 298).

*In Sweden* In 1523, Sweden became independent of Denmark. After studying at Wittenberg, Olavus Petri (1493-1552) did in Sweden what Luther had done in Germany. In 1527, Lutheranism was made the state religion of Sweden (Cairns, p. 298).

*In Finland* Because Finland was controlled by Sweden, Lutheranism spread from Sweden to Finland. Michael Agricola (1508-1557), who became Archbishop about 1510, was the apostle of the Reformation in Finland (Cairns, p. 298).

*In the Netherlands* Lutheranism came to the Netherlands (now Holland and Belgium), but it failed to win the loyalty of the Dutch. Luther's insistence on the authority of the secular ruler was distasteful to those who wanted to revolt against their Spanish rulers. The more democratic Calvinism appealed to them as a way to escape from the Roman system. By 1560, the majority of Protestants were Calvinists, a minority were Anabaptists, led by Menno Simons, and a small minority were Lutherans (Cairns, p. 323).

Philip II, a devoted Roman Catholic, was determined to bring the Spanish Netherlands back to the fold of the pope. Between 1567 and 1573, 2000 people were executed and by the end of the century, 40,000 had migrated to other countries (Cairns, p. 323). When the Netherlands obtained independence from Spain, Holland became Protestant, but Belgium remained Roman Catholic.

James (Jacobus) Arminius (1559-1609) studied at Leiden and at Geneva. After 15 years as a pastor in Amsterdam, Arminius became a professor of theology at Leiden in 1603. He attempted to modify Calvinism so that God might not be considered the author of sin, nor man an automaton in the hand of God. He was opposed by Francis Gomar, a colleague. Arminius asked the government to call a national synod, but he died before it could be called. His supporters compiled their ideas in the *Remonstrance* (1610). From 1618 to 1619, a synod was held in the city of Dort. The synod passed the Canons of Dort and deprived the Armenian clergy of their positions. The persecution of the Arminians did not cease until 1625 (Cairns, pp. 324-325).

*In France* In 1512, Jacques Lefevre published a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, in which he denied that good works could earn salvation and asserted that justification is by faith. Although he translated the New Testament into French so that people could know the Bible and he wanted the church to preach Christ in a simple way,

he and his followers had no intention of breaking from Rome (Kuiper, p. 211). Nevertheless, Lefevre has been called “the father of the French Revolution” (Houghton, p. 129).

Luther’s writings gave impetus to the Reformation in France. A book containing nearly all of his writings up to October 1518 was imported into France. This book and others Luther wrote aroused widespread interest. So much so that the Catholic theologians in France started publishing tracts to counteract the Reformation movement. No exact figures are available, but it was estimated that in 1534 there were 30,000 followers of Luther in Paris alone (Kuiper, p. 211). In 1532, the Waldensians adopted Calvinism (Cairns, p. 316).

In 1536, Calvin wrote *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* to defend the French Christians as loyal subjects and to suggest that the persecution cease (Cairns, p. 316). In fact, Calvin dedicated the *Institutes* to Francis I, hoping to avert persecution (Houghton, p. 129). Later, between 1555 and 1556, over 1550 pastors trained in Geneva were sent to France (Cairns, p. 316). Calvin carried on extensive correspondence with Protestants in France (Kuiper, p. 211).

The Reformation in France encountered several problems. The movement lacked leadership and alarmed at the rise of Protestantism, Francis I, who ruled from 1515-1547, decided to use force to prevent it from spreading (Cairns, pp. 315-316). By 1545, thousands of Protestants had been killed and 22 towns and villages had been virtually destroyed. Henry II (1547-1559), the son of Francis I, was more constant and controlling than his father in opposing the Reformation (González, II p. 103). He had all packages coming into France inspected, forbade peddlers from selling books, and forbade unlettered people from speaking about religious matters, at home, at work, or among their neighbors. He had government agents regularly visit printers (Houghton, pp. 129-130).

After 1560, the French Protestants became known as the Huguenots (the origin of the name is uncertain). As a result of the growth and power of the Huguenots, between 1562 and 1598, there were eight wars against Protestants in French. In August of 1572, the king’s sister married a Protestant. On that occasion, many wealthy and prominent Huguenots gathered in largely Catholic Paris. On August 23 (the eve of the feast of Bartholomew the Apostle), the king ordered the killing of a group of Huguenot leaders and the slaughter spread throughout Paris. The massacre spread from Paris to other urban centers and to the countryside. Twenty thousand were massacred and their property was seized by Roman Catholics (Cairns, p. 316). Houghton says the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre was “one of the most hideous crimes recorded in history” (Houghton, p. 131; see Houghton pp. 131-134 for details of this event).

In 1685, Louis XIV, desiring to have one state, one ruler, and one faith, revoked the Edict of Nantes that had protected the Huguenots since 1598 and, as a result, 400,000 Huguenots fled to England, Prussia, Holland, South Africa and Carolinas in North America. Since that time, Protestants have been a small minority in France (Cairns, pp. 316-317).

*In England* Before the Protestant Reformation, John Tyndale (ca. 1494-1536) translated the New Testament into English (1525). This translation from Erasmus’ Greek New Testament was the first printed English New Testament (Cairns, p. 328). More than any other English translation, it has shaped all other English translations since. Tyndale was martyred in 1536.

In 1521, King Henry VIII, who ruled from 1509 to 1547, wrote *In Defense of the Seven Sacraments*, which was an attack on Luther's *Babylonian Captivity*. In response, Pope Leo X (1513-1521) named Henry VIII "Defender of the Faith." Henry wanted a male heir, but he and his wife Catherine had only one child, a daughter, who later ruled as Mary Tudor (two sons died in infancy, Houghton, p. 112). In 1527, Henry sent Cardinal Wolsey to Rome to negotiate an annulment with Pope Clement VII (1523-1534). Clement VII was unable to grant the request because he was under the control of Catherine's nephew, Charles V, the ruler of Spain and the Emperor of Germany and Catherine requested that the pope not grant the annulment (González, p. II, 72).

Here are the details. Henry VIII had a brother named Arthur, who was married to Catherine of Aragon. When Arthur died, Henry was granted permission by the pope to marry Arthur's wife Catherine, but when she failed to have a son to be Henry's successor on the throne, Henry requested the next pope, Clement VII, to declare that papal permission given to him to marry Catherine was contrary to the law of God and, therefore, he had never really been married to her at all and was free to marry another. When Clement did not do that, Henry appointed Thomas Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury, a man who was willing to accept Henry's claim that he had never been married to Catherine according to the law of God and who was willing to join Henry and Anne Boleyn in marriage (Houghton, p. 112).

Thus in 1533, Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556), Archbishop of Canterbury, declared that Henry's marriage to Catherine was invalid. In the same year, Henry married his mistress, Anne Boleyn, who bore him a daughter—Elizabeth! In 1536, Henry had Anne beheaded on charges of adultery, which were false accusations (Houghton, 113). In 1534, the Act of Supremacy declared the king to be the "supreme head of the Church of England" (Cairns, pp. 329-330). Thus the Reformation in England was instituted by the Parliament and the king (Cairns, p. 329). Henry did all of this without embracing Protestant theology (Noble, p. 67). Although excommunicated, he remained a Roman Catholic in doctrine and practice (Eerdmans' p. 386) and a bitter enemy of the Reformed faith until the day he died, even putting to death people who embraced Protestantism (Houghton, pp. 112-113). Yet he destroyed the power of the pope and ended monasticism in England (Eerdmans' p. 386).

In 1539, the English Parliament passed the Six Articles, which reaffirmed transubstantiation, celibacy, and confession. In other words, at first, the theology of the Church of England remained true to Roman Catholicism (Cairns, p. 329).

After having Anne Boleyn beheaded, Henry married Jane Seymour, who gave birth to a son (Edward) before she died. Later, Henry married Anne of Cleves, whom he then divorced. Then he married Catherine Howard, whom he had executed and Catherine Parr, who outlived him (Cairns, pp. 330-331). When Henry VIII died, the Church of England was a national church with the king as its head, but it was Roman Catholic in doctrine. In his will, Henry named Edward as his successor to the throne (Cairns, p. 331).

Under Edward V (1547-1553), Henry's son, the cause of the Reformation, made great progress. Led by Cranmer, Nicolas Ridley, the scholar, and Hugh Latimer, the preacher, the Reformation was introduced (Eerdmans' p. 386) and the Church of England was established. The Six Articles were repealed (1547), the marriage of priests was legitimized (1549), and services were conducted in English instead of Latin. The Act of Uniformity (1549) provided for the use of the Book of Common Prayer, which emphasizes the reading of the Bible and the participation of the congregation in the church service. This second

edition of the Book of Common Prayer (1552) reflected Calvinistic influences. With slight modifications, this edition was adopted in Elizabeth I's reign and is the one the Anglican Church has used since that time. In 1553, by royal assent, the Forty-Two Articles were made the creed of the Anglican Church (Cairns, p. 331).

Queen Mary (1553-1558), Henry's daughter by Catherine of Aragon, was an ardent Romanist, who restored the church in England to what it was at the death of her father in 1547. During her five-year reign, persecution reigned. Nearly 300 were martyred, including Cranmer, who at first recanted but later recanted his recantation, Ridley, and Latimer (Cairns, p. 332). Mary decided that even though Cranmer recanted, he should be burned at the stake; she never forgave him for setting aside her mother's marriage to Henry (Houghton, p. 115) and, besides, that decision also declared her an illegitimate child (González, II, p. 76). No wonder she's known as "bloody Mary." Fox's *Book of Martyrs*' (1553) account of these persecutions in gory detail aroused sympathy for Protestantism (Cairns, p. 332). Therefore, Mary actually did more to strengthen Protestantism than to weaken it (Eerdmans' p. 387). Many of those who fled to the Continent because of her persecution returned after her death, bringing Zwinglian and Calvinist ideas with them (González, II, p. 78).

Under Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603), Henry's daughter by Anne Boleyn, the Church of England was reestablished and took the form in which it has continued to the present day. The Forty-Two Articles were revised to the Thirty-Nine Articles, which were accepted by Parliament (1563) as the creed of the Anglican Church. With slight revisions (1571), the Thirty-Nine Articles has been the creed of the Anglican Church since that time. Pope Pius V enlisted Philip of Spain to recover England for Roman Catholicism. In 1588, his Spanish Armada was ignominiously defeated by the British Navy.

So under Queen Elizabeth, I, the Church of England was *really established* as the state church in England. Elizabeth I was the "supreme governor" of the church. The state supervised, enforced conformity to, and financially supported the Church of England. The government appointed bishops and provided for the theological education of the clergy. In order to attend Oxford or Cambridge, be ordained a clergyman, or even be a member of Parliament, a person had to sign the Thirty-Nine Articles (that was not changed until 1871). In 1559, Parliament passed the Act of Uniformity, which required that services be conducted according to the *Book of Common Prayer* ("common" means this is the way the people in England are to pray in common). Under Elizabeth, and for much of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, it was illegal not to go to church (this was changed by the Act of Toleration in 1689). The people were required to go to the Church of England, but they were not required to believe in the Thirty-Nine Articles or to partake of communion. They just had to be in church. It was merely outward conformity (Cary, from lectures on The History of Christian Theology; see also Course Guidebook, pp. 97-99).

*In Scotland* Several factors contributed to the cause of the Reformation in Scotland. Patrick Hamilton (ca. 1503-28), who was educated at Wittenberg, preached justification by faith and asserted that the pope was the Antichrist. As a result, he was burned at the stake in 1528. George Wishart (ca. 1513-46) was also burned at the stake in 1546 for teaching Protestant doctrine. Scottish merchants brought copies of Tyndale's New Testament to Scotland. At that time, "concubinage, drunkenness, simony, and a greed for wealth coupled with disregard for the people characterized the leaders of the Roman church in Scotland" (Cairns, p. 319).



The man who established the Reformation in Scotland was John Knox (ca. 1514-72). He was educated at the University of St. Andrews and, in 1536, was ordained to the priesthood. Later he became a Calvinist. In 1560, led by Knox, the Scottish Parliament ended the rule of the pope over the Scottish church, declared the Mass illegal, and repealed all statutes against heretics. It accepted the Scottish Confession of Faith, which had been drawn up in less than a week by John Knox and five other men. The Scottish Church was organized into presbyteries, synods, and a national assembly (Cairns, pp. 320-21).

The Presbyterian Church, planted by Knox, became the established church of Scotland. Early in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, many Scottish Presbyterians migrated to northern Ireland and from there, 200,000 migrated to America in first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Cairns, p. 321).

*In Ireland* Gissur Einarsson, a clergyman who came under the influence of Lutheranism during his stay in Germany, returned to Ireland in 1533 and began to preach Lutheran doctrine. In 1540, when he became bishop, he introduced Lutheranism to the people in his bishopric. In 1554, by royal decree, Lutheranism became the official religion of Ireland (Cairns, p. 298).

Conclusion: At the opening of the sixteenth century, the only church in Western Europe was the Roman Catholic Church. Before the end of that century, every land of northern Europe west of Russia had broken away from Rome and established its own national church.

## The Reformers

### Martin Luther

*His Life* Martin Luther (1483-1546) was born on November 10, 1483 to a peasant family. Since the day after his birth was the feast of St. Martin, he was named after that saint (Houghton, p. 79). He was reared under strict discipline. He tells of being whipped by his mother for stealing a hazelnut and being whipped at school 15 times in one morning. His pious but superstitious mother also inculcated in him many of the superstitions of the day. "His love of hard work, his strong will, and his practical conservatism were present in him from the beginning" (Cairns, p. 288).

In 1501, he entered the University of Erfurt, where he studied the philosophy of Aristotle under the influence of teachers who followed the ideas of William of Ockham. William taught that revelation was the only guide in the realm of faith and reason was the guide to truth in philosophy. In 1502 or 1503, Luther received a Bachelor of Arts degree and in 1505 was granted the Master of Arts degree. His father wanted him to study law, but in July 1505, Luther became frightened during a severe thunderstorm and promised Saint Anne that if he were spared, he would become a monk. His father suggested that this might be "a trick of the devil." About two weeks later, he entered an Augustinian monastery in Erfurt, where, in 1507, he was ordained and celebrated his first mass. In 1508, he taught theology for a semester at a new university which had been founded in Wittenberg (Cairns, pp. 288-289).

When he was struggling spiritually, he cried out to Johann von Staupitz, the head of the Augustinian order in Germany, "Oh, my sins! My sins! My sins!" Staupitz replied, "Remember that Christ came into the world for the pardon of our sins." On another occasion, when the thought of Christ terrified Luther because he thought of the Lord as the

One who punishes sin, Staupitz told him, “Your thoughts are not according to Christ; Christ does not terrify, he consoles. Look at the wounds of Christ and you will there see shining clearly the purpose of God towards men” (Houghton, p. 81). Staupitz urged Luther to trust God and study the Bible (Cairns, p. 289).

In 1510, Luther went to Rome. On his journey, as he stayed in monastery after monastery, he discovered that the priests were deplorably ignorant, given to gross superstitions, and many were unbelievers and even blasphemers. In Rome, he said a dozen masses and regretted that his father and mother were still living because if they had been dead, his masses would have helped them get out of purgatory (Houghton, p. 82).

In Rome, he also climbed up Pilate’s stairs on his bare knees. In one of his sermons he refers to that experience. He said, “I wish to liberate my grandfather from purgatory and went up the staircase of Pilate praying a *pater noster* (Latin: “our Father,” a reference to the Lord’s Prayer) on each step; for I was convinced that he who prayed thus could redeem his soul. But when I came to the top step, the thought came to me, “Who knows whether this is true?” An account written by his youngest son, Paul, says that as his father ascended the staircase, the words of Habakkuk came to his mind, “The just shall live by faith,” which caused him to realize the worthlessness of stair-climbing (Houghton, pp. 83-84).

On his way to Rome, when he first saw it from a distance, Luther fell on his knees, exclaiming, “Hail, holy Rome, thrice holy for the blood of the martyrs shed here.” At the end of his stay in Rome, he said, “If there is a hell, Rome is built over it” (Houghton, p. 84).

In 1511, Luther transferred to Wittenberg, where he received a Doctorate of Theology degree and became a professor of Bible. Until his death, he held the position of lecturer in biblical theology. From 1513 to 1515, he lectured on the Psalms (Cairns, p. 289). As a monk, Luther had followed the traditional hours of prayer. Therefore, he knew the Psalter by heart (González, II, p. 18). From 1515 to 1517, he taught Romans, and later, he taught Galatians and Hebrews. He lectured in German instead of Latin and was one of the first professors in Germany to base his lectures on the Hebrew and Greek texts (Kuiper, p. 163).

Scholars differ concerning the date of Luther’s conversion. Some say it occurred at the end of 1512 when, in his room in the tower of the Black Cloister, he read, “the just shall live by faith” in Romans 1:17 (Kuiper, p. 163). Others claim his understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith probably came in 1515 when he began teaching the book of Romans. After struggling with Romans 1:17, which says, “The righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, ‘the just shall live by faith,’” Luther realized the righteousness of God is given to those who live by faith. “The righteousness or justice of God is not the justice by which God punishes sin but the justice by which he makes us just” (Cary, *Luther*, vol. 1, p. 16). Concerning this discovery, Luther said, “I felt that I had been born anew and that the gates of heaven had been opened, the whole of Scripture gained a new meaning” (González, II, p. 19-20). Luther found peace for his soul, which he had not been able to find in rites, acts of asceticism, or in the theology of the mystics (Cairns, p. 289).

In 1517, Tetzl began selling indulgences near Wittenberg. He was “an unscrupulous man who was willing to make scandalous claims for his wares as long as such claims would help sales.... (such as) ‘the cross of the seller of indulgences has as much power as the cross of Christ.’ Those who wish to buy an indulgence for a loved one who was deceased

were promised that, ‘as soon as the coin in the copper rings, the soul from purgatory springs’” (González, II, p. 21).

On October 31, 1517, Luther posted his 95 Theses on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. He was 34 years old at the time (Kuiper, p. 163). In the 95 Theses, Luther attacked the indulgence system. For example, he said, “Christians are to be taught that he who gives to the poor or lends to the needy does a better work than buying pardons” (thesis 43). “Christians are to be taught that he who sees a man in need, and passes him by, and gives [his money] for pardons, purchases not the indulgences of the pope, but the indignation of God” (thesis 45). “Christians are to be taught that unless they have more than they need, they are bound to keep back what is necessary for their own families, and by no means to squander it on pardons” (thesis 46). “That the papal pardons are not able to remove the very least of venial sins, so far as its guilt is concerned” (thesis 76). Since Tetzel was saying that the indulgences would even take way the sin of adultery with the Virgin Mary, thesis 75 states, “To think the papal pardons so great that they could absolve a man even if he had committed an impossible sin and violated the Mother of God—this is madness.”

Luther also went beyond attacking the indulgence system. He argued that the pope ought to give money to the poor, even if he had to sell St. Peter’s Basilica to do it (thesis 51), that the assurance of salvation by letter of pardons is vain, even if the pope himself were to stake his soul on it (thesis 52), that the true treasure of the church is the gospel of the grace of God (thesis 62, contrasting “treasures of the church with its true wealth, the gospel,” Eerdmans’, p. 362), that if the pope can redeem souls from purgatory “for the sake of miserable money with which to build a church,” he ought to “empty purgatory, for the sake of holy love and of the dire need of the souls that are there” (thesis 82), that the pope, “whose riches are today greater than the riches of the richest” ought to “build just this one church of St. Peter’s with his own money, rather than the money of poor believers” (thesis 86), that “greater blessing could come to the Church if the pope were to do a hundred times a day what he now does once, and bestow on every believer these remissions” (thesis 88), etc.

Nailing the 95 Theses on the church door was an invitation to a debate, but no one accepted Luther’s challenge until two years later (Kuiper, p. 164). The 95 Theses, however, caused a stir before that. As was mentioned, they were nailed to the door of the Castle Church, which contained 5000 relics. The day after Luther nailed his theses to the door was All Saints Day, the day those relics were put on display and a large number of people from far and wide came to see them. Naturally, they saw the theses on the door. When they returned home, they told their neighbors what they had read and the neighbors told other people. The news spread like wildfire. Moreover, the theses were translated into many languages, printed, and published in every country in Western Europe. Within two weeks, the theses had become known throughout Germany and, after four weeks, they were read all of Western Europe. The publication alone almost stopped the sale of indulgences (Kuiper, pp. 164-165).

The Archbishop of Mainz, who received a share of the proceeds from the sale of indulgences, didn’t like this. He sent a copy of the theses to Leo X, who did not think it was a serious matter. He asked the leader of Luther’s monastic order to advise the monk to keep quiet (Kuiper, p. 165). That, obviously, did not work

In 1518, Luther was summoned to appear before the imperial Diet of Augsburg. At the Diet, Cardinal Cajetan demanded that Luther retract his views. Luther refused to do so, unless he could be convinced from the Scriptures that they were false. “He also denied the pope’s final authority in faith and morals and the usefulness of the sacraments without faith” (Cairns, p. 291).

In July 1519, Luther debated John Eck, his sharpest opponent, at Leipzig. “Luther denied the supremacy of the pope and the infallibility of general councils” (Eerdmans’, p. 362). Luther’s arguments were historical; he said that the Eastern Greek Church never acknowledged the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, and the ecumenical Councils knew nothing of papal supremacy (Kuiper, p. 173).

In 1520, Luther wrote three pamphlets (see below under “His Works”). His books were burned at Cologne, and Pope Leo X issued a bull that eventually resulted in Luther’s excommunication (Leo X was one of the worst popes during the time of corrupt popes, González, II, p. 21). In response to the bull, Luther burned it (December 10, 1520) and wrote *Against the Execrable Bull of Antichrist*, in which he defiantly proclaimed, “Whoever wrote this bull is Antichrist. I protest before God, our Lord Jesus, his sacred angels and the whole world that with my whole heart I dissent from the damnation of this bull, that I curse and execrate it as sacrilege and blasphemy of Christ, God’s Son and our Lord. This be my recantation, O bull, thou daughter of bulls.” When Luther did that, “the breach was final and there was no way to undo it” (González, II, p. 27).

Charles V, the new emperor, issued a summons for Luther to answer for his views at an imperial Diet at Worms (Cairns, p. 292). Remembering what happened to Jan Hus, his friends warned Luther not to go. He believed that by going to Worms, he was going to his death (Kuiper, p. 177). Nevertheless, he told his friends, “If there are as many devils in Worms as tiles on the housetops, I will still go there.”

On April 17, 1521, Luther appeared before the assembly, which consisted of 206 political and ecclesiastical dignitaries, including 30 archbishops, bishops, and abbots. When asked if he was willing to retract the doctrines in his books, which the church disapproved, Luther requested time to reflect. They gave him until the next day.

“This is a difficult moment for Luther, not so much because he feared imperial power, but rather because he feared God. To dare oppose the entire church and the emperor, whose authority had been ordained by God, was a dreadful act” (González, II, p. 28). Luther prayed all night. The next day, April 15, 1521, has been called the greatest day in his life and the speech he gave has been called the speech that shook the world. In it, he said, “Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Scriptures or by clear arguments that I am in error—for popes and councils of often erred and contradict themselves—I cannot withdraw, for I am subject to the Scriptures I have quoted; my conscience is captive to the Word of God. It is unsafe and dangerous to do anything against one’s conscience. Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise. So help me God” (Houghton, pp. 88-89). When Luther burned the papal bull, he challenged Rome. At Worms, he challenged the Empire.

After his departure from Worms, the Diet issued an edict that ordered all subjects to seize Luther and turn him over to the authorities. The reading of Luther’s writings was also banned. On the road back to Wittenberg, Luther’s friends kidnapped him and took him to the Wartburg Castle (Cairns, pp. 292-293). From May 1521 to March 1522, for his protection, Luther resided at the Wartburg Castle. While he was there, using Erasmus’s edition of the Greek New Testament, he translated the New Testament into German. He

also wrote *On Monastic Vows*, in which he argued that monks and nuns should repudiate their wrongful vows and marry (Cairns, p. 293).

Melanchthon gave Luther's New Testament translation a thorough revision. It sold at lightning speed for a sum equivalent of the week's wage of a carpenter. With the help of others, the translation of the Old Testament was published in parts and completed by 1534 (Houghton, p. 91).

In 1522, Luther returned to Wittenberg "to put a brake on the more radical reformers there" (Eerdmans', p. 363). Years later, in 1535, Luther broke with the Anabaptist movement (Cairns, p. 294).

At first, Erasmus supported Luther, but in 1524, he published *The Freedom of the Will* as an answer to Luther's denial of the freedom of the will (Cairns, p. 294). In a debate with Erasmus, Luther argued that salvation is entirely in the hands of God (Eerdmans', p. 363).

In 1525, Luther married Catherine von Bora. Luther called his wife "dear rib," an allusion to Genesis 2:21. In his will, he described her as his "pious, faithful, and devoted wife, always loving, worthy, and beautiful" (Houghton, p. 93). They had six children (Cairns, p. 294).

In 1529, Luther wrote the *Shorter Catechism*, which was a concise statement of the Ten Commandments, the Apostle's Creed, the Lord's Prayer and other matters of theology and liturgy. Also, in that year, Luther and Zwingli met. They agreed on 14 out of 15 propositions but disagreed concerning communion. Zwingli contended it was a memorial of Christ, but Luther argued that there was a real physical presence of Christ around and under the elements (Cairns, pp. 294-295).

Throughout his life, Martin Luther was given to periods of depression and anxiety (González, II, p. 15). He was "uncouth and even rude in his manner" (González, II, p. 14). Actually, that's putting it mildly. As Cary explains, toward his theological opponents, Luther's language was abusive, even filthy (usually excremental), but these were not personal attacks. For Luther, this was a matter of doctrine, doctrine that was from the devil (Cary, *Luther*, part II, p. 42).

In 1523, Luther wrote a treatise entitled "That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew," in which he argued that Christians should cease persecuting the Jews, but in 1543, he wrote treatises such as "On the Jews and Their Lies." He insisted that they were of the devil, that they were a threat to the Christian faith, that their synagogues should be burned, that their houses should be torn down, that their book should be confiscated, etc. Cary claims that Luther's attitude was not like modern racist anti-Semitism. Rather, Luther began to see the Jews not as neighbors to be loved, but as his theological enemies who threatened to undermine faith in the gospel. He accused them of blasphemy. So to Luther, to tolerate their blasphemy was to share in the guilt of it. Luther was not trying to punish them; he was trying to purge the land of blasphemy's lies that provoked the wrath of God (Cary, *Luther*, part II, pp. 447-49).

Luther died on February 18, 1546, at the age of 63 (Eerdmans', p. 263).

*His Works* In May 1520, Luther published a pamphlet entitled *On Good Works*. In it he said, "The noblest of all good works is to believe in Jesus Christ." He also asserted that we must serve God in the world by faithfully performing our daily occupations. This was a departure from medieval asceticism and became one of the most distinctive characteristics of Protestant Christianity (Kuiper, p. 174).

In 1520, Luther published three pamphlets. In the *Address to the German Nobility*, he refuted from the Scripture the claim of the papacy that spiritual authority was superior to temporal authority, that the pope alone could interpret the Scriptures, and that only the pope could call a council. He stated that the princes should reform the church when it was necessary, that the pope should not interfere with civil affairs, and that all believers are spiritual priests who can interpret the Scripture. In *Babylonian Captivity*, he challenged the sacramental system of Roman Catholicism. For him, only the Lord's Supper and baptism were valid. (Because of his attempt to answer the attack of Luther on the sacramental system, the pope designated King Henry VIII of England as "Defender of the Faith.") In *Freedom of the Christian Man*, Luther attacked the theology of the Roman church by asserting the priesthood of all believers as a result of their personal faith in Christ (Cairns, p. 292). It is in *Freedom* that Luther argues God justifies us by giving us Christ in His promise. In what Luther calls a "blessed exchange," Christ receives all the believer's debts, wounds, and sins, and believers receive all that is Christ's, including His divine attributes of righteousness, holiness, blessedness, etc. (Cary, Luther, vol. 1, p. 19).

That was only the beginning. It has been estimated that it would take a rapid writer an average lifetime to transcribe all the books that Luther wrote over a period of 25 years. The English translation of some of his works fills 55 volumes. His best-known books are his *Large* and *Small Catechism*. His *Bondage of the Will* has been called his greatest book (Houghton, p. 93; for more details concerning *The Bondage of the Will* see the discussion on Erasmus below). In his own book *Grace Abounding*, John Bunyan said that except for the Bible, he preferred Luther's commentary on Galatians above all other books (Houghton, p. 97). Luther's final pamphlet *Against the Roman Papacy, Instituted by the Devil* repeated his old attack on Catholicism (Eerdmans', p. 263).

*His Theology* In 1529, Luther wrote his Larger Catechism and his Smaller Catechism. In 1530, Melancthon authored the Augsburg Confession. In 1537, Luther wrote the Schmalkald Articles of Faith. In 1577, Melancthon and other German reformers drew up the Formula of Concord. These documents make up the doctrinal basis of Lutheranism. Luther called his theology "evangelical" (the Greek word for gospel) because it was based on the gospel message of justification by faith through grace alone (Mead, p. 113).

Luther believed the Bible was the inspired, authoritative guide. For him, Scripture, not the church or the priest, was the final authority over conscience (Mead, pp. 112-113). He had difficulty with several books in the New Testament. In his preface to the New Testament, Luther said that as compared to the Gospel of John, 1 John, the epistles of Paul, especially Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and Peter's epistles, the book of James is "a perfect straw-epistle." His complaint was that James did not include the gospel. In his German New Testament, Luther placed Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation at the end, assigning them no numbers in the table of contents.

Harrison says Luther distrusted James and was disappointed in it (Everett Harrison, p. 360). Ryrie observes, "Sometimes it is claimed that Martin Luther rejected the Book of James as being canonical. This is not so. Here's what he wrote in his preface to the New Testament, in which he ascribes to the several books of the New Testament different degrees of doctrinal value. 'St. John's Gospel and his first Epistle, St. Paul's Epistles, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and St. Peter's Epistle—these are the books which show to thee Christ and teach everything that is necessary and blessed for thee to know, even if you were never to see or hear any other book of doctrine. Therefore,

St. James' Epistle is a perfect straw epistle compared with them, for it has in it nothing of an evangelic kind.' Thus Luther was comparing (in his opinion) doctrinal value, not canonical validity" (Ryrie, p. 109). The Lutheran Church has not followed Luther's evaluation of James.

Luther believed in double predestination (predestination to salvation or damnation), in total depravity (man's will is in bondage to Satan), in justification by faith, in faith as a gift of God, and in assurance of salvation (Watson, in Rupp and Watson, pp. 19-23).

Luther believed that justification is by faith alone. Faith believes the gospel, that is, that Christ died "for me." It is believing the promise given to us in the gospel that the sinner is united to Christ and receives all that is His. Luther compares this to marriage in which we receive Christ and all His riches, while He takes us to Himself together with all of our sins and, making them His own, He destroys them on the cross (Cary, *HCT*, p. 77).

Like Augustine, Luther did not make a distinction between forensic justification and progressive sanctification, which was a later development within Protestantism (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 98). Melancthon, not Luther, was the first to speak of justification in forensic terms (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 100).

Luther believed in imputed righteousness, that is, at the moment of faith, believers are given the righteousness of Christ (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 222). He also believed that justification was progressive. He wrote, "Justification is not yet complete.... It is still under construction. It shall, however, be complete in the resurrection of the dead" (Luther, cited by Geisler and McKenzie, p. 223). "He is quite clear that there is a moment when a believer is actually justified by faith. He then has the righteousness of another. The alien righteousness of Christ imputed to him. This is the beginning of the journey toward a time (following the resurrection of the dead in the age to come) when he will in fact, possess perfect righteousness created in him by the Spirit of God" (Toon, cited by Geisler and McKenzie, p. 224).

Luther believed that believers are righteous in the sight of God and, at the same time, they are sinners. In the believer, sin and righteousness coexist (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 224). He taught that the depraved nature in people was not only "bent" (toward the things of the world) but was also "bent" in upon itself," enclosed in a vicious cycle of egocentrism (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 60).

Luther believed that our good works are always in themselves mortal sins. He said, "We are at the same time righteous and sinners," because we are righteous by faith in Christ but sinners by our good works (Cary, *HCT*, pp. 77-78).

Luther believed there were only two sacraments: baptism and communion. Baptism is a sign of the death and resurrection of the believer with Christ, but it is more than a sign because by its power, people are made members of the body of Christ. Without faith, baptism is not valid, but that does not mean that one must have faith before being baptized or that infants, who are incapable of faith, should not be baptized. After all, faith is a gift of God (González, II, p. 34). I once asked a Lutheran pastor how he could baptize infants, who obviously cannot believe when the Bible so clearly teaches that faith precedes baptism. He told me God gives the infant faith.

Actually, Luther changed his mind concerning infant baptism. At first, he declared the children are baptized on the basis of the faith and the confession of their sponsors, who in the baptismal liturgy are asked to answer in the place of the child being baptized whether he believes. Later, he began to teach that infants themselves believed when they are

baptized, arguing that John the Baptist believed while he was in his mother's womb. In the Larger Catechism (1529), he changed his view again. He said that whether the baptized person believes or does not believe does not make the baptism invalid; everything depends on God and the commandment. He vigorously opposed the Anabaptists who rejected infant baptism (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 488).

Luther categorically rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation and believed that the idea of the mass being a meritorious sacrifice was contrary to justification by faith. On the other hand, he did not accept the concept of communion as a sign or symbol. He interpreted the words "this is my body" as Jesus being physically present in communion. Therefore, in communion, believers literally partake of the body of Christ, but the bread does not become the body and the wine does not become blood. The bread is still bread and the wine is still wine. Nevertheless, the body and blood of the Lord are in the elements and believers are nurtured by that body and that blood through the act of eating the bread and drinking the wine. The body of Christ is in, with, under, around, and behind the bread and the wine. Later this interpretation of communion came to be called consubstantiation (González, II, pp. 35-36).

According to Luther, God established two kingdoms: one under the law (the state) and the other under the gospel (church). Believers are under the authority of the state, but civil authorities have no power in the kingdom of the gospel (González, II, p. 36). Luther's idea of two kingdoms marked the beginning of the concept of the separation of church and state, but as González explains, even though Luther had serious doubts about the traditional understanding of the relationship between church and state, in his situation, it was difficult to apply (González, II, p. 37). Lutheranism spread to Poland, Russia, Austria, Hungary, France, Holland, Lithuania, and Bohemia. It became the state Church of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Iceland, Estonia, and Latvia (Mead, p. 113).

*His Significance* Except for Christ, more books have been written about Luther than about any other figure in history (Eerdmans', p. 362). "In the place of an authoritative church, he put an authoritative Bible as the infallible rule of faith and practice that each believer-priest should use for guidance in matters of faith and morals" (Cairns, p. 297). He rediscovered and spread widely the doctrine of justification by faith.

As a result of Luther's labors, national Lutheran churches were established in Germany and in the Scandinavian countries. Luther restored preaching to its rightful place in the church (Cairns, p. 297). He reformed public worship, emphasizing the preaching of the Word, communion, and congregational singing (Eerdmans', p. 263). He personally wrote hymns such as "A Mighty Fortress is our God, which were sung in the vernacular by the whole congregation (Cairns, p. 297).

Luther's translation of the Bible into German helped standardize the German language (Cairns, p. 297).

## **Zwingli**

*His Life* Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) was born in January 1484, less than two months after Luther (González, II, p. 46). He attended the University of Vienna and went to the University of Basel (1502), where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree (1504) and a Master of Arts degree (1506). He served as a parish priest at Glarus for ten years. At this point in his life, he emphasized the ethical aspects of Christianity. From 1513 to 1515, he served as a chaplain with the mercenaries from Glarus (Cairns, p. 302).



In 1515, he met Erasmus and was deeply influenced by him (Eerdmans', p. 379). Erasmus was his idol; his study of Erasmus's teaching led him to the study of the Bible (Cairns, p. 302). He read the writings of the early church Fathers and the books of Wycliffe and Hus (Houghton, p. 99). In 1516, when Erasmus's Greek New Testament came out, he copied the letters of Paul so that he might have his own copy (Cairns, p. 302). He memorized Paul's epistles (Westin, p. 46).

Zwingli served as priest at Einsiedeln (1516-1518). As he reflected on the abuses in the church, he began to develop evangelical beliefs (Eerdmans', p. 379) and opposed some of the abuses of the indulgence system.

In 1518, he became a priest in Zürich, a population of about 6000. He was converted in 1519 as a result of being (miraculously) delivered from the plague and coming in contact with Lutheran ideas (see Cairns, p. 302). In the summer of 1519, Zwingli had a near-death illness. After that experience, Zwingli's preaching was marked by "an emphasis on free salvation through grace" (Westin, p. 47). There is some debate among scholars as to how much influence Luther had on Zwingli, some claiming Luther played a decisive role in changing his theology and others contending that Zwingli did not pay much attention to Luther's theology. Westin says, "Zwingli never was willing to acknowledge any dependence on Luther" (Westin, p. 47).

His 1519 sermons contain some of his ideas concerning reformation. He attacked moral corruption. He accused monks of high living. He rejected the veneration of the saints, the idea that unbaptized children were damned, and the practice of indulgences.

In March 1522, Zwingli and others deliberately broke the fasting rule of Lent by cutting and distributing two smoked sausages. In a sermon, he argued that no valid rule on food could be derived from the Bible and to transgress such a rule was not a sin. This event came to be referred to as the Affair of the Sausages and is considered to be the start of the Reformation in Switzerland.

In April 1522, he was secretly married to the widow Anna Reinhard. In 1524, they were publicly married (Cairns, p. 302) on April 2, three months before the birth of their first child (Potter, p. 80). They had four children (Eerdmans', p. 379).

In 1523, the elected authorities in Zürich decided to hold a public debate to see what faith the city should adopt. Zwingli prepared the *Sixty-seven Articles*, which emphasized the authority of the Bible, the headship of Christ in the church, salvation by faith, and the right of the clergy to marry. He argued that the Eucharist was a commemorative meal, not a sacrifice. He debated Johann Faber and won the debate. Some reforms were instituted, but it was not until 1525 that the city of Zürich abolished the Mass (Cairns, pp. 302-303). Communion was celebrated four times a year.

In the spring of 1525, some of Zwingli's followers insisted that converts be baptized. They became known as Anabaptists. In 1525, the city council banned them from the city and in 1527, an Anabaptist named Felix Manx (1498-1527) was executed by drowning (Cairns, p. 303).

In 1527, a Synod of Swiss evangelical churches was formed and, at about the same time, the Bible was translated into the vernacular (Cairns, p. 303).

In 1529, Zwingli and Luther met at Marburg. This meeting is known as the Marburg Colloquy. The result of their three-day debates was published in the 15 *Marburg Articles*. They agreed on 14 of 15 articles of faith. They differed on the issue of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Zwingli insisting the Lord's Supper was symbolic (he used John

6:63 against Luther) and Luther arguing for the real presence of Christ in the elements. Because they could not agree on the presence of Christ in the communion, Zwinglianism developed separately from Lutheranism (Cairns, p. 303).

With tears in his eyes, Zwingli said, "There are no people on earth with whom I would rather be in harmony than with the Wittenbergers." Luther "would only receive the Swiss reformer and his followers as friends, not as brethren and members of the Church of Christ. He said to Zwingli, "You have a different spirit" (Houghton, p. 100; González says that what Luther said was, "We are not of the same spirit," González, II, p. 52). González describes the difference between Zwingli and Luther as being that Luther was willing to retain all traditional uses that did not contradict the Bible, but Zwingli insisted that all that had no explicit scriptural support must be rejected. For example, Zwingli suppressed the use of the organ in church, as well as the violin, which he played expertly, because they were not found in the Bible (González, II, p. 50).

Also in 1529, war broke out between the Protestants and Catholics in Switzerland. A peace settlement was reached, but in 1531, war broke out again. Zwingli went with the soldiers as a chaplain and was killed in fighting. Houghton tells the story of Zwingli's death: "Zwingli cared for the wounded and the dying, many of his own relations being among them, including his brother-in-law, stepson, and son-in-law.... Zwingli was among the slain. Wounded in the leg by a spear, and his helmet battered by a stone, he had fallen down. One of the enemies, acting in kindly fashion, offered to call a Catholic priest to hear his dying confession. Unable to speak, Zwingli shook his head. 'Then pray to the Mother of God, and call on the saints, that God's grace may accept you,' said the foe. Again Zwingli shook his head, an action marking him as a Protestant. More of the enemy then arrived and one of them, reviling Zwingli for holding the Reformed faith, struck him with his sword and killed him. His body was next quartered by a hangman, and according to the law the Empire, its various parts were mixed with dung and burned, his ashes being scattered to the wind. Zwingli was only 47 years of age" (Houghton, p. 102).

*His Theology* Zwingli's *Commentary on True and False Religion* (1528) was a systematic theology that had a considerable impact upon Protestantism. He was the first of the Reformed theologians (Eerdmans', p. 379). In his writings, he constantly appealed to the Scripture. He placed its authority above any other, including the Church Fathers and the ecumenical councils. In his study of the Scripture, he paid attention to the immediate context and attempted to understand the purpose behind what was written. He would not permit anything to be done that could not be supported by the Scriptures.

He believed in unconditional predestination, but believed that only those who heard and rejected the gospel were predestined to condemnation. He believed in original sin, but did not think of it as guilt. Therefore, infants could be saved without baptism (Cairns, pp. 303-305). He believed faith was essential in the sacraments and that the Lord's Supper was symbolic. He believed that secular rulers had a right to act in the church matters (Eerdmans', p. 379). He defended the practice of infant baptism, claiming it replaced circumcision.

## **John Calvin**

Although other sources were consulted, the two main sources for this material on Calvin come from the works of Francois Wendel and T. H. L. Parker, both of whom were respected authorities on Calvin. Wendel, a Lutheran, lawyer, historian, and Dean of

theology at the University of Strasbourg, wrote *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought* (1963). Parker, a Reader in Theology at the University of Durham in England, wrote *John Calvin: A Biography* (1975).

*His Life* John Calvin (1509-1564) was born in Noyon, France. He went to Paris, where he attended the University of Paris. The date of his arrival in Paris is generally given as 1523 (for example, Wendel, p. 17), but Parker argues that Calvin went to Paris in 1520 or 1521 (Parker, pp. 4, 156-161). If Parker is correct, Calvin went to Paris when he was about 12 years old, which would not have been unusual in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century (Parker, p. 157). “In Paris he was so strict and severe in manner that some of his fellow students dubbed him ‘the accusative case.’ ... He obeyed his intellect rather than his passions” (Houghton, p. 104). According to Parker, Calvin received his BA degree when he was 14 or 15 and his MA when he was 16 or 17 (Parker, p. 10; if Wendel’s dates are accurate, Calvin was two years, or slightly more, older).

Beza, Calvin’s successor at Geneva, wrote a biography of Calvin in which he said that when Calvin was at the University of Paris, he was introduced to Protestant ideas by his cousin Pierre Oliver (Cairns, p. 310; Wendel, p. 19; Parker doubts this happened before Calvin was at Orleans, Parker, p. 18). Calvin became familiar with the teachings of Wycliffe, Hus, and Luther, but, as he later declared, “I was stubbornly tied to the superstitions of the papacy” (González, II, p. 62). He studied law at the University of Orleans and, in 1529, transferred to the University of Bourges (Cairns, p. 310; Parker, pp. 156 and 161).

Little is known of Calvin’s conversion. It has been dated anywhere from 1527 to 1534. Parker argues at length for a date somewhere between late 1529 and early 1530 (Parker, pp. 162-165). The only reference Calvin made to his conversion is recorded in his preface to his commentary on the Psalms. He compares himself to David, saying that as David was taken from the sheepfold and raised on the throne, so he had been raised from obscure origins and made a minister of the gospel (Parker, p. 22).

Calvin wrote, “My father had intended me for theology from my early childhood ... Then, changing his mind, he set me to learning law ... until God at last turned my course in another direction by the secret rein of his providence. By a sudden conversion he turned to teachableness a mind too stubborn for its years, for I was so strongly devoted to the superstitions of the papacy that nothing less could draw me from such depths of mire” (Calvin, cited by Houghton, p. 103, who explains “a sudden conversion” as “unexpected”).

As a new rector in Paris, Nicolas Cop delivered his inaugural address on November 1, 1533. It revealed his sympathy with Luther. Calvin was somehow implicated in this address. It was once held that he wrote it, but that is doubtful (for details, see Wendel, pp. 40-41). At any rate, as a result of the reactions to that speech, both he and Cop fled Paris. For the next year, Calvin was on the move (Parker, p. 30).

In January 1535, Calvin arrived at Basel. It was here that he wrote *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, which was published in March 1536, but was probably completed before August 23, 1535, the date of the dedication. That suggests that a large part of it may have been written before he came to Basel (Parker, pp. 32-33).

After a little more than a year in Basel, Calvin decided to move to Strasbourg, but because of a war, he made a long detour to the south and, as a result, spent one night in Geneva (Houghton, p. 108). Before Calvin’s arrival, the general assembly of Geneva had voted for Geneva to become an evangelical city (May 25, 1536). When Farel, a reformer

who was working on the reform in Geneva, heard that the author of the *Institutes* was in town, he went to see him (González, II, p. 65). The meeting between Calvin and Farel was about three months after the vote of the city council to become an evangelical city (Parker, p. 57). In that meeting, Farel pressured Calvin to stay in Geneva to help with the Reformation.

As Calvin himself explained, “After he learned that my heart was set upon devoting myself to private studies, and finding his entreaties were in vain, he went on to say that God would curse my retirement and the peace of study that I sought, if I withdrew and refused him my help when the need for it was so urgent. I was so terror-stricken that I abandon the journey I had planned; but I was so sensible of my natural shyness and timidity that I would not bind myself to accept any particular office” (Calvin, cited by Houghton, pp. 104-105).

So, in 1536, Calvin was ordained in Geneva as a teaching minister. After that, he became a pastor (Parker, p. 57). On January 16, 1537, Farel and Calvin submitted their proposal for reforming the church to the City Council. It was entitled *On the Organization of the Church and its Worship in Geneva* and was probably largely composed by Calvin (Parker, p. 62). It proposed a formal confession of faith, which “became obligatory upon all who wish to remain in the town” (Wendel, p. 51). It called for observing the Lord’s Supper every Sunday, but since, under the papacy, the people had only commemorated it two or three times a year, it was suggested that they start with a monthly celebration. The council adopted a quarterly observance. The proposal also called for the exercise of church discipline, including excommunication, and for congregational singing of the Psalms. A commission composed of counselors and ministers was appointed to propose revisions of the marriage laws based on the most frequent causes of trouble in marriage (Parker, pp. 62-64).

Later that year the implementation of the proposal met with resistance from the people in Geneva (Wendel, pp. 52-53). Because of differences on several different issues, relationships between the ministers and the council became strained (Wendel, pp. 53-56). In a sermon, Calvin called the council “a council of the devil.” At one point, there were actually riots in the streets. The council decided that Farel and Calvin should leave Geneva as soon as substitutes could be found, but shortly thereafter said they need not wait for substitutes and were told to leave town within three days (Parker, p. 66). Calvin was accused of being too severe, too unaccommodating (Parker, p. 84). Houghton says they were banished from the city because of the “strict discipline” they introduced (Houghton, p. 105). It was Calvin who insisted on the necessity of the excommunication of unrepentant sinners. The government at the time refused to allow this, claiming it was unwarranted rigidity (González, II, p. 65). This happened in 1538 (Cairns, p. 311). “His ministry in Geneva had ended in disaster for the church and in ignominy for himself” (Parker, p. 70).

Being banished from Geneva, Calvin finally made it to Strasbourg. From 1538 to 1541, Calvin was pastor of a French refugee congregation in Strasbourg, where Martin Bucer (1491-1551) led the Reformation and lectured on theology (Cairns, p. 311). The church had four or five hundred members. Calvin preached or lectured every day as well as delivering two sermons on Sunday (Parker, p. 68). While he was there, Calvin compiled a psalm book which was used to popularize psalm-singing throughout Reformed churches (Houghton, p. 105) and instituted church discipline (Wendel, p. 60). Church discipline was

a major issue for Calvin. He thought Lutherans were not giving it as much as importance as he and Bucer did (Wendel, p. 64).

In 1540, Calvin married Idelette de Bure, the widow of an Anabaptist pastor (Cairns, p. 311), who was one of Calvin's converts (Wendel, p. 66). She had two daughters. In 1542, they had a son (their only child), who was born prematurely and only lived for a short time (Parker, p. 102). In Geneva, they lived in a very large house, but the house and the furniture belonged to the City Council (Parker, p. 101). Idelette died in 1549 (Cairns, p. 311). In 1557, Judith, his stepdaughter, was convicted of adultery (Parker, p. 102).

In September 1541, Calvin was invited back to Geneva. He was 32 years old (Wendel, p. 70). At his insistence, his *Ecclesiastical Ordinances* was adopted by the city council on November 20, 1541 (Wendel, p. 75). Calvin's plan called for four church officers: pastors, teachers ("to instruct the people in sound doctrine"), elders ("to admonish those whom they see weakening or leading a disorderly life"), and deacons (to attend the sick and distribute goods to the poor). Since the city council had final authority in church discipline, a group was formed called the Consistory, made up of the elders and members of the city council, to make recommendations to the Council (Wendel, pp. 77-78). In other words, the government of the church was placed mostly in the hands of the Consistory, which consisted of five pastors and twelve lay elders, but the Consistory usually followed Calvin's advice (González, II, p. 67; Wendell says that a member of the city council was president of the Consistory, Wendel, p. 78).

In the first edition of the *Institutes* (1536), Calvin only mentioned pastors and deacons and in his proposal to the city council in Geneva in 1537, he only mentioned pastors. Thus his proposal for four ministries in the church in 1541 was new. Wendel says it has been demonstrated that Calvin got the idea of four officers in the church from Bucer, whom he worked with in Strasburg (Wendel, p. 76). In the 1543 edition of the *Institutes*, however, Calvin only mentioned three ministries and he maintained that position up to and in the last edition in 1559 (Wendel, p. 303; see *Institutes*, IV, 4, 1 where he listed elders for "the censure of manners and discipline," pastors for teaching, and deacons "for the care of the poor and the dispensing of alms").

At any rate, in the *Ecclesiastical Ordinances*, "Geneva was divided into three parishes; five ministers and three assistant ministers were appointed to conduct services at daybreak, noon, and in the afternoon, on Sunday; and there were services on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday in addition.... Seventeen sermons a week in the city of 13,000 people! ... Communion was held quarterly" (Houghton, p. 108).

A wide variety of laws regulated eating and drinking, buying and selling, dress and morals. The lives of the people "were regulated at every point." Attendance at church was enforced by fines for unavoidable absences, and men were appointed to deal with delinquents (Houghton, p. 108). Parents were obligated to send their children to religious instruction on Sundays (Wendel, pp. 78-79). No one was to be totally confined to bed for three days without informing the minister (Parker, p. 80). Pastors met quarterly "for mutual frank and loving self-criticism" (Parker, p. 89). There was a law against dancing (Parker, 99). Taverns were closed and in their place were open five clubs. In the clubs, grace was to be said before and after eating and drinking, a French Bible was to be on the premises, swearing, slandering, and dancing were forbidden, Psalms might be sung, and anyone so moved might address the rest of the company for their edification (Parker, p. 100).

Performances of the secular theater were prohibited, but sacred presentations were permitted (Wendel, p. 85).

People were examined concerning their religious knowledge, their criticism of pastors, and their family quarrels (Wendel, p. 84). In 1550, the council approved a law that the pastor should make one visit each year to the homes of all of their parishioners to see for themselves whether or not ecclesiastical regulations were being observed (Wendel, p. 89).

Disciplinary actions were taken against a widow who prayed for her husband on his grave, against people who had their fortunes told by gypsies, against a goldsmith for making a chalice, against people who said French refugees had raised the cost of living, against a 70-year-old woman who was about to marry a man of 25, against a man who said the pope was a good man, against a man criticizing Geneva for putting men to death on account of differences in religion, against someone singing a song defamatory of Calvin, etc. (Wendel, p. 84). In 1546, a number of notables in Geneva attended a party where some danced, including the current president of the Consistory (the church council in charge of church discipline). Those guilty of dancing were arrested and summoned to appear before the Consistory to determine their punishment.

Calvin used the state to inflict more severe penalties because he believed part of the purpose of the state was to establish true religion and to maintain that religion once it was established. In his view, it is the duty of the state to punish heretics (Parker, p. 123). In 1546, a man named Ameaux called Calvin a bad man who preached false doctrine. He was arrested, tried, sentenced to pay a fine, and make public acknowledgment of his faults. When the sentence was reduced to making an apology to Calvin before the city council, "Calvin would have none of this." He refused to enter the pulpit again until Ameaux made suitable reparation for his insult against the name of God. Finally, the council sentenced Ameaux to parade through the city, carrying a torch, kneeling at certain places, and begging God for pardon (Parker, p. 99; for more details on the Ameaux case and for an illustration of a man Calvin had a part in having beheaded, see Wendel, pp. 86-87).

By 1546, 76 people had been exiled and 58 people had been executed (Cairns, p. 311). For example, Sebastian Castello was expelled from Geneva for interpreting the Song of Solomon as an erotic love story (González, II, p. 68). In 1553, Servetus (1511-1553), a doctor who discovered the circulation of blood (Wendel, p. 94), was executed for denying the doctrine of the Trinity (Cairns, p. 311). The city council ordered that Servetus be burned alive (Houghton, p. 108), although Calvin had asked for a less cruel death, namely beheading (González, II, p. 67). All the reformers, including Calvin, believed it was the duty of civil government to execute blasphemers who killed the soul, just as they punished murderers who killed the body (Wendel, p. 97), which was the Augustinian principle of repressing heresy by the secular sword (Wendel, p. 98).

On June 5, 1559, the Academy (a college) was opened in Geneva. Calvin hired Theodore Beza as rector. Calvin was one of the theological professors. Within five years, the college had over 1000 students (Parker, pp. 128-29). The establishment of the Academy has been called Calvin's "crowning work" (Wendel, p. 105).

There was opposition to Calvin. On June 27, 1547, a threatening letter was found on the pulpit. It read, "Big pot-belly, you and your fellows would do better to shut up. If you drive us too far, you will find yourselves in a situation where you will curse the day you skipped your monastery. We've had enough of blaming people" (Parker, pp. 107-08). The persistent opposition got to Calvin. On July 24, 1552, he admitted he was beaten and asked

to be allowed to resign. The council refused his request (Parker, p. 116). There was tension between Calvin and the council until May 1554, when his enemies were finally defeated (Parker, pp. 124-26).

Calvin was said to be frail, to sleep little, to have a weak stomach, and to suffer from migraines. At one point, he said of himself, "I am incessantly tormented with a heaviness which will not let me do a thing. Apart from the sermons and the lectures, there is a month gone by in which I have scarcely done anything, in such wise, that I am almost ashamed to live thus useless" (Parker, pp. 103-04). Calvin died in Geneva, Switzerland on May 27, 1564. He was 54 years old. His funeral was simple and he was buried in a common cemetery without a tombstone, less his followers create a shrine out of this tomb (Houghton, p. 110).

*His Works* In 1532, Calvin wrote a commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia*, a writer who lived in the days of the Roman Empire (Houghton, p. 103). In 1536, at the age of 26, while he was at Basel, Calvin completed the first edition of his greatest work, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. It was patterned after Luther's *Catechism*. He discussed the Ten Commandments, the Apostle's Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the two sacraments, the evils of the Roman view of the Lord's Supper, and Christian liberty (Cairns, p. 311). It was an immediate success. The first edition, which was in Latin, sold out in nine months.

*The Institutes* went through numerous editions (1539, 1541, 1543, 1545, 1550, 1551, 1559, 1560) and grew in size because Calvin added to it discussions of the controversies of the time, opinions of various groups that he believed to be in error, and the practical needs of the church (González, I, pp. 63-64). The second edition (1539) went far beyond the didactic and elementary purpose of the first edition. It no longer looked like an elaborate catechism; it was a copious manual of dogmatic theology (Wendel, p. 61). It was three times longer than the 1536 first edition (Parker, p. 73). Over the years it grew from six chapters to 17, from 17 to 21, and finally to 80. The final edition consisted of a new format and considerable additional material. Calvin said it could almost be regarded as a new work, although the increase in size was obtained by extending the treatment of existing topics (Parker, p. 131). The historian Will Durant said *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* was among the world's ten most influential works.

In 1539, Calvin published his commentary on the book of Romans; many other commentaries followed (Eerdmans', p. 381).

Parker contends that it is impossible to do justice to Calvin's work in Geneva without giving preaching the main place (Parker, p. 96). "Following the practice of many of the Church fathers, but even more extensively, Calvin preached through whole books of the Bible Sunday after Sunday or day after day" (Parker, p. 91). He preached 123 sermons on Genesis, 200 on Deuteronomy, 159 on Job, 342 on Isaiah, 174 on Ezekiel, 189 on the book of Acts, etc. He preached without notes and apparently directly from the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament (Parker, p. 92). Acknowledging that there were elements of logical lectures on the sovereignty of God, predestination, and church discipline, attacks on the city council, the people, and the papacy as well as attacks on the theological stupidity of his opponents, Parker insists that in the main, Calvin's sermons were expositions of passages of Scripture with applications. He sums up the theme of Calvin's messages by saying it was about the redemption of God in Christ and the believer's life of obedience (Parker, p. 94).

*His Theology* The *Institutes* are a summary of the ideas he expounded in all of his works (Wendel, p. 111). The English translation of the final form (1559) is 860 pages of fine print. Only some of his major ideas are summarized here.

Calvin is known for his doctrine of predestination. It is true that Calvin believed in double predestination (the predestination of the saved to go to heaven and the unsaved to go to hell; *Institutes*, III, 21, 7). Calvin and the Lutherans were in general agreement concerning the doctrine of predestination (González, II, p. 69). In fact, Calvin's theology was strongly influenced by Lutheranism (Eerdmans', p. 381; see also Wendel, pp. 131, 133, 135).

Nevertheless, it is too much to say that predestination was Calvin's central doctrine. As Wendel explains, "His earliest writings do not contain any systematic statement of the problem, and although, later on, and under the influence of St. Augustine and Bucer, he accorded a growing importance to it, he did so under the sway of ecclesiological and pastoral preoccupation rather than to make it the main foundation of his theology.... He only very rarely speaks of predestination except in the four chapters that are devoted to it in the edition of 1559. As Wernle has said, 'It cannot be overemphasized: faith in predestination is a long way from being the center of Calvinism'" (Wendel, p. 264). Calvin said that justification was the "main hinge upon which religion turns" (Calvin, *Institutes*, III, xi, 2; cited by Geisler and McKenzie, p. 101).

Calvin's successor, Beza, was the first to elevate predestination, expounding it before the doctrines of providence and creation (Wendel, p. 268). It was not until the following century that predestination came to be seen as the hallmark of Calvinism (González, II, p. 69).

Calvin's view of free will was that it is the freedom to sin. He said, "It will be beyond dispute that free will does not enable any man can perform good works unless he is assisted by grace; indeed, the special grace which the elect alone received to regeneration.... The servants of sin (are) able to do nothing but sin" (Calvin, *Institutes*, II, 2, 6). He adds, "Man is said to have free will, not because he has free choice of good and evil, but because he acts voluntarily and not by compulsion (to sin). This is perfectly true: but why should so small a matter have been dignified was so proud a title?" (Calvin, *Institutes*, II, 2, 7). He cites Augustine as saying, "The will is indeed free, but not freed—free of righteousness, but enslaved to sin." He adds that Augustine seems to jest at the emptiness of the name, saying, "I am unwilling to use it myself; and others, if they take my advice, will do well to abstain from it" (Calvin, *Institutes*, II, 2, 8). Wendell notes that Calvin did not like the term "free will" and preferred to follow Luther in denying it altogether (Wendel, p. 190).

Calvin concedes that there are actions that are not bad in themselves and that people accomplish things that are worthy of praise, but that does not mean that they are good; it only means that God grants them special gifts (Wendel, p. 192).

Like Luther, Calvin said there were two aspects to faith. The first aspect is a belief in the existence of God and the truthfulness concerning the narratives about Christ. The second aspect is trust. We not only believe *that* God and Christ exist, we believe *in* God and *in* Christ. It is "putting all our hope and faith in one God and Christ alone and being so confirmed in that faith that we have no doubt of God's goodwill toward us." After 1539, "Calvin was no longer content with the definition that identified faith with confidence and hope; he now qualified it as 'a sure and certain knowledge of God's will toward us which,



being found upon the promise freely given in Jesus Christ, is revealed in our understanding and sealed in our hearts by the Holy Spirit” (Wendel, pp. 240-241).

In light of what later became known as Calvinism, it is important to note that Calvin himself believed people could have the assurance of their salvation. In the first place, he defined faith as a “sure and certain knowledge.” Furthermore, he specifically brings up the issue of the assurance of salvation in his commentary on Matthew 11:27. When he does, he says, “Christ enjoins them (those who are anxious about assurance of salvation) to come directly to himself, *in order to obtain certainty of salvation....* Though our salvation was always hidden with God, yet Christ is the channel through which it flows to us, and we receive it by faith, *that it may be secure and ratified in our hearts*” (Calvin in his comments on Matthew 11:27, italics added).

Granted, Calvin says, “The fruits of regeneration furnish them with a proof of the Holy Spirit dwelling in them,” but he quickly adds, “this they could not do had they not previously perceived that the goodness of God is sealed to them *by nothing but the certainty of the promise. Should they begin to estimate it by their good works, nothing will be weaker are more uncertain*; works when estimated by themselves, no less proving the divine displeasure of their imperfections than his goodwill by their incipient purity. In short, while proclaiming the mercies of the Lord, they never lose sight of his *free favor*” (*Institutes*, III, 14, 19, italics added).

Commenting on Calvin’s view of assurance, Wendel says, “What assures us of our election, then, is first, our faith in Christ and our union with him, and secondly, the gifts that God grants in sanctifying us. We know that some disciples of Calvin took a much more affirmative position with regard to the testimony of works and that for a number of his spiritual successors, the abundance and success of our works provided the manifest proof of our election and our salvation. But this tendency, it must be repeated, is contrary to authentic Calvinist thought” (Wendel, pp. 276-277).

According to Calvin, the difference between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant is their chronological position in the plan of salvation, not their contents (Wendel, p. 209). “Christ came to renew and confirm the covenant that the Jews had broken and to extend it to all people, rather than to bring another Covenant new in itself” (Wendel, p. 214). Believers are free from the Law so far as their justification is concerned, but under grace, “it is in that Law that the believer will continue to know the will of God” (Wendel, p. 204). Borrowing from Bucer, Calvin believed in the permanent validity of the Law (Wendel, p. 142) and the practice of church discipline (Wendel, p. 143).

Based on Matthew 3:11, the Anabaptists made a distinction between the baptism of John the Baptist and the baptism of Christ. Calvin rejected that (Wendel, p. 321). He denied that Paul re-baptized the disciples of John the Baptist in Acts 19:3-5, contending that baptism in that passage was nothing more than the laying on of hands. Wendell remarks, “This passage gives us a striking example of how adventurous Calvin’s exegesis could be when he was using it in the service of his dogmatic preconceptions. To him as to other reformers, the Anabaptists’ argument presented puzzles enough for all of the ingenuity he could bring to bear upon them” (Wendel, p. 323).

Calvin defended infant baptism. At first, he aligned himself with Luther’s opinion that children were endowed with a faith of their own. Because of the continual attack of the Anabaptists, he later used the arguments that baptism and circumcision conveyed the same promises, that Jesus blessed children, and that infants are baptized for their future faith.

Wendell comments, “Since it is not possible for him to adduce a single New Testament passage containing a clear allusion to infant baptism, he had to be content with indirect inferences and analogies drawn from circumcision and Christ’s blessing of the children” (Wendel, pp. 324-328).

Roman Catholicism taught that the bread and wine actually became the body and blood of Christ. Luther taught that the bread and wine remained bread and wine, but Christ was physically present in them. Zwingli believed the elements were symbolic. Martin Bucer, the reformer from Strasbourg who influenced Calvin, took an intermediate position between Luther and Zwingli, affirming the presence of Christ in Communion was real, although it was spiritual. Calvin thought that the notion that we derive spiritual life from literal flesh is “more than stupid” (*Institutes*, IV, 17, 24). He adopted Bucer’s view. “While rejecting the material presence of the body of the Christ in the bread, he proclaims that the whole of Christ is truly present, in his humanity and his divinity” (Wendel, p. 343). Calvin’s two-part explanation of the Eucharist is difficult to reconcile. On the one hand, he insists that the body of Christ is present in the elements. He said in a letter, “I see nothing absurd in saying that we are truly and really receiving the flesh and blood of Christ and thus he is food to us substantially” (Wendel, p. 352), but on the other hand, he declares that the body of Christ has no spatial relationship to the material elements of the Eucharist (Wendel, p. 350).

In 1536, Bucer, Luther, and others drew up the Wittenberg Concord, which made room for both Luther’s and Bucer’s views. In 1549, Bucer, Calvin, and others signed the Zürich Consensus, a similar document to the Wittenberg Concord. Moreover, Luther was pleased with Calvin’s *Institutes*. “Therefore, the difference between Calvin and Luther on the presence of Christ in Communion should not have been an insurmountable obstacle to the Protestant unity” (González, II, pp. 68-69).

Unfortunately, the followers of the Reformers were less flexible. In 1552, Joachim Westphal, a Lutheran, published a treatise in which he declared that Calvin’s view was making headway into the traditional Lutheran territory. Since Luther had died, Westphal wanted Melanchthon to attack Calvin, but Melanchthon refused to do so (González, II, p. 69).

*His Significance* Beyond his work in Geneva, Calvin’s greatest contribution was his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, which was his endeavor “to systematize spiritual data into a coherent whole” (Wendel, p. 357). It was that work that was accepted as the authoritative expression of Reformed theology. Calvin also wrote commentaries on many books of the Bible and was a voluminous letter-writer to the many people from all over Europe and the British Isles who wrote him for advice. His writings, including his letters, fill nearly 57 volumes of the *Corpus Reformatorum*. On top of that, 2000 of his sermons are extant (Cairns, p. 312).

Calvin is recognized by many as a great theologian and expositor of the biblical text, but there are serious flaws in his work. As Wendel, the professor who wrote a scholarly book on Calvin’s thought, said, “Sometimes, for the sake of logical coherence or out of attachment to pre-established dogmatic positions, he also did violence to the biblical text. His principle of Scriptural authority then led him to teach the Scripture for illusory support by means of purely arbitrary interpretations. The memory of his studies in law very likely played some part in this. The jurist, practicing their exegesis upon the text of Justinian, adopted much the same procedure. In this way, they manage, by sheer ingenuity, to make

their authorities say about anything they wanted them to, sometimes things that had very little connection with the thought of the authority they quoted.... He knew how to adapt the text to the requirements of his doctrine.... Truth compels one to admit frankly that, despite all of his fidelity to the Bible, he seems to have been searching the Scriptures more frequently for text to support the doctrine accepted in advance than to derive doctrine from the Scriptures” (Wendel, p. 359).

Calvin encouraged education. In Geneva, he set up a three-level system of education, at the top of which was the Academy, now known as the University of Geneva, which he founded in 1559 (Cairns, p. 312), under the direction of Theodore Beza (González, II, p. 68). Students of theology came to the Academy from all parts of Western and Central Europe, especially France (Erdmans’, p. 381). His emphasis on education affected America, where Calvinistic Puritans created colleges (Cairns, p. 312).

As a result of the *Institutes* and the Academy, Calvin’s theological influence was felt in Europe and eventually, a number of churches appeared in the Netherlands, Scotland, Hungary, France, etc. (González, II, p. 69).

It has been suggested that Calvin influenced democracy because he accepted the representative principle in the government of the church and the state. He clearly influenced the Reformed Church, Presbyterian Church, and the Puritans (Cairns, p. 312).

Calvin clearly had an “authoritarian character” (Wendell, p. 82). He was trained in law and was influenced by Bucer, who put a heavy emphasis on church discipline. Thus by temperament and training, Calvin was a rigid, judgmental individual. Those attitudes still characterize many who claim his name to describe their theology.

## The Radical Reformers

*The Backdrop* First, a word about the environment out of which the radical Reformers came. Radical Reformation began in Zürich, Switzerland. In Zürich, as in the other cities in Europe at the time, the city council controlled the churches. Furthermore, all the citizens of the city were baptized as infants and were automatically members of the church, whether it was Roman Catholic or Protestant. Against that backdrop, a group of Reformers became known as radical; they were radical compared to Martin Luther, Zwingli, and John Calvin, all of whom were part of a “state” church and all of whom practiced infant baptism.

*Their Beliefs* The Anabaptists were the radical Reformers. They were not interested in writing creeds or forming organizations. They were devoted students of the Bible who felt the Reformers were not applying all the principles taught in the Scriptures (Kuiper, p. 204). “They were not interested in simply reforming the church; they were committed to *restoring* it to the vigor and faithfulness of his earliest centuries” (Erdmans’ p. 401). Their primary concern was not theology or liturgy. They were committed to living based on the Sermon on the Mount (Mead, p. 148).

The Anabaptists agreed with the Reformers that the Bible is the final authority for faith and practice, and that justification is by grace through faith. Part of their reaction to the Reformers was the close tie between church and state. The decisions of rulers and city councils to join the Reformation movement brought whole states and cities into Protestant churches. The citizens felt they were members of the church—with the result that the world was brought into the church. The Anabaptists insisted that membership in the church be

limited to those who were converted (Kuiper, p. 205). Moreover, the Protestant Reformers continued the Catholic practice of baptizing infants.

*“In the New Testament record, they found a church free from the state and composed only of believers, with no mention of infant baptism. To their minds, infant baptism and the close union between church and state were at the bottom of all the terrible corruption in the church”* (Kuiper, p. 206, italics added).

Actually, there were many different groups of Anabaptists, each with a slightly different set of beliefs. They practiced believer’s baptism (versus infant baptism), first by affusion (pouring) and later by immersion (Cairns, p. 307). Taking the Sermon on the Mount literally, most Anabaptists were pacifists (González, II, p. 54). They were also radical egalitarians. In most groups of Anabaptists, women had the same rights as men (González, II, p. 56). They frowned upon involvement in secular activity, taking oaths, bearing arms, and holding public office (Mead, p. 148).

The earliest known Anabaptist doctrinal statement was drawn up in February 1527 in Schleitheim, Switzerland. It consisted of seven articles: 1) believer’s baptism, 2) excommunication for members who fell into sin, 3) the Lord’s Supper as a memorial for those who had united with the church by baptism, 4) separation from the world and the external church system, including the use of the sword, 5) each congregation should be united under one shepherd, who is supported by the congregation which appointed him and who is accountable to the congregation, 6) civil government is to punish evildoers and protect those who do good, but believers should not hold office in the government, 7) the godly are forbidden to take oaths (Westin, pp. 70-72).

*Their Name* The Anabaptists did not adopt the name “Anabaptist.” It was a pejorative term given to them by their opponents. At the time, the Catholics and the Reformers practiced infant baptism. The Anabaptists rejected the practice of infant baptism and insisted that the Bible taught believer’s baptism. From the viewpoint of their opponents, since they were baptizing people who had already been baptized as infants, they were re-baptizing people. Hence the name “Anabaptist,” which means “to baptize again.”

The Anabaptists, of course, rejected that name because, in their view, they were baptizing people for the first time, not for a second time (Eerdmans’ p. 399). They preferred the name “brethren.” The earliest Anabaptists were Swiss brethren. Later they were called Mennonites and Hutterites.

*Their Persecution* Their refusal to have anything to do with the state (hold public officials or participate in war) and their rejection of government-ordered infant baptism resulted in severe persecution. For example, in 1528, Charles V ordered that Anabaptists be put to death based on an ancient Roman law directed against the Donatists, which established the death penalty for all guilty of baptizing. Both Catholics and other Protestants persecuted the Anabaptists. “Thousands of Anabaptists were put to death (by fire in the Catholic territories, by drowning and the sword under Protestant regimes). Thousands more saved their skins by recanting” (Eerdmans’ p. 402).

The minutes of the trial of an Anabaptist in Germany named Ambrosius Spittelmaier revealed their defense. At his trial, Spittelmaier testified that he believed in the absolute authority of the Scripture, the deity of Christ, salvation by faith, the equality of believers (one believer is not above another), believer’s baptism (not infant baptism), the symbolic nature of communion, and the Second Coming of Christ when He would be King in a new kingdom. He also said Christians could own property (no Christian communism), but they

should not hold public office. He repudiated the accusation against Anabaptists that they were guilty of disturbance and the overthrow of the government. For such opinions, the court imposed the death penalty (Westin, pp. 89-92). Ambrosius Spittelmaier was beheaded on February 6, 1528. Such Anabaptists were looked upon as radicals who were overthrowing the established order (Westin, p. 101).

There were many martyrs, probably more than those who died during the first three centuries. The more fiercely the Anabaptists were persecuted, the more the movement grew (González, II, pp. 56-57).

*Their History* The Anabaptist movement began in northern Switzerland during the Zwinglian movement and, from there and spread to Moravia, Holland, and other lands. Zwingli's insistence on the biblical basis for teaching encouraged the rise of the Anabaptist concepts based on the Bible (Cairns, p. 305).

1. In Switzerland. Conrad Grebel (1498-1526) was the founder of the Swiss Anabaptists and the father of the Anabaptist movement. He attended the Universities of Vienna and Paris (Cairns, p. 305; many of the early leaders of the Anabaptists were scholars, González, II, p. 57). He was converted in 1522. Zwingli's view that infant baptism had no biblical basis appealed to him (Cairns, p. 305). He worked with Zwingli and was a leader among Zwingli's followers.

Zwingli wanted to reform the church, but, in his opinion, it would have to be brought about by legal procedures, that is, by a decision of the city council (Westin, p. 48). As was pointed out earlier under the discussion of Zwingli the reformer, in 1523, the city council in Zürich decided to hold a public debate to see what faith the city should adopt. The city council decided that they should reform the church and made some reforms but "declared that until further notice the old order should remain and that anyone who attempted on his own to change matters would stand in jeopardy of being punished" (Westin, p. 53). Choosing not to break with the city council, Zwingli continued to officiate at the Mass.

Meanwhile, an edition of Luther's translation of the Bible appeared in Basel (December 1522), which was only a few miles northwest of Zürich. Because of the printing house in Basel, the distribution of Bibles in Zürich greatly increased. A Bible study movement came into being. As a result, unlearned peasants in the country and laborers in the city became familiar with the Scripture (Westin, p. 54). It was Bible study that fueled the forces of opposition. In the summer of 1523, the issue was forming a separate church (Westin, p. 57). Grebel and others rejected the role of civil government in the Reformation and grew impatient with the slow pace of reform.

Zwingli and the council became concerned about the rise of this radicalism. In June 1523, Zwingli preached a sermon in which he said there were four groups among church people in Zürich: the old Catholics, the evangelicals (those who followed him), the radicals (the Anabaptists), and the indifferent. The Anabaptists' demand for a holy life was interpreted as a doctrine of good works and holiness based on deeds (Westin, pp. 49-50).

In the spring of 1524, some parents began to object to taking their children to priests to be baptized (Westin, pp. 53-55). On August 15, 1524, the city council insisted on the obligation to baptize all newborn infants. In September, Grebel, Felix Manz, and others wrote a letter in which they said they had not found infant baptism in the Bible and, therefore, they considered it meaningless and contrary to Scripture. Only believers were to be baptized. The letter also stated that there were hardly twenty who accepted the Bible on this issue; most were still conforming to human authority (Westin, p. 55).

Zwingli, at first, used debate to persuade the Anabaptists to give up their views (Cairns, p. 305). Then he charged them with bitterness, quarrelsomeness, and showing a carnal attitude. By the end of 1524, Zwingli was suggesting severe penalties for those who opposed infant baptism (Westin, p. 56).

On January 21, 1525, the city council issued an order demanding all who had failed to have their infants baptized must have them baptized within one week or suffer the risk of banishment (Westin, p. 56). That evening the radicals met, baptized each other, and became the first free church of modern times (Eerdmans' pp. 399-400; González, II, p. 55). Grebel baptized George Blaurock, a former monk, and Blaurock baptized Grebel (Cairns, p. 305) and fifteen others (Westin, p. 56). These were the first recorded Anabaptist adult baptisms.

On February 2, 1525, the city council repeated the requirement that all infants must be baptized and some who failed to comply were arrested and fined, including Felix Manz and George Blaurock.

On March 7, 1526, the city council of Zürich mandated that no one should rebaptize another under the penalty of death. "Grebel, Manz, Blaurock were condemned to severe imprisonment on bread and water; no one could visit them, not even in the case of illness: they were to rot and die in their cells. If anyone recanted and then again fell into this delusion, he would be drowned without compassion" (Westin, p. 59). With the help of friends, Grebel escaped but died of the plague in the summer of 1526. Felix Manz was executed on January 5, 1527, by being drowned. He was the first Anabaptist martyr. On that same day, Blaurock was severely beaten and expelled from Zürich. By 1535, the Anabaptist movement in Zürich was practically nonexistent because of the treatment they received and because they fled to other lands.

Nevertheless, the Anabaptist movement grew. One official reported that in his district there were more than 100 Anabaptists, but only 13 had recanted (Westin, p. 59). In the spring of 1525, Grebel visited the city of St. Gall. Soon there were approximately 800 baptized believers there, where their meetings were called "readings" and those who led these groups were called "readers" (Westin, p. 60). Using the methods that Zürich had employed, St. Gall controlled the Anabaptist movement with fines, imprisonment, banishment, confiscation of private, and death (Westin, p. 61). There were also Anabaptist converts in other cities in Switzerland, including Bern, Basel, Appenzell, and Schaffhausen. The Anabaptists in these cities were persecuted. For example, in 1529, Blaurock was again imprisoned, this time in Basel.

The Amish in Pennsylvania came out of this background (Cairns, pp. 305-306).

2. In Germany. From Switzerland, the Anabaptist movement spread to other countries. As in Switzerland, they encountered persecution.

Balthasar Hubmair (ca. 1481-1528) was one of the early German Anabaptists. He received a doctorate of theology degree from the University of Ingolstadt. He pastored a church at Waldshut, a town near the Swiss border. As a result of coming in contact with the Swiss Anabaptists, he adopted their ideas. He believed in the authority of the Bible, the baptism of believers, and the separation of church and state (Cairns, p. 306). He rejected the papacy and got married (Westin, p. 93).

In 1525, Hubmair and three hundred followers were baptized by affusion (pouring) and he fled to Zürich to escape the Austrian authorities. From there, he was banished to Moravia. There, he became the leader of the Anabaptists who fled from Zürich and thousands of Moravians who were converted to Anabaptist views (Cairns, p. 306). A

contemporary chronicle from St. Gall said that the writer could verify Hubmair had baptized 6000 people (Westin, p. 95). In 1528, he was burned at the stake by order of the Emperor and his wife was drowned by Roman Catholic authorities (Cairns, p. 306).

Hubmair was one of the foremost theologians and apologists for the Anabaptists (Westin, pp. 93-94). He believed that justification is by faith alone. Predestination played little part in his theology, but he believed that justification, and even faith, were works of God. Yet his theology provided wide latitude for the operation of man's free will. He wrote two articles containing to the freedom of the will (Westin, p. 99).

In 1529, Melchior Hoffman (ca. 1495-1543) arrived in Strasbourg, proclaiming that the millennium would begin in 1533 and that Strasbourg would be the New Jerusalem (Cairns, p. 307). He rejected pacifism on the grounds that as the end approached, it would be necessary to fight (González, II, p. 58). In 1533, he was put in jail in Strasbourg and remained there for ten years until his death (Westin, p. 117).

In 1534, Jan Matthys, one of Hoffman's followers, proclaimed that he was Enoch and later decided that Munster, not Strasbourg, was the New Jerusalem. He moved to Munster with his wife, Divara, a former nun (Cairns, p. 307). Soon that the number of Anabaptists in Munster grew to the point that they took over the city. They expelled the Catholics, who laid siege to the city, killing every Anabaptist who fell into their hands (González, II, p. 58).

When John Matthys was killed, John of Leiden became leader of the besieged city. As a result of the war, there were more women than men in Munster. To address that problem, John of Leiden decreed the practice of polygamy (González, II, p. 58). He married Divara and fifteen other women (Cairns, p. 307).

At one point, in the city of Munster, the Anabaptists even crowned King David (Eerdmans' p. 402). The Catholics retook the city. After granting a short grace period for the Anabaptists to leave the city, the Catholics killed without mercy all suspected of being out of sympathy with them (Kuiper, p. 208). The Munster incident brought condemnation and persecution against the Anabaptist movement from both the Protestants and Roman Catholics (Cairns, p. 307).

3. In Moravia. In 1533, a Swiss minister, Jacob Hutter, became pastor of the Austerlitz Anabaptists. He instituted strict discipline in communal living. Each unit was called a *bruderhöfe*, a "brother-estate." He was burned at the stake in 1536 (Kuiper, p. 206). During the 16<sup>th</sup> century, no less than 80 vicinities in Monrovia contained communal households (Westin, p. 107). Persecution drove the Hutterites to Hungary and the Ukraine (Cairns, p. 307).

4. In the Netherlands. In 1536, Menno Simons (1496-1561) gave up the priesthood, embraced Anabaptist views, and became the leader of the "brethren," the name that the Anabaptists in the Netherlands adopted in order to get rid of the stigma attached in the name "Anabaptist" after the debacle in Munster. Simons believed pacifism was an essential part of Christianity and that Christians ought not take any oaths whatsoever, including not taking any position that required them (González, II, p.59). He was the pioneer of the peaceful branch of the Anabaptist movement (Westin, p. 130). All He traveled widely throughout the Netherlands in neighboring parts of Germany, establishing churches (Kuiper, p. 209). After Simon's death, the "brethren" became known as the Mennonites (Cairns, p. 307).

Leonard Bouwens was a leader of the Anabaptist movement in Holland in the latter part of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. He was the most successful of all the preachers. He baptized no less than 10,378 people in 142 different places. He died in 1582 (Westin, p. 133).

The Anabaptists grew rapidly, were persecuted severely, and dwindled significantly. “They were hunted by the Catholics and harried by the Protestants. Then they hunted and harried each other, shunning, banning, and excommunicating, until they fractured themselves into impotence by the mid (16<sup>th</sup>) century” (Bangs, p. 21).

Under the pressure of persecution, only three groups were able to survive beyond the mid-sixteenth century: the Brethren in Switzerland and South Germany, the Mennonites in the Netherlands and North Germany, and the Hutterites (followers of Jakob Hutter, who died in 1536) in Moravia. Unfortunately, over the centuries, the descendants of the early Anabaptists lost many of their characteristics. “Seeking purity, they became legalistic. In the interest of sheer survival, they lost evangelistic zeal” (Erdmans’ p. 403).

Today the descendants of the Anabaptists are the Mennonites, the Hutterites and the Amish (Cairns, p. 305).

“Mennonites are often associated with the Old Order Mennonites and Amish, who still attempt to live simply in farming communities without the benefit of electrical power and automobiles. However, most Mennonites don’t live this way. They make full use of technology and dress like most everyone else. You’ll find vibrant and growing Mennonite congregations everywhere, from small towns and cities to nearly every major urban center in North America. New York City alone is home of nearly 20 Mennonite congregations” (from a brochure entitled “Who are the Mennonites?” published by the Mennonite Church USA, 2006). Almost all Mennonites practice baptism by pouring, observe the Lord’s Supper twice a year, and observe foot washing as an ordinance in connection with the Lord’s Supper, after which they salute one another with the “kiss of peace” (Mead, p. 149). The strongest branch of the original Anabaptists is the Mennonites from Holland (Westin, p. 170).

Historically, the Amish separated from the Mennonites. Jacob Amman (ca. 1656-ca. 1730) was a Swiss Mennonite bishop who separated from them in 1693. Amman insisted on strict adherence to the confession of faith, especially the shunning of excommunicated members. He called for complete separation from those who had been excommunicated, insisting that members should not eat with anyone who had been excommunicated, even if there were a member of the family. There were also strict regulations concerning food and clothing. For example, buttons were not to be used on clothes; rather, they used hooks and eyes (Westin, pp. 165-166).

The Amish migrated to the United States, concentrating in Pennsylvania and spreading into Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, and other western states as well as Canada. Most are distinguished by their plain clothes, opposition to the use of automobiles, telephones, and higher education, but are recognized as extremely efficient farmers (Mead, pp. 149-150).

When I was visiting Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, where a large number of Amish reside, I picked up a brochure on the Amish, which gave a brief summary of their background and beliefs. The brochure gave an explanation of their belief in non-resistance. It said, “Amish believe in non-resistance, or nonviolence, as a way of life. Biblical nonresistance as held by the Amish should not be confused with politically oriented pacifism. While it is a stand against participation in war, it is much more. It involves doing good for evil and suffering wrongfully. It is a positive stance—a way of love and peace



(Matt. 5:43-48)” (“The Amish in Lancaster County,” published by the Mennonite Information Center, n.d.).

“The Hutterites are a communal people, living on hundreds of scattered *bruderhöfe* or colonies throughout the prairies of northwestern North America. On average, fifteen families live and work in the typical Hutterite colony, where they farm, raise livestock and produce manufactured goods for sustenance” (www.hutterites.org, accessed February 4, 2014). They have over a hundred *bruderhöfes* in Alberta and Manitoba (Kuiper, p. 206).

It should also be noted that the free church concept of the Anabaptists influenced the Puritan Separatists, the Baptists, and the Quakers (Cairns, p. 307).

## The Counter-Reformation

*Dealing with Luther* When Martin Luther nailed the 95 Theses on the church door in Wittenberg, Leo X (1513-21) was pope. He was slow to recognize the potential problem for Roman Catholicism. His first response was to get the Augustinian order to discipline Luther. Then he tried to get Frederick of Saxony to remove protection from Luther. In 1520, he issued the bull *Exsurge Domini*, which condemned 41 points of Luther’s teaching. Luther publicly burned the bull. Then Leo excommunicated Luther (Noble, p. 66).

Leo’s successor, Hadrian VI (1522-23), dismissed Luther as a “petty monk” and an insignificant heretic (Noble, p. 66). The next pope, Clement VII (1523-34), Leo’s cousin, did not recognize the importance of what Luther had done (Cook, p. 83). In the meantime, “within half a century of Luther posting the 95 theses, almost half of what had been Roman Catholic Christianity withdrew its allegiance to the Roman church” (Cook, p. 85). It was during this time that England was lost to Catholicism (Noble, p. 67).

Other than dealing with Luther, Roman Catholicism took steps to regain its losses in Europe, to subvert the Protestant faith, and to promote Roman Catholicism in foreign lands. Several methods were used:

*The Order of the Jesuits* While recovering from a wound, Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556), a Spanish knight, read about and was influenced by Francis, Dominic, and the *Imitation of Christ*. He became a priest and studied theology in Paris (at the same college as John Calvin), where he wrote *Spiritual Exercises* and founded the Society of Jesus in 1534 (Cook, pp. 94-95).

The Society of Jesus was a monastic order characterized by strict discipline, intense loyalty to the Church and the Order, a deep religious devotion, and a strong proselytizing spirit. Its principal aim was to fight the Protestant movement with methods both open and secret. It became so powerful that it incurred the bitterest opposition, even in Roman Catholic countries, and was suppressed in nearly every state of Europe. By the decree of Pope Clement XIV in 1773, it was forbidden throughout the Church. It continued for a time in secret and afterward openly. It was again recognized by the Pope and is still one of the most potent forces for the spreading of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world.

*The Council of Trent* Reform within the church was attempted through the Council of Trent. The Council met at different times and in more than one place, though mainly at Trent in Austria, seventy-six miles northwest of Vienna. It was composed of all the bishops of the Church and lasted nearly twenty years through the reigns of four popes (from 1545-1563). During those years, it met three times: 1545-1547, 1551-1552, and 1562-1563 (Geisler and McKenzie, p. 445).

In 1545, Pope Paul III convened a Council at Trent. In 1547, an outbreak of typhoid fever in Trent caused the Council to be transferred to Bologna in northern Italy. In 1548, the Council was suspended. In 1551, Pope Julian III reopened Trent. Because of political tensions, Julian had to suspend the Council again. Pope Pius IV reconvened the Council in 1562 (Noble, p. 69).

Noble says the accomplishments of the Council of Trent were: it “affirmed the equal validity of Scripture and tradition, the church’s sole right to interpret the Bible, the authority of the text of the Vulgate, traditional teaching on Original Sin and justification and merit, and traditional teaching on the sacraments, in particular, the doctrine of transubstantiation. More cursory affirmations were given to relics, images, saints, and indulgences (although the sale of indulgences was effectively banned).” (Noble, p. 69).

*Active Persecution* Active persecution was another weapon employed to quell the growing spirit of the Reformation. In Europe, every Roman Catholic government sought to exterminate the Protestant faith by fire and sword. In Spain, the Inquisition was established and untold multitudes were tormented and burned. In France, the persecuting spirit reached its height on St. Bartholomew’s Day in 1572. On that day, and for weeks afterward, between 20,000 and 100,000 people perished. In every country where Protestantism was not in control, these persecutions not only stayed the reforming tide but in some countries, notably Bohemia and Spain, they crushed it out altogether.

*Catholic Missions* Catholic missions were largely, though not entirely, under the direction of the Jesuits. Their efforts resulted in the conversion of all the native races of South America, Central America, Mexico and a large part of Canada, and the establishment of great missions of India and lands joining India. Roman Catholic missions in heathen lands began centuries earlier than Protestant missions and greatly increased the number and power of the Catholic Church.

*Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648)* A century after the Reformation began (1618), a war began between the Reformed and Catholic states in Germany. It ultimately involved all the nations of Europe. It is known as the Thirty Years’ War. Political rivalries, as well as religious rivalries, became involved. States of the same faith were, at times, on opposing sides. For nearly a generation, the strife and war continued. Finally, in 1648, the war was ended by the peace of Westphalia, which fixed the boundaries of Roman Catholic and Protestant states mainly as they have continued to the present time. At that point, therefore, the period of the Reformation may be considered ended. Kuiper puts it like this: “When the wars between Catholics and Protestants came to an end with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the geographical extent of the Roman and Protestant churches have become fairly well fixed. There have been no major changes since and the borders are today pretty much what they were at that time” (Kuiper, p. 245).

## **Creeds**

Between 325 and 451, ecumenical creeds, such as the Nicene Creed, were developed. Between 1517 and 1648, Protestant creeds were developed. The first was the Augsburg Confession (1530). It consisted of 29 articles, seven of which were a repudiation of religious abuses by the Roman Catholic Church and 22 of which were statements of Lutheran beliefs (Cairns, p. 295). Many other Protestant creeds followed.

## Calvinism and Arminianism

This material on Calvinism is a condensed version of “Calvinism” by G. Michael Cocoris (available at [www.insightsfromtheword.com](http://www.insightsfromtheword.com)).

*John Calvin* It is commonly recognized that Calvin believed in Total Depravity, Double Predestination (that is, that God ordained some to salvation and some to damnation), Irresistible Grace, and the Perseverance of the Saints. What is not commonly known is that Calvin did not believe in Limited Atonement. Actually, there is a debate about whether or not John Calvin himself believed in Limited or Unlimited Atonement. (For proof that John Calvin believed in Unlimited Atonement, see “Calvinism” by G. Michael Cocoris.)

*Theodore Beza* Theodore Beza succeeded John Calvin in Geneva. Like Calvin, he believed in Double Predestination, etc., but he changed some of Calvin’s theology. These changes profoundly impacted what later became known as Calvinism. In a documented, scholarly study of Beza, Walter Kickel gives the evidence that Beza’s whole theological program was a serious departure from that of Calvin. For example, Calvin did not discuss the doctrine of predestination until he had expounded all of the other doctrines of salvation. Kickel found that Beza, on the other hand, made the doctrine of predestination the centerpiece of his theology. In his theology, the place of the Trinity, the two natures of Christ (He is both God and man), and justification are determined by the doctrine of predestination (Armstrong, p. 41). “It makes the most profound difference whether one approaches theology via predestination or simply discusses the doctrine as an implicate from grace” (Armstrong, p. 40). Bangs concurs. He says, “The emphasis is different. Beza lifts the doctrine of predestination to a prominence it did not have in Calvin. Predestination made an end in itself, became for Beza an utterly inscrutable mystery of the divine will” (Bangs, p. 66).

In addition, based on Aristotelian logic, Beza rationalized Calvin’s doctrine of predestination. “By doing this, his doctrine became singularly rational and free of contradiction. It took on the character of a unified, scientific system” (Kickel, cited by Armstrong, p. 40). Beza also introduced the doctrines of supralapsarianism (speculation concerning the decree of God in eternity past that leads to Double Predestination), Imputed Sin (Adam’s sin is imputed directly on every individual), and Limited Atonement (Armstrong, pp. 41-42).

The introduction of the doctrine of Limited Atonement has profound ramifications concerning the assurance of salvation. If Christ died only for the elect and did not die for everyone, the issue becomes, “How do I know that I am one of the elect for whom Christ died?” I can no longer say, “I know Christ died for me because He died for all and I am trusting in what He did and, therefore, I can know I’m saved.”

Kendall put it like this: “We have no pledge, as it were, that we are elect for we have no way of knowing whether we are one of those for whom Christ died. Had Christ died for all we could freely know we are elected, but Beza has told us Christ died for the elect. This makes trusting Christ presumptuous, if not dangerous: we could be putting our trust in one who did not die for us and therefore be damned. Thus, we can no more trust Christ’s death by a direct act of faith than we can infallibly project that we are among the number chosen for eternity: for the number of the elect and the number for whom Christ died are one and the same. The ground of assurance, then, must be sought elsewhere than in Christ” (Kendall, p. 32).

For Beza, good works are the infallible proof of saving faith. In his little catechism, he asks, “But whereby may a man know whether he has faith or not? Answer: by good works.” Calvin thought that looking to ourselves would lead to anxiety or sure damnation. Not Beza. Kendall concludes that it is as though Beza says all who have the effects have faith; I have the effects, therefore, I have faith. Assurance of salvation, then, is not based on Scripture but on a syllogism, not on looking to Christ but on logic.

Since Beza makes sanctification the grounds of assurance, it is not surprising that he appeals to 2 Peter 1:10 in connection with the assurance of election, something Calvin did not do. As Kendall says, “When Christ is not held forth to all men as the immediate ground of assurance, the result is not only introspection on our part but a need to assure ourselves upon the very grounds Calvin warns against” (Kendall, p. 38).

Beza and others who came after him changed Calvin in several significant ways. Armstrong said, “A careful comparison of his (Calvin’s) writings with those of representative Calvinists of the 17<sup>th</sup> century reveals a radical change of emphasis. In fact, this change of emphasis is so profound that in many points, the whole structure of Calvin’s thought is seriously compromised” (Armstrong, p. xvii). He also observes, “It is axiomatic that thought does not remain static and that most great thinkers have been but imperfectly understood by their successors” (Armstrong, p. xvii).

Beza’s change of emphasis was slow. Armstrong says that the cleavage between Calvin’s and Beza’s theology was not readily apparent to the contemporary observer (Armstrong, p. 129).

*Jacob Arminius* Jacob Arminius was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church. In 1582, he attended the Academy in Geneva that had been founded by John Calvin. While he was there, Arminius heard Beza lecture on the book of Romans. After Geneva, Arminius was ordained in the Dutch Reformed Church and he was the pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church in Amsterdam. In 1603, he became a professor at the University in Leiden.

As a pastor preaching through the book of Romans, Arminius began to have doubts about some of the things that he had been taught at Geneva. Later, he was asked to write a refutation of a book that was opposed to Calvin and Beza’s view of predestination. During his preparation, he underwent a theological transformation and “became a convert to the very opinions which he had been requested to combat and refute” (Arminius, *The Works of Arminius*, vol. 1, p. 30).

Arminius believed that God decreed to save those He knew from all eternity would believe and persevere. He also believed that faith is a gift of God and that it is “impossible for believers as long as they remain believers to decline from salvation” (Arminius, *The Works of Arminius*, vol. 2, p. 677 ff.). The predestinarians teach that believers persevere because they were elected; Arminius says God elects believers whom He foresees will persevere. Arminius says faith can fail. In contrast to semi-Pelagianism, Arminianism teaches that the first steps of grace are taken by God.

*Remonstrance* In 1610, the year after Arminius died, his views were stated in the *Remonstrance* (a word which means a strong or formal protest). The five points of the *Remonstrance* are as follows.

1. God elects on the basis of His “eternal, unchangeable purpose” and only “those who, through the grace of the Holy Ghost, shall believe on this His son Jesus

- Christ.” He also wills “to leave the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath.” (In short, God decreed to save all who believe in Christ.)
2. Christ “died for all men and for every man, so that He has obtained for them all ... redemption and forgiveness of sins; yet that no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins except the believer.” (In short, Christ died for all, but only believers enjoy forgiveness of sins.)
  3. “That man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his free will ... can of and by himself, neither think, will, nor do anything that is truly good (such as saving faith imminently is); but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ.” (In short, people cannot save themselves; they must be born again.)
  4. “That this grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of all good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without prevenient or assisting, awakening, following, and cooperative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good ...” It adds, “As respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible.” (In short, grace is not irresistible).
  5. “That those who are incorporated into Christ by a true faith ... have thereby full power to ... win the victory ... but whether they are capable ... of becoming devoid of grace, that must be more particularly determined out of the Holy Scriptures, before we ourselves can teach it with full persuasion of our minds.” (In short, those in Christ have the power to persevere, but the question of falling from grace is left open.)

*Canons of Dort* For the specific purpose of dealing with Arminianism, a Synod (an assembly of clergymen) met in Dort, a city in the southern Netherlands. On May 29, 1619, the Synod of Dort issued four articles to counter the five articles of the Remonstrance (the four articles of the Synod of Dort deal with the five articles of the Remonstrance, the third and fourth articles being combined). Those now very famous five canons are summarized as follows: “1) That God’s eternal decree of predestination is the cause of election and reprobation and that this decree is not based on foreseen faith (election); 2) that Christ died for the elect only (limited atonement); 3) and 4) that men by nature are unable to seek God apart from the Spirit (inability) and that grace is irresistible (irresistible grace); and 5) the elect will surely persevere in faith to the end” (perseverance of the saints) (Kendall, p. 150, words in parentheses added).

The acronym TULIP is often used to remember the Canons of Dort. The summary of the five points of Calvinism follows the letters of the word “tulip” (the order of the Canons of Dort follows the order of the five articles of the Remonstrance, but to fit the word “tulip” the order is slightly changed).

T	Total Depravity
U	Unconditional Election
L	Limited Atonement
I	Irresistible Grace
P	Perseverance of the Saints

Much, much more could be said about Calvinism. Its critical concepts include: Total Depravity means the total inability of the unregenerate to respond to God in any way (the

unregenerate are like a corpse lying in a casket); genuine faith always produces a changed life, good works, and perseverance; there is a false faith that does not persevere; and to determine whether not a person has genuine faith, look at their life.

*Conclusion* What is known as Calvinism today began with John Calvin but was changed in significant ways and was finalized and formulated at the Synod of Dort. The Westminster Confession is, however, is considered to be one of the clearest and most important examples of Calvinism. It is much more detailed and extensive than the Canons of Dort (González, II, p. 183).

Among many other things, the Westminster Confession teaches that from all eternity God did “freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass” (3.1), that the result of Adam’s sin is “original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and make opposite of all good, and wholly inclined to all evil” (6.4), that the atonement is limited (10.1), that sanctification is inevitable, and that such people “can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere” (17.1).

“While claiming to be a faithful interpreter of Calvin, it (Westminster Confession) tends to turn the theology of the Genevan Reformer into a strict system that Calvin himself might have had difficulty recognizing. Calvin discovered in his own life the liberating joy of justification by the unmerited grace of God. For him, the doctrine of predestination was a means of expressing that joy, and the unmerited nature of salvation” (González, II, p. 184).

## Men of the Period

### Erasmus

*His Life* Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) was born in Rotterdam, Holland. He was the illegitimate son of a priest and a doctor’s daughter, a fact that depressed him all of his life (Winter’s translation, p. vi). He attended the school of the Brethren of the Common Life (1474-1484). The Brethren of the Common Life existed to promote piety, to provide education for boys in need, and to encourage good works in general. One of their pupils was Thomas à Kempis, who wrote *The Imitation of Christ* (Houghton, p. 76).

Erasmus became a monk and an ordained priest (1486-1493; Winter’s translation, p. vi). He left the monastery because he felt he was unsuited for the life of a monk (Eerdmans’, p. 359). He studied at many of the universities in Europe and England (Cairns, p. 263). During his lifetime, he lived in Paris, England, Switzerland, and Italy, but his home was mainly at Basel, in Switzerland. He became a best-selling author.

*His Works* In 1503, using military metaphors of the Christian life, Erasmus wrote *Handbook of the Christian Soldier* (González, II, p. 10). With sarcasm, Erasmus pointed out the evils of the life of the priestly and monastic hierarchy in two books: the *Praise of Folly* (ca. 1511) and *Familiar Colloquies* (1518). For example, in *Praise of Folly*, he pictures men at the last judgment. One tells the Judge how many days he fasted. Another pleads that in his threescore years, he never as much touched a piece of money, except through thick gloves. Another says that in obedience to the Psalm’s injunction not to offend with his tongue, he has forgotten how to speak because of his perpetual silence. The Judge will say, “Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; verily I know you not”

(Houghton, p. 78). *Familiar Colloquies* appeared in over 600 additions (Eerdmans', p. 359).

His most important contribution to the history of the church was his epic-making edition of the printed Greek New Testament (1516; Eerdmans', p. 359). Erasmus was the first to edit a printed Greek New Testament. In 1514, the Spanish scholar Ximenes printed a Greek New Testament, but could not sell it until the pope approved it. In the meantime, Johann Froben, a printer in Basel, who wanted to reach the market with a printed Greek New Testament before Ximenes, urged Erasmus to provide one. Erasmus used four (some say five and some say six) Greek manuscripts that were available at Basel. The last four verses in the book of Revelation were missing in all four of them. So he translated the Latin of those verses back into what he thought the Greek should be (Cairns, 264). Between 1516 and 1535, Erasmus published five editions of the Greek text of the New Testament. His second edition (1519) was used by Martin Luther for his German translation of the Bible (for more details on Erasmus' Greek New Testament see G. Michael Cocoris, "The Translation of the Bible" at [www.insightsfromtheword.com](http://www.insightsfromtheword.com) under advanced courses).

In 1524, in response to Luther's teaching on free will, Erasmus wrote *Discourse on Free Will*. Luther answered by writing *The Bondage of the Will* (1525). This is one of the great debates in church history. Other great debates include Arius (ca. 250-336), who claimed that the Son was a created creature versus Athanasius (ca. 295-373), who insisted that Christ existed from all eternity and was of the same essence as the Father, although He had a different personality, and Pelagius (ca. 360-ca. 420), who believed that each person is a separate creation of God and, therefore, does not inherit a sinful nature versus Augustine (354-430), who taught that as a result of the Fall of Adam, all inherit sin.

The Erasmus-Luther debate began with something Luther wrote. In response to the papal bull against him, Luther wrote *Assertio*, condemning as heretical 42 of the papal propositions. In article 36, Luther said free will was a fiction, a label without reality, "because it is in no man's power to plan any evil or good ... Everything takes place by absolute necessity." Erasmus wrote *Discourse on Free Will* in response to article 36 (Winter's translation, pp. 44-45 fn.).

In *Discourse on Free Will*, Erasmus defines free will as "the power of the human will whereby man can apply to or turn away from that which leads unto eternal salvation" (Winter's translation, p. 20). Winter says Erasmus fails to clarify his own definition (Winter's translation, p. 27 fn.). Rupp, a professor at Cambridge University, explains that Erasmus's argument is better than his definition. He improves as he goes along, not intending to disparage grace, but establishing human responsibility (Rupp and Watson, p. 10). Erasmus argues that as a result of the Fall, man's will has been weakened, not destroyed, but it is "incapable of eternal salvation unless grace be added through faith" (Winter's translation, pp. 21-26).

Erasmus is opposed to Luther's view that all good deeds are as detestable in God's sight as murder and adultery (Winter's translation, p. 27). He objects to the idea that the human will can only commit sin or worse, that God causes evil as well as good, and that everything happens of necessity, which is Luther's view (Winter's translation, pp. 30-31). Erasmus says, "It would be ridiculous to command one to make a choice, if he were incapable of turning in either direction" (Winter's translation, p. 32). This is like tying a man's hands in such a way that he can only reach to the left and telling him an excellent

wine is on the right and poison is on the left; take what you like (Winter's translation, p. 33).

Erasmus says there are four kinds of grace (Winter's translation, pp. 28-30). The first is a grace that is possessed by all mankind by nature. As Creator and Governor of the world, God makes it possible for everyone to speak, to be silent, to sit, to stand up, to help the poor, etc. This kind of grace is seldom called grace. The second kind of grace moves the undeserving sinner to contrition, but does not empower him to eliminate sin making him pleasing to God. This operative grace makes a sinner displeased with himself, although he is not yet abandoned the inclination to sin. He is capable of praying, listening to sermons, requesting people to intercede for him and, thus, by good works obtained the ultimate grace. God offers everyone opportunities for repentance, but they must exercise their will. It is within their power to turn their will toward or away from grace. The third kind of grace is efficient grace, which is also called cooperative grace. The fourth kind of grace leads to the final goal.

To prove free will, Erasmus cites Ecclesiasticus 15:14-18 (from the Apocrypha) and passages from the Old Testament, including Genesis 4:6-7; Deuteronomy 30:15-19; Isaiah 1:19, 21:12, 45:20, 45:22, 52:1-2; Zechariah 1:3; Ezekiel 18:21, 18:24, 18:31, 33:11; Joel 2:12; Jonah 3:8; Isaiah 46:8; Jeremiah 26:3-4; Exodus 32:9; Micah 6:3; Ezekiel 20:13; Psalm 80:14, Psalm 33:13-14; Deuteronomy 30:11-14, etc. He says looking for passages on free will is like looking for water in the ocean.

Erasmus writes, "Whenever the word 'will' is used, it implies free will. Doesn't the reader of such passages ask: why do you (God) make conditional promises when it depends solely on your will? Why do you blame me, when all my works, good or bad, or accomplished by you, and I am only your tool? Why blame me, when it is neither in my power to preserve what you gave me, to keep away the evil you implant in me? Why do you importantly, when everything depends on you anyhow and can be carried out only by your will?" (Winter's translation, p. 35).

Erasmus cites New Testament passages to support his thesis, including Matthew 23:37, 19:17, 21; Luke 9:23-24; John 14:15, 15:7; Matthew 19:21, 5:12, 25:14-30, 11:28, 42:42, 5:44, 7:7; Mark 8:15; Matthew 13:1-8, Matthew 25:1-13, 24:43; 1 Thessalonians 5:2; Matthew 7:24, 23:13, 11:21; Mark 9:18; Matthew 23:33, 7:20; Luke 23:34; John 1:12, 6:68; Romans 2:4, 2:2, 2:5, 2:7, 12:8-9; 1 Corinthians 9:24; 1 Timothy 6:12; 2 Timothy 2:5, 2:3, 2:6, 4:7; James 1:13-15; Acts 5:3; 2 Corinthians 6:15; Matthew 12:33; 2 Timothy 2:1; 1 John 3:3; Romans 13:12; Colossians 3:9; Romans 7:18; 1 Corinthians 14:32; 1 Timothy 4:14; 1 Corinthians 15:10; 2 Peter 1:15, 1:10; 2 Timothy 3:16.

After citing Scripture to prove free will, Erasmus addresses two arguments against free will. The first argument against free will is the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (Ex. 9:12, 16; Rom. 9:14; Malachi 1:2). Erasmus appeals to Origen's solution that God hardens those who reject His offer of mercy. "Just as wax becomes soft and clay hard and of the same sun, so God's gentleness, tolerating the center, causes a change of mind in one and the hardening of evil in another" (Winter's translation, p. 47). The second argument against free will is the election of Jacob and the rejection of Esau. Erasmus' answer is that this deals with service, not salvation, and that God hates some before their birth because he knows what they will do after birth (Winter's translation, pp. 53-60).

Next Erasmus answers Luther's arguments against free will, usually by simply pointing out that the passages Luther quotes are not denying free will or they have nothing to do



with eternal salvation (Gen. 6:3, 8:21; Isa. 40:2, 6-8; Jer. 10:23; Prov. 16:1; Jn. 15:5, 6:44; Phil. 4:13; etc.).

Erasmus concludes by observing that it is possible to ascribe too much to free will, by restating his objection to the notion that all of man's works are sinful (Winter's translation, p. 81), and by arguing again for free will. Speaking of God's grace and human will, he says, "Due to the combination, man must ascribe his total salvation to divine grace, since it is very little that free will can effect, and even that comes from divine grace which has at first created free will and then redeemed and healed it" (Winter's translation, p. 86).

In the preface to *The Bondage of the Will*, speaking directly to Erasmus, Luther says, "Your book is, in my opinion, so contemptible and worthless that I feel great pity for you having defiled your beautiful and skilled manner of speaking with such vile dirt" (Winter's translation, p. 98). In the introduction, Luther states, "Everything we do is evil" (Winter's translation, p. 111).

Luther begins his refutation of Erasmus by pointing out that his definition failed to fully cover the thing defined (Winter's translation, p. 119). He offers to show Erasmus the "sleepy stupidity" of his judgment, by pointing out that Erasmus' definition is one thing and the free will he defends is another (Winter's translation, p. 123).

Luther's refutation of Erasmus's Old Testament quotations is that "the words of the law are spoken, not that they might assert the power of the will, but that they might illuminate the blindness of reason" (Winter's translation, p. 125). The design of the law is to give knowledge and knowledge is not power, nor does it bring power, but it teaches and shows that there is no power (Winter's translation, p. 126). As for the New Testament, it consists of promises, exhortations, and gospel. Erasmus' problem is he does not know how to distinguish between the Old and the New Testaments. "For he sees nothing anywhere but law and precepts by which a man may be formed in good manners. But what the rebirth, renewal, regeneration and the whole work of the Spirit are, he does not see" (Winter's translation, p. 127). Luther examines many passages, but he ends up concluding that Erasmus envisions a free will whose power is so great that it can do all things Paul exhorted without grace (Winter's translation, p. 127).

Luther argues that foreknowledge demands necessity. He says, "If God foreknew Judas would be a traitor, Judas became a traitor of necessity, and it was not in the power of Judas, nor any creature, to alter, or changes his will from that which God had foreseen" (Winter's translation, p. 131). He concludes, "We must go to extremes, deny free will altogether and ascribe everything to God" (Winter's translation, p. 133), but before he finishes, he promises to prove the case against free will. His proof is that since by the works of the law, no human being should be justified, "it is clearly manifest that the endeavor and effort of free will are simply nothing. For if the righteousness of God existed without the law and without the works of the law, how shall it not much more exist without free will?" (Winter's translation, p. 135).

In early 1526, Erasmus replied to this work with the first part of his two-volume *Hyperaspistes*, but this was a long and complex work which did not gain much popular recognition.

So the question is: what can regenerate man do? The Augustinian/Lutheran/Calvinism view is that man has limited freedom. He can choose to behave or not behave according to God's law. He can do good works, but good works do not make a man good because they can only be done from a bad motive (Watson, in Rupp and Watson, p. 17; remember

Luther's view is that all good deeds are as detestable in God's sight as murder and adultery, Winter's translation, p. 27). Man can take no step whatsoever towards salvation without grace (Watson, in Rupp and Watson, p. 15). When it comes to eternal salvation, man does not have free will; he needs to be set free. He is in bondage to Satan. He is either governed by the spirit of God or by the evil spirit (Watson, in Rupp and Watson, p. 18).

Erasmus rejected the idea that man has no active part in securing his own salvation. Man has freedom of choice, that is, he has the ability to "apply himself to the things which lead to eternal salvation or to turn away from them." If man "does what in him lies," God will assist him with His grace because grace "always accompanies human effort," but it is up to man to respond to the divine initiative (Watson, in Rupp and Watson, p. 15).

Watson concludes, "To do justice to the situation, we must be content with the paradox, affirming both divine predestination and human responsibility. Which is not to say that both the Erasmus and Luther have won and that both shall have prizes, for it commits us neither to Luther's overconfident statements about predestination nor Erasmus' much too naïve view of free will. What it means is that we are willing to recognize the limits of our own understanding and to believe that things beyond our comprehension may make perfectly good sense to God" (Watson, in Rupp and Watson, pp. 27-28).

*His Significance* Erasmus has been called a forerunner of the Reformation. In fact, it has been said he made the Reformation almost inevitable. The monks of the time said that Erasmus laid the egg which Luther hatched (Eerdmans', p. 359). Actually, Erasmus was not a reformer himself. He loved peace so much he would sacrifice a part of truth rather than cause dissension. Luther said of him, "He pointed out the evil, but he is unable to point out the good and to lead into the Promised Land." He promoted the Reformation by exposing the abuses of the church in his writings and by editing the first printed Greek New Testament (Houghton, p. 78). He did as much as anybody in preparing for the Reformation, but he did not join the movement; he remained a Catholic and was a critic of the Reformation.

To be more specific, Erasmus rejected the pomp and quest for earthly glories that characterize Roman Catholicism of his day. He spoke against the monks and monasteries which had become havens of idleness, ignorance, and iniquity. He held to such Orthodox doctrines as the Trinity and the incarnation, but he insisted that obedience was more important than orthodoxy. He attacked friars who were capable of subtle theological discussions, but whose lives were scandalous. For example, he said, "What good is it to be outwardly sprinkled with holy water, if one is filthy within?" (González, II, p. 11). No wonder it could be said that he laid an egg which Luther hatched.

## **Philip Melanchthon**

*His Life* Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560) entered the University of Heidelberg when he was twelve. In 1511, at the age of fourteen, he received a BA degree. In 1512, when he applied to take the examinations for the MA degree, the professors refused to allow him to continue, because they thought a fifteen-year-old could not possibly be accepted as a teacher. He finished his studies at Tübingen, where, in 1514, he received a MA at the age of seventeen. He then began teaching and writing, which he was to continue to do for the rest of his life (<http://www.lutheranhistory.org/melanchthon/>, accessed 3/14/2014). He was influenced by Erasmus.

At the age of 21, Melanchthon was already well-trained in the classical languages and Hebrew (Cairns, p. 291). He taught French, first in Tübingen, then at the University of Wittenberg, where he met Luther in 1518. His relationship with Luther changed him from being a humanist into a theologian and reformer (Eerdmans', p. 276).

In 1529, at Marburg, Melanchthon opposed Zwingli, who believed the Lord's Table was a memorial. Melanchthon insisted that it was more than a memorial (Eerdmans', p. 276). When Calvin was living in Strasbourg, he met Melanchthon at a conference in Frankfurt in February 1539. They struck up a friendship that lasted until Luther's death (Wendel, pp. 62-63).

*His Work* In 1518, at the age of 16, Melanchthon published a Greek grammar (Houghton, p. 87). In 1521, he wrote a short work entitled the *Commonplaces (Loci Communes)*, which was the first book to clearly describe the teachings of the Reformation (Eerdmans', p. 276). In it, Melanchthon rejected the authority of the Roman church, the Fathers, canon law, and the Scholastics. He made the Bible the final authority for Christians, taught that man was bound by sin, unable to help himself, and insisted God must initiate the work of salvation that individuals received by faith in Christ. This work established Melanchthon as the theologian of the Lutheran movement. Luther called it "immortal" (Cairns, p. 293). During Melanchthon's lifetime, it went through 50 editions (Houghton, p. 98). He also contributed to Luther's German translation of the Bible. In fact, he gave it a "thorough revision" (Houghton, p. 91). In 1530, he wrote the *Augsburg Confession* (1530), which remains the chief statement of faith in the Lutheran churches (Eerdmans', p. 276).

*His Theology* By and large, Melanchthon agreed with Luther's doctrinal position, but there were differences. "Melanchthon, who had never agreed with Luther's assertions about the 'enslaved will,' was indeed moving to a position that granted the sinful human will greater freedom, and eventually came to speak of a collaboration among the Spirit, the Word, and the human will" (González, II, p. 174). J. I. Packer said, "Melanchthon ascribes to fallen man free will in the sense of 'power of applying oneself to grace.' This phrase from Erasmus, which Luther had abhorred, Melanchthon explicitly approved" (Packer, in Eerdmans', p. 375). Melanchthon affirmed Luther's doctrine of justification by faith but insisted on the need for good works, not as a means of salvation, but as a result (González, II, pp. 173-174).

*His Significance* Melanchthon was Luther's right-hand man and the first theologian of the Reformation (Cairns, p. 263). On Luther's death, Melanchthon took over the theological leadership of the movement Luther had begun. "With his gift for logical consistency and wide knowledge of history, Melanchthon's influence on Protestantism was in certain ways even greater than Luther's was" (Eerdmans', p. 276).

"Luther owed much to the calmness, gentleness, and wise counsel of his colleague (Melanchthon) who did his best to keep the reformer's zeal and fervor within proper bounds" (Houghton, p. 87).

For the sake of peace, Melanchthon was willing to concede matters of doctrine to the Roman Catholics. In fact, he believed reunion was essential (Eerdmans', p. 276). It is said that the sad story of Melanchthon's life is the story of the Interim. After Luther's death, in May 1548, Emperor Charles V invaded Germany and tried to force the people to sign the Augsburg Interim, which was to settle the controversy between the Roman Church and the Evangelicals during an interim period until a church council could be held. The Lutherans

refused to sign it. In November 1548, Melanchthon and others from Wittenberg revised it (called the Leipzig Interim). Melanchthon was criticized for compromising the Lutheran positions (<http://www.lutheranhistory.org/melanchthon/>, accessed 3/14/2014).

The Augsburg Interim ordered the Protestants to adopt Catholic beliefs and practices, including the seven Sacraments, but it allowed for Protestant clergymen the right to marry and for the laity to receive both bread and wine in communion. The Leipzig Interim made a distinction between essential doctrines, such as justification by faith, and nonessential (called adiaphora), such as confirmation, the use of candles, Mass, holy days, etc.

There is also the fascinating story of Prince Philip of Hesse, who was a sincere man committed to the Protestant cause, but who was deeply troubled because for years, he had no marital relations with his wife and found it impossible to remain celibate. Plagued by the guilt from illicit affairs, he consulted the Protestant theologians, Luther, Melanchthon and Bucer about the possibility of taking a second wife without putting away his first wife. All three agreed that the Bible did not forbid polygamy! They said, however, that although polygamy was not a crime in the eyes of God, it was such in the eyes of the civil law. Therefore, they recommended that he take the second wife in secret, which is what Philip did. When the secret became public, needless to say, there was a great scandal (González, II, p. 89).

## Theodore Beza

*His Life* Theodore Beza (1519-1605) was trained as a lawyer. He wrote a book of love poetry, which gained him a reputation as a Latin poet. In 1544, he secretly married a woman named Claude Desnoz. They did not have any children. In 1548, he went to Geneva, where he announced that he had become a Protestant (Eerdmans' p. 382) and was appointed professor of Greek at Lausanne University (Wendel, p. 90). From 1549 to 1559, he was a Greek professor at Lausanne (Bangs, p. 66). In 1559, he became the first rector of the Genevan Academy (Eerdmans' p. 382). When Calvin died, Beza became the leader in Geneva (Cairns, p. 312).

*His Works* Beza edited several editions of the Greek New Testament, which became the basis for the Geneva Bible and the King James Bible version. He completed the translation of the psalms begun by the French Renaissance poet Clément Marot and wrote a biography of Calvin, as well as political, polemical, and theological tracts (Eerdmans' p. 382).

*His Theology* For a more detailed discussion of Beza's theology, see "Theodore Beza" under Calvinism above. As was stated earlier, predestination was the centerpiece of his theology. What was not mentioned was his biblical justification for doing that. He said Paul's question, "Does not the potter have power over the clay from the same lump to make one vessel for honor and another for dishonor?" (Rom. 9:21) indicates that God decreed that some would be saved and some would be damned before human beings were created. This became known as supralapsarianism.

Evidently, the terms supralapsarianism, infralapsarianism, and sublapsarianism were not used until shortly after the Synod of Dort (Bangs, p. 67). The word "lapsus" is a Latin word that means "fall." Thus, the issue is, within the theoretical decree of God, what did He decree would happen *before* the Fall and what did He decree would happen *after* the Fall? Supralapsarianism ("supra" comes from the Latin word "above") is the doctrine that

God decreed the election of some and the damnation of others *before* He decreed the Fall. This is the position of Double Predestination.

Infralapsarianism (“infra” comes from the Latin word “below”) is the view that *after* the decree of the Fall, God decreed the election of some and the damnation of others. Those who hold to infralapsarianism say God was passive in Double Predestination, that is, He actively elected some to salvation, but He simply passed by others, who would, therefore, be damned.

Sublapsarianism (both “infra” and “sub” mean “below”) is the theory that after God decreed the Fall and the atonement for all, He decreed the election of some and the damnation of others. This is the position of Unlimited Atonement.

*His Significance* Beza succeeded Calvin in Geneva as the leader of Reformed Protestantism. He was one of the leading advisors to the Huguenots in France, even participating in their conferences (Poissy, 1561; La Rochelle, 1571). “Beza’s theological method made the Reformed position more rigid. Under his leadership, Geneva became the center of Reformed Protestantism” (Eerdmans’ p. 382).

## John Knox

*His Life* John Knox (ca. 1514-1572) was educated for the priesthood at St. Andrews University in Scotland and was ordained in 1536 (Cairns, p. 320). Instead of entering a pastorate, he became a tutor. There is no record of when he was converted to Protestantism. He did have contact with George Wishart, the Protestant preacher who died for his faith (González, II, p. 81).

In 1547, Knox was taken prisoner by the French and forced to serve as a galley slave (Eerdmans’ p. 391). His captivity lasted 19 months. After his release, he went to England, where he became a pastor (González, II, p. 82). Edward VI was king at the time. When Mary came to the throne, Knox escaped to Germany and Switzerland. He spent four years in Geneva, where John Calvin was preaching (Houghton, p. 126). He adopted Calvin’s views of doctrine and church government. To him, Calvin was “that noble servant of God” (Cairns, p. 320). He also spent some time in Zürich with Bullinger, Zwingli’s successor (González, II, p. 82). In 1559, he returned to Scotland. Later, with local adjustments, he organized the Reformed church in Scotland according to the pattern in Geneva (Parker, p. 144).

He died in 1572. As his body was lowered into its grave, Morton, the regent of Scotland, pointed to it with the words, “There lies a man who never feared a man!”

*His Works* Knox consolidated the Reformation in Scotland by drawing up a *Confession of Faith* (1560), a *Book of Discipline* (1561) and a new liturgy (the *Book of Common Order*, 1564) and by translating Calvin’s catechism (Eerdmans’, p. 392). He wrote a book against Mary, the Tudor Queen of England, entitled *First Blast Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*. In it, he argued that it was contrary to nature, God, and His Word to have a woman ruler (Cairns, p. 320). Soon after it circulated in England, Mary died and she was succeeded by Elizabeth I, who resented much of what Knox and written. None of Knox’s repeated retractions satisfied the English queen (González, II, p. 82). Incidentally, Calvin dedicated the revised edition of his commentary on Isaiah to Queen Elizabeth I (Parker, p. 144).

*His Significance* John Knox gave Scotland a body of Protestant doctrine and a pattern of worship that endures to this day (Houghton, p. 125). He was able to make the

Presbyterian faith and order supreme in Scotland and to direct reform more radical than in any other land of Europe.

## Arminius

Books on church history often skip over the *life* of Arminius, focusing more on his theological differences with Beza. The major source for this material on Arminius comes from a book by Carl Bangs, a professor of historical theology, who has examined original sources concerning Arminius (Carl Bangs. *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation*).

*His Life* Jacobus Arminius (1559-1609), who was born in Holland, entered Leiden University in 1576 (Bangs, p. 47). He finished his studies there in 1581 when he was about 22 years old (Bangs, p. 64). On January 1, 1582, he signed the register to enter the Academy in Geneva, where Beza, who was 62 years old, was the honored patriarch of the Reformed churches (Bangs, p. 66). During the period of his life when he was at Geneva, Arminius studied at Basel and traveled to Italy (Bangs, pp. 71, 78).

In 1587, Arminius arrived in Amsterdam, where he spent 15 years as a pastor (Bangs, p. 80). On November 6, 1588, he began preaching alternately on Romans and Malachi. He did not finish the series on Romans until September 30, 1601, but in 1591, when he reached Romans 7, his preaching created controversy (Bangs, p. 128). The controversy was debated before the consistory (a meeting of ministers), but Arminius was not condemned (for details see Bangs, pp. 142-147).

Instead of interpreting Romans 7 as a description of the regenerate (the view of Calvin and Beza), he said that Romans 7 was describing the unregenerate. His explanation of Romans 7 begins with his understanding of Romans 6:14 (“sin shall not have dominion over you”). In other words, the regenerate are not dominated by sin. Then he argues that “carnal” and “sold under sin” in Romans 7:14 as well as “sin that dwells in me” in Romans 7:17 are talking about being dominated by sin. Therefore, since sin does not dominate the regenerate, Romans 7 is talking about unregenerate people. He also uses Romans 7:22, 23, 25 to support his position (Bangs, pp. 188-189). From the Reformed point of view, to say that Romans 7 is describing an unregenerate person is to allow too much good striving in the sinner (Bangs, p. 140).

In 1593, when Arminius reached Romans 9 (esp. verse 18), another controversy arose. Again the issue came before the consistory, but his statements were found acceptable and the matter was declared closed (Bangs, pp. 147-149).

In his written material on Romans 9, it is obvious that Arminius is arguing against Beza. Beza is named many times (Bangs, p. 195). Arminius admits that the explanation of Romans 9 is “most difficult” (Bangs, p. 194). His explanation is that Ishmael and Esau are *classes* of people who seek righteousness by works and Isaac and Jacob are *classes* of people who seek righteousness by faith. In short, there is a predestination of classes, not individuals (Bangs, p. 196). He concedes that if Isaac and Ishmael, Esau and Jacob are taken as individuals, Romans 9 teaches predestination of individuals (Bangs, p. 195).

Beza interpreted the “lump” in Romans 9:21 as “mankind not yet made, much less corrupted.” From that, Beza concluded that in eternity past, God decreed who would be elected to salvation and who would be elected to damnation *before* He decreed He would create human beings. This became known as supralapsarianism. Following Augustine, Arminius interpreted the lump as *fallen man*. In his view, “God makes man a vessel; man makes himself an evil vessel” (Bangs, p. 198).

Thus, according to Arminius, the message of Romans 9 is that God predestinated to salvation all who believe in Christ. At the same time, he insisted that salvation is by grace alone and that human ability or merit must be excluded as a cause of salvation (Bangs, p. 198).

William Perkins (1558-1602), a professor at Cambridge University, wrote a pamphlet on predestination. Arminius wrote a reply, which lay dormant until after his death. It was published under the title *The Examination of Perkins' Pamphlet on the Order and Mode of Predestination*. In it, Arminius declares God elects those who believe (Bangs, p. 212). He argues that if God commanded people to believe, they must have the ability to believe (Bangs, p. 215). "The ability to believe belongs to nature; believing, to grace" (Arminius, cited by Bangs, p. 216). He was not prepared to say whether or not true saving faith could finally and totally fall away (Bangs, p. 217, who adds that Arminius skirted this issue throughout his entire career, p. 219). Predestination of classes is absolute and without qualification; predestination of individuals is with respect to foreseen faith (Bangs, p. 219)

In 1603, Arminius was appointed professor of theology at Leiden University (Bangs, p. 239). Leiden University was a great training ground for Dutch clergy (Houghton, p. 143). Before he assumed his duties as a professor, he presented himself for a doctoral examination. He passed, but as will be evident later, it is noteworthy that Francois Gomaer (also known as Franciscus Gomarus), one of the professors at Leiden, was the one who examined him. Thus, Arminius became a doctor of theology at Leiden (Bangs, pp. 252-253)

Regular disputations (debates) were held at the University of Leiden. On October 31, 1604, Gomaer held a public disputation on predestination. It was not his turn, but he spoke because there was error. No direct mention was made of Arminius. Gomaer presented essentially the same position as Beza. He was a supralapsarian. Arminius wrote an answer that was not published until after his death. This was the beginning of a theological battle (Bangs, pp. 263- 264).

Over several years, the battle intensified. It spread from the academic halls to pulpits and from the pulpits to the streets. There were rumors, accusations, and even seeming periods of peace between Arminius and Gomaer. In 1606, Arminius called for a national synod. There was even a controversy over how that should be structured. Then there was a controversy over Arminius's doctrine of the Trinity. He believed in subordinationism and so did Beza (Bangs, pp. 265-283).

It is interesting to note that in the midst of this debate, Arminius said in a letter, "I affirm that in the interpretation of the Scriptures Calvin is incomparable and that his *Commentaries* are more to be valued than anything that is handed down to us in the writings of the fathers—so much so that I concede to him a certain spirit of prophecy in which he stands distinguished above all others, above most, indeed, above all" (Arminius, cited by Bangs, p. 287). Arminius also said that he recommended his students read Calvin's *Institutes*, adding "with discrimination, as the writings of all men ought to be read" (Bangs, p. 289).

A Preparatory Convention for national synod was formed. Arminius was a member, but lost the debate over the question: should the delegates be bound only by the Word of God or by the Confession and the Catechism as well as the Scripture? Calvin had been willing to recognize more than one Confession, including the Augsburg confession (Bangs, pp. 289-290).

In the meantime, Arminius insisted that he had never taught anything that was contrary to the Scripture, which ought to be the sole rule of thinking and speaking, nor had he ever opposed the Dutch Confession of Faith or the Heidelberg Catechism (Bangs, p. 295). In a letter, he said his only ambition was “to inquire with all earnestness in the holy Scripture for divine truth ... for the purpose of my winning some souls for Christ, that I might be a sweet savor to him and may obtain a good name in the church of the saints” (Bangs, p. 296).

Nevertheless, the situation deteriorated. Bangs says the enemies of Arminius were now so strong that they “created an atmosphere of hysteria in which he was to be blamed for everything that went wrong. It was as if he were the scapegoat on which all the sins and troubles the church and state were to be laid, so that if only he could be driven out, there would be no more problems” (Bangs, p. 299).

On October 30, 1608, Arminius read his *Declaration of Sentiments* before the full assembly of the States of Holland and West Friesland. It expresses his mature views (Bangs, p. 307). In it, he rejects predestination, especially supralapsarianism, and states his doctrine of predestination: God decrees the salvation and damnation on the basis of divine foreknowledge of an individual’s belief and perseverance or lack thereof. He also asserts that man in sin is unable to exercise his will to do any good at all, that grace is not an irresistible force, and that it is possible for a person to have the assurance of salvation by the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit, the fruits of the spirit, and the testimony of God’s Spirit witnessing together with his own conscience. He deals with other doctrines, such as deity of Christ and justification by faith. He supports the revision of the Confession and the Catechism, pointing out that even the Augsburg Confession had been revised. He recommends that the confession contain as few articles as possible, explaining that with brevity, there will be fewer errors. As Bangs points out, Arminius “denies that the creeds teach what his opponents teach, but he wants to remove the ambiguities under which they take cover” (Bang, pp. 307-316).

A date of a national synod had yet to be set. Nevertheless, on December 12, 1608, Gomaer delivered a scathing speech against Arminius to the assembly of the States of Holland. Among other things, he accused Arminius of “teaching that faith comes not from grace but from man’s natural ability, that we are justified not by a reputed righteousness of Christ but by our own faith as a work of our own righteousness, and that believers can perfectly fulfill the law of God” (Bangs, p. 319).

The state, trying to avoid a national or provincial synod, attempted to bring about a settlement between the two Leiden professors by summoning them to a “friendly conference” for an exchange of views. The meeting began on August 13, 1609. In these meetings, they rehashed the arguments on justification, predestination, irresistible grace, free will, and perseverance with nothing new turning up. The conference was cut short on August 21 when Arminius got sick and had to return home (Bangs, pp. 326-327).

On October 19, 1609, Arminius died peacefully in his home surrounded by his family and friends. He was 50 years old. His oldest child was 16 and the youngest was 13 months old. He had nine surviving children (Bangs, p. 330). The synod Arminius wanted did not take place until 1618. It was the Synod of Dort, which developed the famous five points of Calvinism.

*His Theology* At the end of his biography of Arminius, Bangs gives a comprehensive survey of the theology of Arminius, drawing on all of his writings. Arminius taught the



Belgic Confession before it was revived by the Synod of Dort ten years after his death. The following is taken from the survey of Bangs (Bangs pp. 332-355).

Arminius was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church, which was a form of union of church and state. In other words, Arminius did not believe in the separation of church and state; he was not an Anabaptist. Although during his many controversies, his enemies spread rumors that he was sympathetic toward Roman Catholicism, he was anti-Catholicism. He rejected transubstantiation and consubstantiation. His definition of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament followed Calvin's definition precisely. He rejected baptismal regeneration; he believed in infant baptism by sprinkling.

The election of individuals is based on God's foreknowledge of who would believe. The elect are those who, by the grace of God, believe in Christ.

Sinful man has "free will," but not a will that is capable of accomplishing any spiritual good, that is, of doing a meritorious work. His free will is in bondage to sin and needs salvation from outside. Man's response to divine calling is a work of grace. The entire process of believing, from "initial fear" to "illumination, regeneration, renovation, and confirmation," is of grace but one result of gracious renewal is the cooperating which man does in believing. The cooperation is not the means of renewal; it is the result of renewal. (Yet free will and grace work together; one does not act without the other; see Bangs, p. 324).

Arminius said, "The mind of the natural and carnal man is obscure and dark, that his affections are corrupt and inordinate, that his will is stubborn and disobedient, and that man himself is dead in sin." He also said, "Grace is simply necessary for the illuminating of the mind, the due ordering of the affections, and the inclination of the will to that which is good." Arminius affirmed grace to be essential for the beginning, continuation, and the consummation of faith. He also said, "I believe that many persons resist the Holy Spirit and reject the grace that is offered." (In fact, he said, "I am fully persuaded that the doctrine of irresistible grace is repugnant to the sacred Scriptures, to all the Fathers, and to our own confession and catechism;" see Bangs, p. 325).

For Arminius, justification is a forensic act whereby God pronounces man righteous. Although he was accused of not believing in imputed righteousness, Arminius insisted that he did, pointing to 2 Corinthians 5:21.

Arminius stands squarely with Luther and Calvin in holding that a believer is simultaneously justified and sinful. He said, "This sanctification is not completed in a single moment, but sin, from whose domain we have been delivered to the cross and the death of Christ, is weakened more and more by daily losses, and the inner man is day by day renewed more and more, while we carry about with us in our bodies the death of Christ, and our outward man is perishing." Concerning reaching perfection in this life, he said, "While I never asserted that a believer can perfectly keep the precepts of Christ in this life, I never denied it, but always selected as a matter which is still to be decided."

Arminius believed that a believer could have the present assurance of present salvation. He said, "It is possible for him who believes in Jesus Christ to be certain and persuaded ... he is now in reality assured that he is a son of God and stands in the grace of Jesus Christ." In fact, for Arminius, the absence of such assurance is impossible. He says, "Since God promises eternal light to all who believe in Christ, it is impossible for him who believes and who knows that he believes, to doubt his own salvation, unless he doubts this willingness of God."

He apparently did not believe, however, in the present assurance of final salvation. Yet he says he never affirmed, “the true believer can either totally or finally fall away from the faith and perish.” Yet he also said that it is impossible for believers “as long as they remain believers to decline from salvation.”

Bangs concludes that Arminius created a system of salvation where God is not the author of sin and man is not the author of salvation (Bangs, p. 354).

*His Significance* The year after Arminius died, the ministers who agreed with him responded to the invitation of the States of Holland. What they wrote is known as the Remonstrance of 1610. Finally, in 1618 that long-awaited national synod was held in the city of Dort. By that time, the Remonstrants had been removed from their pulpits and appeared at the Synod only as the accused. Their documents were condemned and they were forbidden to preach. Many of them fled the country. Some were imprisoned and one was beheaded. Several years later, the Remonstrants were allowed to return to Holland. They formed Remonstrant-Reformed Church, which still exists.

The theology of Arminius became Arminianism, which is a major theological system. His challenge to Beza resulted in the Synod of Dort, which crafted the five points of Calvinism in response to his teachings.

**Summary:** During the period of the Reformed Church, a number of causes contributed to a reformation of the church that produced Lutheranism, the Reformed Church, the Anabaptists, a counter-reformation, Calvinism, and Arminianism.

# THE MODERN CHURCH

The sixth division of church history is the period of the Modern Church. It extends from the end of the Thirty Years War (1648) to the present. As the modern era opens, Christianity has been hopelessly divided into three great parts:

Orthodox Churches: Prevailing in the East and southeast Europe.

Roman Catholicism: Prevailing in southern Europe and South America.

Protestantism: Prevailing in Western Europe and North America.

While the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches have obviously continued to the present, this study will concentrate on Protestantism. It is the truest expression of biblical Christianity. Church historian Harnack says, "The Greek Church is primitive Christianity plus Greek and oriental paganism. The Roman Catholic Church is primitive Christianity plus Greek and Roman paganism. The Protestant church is an effort to restore primitive Christianity free of all paganism."

Protestantism spread mainly in England and America. This chapter will deal with Protestantism in England and the next chapter with Protestantism in America. There will be some time overlap.

## The Puritans

The history of the Puritan movement is complicated. It could be argued that it is part of the Reformation. After all, it began during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (Houghton, p. 148), who ruled during the period of the Reformation. It is true that time-wise it began during the period of the Reformation, but it was not trying to *reform* the church in the sense of *breaking away* from Roman Catholicism; it was an attempt to *purify* the Church of England. Also, Puritanism did not become "a driving force in English religious life" until much later than the reign of Queen Elizabeth (González, II, p. 80).

*Henry VIII (1509 to 1547)* As was mentioned before, Henry VIII was declared the supreme head of the Church of England (1534). In 1539, Parliament passed the Six Articles, which reaffirmed transubstantiation, celibacy, and confession. When Henry died, the Church of England was a national church with a political ruler as its head and with Roman Catholicism as its doctrine (Cairns, p. 331).

*Edward V (1547-1553)* Under Edward V, Henry's son, *reformation* advanced rapidly. The Six Articles were repealed (1547), the marriage of priests was legitimized (1549), and services were conducted in English instead of Latin. The Act of Uniformity (1549) provided for the use of the Book of Common Prayer, which emphasized the reading of the Bible and the participation of the congregation in the church service. This second edition of the Book of Common Prayer (1552) reflected Calvinistic influences.

*Queen Mary (1553-1558)* Under Queen Mary, Henry's daughter, who was an ardent Romanist, the Church of England was restored to what it was at the death of her father in 1547. Because of her severe persecution of Protestantism, however, Mary actually did more to strengthen Protestantism than to weaken it (Eerdmans' p. 387). Many of those who fled

to the Continent because of her persecution returned after her death, bringing Zwinglian and Calvinist ideas with them (González, II, p. 78).

*Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603)* Under Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603), also Henry's daughter, the Church of England was reestablished and took the form which has continued to the present day. The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion (1563) were adopted as the creed of the Anglican Church. With slight revisions (1571), the Thirty-Nine Articles have been the creed of the Anglican Church since that time.

Before the reign of Elizabeth I, under Edward V, the Church of England had swung toward Protestantism and under Mary, toward Catholicism. Elizabeth forged a middle way between the two. In 1559, Parliament approved the Act of Supremacy, which named Elizabeth as Supreme Governor of the church, revived most of Henry's statutes regarding the organization of the church, and repealed a number of principles established by Mary. In 1563, Parliament reaffirmed the Act of Uniformity, which, among other things, enforced attendance at parish churches (Groves, p. xii). Those who did not conform were called nonconformists or dissenters.

The Church of England was *reestablished* during the early reign of Elizabeth I, but there were people in it who wanted to *purify* it to rid it of the "rags of the papacy" and to bring it more in line with the Scripture. After 1560, they were nicknamed Puritans. These *first Puritans* were content to leave the Anglican church structure of bishops in place, but they wanted to eliminate vestments (liturgical garments), which seemed popish to them, the use of saints' days, clerical absolution, the sign of the cross, kneeling for communion (Cairns, p. 335), the use of the organ during worship, etc. They also insisted on a sober life, guided by the Scripture and lacking in luxury and ostentation. Many insisted on keeping the Lord's Day, devoting it exclusively to religious exercises and the practice of charity (González, II, p. 150).

About 1570, Thomas Cartwright (1535-1603), a professor of theology at Cambridge, shifted the emphasis in the Puritan movement from the reform of liturgy to the reform in theology and church government (Cairns, p. 336). In his lectures on the book of Acts, Cartwright raised the question regarding elders in the congregation. He taught that in the New Testament, congregations were to be led by elders and pastors, who were on an equal level with no hierarchy (Westin, p. 139). Insisting on the final authority of Scripture, he pushed for a Calvinistic theology and a Presbyterian form of government (elders elected by the congregation). Cartwright and his followers were *Presbyterian Puritans*. Presbyterianism in England owes its existence Cartwright's initial effort. The First Presbyterian Church in England was established in 1572 (Cairns, p. 336).

In 1593, Elizabeth had an act passed in Parliament that gave the authorities the right to imprison the Puritans for failure to attend the Anglican Church (Cairns, p. 335).

During Elizabeth I's reign, Sir Walter Mildmay founded Emmanuel College at Cambridge. It is reported that Elizabeth said to him, "Sir Walter, I hear you had erected a Puritan foundation." He replied "No, Madam, far be it from me to countenance anything contrary to your established laws; but I have set an acorn, which when it becomes an oak, God alone knows what will be the fruit thereof" (Houghton, p. 152).

William Perkins (1558-1602) was a professor at Christ College at Cambridge (Houghton, p. 153). He was one of the foremost leaders of the Puritan movement. He wrote more than 40 books, many of which were published after he died. He was a firm proponent of Reformed theology, particularly the supralapsarianism of Beza.

*James I (1603-1625)* When Elizabeth I died, James IV of Scotland became James I of England. The Puritans hoped that this Presbyterian from Scotland would set up a Presbyterian government in the Anglican Church. When he arrived in 1603, they presented him with the Millenary Petition signed by nearly one thousand Puritan ministers. It asked that the Church of England be completely “purified” in liturgy and policy. In 1604, James called the Hampton Court Conference. When the Puritans demanded reform, James said that he would “harry them out of the kingdom” if they did not conform and, as for Presbyterian polity in the state church, he said that Presbyterianism “agreed as well with the monarchy as God and the devil” (Cairns, pp. 338-339). Furthermore, the personal character of James did not increase his prestige. He was a homosexual (González, II, p. 152). Permission was given, however, to make a new English translation of the Bible. A group of fifty-four divines began work on the Bible known as the Authorized or King James Version. It was completed in 1611 (Cairns, p. 339).

*Charles I (1625-1649)* Charles I, the son of James I, married Henrietta Maria, a Roman Catholic princess of France, which displeased the strongly Protestant Parliament that was becoming increasingly Puritan. In 1629, Charles I decided to rule without calling Parliament and did so until 1640 (Houghton, p. 154). Because of the pro-Catholic policy of Charles I, many Puritans migrated to America. Between 1628 and 1640, at least 20,000 Puritans left England for America. In 1640, Charles summoned a Parliament because he needed to raise money by raising taxes. It was known as the Long Parliament because it lasted until 1660 (Cairns, pp. 339-340).

In 1643, the Long Parliament abolished the episcopal form of government and commissioned the Westminster Assembly to provide a new creed and a new form of church government. The Westminster Assembly consisted of one hundred twenty-one clergymen and thirty laymen. There were a few Episcopalians and Congregationalists, but the overwhelming majority were Presbyterian Puritans (Kuiper, p. 252). Between 1643 and 1649, they held 1163 daily sessions. In 1648, they completed the Westminster Confession of Faith. At that point, the state Church of England was a Calvinistic Presbyterian Church. Charles I was executed in 1649 (Cairns, pp. 339-341).

The Westminster Confession of Faith has had an enormous influence on Western Christianity in modern times. It has not only had a great influence on Presbyterianism; in 1658, much of its language was written into the Savoy Declaration (Congregationalism) and the Baptist Confession in 1689 (Houghton, p. 156). The Westminster Confession of Faith is one of the fundamental documents of Calvinism (González, II, p. 159).

*Oliver Cromwell (1649- 1658)* Cromwell was a Puritan, an avid reader of Scripture, a member of the House of Commons, and a military leader. In 1649, Cromwell created a Commonwealth headed by him. In 1653, he set up a protectorate and ruled as dictator until 1658 (Cairns, p. 341). His rule represented the triumph of political Puritanism. The public reading of the Book of Common Prayer was forbidden by law. At the same time, provided that the Book of Common Prayer was not used, all forms of Protestant worship could be practiced openly. For the first time in almost 400 years, Jews were allowed to return to England and meet in their synagogues for worship (Houghton, p. 160). Under Cromwell, there was room for Presbyterians, Baptists, and even moderate advocates of episcopacy. Being a Puritan, Cromwell also tried to reform customs regarding the Lord’s Day, horse races, cockfights, theater, etc. He was offered the crown, but refused it, hoping to create a republic (González, II, p. 162).

Cromwell did not belong to any church, but he strongly favored Congregationalism. He appointed John Owen (1616-1683), considered to be the ablest theologian among the Congregationalists of his day, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University (Kuiper, p. 263). Owen wrote a lengthy commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews (Houghton, p. 162).

*Charles II (1660-1680)* After Cromwell died, the English, tired of the strict way of life of the Puritans, reestablished the monarchy under Charles II, adopted the episcopal form of government for the church, and forbade the meeting of Puritans (Cairns, p. 341). In 1662, the Act of Uniformity required that all clergy give their “unfeigned consent and assent” to everything in the Book of Common Prayer. The approximate 2000 Puritan pastors who refused to do so, lost their pulpits. They were called nonconformists and dissenters. In 1664, the Conventicle Act forbade religious meetings in which the Book of Common Prayer was not used. In 1665, the Five Mile Act forbade ejected pastors to come within five miles of a city (Houghton, p. 161).

Besides the Puritans already mentioned, others are well known because of what they wrote. John Bunyan (1628-1688) was put in the Bedford prison, where he remained for 12 years because he would not promise the local magistrates that he would not preach. Although he had very little education, he wrote 68 books, the most famous of which was *Pilgrim’s Progress*, perhaps the best allegory ever written. He also wrote *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*, one of the greatest autobiographies in the English language. Because of his writings, he has been called “the greatest and most influential of the Puritans” (Houghton, pp. 161-162). Matthew Henry (1662-1714) wrote a commentary on the whole Bible. Much of it was preached in the city of Chester between 1687 to 1712 (Houghton, p. 162).

## The Separatists

*Their Beliefs* The Separatists were those who did not want to *purify* the Church of England; they wanted to *separate* from it. They were also called Congregationalists. They were also called independents because they believed that each congregation was a separate church and no other church had any authority over it (Kuiper, p. 251). The Separatists wanted a church covenant by which they bound themselves together in loyalty to Christ and one another, apart from a state church. About 1567, Richard Fitz set up a church based on a covenant.

*Their History* The man behind the concept of Congregationalism is Robert Browne (ca. 1550-1633). When he was a student at Cambridge, Browne heard theologian Thomas Cartwright lecture. After graduation, Browne became an assistant to a Puritan clergyman and evidently was introduced to the Anabaptist concept of the church. He concluded that according to the New Testament, the church of believers was to be autonomous, united together by a covenant; he also practiced infant baptism (Westin, pp. 144-145). Browne and his congregation were forced to flee to Holland, where he wrote three Treatises elaborating the principles of Separatist Congregationalism, namely that believers were united to one another by a voluntary covenant, that officers in the church were to be chosen by its members, and that no congregation was to have authority over another congregation. In 1591, Browne returned to England, where he was ordained in the Anglican Church, which he served until his death, but his principles continued (Cairns, p. 337). Nonetheless,

the principles of church government expounded by Browne are held by Congregationalists to this day (Kuiper, p. 261).

Other leaders took over the Separatist movement, including Henry Barrow, John Greenwood, Francis Johnson, Henry Ainsworth, John Robinson and others (Eerdmans', p. 389). The Separatists were severely persecuted by both church and state (Houghton, p. 149). Henry Jacob (1563-1624) was imprisoned for his view that each congregation should be free from state control to choose its own pastor, determine its own policies, and manage its own affairs (Cairns, p. 336). In 1616, Jacob founded one of the first independent churches in England and because of that is considered the founder of Congregationalism.

In 1604, John Robinson, who had also been a clergyman in the Church of England, adopted Separatist principles and became the pastor of a Congregationalist congregation in the village of Scrooby. Because of persecution, they moved to Leiden, Holland in 1609 (Kuiper, p. 262). The pilgrims who came to the Plymouth colony in America in 1620 were Separatists. Those who came nine years later and established the Massachusetts Bay Colony were Puritans (Kuiper, p. 251).

*Their Doctrinal Statement* The doctrinal statement of the Congregationalists is the Savoy Declaration of 1658, which is an adaptation of the Westminster Confession of Faith that includes a congregational form of church government (Kuiper, p. 263).

## The Baptists

*General Baptists* John Smyth (ca. 1565-1612) was the founder of the General Baptists ([www.reformedreader.org/smyth.htm](http://www.reformedreader.org/smyth.htm), accessed 4/13/2014). His early life is obscure. He received an MA from Cambridge in 1593. In 1594, he was ordained into the Church of England (see <http://www.patheos.com/Library/Baptist/Origins/Founders.html>, accessed 4/10/2014). He was appointed preacher in the city of Lincoln and held that office until 1605 (Vedder, p. 202). Then he was removed from the church at Lincoln because of his Separatist leanings (Westin, p. 194).

Unemployed, Smyth returned to Gainsborough, his hometown, where he became a Congregationalist (Mild, p. 8). In 1606, he joined a group of Separatists in Gainsborough and became their teacher (they disliked the title "ministers"). Thomas Helwys and John Murton were leading members of the congregation.

In 1607 (Mild, p. 8), because of the persecution ordered by James I, they went to Holland, where Smyth supported himself by practicing medicine (Vedder, p. 202). He believed that the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures were inspired by God, but the English translation was not. Therefore, the English translation should not be used in the church service; rather, the Hebrew and Greek should be translated by the preacher on the spot, making it less likely that the Spirit would be quenched. He objected to sermons being read and the hymns being sung from a book (Grove, p. xxii). "Smyth insisted that true worship was from the heart and that any form of reading from a book in worship was an invention of sinful man. Prayer, singing, and preaching had to be completely spontaneous." In addition, Smyth also introduced a twofold church leadership, Pastor and Deacon (<http://www.reformedreader.org/smyth.htm>, accessed, 4/10/2014).

Hugh and Anne Bromehead describe a John Smyth church meeting: "We begin with a prayer after read some one of two chapters of the Bible; give the sense thereof and confer upon the same; that done, we lay aside our books and after a solemn prayer made by the

first speaker he propoundeth some text out of the Scripture and prophesieth out of the same by the space of one hour or three-quarters of an hour. After him standeth up a second speaker and prophesieth out of the said text the like time and space, sometimes more, sometimes less. After him, the third, the fourth, the fifth, etc., as the time will give leave. Then the first speaker concludeth with prayer as he began with prayer, with an exhortation to contribution to the poor, which collection being made is also concluded with prayer. This morning exercise begins at eight of the clock and continueth until twelve of the clock. The like course of exercise is observed in the afternoon from two of the clock unto five or six of the clock. Last of all the execution of the government of the Church is handled” (see H. Wheeler Robinson, *Life and Faith of the Baptists*, 1946, p. 96; <https://www.christianhistoryinstitute.org/magazine/article/baptist-archives-worship-in-john-smyths-church>, accessed 4/10/2014).

In Amsterdam, under Mennonite influence, Smyth adopted Baptist principles (Kuiper, p. 262) and he accepted the ideas of Arminianism (Westin, p. 195). In 1608, Smyth published *The Difference of the Churches of the Separation*. He wanted to revive completely the principles of the New Testament church, including the charismatic gifts (Westin, p. 194). He and others with him concluded that the requirement for membership in the church was baptism on profession of repentance and faith, which eliminated the practice of infant baptism (Groves, pp. xxii-xxiii).

In 1608 or 1609, Smyth baptized himself, Thomas Helwys, and other members of his flock by pouring (Cairns, p. 338). Richard Bernard, a Separatist, nicknamed Smyth a “Se-Baptist,” that is, a self-baptizer, which was later shortened again to “Baptist” (<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/131christians/denominationalfounders/smyth.html>, accessed 4/10/2014; see also Neal, I, p. 422). Thus, “Smyth, Thomas Helwys, and thirty-six others formed the first church composed of Englishmen that is known to have stood for the baptism of believers only” (Vedder, p. 203).

In 1609, he published *The Character of the Beast*, in which he argued that infants should not be baptized because there was no such thing as infant baptism in the New Testament (Westin, p. 195).

A few months after his self-performed baptism (Vedder, p. 204), Smyth became uncertain about its validity. He and some others attempted to join the Mennonites (Westin, p. 195). Helwys, who did not accept some Mennonite doctrines, recommended that Smyth, who was in bad health at the time, be excommunicated. In 1611, they agreed (<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/131christians/denominationalfounders/smyth.html>, accessed 4/10/2014); Groves says Helwys and possibly ten others excommunicated Smyth and that Smyth and thirty-one others, fourteen men and seventeen women, applied for acceptance into the Mennonite church (Groves, p. xxiii).

The Mennonites required a doctrinal statement from Smyth, but they were apparently hesitant to accept him because his doctrinal statement went through four revisions (Vedder, p. 204). Smyth died before the group was accepted into Mennonite membership (Mild, p. 9). He died of tuberculosis before he was 45 years old (Latourette, p. 818).

Separated from Smyth, Thomas Helwys (ca. 1575-ca. 1616) began to write. First, he wrote a confession of faith (Groves, p. xxiii). In 1611, He wrote *A Declaration of Faith of English People Remaining at Amsterdam in Holland*. These twenty-seven articles are the earliest Baptist confessions of faith. Here is a summary of the 27 articles in *The Declaration*: The Father, the Word, and the Spirit are one God by whom all things are



created and preserved on the earth (Art. 1). God created man who fell by disobedience and his sin was imputed to all (Art. 2). By Jesus Christ, all are made alive and His righteousness is imputed to all (Art. 3). Although man is born in sin and has all disposition to evil and no disposition or will to good, God gives grace that man may receive grace or reject grace (Art. 4). Before the foundation of the world, God predestinated that all who believe in Christ shall be saved and all who do not believe will be damned. God did not predestinate men to be wicked and so be damned, but that man being wicked shall be damned, for God would have all men saved and come to the knowledge of the truth (Art. 5). Man is justified only by the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith, yet faith without works is dead (Art. 6). Men may fall away from grace; a righteous man may forsake his righteousness and perish. Let no man think that because he once had grace, he shall always have grace (Art. 7).

Jesus Christ is the virgin-born Son of God, being one person in two distinct natures, true God and true man without sin (Art. 8). Jesus Christ is the Mediator between God and man, being King, Priest, and Prophet, who has set down in his Testament the perfect rule of all persons at all times and no one may add or diminish from that (Art. 9).

The church is a company of faithful people, separated from the world by the Word and the Spirit of God, being united to the Lord and one another by baptism (1 Cor. 12:13), upon their confession of faith and sins (Art. 10). The church is one, but it consists of various congregations, where they come together to pray, prophesy, break bread, and administer all holy ordinances although as yet they have no officers, or that their officers may be in prison, sick or by any other means hindered from the church (Art. 11). No one church has authority over any of the church (Art. 12). Every church is to receive members by baptism upon the confession of their faith and their sins wrought by the preaching of the gospel (Art. 13).

Baptism is the outward manifestation of the dying to sin and walking in newness of life and, therefore, in no wise applies to infants (Art. 14). The Lord's Supper is the outward manifestation of the Spiritual communion between Christ and the faithful to declare His death until He comes (Art. 15).

The members of the church ought to know one another so they may perform all the duties of love toward one another both in soul and body and the elders ought to know the whole flock and, therefore, a church ought not to consist of such a multitude as cannot have particular knowledge of one another (Art. 16). Brethren impenitent in one sin after the admonishment of the church are to be excluded from the communion of the saints (Art. 17). Excommunicants in respect to civil society are not to be avoided (Art. 18). The church ought to assemble on the first day of the week to pray, prophesy, praise God, break bread and perform all parts of spiritual communion for the worship of God, their own mutual edification and the preservation of true religion and piety in the church and ought to labor in their calling according to the moral law which Christ came not to abolish but to fulfill (Art. 19).

The officers of every church are either elders, who by their office do feed the flock concerning their souls, or deacons, men and women, who by their office relieve the necessities of the poor concerning their bodies (Art. 20). Officers are to be chosen when there are qualified people according to the New Testament by the election of the members of the congregation with fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands, there being only one kind of elders (Art. 21). The officers of any church are only over that particular church and,

therefore, cannot have authority over other congregations, except they have an apostleship (Art. 22).

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are written for our instruction (Art. 23). Magistrates are ministers of God, who do not bear the sword for naught, and, therefore, we ought to pay taxes and pray for them for the Lord would have them saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth and be members of the church (Art. 24). It is lawful to take an oath (Art. 25). The dead shall rise again being changed in a moment and having the same bodies in substance though different in qualities (Art. 26). After the resurrection, all men appear before the judgment seat of Christ to be judged according to their works and the godly will enjoy eternal life and the wicked condemned in hell (Art. 27). (For the complete text of *The Declaration*, see <http://www.helwysocietyforum.com/?p=1289>, accessed 4/8/2014).

In 1611, Helwys wrote his second book, entitled *A Short and Plain Proof by the Word and Works of God that God's Decree is Not the Cause of Any of Man's Sins or Condemnation and that All Men are Redeemed by Christ; as Also that No Infants are Condemned* (Groves, pp. xxiii-xxiv). In it, he expounds the doctrines of free will and general (unlimited) atonement. He argued that if Christ's atonement is particular (limited), believers have no assurance of salvation, for they don't know if God decreed their salvation.

Also, in 1611, Helwys wrote his third book, *An Advertisement or Admonition to the Congregations, which Men Call the New Fryelers, in the Lowe Countries, Written in Dutch and Published in English* (Groves, p. xxiv). In it, he challenged the teachings of the Mennonites of Amsterdam and John Smyth. (Helwys took pains to disassociate himself from the Mennonites, Latourette, p. 818.) First, they were teaching that Christ's flesh was celestial rather than human. Helwys defends Christ's human flesh (and hence His full humanity) by appealing to Scripture. Second, they were teaching that government magistrates were "by their office and ministry debarred of salvation," the implication being that an officer of the state cannot be saved. Helwys explains that this position is built on a misinterpretation of Jesus' words (Mt. 20:25-26; Lk. 22:24-26; Mk. 10:42-43). Third, they were abandoning corporate worship. Helwys argues that this disregards one of the Ten Commandments. Finally, they were teaching the doctrine of succession, which held that believers may only receive the ordinances from Mennonite elders. Helwys counters that this position is neither logical nor biblical. With each of these unbiblical teachings, Helwys posits that pride has led them astray. Characteristically, Helwys concludes by imploring them to earnestly search out the matter for themselves.

While he was in Amsterdam, Helwys wrote his fourth and last work, *A Short Declaration on the Mystery of Iniquity* (Groves, p. xxiv). The title was taken from 2 Thessalonians 2:7. He did not publish it until he went back to England (see below).

Probably in 1611 (Veder, p. 205), Thomas Helwys, John Newton, and their followers returned to England. In 1612, they organized the first Baptist Church on English soil (Groves, p. xiv). They practiced baptism by affusion (pouring) and held Arminian documents with which they had become familiar during the Arminian dispute in Holland (Cairns, p. 338). They became known as General Baptists because they held to a general rather than a particular (limited) atonement.

In England, Helwys published *The Mystery of Iniquity* (Groves, p. xxiv). It consists of four parts. In the first part, Helwys says that Roman Catholicism is the "abomination of

desolation” spoken of by Daniel, the “mystery of iniquity,” “the man of sin” spoken of by Paul, and the first beast of Revelation 13. He argues that the Church of England is the second beast of Revelation 13 because of its attempts to compel people to worship the image of the first beast.

The second part of the book is addressed directly to the king, James I. It contains a defense for the freedom of conscience, that is, the freedom of religion. In a day when the religion of the people was determined by the monarch, Helwys argues that people should choose for themselves their religion. He even argues that the Jews and the Catholics should have the same freedom. He says, “Let them be heretics.”

In the third part of the book, he criticizes the Puritans because they did not separate themselves from the second beast; they sought and accepted church appointments, which is hypocritical. He argues that each congregation should be able to call its own pastor.

In the fourth book, he criticizes Brownism (the Congregationalists), who taught that the church is a body of people who voluntarily entered into a relationship with one another on the basis of a covenant. Helwys insists that baptism, not a covenant, is the unifying foundation of the church. He also criticizes them for their practice of infant baptism.

*The Mystery of Iniquity* is the first exposition in English of universal religious liberty. While some were arguing for freedom for Christianity, Helwys was arguing that religious liberty must be made available to everyone, even heretics (Groves, p. xxxi-xxxii).

Helwys sent King James I a copy of *The Mystery of Iniquity* along with an appeal arguing for the liberty of conscience (religious liberty). Helwys wrote, “The King is a mortal man and not God; therefore he hath no power over the mortal soul of his subjects to make laws and ordinances for them and to set spiritual Lords over them.” James I had Helwys thrown into Newgate Prison, where he died. He was about 40 years old (“Helwys, Thomas.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*). John Murton became the leader of the church after Helwys died (Westin, p. 195).

Thus, the first Baptists emerged from the Separatist Congregationalists, practiced baptism by pouring rather than immersion, and were Arminian in doctrine. Baptists were different from the Anabaptists concerning the state, the community, taking oaths, the sword, and holdings to the civil positions (Westin, p. 195). “By the year 1626, there were five such churches in England, though all were small and, in the aggregate, contained about one hundred and fifty members. In 1644, they had increased to forty-seven churches, according to their opponents; possibly there were more” (Vedder, p. 205). All of these churches were Arminian in doctrine and practiced affusion rather than immersion (Westin, p. 196).

*Particular Baptists* As with General Baptists, the Particular Baptists came out of the Separatist/Congregationalist movement. In 1616, Henry Jacob founded the first Congregational Church. In 1633, sixteen people asked the church to let them form a separate church, because the church was too much like the Church of England. In 1638, six more people left the Jacob church over the issue of believer’s baptism (Chris Traffanstedt, *A Primer on Baptist History*. [www.spurgeon.org/~phil/history/trail.htm](http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/history/trail.htm), accessed, 4/13/2004). “Not long after, this church seems to have wholly adopted Baptist principles and practices, and is therefore entitled to be called the first Particular Baptist church in England” (Vedder, p. 206). They held to the baptism of believers by immersion and Calvinism that emphasizes limited atonement. This congregation, first led by John Spilsbury, became the main influence of the English Baptist movement (Cairns, p. 338).

John Bunyan and Roger Williams, the father of American Baptists, were Particular Baptists (Westin, p. 198).

By 1660, there were roughly 300 General and Particular Baptist churches in England (Eerdmans', p. 396).

*Hyper-Calvinist Baptists* In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, some English Baptists became hyper-Calvinists. John Gill (1697-1771), who pastored a Baptist church in London that eventually was pastored by Charles Haddon Spurgeon, is sometimes considered the founder of Hyper-Calvinism. Hyper-Calvinism teaches that the call of the gospel to repent and believe is not universal; that is, it is not for all and that unregenerate people do not have a duty to repent and believe in Christ for salvation.

For example, in the confessional articles of the Gospel Standard Churches (English Baptist) is this statement: "We deny duty faith and duty repentance – these terms suggesting that it is every man's duty spiritually and savingly to repent and believe. We deny also that there is any capability in man by nature to any spiritual good whatever. So that we reject the doctrine that man in a state of nature should be exhorted to believe in or turn to God." Another article reads, "Therefore, that for ministers in the present day to address unconverted persons, or indiscriminately all in a mixed congregation, calling upon them to savingly repent, believe, and receive Christ, or perform any other acts dependent upon the new creative power of the Holy Ghost, is, on the one hand, to imply creature power, and on the other, to deny the doctrine of special redemption."

To sum up: Baptists rejected a national church. Instead of geographical parishes, where everyone born in that geographical area is baptized as an infant and thereby becomes a member of the state church, Baptists believed that the church was a local, voluntary congregation of regenerate people, who baptized believers instead of infants. "In their struggle to win freedom from government persecution, the Baptists became leaders in the fight for religious liberty for all, both in England and America." While there is a large variety of Baptist beliefs, there are four constants: "rejection of infant baptism, commitment to congregational autonomy, regenerate church membership, the Bible as sole authority" (Cary, *HCT*, p. 103).

## The Quakers

*Mysticism* During the Middle Ages, there were mystics within Roman Catholicism and within Orthodox churches. Mysticism seeks an experience with God rather than just knowledge of God. Lutherans, Quakers, Anglicans, Episcopalians, Methodists, Pentecostals, and Charismatics have, in various ways, remained open to the idea of mystical experiences.

*Quietism* In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Quietism was a mystical movement within Roman Catholicism. In reaction to the emphasis on the rationalization of dogma, it emphasized "an immediate intuitional approach to God by the passive soul opening itself to the influence of the inner light" (Cairns, p. 378).

*Quakers* In 1643, at the age of 19, George Fox (ca. 1624-1691) started his search for spiritual truth. In that year, two Puritans challenged him to a drinking contest in which the one who stopped drinking first paid for the drinks. In disgust, he left the church and began seeking (Cairns, p. 379). After several years of traveling, talking to religious leaders, and searching the Scriptures, Fox slowly came to the conclusion that all the various sects in

England were wrong and their worship was an abomination before God. Hymns, sermons, sacraments, creeds, and ministers were human hindrances to the freedom of Spirit. The Calvinistic doctrine of total depravity is a denial of the love of God. There is an inner light in everyone, no matter how dim it may be (Jn. 1:9). Those who follow it find God. Because of that light, pagans, as well as Christians, can be saved (González, II, pp. 198-199). Fox was once sent to prison (he spent a total of six years in prison) for interrupting a preacher who declared that ultimate truth was found in the Scripture. Fox argued that was not true because truth is in the Spirit who inspired the Scripture (González, II, p. 200).

Fox began to preach and people began to follow him. In 1652, a group of his followers organized. They called themselves Friends (Jn. 15:15), “Children of the Light” or “Publishers of the Light.” Later they called themselves the “Society of Friends” (Eerdmans’, p. 480). When Fox told a judge to “tremble at the Word of the Lord,” the judge called him “a Quaker” (Mead, p. 160). The group grew rapidly. In 1654, there were sixty Quakers. Four years later, there were thirty-thousand (Kuiper, p. 270).

Quaker services were conducted in silence. Structure is an obstacle to the work of the Spirit. Anyone is free to speak, including women. There is no baptism or communion because physical water, bread, and wine would draw attention away from the spiritual (González, II, p. 200).

Robert Barclay (1648-1690) became their theologian. In 1678, he published *An Apology for True Christian Divinity*. According to him, the Spirit is the source of the Inner Light within a people that gives them spiritual illumination. The inspiration of Fox and any other Quakers is on the same level as the inspiration of the writers of the Bible, which is a secondary rule of faith. A Quaker revelation should never contradict “the Scripture or right and sound reason” (Cairns, p. 379-380).

In 1681, the Quaker William Penn established the colony of Pennsylvania (Houghton, p. 160; on page 173, he says Pennsylvania was founded in 1682).

## The Pietists

*Background* Luther warned: “The Word of God is seldom retained in its purity in any one place beyond twenty or at best forty years. The people become accustomed to it, grow cold in their Christian love, and regard God’s gifts of grace with indifference” (Luther, cited by Houghton, p. 174). Sure enough, by the seventeenth century, the Lutheran church in Germany was characterized by “cold orthodoxy” (Cairns, p. 381). The insights of the Reformers had “hardened into rigid formulas” (Eerdmans’, p. 442). Lutheranism had degenerated into an unedifying Protestant scholasticism, which was full of arguments refuting Catholicism but not teaching that which strengthened the Christian life (Cary, *HCT*, p. 106). “All that was expected of church members was that they should know their catechism, attend church service, listen to doctrinal sermons, and partake of the sacraments.... Among the members of the church, there was much drunkenness and immorality” (Kuiper, p. 272).

*Description* In that environment, Pietism arose. It re-emphasized the importance of the new birth, personal faith, the warmth of Christian experience, and the missionary concern (Eerdmans’, p. 442). It stressed an internal, subjective, and individual return to Bible study and prayer to cultivate a pious life and the function of the Holy Spirit as the illuminator of Scripture (Cairns, p. 381). Carey says it was a turn to experience, adding that as society

became more secularized, the situation favored theologies of the Spirit and experience over theologies of Word and sacrament (Cary, *HCT*, p. 106).

*Leaders* The father of Pietism was Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705). In 1666, he became a Lutheran pastor in Frankfurt. He was in complete agreement with Lutheran theology, except for his belief in a millennium on the earth. In his sermons, he stressed the life of devotion rather than correct dogma (Eerdmans', p. 443). He preached moderation in eating, drinking, and dress. Like the English Puritans, he was against theater-going, dancing, and playing cards, which things Lutherans generally looked upon as belonging to "indifferent things" (Kuiper, p. 273). In 1670, he organized meetings in homes for practical Bible study and prayer. In 1675, he wrote *Pia Desideria (Holy Desires)*, which emphasized the "cottage prayer meeting" as a means for the cultivation of personal piety among Lutherans (Cairns, p. 381). These were "little churches within in the church" (Kuiper, p. 272).

In 1687, when he was 24 years old, August Francke (1663-1727) was converted. Shortly after that, he spent two months with Spener and joined Pietism. In 1689, Francke went to Leipzig, where he lectured to students and townspeople. He developed a large following, but soon ran into trouble. His students neglected their studies and criticized their other professors as well as the local ministers. He moved to Erfurt, where the same thing happened. Spener secured an appointment for him at the newly founded University of Halle (1692), which became the center of Pietism. He worked there until he died in 1727 (Kuiper, p. 272).

Francke organized a free elementary school for poor children (1695), a secondary school (1697), a home for orphans, and was influential in the creation of a Bible Institute (1719; Cairns, p. 381). Francke's students became missionaries. During the 18<sup>th</sup> century, no fewer than 60 missionaries were sent out from the University of Halle (Kuiper, p. 274).

Prior to Pietism, Lutheranism suffered from a one-sided intellectualism, an emphasis on knowledge. Pietism was a reaction to intellectualism, but it too was one-sided. It emphasized severe self-denial. "Pietism was critical and uncharitable; it condemned as irreligious everyone who was not a Pietist. It denied the name of Christian to all those who could not tell of a conscious conversion through an inner struggle. Pietism had but little regard for doctrine. The Lutheran Church of the seventeenth century laid one-sided emphasis on doctrine; Pietism laid one-sided emphasis on life. By underestimating the value of sound doctrine, it helped ease the way for liberalism" (Kuiper, p. 274).

Count Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760) was the godson of Spener (their fathers were close friends). When he was ten years old, was sent to Francke's school at Halle. There he organized a club which he called "The Order of the Grain of Mustard Seed." The purpose of the club was the promotion of personal piety and the evangelization of the world. When he was fifteen years old, he and some of his schoolmates made a promise that they would on every of occasion confess Christ and seek the conversion of men (Kuiper, pp. 275-276).

He wanted to study theology, but his stepfather persuaded him to study law, which led to government service (Houghton, p. 177). From 1716 to 1719, he studied law at Wittenberg University, where he learned Lutheranism (Kuiper, p. 276). In 1719, on a tour of Europe, he saw Domenico Feti's painting *Ecce Homo*, showing Christ wearing a crown of thorns, in an art museum. The inscription read: "This is what I did for you. What will

you do for me?” It made a profound impression on him. In 1721, he entered civil service (Eerdmans’ p. 477). He became the king’s judicial counselor.

Zinzendorf purchased a large estate (1722). The Hussites, who were being severely persecuted, asked him for shelter on his estate. More than 300 refugees settled on it and call their settlement Herrnhut (“the Lord’s Lodge”). Herrnhut sheltered Hussites, Lutherans, and Calvinists. In 1727, the Moravian church was organized (Houghton, p. 177). Pietism resulted in the founding of the Moravian church by Zinzendorf (Cairns, p. 381).

Zinzendorf was a pietistic Lutheran. He had an extreme emphasis on Christ as the heart of religion, which led to great sentimentality in his sermons and hymns. He was particularly focused on the wounds of Christ, especially the wound in His side. He felt that the members of the Moravian church were soldiers for Christ, whose duty it was to take the gospel to the world (Kuiper, pp. 277- 278). Soon people from Herrnhut established churches in Holland, England, Denmark, and North America. In 1732, they sent out their first missionaries, who set sail for St. Thomas in the West Indies. Others were sent to Greenland, Lapland, Algiers, etc. (Houghton, pp. 176-177). The Moravians were the first Protestant group to take the great commission seriously (Kuiper, p. 278).

“Zinzendorf was a man of many talents—pastor, teacher, theologian, missionary, hymn-writer, linguist, and administrator. He was a pioneer of ecumenism, and indeed was the first to employ the term ‘ecumenical’ in the modern sense. His aim was to unite all Christians in evangelism” (Eerdmans’ p. 477).

## The Methodists

In eighteenth-century England, sermons in the Church of England were usually long homilies filled with moral platitudes (Cairns, p. 382). The chief interests of bishops and pastors were often entertainment, sports, and politics. Puritanism was also dead. The people in England were involved in drunkenness, immorality, cruel sports, unbelief, and complete indifference to the Word (Houghton, pp. 186-187). Spiritually, conditions in England at the time were deplorable (Kuiper, p. 288).

Methodism was born during such a time. Its origins can be traced to a small group of serious-minded students at Oxford University, who were dubbed “Methodists” because of their strict regimen of prayer, fasting, Bible reading, and charitable works. They were inspired by William Law’s (1686-1761) *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* and *A Treatise on Christian Perfection*. Among the members of this group were John Wesley, Charles Wesley, and George Whitefield (sometimes spelled Whitfield). All three were later ordained in the Church of England (Mead, p. 217).

John and Charles Wesley’s father, Samuel Wesley, was a minister in the Church of England (Kuiper, p. 284) and a staunch high churchman, but their grandparents were nonconformists. Susanna, their mother, was a remarkable woman, who had an enormous influence on her sons (Eerdmans’ p. 447). Samuel and Suzanna Wesley had 19 children, eight of whom died in infancy. Their fifteenth child was John and their eighteenth child was Charles (Kuiper, p. 284).

*John Wesley* John Wesley (1703-1791) was barely five feet six and weighed only 122 pounds (Wesley, p. 25). He entered Oxford in 1720. In 1728, he was ordained a priest in the Church of England (Cairns, p. 382). While John was absent from Oxford to be his

father's assistant, Charles and several other students formed a club for the promotion of their studies. They soon began spending time reading books that might be helpful to their Christian life. In 1729, when John returned to Oxford, he became the leader of the club. They began to visit prisoners in jail and practice systematic fasting. The Oxford students made fun of them, calling their club the "Holy Club" and calling them "Methodists" (Kuiper, pp. 285-286).

In 1735, John and Charles sailed for Georgia in America to be missionaries. During the voyage, the ship encountered a storm so severe its main mast split. The Moravians on board were unbelievably calm, even singing throughout the ordeal. They told John Wesley they behaved so bravely because they did not fear death, a comment that made Wesley begin to doubt the depth of his own faith (González, II, p. 209).

August Spangenberg, the leader of the Moravian settlement in Georgia, asked John if he knew Jesus Christ. When John told him that he knew Jesus was the Savior of the world, Spangenberg asked, "Do you know that He has saved you?" For the next three years, that question preyed on John's mind, because he was not sure of the answer (Kuiper, p. 286). John later said, "I who went to America to convert others was never converted to God myself." He also said, "I diligently strove against sin, I omitted no sort of self-denial which I thought lawful. I omitted no occasion of doing good; but could not find that all this gave me any assurance of acceptance with God." Concerning the witness of the Moravians, he said, "I understood it not at first. I was to learn to be wise so that it seemed foolish to me. I continued preaching, and following after, and trusting in, that righteousness wherein no flesh can be justified" (Houghton, pp. 188-189).

John and Charles labored with all of their might in Georgia. John was a linguist; he knew many languages well. He preached in English, German, French, and Italian. In spite of all their efforts, John and Charles were unsuccessful in their mission to Georgia. A year after their arrival, Charles fell ill and returned to England (Kuiper, p. 287). Because of his strictness and frankness, John was forced to go home in 1737 (Cairns, p. 383).

Back in England, John and Charles became acquainted with Peter Bohler, a Moravian, who taught "a faith of complete self-surrender, instantaneous conversion, and joy in believing" (Kuiper, p. 287). In his *Journal*, Wesley relates that Peter Bohler convinced him that salvation was by faith alone, but since he didn't have it yet, he considered ceasing to preach. Bohler told him, "Preach faith until you have it; and then, because you have it." That is what Wesley did. He preached salvation by faith alone before he trusted Christ (Wesley's *Journal*, March 4, 1738, p. 58; see also the journal entry on April 25, 1738, p. 61 and May 14, 1738, p. 63). On May 21, 1738, Charles was converted (Kuiper, p. 287).

On May 24, 1738, John attended a Moravian meetinghouse in London (Houghton, p. 189) on Aldersgate Street (Mead, p. 218), where, while listening to the reading of Luther's preface to his *Commentary on Romans*, he was converted (Cairns, p. 383). He was 34 years old at the time (Kuiper, p. 287). He described what happened: "About a quarter before nine, while I was listening to Luther's description of the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given to me, that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death" (Wesley's *Journal*, March 24, 1738, p. 64). "What happened in that little room was of more importance to England than all the victories of Pitt by land or sea" (Eerdman's p. 447). John's experience of conversion determined his concept of conversion. He thought of it as an instantaneous experience,



preceded by a long and hard struggle. He believed that a person should be able to tell the exact circumstances, the time, and the place of his conversion (Kuiper, p. 287).

Wesley wanted to know more about the Moravians. So three weeks after his conversion, he went to Germany, where he met Count von Zinzendorf and spent two weeks in Hernnut. Wesley owed much to the Moravians, but he was more active and not mystical enough to feel entirely at one with them (Kuiper, p. 287). He feared and deplored their quietism (González, II, p. 214).

In 1739, George Whitefield (1714-1770) asked John (and Charles) to engage in field preaching at Bristol, which launched Wesley's career of field preaching (Cairns, p. 383). Preaching in open fields instead of a church was entirely novel. John quickly learned that coal miners were poor people who had never been inside of a church. On April 2, 1739 John preached his first sermon in the open air (Kuiper, p. 289).

Wesley preached to thousands at a time. At one point in his diary, he wrote, "Supposing the space to be fourscore yard square and to contain five persons in the square yard, there must be above two and thirty thousand people, the largest assembly I ever preached to, yet I found, upon inquiry, all could be heard even to the skirts of the congregation! Perhaps, for the first time that a man of seventy has been heard by thirty thousand persons at once!" (Wesley's *Journal*, September 21, 1773, p. 341).

Wesley's methods were not only new, they were revolutionary. Rather than restricting himself to one church (parish) he preached anywhere he saw a need; hence his famous statement, "The world is my parish" (Kuiper, pp. 292-293). He was a circuit-riding preacher. Rising about four in the morning, he often preached his first sermon at five and usually two or three more sermons before the day ended (Houghton, p. 191). "During his lifetime, he traveled over 200,000 miles on horseback in England, Scotland, and Ireland, preached about 42,000 sermons, wrote about 200 books, and organized his followers" (Cairns, p. 383; Houghton says it was 250,000 miles, p. 192). Whereas only ordained men were allowed to preach in the Church of England, Wesley enlisted un-ordained men to preach (Kuiper, p. 293). He virtually invented the religious tract and he pioneered a new type of publication—the monthly magazine (Eerdmans' p. 448).

Wesley's complete, 26-volume *Journal* has never been printed. The published version consists of four volumes (Wesley, p. 7). The published version began on October 14, 1735 and the last entry is dated Sunday, October 24, 1790 (Wesley, p. 15). For the most part, Wesley wrote his *Journal* on horseback (Wesley, p. 16).

Wesley's theology was Arminianism. His passion for evangelism motivated him to oppose Calvinism. To him, Calvin's doctrine of predestination stifled the call to conversion. Furthermore, he believed that people accepted Christ by their own choice. He practiced infant baptism (Kuiper, p. 294). Wesley preached justification by faith through an instantaneous experience of regeneration. He placed great emphasis on the doctrine of Christian perfection, the notion that by an act of faith, the love of God could so fill the heart of the believer that it would expel sin and promote holiness. He taught that this was not sinless perfection, but sinlessness in motive. He explained this doctrine in his book *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. "He opposed liquor, slavery, and war" (Cairns, p. 384). He was opposed to wearing jewelry (Wesley, p. 26).

Wesley's marriage was a failure. In his journal, Wesley records, "For many years I remained single because I believed that I could be more useful in a single, than in a married state. And I praise God, who enabled me to so do" (Wesley, *Journal*, February 1, 1751).

Then, he fell in love with Grace Murray, a widow who was an outstanding Christian. His brother Charles opposed the marriage because of her lowly birth and she married someone else. John married Mary Vazeille (Parker, editor of Wesley's *Journal*, pp. 27-30). Three months after they were married, troubles started and the marriage ended in a permanent separation.

John Singleton, a Methodist, explains: "Wesley and Mary Vazeille, a well-to-do widow and mother of four children, were married in 1751. By 1758 she had left him—unable to cope, it is said, with the competition for his time and devotion presented by the ever-burgeoning Methodist movement. Molly, as she was known, was to return and leave him again on several occasions before their final separation. Due to her husband's constant travels, Molly felt increasingly neglected. She grew jealous of her husband's time since he was often away. And she became suspicious of the many friendly relationships he maintained with various women who were part of the Methodist movement. Wesley, for his part, did little to assuage her fears" (Singleton, cited by Nathan Busenitz, "John Wesley's Failed Marriage," [www.thecripplegate.com/john-wesleys-failed-marriage/](http://www.thecripplegate.com/john-wesleys-failed-marriage/), accessed April 23, 2014).

Here are episodes recounted in Stephen Tomkins' biography of Wesley.

"[When Wesley left for a ministry tour in Ireland in 1758, Molly reported that her husband's parting words to her were:] 'I hope I shall see your wicked face no more' (p. 155).

"Reunited in England, they clashed violently—Wesley refusing to change his writing habits [of sending affectionate letters to other women] and Molly accusing him of adultery and calling down on him, in her own words, 'all the curses from Genesis to Revelation' (p. 155).

"Almost the sole surviving record of this marriage from Molly's side dates from December 1760, when she said Wesley left a meeting early with one Betty Disine and was seen still with her the following morning. She told him 'in a loving manner to desist from running after strange women for your character is at stake' (p. 159).

"In 1771, Molly announced that she was leaving John again. On 23 January, the *Journal* reports, 'For what I cause I know not to this day, [my wife] set out for Newcastle, purposing "never to return." I did not leave her: I did not send her away: I will not call her back'" (Tomkins, p. 174; cited by Nathan Busenitz, "John Wesley's Failed Marriage," [www.thecripplegate.com/john-wesleys-failed-marriage/](http://www.thecripplegate.com/john-wesleys-failed-marriage/), accessed April 23, 2014).

On the other hand, Parker says, "The most charitable construction that can be placed on her malicious, unreasonable behavior is that she was at times mentally unbalanced. She took papers and letters from his desk, changed the wording in his letters, then put them into the hands of his enemies or had them published in the newspapers. She is known to have driven one hundred miles in a jealous rage to see who was traveling with him. One of Wesley's preachers, John Hampson, said, after observing one of her tantrums, 'more than once she laid violent hands upon him, and tore those venerable locks,' ... One of Charles Wesley's biographers, Jackson, states that John Wesley's letters to his wife show 'the utmost tenderness of affection, such as few female hearts could have withstood; and an justify the opinion that, had it been his happiness to be married to a person who was worthy of him, he would in one of the most affectionate husbands that ever lived' (Parker, p. 30).

Wesley was a great preacher, organizer, and scholar. He edited grammars in five languages as well as the works of classic authors. He wrote commentaries on Scripture, as

well as his famous *Journal*, a record of his day-to-day activities. He even wrote a book on how to maintain good health or recover it when it had been lost (Houghton, p. 192).

Wesley had an enormous impact on England. Some historians contend “that Wesley’s preaching saved England from a revolution similar to that of France. Methodism was to Anglicanism what Puritanism was to Lutheranism” (Cairns, p. 382). Methodism taught obedience to the powers that be; the Methodists were the most loyal of all English citizens to the British crown, praying regularly for the king and opposing the unchristian program of the French revolution (Houghton, p. 193).

This much is certain: “The England Wesley left behind him was so different from the England he founded it was almost unrecognizable. He transformed it.... Much of the ignorance, coarseness, brutality, and drunkenness disappeared from English life.” He built a large, entirely new denomination. He influenced John Newton, the hymn writer, William Cowper, the great English poet, William Wilberforce, who helped eliminate slavery, John Howard, who did much to reform the unspeakable conditions in prisons, and Robert Raikes, the father of Sunday schools. “The influence of Wesley and the Methodists, particularly in the English-speaking world, is indeed immeasurable” (Kuiper, p. 295).

*Charles Wesley* While a student at Oxford, Charles Wesley (1707-1788) started the “Holy Club” (Eerdmans’ p. 447). He was converted several days before his brother John. Charles wrote about 7000 hymns (Houghton, p. 190), including “Jesus Lover of My Soul” and “Hark! The Herald Angels Sing.” Although Charles is known as the hymn-writer, like his brother, he was a powerful preacher (Eerdmans’ p. 447). For many years, he, like his brother, was a circuit-riding preacher. His wife, a woman of wealth, accompanied him on his travels and led the song service at his meetings. Not having the constitution of his brother, Charles seldom traveled after 1756. He had a ministry at Bristol, but from 1771 until his death in 1788, he preached in London (Kuiper, pp. 293-294).

*George Whitefield* (1714-1770) grew up in poverty and in an environment of low morality. His father was a tavern keeper. In 1733, he attended Oxford University, where he was a member of the “Holy Club” (Kuiper, p. 345). He was converted in 1735 (Eerdmans’, p. 440). In 1736, he was ordained in the Church of England (González, II, p. 228). Concerning his first sermon, Whitefield said, “Some few mocked, but most for those present seemed struck, and I have since heard that a complaint had been made to the Bishop that I drove fifteen mad” (Houghton, p. 195). In 1737, he set sail for Georgia. When he returned to England, he discovered his talent for open-air evangelism (Eerdmans’, p. 440).

In 1740, he and the Wesleys separated over Calvinism versus Arminianism, a breach that was never healed (Eerdmans’, p. 440). In his journal, Wesley writes, “He (Whitefield) told me that he and I preached two different gospels; and therefore he not only would not join with or give me the right hand of fellowship, but was resolved publicly to preach against me and my brother where so ever he preached at all.” Wesley goes on to relate that when Mr. Hall, who was with him, reminded Whitefield that just a few days before, he promised never to publicly preach against Wesley, Whitefield said that promise was only an effort of human weakness in and he was now of another mind (Wesley’s *Journal*, March 28, 1741, pp. 88-89). On a personal level, they remained “brothers in Christ,” but they felt it was better to work apart (Houghton, p. 195).

Whitefield was a dynamic preacher, who spoke in a simple style with fervor. He was eloquent and had an extraordinarily strong and melodious voice. For example, in his last field sermon, which occupied two hours, he cried out in a tone of thunder, “Works! Works!

A man to get to heaven by works! I would as soon think of climbing to the moon on a rope of sand!" ... One of the greatest actors of his day declared that he would give 100 pounds to be able to say "Oh!" the way Whitefield said it (Houghton, pp. 196, 200-201). Dodds adds that the actor David Garrick said that Whitefield could make on his audiences weep or tremble just by varying the pronunciation of the word "Mesopotamia" (Dodds, pp. 85-86).

Whitefield traveled extensively. He made fourteen trips to Scotland, visited America seven times, and traveled all over England and Wales (Eerdmans', p. 440). In the American colonies, he preached from New England to Georgia, sometimes attracting enormous crowds. While George Whitefield was preaching, Benjamin Franklin stood half a mile away in a crowd he estimated to be 30,000 and claimed he heard Whitefield clearly (Dodds, p. 85). It has been said that he was "the greatest preacher of the eighteenth century and one of the greatest of all time" (Kuiper, p. 346; Houghton says he was "one of the greatest preachers of the gospel of all time," p. 194).

Interestingly, Whitefield conscientiously believed in slavery. In 1751, he wrote, "As far as the lawfulness of keeping slaves, I have no doubt." When he died in 1770, he owned 75 slaves, who worked at the Bethesda Orphanage in Georgia. On the other hand, John Wesley denounced slavery. He once wrote was to William Wilberforce, commending him for opposing slavery, calling it "that execrable villainy which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature" (Houghton, p. 215). Whitefield and Wesley differed on more than predestination!

Whitefield was the founder of the Calvinistic Methodist Church, which was absorbed into Congregationalism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. He introduced John Wesley to open-air evangelism, published a magazine, and organized a conference for preachers (Eerdmans', p. 441). On September 30, 1770, Whitefield died in Newburyport, Massachusetts, where he is buried under the pulpit of the Old South Presbyterian Church (Kuiper, p. 346).

*Methodism* John Wesley did not want to break with the Anglican Church. Therefore, he organized his converts into societies, similar to Spener's cottage prayer meetings (Cairns, p. 383). In 1739, he founded his first Methodist Society in Bristol. He made it a rule that only converted people could belong to these societies and new converts were expected to convert others (Kuiper, pp. 290-291). In 1742, the societies were subdivided into classes of 10 to 12 under a lay leader (Cairns, p. 384). Also in 1742, Thomas Maxfield became the first lay preacher, that is, a man who was not trained and ordained as a minister. Other officers included stewards, who cared for property, teachers who conducted schools, and visitors cared for the sick (Kuiper, p. 291). In 1744, the first annual conference of preachers was held in London. In 1746, Wesley divided England into seven circuits and he also established the first free medical dispensary in England (Cairns, p. 384).

In 1772, Wesley commissioned Francis Asbury to superintend the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America. In 1784, Wesley sent Dr. Thomas Coke, a colleague, to form an independent American Methodist church. Coke was persuaded to adopt the title "Bishop" in place of "superintendent," a decision that angered Wesley, but it remains the American title (Houghton, p. 193). The Methodists in England were not organized into the Methodist Church separate from the Anglican Church until after Wesley's death in 1791.

## Rationalism

Rationalism is the notion that everything is judged by reason (Eerdmans', p. 480). It reached its apex in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries (González, II, p. 185).

*Descartes* The first great rationalist was René Descartes (1596-1650). He was a French mathematician, philosopher, and Roman Catholic. In the winter of 1619-20, he decided to doubt everything that could possibly be doubted. He concluded that there was only one thing he could not doubt—the fact that he doubted. He ultimately decided, “I think, therefore, I am.” His great philosophical ideal was to think rationally. He used Aquinas' cosmological and ontological arguments to prove the existence of God. He remained an Orthodox Catholic (Eerdmans', pp. 479-480, 484), but he was a rationalist who maintained that human reason was the only dependable key to knowledge of the universe.

*Spinoza* Baruch Spinoza (1632- 1677) was drawn to the rationalism of Descartes. He was expelled from his Jewish synagogue for his unorthodox views. He emphatically denied the existence of a God who is over and above the world. Rather he believed there was only one God (nature) and that all of reality is a manifestation of that God. In other words, he was a pantheist (Eerdmans', p. 484). He insisted that reason alone was the final authority in science, politics, and religion.

*Semler* Johann Salomo Semler (1725-1791) was the father of German rationalism. It was through him that rationalism became a movement in the church. He grew up in pietistic surroundings, but he never became a Pietist. He rejected the traditional canon and the inspiration of Scripture as well as the correctness of the text of the Old and New Testaments ([http://www.theodora.com/encyclopedia/s/johann\\_salomo\\_semmler.html](http://www.theodora.com/encyclopedia/s/johann_salomo_semmler.html)).

*Strauss* David Friedrich Strauss (1808-1874) was a German theologian. The rationalistic spirit grew until nearly all the universities of Germany were controlled by it. It reached its culmination in the publication of Strauss' book *Life of Christ* (1835). Strauss dismissed all the supernatural and messianic elements in the Gospels as myths or legends (Eerdmans', p. 544). In 1846, this book was translated into English and received a wide circulation in both England and America.

*Schleiermacher* Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) is called the “Father of Liberalism” (González, II, p. 287). He was trained in Moravian schools, where there was an emphasis on the subjective. He became a professor at the University of Halle. He made emotion the element out of which religious experience develops. In *The Christian Faith* (ca. 1821), he wrote that religion is not a set of beliefs, but is the result of man's feelings of absolute dependence in a majestic universe in which he is but a small entity. It is a mere subjective apprehension of Christ. Thus man is free from dependence on the revelation of the will of God and only needs to cultivate the feeling of dependence on God (Cairns, pp. 410-11). This “feeling” is not a passive emotion or a sudden experience. It is a profound awareness of the existence of One on whom all existence depends; it is absolute dependence on God (González, II, p. 286). He made experience of dependence the key to every Christian doctrine. God is that on which people feel dependent. Sin is the failure of the sense of dependence. Christ is the one who was utterly dependent on God in every thought, word, and action. His mission was to communicate this sense of dependence (Eerdmans', p. 541).

Rationalism produced theological liberalism, which led to a break with the Bible and the theology of the Reformation (Cairns, p. 37). Theological liberalism in America will be discussed later. It has its roots in European rationalism.

## The Missionary Movement

From the beginning, Christianity was missions-minded. Jesus gave the Great Commission to the apostles to preach the gospel in all the world, which they did. In the first four centuries, the church won the Roman Empire to Christianity. For the first thousand years, Christianity was a missionary institution. Although it was never lost, after the tenth century, the missionary spirit declined.

*The Reformation Period* During the Protestant Reformation, Protestant churches did not do much missionary work. During the Counter-Reformation, the Jesuits and other orders within Roman Catholicism did missionary work (Cairns, p. 401).

*The Moravians* As early as 1732, the Moravians began to establish foreign missions. They sent missionaries to Greenland, North America, and to the West Indies.

*Carey* Although the Moravians sent out missionaries in the early part of the eighteenth century, Englishman William Carey (1761-1834) is considered the founder of modern Protestant missions. He was a self-educated shoemaker. In 1779, through the efforts of a fellow apprentice shoemaker, Carey was converted. He became a dissenter and, in 1783, was baptized as a believer. He became the pastor of the Moulton Baptist Chapel (1786) and later the pastor of the Baptist church at Harvey Lane (1789; Eerdmans', p. 548).

In 1792, Carey published *An Enquiry into the Obligation of the Christians to use Means for The Conversion of the Heathen*. In it, He argued that the Great Commission to preach the gospel to every creature applied to all Christians (Eerdmans', p. 548). At a ministers' meeting, when Carey asked, "Have the churches of Christ done all that they ought to have done for the heathen nations?" (Mild, p. 25), John Ryland told him, "Young man, sit down, sit down. You are an enthusiast. When God pleases to convert the heathen, he will do it without your aid or mine" (Houghton, p. 203). In the same year, he preached a sermon in which he urged Christians to "expect great things from God and attempt great things for God." As a direct result of that sermon, a Missionary Society was founded in October 1792 (Eerdmans', p. 548). It was named The Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen and was later shortened to Baptist Missionary Society (González, II, p. 306).

In 1793, Carey and his family sailed to India. He served in India until the day he died. He translated the New Testament into Bengali. By 1824, he had supervised six complete and 24 partial translations of the Bible as well as publishing grammars, dictionaries, and translations of eastern books. He instituted mission schools, conceived of the Serampore College, founded the Agricultural Society of India (1920), and took a leading role for the abolition of widow-burning, which succeeded in 1829 (Eerdmans', p. 548).

*Mission Societies* The Scottish Presbyterians founded the Scottish Missionary Society (1796) and the Glasgow Missionary Society (1797). The evangelicals in the Church of England founded the Church Missionary Society (1799). The Methodists founded the Wesleyan Missionary Society (1817). In 1865, Hudson Taylor founded the China Inland Mission as a faith mission and by 1890, it embraced 40% of the missionaries in China (Cairns, p. 402).

*Other Missionaries* Other well-known missionaries include David Livingstone of Scotland (1813-1873), who crossed Africa from East to West and wrote *Missionary Travels* (1857) and John Patton of Scotland (1824-1907), who went to the New Hebrides islands (Houghton, p. 205). See also the story of Hudson Taylor below.

## The Plymouth Brethren

*Distinctive* In 1825, Edward Cronin, who lived in Dublin, Ireland, was disturbed by the divisions within Protestantism; he saw no place for denominationalism. He also felt a growing repugnancy to a one-person ministry. It was not that he denied the responsibility for teaching the Word might be restricted to one gifted individual. It was that he thought the Spirit of God should be able to use whom He would to edify believers in a church meeting. Because of his views, he was informed that he was no longer allowed to partake of the Lord's Supper without membership in the church. He says he was "left exposed to the charges of irreligion and antinomianism." He was publicly denounced from the pulpit by one of the pastors in Dublin (Ironsides, pp. 10-12).

Edward Wilson, who was assistant secretary to the Bible Society, protested the treatment of Cronin and he too left the church. Cronin and Wilson began to meet in Wilson's home for the breaking of bread and prayer. Others began meeting with them. This little group believed in the unity of the body of Christ and in the presence of the Holy Spirit to direct the ministry. This meeting in Dublin in 1825 is said to be the beginning of what became known as the Plymouth Brethren (Ironsides, p. 12).

From the beginning, they refused any name that would not apply to all of God's people. Therefore, they call themselves Brethren, Believers, Christians, Saints, or used other terms (Ironsides, p. 9). Also, although they later became known for their emphasis on prophecy, the Brethren movement was not founded upon a particular view of prophecy. That did not happen until later. From the beginning, what marked them was their belief that they could gather around the Lord's Table without ordained clergy being present (Ironsides, p. 16). It was their "principles of gathering" that united them. Thus, the Brethren rejected all creeds, denominationalism, and ordained clergy. Because they believe that all believers are priests, they believe the Holy Spirit guides all believers and unites them in faith and worship after the apostolic model (Kuiper, p. 305).

*Dissemination* In 1827, John Nelson Darby (1800-1882), who at the time was a clergyman in the Church of Ireland, also began meeting with them (Ironsides, pp. 12, 16). In that year, he also published a tract entitled, "The Nature and Unity of the Church of Christ." As a result of that publication, within a few years, a number of "gatherings" similar to the one meeting in Dublin were established (Ironsides, p. 17, 20).

In 1832, at the request of B. W. Newton, Darby joined him in the work in the city of Plymouth. From 1832 to 1845, Plymouth was one of the chief centers of the Brethren movement. By 1840, over 800 people were part of that fellowship and by 1845, there were 1200 (Ironsides, p. 31). It was because evangelists and teachers from that chapel went to surrounding parts to minister to the world, that they began to be spoken of as "some of those brethren from Plymouth," which led to the nickname Plymouth Brethren, a name which they never accepted (Ironsides, p. 25). Nevertheless, they came to be called Plymouth Brethren because the city of Plymouth was prominent in their early days (Eerdmans', p.

520). Also, in 1832, a meeting began in London. It was in that meeting that the rapture of the church before the Tribulation was brought to light (Ironside, p. 23).

In 1837, Darby went to Switzerland, where he ministered and from there labored in France, Germany, and Holland; he preached in French and German (Ironside, pp. 24-25). He also organized churches in Canada and the United States (Kuiper, p. 305).

George Müller (1805-1898), the famous founder of a large orphanage in Bristol, was a member of the Plymouth Brethren (Cairns, p. 400). Müller did not ask for financial support, yet he took care of 2000 children (Houghton, p. 233). Samuel P. Tregelles (1813- 1875), who is recognized by biblical scholarship for his contribution to the study of the history of the Greek text of the New Testament, was also a Plymouth Brethren (Cairns, p. 400).

*Dispensationalism* The basic idea in Dispensationalism is that God has administered different programs at different times. The ultimate issue in Dispensationalism is that there is a distinction between Israel and the church. The origin of Dispensationalism is debated. Dispensationalists claim that the origin is in Scripture. Non-dispensationalists contend that it originated with Darby. All agree, Dispensationalism was systematized by Darby (see Ryrie, pp. 61-67, esp. p. 67; Vlach, <http://www.theologicalstudies.org/resource-library/dispensationalism/421-what-is-dispensationalism>, accessed 5/2/2014).

In 1819, while at Trinity College in Dublin, based on his study of Isaiah 32, Darby came to believe in a future salvation and restoration of Israel. He saw a distinction between Israel and the church. He also came to believe that the rapture will occur is before the Tribulation, after which there would be a Millennial Kingdom on the earth. He saw seven dispensations: 1) Paradisaical state to the Flood, 2) Noah, 3) Abraham, 4) Israel, 5) Gentiles, 6) The Spirit, and 7) The Millennium. He said his dispensational theology was fully formed by 1833 (Vlach).

*Division* For years, Darby and Newton (the leader of the assembly at Plymouth) were devoted friends and fellow-workers, but they became “utterly estranged from one another” (Ironside, p. 23). Their differences were theological. Except for eschatology, Newton viewed with extreme disfavor any departure from Puritan theology. Newton thought that Darby’s dispensational teaching was the “height of speculative nonsense.” He maintained that the church must go through the Tribulation (Ironside, p. 32). Darby accused Newton of sectarianism, clericalism, and erroneous prophetic views (Ironside, p. 44). There were also questions about Newton’s doctrine regarding the nature of Jesus Christ (Ironside, p. 51-55).

These disagreements led to the Brethren dividing into two groups (1848; Ironside, p. 39). The “Open Brethren” (Müller) refused to admit to their fellowship any who were convicted of holding evil doctrine, but did not exclude those who came from Mr. Newton’s meeting. The “exclusive brethren” (Darby) refused to admit to their fellowship any who came from an assembly where evil was taught, even if they themselves did not embrace it.

That division was only the beginning. Harry Ironside’s book, *A Historical Sketch of the Brethren Movement*, gives the details of one division after another. At one point in his book, Ironside says, “The rigid application of the exclusive principle of disciplinary action has wrought dividing this particular wing of the movement into eight clearly defined companies” (Ironside, p. 132). W. H. Griffith Thomas said, “The Brethren are remarkable people for rightly dividing the Word of truth and wrongly dividing themselves” (Ironside, p. 110). Charles Haddon Spurgeon said, “No people ever began with higher aims or nobler purposes, and none were more utterly disappointed this early promise by the spectacle of



unseemly narrowness and strife which it has displayed” (Spurgeon, *The Watchword*, June 1863, cited by Dollar, p. 73).

*Significance* Plymouth Brethren are scattered all over the world. In Argentina, they make up the second-largest Protestant group. They have had an influence out of proportion to their numbers (Eerdmans’, p. 521). In 1942, Ironside said, “The great majority of outstanding fundamentalist leaders readily acknowledge their indebtedness, in a measure at least, to the oral and written ministry of the Brethren” (Ironside, p. 7). Their views concerning Dispensationalism, Pre-millennialism, and the Pre-tribulation rapture helped to shape evangelicalism. In recent years, their emphasis on a plurality of leadership in each local church has influenced evangelicalism (Mead, p. 310). The writings of the Brethren have had a broad impact on evangelicalism and influenced ministers in the United States, such as D. L. Moody, James Brookes, J. R. Graves, A. J. Gordon, and C. I. Scofield (Vlach).

## The Irvingites

Edward Irving (1792-1834) was a forerunner of the Pentecostal movement. Dillimore, who wrote a biography on Irving, entitled his book *Forerunner of the Charismatic Movement: The Life of Edward Irving*.

*Minister* When Irving was 12 years old, he decided to be a minister (Dillimore, p. 22). At the age of 13, he entered the University of Edinburgh to prepare for the ministry. Four years later, he graduated with a Master of Arts degree (Dillimore, p. 30). In 1819, at the age of 27, Irving became an assistant pastor to the distinguished Thomas Chambers of St. John’s Church in Glasgow (Dillimore, pp. 30-35). He was now a Scottish Presbyterian minister (Cairns, p. 400).

In 1822, Irving became the pastor of the Caledonia Chapel in London. The church building held about 500, but when Irving went there, there were 50 in attendance. Within six months of his arrival, attendance exploded, including the attendance of notable literary figures such as Charles Lamb, Zachary Macaulay, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Thomas De Quincey called him “the greatest orator of the age” (Dillimore, pp. 45-50).

*Prophecy* Through the influence of a man named Hartley Frere, from 1824 to 1828, Irving concentrated on preaching on prophecy. The professional and literary people in his church ceased to attend, but the emphasis on prophecy attracted others from lesser walks of life (Dillimore, pp. 71-77). Irving convinced many Christians that they were too optimistic about the conversion of the world, because the Day of Judgment was at hand (Eerdmans’, p. 513).

*An Accusation* Because of statements he made in a series of sermons on the Trinity, Irving was accused of teaching Christ had a sinful flesh. He denied the charge, but what he said in his defense was contradictory. On the one hand, he had said, “Christ did not sin.” On the other hand, he stated, “His iniquities were more than the hairs of His head” (Dillimore, pp. 93-98). When he returned to London after a trip to Scotland, the London Presbytery found him guilty of heresy, primarily concerning the sinful substance of Christ. The elders and deacons of his church, however, insisted that they believed and he preached that Jesus was “very God and very man, yet one Christ” (Dillimore, pp. 112-113).

*Miraculous Gifts* In 1828, while on a preaching tour in Scotland, he met A. J. Scott, a preacher who convinced him that the miraculous gifts possessed by the apostles had been lost to the church because of a lack of faith (Dillimore, p. 104).

In the meantime, Scott, who had become Irving's assistant in London, returned to Scotland. On that trip, he tried to convince a young lady of the distinction between regeneration and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. This was the first mention anywhere in the Irvingite movement of that distinction. This lady, Mary Campbell, claimed to have come into a new and superior relationship with the Holy Spirit. Then she looked forward to receiving two of the apostolic gifts, namely, tongues and prophecy, which she intended to use in missionary service. Sure enough, she experienced a "seizure of the Holy Ghost" and uttered sounds that were incomprehensible to the people who heard her speak. This was the first experience of "speaking in tongues" in the Irvingite movement. The year was 1830. Mary asserted that she was speaking the language of the people on a remote island in the South Seas, the Pelew Islanders, a people about whom she had been reading. Later she experienced automatic writing (Dillimore, p. 121), claimed that she could speak Turkish and Chinese, and moved to London (Dillimore, p. 124).

Also, in 1830, Margaret McDonald, a semi-invalid in Scotland, said she received the gift of prophecy and her two brothers spoke in tongues. James, one of the brothers, then commanded her to arise and she was "healed." When Rev. McLeod Campbell visited the McDonald home to see if the speaking in tongues was real, he said they ought to be interpreted. At that, James broke out into incomprehensible sounds and his brother George gave the interpretation: "Behold He, cometh—Jesus cometh." Dillimore says during the early part of 1830, in the space of one month, many people claimed to have received the gift of tongues, the gift of prophecy, miraculous healing, and the interpretation of tongues (Dillimore, p. 122).

When Irving's one-year-old son became ill and seemed near to death, Irving proclaimed that "bodily disease is the direct infliction of Satan and therefore faith and power alone, should be employed as means of deliverance from it." Although they prayed and two physicians were called (probably by Irving's wife, while he was away), the baby passed away (Dillimore, p. 128). Irving believed that sickness was due to sin and Satan (Dillimore, p. 82).

The practice of speaking in tongues increased in Irving's church, but there were strong differences of opinion as to its origin and nature. Irving believed the tongues were languages (Dillimore, p. 134). George Pilkington, who interpreted some of the tongues of speaking, left the movement and wrote a pamphlet calling what was going on a delusion (Dillimore, p. 139). One pastor who investigated the situation concluded that the tongues-speaking was of human origin (Dillimore, p. 140). By September 1831, Irving's church was divided over these charismatic practices (Dillimore, p. 141). Nevertheless, it finally broke out in the church service itself and Sunday after Sunday was repeated. The traditional Presbyterians were outraged by allowing such proceedings in the house of the Lord. Some left, never to return (Dillimore, pp. 144-145).

*Robert Baxter* Then, a lawyer named Robert Baxter received the "baptism of the Holy Spirit," the gift of prophecy, and occasionally spoke in tongues, which he took for granted was an actual language. For him, however, the much superior experience was being "in the power." He had an unrelenting concern about impulses and impressions. His life was under the control of something mystical and uncertain. He was constantly looking for miracles. His moods were far from steady. His periods of joy sometimes gave way to confusion (Dillimore, pp. 147-150).

Baxter is also said to have received the gift of knowledge. In a sermon he preached on January 14, 1832, he predicted that in 1260 days, the saints of the Lord would meet the Lord in the air. In other words, he predicted the Lord would return on June 27, 1835. In the next several months, he repeated the prediction several times. A majority in the Irvingite movement believed the Lord would come not later than 1835 or 1836. He received other extreme and bizarre “revelations.” For example, he thought he should leave his wife as a judgment on her for not believing in the charismatic manifestations. Irving told him that if any man did not provide for his own, he denied the faith. Baxter did not leave his wife (Dillimore, pp. 150-152).

Irving declared that the “baptism with fire” would soon be experienced. Baxter received a revelation that said at the end of 40 days, he would be baptized with fire, interpreted by both Irving and him as a second Pentecost. When it happened, signs and wonders would appear, including the dead being restored to life. When he did not receive his expected “baptism of fire,” he dropped the idea of a little fire and thought of it as an experience in which all sin would be burned out of the soul. Meantime, he was experiencing many failures: revelations that did not come to pass, healings that did not take place, etc. Irving taught that miracles failed due to the lack of faith in the person on whom the miracle was to be wrought. Then Baxter met a man who told him that Irving’s views were utterly heretical. When Baxter asked Irving for an explanation, especially about “the sinful substance of Christ,” Irving plainly admitted that he taught Christ possessed a sinful nature (Dillimore, pp. 152-156).

Baxter faced the realization that his beliefs were wrong. He began to study the Bible again. He realized that he had substituted mystical impressions for logical thought. As he studied the Scripture, he was no longer burdened with concerns about impulses, introspectiveness, and uncertainty as to whether or not he understood divine directions. He discovered a biblically-based assurance and enjoyed a steady peace. His chief complaint concerning the Irvingite practices is that Irving demanded that the intellect should be inhibited. Baxter concluded that the Bible stresses the use, not the disuse, of the mind. Ultimately he concluded that the various manifestations, despite inexplicable features, were either from psychic activity or the working of Satan. He looked upon the entire movement as a “grand illusion” (Dillimore, pp. 156-158).

*Dismissal* After months of division in his church, the trustees decided they had to take action. First, they demanded that Irving forbid the use of tongues in the church service. Irving refused to do that, believing that forbidding tongues was to silence the Holy Spirit. The trustees then charged Irving before the London Presbytery with allowing church services to be disturbed by people who were not ministers and by females. On April 26, 1832, the London presbytery ordered Irving to stand trial. A year earlier, he had stood before them charged with heresy of the “sinful substance of Christ.” On the former occasion, trustees defended him. This time they were his accusers. On the morning of the trial, Baxter came to see Irving and told him he concluded that the seemingly supernatural manifestations were a grand illusion. The Presbytery concluded that Irving had “rendered himself unfit to remain the minister of the National Scotch Church” and he was removed from the church (Dillimore, pp. 161-164).

Irwin left his Presbyterian Church and 800 people followed him. They rented a hall and continued holding services. This church was very different from the former church. The prophets ran the church! Believing they were speaking for God, Irving had no choice but

to submit. When they moved to a new facility, they constructed a platform that consisted of six levels. The apostles sat at the highest level. Slightly below them were the prophets. Then in descending order were the elders, the evangelists, and the deacons. Finally, on the lowest level was the messenger—Edward Irving. To make matters worse, on March 13, 1833, the Presbytery that had ordained Irving put him on trial for his view concerning “the sinful substance of Christ.” Irving was found guilty of heresy and “deposed from the ministry of the Church of Scotland” (Dillimore, pp. 164-168).

*Difficulties* When Irving returned to his church, he encountered one problem after another. The prophets informed him that now that his ordination had been revoked, he had no ministerial status whatsoever. (The church “consecrated” him for ministry rather than ordaining him.) People left the movement, including A. J. Scott, the man who first made the distinction between regeneration and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Men such as McLeod Campbell, who were earlier inclined toward accepting tongues, lost all belief in them. David Brown, of Jamison, Faussett, and Brown commentary fame, who was once Irving’s assistant, left because he could not accept the charismatic manifestations (Dillimore, pp. 171-174).

There was the problem of tongues being an actual language. Mary Campbell became a missionary, but she was unable to speak the language of the people. The movement decided there were two types of tongues in the New Testament, the actual languages in the book of Acts and the ecstatic utterance of incoherent sounds in 1 Corinthians (Dillimore, p. 175).

Prophecies lacked substance. Many were meaningless. Predictions did not come true. Irving was forced to say that some prophecies were from God and some were from Satan and there was no way of knowing which words were Satan’s and which were truly from God (Dillimore, pp. 176-177).

Irving taught that sickness was either the work of the devil on the judgment of God. All that was needed for healing in every case of sickness was sufficient faith. Irving himself had two infant sons die. His wife was sick most of her life. Then he himself became the victim of tuberculosis (Dillimore, p. 178).

*Death* After struggling with his sickness for some time (and during which time he saw several doctors!), Irving died at the age of 42 (Dillimore, p. 189). Irving never received any of the charismatic gifts (Dillimore, p. 179).

After he died, Irving’s church in London gave birth to a new denomination. It became known as the Catholic Apostolic Church. Its churches practiced the gifts of prophecy, tongues, and healing, but they were particularly characterized by an insistence on the nearness of the Lord’s return (Dillimore, p. 191).

*Significance* As was pointed out at the beginning of this discussion, Irving was the forerunner of the Pentecostal movement. In his book, *The Pentecostal Theology of Edward Irving*, Strachan says, “The beliefs and experiences of the various branches of the contemporary Pentecostal Churches are so similar to those of Irving and his followers that one might suspect that they had been handed down by word-of-mouth or discovered like some Deuteronomy of the Spirit” (Strachan, cited by Dillimore p. 193).

Although the last apostle died in 1901, the Catholic Apostolic Church continues till this day (Kuiper, p. 305). “The New Apostolic Church of North America is a variant of the Catholic Apostolic Church movement in England” (Mead, p. 246).

## The Keswick Movement

(For a more detailed discussion of this subject, see G. Michael Cocoris, *The Five Views of Sanctification*).

*Broadman* The Keswick movement is named after a town in England, but it did not start there. Here's the story. In 1859, W. E. Broadman, a Presbyterian minister, wrote a book entitled *The Higher Christian Life*. It was the first book on holiness that broke down the prejudice against the subject among all the denominations.

*Smith* Mr. and Mrs. Robert Perisol Smith were born and bred Quakers. Eight years after they were married, they were converted (1858). When the joy wore off, Mrs. Smith struggled with being defeated by sin. From a Baptist theological student, she heard that the way of victory was by faith and from a Methodist dressmaker, she learned of an experience called "the second blessing." She discovered that when she committed her daily life to Christ, she had deliverance from the power of sin. Her husband entered the experience when she showed him Romans 6:6. They felt that "the Lord was able and willing to deliver us out of every temptation if we would but trust Him to do it" (Pollack, p. 13).

The Smiths began to propagate their view of the spiritual life. Robert wrote *Holiness through Faith* (1870) and *Walk in the Light* (1873). His wife, Hannah Whittall Smith, wrote *The Record of a Happy Life*. In 1875, she wrote *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*. It was enlarged in 1889. They also traveled around the eastern states speaking on the spiritual life. In the spring of 1873, Smith and Broadman were asked to speak to a small group of ministers and Christian workers in London. Thirty and forty at a time attended these breakfast meetings. In all, 2,400 ministers heard their message.

*Hopkins* On April 1, 1873, Smith spoke to a small group of 15 or 16, one of whom was Evan Hopkins. As a result of hearing Smith and analyzing 2 Corinthians 9:8, Hopkins declared that the Lord would not just merely help him, "It's that He will do all and will live in me His own holy life, the only holiness possible to us" (Pollock, p. 15). He called this his "May Day" experience. After he talked to his wife, she said, "I too took God at His Word and accepted Christ as my indwelling Lord and life, and believed that He did enthrone Himself in my heart" (Pollock, p. 15). Later, Hopkins became one of the most influential of Keswick leaders.

*Cowper-Temple* In the summer of 1874, William Cowper-Temple opened his country home, "Bradlands," for a conference. The stated purpose was to "have a few days of quiet prayer and meditation upon the scriptural possibilities of the Christian life as to maintain communion with the Lord and victory over all known sin." On July 17<sup>th</sup>, about 100 assembled, all by invitation, for the six-day meeting. Mr. Smith acted as chairman. At the close of the meeting, it was proposed that the conference be repeated on a larger scale. Sir Arthur Blackwood, a well-known Christian layman and head of the post office, proposed that it be held at Oxford University during vacation time when the dormitory rooms would be empty.

*Harford-Batterby* So, a few weeks later, between August 29 and September 7, 1874, a conference was held at Oxford. The Reverend T. D. Harford-Batterby, Rector of St. Johns in a town called Keswick, was present for the first time. At first, Hartford-Batterby did not accept what was being taught. On Tuesday evening Evan Hopkins delivered one of the two addresses from the story of the nobleman in John 4. He made a distinction between seeking faith and resting faith. That night Hartford-Batterby decided he would rest in Him.

Rev. Hartford-Batterby had invited the Smiths to Keswick. Three or four days before the opening of the meeting, Hartford-Batterby received a telegram saying the Smiths would not be coming, but he did not cancel the meetings. Except for the war years, there has been a convention at Keswick every year since (Pollock, p. 39).

*The Message* Traditionally, there has been a sequence to Keswick teaching that follows the days of the week. On Monday, the subject is the nature and effect of sin in the believer. Tuesday's theme is cleansing. Wednesday's subject is consecration. The believer must surrender unconditionally to God. On Thursday, the message is the filling of the Spirit. According to the Keswick message, *the spiritual life is a crisis* (Wednesday) *with a process in view* (Thursday). Friday's focus is service, the result of the sequence.

*Significance* Many well-known Christian leaders have been connected with Keswick, some slightly and others giving their full support. Although he only spoke at Keswick once (1892), D. L. Moody became a "strong supporter" (Pollock, p. 77-78n). He invited Keswick speakers to Northfield and Chicago. At first, R. A. Torrey, the superintendent of the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, and C. I. Scofield, who at the time was a pastor in Northfield, lodged "heavy protests," but later, they understood "the drift" (Pollock, p. 117). Torrey actually spoke at Keswick on one occasion. In 1904, while in England to conduct meetings, he traveled to Keswick to listen. Once there, he was invited to give the Bible readings because H. W. Webb-Peploe had been called away due to family illness. He spoke on his series concerning the Holy Spirit. Other notables include F. B. Meyer, William Murray, Grahams Scroggie, Donald Grey Barnhouse, Alan Redpath, Paul Rees, Wilbur Smith, John R. Stott, and Warren Wiersbe.

Through these leaders and others, the Keswick message of "total surrender" (a.k.a. full surrender, consecration) has had an impact on American Evangelicalism.

## Roman Catholicism

In the modern era, several things happened within Roman Catholicism that are of historical significance in church history.

*The Immaculate Conception* Pius IX (1846-1878) was pope longer than any other pope. In 1854, he pronounced the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the notion that although Mary was conceived through natural means, she was without original sin. He proclaimed it "by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority." No pope had ever defined a dogma without the counsel of bishops (Cook, p. 110).

By the way, in 1864, he issued the famous *Syllabus of Errors*, which condemned "just about every new idea proposed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It lists errors that Catholics are to avoid and oppose—particularly Enlightenment ideas about the supremacy of reason" (Cook, p. 111).

*Vatican I* In 1869, Pius IX convened the first Council since Trent in 1563. He decided the best way to deal with all the church's difficulties was to define papal infallibility as doctrine. The idea of papal infallibility was conceived in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, primarily to limit papal authority (the word "infallibility" also means irrefragability).

Advocates for papal infallibility use the same scriptural passages Leo I used 1400 years earlier to make the case for universal papal jurisdiction, which was a very different thing. Arguments from tradition were also used, but they were often texts taken from their

historical context. There was serious opposition to the doctrine of infallibility at Vatican I; nevertheless, it passed.

In German-speaking lands, a schism resulted. They formed the Old Catholic Church, which still exists. Hans Kung, a theologian who attended Vatican II, wrote a book called *Infallibility? An Inquiry* that raised serious problems with the definition of papal infallibility. Brian Tierney, a historian, published *The Origin of Papal Infallibility*, a book that asked how to decide which papal statements before 1870 were infallible and which ones were not (Cook, pp. 111-112).

*The Papal States* In 1929, Pius XI (1922-1939) signed the Lateran Treaty with Italy, surrendering claim to the Papal States and, in return, gained sovereignty over Vatican City (Cook, p. 113).

*The Assumption of Mary* In 1950, on his own infallible authority, Pius XII (1939-1958) defined the dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, which had been a long-held tradition (Cook, p. 116).

*Vatican II (1962-1965)* Vatican II was opened on October 11, 1962 (the 21<sup>st</sup> Ecumenical Council). Vatican II repeated the claim that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true church, although it recognized that other churches contain elements of truth. The primary purpose of the council was to update the liturgy and administrative practices. For example, Latin is no longer required in the Mass, except in the prayer of consecration. No changes were made in the doctrinal structure of the church (Boettner, p. 10).

## Men of the Period

### John Bunyan

John Bunyan (1628-1688) is known as the author of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678), an allegory of progress in the Christian life (Cairns, p. 341). It has been called the best allegory ever written and it has been said that next to the Bible, it is probably the best-known of all Christian books (Houghton, p. 161).

*His Life* After despairing over his spiritual state for several years, Bunyan was converted. He joined an independent congregation meeting at Bedford and soon after that began to preach there (Eerdmans', p. 392). John Bunyan was a Puritan. He was arrested, convicted, and thrown into the Bedford jail for having "abstained from coming to church" (Kuiper, p. 255), meaning he did not attend the Church of England.

The local magistrates would have released him if he had promised not to preach the gospel, but he refused to do that. "He declared that he would remain in prison until the moss grew on his eyelids rather than fail to do what God had commanded him to do." ("Helwys, Thomas," Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) The magistrates asked, "Do you not love your wife and children?" He replied, "Indeed I do, very dearly, but in comparison with Jesus Christ, I do not love them at all." He remained in the Bedford jail for 12 years (Houghton, p. 161; 1660 to 1672). Bunyan was jailed again around 1676 (Eerdmans', p. 392).

*His Works* While he was in prison, Bunyan wrote *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* (1666), which is an account of his own spiritual pilgrimage. In 1678, he wrote *The Pilgrim's Progress*. In it, Christian meets characters such as Evangelist, Faithful, Pliable, and Giant Despair. His hazardous journey takes him from the City of Destruction, through

the Slough of Despond, to the foot of the cross; then on through the Valley of the Shadow, Vanity Fair, Doubting Castle, and many other places till he finally crosses the river to reach the shining city. In 1682, he wrote, *The Holy War* (Eerdmans', pp. 392-393).

*His Significance* Bunyan wrote 68 books. His writings make him the most influential Puritan (Houghton, pp. 161-162).

### **Charles Haddon Spurgeon**

*His Conversion* Charles Haddon Spurgeon (1834-1892) was a hugely successful Baptist preacher in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in England. Although his grandfather and father were independent ministers, he was not converted until he heard a primitive Methodist preacher in January 1850 (Eerdmans', p. 529).

Spurgeon gave his own testimony of conversion as follows. "While under the concern of soul, I resolved that I would attend all the places of worship in the town where I lived, in order that I might find out the way of salvation. I was willing to do anything, and be anything, if God would only forgive my sin. I set off, determined to go round to all the chapels, and did go to every place of worship, but for a long time, I went in vain. I do not, however, blame the ministers. One man preached Divine Sovereignty; I could hear him with pleasure, but what was that sublime truth to a poor sinner who wished to know what he must do to be saved? There was another admirable man who always preached about the law, but what was the use of ploughing up ground that needed to be sown? Another was a practical preacher. I heard him, but it was very much like a commanding officer teaching the maneuvers of war to a set of men without feet. What could I do? All his exhortations were lost on me. I knew it was said 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved,' but I did not know what it was to believe on Christ.

"I sometimes think I might have been in darkness and despair until now had it not been for the goodness of God in sending a snowstorm, one Sunday morning, while I was going to a certain place of worship. When I could go no further, I turned down a side street, and came to a little Primitive Methodist Chapel. In that chapel, there may have been a dozen or fifteen people. The minister did not come that morning; he was snowed up, I suppose. At last, a very thin-looking man, a shoemaker, or tailor, or something of that sort, went up into the pulpit to preach. Now, it is well that preachers should be instructed, but this man was really stupid. He was obliged to stick to his text for the simple reason that he had little else to say. The text was, 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth.' He did not even pronounce the words rightly, but that did not matter. There was, I thought, a glimpse of hope for me in that text. The preacher began thus: 'My dear friends, this is a very simple text indeed. It says, 'Look,' Now lookin' don't take a deal of pain. It ain't liftin' your foot or your finger; it is just, "Look." Well, a man needn't go to college to learn to look. You may be the biggest fool, and yet you can look. A man needn't be worth a thousand a year to be able to look. Anyone can look; even a child can look. But the text says, "Look unto *Me*." 'Ay!' said he, in broad Essex, 'many on ye are lookin' to yourselves, but it's no use lookin' there. You'll never find any comfort in yourselves. Some look to God the Father. No, look to Him by and by. Jesus Christ says, 'Look unto *Me*.' Some on ye say, 'We must wait for the Spirit's workin'.' You have no business with that just now. Look to *Christ*. The text says, "Look unto *Me*.'"

"Then the good man followed up his text in this way: 'Look unto Me; I am sweating great drops of blood. Look unto Me; I am hangin' on the cross. Look unto Me; I am dead



and buried. Look unto Me; I rise again. Look unto Me; I ascend to Heaven. Look unto Me; I am sittin' at the Father's right hand. O poor sinner, look unto Me! Look unto Me!

"When he had gone to about that length, and managed to spin out ten minutes or so, he was at the end of his tether. Then he looked to me under the gallery, and I dare say, with so few present, he knew me to be a stranger. Just fixing his eyes on me, as if he knew all my heart, he said, 'Young man, you look very miserable.' Well, I did, but I had not been accustomed to have remarks made from the pulpit on my personal appearance before. However, it was a good blow, struck right home. He continued, 'and you will always be miserable—miserable in life, and miserable in death—If you don't obey my text; but if you obey now, this moment, you will be saved.' Then, lifting up his hands, he shouted, as only a Primitive Methodist could do, 'Young man, look to Jesus Christ. Look! Look! Look!' Oh! I looked until I could almost have looked my eyes away. There and then the cloud was gone, the darkness had rolled away, and that moment I saw the sun, and I could have risen that instant, and sung with the most enthusiastic of them, of the precious blood of Christ, and the simple faith which looks alone to Him. Oh, that somebody had told me this before. 'Trust Christ, and you shall be saved'" (Spurgeon, pp. 86-88). Spurgeon was 15 years old when he was converted. He decided that day to preach the gospel (Day, p. 61).

*His Baptism* Within three weeks of his conversion, after reading the Bible day and night, Spurgeon came to the conclusion that he should be immersed. In a letter to his mother dated February 19, 1850, he wrote: "Conscience has convinced me it is a duty to be buried with Christ in baptism, although I am sure it constitutes no part of salvation" (Day, p. 61). His mother later said, "Charles, I have often prayed to the Lord that you might be converted, but I never asked Him that you might be a Baptist." To which Charles replied that God had answered her prayers with His usual bounty, giving her more than she had asked (Conwell, p. 97).

*His Education* Spurgeon never attended college. Arrangements were made for him to meet the President of a college at a private home. A servant girl inadvertently put them in different rooms. After an hour or two of waiting, both left. Later, he decided not to reapply when he believed God spoke to him, "Seek thou great things for thyself? Seek them not!" (<http://www.patheos.com/blogs/borntoreform/2013/01/32-things-you-might-not-know-about-charles-spurgeon/#ixzz3AtjbfIFU>, accessed 8/19/2014).

*His Ministry* At the age of 17, Spurgeon became a minister of a Baptist church near Cambridge. In 1854, when he was 19, he accepted the pastorate of the declining London congregation (Houghton, p. 228), the New Park Street Chapel (Eerdmans', p. 529). A brochure from the church, now called Metropolitan Tabernacle, gives a bit of the history of the church. It was founded in 1650. In 1720, John Gill became the pastor. He pastored the church for 51 years (1720-1771). After Gill, John Rippon served the same church for 63 years. Spurgeon followed Rippon. He pastored the church for 38 years.

Spurgeon was immediately successful at the New Park Street Chapel. The 1200-seat auditorium was filled. London streets were blocked with traffic wherever he preached (Houghton, p. 228). He quickly gained fame for directness in his sermons, which some thought bordered on irreverence. He drew vast crowds to the Exeter Hall, filling the 4500-seat auditorium, while his own chapel was being extended (Eerdmans', p. 529). When he returned to his expanded chapel, it was too small. After a year, they rented the Surrey Gardens Music Hall, which seated up to 10,000.

In 1861, the Metropolitan Tabernacle, which seated 6000, was built for him. When they occupied the building, it was debt-free. He preached there from 1861 until 1891. It was always filled to capacity (Houghton, p. 228). By 1891, nearly 15,000 people were added to his church (Cairns, p. 401).

From 1855 to 1892, each sermon preached and afterward revised by Spurgeon was printed and sold in large quantities. When he died, the backlog of unpublished sermons was so large that the weekly issue continued for another 25 years (until 1917). He produced a monthly magazine called *The Sword and the Trowel* (Neh. 4:17-18), wrote dozens of books, and a large commentary on the book of Psalms, *The Treasure of David* (1870-85). He founded and maintained an orphanage and a college to train preachers (Houghton, p. 228). Before he died, 900 men were trained at the college. He also founded a Colportage Society for distributing Christian literature and many other ministries. “Spurgeon injected his playful humor, common sense, and gift for epigram into all his numerous works” (Eerdmans’, p. 529).

Spurgeon died at the age of 57.

*His Doctrine* Spurgeon was a “thorough Calvinist” (Kuiper, p. 265). He’s often been called “the last of the Puritans,” or “the last of the broad brims,” another name for Puritans. “Spurgeon gloried both in being a Calvinist (although he warmly supported Moody and Sankey) and in being a Baptist during the Down-Grade Controversy of 1887. Spurgeon declared that the theory of evolution was a monstrous error which would be ridicule” (Eerdmans’, p. 539).

*His Significance* Spurgeon was clearly “the most popular and greatest preacher of his age” (Eerdmans’, p. 539). His church “must have been one of the largest in regular session since the days of the apostles” (Houghton, p. 228).

In 1898, Robertson Nicoll, the best known of the nonconformist editors, said of Spurgeon, “The influence of Spurgeon was not of those that have passed or that can pass away like a dream. Even yet, people will explain his popularity by his voice, his humor, by his oratory, and the like. But the continued life and power of his printed sermons show that his oratory, noble as it was, was not the first thing. Our firm belief is that the sermons will continue to be studied growing interest in wonder, that they will ultimately be accepted as incomparably the greatest contribution in the literature of experiential Christianity that has been made in this century, and that their message will go on transforming and quickening lives after all other sermons of the period or forgotten” (Nicoll, cited by Houghton, p. 228). Few would argue with that assessment.

## **Hudson Taylor**

*His Life* Hudson Taylor (1832-1905) was the founder of the China Inland Mission. He was converted when he was 17 years old. In 1853, he went to China as a missionary with the Evangelization Society. Because of the shortcomings of the support system, he broke his ties with the CES, but continued as an independent missionary in China until his ill health forced him to return home in 1860. He completed his medical training and founded the China Inland Mission (Eerdmans’, p. 554). He then returned to China under the offices of the China Inland Mission (Gonzalez, II, p. 312).

*His Methods* Prior to Taylor, missionaries had been substantially confined to the coastal areas of China (Houghton, p. 207). Taylor’s desire and drive was to bring the gospel to every unevangelized province in China, but he did not want to divert funds from other

missions. So he resolved never to appeal for financial support. Inspired by the example of George Mueller, he decided to rely on prayer to bring in the necessary funds and depend on careful administration to conserve them. “This ‘faith principle’ did not rule out appeals for prayer and for specific numbers of missionary recruits.” He kept Christians at home, fully informed by his writing and preaching (Eerdmans’, p. 554).

Contrary to general mission practices of his day, Taylor accepted candidates who had no college training (Eerdmans’, p. 554) and he accepted from all denominations (González, II, p. 313). He also required missionaries to identify with the national people by doing such things as wearing Chinese dress. He insisted on local control of the work, rather than ultimate control of mission headquarters at home (Eerdmans’, p. 554).

*His Significance* Hudson Taylor founded the China Inland Mission in 1865 and by 1890 it embraced 40% of the missionaries in China (Cairns, p. 402). It was “the first truly interdenominational foreign mission and the prototype of the ‘faith’ missions that grew to play so prominent a part in world evangelization during the nineteenth century” (Eerdmans’, p. 554).

In 1932, Hudson Taylor’s son (Howard) and his daughter-in-law wrote *Hudson Taylor’s Spiritual Secret*. It contains a brief narrative of Taylor’s life with a focus on his “secret” to spiritual peace and strength. They said, “Taylor had many secrets, for he was always going on with God, yet they were but one—the simple, profound secret of drawing for every need, temporal or spiritual, upon ‘the fathomless wealth of Christ.’” *Hudson Taylor’s Spiritual Secret* is considered a Christian classic.

**Summary:** During the period of the Reformed Church in England, Protestantism split and splintered even further into groups, such as the Puritans, the Separatists, the Baptists, the Quakers, the Pietists, the Methodists, the Rationalists, the Plymouth Brethren, and the Irvingites, and movements such as rationalism, the missions movement, and the Keswick movement arose and spread.

The Roman Catholic Churches and the Reformed Churches are national churches; the national government is involved in these “state” churches by financially supporting them through taxation, approving bishops, etc. The Catholic Church is the national Church of Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, etc. The Lutheran Church is the national Church of Germany, etc. The Presbyterian Church is the national Church of Scotland. The Anglican Church is the national Church of England.

The Puritans wanted to purify the Anglican Church, but they wanted to remain part of it. The Separatists wanted to separate from the Anglican Church and have their own independent churches. The Baptists wanted independent churches that practiced believer’s baptism, instead of infant Baptism.



# THE AMERICAN CHURCH

The seventh and last period of church history is the period of the American Church. It begins with the arrival of the Roman Catholics on Columbus' second voyage to America (1494) and continues to the present. In terms of the time, it overlaps the Modern Church Period, which focused mainly on England.

## Denominationalism

*Roman Catholicism* The Spaniards had flourishing settlements in the West Indies, Mexico, and Central and South America before any other European nation had colonies in the Western Hemisphere (Kuiper, p. 326). The earliest expeditions were from Spain, Portugal, and France—all Roman Catholic nations. Thus, the first church planted in North and South America was the Roman Catholic Church.

In 1513, the Spanish explorer Ponce de Leon claimed Florida for Spain. In 1564, a group of Huguenots (French Protestants) established a colony near what is now Jacksonville. Philip II, the King of Spain, sent Pedro Menendez de Avilés to drive the French from Florida. Menendez founded St. Augustine and massacred the French ([www.thehistoryprofessor.us/bin/histprof/misc/augustinefl.html](http://www.thehistoryprofessor.us/bin/histprof/misc/augustinefl.html), accessed May 13, 2014). Menendez then reported that he had hanged 142 people, attaching to each one an inscription that read “Not as Frenchmen but as heretics” (Kuiper, p. 326). Thus, the earliest church established on the North American continent is said to be a Roman Catholic Church in St. Augustine, Florida (est. September 8, 1565)—before there was even a Protestant baptism in America.

The Spaniards occupied territory mainly in the southern part of the country, that is, in Florida, and later New Mexico, Arizona, and California (Cairns, p. 364). In 1634, Roman Catholics from England founded Maryland (Mead, p. 83). The French Catholics settled in the north along the St. Lawrence River in Canada. Quebec was settled in 1608 and Montreal in 1644.

By the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, all the territory beyond the Alleghenies was under French influence. The southwest was ruled by Spain. The Roman Catholic Church was supreme. Only a narrow ribbon along the Atlantic coast was Protestant. At that point, it looked as if Catholicism would rule the continent, but the British conquest of Canada in 1759 and later the concession of Louisiana and Texas to the United States changed the balance of power in North America from Catholicism to Protestantism.

“The Roman Catholic Church is the largest single religious body in the United States and has the oldest continuous institutional existence. Nearly one in four Americans is a member of the Catholic Church” (Mead, p. 94).

*The Protestant Episcopal Church* The Church of England was the first Protestant church established in America. A service was held under Sir Francis Drake in California as early as 1578 (Mead, p. 103). Clergymen accompanied the expedition of Sir Walter Raleigh in 1587. The first English baptisms were conducted in Raleigh's colony on the Outer Banks of North Carolina (Mead, p. 103).

In 1607, the Virginia Company sent settlers to Jamestown, Virginia. Provision was made for the establishment of the Anglican Church (Cairns, p. 359). The Church of England was the only church recognized in the early period in Virginia. When New York, settled by the Dutch, became an English territory in 1664, the Church of England was established and soon became the official church of the colony, although other Protestant churches were not forbidden.

In 1693, William and Mary College was founded in Virginia. It was named in honor of the reigning English monarchs King William III and Queen Mary II. It was founded as an Anglican institution. Professors were required to declare allegiance to the Thirty-Nine Articles and students were required to be members of the Anglican Church.

In 1702, despite the opposition of the Roman Catholics, the Anglican Church became the established church of Maryland. It also became the established church in South Carolina (1706), North Carolina (1715), and Georgia (1758). This pattern did not change until the American Revolution (Cairns, p. 360).

Two-thirds of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Episcopalians (Kuiper, p. 348), but the American Revolution almost destroyed the Church of England in America. At his ordination, every clergyman of the Church of England was required to take an oath of allegiance to the British crown. So when the Revolution broke out, the Church of England clergymen had to choose whether to flee to England or Canada, remain in the colonies as a Loyalist and face opposition, or break their vow of allegiance (Mead, p. 103). At the close of the Revolution, many Episcopal clergymen left the country.

In 1783, a conference of their churches was held in Annapolis, Maryland and they formally adopted the name "Protestant Episcopal Church." They called themselves Protestant to distinguish themselves from Roman Catholicism and Episcopal to distinguish themselves from the Presbyterians and Congregationalists (Mead, p. 103).

*The Congregational Churches* In 1620, one hundred and two men, women, and children called "Pilgrims" sailed for two months across the Atlantic on the Mayflower before reaching Cape Cod. They established the Plymouth Colony in New England. Within six months, half of the company had died (Houghton, pp. 169-170). The Pilgrims were English Separatists (Kuiper, p. 327), who had left England and had lived in Leiden in the Netherlands (Eerdmans', p. 389). They were Congregationalists (Independents). In fact, the Mayflower Compact was an extension of the covenant idea of the Separatists applied to civil government (Cairns, p. 361). They established a "theocratic" government based on biblical law and Calvinism (Mead, p. 126).

As the Church of England was the state church of Virginia, so the Congregational Church was the established church in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Everyone was taxed for the support of the church and only church members could vote in elections. Not until 1818 in Connecticut and 1833 in Massachusetts were church and state separated, and church financial support made entirely voluntary.

Between 1630 and 1640, 20,000 more Puritans, mostly Congregationalists, joined them (Mead, p. 126). The Congregationalists founded Harvard (1636), Yale (1707), and Dartmouth (1769; Mead, p. 127) Universities.

*The Reformed Churches* New York was first occupied by the Dutch as a trading post in 1613. It did not become a town with permanent settlers until 1623. The colony was first called "New Netherland" and the city was called "New Amsterdam." The first church was organized in 1628 under the name of The Reformed Protestant Dutch Church (Kuiper, p.

329). During the Dutch supremacy, it was the official church of the colony. In 1664, the colony was taken by Great Britain, renamed New York, and the Church of England became the state religion, but the Dutch Reformed Church was allowed to continue unhindered (Kuiper, p. 330). In 1867, the word “Dutch” was omitted from the official title and it became the Reformed Church in America.

Actually, there are four Reformed Church denominations in the United States. The first (the one just mentioned) is The Reformed Church in America (founded 1792). Robert H. Schuller, the famous pastor of the Crystal Cathedral in Garden Grove, California, was a member of this denomination (Mead, p. 145). The second Reformed denomination is The Christian Reformed Church in North America (founded 1857), which was organized by Dutch immigrants in Michigan in 1847. From 1850 to 1857, it was affiliated with the Reformed Church in America, but split with them over matters of doctrine and discipline. They produce the “Back to God Hour” radio broadcasts and operate Calvin College and Calvin Theological Seminary (Mead, pp. 133-134). The third is the Netherlands Reformed Congregations in North America (founded 1907), which broke away from the Christian Reformed Church over doctrinal differences (Mead, p. 139). The fourth is the Protestant Reformed Churches in America (founded 1926), which is also a split-off of the Christian Reformed Church as a result of a disagreement over the doctrine of common grace (grace is extended in some measure to those who are not part of God’s elect). Herman Hersema (1886-1965) taught grace is for the elect alone (Mead, p. 143). Efforts have been made to unite these four Reformed churches into one body without success.

All Reformed churches hold to the Calvinistic system of doctrine, teach the Heidelberg Catechism, and are organized around a similar plan to the Presbyterians, but with different names for their ecclesiastical bodies.

*The Baptist Churches* “The Baptists comprise one of the largest and most diverse groupings of Christians in the United States” (Mead, p. 181). The first Baptist church in America was established in Rhode Island. The story begins with Roger Williams (ca. 1603-1583). He graduated from Cambridge University and became an Anglican pastor, but he soon adopted Separatist views. In 1631, he went to Boston and from there to Plymouth, because he thought the Boston church had not purified itself sufficiently (Cairns, pp. 362-363). In 1634, he was called to be the pastor of the Congregational Church in Salem. At the time, the Congregational Church was the state church of the Massachusetts Colony (Kuiper, p. 330). In 1635, the General Court ordered Williams out of the territory within six weeks, because “he upheld the Indian ownership of land, opposed the state church, and insisted that the magistrates had no power over a man’s religion” (Cairns, pp. 362-363).

Since it was in the fall and Williams was in poor health, the court allowed him to wait until the following spring before he left the territory, but when he began conducting meetings in his home, the court ordered him to leave immediately. To raise money, Williams took a mortgage on his house. He left his wife and two children in Salem and for fourteen weeks wandered about in deep snow in the forest. Finally, Indians he had befriended in Plymouth took him in. That summer (1636), he purchased land from the Indians, his family and friends came from Massachusetts, and they founded the town of Providence.

In 1639, a church was formed in Providence and all the members were baptized as believers by immersion, including Williams (Houghton, p. 216). This is generally considered to be the first Baptist church in America (Cairns, p. 363; Mild, 11; a Baptist

church in Newport, Rhode Island and the one in Providence still dispute over the title of “oldest Baptist church in America”). After three or four months, Williams disassociated himself with the church in Providence (Mild, p. 10). He decided that perhaps the religion of the Indians was as acceptable to God as was Christianity and they did not have to become Christians in order to be saved. Eventually, he concluded that all churches were false and that the Bible was to be understood purely spiritual terms (González, II, p. 225).

When the government of Rhode Island was set up in 1647, among other things, it was founded on the separation of church and state and complete freedom of religion. A number of *members* of the Congregational Churches in the Puritan colonies adopted Baptist views, including Henry Dunster, the first president of Harvard (Kuiper, pp. 330-331), but it was not until many years later that other *colonies* followed the example of Rhode Island (see “The Congregational Churches” above: 1818 in Connecticut and 1833 in Massachusetts).

Baptists did not flourish in New England because of persecution. In 1649, a Welsh Baptist pastor founded a church in Swansea, Massachusetts. Shortly thereafter, each church member was fined for worshiping God contrary to the established order (Houghton, p. 216). In 1651, while visiting Massachusetts, John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes, and John Crandall were arrested for holding a religious meeting at a home in Lynn, Massachusetts. The authorities were irritated because the three had preached against infant baptism. Homes received 30 lashes. Clark was fined 20 pounds (at least half a year’s salary) and Crandall was fined five pounds (Mild, pp. 12-13).

The half has not been told. Holmes was beaten so badly that for weeks he was not able to allow any part of his body to touch his bed; he had to lie on his knees and elbows. The cruelty of the punishment caused people to question what was done, including the man who was the first president of Harvard, Henry Dunster (1609-1658.59). Dunster, a graduate of Cambridge, was an Anglican who became a Separatist. Then he began to question infant baptism. In 1653, realizing that it would cost him his job and his status in the community, Dunster refused to have his infant child baptized. He was indicted by a grand jury for disturbing the ordinance of infant baptism and sentenced to public admonition. He was compelled to resign his office as president of Harvard.

Here’s an account of what happened next: “Dunster had contributed to the college a hundred acres of land, on which he had built the president’s home with his own hands. . . . Now, with a sick family and winter approaching, he received an order to vacate this home of pleasant memories. Dunster pleaded in behalf of his beloved family, but received little sympathy. Apparently, the Overseers were more eager to get the new president installed than to make the old president comfortable; for we find Dunster again addressing the General Court on November 16. It was a moving and pathetic appeal to their humane sentiments. Winter was coming on; he and his young family had no knowledge of the place whither they were destined; their goods and cattle could be moved at that season only with great loss; Mrs. Dunster was ill and the baby too ‘extremely sick’ for a long journey. Although the General Court of Overseers allowed Dunster to remain in the house until March, they constantly hounded him with new proceedings over his objections to infant baptism. This continued until 1655, long after the family had moved” to the Plymouth Colony (<http://more.mbu.edu/journal/volume-three/henry-dunster-harvards-baptist-president/>, accessed 8/16/2014).

In the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Baptists were persecuted in Virginia. A prosecuting attorney said to a judge, “May it please Your Worship, the men are great disturbers of the



peace; they cannot meet a man on the road but that they ram a text of Scripture down his throat.” Those charged were imprisoned. In prison, they preached every day from the window to the crowds which assembled to hear them. Many were converted (Houghton, pp. 216-217).

Baptists flourished in Pennsylvania and New Jersey because those colonies offered religious liberty and there they formed associations (Mild, p. 14). “Technically, there is no such thing as a Baptist denomination, because Baptists are strongly congregational in polity: each local congregation is independent of the others” (Mead, p. 181). But almost from the beginning, the Baptist churches in Pennsylvania and New Jersey held joint meetings to administer baptism, ordain ministers, and provide inspirational preaching.

At first, joint meetings were held quarterly. Then “associations” were formed. The first Baptist Association in America consisted of five churches and was formed in Philadelphia in 1707 (Kuiper, p. 332). By 1780, there were twelve associations of Baptist churches in the colonies and by 1790, there were thirty-five. Decisions made by an association of Baptist churches are not binding on individual churches (Mild, p. 14). Associations and later, national conventions were established to carry on educational and missionary work (Mead, p. 181).

In 1688, there were only 13 Baptist churches in North America (7 in Rhode Island, 2 in Massachusetts, 1 in South Carolina, 2 in Pennsylvania, and 1 in New Jersey), but by the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, there were upwards of 13,000. In 1768, there were only 10 Baptist churches in Virginia, but in 1790 there were 210! One of the reasons given for the rapid growth is that Baptist pastors, in general, adapted themselves to the conditions and habits of the people (Houghton, p. 217).

Baptists founded one of the first colleges in America. The Philadelphia Association of Baptist Churches sent James Manning, a Baptist minister, to Rhode Island to start a Baptist college to, among other things, educate future Baptist ministers. In 1764, Manning was the founding president of a college that was to become Brown University (Mild, p. 16; in 1804, it was renamed Brown in honor of a donor). Brown is the third oldest college established in New England.

Baptists fought for the separation of church and state. Baptists seldom became civic leaders in colonial America, because of the state churches, Congregational in New England and Anglican in the South. Only one Baptist, John Hart, signed the Declaration of Independence (Mild, p. 15), but when the Continental Congress met in 1774, Baptists were on hand lobbying from the outside to get religious liberty included in the discussion (Mild, p. 16). A Baptist preacher named Isaac Backus pointed out to Samuel Adams that the Massachusetts’ taxation of Baptists to support a state church was just as unjust as the British taxation of the American colonies (Mild, p. 17). On another occasion, Backus argued, “All Americans are alarmed at the tea tax, though if they please, they could avoid it by not buying the tea, but we have no such liberty” (Mild, p. 20).

In a meeting that was not part of the Continental Congress, John Adams actually defended the laws of Massachusetts as being “the most mild and equable establishment of religion that was known in the world!” (Mild, p. 19)! He later said, “They might as well turn the heavenly bodies out of their annual and diurnal courses, as (turn) the people of Massachusetts at the present day from their meetinghouse and Sunday laws” (Mild, p. 19).

Baptists were missions-minded. Adoniram Judson was the son of a Congregational pastor. After graduating from Brown University and Andover Theological Seminary, he

was ordained a Congregational minister. Partly as a result of his persuasiveness, the Congregationalists organized a mission society. In 1812, he and others sailed from Salem, Massachusetts to Asia to become Congregational missionaries. On the voyage, he translated the New Testament, a project he had started while in seminary. His translation work convinced him that baptism had to follow conversion and that it had to be by immersion. When he and his wife, Ann, reached India, they were baptized and declared themselves to be Baptists. Another Congregational missionary on the trip, Luther Rice, also became a Baptist. They resigned as Congregational missionaries and sought support from Baptist churches (Mild, pp. 29-30).

Because he had to return to America for medical treatment, Luther Rice decided to raise Baptist support for the Judsons, who went to work in Burma. For the next 20 years, Rice and Judson formed a partnership to make missions of vital force among American Baptists. Traveling up and down the eastern seaboard, Luther Rice challenged Baptists to support missions in general and Judson in Burma in particular (Mild, pp. 30-31).

Luther Rice's greatest contribution was getting the American Baptists organized for the support of overseas missions. In May 1814, by agreement of Baptist associations throughout the country, a convention was called in Philadelphia to create a national missionary society. After that, the mission society met every third year in May. (It was called the Triennial Convention.) When other national societies were created for the publication of literature or home missions, they also met in May, so that the delegates from various associations could attend all of the meetings (Mild, pp. 31-32). Missions united Baptists.

When the American Baptist Missions Society (the home missions society) was created in 1832, William Colgate was elected treasurer (Mild, p. 36). Colgate (1783-1857) was born in England and came to America in 1798, when his family immigrated to Baltimore. When he was sixteen years old, he left home to find employment in New York City. Having previously worked in a soap manufacturing shop, he told the captain of the boat upon which he was traveling that he planned to make soap in New York City. The captain told him, "Someone will soon be the leading soap maker in New York. You can be that person. But you must never lose sight of the fact that the soap you make has been given to you by God. Honor Him by sharing what you earn. Begin by tithing all you receive." In New York, he attended a Presbyterian Church and decided to make a public profession of faith. He wrote his father stating the chief points of his Christian beliefs quoting a "thus saith the Lord" for each one. His father wrote back, asking for the "thus saith the Lord" proof for sprinkling infants. After studying the Scriptures, William became a Baptist and practiced tithing. He established a soap business and became one of the most prosperous men in the city. He gave the tenth of the earnings of Colgate's soap products, then two-tenths, then three-tenths, and finally half of all his income to the Lord's work in the world.

Baptists split over the issue of slavery. There were abolitionists and slave owners among Baptists, even Baptist pastors. In the 1840s, the mission boards became the battleground for the Baptist fight over slavery. The Alabama Baptist convention voted to withhold funds from the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and from the American Foreign Bible Society until they could be sure that these agencies had no connection with abolitionists. Otherwise, they threatened to form a southern board. The Georgia Baptist convention deliberately created a test case presenting to the Home Mission Society a missionary candidate who was a slave owner. The board voted seven to five against his

appointment. When the Alabama Baptist Convention asked the Foreign Missions Board about this question, they received the same answer. In 1845, the Home Mission Society decided it would be better if there were two separate organizations. In May 1845, the Baptists of the South met in Augusta, Georgia to organize the Southern Baptist Convention (Mild, pp. 44-45).

In the 1850s, the Landmark Baptists arose among Southern Baptists. They took as their motto, "Remove not the ancient landmarks, which thy father hath set" (Prov. 22:28). Landmark Baptists teach that there is an unbroken, but hidden, line of Baptist churches from the New Testament to the present. They do not recognize non-Baptist churches, ministers, or ordinances. They refused to recognize alien immersion, that is, adult baptism by immersion performed outside a Baptist church. They practice "close communion," that is, they exclude from the Lord's Supper non-Baptists and even Baptists from other congregations (Cary, HCT, p. 104).

When I was in seminary, I was the pastor of a Southern Baptist church, where I first encountered Landmarkism. From that experience, I learned that they do not believe in the universal church. For them, the only church is a local church. James R. Graves (1820-1893) was a major leader of the movement. He repeatedly tried to get the Southern Baptists to adopt his views, but in 1859, the Southern Baptist Convention approved several resolutions rejecting Landmarkism. The followers of Landmarkism gradually withdrew from the Southern Baptist Convention to form their own churches and associations.

After the Southern Baptists formed their own convention, the other Baptist churches participating in the mission societies continue doing so until they formed the Northern Baptist Convention in 1907. The first president of the Northern Baptist Convention was Charles Evans Hughes, himself the son of a Baptist preacher, who was then the governor of New York and who three years later was named to the United States Supreme Court. He resigned in 1916 to run as a Republican candidate for president and was narrowly defeated by Woodrow Wilson. He became Secretary of State and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from 1930 to 1941 (Mild, pp. 49-50).

In 1922, rather than adopt a formal creed, the Northern Baptist Convention overwhelmingly voted to affirm "that the New Testament is the all-sufficient ground for our faith and practice, and we need no other statement" (Mild, p. 51). In 1933, as a result of the fundamentalist/liberal controversy, 50 churches withdrew from the Northern Baptist Convention and formed the General Association of Regular Baptists. In 1947, over the same fundamentalist/liberal controversy, almost 1000 churches departed from the Northern Baptist Convention to form the Conservative Baptist Association of America (Mild, pp. 52- 53). In 1950, the Northern Baptist Convention changed its name to the American Baptist Convention and in 1972, to the American Baptist Churches USA.

There are more than 30 different groups of Baptists in the United States. In his book, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, Mead lists 31 different groups of Baptists; there are other groups of Baptists in America not listed, such as the Bible Baptist Fellowship, the Southwide Baptist Fellowship, etc. The Baptist World Alliance, which was organized in 1905, now includes more than 40 million Baptists in more than 170 member bodies (Mead, p. 185). Besides the groups already mentioned (the American Baptists, the Southern Baptists, the General Association of Regular Baptists, Conservative Baptists) there are the American Baptist Association (Landmark Baptists), Cooperative Baptists (a

break away from Southern Baptists), Free Will Baptists, National Baptists (African-American), Primitive Baptists, Reformed Baptists, Seventh Day Baptists, etc.

If there are so many varieties of Baptists, what makes a Baptist a Baptist? Historically, Baptists believe that the Bible is the sole authority for faith and practice, that salvation is by faith, that baptism is of believers by immersion (versus infant baptism), that the church is a group of regenerated believers, that each church is autonomous (there is no higher human authority than the congregation, either political or ecclesiastical), and that there should be the separation of church and state (Mead, pp. 181-182).

*The Quakers* Because of persecution in England, Quakers sought refuge in New England, but found the Puritans no less persecuting than the Anglicans. When Quakers in Boston challenged the exclusiveness of Puritan control, the Puritans instituted banishment. In 1656, when two Quaker women arrived in Massachusetts, they were promptly accused of being witches and were deported (Mead, p. 160). When banishment failed, Governor Endicott ordered the death penalty. In 1660-1661, three Quakers were hanged on Boston common (Eerdmans' p. 43). Quakers settled in the colonies that had more freedom of religion, such as Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Maryland. In spite of laws against them, they also made inroads into Virginia (González, II, p. 220). Thus, when George Fox, the founder of the Friends, came to the 13 colonies (1672-1673), he found many Quaker groups already here (Cairns, p. 379).

In 1667, William Penn, an English real estate entrepreneur and philosopher, became a Quaker convert (Houghton, p. 173). In 1681, Charles II of England gave Penn, who was then a leader among the Quakers, the territory of Pennsylvania. In 1682, Penn organized Pennsylvania on the basis of complete religious freedom and invited the oppressed religious groups of Europe to Pennsylvania (Cairns, p. 380). For seventy years, the governors of Pennsylvania were descendants of William Penn. In the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Benjamin Franklin said Pennsylvania was one-third Quaker, one-third German, and one-third miscellaneous (Houghton, p. 174).

Quakers began to enforce strict discipline. Pleasure, music, and art were prohibited and sobriety, punctuality, and honesty were demanded. Dress was plain and speech was biblical. As a result, they won few converts and separate groups were formed, including the Hicksites (1827), the Wilburites (1845), and the Primitives (1861). Also, during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as a result of the revival movements, most Friends in the United States abandoned quietism (Mead, p. 161). President Herbert Hoover came from a Quaker family (Kuiper, p. 270).

*The Handbook of the Dominations of the United States* lists three groups of Quakers in the United States today: the Friends General Conference (founded 1900), the Friends United Meeting (founded 1902), and the Evangelical Friends International (founded 1990; see Mead, pp. 164-165).

*The Lutheran Churches* Lutherans came later and in smaller numbers to America than the other churches that originated in Europe (Eerdmans', p. 334). Lutheranism actually had its beginnings in America among the Dutch (Kuiper, p. 237). In 1619, a Lutheran Christmas service was held at Hudson Bay, but the first European Lutherans to remain permanently in this country arrived at Manhattan from Holland in 1623 (Mead, p. 113). So from 1623, Lutherans from Holland were conducting meetings in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam, which was later renamed New York. In 1652, when the Lutherans applied for permission to have their own church and pastor, the Dutch Reformed authorities objected.

In 1657, the Dutch Reformed authorities caused the first Lutheran minister to be sent back to Holland. The services, however, were quietly continued. Not until the English conquest of New Amsterdam, in 1664, were the Lutherans allowed freedom of worship.

In 1638, the first independent colony of Lutherans was established along the Delaware River at Fort Christiana, present-day Wilmington, Delaware, but most of the Lutheran immigrants went to Pennsylvania (Mead, p 113). After the Civil War, immigrants to America were mostly German, many of whom were Lutheran, with the result that in many Midwestern cities, the Lutheran Church became the foremost Protestant denominations (Houghton, p. 211)

Between 1727 and 1745, many Germans came to America, most of whom were Lutheran, but since they were poor and without pastors, they were slow in organizing churches (Kuiper, p. 338). In 1748, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg (1711-1787) united the pastors and congregations in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Maryland into the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. In 1820, the General Synod was established. The Missouri Synod was formed in 1847 (Mead, pp. 113-114).

As immigrants came from different countries, various groups of Lutherans were organized. At one time, there were 150 Lutheran bodies in the United States. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, consolidation reduced that number to fewer than a dozen (Mead, p 114). *The Handbook of the Denominations in the United States* lists ten groups of Lutherans. As a result of the merger of several Lutheran bodies, the largest and youngest Lutheran denomination in the United States is the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (founded 1988), but because it traces its history to the formation of the first Lutheran synod in America, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, it is the oldest (Mead, p. 119). Two of the oldest Lutheran denominations are the Missouri Synod (founded 1847) and the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (founded 1850). The Missouri Synod produces the Lutheran Hour radio broadcast and owns the oldest religious radio station, KFUE in St. Louis, Missouri (Mead, p. 122).

*The Presbyterian Churches* The Presbyterians in America sprang from two sources. One was the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, formed in 1560 by John Knox. From Scotland, it spread to the northwest of Ireland (where the population still remains Protestant). The other source was the Puritan movement in England. The Scotch, Irish, and English all helped form and build up the Presbyterian Church in America.

In New England, Presbyterian immigrants united with the Congregational churches, but in the other colonies, they organized their own churches. The father of American Presbyterianism is Francis Makemie (1658-1708), an Irishman who arrived in the colonies in 1683. He established preaching stations in the Scotch-Irish communities in eastern Maryland. Then, for several years, he went up and down Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas preaching in scattered settlements. Through his work and that of his helpers, a number of churches were established (Kuiper, p. 341). By 1706, he had organized a Presbytery (and association of churches) in Philadelphia. The first Presbyterian synod in the colonies was held in 1716 (Cairns, p. 365), with Makemie as its moderator (Eerdmans', p. 435).

In 1720, a "log college" was organized in a cabin at Neshaminy, Pennsylvania to train Presbyterian ministers and evangelists. Eventually, it became the College of New Jersey and later was renamed Princeton University. It produced revivalistic Presbyterian preachers, who played a leading role in the Great Awakening of the 1740s. They promoted

an emotional “new birth” revivalism, which conflicted with creedal Calvinism. Presbyterians split over this issue. The “old side” opposed revivalism, while the “new side” endorsed it. The two sides quarreled with each other until they were reunited in 1757 (Mead, p. 129).

The only clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence was a Presbyterian named John Witherspoon (1723-1794). He was the president of Princeton Seminary (Mead, p. 130).

Like the Baptists, the Presbyterians in America split over the issue of slavery. In 1846, the Old School assembly did not consider slavery a bar to communion, but the New School strongly condemned it. By 1857, several Southern New School synods formed the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. In 1861, forty-seven presbyteries of the Old School formed the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. In 1867, they merged to form the Presbyterian Church in the United States (PCUS). In 1870, the Old School and the New School bodies of the Northern Presbyterians were united on the basis of the Westminster confession. In 1983, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) was formed (Mead, p. 130). *The Handbook of the Denominations In The United States* lists thirteen Presbyterian Denominations, including The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) (founded 1983), the Bible Presbyterian Church (founded 1938), the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (founded 1810), and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (founded 1936).

Although there are a number of different branches of Presbyterianism in the United States, all hold substantially to the Calvinistic doctrines as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. The local church is governed by a board called the session, composed of the pastor and elders. The churches are united into a presbytery, the presbytery into a synod, and overall is a General Assembly.

*The Methodist Church* Shortly after his arrival in Maryland in 1760, Robert Strawbridge, a Methodist preacher from Ireland, opened his log cabin for services and formed a Methodist society. In 1765, Philip Embury started a Methodist society in New York. Thomas Webb, a British army officer who was helping Embury, sent John Wesley in England an account of what was happening and appealed for help. Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor volunteered to go to America (Eerdmans’ p. 452). So, in 1768, Wesley sent Boardman and Pilmoor as official missionaries (Cairns, p. 365). In 1771, Francis Asbury (1745-1816) responded to another call to help in America. When the Revolutionary War broke out, all the Methodist preachers, except Asbury, left the country.

In 1784, Wesley appointed Francis Asbury and Thomas Coke (1747-1816) as joint “superintendents” over the Methodist societies in America. At a conference in Baltimore, the American Methodist societies, contrary to Wesley’s wishes, adopted the title Methodist Episcopal Church. Asbury and Coke were made bishops. “This amounted to a declaration of independence; American Methodism now stood on its own feet as a separate body” (Eerdmans’ p. 452). Cook returned to England. Asbury, as Bishop, was head of the Methodist Church throughout the United States (Kuiper, p. 356).

“Under Asbury’s energetic direction, Methodism was adapted to the American rural setting. Circuit riders, preachers on horseback traveled the expanding frontier, went to mountain cabins, prairie churches, schoolhouses, and camp meetings, preaching the need for conversion.... The revivalistic flavor of the camp meeting, born among the Presbyterians, was adopted by the Methodists” (Mead, p. 219).

Like the Baptists and the Presbyterians, the Methodist churches split. The most devastating split was in 1844 over slavery. It was healed in 1939 when the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church were united to form the Methodist Church. In 1968, the Methodist Church merged with the Evangelical United Brethren to form the United Methodist Church (Mead pp. 219-220).

The *Handbook of Denominations in the United States* lists twelve Methodist denominations, including the United Methodist Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME), and the Primitive Methodist Church, U.S.A.

*The Disciples of Christ/The Christian Church* This demonization was formed from two movements, which were independent of each other. One was led by Alexander Campbell, who was working in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Virginia. The other was led by Barton W. Stone, who was laboring in Kentucky and Ohio.

Thomas Campbell (1763-1854), the father of Alexander Campbell and a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian, came to America in 1807. When his church refused to allow him to administer communion to those outside of their church, he decided to preach a non-creedal faith based on the Bible (Cairns, p. 418). In 1809, he formed the Christian Association of Washington County, Pennsylvania and published the Declaration and Address, the Magna Carta of the restoration movement. He argued that “schisms, or uncharitable divisions,” in the church were “anti-Christian, anti-Scriptural, and anti-natural” and “productive of confusion and every evil work.” His slogan was, “We speak when the Scriptures speak and remain silent when they are silent.” Based on that concept, he eliminated traditional church practices, including the use of musical instruments in church (Mead, p. 249).

Thus, the Disciples started as a protest against all the divisions in the church and a desire to return to the simplicity of the New Testament (Kuiper p. 358). They had no desire to form a new church or denomination. In fact, their purpose was to call all Protestants to unity through the proclamation of the Gospel in its original form (González, II, p. 242).

In 1811, the Christian Association became the Bush Run Church in Bush Run, Pennsylvania. In 1812, Thomas Campbell was joined by his son Alexander Campbell and they began to practice baptism by immersion. The nearby Redstone Baptist Association invited the Bush Run Church to join them for fellowship. From 1815 to 1824, the Campbells worked within the Redstone Baptist Association and later moved to the Mahoning Baptist Association.

Alexander Campbell (1788-1866) became the leader of the movement. He was firmly convinced that Christian unity could be achieved by returning to primitive Christianity as he understood it (González, II, p. 242). By 1830, the Campbells separated from the Baptists and were known as Disciples (Cairns, p. 418). Contrary to their original intent, they ended up formatting a new denomination, the Disciples of Christ!

Barton W. Stone (1772-1844) was a Presbyterian pastor who was unable to accept the Calvinistic doctrines of total depravity and unconditional election. He and other Presbyterian pastors left the Presbyterian Church (1804) and used the name the Christian Church. They wanted to be known as Christians based on Scripture rather than a creed.

In 1824, Campbell and Stone met for the first time and became steadfast friends. Campbell was publishing the *Christian Baptist*, and Stone began publishing the *Christian Messenger* in 1826. These two publications helped to bring together the two movements.

In 1832, the “Disciples” movement led by Alexander Campbell and the “Christian” movement associated with Stone merged (Cairns, p. 418), forming the Disciples of Christ a.k.a. The Christian Church. Today the official name of the church is the Christian Church (the Disciples of Christ; Mead, p. 250). There are other Christian restorationist churches, including the Church of Christ

Obviously, all of these denominations appear in all the states, but it is interesting to note that Boston was the center of Congregational churches, New York of the Episcopal churches (the Church of England), Philadelphia of Presbyterian churches, and Baltimore the headquarters of American Methodism (Houghton, p. 193).

## Revivalism

*The Great Awakening* Many say that the Great Awakening started with Jonathan Edwards, but George Whitefield believed that Theodore Frelinghuysen was the instigator (Eerdmans’, p. 437). Thus, it can be said that the Great Awakening began in 1726 with the preaching of Theodore Frelinghuysen to his Dutch Reformed congregation in New Jersey (Cairns, p. 366).

Theodore Frelinghuysen (ca. 1691-ca. 1747) was born in Germany, influenced in the Netherlands by Pietists, and came to America in 1720. Preaching with fervency, he put emphasized conversion (Kuiper, p. 344), a conversion with a heartfelt faith expressed in holy living. Frelinghuysen emphasized a faith that could be felt and that resulted in a sanctified life, but it was not emotionalism. Frelinghuysen told church members they were not truly Christians ([http://greaatawakeningdocumentary.com/archive/files/theodore-frelinghuysen\\_ca437da825.pdf](http://greaatawakeningdocumentary.com/archive/files/theodore-frelinghuysen_ca437da825.pdf), accessed 5/23/2014).

Frelinghuysen influenced the Presbyterian pastors Gilbert Tennent (1703-1764) and William Tennent, Jr. (1705-1777), who became fiery evangelists for the revival among the Scotch-Irish of the middle colonies. The revival that started among the Dutch Reformed and Presbyterians in the middle colonies spread to the Congregationalists in New England through the preaching of Jonathan Edwards. Presbyterians from the middle colonies also carried the revival fires to the South (Cairns, pp. 366-367).

Before considering Jonathan Edwards, it is helpful to know about his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard (1643-1729). Stoddard graduated from Harvard College in 1662. In 1670, when Eleazar Mather passed away, Stoddard succeeded him as pastor at Northampton in western Massachusetts. Within a few months, Stoddard married Mather’s widow, moved into his house, and took over his pulpit to become Northampton’s second minister. He was pastor of that church for 55 years. He and his wife had thirteen children.

Stoddard wanted to see people converted. He believed that conversion came through preaching and, rejecting the Puritan claim that no one could know for sure that he was converted, he believed that people could know when they were converted. So he decided to use communion as a converting ordinance. The Half-Way Covenant (1662) allowed children of *non-professing* members to be baptized, but they could not partake of the Lord’s Supper. Thus, they were halfway into church membership. In 1700, Stoddard published *The Doctrine of Instituted Churches*, in which he claimed that the Lord’s Supper was not a privilege reserved for the regenerate but a *means* of salvation for the unregenerate (Simonson, p. 34). He argued there was no biblical justification for allowing only



regenerate members to partake of communion. So, he allowed the “unregenerate” to partake of communion, provided their reputation was not “scandalous” (Dodds, p. 111).

Stoddard has been called the first great revivalist in New England. During his sixty years as a pastor, he reaped what he called five consecutive “harvests” (Eerdmans’ pp. 37, 39). Incidentally, in 1722, Stoddard published a pamphlet entitled “Answer to Some Cases of Conscience,” in which he argued that the newly fashionable hoop petticoats were “contrary to the light of nature” and that “hooped petticoats have something of nakedness” (times have changed!).

The point is that because of the Half-Way Covenant and Stoddard’s claim that the Lord’s Supper was a converting ordinance, there were unsaved people in his church. Into that situation came Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758). He graduated from Yale in 1720 at the age of 17. In 1727, he became associate pastor at Northampton (Cairns, p. 367). In other words, he became the associate pastor with his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard. Two years later he became the pastor.

In December 1734, Edwards preached a series of sermons on justification by faith, during which he urged sinners to flee from the wrath of God. Edward’s sermons were not emotive; they were careful expositions of profound theological subjects, but he did underscore the need for an experience of conviction of sin and forgiveness. Nevertheless, people began to respond with emotional outbursts (González, II, pp. 228- 229).

During the following spring and summer, the town was said to be full of the presence of God (Kuiper, p. 345). In his *A Narrative of Surprising Conversions*, Edwards said, “There was scarcely a single person in the town, young or old, left unconcerned about the great things of the eternal world. Meetings were thronged” (Edwards, cited by Houghton, p. 184). Edwards wrote, “Souls began to flock to Christ, as the Savior in whose righteousness alone they hope to be justified” (Edwards, cited by Simonson, p. 44).

To be more specific, the complete title of his work was *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversion of Many Hundreds of Souls in Northampton and the Neighboring Towns and Villages* (1737; titles were long in those days). As Edwards explains, in December 1734, the townspeople were unsettled by the startling conversion of several people, especially “a young woman considered to be one of the ‘greatest company-keepers in the whole town.’”

Within a year in Northampton alone, a town of some 200 families, approximately 300 people were saved. By the next year, the revival had spread to South Hadley, Suffield, Sunderland, Deerfield, Hatfield, West Springfield, Long Meadow, Enfield, Westfield, Northfield, East Windsor, Coventry, Stratford, Ripton, Tolland, Hebron, Bolton, and Woodbury (Simonson, pp. 45-46). During the first year of the revival, more than 3000 people were converted (Kuiper, p. 345).

Edwards describes conversion as a light dawning on the soul. He says, “In some, converting light is like a glorious brightness suddenly shining in upon a person, and all around him: they are in a remarkable manner brought out of the darkness into marvelous light. In many others, it has been like the dawning of the day, when it first but a little light appears, and it may be presently hidden with the cloud; and then it appears again, and shines a little brighter, and gradually increases, with intervening darkness, until at length, perhaps it breaks forth clearly from behind the clouds.” He also says the dawning of the light sometimes released laughter, tears, or loud weeping (Edwards, cited by Simonson, p. 47).

At the climax of *A Narrative of Surprising Conversions*, Edwards describes two conversions in detail. Abigail Hutchinson was an unmarried, sickly lady who was an example of the process people went through. First, they are convicted of their sin, seeing the misery of their sinful condition. Their consciences are smitten as if their hearts were pierced through with a dart. They sometimes fear they have committed the unpardonable sin and always have a “terrifying sense” of their sinful condition. In the second phase, they are convinced that God is just in condemning them. The third phase is one of calmness, followed by a sense of all-sufficient grace. Their thoughts were fixed on God and His “sweet and glorious attributes” (Simonson, pp. 47- 48).

The second conversion Edward describes is that of a four-year-old girl named Phebe Bartlet. She spent long hours in her closet, where she prayed for salvation and saw all manner of awesome visions. Her mother’s efforts to calm her were to no avail. Subjected to horrendous spells of weeping, she cried, “I am afraid I shall go to hell!” When she emerged from her closet, she explained, “I can find God now... I love God... Now I shan’t (go to hell)” (Simonson, p. 48).

In the summer of 1735, Edwards’s uncle, Joseph Hawley, had spiritual travail that took him into desperate melancholy. According to Edwards, the devil drove his uncle into even more “disparaging thoughts,” leading to sleeplessness, delirium, and finally, suicide. On June 1, 1735, Hawley slit his throat. After that, other people in town heard voices bidding them, “Cut your own throat, now is a good opportunity: *now*, Now!” (Edwards, cited by Simonson, p. 49). After the Hawley incident, the fires of revival burned low in Northampton.

In 1740, George Whitefield visited Northampton. He came on October 17, preaching four times during the weekend and once at a small session in the parsonage. By the way, after his exposure to Sarah Edwards, Jonathan’s wife, Whitefield, “went out wife hunting for himself. The next year he married a widow ten years older than he” (Dodds, p. 87). Whitefield preached in other towns and cities in Massachusetts for a month. Once again, the fervor quickened, this time “bringing manifestations even more bizarre than the earlier ones.” People “bewailed their sins aloud and groaned in fear and repentance” (Simonson, p. 49). There were strong emotional and physical manifestations. Strong men fell as though they were shot and women became hysterical (Kuiper, p. 345). Edwards steadfastly defended revivalism even with its excrescences (Simonson, p. 51).

Dodds, who wrote a book describing the Edwards family, says that Sarah, Jonathan Edwards’ wife, “went to pieces” in the month of January 1742. She experienced hallucinations, fainting spells, and sleepless nights. On January 29, she woke up trembling with anxiety over the fact that someone other than her husband was to speak in the church that morning. She was concerned that this speaker, Mr. Williams, might be a greater instrument for good than her husband. She thought that during this time, she was passing through a period of religious ecstasy. Her husband believed that what she was experiencing was a theological crisis, which is part of the process of conversion, the gate through which she had to stumble before she could share the full sweetness in the universe that God rules. At any rate, after this experience, she did begin to live in the assurance of salvation that she didn’t have to try to deserve (Dodds, pp. 95-106).

Other authors say similar things about Sarah’s conversion. While she was dwelling on God, she was deprived “of all ability to stand or speak; sometimes the hands were clenched, and the flesh cold, but the senses still remaining” (Edwards, Simonson, p. 52). “Her

emotions ranged from the dread over an eternal hell to the sweet piece of spiritual serenity” (Simonson, p. 52). Edwards thought if this was a distraction, he would to God that all of mankind were distracted (Simonson, p. 53).

Although unusual phenomena often followed preaching during the First Great Awakening, it was a much more sober type of revival than the Second Awakening. It was the counterpart of Pietism in Europe and the Methodist revival in England (Cairns, pp. 367-368).

In June 1741, Edwards preached a sermon entitled “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” in his church in Northampton, Massachusetts. People in his church listened lethargically and unscathed by the sermon and “strolled outdoors to talk about whether the sunshine would hold for the haying season” (Dodds, p. 91). The next month on July 8, Edwards attended a conference in Enfield, Connecticut. When asked on short notice to preach, he dipped into his saddlebag and hauled out the sermon he had preached to his own congregation the month before without causing a ripple of reaction. That time Edwards and his now-famous sermon made homiletical history. People “yelled and shrieked, they rolled in the aisles, they crowded up into the pulpit and begged him to stop.” One observer reported, “One waited with the deepest and most solemn solitude to hear the trumpet sound ... and was deeply disappointed when the day terminated and left the world in its usual state of tranquility” (Dodds, pp. 91-92). Kuiper adds that during his sermon, he had to stop and request silence that he might be heard over the loud weeping (Kuiper, p. 345). Edwards read his sermons, but his earnest manner and prayer had a great effect on people (Cairns, p. 367).

Jonathan Edwards was a key figure in the Great Awakening, but the major influence was that of George Whitefield (Eerdmans’, p. 439). From 1738 to 1770, Whitefield made seven preaching tours to America. He preached from New England to Georgia. Thousands were converted (Kuiper, p. 346). When Whitefield came to the middle colonies in 1739, the grounds for revival had been laid, but the revival flourished under his preaching.

At least ten percent of New England’s population claimed to have been converted, but eventually the fires of the Great Awakening completely burned out. Jonathan Edwards said that between 1744 and 1748, his church was utterly dead. During those years, not one person was converted (Kuiper, p. 346).

The revival divided ministers. On one side, the “Old Lights” led by Charles Chauncy opposed the revival, the itinerant evangelists, and the Calvinism of the revivalists. On the other side, the “New Lights” led by Edwards supported the revivals and a slightly modified Calvinism. This division eventually led to the development of a liberal group and an Orthodox group among the churches. Unitarians emerged out of the Chauncy group and split off from the New England Congregationalists. In 1741, in the middle colonies, the revival split the Presbyterians into two groups. The “Old Side” opposed the licensing and ordaining of untrained men to the ministry, the intrusion of the revivalists in established parishes, and the critical attitude of many of the revivalists toward the established churches. The “New Side” supported the revival and the licensing of untrained men who showed unusual spiritual gifts to take care of the new churches. The Dutch Reformed of New Jersey and the Baptists in the South also split for a time over what attitude the church should take toward revival (Cairns, p. 368).

Nevertheless, there were unusual results. Out of a population of 300,000 in New England, between 30,000 and 40,000 people were converted and 150 new churches

established. Thousands more came into the churches in the middle and southern colonies. Colleges, such as Princeton, King's (Columbia), Hampden-Sydney, and others, were started to provide ministers for the new congregations. Missionary work was increased. For example, with great personal sacrifice, David Brainerd (1718-1747) engaged in missionary work among the Delaware Indians in New Jersey. Many other humanitarian enterprises were started (Cairns, p. 368).

The Great Awakening began in Congregational and Presbyterian churches, but in the long run, it was the Baptists and Methodists who profited from it. At first, Baptists opposed the awakening, calling it frivolous and superficial, but the Awakening led many people to conclusions that were favorable to the Baptists. The experience of conversion raised doubts about infant baptism. As a result, many Congregationalists and Presbyterians eventually rejected infant baptism and became Baptists, including entire congregations. The Great Awakening also led Baptists and Methodists to the western frontier, where they established churches. Thus, those two groups became the most numerous in the newly settled frontier (González, II, pp. 229- to 30).

*The Second Great Awakening* By 1789, the Great Awakening had largely dissipated, mainly by deism brought to the colonies by British Army officers during the French and Indian War, by imported deistic literature, and by the French Revolution. Gambling, profanity, vice, and drunkenness were common among the students at Yale, who were proud of their infidelity (Cairns, p. 417).

The Second Great Awakening was the first of many revivals during the nineteenth century. It began in 1787 at a small college in Virginia named Hampden-Sydney. From there, it spread to Washington College and from there throughout Presbyterian churches in the South (Cairns, p. 417; Houghton calls what happened at Hampden-Sydney the "prelude" to the Second Great Awakening, p. 210).

In 1789, Asbury, the Methodist Bishop, created a unique method of evangelism by appointing the first circuit rider in New England. Soon there were circuit riders in all the New England states (Kuiper, p. 356).

In 1795, Timothy Dwight (1752-1817), a grandson of Jonathan Edwards, became President of Yale. In 1802, as a result of his lectures and chapel sermons, about one-third of the students were converted. From Yale, the revival spread to Dartmouth, Williams, and other colleges (Kuiper, p. 356; in 1802, Yale had 230 students, Houghton, 210).

The Presbyterians were the most influential in the revival on the frontier. They originated camp meetings, the most famous of which was held at Cane Ridge, Kentucky in August of 1801 with 10,000 present. "It was marked by strange physical phenomena, such as falling, jerking, rolling, dancing and barking.... Frontier revivalism was much more spectacular than the quiet, spiritual awakening brought about by the preaching of the Word in New England" (Cairns, p. 418). González says at the beginning, the Second Great Awakening was not marked by great emotional outbursts, but since conditions on the frontier were different, the Awakening became more emotional and less intellectual, to the point that it eventually became anti-intellectual (González, II, pp. 244- 245).

González adds some other interesting data concerning the Cane Ridge camp meeting. It began when a local Presbyterian pastor announced a "camp meeting" for the promotion of a deeper faith. Because there were so few opportunities to gather and celebrate, thousands showed up. Many, of course, came for spiritual reasons, but others came to gamble and carouse. "While some played and others drank, the pastors preached. A cynic

of the awakening later declared that at Cane Ridge, as many souls were conceived as were saved. In any case, the response to the call to repentance was surprising and overwhelming. While some wept and others laughed uncontrollably, others trembled, some ran about, and some even barked. The meeting lasted a week, and since then, many have been convinced that such gatherings were the best way to proclaim the gospel. After that time, when the words ‘evangelism’ and ‘revival’ were used, they evoke images of Cane Ridge” (González, II, pp. 245-246).

Camp meetings became common in American evangelism. They were held in every section of the West. Preachers delivered impassioned exhortations and earnest prayers. People under conviction of sin “sobbed, shrieked, and shouted” (Kuiper, pp. 357-358). Unbridled emotional response became part of the movement (González, II, p. 246).

Some of the Presbyterians reacted against the movement, but the Methodists and Baptists took up the idea and eventually developed it into periodic “revivals.” “Since such revivals became an important part of social life on the frontier, both Methodists and Baptists achieved rapid growth. Another reason for their growth was that they were willing to present the message as simply as possible and to use preachers with little or no education” (González, II, p. 246).

Like the Great Awakening, one of the results of the Second Great Awakening was division among the churches. When the Cumberland Presbytery ordained men without proper educational qualifications to minister to the increasing number of churches on the frontier, there was a division among the Presbyterians, which resulted in the formation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (1810). Their use of camp meetings, the circuit system, and their advocacy of revival made it one of the strongest churches of the frontier (Cairns, p. 418).

The Second Great Awakening indirectly helped the growth of the number of Unitarian Churches in New England. In 1785, the first Unitarian Church in America was founded. In 1805, Henry Ware was appointed to the Chair of Divinity at Harvard—in spite of his Unitarian views. (In protest, Andover Theological Seminary was formed by the orthodox Congregationalists in 1808.) In 1819, William E. Channing preached a sermon in Baltimore that laid out Unitarian doctrine. In 1820, the Massachusetts Supreme Court gave all voters in the parish, whether they attended the church or not, the right to vote on calling a pastor. Channing’s sermon became the doctrinal position of over one hundred churches in New England. These churches opposed orthodox Christianity and the revival movement. In 1825, with 125 congregations, the American Unitarian Association was formed. They held to the unity of God, the humanity of Christ, goodness of man, salvation by character, and the imminence of God in the human heart (Cairns, pp. 418-419).

Another result of the Second Great Awakening was improved morals on the frontier. Because of the revival, drunkenness and profanity were greatly reduced. Although the revival had begun among Presbyterians, the Methodists and Baptists won more followers because they did not insist on an educated ministry and they made extensive use of the camp meeting, which the Presbyterians ceased to use. In three years, over 10,000 joined Baptist churches in Kentucky (Cairns, p. 419).

There were other results. It was during this period that the mid-week prayer meeting became an important part of American Christianity. Between 1780 and 1830, in order to meet the need for more trained ministers, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists formed over a dozen colleges. In 1812, Princeton Seminary was founded. Mission boards were

established. In 1816, the American Bible Society was organized and in 1825, the American Tract Society was founded (Cairns, p. 419).

*Charles Finney* Revivalism did not end with the Second Great Awakening. Charles G. Finney (1792-1875) was a lawyer who was converted in 1821 and became a revivalist. His meetings in Rochester, New York (1830 and 1831) gained attention. He became a pastor for a time in New York City and, later in Overland, Ohio. In 1851, he became the president of Overland College (Cairns, p. 419).

Finney clashed with the Calvinists. Calvinists believed that revival was the sovereign work of the Spirit of God and, therefore, had to be “prayed down” from heaven. Finney taught that revival could be “worked up.” Calvinists believed (and still do) that an unregenerate man is unable to believe. Finney preached faith was an act of the will (Houghton, p. 219).

Finney’s “new measures” for revival included “protected meetings, colloquial language in preaching, unseasonable hours for services, naming individuals in public prayer and sermons, and the ‘anxious bench’ to which inquirers could come” (Cairns, p. 419). He has been called the pioneer of modern mass evangelism (Houghton, p. 219).

Finney was a postmillennialist who believed that churches of regenerate people would make such an impact on society that a perfect millennial order would arise (Cairns, p. 51).

*The Fulton Street Prayer Meeting* On September 23, 1857, six people gathered for a noon prayer meeting on Fulton Street in New York City. In six months, 10,000 were meeting at noon prayer meetings in New York. Between 500,000 and 1 million people were added to the church as a result (Cairns, p. 419).

*Evangelists* After the Civil War, the nature of “revivals” changed to urban, organized mass evangelism conducted outside church buildings in great public halls. From 1873 to 1875, D. L. Moody conducted successful meetings in the British Isles. In 1886, he helped organize the Chicago Evangelistic Society, out of which came the Moody Bible Institute in 1899. Successors to Moody’s new type of evangelism were R. A. Torrey, Gypsy Smith, Billy Sunday, and Billy Graham (Cairns, p. 420).

## Foreign Missions

*The Haystack Prayer Meeting* William Carey is considered the founder of modern missions (see “the Missions Movement” above). Foreign missions in America began in a haystack. In August 1806, five students from Williams College in Williamstown, Massachusetts, met in a field to pray concerning missions. When their meeting was interrupted by a thunderstorm, they hid in a haystack until the rain passed. Hence the name “haystack prayer meeting.”

*The First Missions Board* The haystack prayer meeting is often considered the beginning of foreign missions because, in 1810, some of its members established the first mission board, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). This is the board that sent Adonai Judson, a Congregationalist, to India in 1812.

*The First Baptist Board* As a result of translating the New Testament, Judson and his wife, as well as Luther Rice, became Baptists (see “Baptists” above). That resulted in the formation of the American Baptist Missions Society (González, II, p. 245).

## The Holiness Movement

About the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Holiness movement grew out of the Methodist Church. The Methodist Church in America had focused on conversion and church expansion, neglecting John Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, there was a renewed interest in it (Mead, p. 236). Phoebe Palmer, who experienced "entire sanctification" in 1837, is considered one of the founders of the Holiness movement in America and the Higher Life movement in England. She has been called "the most influential female theologian in Christian history" (White, p. 198).

*Phoebe Palmer* Phoebe Palmer (1807-1874) was reared by devout Methodist parents. In 1827, at the age of 19, she married Walter Clarke Palmer, who was also a devout Methodist. In 1828, Palmer gave birth to a son who died nine months later. In 1830, a second son was born, but he only lived for seven weeks. She wrote in her diary, "The Lord had declared himself a jealous God; He will have no other Gods before Him. After my loved ones were snatched away, I saw that I had concentrated my time and attention far too exclusively, to the neglect of the religious activities demanded. Though painfully learned, yet I trust the lesson has been fully apprehended. From henceforth, Jesus must and shall have the uppermost seat in my heart" (Wheatley, p. 26, cited by an article at <http://www.teachushistory.org/second-great-awakening-age-reform/approaches/phoebe-palmer-1807-1874-holiness-theology>, accessed 7/7/2014, author's name not given). In 1833, she had a daughter who lived. In 1835 she had another daughter, who died when the curtains around her crib caught fire. As a result of losing her third child, she decided, "The time I would have devoted to her, shall be spent in work for Jesus. And if diligent and self-sacrificing in carrying out my resolve, the death of this child may result in the spiritual life of many" (Wheatley, p. 32).

In the early part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, infant mortality rates were high. So losing three infant children was not unusual. Her response to it was. She concluded that these children died so that she could live. On July 27, 1837, she wrote in her diary, "Last evening, between the hours of eight and nine, my heart was emptied of self, and cleansed of all idols, from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and I realized that I dwelt in God, and felt that he had become the portion of my soul, my ALL IN ALL." She wrote, "In coming to the decision, I will be holy NOW, I took a step beyond any I had ever before taken. God is light. As I drew nearer to Him than ever before, He drew nearer to me. I had often entered into a covenant with God before. Now, by the light of the Holy Spirit, I saw that the High and Holy One would have me enter into covenant with Him, the duration of which would be lasting an eternity, absolute, and unconditional" (*Phoebe Palmer: Selected Writings*, p. 118, cited in the internet article at [www.teachushistory.org](http://www.teachushistory.org)).

Palmer became the teacher of the Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness, a weekly prayer meeting with Methodist women, which was held in her home. In 1839, men were allowed to attend these meetings, including ministers, Methodist bishops, and theologians. For example, urged on by his wife, Professor Thomas C. Upham, a Congregational theologian, accepted the doctrine of Holiness and experienced the "blessing." Palmer and her husband became itinerant preachers. Phoebe wrote several books, including *The Way of Holiness*. She and her husband traveled to Canada (1857) and England (1859), where they spent several years. (On the boat going to England, Phoebe criticized a Methodist minister for playing board games with the passengers, which is an

illustration of her strict ideas about how Holiness should be practiced. The minister assured Phoebe that while he did play board games, he did not play cards.) In 1864, the Palmers bought the monthly magazine *The Guide to Holiness*, which Phoebe edited until her death. Phoebe Palmer's daughter, Phoebe Knapp, wrote several hymn tunes, including the melody for Fanny Crosby's "Blessed Assurance."

Palmer's theology was a modification of Wesley's view of sanctification. "Palmer simplified and popularized John Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification, modifying it in six different ways. First, she followed John Fletcher in his identification of entire sanctification with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Second, she developed Adam Clarke's suggestion and linked holiness with power. Third, like Clarke, she stressed the instantaneous elements of sanctification to the exclusion of the gradual. Fourth, again following Clarke, she taught that entire sanctification is not really the goal of the Christian life, but rather it's beginning. Fifth, through her 'altar theology' she reduced the attainment of sanctification to a simple three-stage process of entire consecration, faith, and testimony. Sixth, she held that one needed no evidence other than the Biblical text to be assured of entire sanctification. Each of these changes was later incorporated into the pneumatology of the Pentecostal movement" (White, pp. 198-199).

Palmer placed all the emphasis on the instantaneous (White, p. 202). "The thesis of her first theological book is that there is a shorter way to holiness; "long waiting and struggling with the powers of darkness are not necessary" because 'THERE IS A SHORTER WAY!' In fact, the shorter way is the only way. She reiterated this idea in all her works, arguing for its truth from her own experience and from the Scripture. She told how she had lingered just shy of holiness, waiting for deeper convictions, which would enable her to ask for this grace confidently, only to find that she had been wasting her time. God did not require her to wait for the blessing. In fact, He had commanded her to possess it" (White, p. 202).

Palmer's "shorter way" to holiness was a three-step process: "(1) entire consecration, (2) faith, and (3) testimony. The first step to entire sanctification is entire consecration, 'a perfect and entire yielding up of all to Christ, an entire trust in Christ, and a continuous reliance on Christ, for all needed grace under every diversity of circumstance or experience.' It is a once-and-for-all surrender of 'body, soul, and spirit; time, talents, and influence; and also of the dearest ties of nature,' which must be reaffirmed daily. It is a determination that we give ourselves at once wholly and forever away to [God's] service. The second step to entire sanctification is to exercise faith. According to Mrs. Palmer, in 2 Corinthians 6:16-7:1, God promises to receive the offering of those who separate themselves from all evil through entire consecration. If believers entirely consecrate themselves to the Lord, they have God's Word that He sanctifies them. Whether or not one feels any different after devoting every area of one's life to the Lord, one must not question whether God has sanctified the heart. To doubt that one is entirely sanctified is to doubt God's Word. One must not trust feelings; one must trust the written Word of God" (White, p. 205). The third step is to tell others about your experience.

Phoebe Palmer's teaching is significant because of its influence beyond the Methodist Church. She pursued holiness as an ecstatic state. She was obsessed with achieving a mystical union with the Lord. "Religion was not simply a matter of creed or liturgy. It was something you *felt*." The moment of surrender was an overpowering experience. This was the "shorter way" to holiness (from the article at [www.teachushistory.org](http://www.teachushistory.org), italics are in the article).



Here is a sample of her experience after being entirely sanctified. In her diary for July 2, 1838, she wrote, “In the early part of the meeting, I *felt* an unusual shrinking, when the duty of speaking was presented. I *felt* desirous to avail myself of the opportunity, if assured of its being duty; but the enemy [Satan], *by repeated suggestions*, endeavored to darken my mind. I asked for the light of the Spirit, relative to the requirement, and then *abandoned myself*, soul and body, into the hands of the Lord.... I *felt conscious* assistance from on high, while speaking of the riches of grace manifested toward me in the experience of the past week. I sat down, *feeling* that Jesus was the strength of my soul. As the meeting progressed, rather an unusual backwardness was exhibited. I was *impressed* to tell them of the way in which *I had been led* into this wealthy place. Aware of the impropriety of always following impressions, without examining prayerfully the principles leading to action, I looked confidently to my Heavenly Father *for guidance*, and determined, if another pause ensued, to improve it. I did so, and found it peculiarly blessed, to be obedient to the *motions* of the Spirit. A plain path seems marked out before me—the path of obedience” (*Phoebe Palmer*, p. 135, italics added).

Notice the repeated emphasis on feelings, the mention of the suggestions of Satan, the idea of being led, the notion of abandoning oneself, and the obedience of which she speaks as not being obedience to the Lord as revealed in Scripture, but obedience to the “motions of the Spirit.” These concepts have influenced evangelicalism to this day.

*Keswick* “In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the National Holiness Association was born to promote Wesleyan-holiness theology. Three names are prominent in the promulgation of holiness theology: Phoebe Palmer; William Boardman; and Hannah Whitehall Smith” (M. J. Sawyer, “Wesleyan and Keswick Models of Sanctification,” an article online at <https://bible.org/article/wesleyan-amp-keswick-models-sanctification>, accessed 7/10/2014). William Boardman and Hannah Whitehall Smith were forerunners of the Keswick movement. Andrew Murray (1828-1917): was Keswick’s foremost devotional author, Frances Ridley Havergal (1836-1879) its hymnist and A. T. Pierson (1837-1911) its American ambassador.

*Holiness Denominations* The Holiness movement has produced several denominations. The most well-known are the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana; founded 1881), the Christian and Missionary Alliance (founded 1887, by A. B. Simpson, a Presbyterian pastor in New York City), and the Church of the Nazarene (founded 1908), etc. (Mead, pp. 236-248).

## Church Music

Church music has radically changed during church history. Here is an overview of sacred music beginning with the Old Testament.

*The Old Testament* The Old Testament has a number of references to vocal and instrumental music, including the Song of Moses (Ex. 15:1-18), the Song of Miriam (Ex. 15:20-21), and the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. 2:1-10). David’s harp-playing caused an “evil spirit” to depart from Saul (1 Sam. 16:23). David is generally credited with introducing instrumental music to ancient Israel and assigning the responsibility for it to the Levites (1 Chron. 23:3).

There are numerous musical references in the superscriptions of the Psalms and even in the Psalms themselves (Ps. 33:2-3; 150). Moreover, since all the poetic books (Job,

Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon) and much of the prophetic material are written in poetry, it has been suggested that perhaps these passages of Scripture were delivered with a chant. After all, the Psalms are poetry set to music.

“Israel used all the instruments known to Middle Eastern cultures of that period—lyres, pipes, harps, trumpets, and cymbals” (Hustad, “vol. 81, p. 407).

When the Temple was destroyed, the Israelites formed synagogues in exile. “It is uncertain when music entered synagogue worship, and it may have always been present since both scripture and prayer were traditionally chanted. It is presumed that this cantillation was performed by Levitical singers who brought their art and performance practice directly from the temple; it is also generally agreed that the only alteration was the omission of instrumental accompaniment, since that type of musical expression was associated only with the offering of sacrifices” (Hustad, p. 410).

Apparently, in the Second Temple, the one built after the return from the exile, a Levitical chant at the beginning of the morning sacrifice was accompanied by three trumpet blasts and the sound of the cymbals. At the end of each portion, the trumpets joined the singing to indicate to the congregation was to prostrate themselves (see Jer. 33:10b, 11a). It seems this liturgical singing was performed almost entirely by priests. The people in the congregation were “basically spectators, who may have been emotionally involved, but whose vocal activity was limited to such responses as ‘Hallelujah,’ ‘Amen,’ and ‘for his steadfast love endures forever’ (see Ps. 136)” (Hustad, pp. 408-409).

“It is hard to determine the nature of the Hebrew scale or the sounds emitted by their instruments.... The Hebrews never invented a system of notation, so we have none of their melodies.... We can know nothing of their harmony. Perhaps their singing, as well as the accompaniment, was performed in unison” (Vos, p. 68).

In short, David introduced music to Israel and all kinds of instruments were used, but *the people were spectators* and nothing is known about the melodies.

*The New Testament* The New Testament contains only a few references to music (Mt. 26:30; Mk. 14:26; Acts 16:25; 1 Cor. 14:26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Jas. 5:13). In Ephesians 5 and Colossians 3, Paul mentions psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. Perhaps, he does not intend a great distinction between these words, but is only emphasizing the rich variety of music. There is, however, at least a slight difference. The Greek word translated “psalms” means “a sacred song sung with a musical accompaniment.” Trench says it refers to the Psalter of the Old Testament. Hymns are songs of praise addressed to God (Robinson; Hodge). Spiritual songs are songs which are spiritual, that is, either composed by spiritual men or having spiritual things as their subject, but either way, it is talking about a spiritual song, because in this context, a spiritual man would compose a spiritual song.

“In comparing the first Christian music with that of the tabernacle, the temple, and the synagogue, the one essential difference is the completely congregational nature of the performance. From all the references given above, it is clear that musical worship was no longer sacerdotal, the work of priests or cantors. It was an opportunity for vocal offering by every believer!” (Hustad, p. 411).

In short, in the New Testament, the *congregation* sang different types of music.

*The Early Church* There is very little information available about the music used by Christians in the early centuries. In 112, when Pliny the Younger (a secular ruler) described what happened when Christians met, he said they sang hymns to Christ as a God (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, 3. 33. 1-4). Westin quotes Pliny as saying Christians recited “an

antiphonal (responsive) hymn to Christ as God” (Westin, p. 6). About 150, Justin Martyr described the Sunday meeting of Christians, but did not say anything about music (Justin, *1 Apol.* 66). At the beginning of the third century, Tertullian wrote, “The Scriptures are read and the Psalms are sung, sermons are delivered and petitions are offered” (Hustad, p. 411).

From about the fifth century, most singing in the monasteries and in the church meetings was delegated to priests; laypeople rarely participated. Following the tradition of the practice in the Jewish Temple, the Psalms were normally delivered responsively, either between a cantor and the choir or between two choral groups. The choir responded with the refrain, “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen” (Hustad, p. 412).

Although there is an indication in the New Testament that the first-century church might have used instrumental music (remember the word “psalms” in Eph. 5:19 means to sing to the accompaniment of a musical instrument), evidently the early church did not use musical instruments. “Both the Jews in their temple service, and the Greeks in their idol worship, were accustomed to sing with the accompaniment of instrumental music. The converts to Christianity accordingly must have been familiar with this mode of singing.... (see “psalms” in Eph. 5:19).... But it is generally admitted, that the primitive Christians employed no instrumental music in their religious worship. Neither Ambrose, nor Basil, nor Chrysostom, in the noble encomiums which they severally pronounce upon music, make any mention of instrumental music. Basil (330-379) condemns it as ministering only to the depraved passions of men” (Coleman, pp. 370-371).

The chant emerged out of the monasteries. Through his work to create a standardized liturgy, Gregory the Great (590–604) incorporated the chant into the liturgy, which became known as the Gregorian chant. It is known for its monophonic sound. Believing that complexity had a tendency to create cacophony, which ruined the music, Gregory kept things simple with the chant.

“Musical accompaniments were gradually introduced; but they can hardly be assigned to a period earlier than the fifth and sixth centuries. Organs were unknown in church until the eighth or ninth century. Previous to this, they had their place in the theatre, rather than in the church. They were never regarded with favor in the Eastern Church and were vehemently opposed in many places in the West” (Coleman, pp. 376-377).

Musical notation, which began in the eleventh century, allowed vast new possibilities for arrangements with an emerging multiplicity of sounds called “polyphony.”

To sum up: Little is known about church music in the early centuries. What is known is that about the fifth century the priests (not the laymen) in the monasteries sang the Psalms responsively, that instruments were not used before the fifth or sixth centuries, that about 600, Gregory made the chant from the monasteries a part of the liturgy, and that organs were unknown in church until the eighth or ninth century.

*The Reformers* The Reformers not only changed theology, they changed a thousand years of the practice of church music.

Martin Luther rejected the Gregorian chant. In *Table Talk*, he said he would rather listen to the donkey braying or the barking of dogs and pigs, than to listen to such music (musicologist Paul Nettl, cited by Barber).

Luther loved music. He was accomplished at the lute and the flute, and had a powerful tenor voice. He was so committed to music in the church that men had to demonstrate

competency in music before they could be accepted for ministerial training. In the Forward to Georg Rhau's *Symphoniae*, a collection of chorale motets published in 1538, Luther wrote, "Next to the Word of God, the noble art of music is the greatest treasure in the world. It controls our thoughts, minds, hearts, and spirits.... Our dear fathers and prophets did not desire without reason that music be always used in the churches. Hence, we have so many songs and psalms. This precious gift has been given to man alone that he might thereby remind himself that God has created man for the express purpose of praising and extolling God. ... A person who gives this some thought and yet does not regard music as a marvelous creation of God, must be a clodhopper indeed and does not deserve to be called a human being; he should be permitted to hear nothing but the braying of asses and the grunting of hogs." He also said, "Music is God's greatest gift. It has often so stimulated and stirred me that I felt the desire to preach" (Luther, cited by Barber).

Luther followed the main features of the Catholic liturgy, with a few modifications. He replaced the chant with congregational hymns. In 1523, he composed hymns, thirty-six of which have survived. He also used the Psalms and poems as the basis for many other hymns. In 1524, he published his first congregational hymnbook. He insisted that hymns be sung in every service because he believed the vigorous singing of simple hymns "could open the hearts and minds of God's people to embrace the Word of God."

In the preface of his first hymnbook, published in collaboration with his composer friend Johann Walther, Luther commends heartily the singing of hymns and psalms and spiritual songs "so that God's Word and Christian teaching might be instilled and implanted in many ways." He added that the songs in this collection were arranged "to give the young, who should at any rate be trained in music and other fine arts, something to wean them away from love ballads and carnal songs and to teach them something of value in their place" (Luther, Wittenberg Hymnal of 1524, cited by Barber). This hymnal contained 32 hymns, 24 by Luther.

Scholars debate whether or not Luther used a bar-tune when he wrote "A Mighty Fortress is Our God," which is a paraphrase of Psalm 46. His hymns did use secular folk melodies or new tunes (Hustard, p. 414). Barber remarks, "I have found that people's adverse reaction to the marriage of secular tunes with spiritual words comes from their personal dislike for such a practice, rather than from historical research. The idea that people have confused Luther's use of bar tunes with the fact that he wrote hymns using the metrical bar AAB or bar-form structure forgets that a particularly important class of chorales were the contrafacta or 'parodies' of secular songs, in which the given melody was retained, but the text was either replaced by completely new words or else were altered so as to give it a properly spiritual meaning. The adaptation of secular songs and secular polyphonic compositions for church purposes was common in the sixteenth century." By the way, Luther's "A Mighty Fortress is Our God" had a great impact on Johann Sebastian Bach, one of the greatest musicians and composers who ever lived. Bach was an orthodox Lutheran and a devout believer. "After his death, Bach's music was neglected. A century later, another devout believer, Felix Mendelssohn (1809-1847), re-introduced Bach's music to the world with a performance of Bach's St. Matthew Passion in Berlin in 1829. Today, Bach's influence upon music is overwhelming. In his Well-Tempered Clavier, he established the major-minor system, which supplies the tonal basis for all Western music. Also, Bach is considered the father of music theory and practice method" (Barber).

Did Luther use musical instruments? He is often quoted as saying, “Organ in worship is the insignia of Baal.... The Roman Catholics borrowed it from the Jews” and the source is that is often cited is “Martin Luther,” in *Mcclintock & Strong’s Encyclopedia*, vol.VI, p. 762, but Lutheran scholars routinely credit Luther with allowing instrumental music. Luther said, “Nor am I at all of the opinion that all the arts are to be overthrown and cast aside by the Gospel, as some super-spiritual people protest; but I would gladly see all the arts, especially music, in the service of Him who has given and created them.” One author declares, “Luther certainly approved of using instruments to enhance the music of the church’s liturgy, including the organ” (Charles P. St-Onge, “Music, Worship and Martin Luther,” 2003; see also Kurt J. Eggert, “Martin Luther, God’s Music Man,” 1983).

In a blog post, Jay Guin, a lawyer and a member of the Church of Christ (Churches of Christ usually do not believe in instrumental music), concludes, “I’m confused. The popular quotation, attributed to Luther, treating the organ as an ‘ensign of Baal’ can’t be easily reconciled with his views as interpreted by contemporary thinkers, many from within the Lutheran tradition. And it’s not possible to simultaneously attribute to Luther the normative principle of worship while holding him up as an opponent of instrumental music. In fact, I can’t find any references to Luther’s calling the organ an ‘ensign of Baal’ other than in articles condemning instrumental music—mostly from within the Churches of Christ. But I have confirmed that the statement is found in the *Mcclintock & Strong’s Encyclopedia*—in an article that defends the *a cappella* tradition” (from an article at <http://oneinjesus.info/2011/02/instrumental-music-martin-luther-and-instrumental-music/>).

At any rate, the Lutheran Church has a great tradition of choral and congregational singing. Organ music has flourished (Eerdmans’, p. 428).

Like Zwingli, John Calvin’s predisposition was to not have music in church—at all! However, during his stay in Strasbourg (beginning in 1538), he was impressed with the German metrical psalms and, as a result, he made some metrical psalm versions of his own. Later he commissioned the French court poet Clement Marot to set all 150 Psalms to meter. Marot did that without adding and deleting anything from the biblical content of each psalm. Calvin felt “only God’s Word was worthy to be sung in God’s praise.” Like Luther’s hymns, the Calvinistic Psalms used secular folk melodies or new tunes (Hustard, p. 414). Barber puts it like this: “Luther wanted the hymns of the church to reflect as closely as possible the exact words of scripture. Calvin went a step further. He felt that the singing of the express words of only the psalms, though he did permit the singing of other select scripture texts, ensured that Divine revelation was being put to music. The only notable musical contribution of the early Calvinist churches was therefore the Psalters, metrical translations of the Book of Psalms” (Barber).

Calvin did not allow the use of musical instruments. Commenting on Psalm 33:2, he wrote, “It is evident that the Psalmist here expresses the vehement and ardent affection which the faithful ought to have in praising God, when he enjoins musical instruments to be employed for this purpose. He would have nothing omitted by believers, which tends to animate the minds and feelings of men in singing God’s praises. The name of God, no doubt, can, properly speaking, be celebrated only by the articulate voice; but it is not without reason that David adds to this those aids by which believers were wont to stimulate themselves the more to this exercise; especially considering that he was speaking to God’s ancient people.

“There is a distinction, however, to be observed here, that we may not indiscriminately consider as applicable to ourselves, everything which was formerly enjoined upon the Jews. I have no doubt that playing upon cymbals, touching the harp and the viol, and all that kind of music, which is so frequently mentioned in the Psalms, was a part of the education; that is to say, the puerile instruction of the law: I speak of the stated service of the temple. For even now, if believers choose to cheer themselves with musical instruments, they should, I think, make it their object not to dissever their cheerfulness from the praises of God. *But when they frequent their sacred assemblies, musical instruments in celebrating the praises of God would be no more suitable than the burning of incense, the lighting up of lamps, and the restoration of the other shadows of the law.* The Papists, therefore, have foolishly borrowed this, as well as many other things, from the Jews.

“Men who are fond of outward pomp may delight in that noise; but the simplicity which God recommends to us by the apostle is far more pleasing to him. Paul allows us to bless God in the public assembly of the saints only in a known tongue, (1 Cor. 14:16). The voice of man, although not understood by the generality, assuredly excels all inanimate instruments of music; and yet we see what St Paul determines concerning speaking in an unknown tongue. What shall we then say of chanting, which fills the ears with nothing but an empty sound? Does anyone object that music is very useful for awakening the minds of men and moving their hearts? I own it; but *we should always take care that no corruption creep in, which might both defile the pure worship of God and involve men in superstition.* Moreover, since the Holy Spirit expressly warns us of this danger by the mouth of Paul, to proceed beyond what we are there warranted by him is not only, I must say, unadvised zeal, but wicked and perverse obstinacy” (Calvin, italics added).

In other words, Calvin considered the use of musical instruments in the Old Testament “shadows of the Law” that have been fulfilled by Christ and are therefore of no use in New Testament church services. Yet in his commentary on Colossians 3:16, he said, “Under these three terms (psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs), he (Paul) includes all kinds of songs. They are commonly distinguished in this way—that a *psalm* is that, in the singing of which some musical instrument besides the tongue is made use of: a *hymn* is properly a song of praise, whether it be sung simply with the voice or otherwise; while an *ode* contains not merely praises, but exhortations and other matters. He would have the songs of Christians, however, to be *spiritual*, not made up of frivolities and worthless trifles.” Amazing! Calvin rejects the use of musical instruments, but acknowledges that the Greek word translated “psalms” means singing with the accompaniment of a musical instrument! Is that not a New Testament warrant for using musical instruments?

Unlike Luther, Calvin “did not require would-be-pastors to pass a musical test before they could be accepted for ministerial training. That Luther did, and because his young men went on to start and to pastor churches all over Germany, and then throughout much of Europe, partly explains the early and rapid proliferation of the Lutheran style of music when no such comparable development took place among the Calvinist churches” (Barber).

Hence, Calvinist churches sang the Psalms unaccompanied and in unison, except in Holland where the organ continued to be used (Eerdmans’, pp. 427-28). On May 20, 1644, the commissioners from Scotland to the Westminster Assembly wrote to the General Assembly: “We cannot but admire the good hand of God in the great things done here already.... the great organs at Paul’s and Peter’s in Westminster (have been) taken down,

images and many other monuments of idolatry defaced and abolished, the Chapel Royal at Whitehall purged and reformed; and all by authority, in a quiet manner, at noon-day, without tumult.”

Barber concludes that the attitude of the Reformers was that “they objected to the distractions of elaborate vocal and instrumental music, the dangers of overly theatrical performances, the unwarranted expense of elaborate ceremonies and enormous pipe organs and the uselessness of text unintelligible to the common man.”

To sum up: Luther replaced the chant with congregational hymns, used secular folk melodies, and probably used musical instruments. Calvin felt only God’s Word was worthy to be sung, used secular folk melodies, and had the people sing in unison, but rejected all instruments in church.

*After the Reformation* As a result, English Protestants fleeing to Geneva because of the persecution under “Bloody Mary” (1554–1559), the exiled Puritans developed the Anglo-Genevan Psalter (1561). Thus, English-speaking congregations sang metrical psalms (not hymns) until the eighteenth century and in some instances, psalters reigned supreme until the middle of the nineteenth century. The first book printed in the colonies was the Bay Psalm Book (1640) (Hustad, p. 414).

“The Baptists were the first to introduce the singing of hymns” (Houghton, p. 265). Benjamin Keach (1640-1704) pastored a church at Horslydown that was probably the first church in England to sing hymns, as opposed to psalms and paraphrases. Keach’s hymnbook, published in 1691, provoked heated debate in 1692 at the Assembly of Particular Baptists. His congregation later became the New Park Street Church, which during the ministry of under Charles Haddon Spurgeon became the Metropolitan Tabernacle. Spurgeon himself did not have musical instruments in the church (Kurfees, p. 196). Also, in the seventeenth century, the Baptists pioneered the use of hymns that were freely written, rather than hymns written by poets (Eerdmans’, p. 426).

Some denominations, such as some the Exclusive Brethren, the Churches of Christ, the Primitive Baptists, and the Free Church of Scotland, prefer unaccompanied, that is, *a cappella* singing. From the Protestant Reformation until the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Reformed churches sang Psalms (Houghton, p. 185).

In short, the Puritans sang metrical psalms (and no hymns) until the eighteenth or even until the middle of the nineteenth century, but the Baptists were the first to introduce the singing of hymns rather than psalms and paraphrases.

*Isaac Watts* Isaac Watts (1674-1748) is the founder of modern English hymnology (Kuiper, p. 288). He was a brilliant scholar and a gifted poet. He learned Latin by age 4, Greek at 9, French at 11, and Hebrew at 13. During his lifetime, especially later in life, he “wrote nearly 30 theological treatises; essays on psychology, astronomy, and philosophy; three volumes of sermons; the first children’s hymnal; and a textbook on logic that served as a standard work on the subject for generations” (Mark Galli, “Isaac Watts, Father of English Hymnody,” <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/131christians/poets/watts.html>, accessed 7/5/2014). He was an English Congregational pastor (Houghton, p. 186).

By Watts’ time, German Lutherans had been singing hymns for 100 years, but the English Protestants followed Calvin in only singing the Psalms and they did not want to change even slightly. For example, in 1723, in New England, a book was printed, which gave both notes and words *of the Psalms* that were to be sung in church. People complained, “If we begin to sing by rule, the next thing will be to pray” (Dodds, p. 133).

Watts complained to his father about the wretched state of psalm-singing in his church. To which his father replied, “Give us something better, young man!” (Hustard, p. 416). He did. Watts radically changed English church music. For one thing, he felt the Psalms “ought to be translated in such a manner as we have reason to believe David would have composed them if he had lived in our day” (Watts, cited by Galli). For example, from Psalm 72, he wrote: “Jesus Shall Reign Where’er the Sun” (Galli). He argued that songs lacked New Testament content. He insisted that restricting songs of praise to the book of Psalms was to act as if Jesus was never born, had never died, had never been raised from the dead, or received up to glory (Houghton, p. 186). He also accelerated the use of “man-made” hymns—as distinct from inspired hymns in the Scripture (Eerdmans’, p. 426).

In 1707, his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* appeared, followed in 1715, with *Divine Songs for Children*, and in 1719, with *The Psalms of David*. Watts composed over 600 hymns, many of which are still being used (Eerdmans’, p. 426; some say he wrote over 750 hymns). He wrote such hymns as “When I Survey the Wondrous Cross,” “O God, Our Help in Ages Past” (a paraphrase of Ps. 90), “Alas! and Did My Savior Bleed,” and “Joy to the World” (a barely-recognizable version of Ps. 98; it was arranged in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by Lowell Mason to an older melody of Handel).

Watts was criticized. People accused him of tossing out divinely inspired Psalms for fantasy. Pastors were fired. Churches split, but Watts’ paraphrases won out (Galli). It has been suggested that more than any other man, Watts is credited with the triumph of the hymn in Christian worship (Houghton, p. 186). Watts’ introduction of extra-biblical poetry opened up a new era of Protestant hymnody. Other poets followed in his path, including Charles Wesley, Augustus Toplady, John Newton, William Cowper, and many others.

In short, although others sang hymns before him (Lutherans and Baptists), Isaac Watts was the founder of modern English hymnology; he radically changed English church music.

*The Methodists* John Wesley’s evaluation of the Sternhold and Hopkins Psalter was that it was “miserable, scandalous doggerel” (Hustard, p. 417). He is quoted as saying: “I have no objection to instruments of music in our chapels, provided they are neither heard nor seen” (Adam Clarke’s comment on Amos 6:5).

Adam Clarke, the famous Methodist commentator, said, “I believe that David was not authorized by the Lord to introduce that multitude of musical instruments into the Divine worship of which we read, and I am satisfied that his conduct in this respect is most solemnly reprehended by this prophet; and I farther believe that the use of such instruments of music, in the Christian Church, is without the sanction and against the will of God; that they are subversive of the spirit of true devotion, and that they are sinful. ... I am an old man and an old minister; and I here declare that I never knew them productive of any good in the worship of God; and have had reason to believe that they were productive of much evil. Music, as a science, I esteem and admire: but instruments of music in the house of God I abominate and abhor. This is the abuse of music; and here I register my protest against all such corruptions in the worship of the Author of Christianity.”

Charles Wesley, the younger brother of John Wesley, wrote over 6000 hymns, including “And Can It Be That I Should Gain?,” “O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing,” “Hark! The Herald Angels Sing,” and “Christ the Lord is Risen Today.”

The first successful hymnbook compiled for use in the Church of England was the collection of *Psalms and Hymns* (1737) compiled by John Wesley and published in



Charleston, South Carolina. Later Wesley edited collections for the Methodists, notably the definitive *Collection* published in 1780 (Eerdmans', p. 427). The Wesley's popularized congregational hymn-singing in England (Eerdmans', p. 429).

Hustard makes an interesting point: "No one will argue that the church did not need the new hymns of Watts and Wesley and all their successors. But is it possible that we have lost a significant form of expression that should be recaptured for the spiritual health of our worship?" (Hustard, p. 417).

In short, although John Wesley was opposed to using musical instruments in church, he and his brother popularized congregational hymn singing in England.

*Charles G. Finney* In his book *Revivals of Religion* (1868), Finney writes about the difficulty of bringing change to a church because Christians "have felt as if God had established just the *mode which they were used to.*" He gets specific.

"(a) *Psalm Books* Formerly, it was customary to sing the Psalms. By and by there was introduced a version of the Psalms in rhyme. This was 'very bad,' to be sure. When ministers tried to introduce them, the churches were distracted, the people displayed violent opposition, and great trouble was created by the innovation. But the new measure triumphed.

"Yet when another version was brought forward, in a better style of poetry, its introduction was opposed, with much contention, as yet a further new measure. Finally came Watts's version, which is still opposed in many Churches. No longer ago than 1828, when I was in Philadelphia, I was told that a minister there was preaching a *course of Lectures* on Psalmody, to his congregation, for the purpose of bringing them to use a better version of psalms and hymns than the one they were accustomed to. And even now, in a great many congregations, there are people who will rise and leave, if a psalm or hymn is given out from a new book. If Watts's version of the Psalms should be adopted, they would secede and form a new congregation, rather than tolerate such an innovation! The same sort of feeling has been excited by introducing the 'Village Hymns' in prayer-meetings. In one Presbyterian congregation in New York, within a few years, the minister's wife wished to introduce the Village Hymns into the women's prayer-meetings, not daring to go any further. She thought she was going to succeed. But some of the careful souls found out that it was 'made in New England,' and refused to admit it.

"(b) *"Lining" the hymns* Formerly, when there were but few books, it was the custom to 'line' the hymns, as it was called. The deacon used to stand up before the pulpit and read the psalm or hymn, a line at a time, or two lines at a time and then the rest would join in. By and by, they began to introduce books and let everyone sing from his own book. And what an innovation! Alas, what confusion and disorder it made! How could the good people worship God in singing without having the deacon to 'line' the hymn in a 'holy tone; for the holiness of it seemed to consist very much in the tone, which was such that you could hardly tell whether he was reading or singing.

"(c) *Choirs* Afterwards, another innovation was brought in. It was thought best to have a select choir of singers sit by themselves so as to give an opportunity to improve the music. But this was bitterly opposed. How many congregations were torn and rent in sunder by the desire of ministers and some leading individuals to bring about an improvement in the cultivation of music by forming choirs! People talked about 'innovations' and 'new measures' and thought great evils were coming to the churches because the singers were seated by themselves, and cultivated music, and learned new tunes that the old people could

not sing. It used not to be so when they were young, and they would not tolerate such novelties in the church.

“(d) *Pitchpipes* When music was cultivated and choirs seated together, then the singers wanted a pitch pipe. Formerly, when the lines were given out by the deacon or clerk, he would strike off into the tune and the rest would follow as well as they could. But when the leaders of choirs began to use pitch pipes for the purpose of pitching all their voices on precisely the same key, what vast confusion it made! I heard a clergyman say that an elder in the town where he used to live would get up and leave the service whenever he heard the chorister blow his pipe. ‘Away with your whistle,’ said he; ‘what, whistle in the house of God!’ He thought it a profanation.

“(e) *Instrumental music* By and by, in some congregations, various instruments were introduced for the purpose of aiding the singers and improving the music. When the bass viol was first introduced, it made a great commotion. People insisted they might just as well have a *fiddle* in the house of God. ‘Why, *it is* a fiddle; it is made just like a fiddle, only a little larger; and who can worship where there is a fiddle? By and by, you will want to dance in the meeting-house.’ Who has not heard these things talked of as though they were matters of the most vital importance to the cause of religion and the purity of the Church? Ministers, in grave ecclesiastical assemblies, have spent days discussing them. In a synod in the Presbyterian Church, it was seriously talked of by some, as a matter worthy of discipline in a certain Church, that ‘they had an organ in the house of God.’ This was only a few years ago. And there are many churches now that would not tolerate an organ. They would not be half so much excited on being reminded that sinners are going to hell, as on hearing that ‘there is going to be an organ in the meeting-house.’ In how many places is it easier to get the church to do anything else than work in a natural way to do what is needed, and wisest, and best, for promoting religion and saving souls? They act as if they had a ‘Thus saith the Lord’ for every custom and practice that has been handed down to them, or that they have long followed themselves, even though it is absurd and injurious” (Finney, *Revivals of Religion*, pp. 285-288).

Finney also discusses people objecting to preaching without notes versus reading the sermon. He tells of a lady in Philadelphia who refused to hear a minister because he did not read his sermon. Then he adds that sermon notes and reading written sermons are “an innovation, and a modern one too. They were introduced in a time of political difficulty in England. The ministers were afraid they should be accused of preaching something against the government, unless they could show what they had preached, by having all written beforehand” (Finney, p. 289).

Even praying was disputed! People complained about extemporary prayers instead of praying prayers from the Prayer Book (Finney, p. 288) and kneeling or not kneeling in prayer. He says that “The time has been in the Congregational churches in New England, when a man or woman would be ashamed to be seen kneeling at a prayer-meeting, for fear of being taken for a Methodist” (Finney, p. 289).

In short, Finney describes in detail the controversy caused by changes in music.

*The Holiness Influence* As has been pointed out, John Wesley was the first in history to teach that after salvation, there was a second experience of entire sanctification and perfection. He called it “Christian perfection.” When the Methodist Church neglected Wesley’s doctrine of entire sanctification, the renewed interest in it eventually resulted in the Holiness movement (Mead, p. 236). Phoebe Palmer, who experienced “entire

sanctification” in 1837, is considered one of the founders of the Holiness movement in America and the Higher Life movement in England.

Palmer’s teaching is significant because of its influence beyond the Methodist Church. She pursued holiness as an ecstatic state. She was obsessed with achieving a mystical union with the Lord. “Religion was not simply a matter of creed or liturgy. It was something you *felt*.” The moment of surrender was an overpowering experience. This was the “shorter way” to holiness (from the article at [www.teachushistory.org](http://www.teachushistory.org); italics in the article). She also taught the notion of abandoning oneself and the obedience, but the obedience of which she speaks as not being obedience to the Lord as revealed in Scripture, but obedience to the “motions of the Spirit.” These concepts have influenced evangelicalism.

“Before 1873 was over, Frances Ridley Havergal, already famous for her hymns and devotional verses, ‘saw clearly the blessedness of true consecration. I saw it as a flash of electric light... so I just utterly yielded myself to Him, and utterly trusted Him to keep me.’ And thus was able before her early death to write those hymns indelibly identified with Keswick: “Like a River Glorious is God’s Perfect Peace,” and “Take My Life and Let it Be” (Pollock, p. 16).

Frances Jane (Fanny) van Alstyne Crosby (1820-1915), who was blind from shortly after birth, is the most prolific hymn writer in church history, writing over 8,000 hymns and gospel songs, many of which have not been set to music. She was a lifelong Methodist, but she considered herself a “primitive Presbyterian” who was “rooted in Puritanism, developed by Methodism, warmed by the Holiness movement, and nourished by Congregationalism“ (Blumhofer, p. 279).

Although she had written many poems before, she wrote her first hymn in 1864. Some of Crosby’s best-known songs include “Blessed Assurance,” “Pass Me Not, O Gentle Savior,” “Jesus is Tenderly Calling You Home,” “Praise Him, Praise Him,” “Rescue the Perishing,” and “To God Be the Glory“ Because some publishers were hesitant to have so many hymns by one person in their hymnals, Crosby used nearly 200 different pseudonyms.

Although she was a Methodist, Crosby was not personally involved with the Holiness movement, but she was friends with people in the movement and attended Holiness camp meetings. “Fanny was a friend of Phoebe and Walter Palmer, sometimes visiting Ocean Grove, New Jersey, as their guest. One of Crosby’s best loved hymns, ‘Blessed Assurance,’ was written for a melody written by Phoebe Palmer Knapp, the daughter of Phoebe and Walter Palmer” (Keith Schwanz, *Satisfied: Women Hymn Writers of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century Wesleyan/Holiness Movement*. Grantham, PA: Wesleyan/Holiness Clergy, 1998; available at <http://www.whwomenclergy.org/booklets/satisfied.php>, accessed 7/10/2014). Some of Crosby’s hymns reflect Wesleyan/Holiness beliefs, including her call to consecrated Christian living in “I Am Thine, O Lord“ (1875):

Consecrate me now to Thy service, Lord,  
By the power of grace divine.  
Let my soul look up with a steadfast hope,  
And my will be lost in Thine.

“Crosby’s hymns were popular because they placed ‘a heightened emphasis on religious experiences, emotions, and testimonies’ and reflected ‘a sentimental,

romanticized relationship between the believer and Christ,' rather than using the negative descriptions of earlier hymns that emphasized the sinfulness of people" (Edith Blumhofer, in Debra Lee Sonners Stewart, "Music in the Ministry of Evangelist Aimee Semple McPherson," a Master of Arts thesis presented to the California State University, Fullerton, CA, ProQuest, 2006:149, 262, cited in an article on Fanny Crosby at ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny\\_Crosby#cite\\_note-autogenerated5-36](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny_Crosby#cite_note-autogenerated5-36), accessed July, 10, 2014).

Ann Douglas argues that Crosby was one of the female authors who "emasculated American religion" and helped shift it from "a rigorous Calvinism" to "an anti-intellectual and sentimental mass culture" (Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture*, cited by Blumhofer, p. xiv). Feminist scholars have suggested that "emphases in her hymns both revealed and accelerated the feminizing of American evangelicalism" (Blumhofer, p. xiv).

"In early 1868 Crosby met Methodist Phoebe Palmer Knapp, who was married to millionaire Joseph Fairchild Knapp, co-founder of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. The Knapps published hymnals initially for use in the Sunday Schools of the St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church in Brooklyn, which was superintended by Joseph F. Knapp for 22 years, while Phoebe Knapp took responsibility for 200 children in the infants' department. They first collaborated on *Notes of Joy*, the first hymnal edited by Knapp, who also contributed 94 of the 172 tunes, and published by her brother Walter C. Palmer, Jr. in 1869. Of the 21 hymns, Crosby contributed to *Notes of Joy*, including eight as 'The Children's Friend,' Knapp provided the music for fourteen of them. Their best-known collaboration was 'Blessed Assurance,' for which Crosby wrote words in the Knapps' music room for a tune written by Knapp while Crosby was staying at the Knapp Mansion in 1873 ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny\\_Crosby#cite\\_note-autogenerated5-36](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny_Crosby#cite_note-autogenerated5-36), accessed 7/10/2014).

Crosby is known as the "Queen of Gospel Song Writers" and as the "Mother of modern congregational singing in America."

Ira Sankey (1840-1908) was converted in a Methodist Church when he was 16 years old. After serving in the Civil War, he worked for the IRS and the YMCA. In 1870, He met D. L. Moody at a YMCA convention and shortly thereafter, they began to work together. When Moody was asked by a local pastor what he felt was the primary contribution that a gospel singer and song leader such as Sankey brought to his meetings, he replied, "If we can only get people to have the words of the love of God coming from their mouths it's well on its way to residing in their hearts."

Fanny Crosby was close friends with Sankey and his wife, Frances, and often stayed at their home in Northfield, Massachusetts. Crosby worked with Sankey from 1871 to 1908. Crosby was the provider and Sankey was the premier promoter of gospel songs. Sankey helped make Crosby a household name to Protestants around the world. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny\\_Crosby#cite\\_note-autogenerated5-36](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny_Crosby#cite_note-autogenerated5-36), accessed July 10, 2014).

Ira Sankey attributed the success of the Moody and Sankey evangelistic campaigns largely to Crosby's hymns (Anne Commire and Deborah Klezmer, *Women in World History: A Biographical Encyclopedia*. Waterford, CT: Yorkin Publications, 2000, p. 220, cited in an article at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny\\_Crosby](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fanny_Crosby), accessed 7/7/2014).

Keep in mind that Palmer's theology is reflected in some of Crosby's most well-known songs and the Moody-Sankey team promoted Crosby's music to the point that it permeated

American evangelicalism. In his *Nine Lectures on Preaching* delivered at Yale, R. W. Dale said, “Let me write the hymns and the music of the church, and I care very little who writes the theology” (Dale, cited by C. Randall Bradley, “Congregational Song as Shaper of Theology: A Contemporary Assessment,” vol. 100: *Review and Expositor*. 2003, p. 352).

“Diligent preaching, and incredible organizational energy, and learned theology have gone into the creation of modern evangelicalism. But nothing so profoundly defined the faith of evangelicalism as its hymnody; what evangelicals have been is what we have sung. Perhaps because it so obviously is a creature of the Bible’s salvific themes, the hymnody of evangelicalism defined a religion that was clearer, purer, better balanced, and more sharply focused than much evangelical practice” (Mark. A. Noll, cited by Bradley, p. 352, who adds, “Music, rather than theology, has been the common thread that helped to bind together a loosely knit movement that is modern evangelicalism”).

To sum up: The Holiness movement had an enormous influence on evangelicalism church music, shifting the focus from the Lord and the sinfulness of man to an emphasis on experiences, emotions, and testimonies.

*The Charismatic Impact* The Pentecostal movement began in Topeka, Kansas in 1901, but it exploded in Los Angeles in 1906 at the Azusa Street Mission. At first, there was no music at all in the Azusa Street meeting. One who was there wrote, “In the beginning in ‘Azusa’ (street) we had no musical instruments. In fact, we felt no need of them. There was no place for them in our worship. All was spontaneous. We did not even sing from hymn books. All the old, well-known hymns were sung from memory, quickened by the Spirit of God. ‘The Comforter Has Come,’ was possibly the one most sung. We sang it from fresh, powerful heart experience” (Bartleman, p. 57).

Later, however, music was very much a part of Pentecostalism, but it was not traditional church music. “Pentecostal music is clearly in debt to African-American musical style. I think that our widespread use of drums, the rhythmic aspects of our worship, which were denied any role in many other denominations, are part of an African-American contribution to Pentecostalism (“Interview with Dr. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr. [a Pentecostalist and historian] by D. Allen Tennison,” *A G Heritage Winter 2005-06*, p. 18, [http://ifphc.org/pdf/Heritage/2005\\_04.pdf](http://ifphc.org/pdf/Heritage/2005_04.pdf), accessed April 11, 2015). The music in Pentecostal churches did not affect other denominations.

As a result, the ministries of Fanny Crosby and Ira Sankey, a choir accompanied by an organ, became standard in American churches deep into the twentieth century, but in the latter part of the twentieth century, the music of the culture began to impact music in the church, perhaps as never before in the history of the church. For example, after World War I, jazz was popular. Jazz influenced the African-American church, where it became known as gospel music. In the 1960s, folk music (ballads) was popular. By 1970, Christian folk music became popular in youth meetings but not in churches. When those young people became adults, they started churches and brought their music with them. The influence of baby boomers on church music was “unprecedented,” for when they “attended or returned to church,” they “brought *their* music with them” (Bradley, p. 354, italics his).

The music introduced by the Charismatic movement revolutionized music in the American church. “‘Praise and Worship’ (music) finds its roots in the Jesus People movements in the 1960s and 1970s, the gospel choruses of the revivalists, celebration music of renewal movements, and in African-American gospel music. Fostered by churches such as Calvary Chapel of Costa Mesa, California, and eventually by publishers

such as Maranatha! Music, Vineyard Music, and Integrity, ‘Praise and Worship’ music has been the single most influential movement in the worship of the last 30 years” (Bradley, pp. 353-54; written in 2003). The charismatic movement in the 1970s changed the church from “musical routine” to “spontaneous praise” (Laudermilch, p. 79).

In 1969, Calvary Chapel in Costa Mesa, California, became a hub of the Jesus Movement. Fifteen Jesus People musical groups were based at Calvary Chapel. The Jesus people began to write new worship songs with a folk-rock style. In 1971, Maranatha! Music was founded by Chuck Smith Sr., pastor of Calvary Chapel, “to promote the ‘Jesus Music’ his young hippie followers were writing and singing, up and down the California coast” (<http://www.maranathamusic.com/about/>, accessed July 17, 2014; examples include: “Seek Ye First,” “Lord I Lift Your Name on High,” “Father I Adore You,” “Open Our Eyes Lord”). At this point, in many churches, these new songs were added to hymns.

In 1977, John Wimber founded a Calvary Chapel church in Yorba Linda, California, which became the Anaheim Vineyard Christian Fellowship. In the 1980s, the Anaheim Vineyard began to write its own worship songs. So in 1985, John Wimber founded Vineyard Music. Worship songs were sung in the first person directed to God, personally and intimately (<http://www.carltuttle.com/wimber-years/>, accessed, July 19, 2004; examples include: “*Come, Now is the Time to Worship*,” “*Your Love is Amazing*”). *The Vineyard music dropped the use of hymns and exclusively sang new songs directed to God.*

The changes brought about by the Charismatic movement affected more than the songs that were sung. The song leader, the hymnal, the organ, the choir, and the soloist were replaced with a worship leader, keyboard, guitar, drums, projected lyrics on a screen, and raised hands. The congregation became the choir. Then, the electric guitar and louder music were introduced.

To sum up: Influenced by music from secular culture (jazz, ballads), the Charismatic movement profoundly changed church music, replacing the song leader, the hymnal, the organ, the choir, and the soloist with a worship leader, keyboard, guitar, drums, projected lyrics on a screen, and raised hands and introducing new praise/worship songs with a folk-rock style.

*The Twentieth-first Century* In the twentieth-first century, a softer sound became popular. Worship teams with a lead guitarist, a keyboard, and drums became standard. Traditional hymns play a limited role, especially hymns sung to God, instead of hymns about God (“How Great Thou Art,” “Great is Thy Faithfulness,” “Be Thou My Vision,” “Come Thou Fount,” “More Love to Thee”). A few older hymns that are not sung to God made the cut (“Amazing Grace,” “Blessed Assurance,” “When I Survey the Wondrous Cross”). Some new hymns are written to sound older (“In Christ Alone,” “Here is Love,” “Vast as the Ocean,” “Before the Throne of God Above,” “How Deep the Father’s Love”). Some country music began to be used (“I Saw the light”).

Within Evangelicalism, “musical styles have nearly replaced denominational distinctives as the demarcating lines among various groups” (Bradley, p. 351). “For many younger people, music has become an inseparable symbol of their personhood. They embody their music. It is ever with them, and its qualities form a significant part of their identity. Music has moved from a cherished experience (either as a performer or listener) to being a commodity designed for consumption. In *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987), Allan Bloom recognizes the importance of music in contemporary culture: ‘Nothing is more singular about this generation than its addiction to music. Today, a large

proportion of young people between the ages of ten and twenty live for music. It is their passion. Nothing else excites them as it does. They cannot take anything alien to music seriously. When they are in school and with their families, they are longing to plug themselves into their music” (Bradley, p. 355).

That is scary, for the simple reason that music has the ability “to upstage the spoken word and to become more important to worshipers than sound doctrine and intellectual content” (Bradley, p. 353). Songwriters are theologians. Worship seminars are now seminaries and worship leaders are the influential ministers (Bradley, p. 356). Conclusion: choose church music carefully.

In short, by the beginning of the twentieth-first century, a softer sound using a worship leader as a lead guitarist, a keyboard, and drums became standard. Most songs are sung directly to the Lord.

*Conclusion* The history of church music has gone from no music at all, to music containing only the biblical text, to allowing music composed by humans. It has gone from Psalms to paraphrased Psalms, to hymns, to emotional songs of testimony, to praise music to music sung almost exclusively to the Lord.

## Liberalism

Classic theological liberalism arose out of German rationalism. In the middle of the nineteenth century, German theologians rejected the supernatural and put reason above revelation. They used natural laws to explain miracles, rejected original sin and Christ’s vicarious atonement, and emphasized the ethical message of a humanized Christ.

*Immanuel Kant* Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) has been called “one of the greatest philosophers of all time.” He provided the *philosophical* framework for biblical criticism and theological liberalism (Cairns, p. 410). He was a rationalist until he read Hume, who taught that there is no valid knowledge gained by the notion of cause and effect (González, II, p. 194). Thus, he rejected the rational arguments for the existence of God (Eerdmans’ p. 543).

In his book *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), Kant argued that experience tells us what is, not what must be. A future experience may prove that a past experience was not true. From past experience, we may conclude that the sun rises every morning, but a future experience may prove that is not always true. Therefore, experience does not give us absolute truth. Absolute truth must be independent of experience. “Pure” reason is knowledge that does not come through our senses; it is *knowledge that is inherent* by the nature and structure of the mind. Therefore, a future experience cannot disprove it. Two plus two equals four. No experience will ever prove that that is not true.

In *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788), he argued that although pure reason cannot prove the existence of God and the soul, there is a practical reason that can, namely morality (González, II, p. 195). The “categorical imperative” is the idea that you should *act only on that maxim which is a universal law*. The categorical imperative is not a source of moral principles; it is a test of those principles we already have. At the conclusion of the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant says, “Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe, the oftener and more steadily we reflect on them: the starry heavens above and the moral law within.”

In *Religion Within the Bounds of Reason* (1793), Kant said there are three kinds of religious delusions: 1) miracles, since there is no scientific evidence for them, 2) mysteries, since their existence cannot be proven through reason, 3) religious rituals or professions of faith will make us more righteous in God's eyes. We can only believe in things for which there is tangible evidence. So we hope grace exists without counting on its existence. Humans must do all they can to behave morally and hope that God will bless them by granting grace (taken from a summary of Kant's *Religion Within the Bounds of Reason*, [www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/religionboundaries/section9.rhtml](http://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/religionboundaries/section9.rhtml), accessed 8/16/2014).

The result of all of this, according to Kant, is that the Bible is a man-made book that was to be subjected to historical criticism (see "higher criticism" in the next paragraph) like any other book. There was no place for Christ as the God-man. With his free will and sense of what is right, man becomes the creator of religion, in which he develops the morality present in himself. This led to the theological liberal notion of a "spark of divinity" within man.

In biblical studies, "lower criticism" and "higher criticism" are technical terms. One is not "higher" than the other in the popular sense of the term. These expressions are used to simply distinguish two different fields of study. "Lower criticism" is the study of the *manuscripts* of Scripture to determine which ones contain the original words of Scripture. Today such a study is called textual criticism. Erasmus, Beza, Tischendorf, Scrivener, Westcott, and Hort are textual critics. "Higher criticism" is the study of such things as the historic origins, the dates, and the authorship of various books of the Bible. Today such a study is called "Introduction." The study of the *historical background* of the various books of the Bible is a legitimate study unless one begins with the presupposition that miracles, prophecy, and even inspiration are not valid, which is what the "liberal" critics do. It was Kant who provided the philosophical framework for biblical higher criticism and theological liberalism.

*Frederick Schleiermacher* Frederick D. E. Schleiermacher (1768-1834) is the "father of liberalism" (González, II, p. 287). He was reared in the home of a Reformed pastor who had Moravian tendencies (González, II, p. 285) and was trained in Moravian schools (Pietism), where he learned the subjective side of Christianity (Cairns, p. 410). He studied under Kant (Dollar, p. 9) and accepted Kant's criticism of the proofs of the existence of God (Eerdmans' p. 543). When the rationalism of his time made it difficult for him to continue holding several of the traditional doctrines of Christianity, he was influenced by Romanticism that taught there was more to humans than cold reason (González, II, p. 285). He made feelings or emotions the basis of spiritual experience.

In *Discourses on Religion* (1799), Schleiermacher defined religion as an intuition or feeling for the universe, often described as an awareness of God. Creeds are valuable only as they express these feelings or intuitions (Dollar, p. 9). In *The Christian Faith* (ca. 1821), he presented religion not as a set of beliefs and obligations but the result of man's feelings of absolute dependence (Cairns, pp. 410-411). By "feeling," he did not mean a passive emotion or sudden experience but rather a profound awareness of the existence of One on which all existence depends. The doctrine of creation is important because it affirms that all existence depends on God, but that does not mean that the Genesis account of creation is historically accurate. Schleiermacher himself did not think it was (González, II p. 286). God is that on which man feels dependent. Sin is a failure to sense dependence. Christ is the man who was utterly dependent upon God in thought, word, and action. His mission



was to communicate this sense of dependence (Eerdmans', p. 541). Schleiermacher was also a pioneer of biblical criticism (Eerdmans', p. 541), called higher criticism.

*Julius Wellhausen* In 1878, Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), a pastor's son and university professor in Germany, wrote *The History of Israel* (revised in 1883, as *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*) in which he advanced the Documentary Hypothesis. He did not originate the Documentary Hypothesis, but he produced the classic expression of it (for a history of the development of the theory see Archer, pp.73-82). Wellhausen acknowledged his indebtedness to Karl Heinrich Graf. In fact, the Documentary Hypothesis is sometimes called the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis.

The Documentary Hypothesis, also known as the JEDP theory, says Moses did not write the Pentateuch. Rather the material in the Pentateuch originated with four different authors (identified by the letters J, E, D, and P). About 850 BC, an unknown author in the Southern Kingdom (J) wrote the narrative sections that call God "Jehovah." An unknown author in the Northern Kingdom, about 750 BC (E), wrote the narrative portions and employed "Elohim," the Hebrew word for God. About 650 BC, an unknown editor, called a redactor, combined J and E into a single document. Then, another unknown author called the Deuteronomist (D) wrote during the reforms of Josiah about 621 BC to compel the people in the Southern Kingdom to abandon their local "high places" and bring their sacrifices to the Temple in Jerusalem. Finally, the priestly portions (P) were composed over a period from about 570 BC to the Exile. The Pentateuch was edited and revised from these documents, perhaps as late as 200 BC.

The Documentary Hypothesis is the liberals' application of "higher criticism" to the Pentateuch; obviously, it is a denial of inerrancy.

In 1881, B. B. Warfield (1851-1921), a professor of theology at Princeton Seminary from 1887 to 1921, and A. A. Hodge (1823-1886), the principal of Princeton Seminary, wrote an article on the inspiration of Scripture in which they defended the inerrancy of Scripture. Marsden said that they wrote this article in answer to the inroads of higher criticism in the Presbyterian Church. In it, they formulated the classic defense of inerrancy that the original manuscripts were without error in historical and scientific detail (Marsden, p. 112). For example, if the Bible says Moses wrote the Pentateuch, Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

*Charles A. Briggs (1841-1913)* Briggs studied in Germany, where he accepted the higher critical view of Scripture. In 1874, he became a professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, which at the time was a Presbyterian seminary. In 1889, he wrote *Whither? A Theological Question for the Times*, in which he sharply challenged the Warfield and Hodge's defense of inerrancy (described in more detail below; see Marsden, p. 112). In that book, he said if anyone can "find any comfort in the verbal inspiration and the inerrancy of Scriptures, we have no desire to disturb him, provided he holds these errors as private opinions and does not seek to impose them upon others. But fidelity to the truth requires that we should state that they are not only extra-confessional, but that they are contrary to truth and fact, and that they are broken reeds that will surely fail anyone who leans upon them, and that they are therefore positively dangerous to the faith and ministry of people" (Briggs, cited by Lindsell, p. 187).

As the head of the new Department of Biblical Theology, Briggs delivered an inaugural address on January 20, 1891. In it, he stated there were four barriers keeping people from the Bible: superstition, verbal inspiration, inerrancy, and belief that the authenticity of the

Bible is founded upon the idea that holy men of old wrote holy writ. Based on higher criticism, he said Moses and David were no more inspired than Confucius. Moses did not write the Pentateuch. David only wrote a few of the Psalms. Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name (Lindsell, pp. 188-1989: on another occasion, Briggs said Daniel did not write the book of Daniel, Lindsell, p. 192).

Briggs finished his inaugural address by saying, "We have undermined the breastwork of traditionalism; let us blow them to atoms. We have forged our way through the obstructions; let us remove them now from the face of the earth.... Criticism is at work everywhere with knife and fire! Let us cut down everything that is dead, and harmful, every kind of dead orthodoxy, every species of effete ecclesiasticism, all mere formal morality, all those dry and brittle fences that constitute denominationalism, and all barriers to church unity." In other words, "The inaugural address was a manifesto urging all liberals to join in the higher criticism war against conservatives" (Lindsell, pp. 189-190). Briggs stated he was glad. "The war had begun."

Two years prior to his inaugural address, Briggs had said in his book that he had no objection to those who believe in inerrancy as long as they held them in private opinion and did not seek to impose them on others. Now he began a campaign to impose his opinion on others. Lindsell asked, "Why should his opinion not also be privately held and not imposed on others?" (Lindsell, p. 190).

Charges of heresy were brought against Briggs by Presbyterian church leaders in 1891 and in 1893, but they were dropped. In 1893, however, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church tried Briggs and suspended him. He became an Episcopalian and Union Seminary became independent (Cooper, pp. 55-56).

It is impossible to determine an exact date for the beginning of liberalism in America, but it has been suggested that it may be dated by the inaugural address given by Briggs in 1891. Cooper claims it was the first public affirmation of liberalism in a seminary in the United States (Cooper, p. 55). Lindsell points out that liberalism was in the seminary prior to Briggs, but Briggs was the catalyst that brought the trend in the seminary to the light of day (Lindsell, p. 191).

To gain prestigious degrees, American professors went to Germany for a theological education (for example, Briggs). Thus, liberalism was "transmitted to America by American students of theology who studied German philosophy and biblical criticism in German and Scottish universities" (Cairns p. 444). They brought back theological liberalism to American seminaries. It did not take long before the pastors trained under such professors were preaching theological liberalism in their churches. "By 1900, the ideas of the universal fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man had spread from the seminaries to the laity" (Cairns p. 444).

By claiming there was nothing supernatural in the Bible, classical liberalism shredded it. Some went so far as to say that Moses not only did not write Pentateuch, he could not have written the Pentateuch, because he could not write! Darwinism explained the origin of man. A post-millennial future through human effort was the optimistic outlook for the future.

*Walter Rauschenbusch* Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918), who studied theology at the University of Berlin, was a professor of church history at a Baptist seminary (Rochester Theological Seminary, now Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School) from 1897-1918 (González, II, p. 257). His books *Christianizing the Social Order* (1912) and *A Theology*

*of the Social Gospel* (1917) spread the social gospel in America (Cairns, pp. 425-426). His theology was based on his concept that the kingdom of God is not the community of the redeemed, but the transformation of society, which calls for social reform and political action (Eerdmans', p. 594). More specifically, the kingdom of God would be realized by means of labor unions, government intervention, and a mild form of socialism (Cairns, pp. 425-426).

*Harry Emerson Fosdick* Harry Emerson Fosdick (1878-1969) popularized liberalism in America. When he was seven years old, Fosdick joined the Westfield Baptist Church. Early in his life, he rebelled against religious taboos, such as playing cards, dancing, and the theater (Dollar, p. 93). From 1896 to 1900, he attended Colgate University, where he doubted the authenticity of the Bible (much of Hebrew history is folklore), revolted against Orthodox views (Calvinism produced "a God who is a devil"), and accepted the theory of evolution. He received a MA from Columbia University (1908) and a BD from Union Seminary (1904, when Briggs was a professor). In 1903, he was ordained as a Baptist minister and over the next 50 years, received 17 honorary degrees (Dollar, pp. 93-94).

From 1904 to 1915, Fosdick was pastor of the Baptist Church in Montclair, New Jersey and an instructor in Practical Theology at Union Theological Seminary. In 1915, he left Montclair to become Professor of Practical Theology at Union, where he taught until 1946, when he retired. Although a Baptist, he served as minister of First Presbyterian Church in New York from 1919 to 1925 (Dollar, pp. 94-95).

Fosdick embraced Rauschenbusch's view that the Kingdom of God is the establishment of social justice and humanitarian improvement, which was the aim of the Old Testament prophets and of Jesus Himself. He rejected expository preaching, believing the congregation was not interested in the meaning of the text. His sermons were more like the lectures on problem-solving techniques. He offered solutions to common problems such as disillusionment and despair (Dollar, pp. 94-95). Some wondered about his brand of Christianity. J. Gresham Machen asked, "The question is not whether Mr. Fosdick is winning men, but whether the thing to which he is winning them is Christianity."

In May 1922, Fosdick replied by preaching a sermon entitled "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" In the sermon, Fosdick pointed out that "all Fundamentalists are conservatives, but not all conservatives are Fundamentalists." Fundamentalists, he said, were intolerant and threatened to divide the church. He said, "They insist that we must all believe in the historicity of certain special miracles, preeminently the virgin birth of our Lord; that we must believe in a special theory of inspiration—that the original documents of the scripture, which of course we no longer possess, were inerrantly dictated to men a good deal as a man might dictate to a stenographer; that we must believe in a special theory of the atonement—that the blood of our Lord, shed in a substitutionary death, placates an alienated Deity and makes possible welcome for the returning sinner; and that we must believe in the second coming of our Lord upon the clouds of heaven to set up a millennium here, as the only way in which God can bring history to a worthy denouement." (In other words, he rejected verbal inspiration, inerrancy, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, and the literal Second Coming of Christ.)

Fosdick goes on to contrast different views on the virgin birth, the inspiration of the Scripture, and the Second Coming and says we should be concerned about the weightier matters of the law, such as justice, mercy, and faith. "As I plead thus for an intellectually hospitable, tolerant, liberty-loving church, Fosdick asked, "Is not the Christian church large

enough to hold within her hospitable fellowship people who differ on points like this, and agree to differ until the fuller truth be manifested? The Fundamentalists say not. They say that the liberals must go” (the entire sermon is available at <http://baptiststudiesonline.com/wp-content/uploads/2007/01/shall-the-Fundamentalists-win.pdf>, accessed 8/21/2014). John D. Rockefeller, the wealthiest man in the nation, paid for 130,000 copies to be distributed to every Protestant minister in the United States. What had been skirmishes between Fundamentalists and liberals exploded into war.

In 1923, Fosdick delivered a series of lectures at Yale Divinity School in which he gave the substance of his *Modern Use of The Bible*, which demonstrated his departure from biblical truth (Dollar, p. 96). He preached a sermon entitled “The Peril of Worshiping Jesus” (Dollar, p. 100). He said that in view of the modern ideas of justice, the substitutionary atonement, where one suffers in the place of others, is “an immoral outrage” (Dollar, p. 99).

Presbyterian William Jennings Bryan exposed Fosdick’s “utter agnosticism” to the New York Presbytery and the General Assembly. Refusing to budge theologically or become a Presbyterian to retain his pulpit, Fosdick resigned in 1924. About this time, W. L. Pettingill wrote, “The fight is on and it grows hotter. Let us praise God for that. Fight is much better than a disgraceful surrender and a fight is necessary just now that the truth of the gospel may continue with us” (Pettingill, cited by Dollar, p. 97).

In May 1925, Fosdick became pastor of Park Avenue Baptist Church in New York, and then moved to the newly built (with Rockefeller money) Riverside Church. In 1935, he preached a sermon entitled, “The Church Must Go Beyond Modernism,” incorporating the emerging neo-orthodox themes of Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr (see the article entitled “Harry Emerson Fosdick, Liberalism’s Popularizer,” which is available at (<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/131christians/pastorsandpreachers/fosdick.html?start=1>, accessed 7/22/2014).

World War I and the Great Depression shattered the idealism of liberalism. Cairns says, “It broke down after World War I because of the horrors of war, major depression, and the rise of neo-orthodoxy” (Cairns, p. 443). He goes on to say that by 1930, liberalism became less influential and the old line liberal denominations declined in membership, influence, and the number of missionaries they sent abroad (Cairns, p. 444).

Rejecting the supernatural in the Bible and only using it to teach ethics, Classic Liberalism is nowhere near biblical Christianity. H. Richard Niebuhr (1894-1962; Reinhold Niebuhr’s brother) said American liberalism taught “a God without wrath brought man without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross” (Eerdmans’, p. 598).

Lightner sums up the situation when he says there was a philosophical attack (rationalism), a scientific attack (evolution), and a theological attack (higher criticism) on the Bible. Rationalism says truth is determined by reason, not revelation. Evolution assumes that the supernatural does not exist and that man is evolving toward perfection. Higher criticism made it impossible to believe in the genuineness and credibility of the Bible (Lightner, pp. 24-29).

## Fundamentalism

*Definition* A simple definition of a “Fundamentalist” is a person who adheres “to a set of basic beliefs or principles.” In that sense, it is used of Christian Fundamentalists, Catholic Fundamentalists, Mormon Fundamentalists, Hindu Fundamentalists, Buddhist Fundamentalists, Islamic Fundamentalists, and even Darwinian Fundamentalists. It is often used in a pejorative sense. Because of Muslim Fundamentalists, when some people hear the word “fundamentalist,” they think of terrorists.

So what is a Christian Fundamentalist? Because of their various associations, defining Christian Fundamentalists can be tricky. Christian Fundamentalism is an “elusive term” (Carpenter, p.4). Christian Fundamentalists have been identified with dispensational premillennialism, but some Christian Fundamentalists were not dispensational or even premillennial. Because of the Scopes trial, a 1925 legal case in which a substitute high school teacher, John Scopes, was accused of violating a Tennessee law which made it unlawful to teach human evolution in any state-funded school, Christian Fundamentalists had been thought of as uneducated and ignorant, but some Christian Fundamentalists were highly educated scholars. With a militant attitude, some Christian Fundamentalists separated from their denomination, but other Christian Fundamentalists with a militant attitude did not. So what is the definition of a Christian Fundamentalist?

Christian Fundamentalism developed over a number of years. It arose as a reaction to theological liberalism (Lightner, p. 17, 32), which rejected inerrancy, the virgin birth, the vicarious atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the Second Coming of Christ (see the discussion about Briggs and Fosdick). Thus, originally it was a *theological position* that focused on belief in the fundamentals of the faith. The fundamentals are usually defined as: 1) the inerrancy of Scripture, 2) the deity of Christ, 3) the virgin birth of Christ, 4) the substitutionary atonement and bodily resurrection of Christ, and 5) the bodily return of Christ (for example, see Lightner, p. 17). So, in one sense, a Christian Fundamentalist is a Christian who believes in the five fundamentals of the faith, especially inerrancy. Marsden says that inerrancy became the “chief symbol” of Fundamentalism (Marsden, p. 9). González says inerrancy became the “hallmark” of Fundamentalism (González, II, pp. 373-374).

Then the theological position became a *movement*. The term “Fundamentalist” was not used until 1920 (Cairns, p. 449). An identifiable Fundamentalist movement arose in the 1920s (Cary, p. 129). Sandeen says Fundamentalism was a new religious *movement* with distinctive beliefs, notably premillennialism, and the verbal inerrancy of the Bible (Sandeen, cited by Carpenter, p. 5, italics added). It was the movement that came to be characterized by a militant attitude, an emphasis on prophecy, the priority of evangelism, and, ultimately, a need for separation.

As a movement Fundamentalism was “militant.” As others have pointed out, “Undoubtedly, historic Fundamentalism’s chief hallmark has been militancy” (Priest, p. 70). Fundamentalism was the response of evangelicals who declared war on liberalism (Marsden, p. 4). Fundamentalism “was begun by men who deemed it necessary to adhere to the injunction of Jude to ‘contend earnestly for the faith’” (Lightner, pp. 21-22). Thus, Fundamentalism became not only a belief in the fundamentals of the faith, but also a *militant* attitude in defending the faith. In his book, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, Marsden speaks of the Fundamentalist mentality and argues that the movement’s

militant opposition to modernism distinguished it from other evangelical traditions; he says Fundamentalism is “militantly anti-modernistic Protestant Evangelicalism” (Marsden, cited by Carpenter, p. 5).

So, what is a Christian Fundamentalist? As a theological position it is belief in the five fundamentals of the faith: 1) the inerrancy of Scripture, 2) the virgin birth (and deity) of Christ, 3) the substitutionary atonement of Christ, 4) the bodily resurrection of Christ, and 5) the Second Coming of Christ. In that sense, there are Fundamentalists who are not militant, anti-intellectual, or separatist, but Fundamentalists who become involved in the *movement* of Fundamentalism not only believe in the fundamentals of the faith, but are also militant and, eventually, they became separatists.

In his book *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, Dollar makes a distinction between Fundamentalism as a theological position and Fundamentalism as a movement (Dollar, p. viii). As a theological position, Fundamentalism is belief in the fundamentals of the faith, but many who believe in the fundamentals of the faith were not part of the Fundamentalist movement. Dollar, a Fundamentalist, defines “Historic Fundamentalism” as “the literal exposition of all the affirmations and attitudes of the Bible and the militant exposure of all non-Biblical affirmations and attitudes” (Dollar, p. xv).

*Roots* The roots of Fundamentalism can be traced to the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The theological debate over inerrancy, the emphasis on prophecy, the priority of evangelism, and the importance of the power of the Holy Spirit were prominent during that period (see Carpenter’s discussion, p. 5).

1. The theological debate over inerrancy began in 1881. Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield (1851-1921) graduated from Princeton University (1871) and from Princeton Theological Seminary (1876). He studied in Germany under Franz Delitzsch and served as the assistant pastor of First Presbyterian Church in Baltimore, Maryland for a short time. He became an instructor at Western Theological Seminary (now Pittsburgh Theological Seminary). He was a professor of theology at Princeton Seminary from 1887 to 1921. In 1881, he and Presbyterian leader A. A. Hodge wrote an article on the inspiration of the Bible, which was a scholarly defense of inerrancy. In many of his writings, Warfield demonstrated that the doctrine of biblical inerrancy was simply an Orthodox Christian teaching and not merely a concept invented in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. His passion was to refute liberalism within Presbyterianism.

In his book *Whither? A Theological Question for the Times* (1889), Briggs challenged the Warfield and Hodge defense of inerrancy (Marsden, p. 112). In an inaugural address at Union Theological Seminary, Briggs denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the unity of Isaiah. He also suggested the possibility of unsaved people having a second chance after their death.

In March 1887, Charles Haddon Spurgeon published an article titled “The Down Grade” in *The Sword and the Trowel*, his monthly magazine. It was written by his friend Robert Shindler, but it was published anonymously. The article charged that some ministers were “denying the proper deity of the Son of God (and) renouncing faith in his atoning death.” These denials were said to be a “slippery slope” or “Down Grade,” away from essential evangelical doctrines. In the next issue of *The Sword and the Trowel*, Spurgeon wrote, “Our warfare is with men who are giving up the atoning sacrifice, denying the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and casting slurs upon justification by faith.” During the remainder of 1887 and in 1888, *The Sword and the Trowel* contained something about the

dispute in every issue. As a result of those in other articles a controversy developed within the Baptist Union, which was bitterly divided over the question.

Spurgeon was not attempting to expel the liberals from the Baptist Union, the Baptist group to which he belonged, nor was he trying to engineer a schism and start an evangelical union. That idea did not appeal to him, nor did he think it was a permanent solution. He was simply warning against theological liberalism. The three doctrines Spurgeon felt were being abandoned were biblical infallibility, substitutionary atonement, and the finality of judgment for those who die without Christ.

When the Baptist Union met in October 1887, the “Down Grade” was the main topic of conversation, but because of fear of causing theological trouble, the subject was not on the official program. Spurgeon resigned from the Baptist Union. If Spurgeon had had his way, the controversy would have ended at that point, but because of his a national reputation, his resignation dealt a blow to the reputation of the Baptist Union.

In December 1887, the Council of the Baptist Union met to deliberate the crisis. They hoped Spurgeon would either withdraw his charges or furnish evidence against the individuals he had named. Spurgeon was determined not to name anyone. So on January 13, 1888, the Council passed a “vote of censure,” which said that since Spurgeon declined to give names and supporting evidence, the Council considered that his charges ought not to have been made. After that, there were political maneuverings within the Baptist Union, but the theological issues were never really addressed. The Down Grade Controversy, took its toll on Spurgeon. During the controversy, his health deteriorated, so that following his death, his wife, Susannah, wrote that “his fight for the faith ... cost him his life” (Mark Hopkins, [www.christianitytoday.com/ch/1991/issue29/2931.html?start=3](http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/1991/issue29/2931.html?start=3), accessed July 1, 2015).

2. Some historians suggest that the roots of Fundamentalism are in the prophecy conferences of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that highlighted dispensational premillennialism (Cary, p. 130). The main purpose and focus of these 19<sup>th</sup>-century conferences was prophecy, but people in that movement spoke out about the fundamentals of the faith.

Methodist minister A. C. Gaebelein, who was personally involved in these prophecy conferences, said they began in the summer of 1875 when six men met in a cottage not far from Chicago to spend a week in Bible study. One of the six was James H. Brookes, a Presbyterian pastor from St. Louis. In the summer of 1876, the original six, plus others, including A. J. Gordon, pastor of the Clarendon Baptist Church in Boston, met in Swampscott, Massachusetts. The emphasis of this meeting was the Second Coming of Christ. In the summer of 1877, they met in Watkins Glen, New York. Then, in 1878, 1879, and 1880, they met in Clifton Springs, New York (Gaebelein, pp. 31-32).

Gaebelein says, as far as he knows, the first prophetic conference held in the United States was at the Holy Trinity Church (Protestant Episcopal) in New York City from October 30 to November 1, 1878. He says the call to meet was for the clear-cut purpose of proclaiming the pre-millennial coming of Christ and it included representatives from all denominations, including Protestant Episcopal, Episcopal Reformed, Dutch Reformed, Reformed, United Presbyterian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Baptist, and Methodist. Signers included W. R. Nicholson (Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church), Joseph A. Seiss (Lutheran commentator on the book of Revelation), W. E. Blackstone (author of *Jesus Is Coming*), James H. Brookes, A. J. Gordon, and others. The call itself lamented the neglect of the personal, pre-millennial advents of Jesus Christ and the

“looking for the blessed hope” (Gaebelein, pp. 32-34; see Dollar pp. 28-41 for details). *The New York Tribune* published the addresses of the conference in an extra edition. In 1879, the proceedings were published in a book entitled *Pre-Millennial Essays of the Prophetic Conference* (Dollar, p. 28).

In 1881, the group met at Old Orchard on the coast of Maine. In 1882, to make it easier for the Canadians to attend, they met on Mackinac Island, Michigan (Gaebelein, p. 34).

From 1883 to 1897, the “Believers Meeting for Bible Study” met at Niagara-on-the-Lake. The teachers included James H. Brookes, A. J. Gordon, Hudson Taylor, A. T. Pearson, C. I. Scofield, and many others. In 1898, the conference now is widely known as the “Niagara Bible Conference; Believers Meeting for Bible Study,” met at Chautauqua, near Jamestown, New York. The next and final meeting was held at Asbury Park, New Jersey (Gaebelein, pp. 35-36). One of the factors for terminating the conferences was the death of James H. Brookes (Gaebelein, p. 36), but a more important reason was a disagreement among the teachers concerning the pre-tribulation rapture (Gaebelein, p. 41; Dollar, p. 72; some were pre-trib and some were post-trib).

According to Dollar, a prophecy conference held in 1886 at Chicago was a major step forward in the creation of a full-fledged Fundamentalism. (In tracing the history of the *Scofield Reference Bible*, Gaebelein does not mention this conference.) Dollar says, “The prophetic conference of 1886 was a Plymouth Rock in the history of Fundamentalism; a Magna Carta of its doctrinal insights; a Valley Forge in facing the onslaught of liberal theology; a Waterloo and the emergence of a victorious confidence in the rightness of interpretation, and a D-Day for the embattled pastors and professors who had been sickening and saddened by the liberal model. Furthermore, it was a birthday of Biblical truths, exposure of God’s enemies, and a determined and valiant answer that the war was on and Fundamentalist would fight” (Dollar, p. 43). Most historians, however, would say the Fundamentalist movement did not actually begin until the 1920s.

The prominent leaders of this conference were A. J. Gordon and James H. Brookes. As in the 1878 conference, this one was interdenominational, including Presbyterians, Baptists, Reformed Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Reformed, Lutherans, Methodists, and Anglicans. Letters were received from D. L. Moody, Frederic Louis Godet, and Franz Delitzsch, congratulating the conference on the new interest in prophetic studies and expressing their agreement with premillennialism (Dollar, pp. 45-46). The Plymouth Brethren did not attend the conferences in 1878 or 1886 (Dollar, p. 74).

The 1895 prophecy conference was held at Niagara. Lightner says this conference was attended by such men as A. J. Gordon, A. T. Pierson, C. I. Scofield, and James M. Gray (Lightner, p. 30). He did not list A. J. Horton, but Horton, who was later connected with Biola University, did attend at least some of these conferences. A. T. Pierson was a Presbyterian who succeeded Spurgeon and was later baptized by Spurgeon’s brother when he was 58 years old. James M. Gray was later connected with Moody Bible Institute.

The so-called “five points of Fundamentalism” are usually linked to the 1895 prophecy conference at Niagara (Cairns, who says the statement actually included fourteen points, p. 450). Dollar, who agrees that there were originally fourteen points, lists them as: 1) The inspiration of the Bible, 2) the depravity of man, 3) redemption through Christ’s blood, 4) the true church, made up of all believers, 5) the coming of the Lord to set up His reign, 6) the Trinity, 7) the fall of Adam, 8) the need for the new birth, 9) the full deliverance from guilt at salvation, 10) the assurance of salvation, 11) the centrality of Christ in the Bible,



12) walk after the Spirit, 13) the resurrection of both believers and unbelievers, 14) the ripening of the present age for judgment. The imminent return of the Lord was omitted because it was a subject of debate and disagreement (Dollar, pp. 72-73).

In 1910, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church said the fundamentals of the faith were: 1) the inspiration of the Scripture, 2) the virgin birth, 3) Christ's substitutionary atonement, 4) the resurrection of Christ, and 5) the miracles of Christ. They reaffirmed this resolution in 1916 and in 1923 (Cooper, *The Eschatology of the Visible Church*, p. 56).

3. Besides inerrancy and prophecy, other prominent issues in the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century influenced the later Fundamentalist movement. For example, Carpenter says that Sandeen and Marsden have shown that what later became Fundamentalism began in the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century as an interdenominational revivalist network that formed around D. L. Moody. The early leaders include A. J. Gordon, A. T. Pearson (a Presbyterian pastor in Philadelphia), C. I. Scofield, (a Congregationalist Bible prophecy teacher), and R. A. Torrey (a Congregationalist evangelist). They gave Fundamentalism its characteristic concerns, including an intense focus on evangelism as the church's overwhelming concern (Carpenter, p. 6).

Nineteenth-century leaders such as A. J. Gordon, A. B. Simpson, and D. L. Moody wanted to prod churches into an evangelistic outreach, but they did not see that as the church's sole function. When their descendants, however, created a separate movement, its vision of the church's mission became narrowly evangelistic, even before the Fundamentalist-modernist controversies. By the 1930s, within Fundamentalism, the evangelistic emphasis overrode virtually every other category of Christian work.

That list of leaders also gave Fundamentalism its concern for the need of the power of the Holy Spirit, as well as the imminent pre-millennial Second Coming of Christ, and the inspiration of the Scriptures whose very words were free from error (Carpenter, p. 6). The Holiness movement and the Keswick teachings also played a prominent role in the theology of Fundamentalism (Cary, p. 130). The holiness movement, emanating from American Methodism, emphasized an act of surrender and consecration of the will that led to "entire sanctification." Keswick teaching modified that idea to make it more compatible with the Reformed doctrine of sanctification. The act of "surrender" or "consecration" brought victory over sin and power to serve more effectively. "By the 1930s Keswick holiness teaching had become the most prominent model of the 'separated life's spiritual dimension.'" This decision to be willing to go anywhere and do anything often led to missionary service. "Without this infusion of 'surrendered life' piety and its byproduct of missionary zeal, Fundamentalism might have turned out different." (Carpenter, pp. 80-82).

*Development* In the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Fundamentalism began to take shape. The successors of Moody and the others became alarmed at the growth of liberal theology, the erosion of evangelistic commitment in their denominations, and the increasingly secular spirit in America. Between 1910 and 1915, they published *The Fundamentals* (Carpenter, pp. 6-7).

In August 1909, A. C. Dixon preached a sermon that led the wealthy oil brothers, Leman and Milton Stewart, founders of the Union 76 Oil Company, to give \$200,000 to publish *The Fundamentals*. This twelve-volume set included articles, by denominational and non-denominational evangelicals on both sides of the Atlantic, including James Orr, B. B. Warfield, R. A. Torrey, C. I. Scofield, and other evangelical leaders. The first volume came out in 1910 and by 1915 the twelfth volume was published. About 300,000 copies of

each volume were sent free to seminary professors, students, pastors, and Y.M.C.A. secretaries in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain (Cairns, p. 450). *The Fundamentals* were published again in 1917, this time in a four-volume edition edited by R. A. Torrey. In 1958, the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (now Biola University) sponsored the third publication in a two-volume set edited by Dr. Charles L. Feinberg. The influence of *The Fundamentals* “was felt in nearly every denomination” (Mild, p. 51). These essays focused on the fundamentals of the faith. Very little was said about prophecy. Of the 100 essays Fundamentalists in the 1917 edition, only two are about the Second Coming.

According to Carpenter, World War I transformed these conservative evangelicals into militant Fundamentalists. The liberals accused premillennialists of being unpatriotic and perhaps subversive, for denying that World War I was the “war to end all wars” and that an Allied victory would “make the world safe for democracy.” In 1919, the premillennialist party led a coalition of conservative Protestants to form the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association (WCFA) to purge such ideas from the nation’s churches and schools (Carpenter, p. 6).

A prophecy conference was held in Philadelphia in 1918. Cortland Myers, pastor of the Tremont Temple in Boston, preached a sermon during which he railed against liberalism. That prophecy conference was the forerunner of the WCFA, which was formed the next year. The leaders in the formation of WCFA included: W. B. Riley, J. R. Stratton, P. W. Philpott, R. A. Torrey, W. L. Pettingill, Lewis Sperry Chafer, W. H. Griffith Thomas, and others. In 1922, the WCFA met in Los Angeles under the sponsorship of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, led by T. C. Horton. In 1923, it met in the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth and in 1926, in the Jarvis Street Baptist Church in Toronto. Over the years, it gradually weakened and finally died in the 1940s (Dollar, pp. 159-162).

*Battles* In the 1920s, the Fundamentalist movement became militant. Fundamentalists waged war in three ways: by attempting to regain control of denominations, mission boards, and seminaries (unsuccessful), by supporting prohibition and Sunday “blue laws” (mixed success), and by attempting to stop the teaching of evolution in the public schools (fairly successful; for more details see Eskridge, [www.wheaton.edu/isae/defining-evangelicalism/Fundamentalism](http://www.wheaton.edu/isae/defining-evangelicalism/Fundamentalism), accessed 8/28/2014).

1. The most famous battle of all was the Scopes trial in 1925 (“later fictionalized in the highly inaccurate play and film *Inherit the Wind*,” Eskridge). At the time, the state of Tennessee had a law that it was unlawful to teach evolution in the public schools. John T. Scopes, a substitute biology teacher, was accused of teaching evolution. The trial was held in Dayton, Tennessee (Cairns, p. 451).

The trial pitted William Jennings Bryan (1860-1925; Presbyterian layman, former Secretary of State, and three-time Democratic candidate for president) for the prosecution against the famed Chicago defense lawyer Clarence Darrow (1857-1938). Scopes lost. The Sunday after the trial ended, William Jennings Bryan died (Hall, p. 70). Several southern state legislatures passed laws banning the teaching of evolution in the public schools (Cairns, p. 451), but this was a case of winning the battle and losing the war. Fundamentalism became an increasingly separatist movement, departing from the mainline Protestant denominations from which it originated (Cary, p. 129).

In addition, despite the fact that some highly intelligent men who were scholars defended the fundamentals of the faith, the term “Fundamentalist” came to denote an anti-scholarly, anti-intellectual, anti-cultural attitude (Eerdmans’ pp. 596-597). Eventually,

some Fundamentalists became separatists (see “separation” below). They practiced ecclesiastical separation and preached personal separation (separation from drinking, smoking, dancing, card-playing, and going to movies). Fundamentalism subsequently disappeared from the nation’s cultural stage (Eskridge).

2. Denominational battles were fought primarily among the Northern (later American) Baptist and the (northern) Presbyterian Church in the USA (Marsden, p. 4). There were Fundamentalists among various denominations, including the Presbyterians (A. A. Hodge, B. B. Warfield, Robert Dick Wilson, J. Gretchen Machen, etc.), the Baptists (Edgar Y. Mullins, Greek scholar Archibald T. Robertson, etc.) as well as other denominations (Cairns, p. 449). The main battles, however, were among the Presbyterians and the Baptists.

In the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (PCUSA), skirmishes against liberalism appeared early (see the discussion concerning Warfield, Hodge, and Briggs above). In 1903, the Presbyterians (PCUSA) changed their position from a hard-line Calvinism to a toned-down version of Calvinism. Dollar suggests that the New Theology among the Presbyterians came through the back door of a watered-down Calvinism. This change eventually gave the Presbyterians the right to attack their standards of faith (Dollar, p. 177).

In 1922, Harry Emerson Fosdick, a liberal Baptist pastor, set the initial terms of the debate with his sermon “Shall the Fundamentalists Win?” Clarence Macartney, a Presbyterian pastor in Philadelphia, said, “It was the first time I had ever seen or heard the word Fundamentalist used in a religious significance.” It was “a word tossed about with a great deal of scorn or contempt.... The only difference between the fundamental and evangelical believers (is that) the Fundamentalists hold for the pre-millennial and imminent coming of Christ” (Macartney, cited by Dollar p. 176).

Macartney led the Presbytery of Philadelphia to seek the Presbytery of New York to bring the preaching of the First Presbyterian Church into line with Presbyterian doctrine. In 1923, J. Gretchen Machen, a Princeton Seminary Greek professor, wrote *Christianity and Liberalism* (Cary, p. 129). In it, Machen argued that liberalism was not another variation of Christianity, but essentially a new religion. Liberals denied the supernatural element in Christianity. The honest solution would be for liberals to withdraw peacefully from the denominations and start their own organization (Marsden, pp. 32-33). “A separation between the two parties in the church is the crying need of the hour” (Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, p. 160, cited by Marsden, p. 33).

In 1910, 1916, and again in 1923, the General Assembly declared that every candidate seeking to be ordained in the Presbyterian Church ought to affirm: 1) the inerrancy of the Scriptures, 2) the virgin birth (and the deity of Jesus), 3) the substitutionary atonement, 4) the bodily resurrection of Jesus, and 5) the authenticity of Christ’s miracles. Robert Hastings Nichols, a professor at the Auburn Theological Seminary, argued that this requirement was contrary to historical polity of the Presbyterian Church, which only required the Bible and the Westminster Confession of Faith. In 1924, Hasting’s proposal (called the Auburn Affirmation) was passed by the General Assembly.

Referring to the five fundamentals as “particular theories,” the Affirmation argument was summarized: “Some of us regard the particular theories contained in the deliverance of the General Assembly of 1923 as satisfactory explanations of these facts and doctrines. But we are united in believing that these are not the only theories allowed by the Scriptures and our standards as explanations of these facts and doctrines of our religion, and that all

who hold to these facts and doctrines, whatever theories they may employ to explain them, are worthy of all confidence and fellowship.”

More specifically the Affirmation held that: 1) a statement on inerrancy is not necessary, 2) the virgin birth is a theory of the incarnation, 3) the vicarious atonement is only one theory of the atonement, 4) the resurrection of Christ was not necessarily bodily, 5) the miracles were the use of means in works (Dollar, p. 178). Guelzo says the Auburn Affirmation “resurrected many of Briggs’s teachings” (Guelzo, p. 62). The Auburn Affirmation is generally regarded as a turning point in the history of American Presbyterianism. Hall says by this time, liberalism had taken over the major schools of theology as well as denominations (Hall, p. 65).

The Baptists also had battles. A list of outstanding men in the Fundamentalist movement includes such men as W. B. Riley (1861-1947), pastor of the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis, John B. Straton (1874-1929) of the Calvary Baptist Church in New York City, and T. T. Shields (1873-1955), a Baptist pastor in Toronto, Canada. The list should also include Bob Jones (a Methodist), the founder of Bob Jones University, Dr. Carl McIntire (a Presbyterian) of the *Christian Beacon*, and Dr. John R. Rice (a Baptist), the founder of the *Sword of the Lord*. Carpenter says Fundamentalism’s most prominent champions were such men as W. B. Riley, J. Frank Norris, John R. Straton, and Mark Matthews (Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Seattle). He adds that these “warlords” were “fiercely independent, jealous guardians of their freedom and scarcely able to get along on a personal level, much less continue any corporate adventures” (Carpenter, p. 15). Dollar says four Baptist pastors (Shields, Riley, Norris, and Straton) were the prima donnas of Fundamentalism.

T. T. Shields (1873-1955), who had no formal education, was the prominent Baptist pastor of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church in Toronto, Canada from 1910 until his death in 1955. He was the “Battling Baptist” (Priest, p. 72). Here are some examples.

In 1919, the *Canadian Baptist*, the Baptist Convention’s paper, published an editorial attacking the inspiration of Scripture. Shields protested at the 1919 convention of Ontario and Québec Baptists. The editorial was officially condemned. In 1921, he was charged by some in his own church with being a dictator and being unethical in debates. He won two different votes, but 341 people left his church.

In 1923, in Kansas City, Shields helped form the Baptist Bible Union and served as its first president. Other leaders who were present at the formation included W. B. Riley, W. L. Pettingill, and J. Frank Norris. According to Shields, “The express purpose was to declare and wage relentless and uncompromising war on modernism (theological liberalism) on all fronts” (Dollar, p. 109).

In 1926, Shields and L. H. Marshall, a professor at McMasters, a Baptist University, held a debate at the Baptist Convention. The Convention sided with McMasters. In 1927, Jarvis Street Church was voted out of the Ontario and Québec Convention. As a result, the Union of Regular Baptist Churches was formed (Dollar, pp. 106-109).

In 1927, Shields took over the leadership of Des Moines University in Des Moines, Iowa. In 1929, a student riot forced the closing of the school. Among other things, Shields was accused of gross indiscretion (it was alleged that Edith Rebman, the school’s secretary-treasurer, was having an affair with Shields; the board exonerated them both, Priest, p. 94). Shields left that position and basically left the American scene, partly because he was an amillennialist who attacked the Scofield Reference Bible, while the Baptists in American

Fundamentalism were committed premillennialists (Dollar, pp. 109-110; Shields despised Dispensationalism). For more information on Shields, see Gerald L. Priest, "T. T. Shields the Fundamentalist: Man of Controversy" (*Detroit Baptist Theological Journal* 10, 2005, pp. 69–101; at [www.dbts.edu/journals/2995/Priest.pdf](http://www.dbts.edu/journals/2995/Priest.pdf)).

W. B. Riley (1861-1947) was the longtime pastor of the First Baptist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota (1897-1942). He fought against liberalism in the Northern Baptist Convention, was a fierce debater, especially on the subject of evolution, and believed the King James Version of the Bible was inerrant.

In 1902, he founded Northwestern Bible School. A seminary was added in 1935 and a liberal arts college in 1944. Together they were known as Northwestern Schools. In 1956, the seminary was dropped, but it continues at Fourth Baptist Church as Central Baptist Seminary. In 1949, Billy Graham became president of Northwestern Schools.

In 1919, Riley was one of the leaders in organizing the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, which was to wage war on liberalism. In 1923, Riley joined J. Frank Norris and T. T. Shields in the formation of the Bible Baptist Union. His relationship with Norris cooled after a shooting incident (1926) and his relationship with Shields cooled over the Des Moines University debacle (1927; Dollar, pp. 112-122).

In 1926, at the annual meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention, Riley's last attempt to pull the Northern Baptist convention in a conservative direction was voted down decisively. In 1927, the Minnesota legislature defeated his anti-evolution bill (Carpenter, p. 37).

J. Frank Norris (1877-1952) graduated from Baylor University (BA in 1903) and from Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky (Th.M.). He was the long-standing pastor of the First Baptist Church in Fort Worth, Texas (1909-1952).

In 1909, when Norris became the pastor of the First Baptist in Fort Worth, it was known as "the church of the cattle kings," including more than a dozen millionaires (Stokes, p. 28). With his abilities as an orator and organizer, Norris built the first megachurch in America (Stokes, p. xi). In the early part of the Roaring 20s, between 5000 and 6000 people regularly attended his church on Sunday morning. He had "the world's largest Sunday school" (Stokes, p. 43).

Norris was a crusader. He crusaded against Hell's Half Acre (the red light district with about 80 houses of prostitution, many owned by some of Fort Worth's most prominent citizens, including those serving on boards of their own congregations.), liquor (he supported Prohibition), and Roman Catholicism.

Norris was a sensationalist, even preaching against people in his own congregation who were involved in drinking parties. He was called the "Texas Tornado" (Dollar, p. 125). He preached against the sins of people in the political life of the city, even publicly calling some of them by name! One of his sermon titles was, "Should a Prominent Fort Worth Banker Buy Expensive Silk Stockings for Another Man's Wife?" When he preached against evolution, he had a monkey dressed in a coat and tie on the platform with him (Stokes, p. 10). In his final years, Norris expressed regret for having used sensationalism to such a degree (Stokes, p. 326).

Norris was an evangelist, winning multiple thousands of people to Christ in Fort Worth, Detroit, and many other places in the United States. When I was in seminary, my history professor was George Dollar, the man who wrote the book *The History of Fundamentalism*

*in America*. I remember him saying that there was not a block in Fort Worth in which Norris had not won somebody to Christ.

On February 4, 1912, the First Baptist Church burned down (Stokes, p. 37). Norris was indicted for perjury, lying about not knowing the origin of threatening notes (Stokes, p. 40). Later, he was indicted for arson (Stokes, p. 41). Norris was acquitted of the perjury charge, the judge dismissed the arson charge, and when it was filed again, Norris was acquitted (Stokes, p. 42).

In 1919, he accused Baylor professors of teaching evolution. A lifelong pursuit followed. In 1922, he was expelled from the Tarrant County Baptist Association. In 1923, the Texas Baptist Convention refused a seat to the lone delegate from the First Baptist Church of Fort Worth and the following year, it officially expelled Norris and his church. When Southern Baptists held their annual meetings, Norris rented halls near the site to preach his tirades against liberal leaders, literature, and professors (Dollar, pp. 126-129).

Norris is the one who ultimately persuaded William Jennings Bryan to take on the Scopes trial (Stokes, p. 6).

Norris conducted an annual Bible conference and invited such speakers as Shields, Riley, and R. A. Torrey. He preached at Jarvis Street in Toronto for Shields and in Calvary Baptist in New York City for Straton, as well as many other places. In 1932, he organized the World Baptist Fellowship and in 1939, founded the Fundamental Baptist Bible Institute (renamed the Bible Baptist Seminary in 1945 and later renamed Arlington Baptist College).

Norris pastored two churches at the same time that were 1300 miles apart! In 1934, Norris held two series of meetings in Detroit. Hundreds of the people who got saved join Temple Baptist Church, which pressured Norris to become their pastor. Without resigning from the First Baptist Church in Fort Worth, Norris was pastor of Temple Baptist in Detroit for 13 years (1934 to 1947).

In 1926, Norris killed a man. Norris had had a running battle with Fort Worth mayor H. C. Meacham. Meacham's friend, D. E. Chipps, a wealthy lumberman, called on Norris at his church on a Saturday and threatened to kill him. Chipps left Norris's office, but immediately turned around and re-entered the office. When Norris thought he was about to be shot, he fired first, killing Chipps (July 17, 1926). Norris was charged with murder, but the jury found him innocent based on the Texas law of self-defense (Dollar, p. 132). It only took the jury a little over an hour to reach that verdict (Stokes, p. 320; for a detailed account of this episode in Norris's life, see David R. Scopes, *The Shooting Salvationist*).

Norris was also politically active. In his sermons, on his radio program, and in his paper (*Searchlight*, later named the *Fundamentalist of Texas*, and still later, the *Fundamentalist*), he campaigned for people running office. In 1928, he campaigned across Texas for Herbert Hoover and against the anti-Prohibition Catholic Democrat Al Smith. Hoover carried Texas and Norris sat on the platform at his Washington inaugural (Stokes, p. 325). Norris was pro-Israel (Stokes, p. 53). Having been a Zionist since World War I, Harry Truman asked Norris for a written opinion on the "Palestinian question," in the weeks prior to America's recognition of the modern state of Israel in 1948 (Stokes, p. 326).

J. Frank Norris was the founder of the Independent Fundamentalist Baptists. The roots of many of today's Fundamentalists and evangelicals can be traced back to him (<http://sharperiron.org/article/book-review-shooting-salvationist>, accessed 9/2/2014). In fact, Barry Hankins wrote a non-favorable book on Norris called *God's Rascal: J. Frank Norris & the Beginnings of Southern Fundamentalism*. The very month that J. Frank Norris

died (August 1952), a young man from Lynchburg, Virginia named Jerry Falwell enrolled in the Baptist Bible College in Springfield, Missouri, which traces its roots to Norris (Stokes, p. 327). Falwell became a well-known (and often controversial) Southern Baptist pastor, televangelist, and commentator. Falwell founded a Christian academy, a university, and the Moral Majority during the late 1960s and 1970s.

John Roach Straton (1874-1929) graduated from Mercer University in Macon, Georgia and Southern Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. In 1918, after being the pastor of several Baptist churches, he became the pastor of Calvary Baptist Church in New York City. It has been said of him that he was “a crusader, a two-fisted hard-hitting man of God,” the most fundamental of the Fundamentalists,” and the “man who fights Broadway.” He entered many controversies.

Straton was of the opinion that theaters should be boycotted because of their degradation of women. In 1922, an actor named Brady challenged Straton to a debate. It was reported on the front page of the *New York Times*. Also, in that year, when Fosdick preached his famous sermon “Shall the Fundamentalists Win?”, Straton answered with a sermon entitled, “Shall the Funny Monkeyists Win?” He also tried to get the New York Baptist Ministers Conference to officially condemn Fosdick’s view, but he was not successful. In 1923, the Northern Baptist Convention invited W. H. P. Faunce, a man who denied the virgin birth, to give the keynote address. Straton stood on a chair during the meeting and made a public protest. He was jeered and hissed. He often opposed liberal seminary professors. In 1926, he debated a Unitarian. In 1927, he debated a preacher who said there was no hell.

On the other hand, Straton stood up for women’s rights, the separation of church and state, and justice for African-Americans, some of whom were members of his church (Dollar, pp. 135-143).

Shields, Riley, and Straton, as well as others in the Northern Baptist Convention, fought liberalism in their convention but did not succeed. Dollar explains (Dollar, pp. 145-158) that as early as 1910, Riley said, “We have surrendered the denomination into the hands of the Higher Critics.” During World War I, A. H. Strong, an American Baptist who compiled *Strong’s Concordance*, expressed alarm over the liberalism of missionaries he saw when he visited the mission field. In 1919, the speaker at the annual convention was Fosdick!

In reaction, just prior to the 1920 convention, a preconvention conference was held at the Delaware Baptist Church in Buffalo, New York. After that preconvention conference, Curtis Lee Lawes, the editor of the *Watchman Examiner*, a national Baptist paper, kept thinking about the numerous references to the fundamentals of the Bible. He called the men at that conference “Fundamentalists,” which is the first recorded use of that name. Lawes wrote, “Not only are we in danger of compromising our distinctive Baptist principles, we are also in danger of compromising our more fundamental Christian principles.” J. R. Straton, W. B. Riley, W. L. Pettingill, Clarence Larkin and others attended that meeting.

At that preconference, A. C. Dixon, a faculty member of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, spoke against evolution. W. B. Riley spoke on “Modernism in Baptist Schools,” stressing the inerrant book, the deity of Christ and the need for the new birth, which he declared were essentials of the Baptist faith, which were being denied in Baptist schools.

In 1921, the Fundamentalists met before the regular convention, calling themselves the Fundamentalist Fellowship. During the convention itself, decisions were made that, in essence, allowed liberals to remain on the faculties of various schools. Dollar declares,

“The fight was over, and only skirmishes would ensue.... From 1922 to 1925 the Fundamentalists suffered defeat after defeat on the Convention floor” (Dollar, p. 154). “Protesters had expected success at the Buffalo convention in 1920; they had continued to hope for change at Des Moines in 1921; they had seen failure written on the wall of the 1922 conclave at Indianapolis; and they had been soundly defeated and routed at the Atlantic meeting in 1923” (Dollar, p. 162).

Dollar says the 1920s marked the end of the Fundamentalists’ protest within the various denominations. “Fundamentalists lost the battles but not the Bible; they left the religious structures but not the Scriptures, for no man could take these from them. Attempts to cleanse their groups had failed. Now they turned to new fellowships and new schools, thereby becoming isolated from the mainstream of American religious life” (Dollar, p. 86). Thus, the next step in the history of Fundamentalism was separation.

*Separation* The Fundamentalists separated from the mainline denominations, but separation was not originally a part of Fundamentalism. In fact, at first, they did not want to separate! “In the early stages of the controversies, Baptist and Presbyterian militants had hoped to drive the liberals out of power, if not out of the denomination altogether” (Carpenter, p. 43). Even as they lost denominational battles during the 1920s, many Fundamentalists stayed within their denominations as an evangelical influence. Among the Northern Baptists, some of the most militant Fundamentalists felt no compelling need to withdraw from the denomination (Carpenter, p. 44). Nevertheless, even though the early Fundamentalists did not start out to separate from the mainland denominations, they eventually did just that. The story of the Bible Baptist Union is an illustration.

In 1923, the Baptist Bible Union (BBU) was founded in Kansas City. Riley, Norris, Shields, and Straton were there; Shields was elected the first president. Riley’s vision was that the BBU would create a worldwide fellowship of Fundamental Baptists. His vision never materialized. Shields said that the BBU was organized for “the express purpose of declaring and waging relentless and uncompromised war on modernism on all fronts.”

At this point in the history of Fundamentalism, *separation was not an issue*. In fact, one of the resolutions stated, “We declare our determination not to withdraw from the various conventions but to purge our beloved denominations from such heresies.” Of the three “prima donnas” in the USA (Norris, Riley, and Straton), only Norris had left his convention and that was because his church was not accepted in the Association. In Canada, Shields’ church was voted out of their convention in 1927. Riley remained in the Northern Baptist Convention until 1947, the year he died.

They did not make prophecy an issue either. Another resolution stated, “We welcome to its membership all Baptists who sign its confession of faith, whatever variations of interpretation they may hold on the millennial question, consistent with the belief in the personal bodily Second Coming of Christ.” This noncommittal stand on prophecy was probably designed to accommodate either Shields, who was an amillennialist, or those who insisted on a strict doctrine of the imminent return of Christ.

The BBU was a preacher’s movement. Planning, organization, and effective implementation were secondary to preaching. The shooting by Norris in 1926 was a serious blow to the BBU. Other factors weakened it, but the other major blow was the debacle surrounding the bankrupt Des Moines University. Without Norris or Riley, Shields opened it in 1927. Several problems developed: hostility between the faculty, Shields and Rebman, the charge that the degrees of the president of the school, H. C. Wayman, had not been



earned, the student riot, and the rumor of an affair between Shields and Redman. The University went under after only two years.

The last meeting of the BBU was held in 1932. In that meeting, a new name was adopted—the General Association of Regular Baptists (GARBC). The Regular Baptists saw their mission as being a separated fellowship, planting new congregations, and also stirring up “Fundamentalist outrage against Northern Baptist liberalism and recruiting as many dissident congregations as possible” (Carpenter, p. 46). One of their chief controversialists, Robert T. “Fighting Bob” Ketchum, wrote against the Northern Baptists, concluding that correction from within was impossible and, thus, implying that anyone who persisted in cooperating with the denomination was a coward and a compromiser (Carpenter, p. 47).

The “prima donnas” of Fundamentalism never associated with the new organization. W. B. Riley, a staunch Fundamentalist who had been a leader in the Bible Baptist Union, stayed within the Northern Baptists, expressing hope that Fundamentalists would prevail by placing more pastors and missionaries than the liberals (Carpenter, p. 47; Riley left the Northern Baptists just before he died in 1947, Carpenter, p. 48). After the collapse of the BBU, J. Frank Norris organized the World Baptist Fellowship (1932).

At any rate, the BBU is an illustration of Fundamentalism’s move from militancy to separation. At first, separation from their denomination was not the issue, but later it became the issue. By the 1930s, the Fundamentalist movement emerged as an estranged group of dissenters (Carpenter, p. 35). Carpenter pinpoints three factors that contributed to this development.

The first factor was an intense desire to reach the masses with their message, coupled with a strong streak of anti-elitism. While an academic revolution was changing the cultural power in America with modern research universities and their naturalistic presuppositions replacing the theistic foundation of earlier intellectual life, the Fundamentalist movement lost touch with the nation’s intellectual current, concentrating on reaching the masses with their message (Carpenter, pp. 35-36).

A second factor was the prophetic pessimism of dispensational premillennialism that predicted the ruin of the church because of its departure from orthodox Christianity. As early as the 1870s, the Plymouth Brethren had urged American revivalists to separate themselves from the mainline denominations, but, at that time, the vast majority of American converts to dispensationalism remained within their denominations. One of the few exceptions was A. C. Gaebelein, who practiced ecclesiastical separation by leaving the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1899 (Carpenter, p. 38).

In 1917, several liberal professors at the University of Chicago Divinity School launched an attack against premillennialism. As mentioned earlier, these liberal professors accused premillennialists of disloyalty because they preached that World War I was not “the war to end all wars,” that the kingdom of God would not come through moral progress, and that the social application of the gospel was a waste of time. These professors argued that such ideas were “inherently hostile to democratic ideals, unpatriotic in a time of national crisis, and possibly a threat to national security.” One went so far as to insinuate that the premillennialists might be receiving funding from the enemy. R. A. Torrey retorted that the charge that German agents were providing the funding for “pre-millennial propaganda” was obviously ridiculous, but “the charge that the destructive criticism that rules in Chicago University” came from German sources was “undeniable.” American

university professors and liberal theologians teaching godless philosophies were the real traitors (Carpenter, pp. 38-39).

A third factor was the alienation of the once-respected conservatives who were no longer taken seriously (Carpenter, p. 35). A liberal professor “equated premillennialists with Jehovah’s Witnesses, accused the premillennialists of holding to a crude dictation theories of inspiration, and expressed condescending assumptions about the views of the ‘thoughtful Christians today,’ which were opposed, of course, to premillennialists’ views (Carpenter, p. 41).

Thus, by the late 1920s and early 1930s, even the most moderate Fundamentalists were feeling afflicted and alienated. “To be a Fundamentalist in the 1930s was to bear the social and psychic burden of an outsider” (Carpenter, p. 43). It was during this period that some Fundamentalists separated from their denominations.

1. The Presbyterians. J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937) was a New Testament scholar at Princeton Seminary from 1906 to 1929 and the author of books defending the faith, including *The Origin of Paul’s Religion* (1921), *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923), *What is Faith?* (1925), and *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1930). Machen took the lead in founding Westminster Seminary in Philadelphia (1929), where he taught the New Testament until his death.

In 1933, being concerned about liberalism among Presbyterians on the mission field, Machen formed an independent mission board, the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions. At that point, Machen lost a considerable number of allies including Clarence Macartney, who saw the Independent Board as divisive (Carpenter, p. 45). Although Machen had preached Congregational pastor Harold Ockenga’s ordination sermon, Ockenga, who had become Macartney’s assistant pastor in Pittsburgh, sided with Macartney (Carpenter, p. 48; Ockenga later became one of the founders of Neo-evangelicalism; see below under Neo-evangelicalism). At this point, Carl McIntyre stayed with Machen (Carpenter, p. 48).

The General Assembly declared that independent mission boards were unconstitutional and gave those associated with them an ultimatum to sever their ties to them or face a trial. When that happened, Machen lost more followers, including Wilbur M. Smith (Carpenter, p. 45). Others refused to sever ties with the Independent Board. Machen, Charles Woodbridge, Carl McIntyre, and five others were charged and “unfrocked” (their ordination was removed). A Unitarian writer called this “the strangest of all church trials” because it involved a rebellion against heresy (Dollar, p. 180).

In 1936, Machen and others organized the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. By that time, “only a small fraction of the original Presbyterian Fundamentalist coalition went with him” (Carpenter, p. 45). In 1937, a dispute over premillennialism, polity, and lifestyle resulted in another split. Carl McIntire and J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., President of Wheaton College, broke from Machen and organized the Bible Presbyterian Church (1938; Carpenter, p. 45). Later, Carl McIntire founded the Faith Theological Seminary, which held to premillennialism. Defectors from McIntire’s group founded Covenant Seminary in St. Louis.

The separation issue produced divisions and lasting resentments among people who agreed on the fundamentals of the faith and had even been close friends. For example, two Westminster Seminary classmates, Harold Ockenga and Carl McIntyre, later developed a bitter rivalry over these issues. The feud between the two lasted for decades. In 1940 and

1941, Ockenga was involved in forming what became the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), a broad coalition of Protestant conservatives who were non-separating Fundamentalists. McIntyre hastily formed the militant separatist American Council of Christian Churches (1941) and lost no time in attacking the NAE, which had elected Ockenga as president, for being soft on separation, modernism, and communism (Carpenter, p. 48).

An obituary for Machen, which was published in the *Baltimore Evening Sun* on January 18, 1937, was entitled “Dr. Fundamentalist.” Machen himself said, “I never call myself a ‘Fundamentalist.’ There is indeed, no inherent objection to the term; and if the disjunction is between ‘Fundamentalism’ and ‘Modernism,’ then I am willing to call myself a Fundamentalist of the most pronounced type. But after all, what I prefer to call myself is not a ‘Fundamentalist’ but a ‘Calvinist,’ that is, an adherent of the Reformed Faith. As such I regard myself as standing in the great central current of the Church’s life, the current which flows down from the Word of God through Augustine and Calvin, and which has found noteworthy expression in America in the great tradition represented by Charles Hodge and Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield and the other representatives of the ‘Princeton School’” (<http://www.opc.org/books/fighting/pt1.html>; accessed 8/26/2014).

2. The Baptists. As has been pointed out, in 1932, Baptist Bible Union (BBU) became the General Association of Regular Baptists (GARBC). In 1947, the Conservative Baptist Association was founded (Cairns, p. 451). It was organized by “Baptists who could not stand the liberalism of Northern Baptists” (Dollar, p. 227). First, in 1943, they formed the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society (CBFMS) for evangelical missionaries within the Northern Baptist Convention. Then in 1946, what was left of the 1921 Fundamentalist Fellowship (Northern Baptist pastors), was renamed the Conservative Baptist Fellowship (CBF). Finally, in 1947 the Conservative Baptist Association of America (CBA of A) was created. In 1950, the Conservative Baptist Home Missions Society was added.

In 1950, the Baptist Bible Fellowship formed. In 1932, J. Frank Norris had organized the World Baptist Fellowship and in 1939, founded the Fundamental Baptist Bible Institute (renamed the Bible Baptist Seminary in 1945 and later renamed again the Arlington Baptist College). G. Beauchamp Vick, who had worked closely with Norris in Detroit and had been made president of the Bible Baptist Seminary in Fort Worth, split with Norris in 1950 (see, Dollar, pp. 217-218; for Vick’s explanation of what happened, see *Baptist Bible Tribune*, June 23, 1950 at <http://www.tribune.org/files/6-23-50Pg1.pdf>, accessed August 26, 2014). Vick and 118 others pastors from the World Baptist Fellowship formed the Baptist Bible Fellowship and started the Baptist Bible College in Springfield, Missouri. Dollars says the Bible Baptist Fellowship is the largest Fundamentalist group in the world (Dollar, p. 219). In 2000, they had 3,294 churches (Mead, p. 190). Jerry Falwell was a graduate of Baptist Bible College.

3. Other Groups. In 1930, The Independent Fundamental Churches of America (IFCA) was founded at the Cicero (Illinois) Bible Church. Many of its pastors and leaders were from Congregational and Presbyterian backgrounds. Members of this group include Louis Talbot, M. R. DeHaan, John F. Walvoord, Charles L. Fienberg, Alden A. Gannett, Merrill F. Unger, et al.

As well, many theologically conservative *churches* became identified with the Fundamentalist movement. Dollar lists those distinctively fundamental churches as

Tremont Temple in Boston, Calvary Baptist and First Baptist in New York City, Moody Memorial in Chicago, First Baptist in Fort Worth, Church of the Open Door in Los Angeles, and First Presbyterian in Seattle (Dollar, p. 89). “With their own newspapers, radio programs, missionaries, youth programs and Bible conferences, they [these churches] were virtually pocket-sized denominations, separated and sufficient unto themselves” (Carpenter, p. 46).

It should be pointed out that Fundamentalists built “a network of Bible and missionary training schools, Bible conference centers, domestic and foreign missions, agencies, and religious magazines” (Carpenter, p. 6). Carpenter gives a detailed description of the Bible Institutes, the Bible conferences, the radio broadcasts, the publishing enterprises, and the foreign mission boards (Carpenter, pp. 16-32).

“Most Fundamental pastors and teachers have been affected directly or indirectly by the Bible School movement” (Dollar, p. 188). It started in 1856 when Charles Haddon Spurgeon founded the Pastors’ College (in 1923, the name was changed to Spurgeon’s College). The purpose was to give people with little academic background an opportunity for training. In 1872, H. Grattan Guinness organized the East London Institute for Home and Foreign Missions for the purpose of bypassing university training for those going to the mission field. It majored in the knowledge of the Bible and practical experience.

Impressed with the work of Guinness, in 1880, A. B. Simpson wrote an article calling for the establishment of a missionary training college. In 1883, under his leadership, such an institution was opened in the Christian and Missionary Alliance Tabernacle in New York City. It was patterned after Guinness’ school (Dollar, pp. 70-71).

Other Bible institutes opened including the Boston Missionary Training School (1889; later named Gordon Bible College and then Gordon College in Wenham, Massachusetts), Hyack Missionary College (1892), Moody Bible Institute (opened in 1886, but did not engage in its present work until 1899), the Toronto Bible College (1894), and the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (1908, now Biola University). By 1976, 50,000 students were enrolled in 400 Bible schools.

Dollar says what Spurgeon did in London, Gordon did in Boston, Moody did in Chicago, Riley did in Minneapolis, Norris did in Fort Worth, Shields did in Toronto, John Brown and Bob Jones, Sr., did in the South, Lee Roberson did in Chattanooga, T. C. Horton did in Los Angeles, and Lewis Sperry Chafer did in Dallas (Dollar, pp. 80-81). Brookes did not start a school in St. Louis, but later a school was organized and named after him (Brookes Bible Institute, Dollar, p. 76).

Also, Wheaton College was founded in 1860 and Columbia Bible College was started in 1923. Dallas Theological Seminary was founded by Lewis Sperry Chafer (1871-1952) in 1924. Chafer wrote a multi-volume *Systematic Theology* (1947-1948), setting forth dispensational pre-millennialism. In 1926, evangelist Bob Jones began Bob Jones University.

*The Scofield Reference Bible* should also be mentioned. C. I. Scofield (1843-1921) popularized dispensational pre-millennialism in the footnotes of his *Scofield Reference Bible*, which was first published in 1909. It was the unofficial text of the Bible in many Bible schools and was widely used by laypeople (Cairns, p. 450), especially in Fundamentalist circles (González, II, p. 257).

Why did some Fundamentalists insist on ecclesiastical separation while others did not? Carpenter gives an extensive answer to this question (Carpenter, pp. 49-53). He lists a

variety of factors, including doctrinal, social, temperamental, experiential, environmental, and associational. For some, a contributing factor was the idea that the true church imposes discipline (an idea inherent in Calvinism). For some, the issue was that believers should separate from the coming Great Apostasy (a dispensational doctrine). Except for Machen and T. T. Shields, all separatist groups were thoroughly dispensationalists, yet there were dispensationalists on both sides of the debate. For some, the critical catalyst was personality. “Some Fundamentalist leaders seem destined to become separatists by virtue of their personalities. J. Frank Norris, for instance, was a violent person who relished agitation and conflict, and he felt driven to build his own empire.... By the end of his career, Norris had alienated not only the (Southern) Convention loyalists but militant allies such as Robert T. Ketcham, John R. Rice, William Bell Riley, and even his former associate pastor G. Beauchamp Vick. All agreed that Norris was temperamentally unable to be part of any association that he could not dominate. This trait helps explain the highly feudal character of separatist Fundamentalism, which is marked more by the empires of regional warlords than by strong networks of cooperation” (Carpenter, p. 51).

Even after the Fundamentalists were separated ecclesiastically so that they had relatively few opportunities for a face-to-face confrontation with liberals, “maintaining a militant stance against modernism was so important to Fundamentalists’ sense of identity and purpose that the movement’s leaders kept up the rhetorical attacks” (Carpenter, p. 64). Fundamentalists were a contentious lot and “they held up confrontation as one of their principal duties” (Carpenter, p. 64). For some, fighting became a way of life. Aggressiveness became a badge of Fundamentalism. A combative posturing before the congregation of the already-convinced became a trademark (Carpenter, p. 66). The militant stance of separatist pastors affected the way they ministered to their own flock. They became “increasingly authoritarian and, at times, bullying in their relationships with their congregation. Pastors saw themselves as the Lord’s anointed.... Browbeating from the pulpit, a common practice in separatist circles, was one of the most obvious indications of this growing dictatorial spirit” (Carpenter, pp. 66-67). “By example and by explicit teaching in his publications, (John R.) Rice taught thousands of Fundamentalist pastors how to boss others around” (Carpenter, p. 67).

To ecclesiastical separation was added personal separation. The forerunners of the Fundamentalist movement were influenced by the holiness movement. The holiness revivals of the 1870s, 1880s, and 1890s called for a return to Wesley’s teaching of a morally disciplined life, including standards for modesty, chastity, and temperance. By the late 1920s and early 1930s, as American culture was turning more and more away from God, Fundamentalists stressed the “separated life.” “The separated life of the Fundamentalists meant a variety of things, but most visibly, of course, was their desire, in the midst of the Jazz Age, to uphold all the behavioral standards of 19<sup>th</sup>-century evangelicalism. In addition to abiding by the principles of strict sexual chastity and modesty in dress, Fundamentalists were to abstain from alcoholic drink, profanity or coarse language, social dancing, (and dance music), and the theater—including the movies, using tobacco, playing cards, gambling, and working on Sunday (even playing too strenuously) were also forbidden. Extremes in fashion and heavy use of cosmetics were considered worldly” (Carpenter, p. 58).

Prior to the 1930s, students in Bible schools and Christian colleges were largely unregulated (Carpenter, p. 59). The 1931 Wheaton College catalog introduced a policy

change; each student had to sign a formal agreement to abide by the school's "standards of life." In 1939, a statement was added to the catalog that every student had to sign the standards every year and the 1944 catalog stipulated that the Wheaton "pledge" was enforced for its students, year-round, even during summer vacations (Carpenter, p. 60).

"By stiffening their requirements for behavioral conformity, Fundamentalists were replicating part of the sectarian pattern of development that had marked the Wesleyan holiness movement several decades earlier. It had become very important for the identity and coherence of Fundamentalism to be able to tell who was an insider and who was an outsider. The behavioral code was becoming an indispensable tool for boundary-setting" (Carpenter, pp. 60-61).

In 1935, J. Edwin Orr, an Irish Fundamentalist revivalist, toured the American South. To his dismay, he discovered that "quite a majority of believers go to the movies once a week, as well as other questionable amusements, and the *unpainted* face is more an exception than the rule" (Carpenter, p. 59, italics his). There were a few exceptions. In 1932, Donald Grey Barnhouse wrote that genuine separation is "an attitude of the heart and mind and not a mere withdrawal of the body" (Barnhouse, cited by Carpenter, p. 61). In 1936, McIntyre criticized Westminster Theological Seminary for not requiring its students and faculty to forswear the use of alcohol (Carpenter, p. 60).

Realizing that codifying external behavior ran the risk of being pharisaical, Fundamentalists also taught that the truly separated believer observes positive norms such as daily family prayer and Bible reading, parents leading their children to Christ, participation in Christian activities, etc. (Carpenter, p. 61). Living in such an environment reinforced external standards.

To sum up, originally, Fundamentalism was simply a *theological position* (a belief in the fundamentals of the Christian faith). Although dispensational premillennialists were among the first Fundamentalists, dispensational premillennialism was not part of the fundamentals (see the 1895 statement *The Fundamentals*, and the statement of the Presbyterians in 1910). In the 1920s, Fundamentalism became a *movement*. When the Fundamentalists attempted to rescue their denominations from liberalism, *militancy* became a characteristic of Fundamentalism. Even then, dispensational premillennialism was not part of Fundamentalism (Marsden, p. 10). Still later, the Fundamentalists *separated* from their denominations, but that was not their original intent. Thus, the evolution of Fundamentalism went from a theological position to a militant movement to a separatist stance.

To put Fundamentalists into clear focus, Carpenter makes a distinction between Fundamentalists and evangelicals. He points out that all Fundamentalists are evangelicals, but not all evangelicals are Fundamentalists. For example, the very conservative Missouri Synod Lutherans made proclamation of the gospel and opposition to modernism a central concern, but they were critical of true Fundamentalists, because of their emphasis on conversion, their de-emphasis of the sacraments, their interdenominational attitude, and their view of biblical prophecy. In fact, concerning prophecy, the Missouri Synod Lutherans considered Fundamentalists near-heretics. The theologically conservative and enthusiastically evangelistic Southern Baptists had Fundamentalist agitators in their midst, but Southern Baptist leaders resented making premillennialism a test of orthodoxy while downplaying denominational loyalty. The Assemblies of God and other Pentecostal groups considered themselves to be doctrinally "fundamental," but insisted that Fundamentalism

was missing the “full gospel” (Carpenter, p. 8). So by the early 1930s, the Fundamentalist movement consisted of those whose roots, by and large, were in the interdenominational, premillennial, Bible school network (Carpenter, p. 8). “Nevertheless, Fundamentalism was probably the most broadly influential American evangelical movement in the second third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; its ideals, outlook, and religious ‘goods and services’ penetrated virtually all other movements and traditions” (Carpenter, p. 9).

In 1973, after the emergence of Neo-evangelicalism (see below), Dollar wrote his book on the history of Fundamentalism; In it, he divided Fundamentalists into three groups: 1) militant Fundamentalists (and those who interpret the Bible literally and expose all affirmations and attitudes not found in the Word of God), 2) moderate Fundamentalists (those who accept all the affirmations of the Bible, but refuse to expose error), 3) modified Fundamentalists (those who are basically evangelical, but because of their surrender to Neo-evangelicalism, they are outside the mainstream of historic Fundamentalism; for example, they dismiss the imminent coming of the Lord as unimportant). He says, “The basis of this classification is the militancy of opposition to all forms of compromise with apostasy” (Dollar, pp. 282-289). Carpenter divides Fundamentalism into militant, moderate, and revisionist (Carpenter, p. xi).

Clearly, Dollar considers militancy to be the chief characteristic of historic Fundamentalism. To that could be added the preaching of ecclesiastical and personal separation. For example, people who served key roles in J. Frank Norris’s church had to affirm that they did not play cards (Stokes, p. 277). Indeed, separation became an article of faith (Marsden, p. 7). Marsden calls Fundamentalists “strict separatist Fundamentalists” and yet acknowledges that there are “countless subgroups” each with “its own emphasis, institutions, and personalities” (Marsden, p. vii).

For example, among Baptist Fundamentalists, pastors insisted on giving an “altar call” at every service. Carpenter says, “going forward” became “a Fundamentalist sacrament” (Carpenter, p. 77). He adds, “Evangelism was so central a duty for the born-again Christian that some Fundamentalists felt guilty if they did not try to give some evangelistic word during even the most casual or fleeting of human contacts” and “the entire Christian mission was largely reduced to winning converts.... By the 1930s, therefore, the evangelistic emphasis overrode virtually every other category of Christian work within Fundamentalism” (Carpenter, p. 78). The church was reduced to “a soul saving station and an armory for mobilizing cadres of lay evangelists” (Carpenter, p. 79).

Evangelism was central but varied widely. “Whether straightforward and sentimental like Moody and Sankey or more formal and intellectual like their protégé, Reuben A. Torrey, or sentimental and vaudevillian like Billy Sunday, Fundamentalists made the revival style and ethic integral to their movement” (Carpenter, p. 126).

Also, among Baptist Fundamentalists, there was an emphasis on living a separated life. The separated life was described as not participating in such “worldly” activities as dancing and going to the movies. One critic of Fundamentalism complained that the gospel had been warped into “believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, don’t smoke, don’t go to movies... and you will be saved” (Carnell, cited by Carpenter, p. 87). Fundamentalists, of course, would object that that’s not what they are saying a person has to do to be saved, but they would most assuredly say that that’s what a person had to do to be separated from the world.

## Pentecostalism

Before the beginning of Pentecostalism (1901), there was a teaching within Methodism of an experience of entire sanctification after salvation, a growing belief in the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a third blessing, and renewed interest in spiritual gifts, particularly healing (Eerdmans', p. 618; for more details, see G. Michael Cocoris, *Pentecostalism*). Pentecostalism is the doctrine that the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, an experience subsequent to salvation, is speaking in tongues, originally said to be speaking in a language not previously known or learned. Pentecostalism began in Topeka, Kansas, but the three-year-long meetings held on Azusa Street in Los Angeles were the launching pad of twentieth-century Pentecostalism (Eerdmans', p. 618).

*Charles Parham* Charles F. Parham (1873-1929) was "The Father of the Pentecostal Movement," because he was the first in church history to teach that there was an experience after conversion called the baptism of the Holy Spirit and *the evidence of it was speaking in tongues*. The story begins in Topeka.

Being interested in church history, I went to see if I could find the place where Pentecostalism began. After visiting Topeka, I ended up at the Apostolic Faith Church, which is now in Baxter Springs, Kansas. I met with the leaders of the church, who spent several hours talking with me about the history of their movement. They also gave me a copy of Parham's biography written by his wife (Sarah E. Parham. *The Life of Charles F. Parham*. Baxter Springs, Kansas: self-published, 1930; a copy is on the website [www.freelygiven.us](http://www.freelygiven.us)). The following account of the Charles Parham story is taken from that book (remember, it was written by his wife) with comments from other sources.

Charles Fox Parham was born in Muscatine, Iowa on June 4, 1873 (his mother was a Quaker, hence the name Fox). When he was five years old, his family moved to Kansas. At 13, he was converted in a Congregational church (Parham, pp. 3-5). He preached his first sermon when he was 15 years old and at age 16, he entered Southwestern Kansas College. Before long, he dropped out of college, feeling that education was not a priority for him (Robeck, p. 40.)

After his ordination, he served as pastor of the Methodist Church in Eudora, Kansas. Being "often in conflict with higher authorities," he left "denominationalism forever" (Parham, p. 23). In 1894, Parham became an evangelist. As a result of his meetings, he established the Apostolic Faith movement of independent churches (originally called "missions"). While conducting evangelistic meetings, he became convinced that he should be baptized by immersion (Parham, p. 27). In 1898, he established "a Divine Healing Home" on the corner of Fourth and Jackson streets in Topeka, which he called "Bethel" (Parham, p. 39).

In June 1900, Frank Sandford, an evangelist from Maine, held a series of tent meetings in Topeka. Those meetings prompted Seymour to travel to Maine to see Sandford's work first-hand. Along the way, he stopped to observe the work of John Alexander Dowie in Zion, Illinois and that of A. B. Simpson of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in New York City. Parham spent six weeks watching Sandford's work at the Holy Ghost and Us Bible School in Maine.

Since Sandford influenced Parham (Robeck, p. 42), some things about Sandford need to be noted. Sandford embraced the Holiness position on sanctification, taught the Anglo-Israelite theory (a hypothesis that Anglo-Saxons were descended from the ten "lost tribes"



of ancient Israel), and was an advocate of divine healing. As a result of a D. L. Moody's summer conference in Northfield, Massachusetts, Sandford was committed to world evangelism. After a trip around the world, in 1892, he decided that all current missionary methods were inadequate and ineffective. He decided that God wanted him to work with apostolic "signs, wonders, and mighty deeds" and that the gift of tongues, the ability to speak the languages of the world without prior study, needed to be restored (Robeck, pp. 41-42).

The most definitive study of Sandford and "Shiloh" (the name of the town in southern Maine and also a nickname of Sandford's Christian sect) entitled *Fair, Clear, and Terrible: The Story of Shiloh* (British American Publishing, 1989) was written by Shirley Nelson, whose parents grew up as part of the Shiloh community. Nelson calls Sandford "deluded and self-exonerating" ([www.deceptioninthechurch.com/trustandtrouble.html](http://www.deceptioninthechurch.com/trustandtrouble.html), accessed April 11, 2015). Sandford claimed to be Elijah and told people, "If they rejected him, they would go to hell" (<http://fwselijah.com/timeline.htm>, accessed April 11, 2015).

"Parham's visit to Shiloh had a profound effect on him. He concluded that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was available to all believers who lived a holy life and sought to attain it. He believed in the restoration of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, listed in 1 Corinthians 12-14. He came to believe, like Sanford, that the gift of tongues meant the ability to speak in different foreign languages of the world without prior knowledge or study. This would become the ultimate evangelistic tool for the person with this gift would be able to proclaim the gospel in a foreign setting in complete reliance upon, and under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit" (Robeck, p. 42). After spending six weeks at Shiloh (<http://fwselijah.com/timeline.htm>), Parham returned to Topeka in September 1900 "excited to start a new Bible school, where the only text was the Bible" (Hayford and Moore, p. 55)

In October 1900, Parham opened the Bethel Bible School (Parham, p. 51), where he was the only teacher. Students were required to "forsake all." The highly regimented schedule consisted of daily prayer, classroom study, routine chores, evangelism, and community service. As well, a twenty-four-hour prayer chain was established with each student taking a three-hour shift (Hayford and Moore, p. 56). Students did not pay board or tuition (Parham, p. 51).

Parham believed that salvation is by faith in the finished work of Christ. He preached that sanctification was a second work of grace, as taught by John Wesley (Parham, p. 21; later he came to believe in three experiences: in being saved, sanctified, and baptized with the Holy Spirit; Parham, pp. 210, 259). He preached and practiced healing, believing that healing was in the atonement (Parham, pp. 31, 40, 238). He believed in the restoration of the nine gifts of the Holy Spirit (Parham, p. 182). Yet he said, "We know many dreams are caused by something that we had eaten or an overloaded stomach" (Parham, p. 189). In his 1902 book *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness*, Parham taught Anglo-Israelism, yet he also taught that the Jews would return to Palestine (Parham, p. 105). As a result of the influence of his wife's grandfather, Parham believed in the destruction of the wicked, instead of eternal torment (Parham, p. 14). He was a conscientious objector (Parham, p. 272).

At any rate, here is Parham's account of the origin of the Pentecostal Movement: "We opened the Bible School at Topeka, Kansas in October 1900 to which we invited all ministers and Christians who were willing to forsake all, sell what they had, give it away, and enter the school for study and prayer, where all of us together might trust

God for food, fuel, rent and clothing [remember his visit to see Sandford.]. The purpose of this school was to fit men and women to go to the ends of the earth to preach, 'This Gospel of the Kingdom.' Matt. 24:14. as a witness to all the world before the end of the age. Our purpose in this Bible School was not to learn these things in our heads only but have each thing in the Scriptures wrought out in our hearts. And that every command that Jesus Christ gave should be literally obeyed. No one paid board or tuition, the poor were fed, the sick were entertained and healed, and from day to day, week to week and month to month, with no sect or mission or known source of income back of us, God supplied our every need, and He was our all sufficiency in all things.

"In December of 1900, we had had our examination upon the subject of repentance, conversion, consecration, sanctification, healing and the soon coming of the Lord. We had reached in our studies a problem. What about the 2<sup>nd</sup> Chapter of Acts? I had felt for years that any missionary going to the foreign field should preach in the language of the natives. That if God had ever equipped His ministers in that way He could do it today. That if Balaam's mule could stop in the middle of the road and give the first preacher that went out for money a 'bawling out' in Arabic that anybody today ought to be able to preach in any language of the world if they had horse sense enough to let God use their tongue and throat. But still I believed our experience should tally exactly with the Bible and neither sanctification nor the anointing that abideth taught by Stephen Merritt and others tallied with the 2<sup>nd</sup> Chapter of Acts. Having heard so many different religious bodies claim different proofs as the evidence of their having the Pentecostal baptism, I set the students at work studying out diligently what was the Bible evidence of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that we might go before the world with something that was indisputable because it tallied absolutely with the Word. [Robeck says Parham assigned his students the task of finding the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but after spending time with Sandford, he obviously thought that he knew the answer, Robeck, p. 42.]

"Leaving the school for three days at this task, I went to Kansas City for three days of services. I returned to the school on the morning preceding Watch Night services in the year 1900.

"At about 10 o'clock in the morning, I rang the bell calling all the students into the Chapel to get their report on the matter in hand. To my astonishment they all had the same story, that while there were different things occurred when the Pentecostal blessing fell, that the indisputable proof on each occasion was, that they spoke with other tongues. About 75 people beside the school which consisted of 40 students had gathered for the watch night service. A mighty spiritual power filled the entire school.

"Sister Agnes N. Ozman (now LaBerge) asked that hands might be laid upon her to receive the Holy Spirit as she hoped to go to foreign fields. At first I refused not having the experience myself. Then being further pressed to do it humbly in the name of Jesus, I laid my hand upon her head and prayed. I had scarcely repeated three dozen sentences when a glory fell upon her, a halo seemed to surround her head and face, and she began speaking in the Chinese language; and was unable to speak English for three days. When she tried to write in English to tell us of her experience she wrote the Chinese, copies of which we still have in newspapers printed at that time.

"Seeing this marvelous manifestation of the restoration of Pentecostal power, we removed the beds from a dormitory on the upper floor, and there for two nights and

three days we continued as a school to wait upon God. We felt that God was no respecter of persons and what He had so graciously poured out upon one, He would upon all.

“Those three days of tarrying were wonderful days of blessings. We all got past any begging or pleading, we knew the blessing was ours with ever-swelling tides of praise and thanksgiving and worship, interspersed with singing we waited for the coming of the Holy Spirit.

“On the night of January 3<sup>rd</sup>, I preached at the Free Methodist Church in the City of Topeka telling them what had already happened, and that I expected upon returning the entire school to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. On returning to the school with one of the students, we ascended to the second floor, and passing down along the corridor in the upper room, heard most wonderful sounds. The door was slightly ajar, the room was lit with only coal oil lamps. As I pushed open the door I found the room was filled with a sheen of white light above the brightness of the lamps.

“Twelve ministers, who were in the school of different denominations, were filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke with other tongues. Some were sitting, some still kneeling, others standing with hands upraised. There was no violent physical manifestation, though some trembled under the power of the glory that filled them.

“Sister Stanley, an elderly lady, came across the room as I entered, telling me that just before I entered tongues of fire were sitting above their heads.

“When I beheld the evidence of the restoration of Pentecostal power, my heart was melted in gratitude to God for what my eyes had seen. For years I had suffered terrible persecutions for preaching holiness and healing and the soon coming of the Lord. I fell to my knees behind a table unnoticed by those upon whom the power of Pentecost had fallen to pour out my heart to God in thanksgiving. All at once they began to sing, ‘Jesus Lover of My Soul’ in at least six different languages, carrying the different parts but with a more angelic voice than I had ever listened to in all my life.

“After praising God for some time, I asked Him for the same blessing. He distinctly made it clear, to me that He raised me up and trained me to declare this mighty truth to the world, and if I was willing to stand for it, with all the persecutions, hardships, trials, slander, scandal that it would entail, He would give me the blessing and I said ‘Lord I will, if You will just give me this blessing.’ Right then there came a slight twist in my throat, a glory fell over me and I began to worship God in the Sweedish (sic) tongue, which later changed to other languages and continued so until the morning.

“Just a word: After preaching this for all these years with all the persecutions I have been permitted to go through with, misunderstanding and the treatment of false brethren, yet knowing all that, this blessing would bring to me, if I had the time and was back there again I’d take the same way.

“No sooner was this miraculous restoration of Pentecostal power noised abroad, than we were beseiged (sic) with reporters from Topeka papers, Kansas City, St. Louis and many other cities sent reporters who brought with them professors of languages, foreigners, Government interpreters, and they gave the work the most crucial test. One Government interpreter claimed to have heard twenty Chinese dialects distinctly spoken in one night. All agree that the students of the college were speaking in the languages of the world, and that with proper accent and intonation. There was no chattering, jabbering, or stuttering. Each one spoke clearly and distinctly in a foreign tongue, with earnestness, intensity

and God-given unction. The propriety and decency of the conduct of each member of the Bible School won the warmest comment from many visitors.

“Our first public appearance after others had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit was in Kansas City, in the Academy of Music, about January 21<sup>st</sup>. The Kansas City papers loudly announced our coming. Two columns appeared in the Kansas City Journal, with large headlines on the front page. These headlines, being the largest on the front page, attracted the attention of the newsboys, and they not knowing a Pentecost from a holocaust ran wildly up and down the street crying their papers, Pentecost, Pentecost, Pentecost, read all about the Pentecost.

“I have on record the sermon preached on this occasion. The first upon the baptism of the Holy Ghost in all modern Pentecostal Apostolic Full Gospel movements. Also on file all that the papers had to say about these things in those days. Through great trials and persecutions we conducted the Bible school in the city of Topeka itself, then one in Kansas City” (Parham, pp. 51-55). Parham claims that “God actually fulfilled the second chapter of Acts at the Bible School in Topeka, Kansas” (Parham, p. 150).

Although Parham and the others claim that they spoke an authentic foreign-language, as the apostles had done on the day of Pentecost, there was no objective confirmation to verify that claim. Later, Pentecostals acknowledged that there was no proof that known languages were spoken. In his 1919 Ph.D. dissertation, Charles Shumway, records that he tried to prove that the early Pentecostals spoke actual languages, but he could not find a single person to validate that claim (Goff, *White Unto Harvest*, p. 76, cited by MacArthur, p. 272). In fact, in his dissertation, Shumway censured the *Houston Chronicle* for reporting that “letters (of proof) are on hand from several men who were Government interpreters” (Goff, p. 98, cited by MacArthur, p. 272).

Charismatic authors Jack Hayford and David Moore write, “Sadly, the idea of xenoglossal tongues (the supernatural ability to speak in a foreign language without formal training) would later prove embarrassing failure as Pentecostal workers went off to mission fields with their gifts and found their hearers did not understand them” (Hayford and Moore, p. 57). S. C. Todd investigated 18 Pentecostal missionaries who went to Japan, China, and India expecting to preach in the language of the people, but admitted that “in no single instance had (they) been able to do so” (Robert Mapes Anderson, *Visions of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*, pp. 90- 91, cited by MacArthur, p. 23).

The account of Miss Lilian Thistlethwaite (Parham’s sister-in-law), who was also there, supplies additional details. For example, including children, there were about forty people present (Parham, p. 58). The Stephen Merritt mentioned in the Parham’s account taught that the baptism occurred at sanctification (Parham, p. 58). The Bible School building was sold and the Bible School was moved to Kansas City. Later the original Bible School building was destroyed by a fire (Parham, p. 62). Agnes N. Ozman, the first to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit, had attended T. C. Horton’s Bible School in St. Paul, Minnesota and A. B. Simpson’s Bible School in New York City.

In her account of what happened, Agnes N. Ozman states, “It was nearly seven o’clock on this first of January that it came to my heart to ask Bro. Parham to lay his hands on me that I might receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. It was as his hands were laid upon my head that the Holy Spirit fell upon me and I began to speak in tongues,

glorifying God. I'd talked several languages, and it was clearly manifest when a new dialect spoken" (Parham, p. 66).

Agnes Ozman not only said she spoke in Chinese, she claimed to have written in Chinese. Photographs of her writings were published in newspapers such as the *Topeka Daily Capital* and the *Los Angeles Daily Times*. When the *Topeka Daily Capital*, published what she claimed was Chinese and it was taken to a Chinese man for translation, he responded, "No understand. Takee to Jap" (MacArthur, p. 273; for a copy of someone's writing in tongues see Robeck, p. 113). Parham said his wife, who was also present and who also received the baptism, talked in tongues in her sleep (Parham, p. 69).

There are several discrepancies between Parham's account and Ozman's account of what happened. According to Parham, Ozman asked for prayer to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking with tongues at around 11 p.m. on New Year's Eve 1900, but Agnes says it was the next day, on January 1, 1901, that these events occurred. James Goff, Parham's biographer, has argued that Parham's account is romanticized memory, wanting to have Ozman speaking in tongues as the new century dawned. In Parham's version, the students studied the Scripture to determine the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit *prior* to anyone having the experience, but Osman said that she did not begin to study the issue until *after* her experience and that it was not until several months later that she concluded that tongues was the initial evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. She also claims she did not have a Bible study assignment from Parham prior to her experience (Hayford and Moore, pp. 50-51).

It should be pointed out that not everyone at the school accepted the Parham explanation of what happened. S. J. Riggins, one of the students at the school, told a newspaper reporter from the *Topeka Daily Capital*, "I believe the whole of them (Parham and the students) are crazy" (reported by Joe Newman, *Race, and the Assembly Of God Church*, Youngstown, New York: Cambria, 2007, pp. 49-50, cited by MacArthur, p. 22).

The historical point is that on January 1, 1901 (or December 31, 1900, depending on who is right), Parham was the first in church history to lay hands on someone to have them speak in tongues *as the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit*. Convinced that every Christian ought to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit and ought to speak in tongues as proof that he or she had done so, Parham began to preach the "Pentecostal message" in other cities, including Kansas City, Lawrence, Joplin, Houston, and elsewhere.

In 1903, a woman minister who had been "brought into the faith" when Parham held meetings in Lawrence, Kansas in 1901, invited him to hold a meeting in a mission she had established in Nevada, Missouri. It was there that Parham saw "fleshly manifestations," which he called "fanaticism" (Parham, p. 87).

In 1905, a couple from Orchard, Texas, who heard Parham preach in Kansas and Missouri, invited him to preach in Orchard. In July of that year, he began meetings in Houston.

In 1906, Parham started a Bible School in Houston. W. J. Seymour, a black preacher, attended those Bible classes (Parham, p. 137), where he learned about the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When he felt led to go to California, Parham "made up his car fare and bid him God's speed," even though at that time, Seymour had not yet received the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Parham, p. 142).

In describing the Pentecostal experience, Mrs. Parham writes, "The experience they receive was very different to what many today considered Pentecostal Power. There was

no yelling and screaming with violent physical exertion and consequent exhaustion. There was no nervous strain in connection with any of the demonstrations” (Parham, p. 144).

In the fall of 1906, Parham went to Zion City, Illinois (now simply Zion; Zion City was founded in July 1901 by John Alexander Dowie, a famous faith healer; Dowie also started the Zion Tabernacle of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church, which was the only church in town). Parham met resistance from the officials of Zion, meaning the public facilities were not available for his meetings. Mrs. Parham writes, “Hatred and malice, envy and strife reigned in this place which had been planned for a city of righteousness and peace” (Parham, p. 156). For weeks, Parham met nightly in living rooms, including the living room of F. F. Bosworth, who received the baptism of the Holy Spirit and became a well-known faith healer.

In the late fall of 1906, at Seymour invitation, Parham visited Los Angeles. Seymour and Lucy Farrar had come from Houston to take the Pentecostal message to the black people in Los Angeles. It was at a prayer meeting in a home at 214 Bonnie Brae Street (not far from downtown Los Angeles) that Seymour received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The home meetings were moved to a rented building about two miles away in downtown Los Angeles on Azusa Street (Parham, p. 162). Concerning the Azusa Street Mission, Mrs. Walter Oyler wrote, “It was very plain to me that God was doing a wonderful work and Satan was trying to tear it to pieces. Many things were done that were far from being the work of the Holy Spirit. Soon there was bitterness, strife, division, and lack of brotherly love” (Parham, p. 162).

Parham himself wrote, “I hurried to Los Angeles, and to my utter surprise and astonishment I found conditions even worse than I had anticipated. Brother Seymour came to me helpless, he said he could not stem the tide that had arisen. I sat on the platform in Azusa Street Mission, and saw the manifestations of the flesh, spiritualistic controls, saw people practicing hypnotism at the altar over candidates seeking the baptism; though many were receiving the real baptism of the Holy Ghost. After preaching two or three times, I was informed by two of the elders, one who was a hypnotist I had seen him lay his hands on many who came through chattering, jabbering and sputtering, speaking in no language at all that I was not wanted in that place” (Parham, p. 163).

Parham began meetings in the W. C. T. U. (Women’s Christian Temperance Union) building at Broadway and Temple in downtown Los Angeles. He said, “Great numbers were saved, marvelous healings took place and between two and three hundred who had been who had been possessed of awful fits and spasms and controls in the Azusa Street work were delivered, and received the real Pentecostal teaching and many spoke other tongues” (Parham, pp. 163-164). Parham’s meetings in Los Angeles closed in 1907 after the scandal emerged about Parham’s alleged indiscretion (Hayford and Moore, p. 86; see below).

According to Mrs. Parham, Seymour possessed with spirit of leadership and sought to prove that the Azusa Street Mission was where the baptism of the Holy Spirit first fell. Parham pleaded with Seymour to repent (Parham, p. 164). On December 1, 1906, Parham wrote a letter in which he said, “Extremes, wild-fire, fanaticism, and everything that is beyond the bounds of common sense and reason, do not now and never have had any part or lot in Apostolic Faith work and teachings. Let me speak plainly with regard to the work as I have found it here. I found hypnotic influences, familiar spirit influences, spiritualistic influences, mesmeric influences, and all kinds of spells, spasms, falling in trances, etc. All

of these things are foreign to and unknown to this movement outside of Los Angeles, except in places visited by workers sent out from this city. A word about the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The speaking in tongues is never brought about by any of the above influences. In all our work the laying on of hands is practiced only occasionally and then for the space of only a minute or two. No such thing is known among our workers as the suggestion of certain words and sounds, working of the chin, or the massage of the throat. Nonsense! The Holy Ghost needs no help!" (Parham, pp. 168-69).

Parham went on to say, "The falling under the power in Los Angeles has, to a large degree, been produced through a hypnotic, mesmeric, magnetic current. The Holy Ghost does nothing that is unnatural or unseemly, and any strain exertion of body, mind, or voice is not the work of the Holy Spirit, but of some familiar spirit, or other influence brought to bear upon the subject" (Parham, p. 169) and "the Holy Ghost never leaves us beyond the point of self-control or the control of others, while familiar spirits or fanaticism leads us beyond self-control and the power to help others" (Parham, p. 170).

Parham spent the rest of his life traveling extensively from coast to coast, including a trip to Palestine. He passed away in Baxter Springs, Kansas on January 29, 1929. His tombstone is shaped like a pulpit.

Parham was once detained on morals charges (sodomy) that were later dropped. He vehemently denied the charge until the day he died. Church historians largely agree that he was falsely accused for political purposes. In his biography written by his wife, she says that he was once arrested in Texas, but that the city attorney did not press charges because he was "satisfied it was all spite work" (Parham, p. 198). She also tells the story about attending a meeting in Missouri conducted by her husband. After the service a lady said to her that she thought it was a great sermon and that Parham must have come back to God. When Parham's wife told the lady that she did not know Parham had ever backslidden, the woman proceeded to tell her a long, sad story about how he left his wife and family. Parham's wife assured the lady that it was not true. When asked how she knew, Parham's wife replied with a smile, "I am his wife" (Parham, p. 20). When he was accused of being a "no-hellite," he responded that he believed in a hotter hell and than they did (he believe in hell, but he believed that hell would completely destroy the people in it; Parham, p. 201).

Parham trusted God to meet his material needs. He dropped his life insurance policy (not a good idea), because he wanted to trust God (Parham, p. 32). His ministry was conducted entirely on faith (Parham, p. 63). He did not take collections during his meetings (Parham, pp. 97, 115, 259). It was said that he didn't even pray much about temporal needs, but simply trusted God to supply (Parham, p. 141).

Parham made a practice of not counting converts (Parham, p. 92), although his biography is full of the numbers of people who were saved, healed, or baptized with the Holy Spirit in his various meetings (for example, see p. 95, where it is noted that 500 people were converted in a meeting). His wife quotes Volume 3 of *History of Kansas and its People*, published in 1928 which records that "a New York statistician has given Mr. Parham credit for the conversion of fully 2,000,000 persons, though his personal appeals and through the medium of ministers who have loyally followed his teachings and examples" (Parham, p. 450).

Parham staunchly refused to be the founder of a new church or creed (Parham, p. 75). He refused any thought of leadership or organizing a movement in any way (Parham, pp. 175, 183, 201).

In their book on the history of Pentecostalism in the twentieth century, Hayford and Moore entitled the chapter on Parham “The Enigma of Charles Fox Parham.” They point out that, on the one hand, he was the architect of the Pentecostal assertion that supernaturally speaking a known human language the speaker had never learned was the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, who had some commendable spiritual qualities. On the other hand, there were concerns over his headstrong independence, financial management, eccentric doctrines, his racist attitudes (he became an ardent segregationist, even praising the Ku Klux Klan). Hayford and Moore conclude, “Parham became an embarrassment to the Pentecostal movement” and “for over twenty years until his death in 1929, Parham was alienated and ignored by the movement he helped start” (Hayford and Moore, pp. 64-65).

*W. J. Seymour* W. J. Seymour (1870-1922), the leader of the Azusa Street revival in Los Angeles, was born in Louisiana to former slaves. In his book *Azusa Street, Mission and Revival*, Robeck, an ordained Assemblies of God minister, Professor of Church History and Ecumenics, and Director of the David J. du Plessis Center for Christian Spirituality at Fuller Theological Seminary, explains the social, cultural, racial, and religious context of both Seymour and the Azusa Street revival (Robeck, p. 16). In the process of doing that, he says the slaves in southern Louisiana, combined African voodoo with Catholic rituals, creating a “popular Catholicism” (Robeck, p. 22). By Seymour’s time, the popular variation of that was known as Hoodoo. “Many of the slaves participated in a slave culture in which symbols, spells, incantations, sympathetic magic, and root work were a regular part of life. In spite of their differences, they held many things in common with the Christian worldview.... William J. Seymour was undoubtedly well aware of such things, even as a child” (Robeck, p. 23). He was reared a Roman Catholic, but during his formative years, the supernatural was taken for granted. Spirits, both “good” and “evil,” were commonly discussed. Dreams and visions were understood to contain messages that sometimes something foretold the future (Robeck, pp. 23-24).

After his father died in 1895, Seymour went to Indianapolis, where he worked as a waiter. While he was in Indianapolis, he was converted in an African-American Methodist Episcopal church, but he soon left that church because it was not pre-millennial and because he differed with it on the role of “special revelation” (Robeck, pp. 25-29). He was probably “sanctified” while attending the services of the Evening Light Saints (now known as the Church of God, Anderson, Indiana), a church that was restoring the church of the apostles. In the 1890s, it was one of the few churches in which “blacks and whites were treated equally and gifted women were encouraged to preach” (Robeck, pp.29-30).

There is an oral tradition that says Seymour was also influenced by Martin Wells Knapp, who, in 1900, established God’s Bible School and Missionary Training House in Cincinnati, Ohio. Robeck says three factors “must have attracted” Seymour to study there: racial inclusiveness (blacks and whites studied side-by-side), premillennialism, and “special revelation.” Knapp wrote a book entitled *Impressions*, which described how to discern whether a person had received an “impression” from God or from Satan. “Such subjects were rarely mentioned in traditional white, Christian circles and when they were discussed, they were typically set aside in favor of rational understanding of God’s direction based largely on the interpretation and application of biblical text” (Robeck, p. 33).



Robeck adds, “Seymour’s interest in “special revelation,” however, may actually reflect another aspect of his years of formation. He had undoubtedly heard appeals to dreams and visions within southern Louisiana’s African-American community. There are many “slave narratives” going back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, in which slaves talked about receiving guidance through visions and dreams, hearing voices, and experiencing different states of altered consciousness such as trances. All of these suggest that the role of what might be described as “special revelation” was widely accepted within the African-American community. Seymour was undoubtedly aware that similar things were frequently involved in the ‘Hoodoo’ tradition which was prevalent around Centerville” (Robeck, p. 33; Seymour was born and went to school in Centerville).

During the few years Seymour lived in Cincinnati, smallpox invaded the city (Robeck, p. 35). He contracted the disease, which left him blind in one eye and with a scarred face. For the rest of his life, he wore a beard to hide the scars. (azusastreet.org, accessed April 9, 2015). His lost eye was replaced with an artificial one. Seymour believed that God had sent this plague upon him because he had been slow to respond to a call to the ministry (Robeck, p. 35).

From 1903 to 1905, Seymour lived in Houston, Texas. During those years, he traveled to Chicago, where he met with John G. Lake, a minister working with John Alexander Dowie of Zion, Illinois. By “special revelation,” he went to Jackson, Mississippi to receive spiritual advice from a well-known African-American clergyman (Robeck, p. 35). Robeck suggests that Seymour met with either Charles Price Jones or Charles Harrison Mason, both of whom were originally ministers of the Mississippi Baptist Association, but following their acceptance of the holiness doctrine regarding sanctification as a second work of grace, they formed the Church of God in Christ (Robeck, p. 36; Hayford and Moore say Seymour met with Jones and later Jones and Mason split over the Pentecostal experience, with Mason assuming the leadership of the Church of God in Christ, Hayford and Moore, p. 75).

Throughout his long career as Chief Apostle and Bishop of the Church of God in Christ, Charles Mason dealt with “special revelation” (Robeck, p. 38). He frequently posed for pictures with “oddities of nature” (such as a stick shaped in the exact likeness of a snake), claiming that by means of the Holy Spirit, he could discern the message God had placed in them. Based on Psalm 19:1-4b, he believed he was giving voice to the wordless speech of God’s creation. “There is a sense in which Mason baptized into Pentecostal practice, something that he had seen in the surrounding African-American conjure (hoodoo) culture. He stood in the place of the median or shaman, in the place of the ‘conjure’ doctor or root worker, and using the same signs as they use, he gave them completely new meaning. He filled them with ‘Christian’ meaning. Charles Mason thereby preserved something from a historic African cultural basis, a non-Christian ‘conjure culture’ while transforming it into a Christian means of communication” (Robeck, pp. 37-38).

“When the Assemblies of God formed in Hot Springs, Arkansas, in April 1914, C. H. Mason preached at one of the inaugural services. During that service, Mason drew attention to a sweet potato that he had carried into the pulpit, and in part, he proceeded to give what he believed to be God’s message in those gathering before him based on what the Holy Spirit had revealed in that sweet potato” (Robeck, p. 39). Mason was not using these objects as “object lessons;” he was claiming he heard the voice of the Holy Spirit in them (Robeck, p. 38).

Seymour and Mason “became close lifelong friends” (Robeck, p. 39).

While living in Houston, Seymour attended a Holiness Church pastored by Lucy Farrow, an African-American. In 1905, leaving Seymour as interim pastor, Farrow left the pastorate of that church to work for Parham as a governess. Under Parham’s ministry, she experienced the baptism of the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues. She then introduced Seymour to Parham (Reve’ M. Pete, “The Impact of Holiness Preaching as Taught by John Wesley and the Outpouring of the Holy Ghost on Racism,” chapter 8, <http://www.revempete.us/research/holiness/africanamericans.html>, accessed April 10, 2015).

In January 1906, Seymour attended Parham’s Bible school in Houston for about six weeks. Because of segregation laws, Seymour was not allowed to sit inside the classroom. So, Parham had him sit in the hall (Robeck, p. 4). Seymour rejected Parham’s views of the annihilation of the wicked and the Anglo-Israelite theory. He shared Parham’s emphasis on sanctification, the pursuit of holiness, evangelism, divine healing, and premillennialism. At first, Seymour had doubts about speaking in tongues, being the evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Like many holiness people, he believed that he had been baptized with the Spirit when he had been sanctified. Even when he changed his mind about that, he was not fully convinced of Parham’s claim that the language one received was a human language intended to be used for evangelistic purposes (Robeck, pp. 46, 49-50).

In the meantime, in the spring of 1905, in Los Angeles, Julia W. Hutchins and eight African-American families were asked to leave the Second Baptist Church of Los Angeles (an African-American church) because they professed the holiness doctrine that sanctification was a second work of grace after conversion. After their expulsion, the group met at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Asberry at 214 Bonnie Brae Street. Hutchins became the founder and pastor of a Holiness Church at Ninth and Santa Fe Streets. It was affiliated with the Church of the Nazarene (Reve’ M. Pete). Neeley Terry, a black woman from that church visiting Houston, heard Seymour preach and was so impressed by him that when she returned to Los Angeles, she persuaded her church to invite him to preach (<http://azusastreet.org/WilliamJSeymour.htm>, accessed April 3, 2015; the Holiness Church was located at 1604 East Ninth Street, Robeck, p. 60). Actually, Seymour was invited to serve as pastor of the church.

Seymour arrived in Los Angeles by train on February 22, 1906. Although he himself had not yet received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, two days later, when he spoke at the Ninth and Santa Fe mission, he preached what he had learned from Charles Parham in Houston, namely, that speaking in tongues was the biblical evidence of being baptized in the Spirit. He told them that sanctification was not the baptism of the Holy Spirit and that unless they had spoken in tongues, they had not been filled with the spirit (Hayford and Moore, pp. 71-72).

By Sunday, March 4, Mrs. Hutchins, the pastor of the congregation who was hoping to go to Africa as a missionary and originally intended for Seymour to take her place, decided that Seymour was not the man for the job after all. She refused to allow him to continue because she disagreed with him over the nature of the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Robeck, pp. 4-5). He was literally locked out of the church on March 4 (Robeck, pp. 62-63).

Edward and Mattie Lee invited Seymour to stay in their small home until he could decide what to do. Each evening they gathered together for prayer and Seymour spoke to them. Others were invited to attend. By mid-March, needing room to accommodate more

people, they moved two blocks to the larger home of Richard and Ruth Asberry at 214 (now 216) Bonnie Brae Street (Robeck, p. 5, see also p. 64).

The group that gathered at the Asberry home consisted of about 15 African-Americans, including five children. As Seymour explained his position on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, those who gathered accepted his teaching and prayed that they might receive the baptism. Keep in mind that Seymour himself had not yet received the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. He invited Lucy Farrow and Joseph Warren from Houston to join him for the meetings at the Asberry house (Robeck, p. 65).

News of the meetings at Asberry home spread throughout the holiness groups in Los Angeles. During a break at work, Edward Lee claimed he had a vision in which he saw Peter and John, who began speaking in tongues. After Farrow had arrived in Los Angeles from Houston, at dinner in the home of Edward Lee on Monday night, April 9, she laid hands on Lee and he spoke in tongues. After dinner, the group that had assembled at Lee's house walked two blocks to the Asberry home. The people present filled the double parlor, with a few in adjacent rooms. After a few songs and prayer, Seymour told what had happened to Lee. Someone in the group began to speak in tongues. Then others did the same (Robeck, pp. 66-68).

Thus, on April 9, 1906, seven people were baptized with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in tongues. People fell to the floor as if unconscious. Others shouted and ran through the house. "One young lady went to the piano and sang in the tongue she thought was Hebrew" (Hayford and Moore, p. 73).

The news spread rapidly. By the next day, the Asberry house was filled with seekers and curious onlookers. People gathered outside, straining to hear through open windows what was going on indoors. The front porch became a platform from which people sang, testified, and preached. The yard and the street were filled with people. On Thursday, April 12, Seymour finally received the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Robeck, p. 69).

To accommodate the crowds, they moved to 312 Azusa Street, located in the black section of Los Angeles near downtown (Hayford and Moore, p. 73). The building had been an African Methodist Episcopal Church, but when the former tenants vacated, the upstairs sanctuary had been converted into apartments. When a fire destroyed the pitched roof, "it was replaced with a flat roof giving the 40 x 60 feet building the appearance of a square box. The unfinished downstairs with a low ceiling and dirt floor was used as a storage building and stable. This downstairs became the home of the Apostolic Faith Mission. Mix matched chairs and wooden planks were collected for seats and a prayer altar and two wooden crates covered by a cheap cloth became the pulpit" (azusastreet.org, accessed May 26, 2015). The first meeting was likely held on Sunday, April 15 (Hayford and Moore, p. 76).

*The Los Angeles Daily Times* sent a reporter to investigate. In the reporter's article published April 18, 1906, he called the worshippers "a new sect of fanatics." He wrote that they spoke a "weird babel of tongues." The same day the article appeared, the great earthquake of 1906 struck San Francisco. Southern Californians heard the news and remembered the story about the revival where doomsday prophecies were common (azusastreet.org, accessed May 26, 2015). Many people were scared; others were curious.

Frank Bartleman, an itinerate evangelist and Azusa Street participant, published a tract about the earthquake. (In 1925, he also wrote *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles*, a book Robeck says is "unquestionably unique as the primary witness to the revival," Robeck, p.

15.) “Thousands of the tracts, filled with end-time prophecies, were distributed. Soon, multitudes gathered at Azusa Street. One attendee said more than a thousand at a time would crowd onto the property. Hundreds would fill the little building; others would watch from the boardwalk; and, more would overflow into the dirt street” (azusastreet.org, accessed May 26, 2015). Services at the mission were conducted three times each day at 10 AM, 3 PM, and 7:30 PM. They often ran together until the entire day became one long service. This schedule was continued seven days a week for more than three years (Robeck, p. 136).

“Enormous leeway” of emotional expression was allowed in the services. Many of these “expressions” were found within the traditional African-American centers of folk worship, especially in the south. These expressions included ecstatic manifestations, such as praying all at one time, speaking in tongues, singing in tongues, sometimes without words (?) or in a language no one understood, prophesying, dreams, visions, trances, healings (including using anointed handkerchiefs), exorcisms, and falling in the Spirit (Robeck, pp. 137-138, 143-144, 150-151).

People filled the church and seekers filled the altar for an experience with God. Some came for conversion (at their first water baptismal service in July 1906, 138 were baptized). According to what was taught at Azusa Street (and in accordance with Holiness doctrine), the next step in the Christian life was sanctification, which in order to receive, one must engage in an intense time of prayer. The Azusa Street Mission statement claimed that sanctification cleansed the believer from “embedded sin” and “embedded disease” (Robeck, p. 173). Once believers had been sanctified, they were ready to be baptized in the Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues (Robeck, p. 177). In other words, three experiences were taught: conversion, sanctification, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit

The “intense time in prayer” could last for an hour or more. In September 1906, an evangelist said, “I was under the power of God for about an hour and a half and it was there that all pride, and self, and conceit disappeared, and I was really dead to the world, for I had Christ within His fulness (sic). I was baptized with the Holy Ghost and spoke in a new tongue” (Robeck, p. 178). A pastor from Chicago testified that “for three hours, he was conscious of God’s ‘power,’ touching him and causing his body to ‘quake’” (Robeck, p. 180).

Experiences at the altar were not only long, but they were also often noisy, emotional, and dramatic. “Noise was not the only feature of time spent around the altar. What came to be caricatured as ‘gymnastics’ was another.” People at the altar “jerked and twisted, shook and rolled.” One of the most common experiences at the altar was being “slain in the Spirit.” In their ecstasy, some leaped over chairs and jumped through open windows (Robeck, p. 176). It was reported (in the *Los Angeles Herald* newspaper on September 10, 1906) that “one big black woman, with a voice like a megaphone, continued howling, ‘O Lo’d, let me git it. O Lo’d, let me have it.’ For about 15 minutes, she kept this up. Then she got it and she got it good and plenty, whatever it was. She began rocking and writhing and in five minutes, she was on the floor apparently in the greatest of pain. Her eyes rolled wildly, and if her arms and legs had not been fastened on, they would have been scattered to the four winds. She jumped to her feet and some of the unregenerate who had looked on with open-mouth wonder fled from the building in terror. But she didn’t intend to do anyone any damage. She had received sanctification and was simply expressing her joy in her own particular way” (Robeck, p. 174).

At first, the leaders of the Azusa Street Mission embraced all who spoke in tongues. As time passed, however, Seymour decided speaking in tongues could be accepted as the Bible evidence of a person's baptism in the Spirit only if it were also accompanied by divinely given love. Without the fruit of the Spirit, Seymour was not convinced that the tongues had been given by God (Robeck, pp. 177-178). Robeck concedes that not every phenomenon at Azusa Street came from the Holy Spirit, especially "the spectacular screams and gyrating gymnastics" (Robeck, p. 135).

Seymour invited Parham, the founder of Pentecostalism, to come to Los Angeles to help "set things in order" (Hayford and Moore, p. 85). As was pointed out earlier, in November 1906, when Parham, the founder of Pentecostalism, saw what was happening at Azusa Street, he said it was a manifestation of the flesh (Parham, p. 163). He condemned the workers who laid hands on those seeking the baptism, jerking their chins, massaging their throats, and telling them to repeat certain sounds over and over or faster and faster until they spoke in tongues. These workers had people yell "glory, glory" until they could no longer say it in English but only speak it "in a half hypnotized condition." Parham was of the opinion that such mechanical techniques produced counterfeit results (Robeck, pp. 140-141). He saw nothing spiritual about their singing in tongues; he thought it was nothing more than "a modification of the Negro chanting of the Southland" (Robeck, p. 150, who said he too was struck by how similar their singing in tongues was to the description he has read of the "Negro chant" present in the African-American "praise houses" during and after slavery).

Parham complained about more than the manifestation of the flesh. He said that "religious orgies outrivaling scenes in devil or fetish worship, took place in the upper room" (that is, the second floor of the Azusa Street Mission). He also said those who imitate the sounds of the "cackling of hens" or the shrill cry of the panther" were engaged in activities typical of "spiritualistic mediums" (Robeck, p. 169).

The Azusa Street Mission was frequently criticized for being a hotbed of spiritualism, hypnotism, etc. (Robeck, p. 168). Joseph Smale, who resigned as pastor of the First Baptist Church of Los Angeles, became founder and pastor of the First New Testament Church, and allowed the exercise of spiritual gifts in his new church said, "The same manifestations as take place in the meetings of spiritualists were prevailing among us, such as shaking, babblings, (and) uncontrolled emotions. In spiritualist meetings, there are those who talk in several languages and write voluminously in the unknown tongue" (Robeck, p. 168). Concerning speaking in tongues, he said, "the devil, as well as God, is having a hand in this" (Robeck, p. 203).

The evangelists and missionaries sometimes "were so noisy that they could be heard blocks away. And their antics were often unseemly. Sometimes they violated the public peace and even disrupted common standards of public decency. They were harassed by neighbors seeking peace so that they could sleep" (Robeck, p. 8). "Viewed as fanatics, many of its members were arrested, fined, and jailed on the grounds that they were 'insane.' Los Angeles police department assigned special offices to monitor the mission's ongoing services" (Robeck, p. 12) to guarantee the order was maintained and noise levels did not rise too high (Robeck, p. 160).

Hayford and Moore add a few more details concerning the Azusa Street meetings. For example, during the early period, there were no musical instruments used in the services. No formal offerings were taken. Rather, a box for gifts was at the back by the door with a

sign which read “Settled with the Lord.” Prayer for the sick was a regular part of the service. By the summer of 1906, there were as many as 350 worshipers crowded into the building and sometimes double that. A September report said there were “twenty-five blacks and 300 whites” at the meeting (Hayford and Moore, p. 79).

“Like Parham, Seymour believed that tongues were an actual human language that would enable missionaries to proclaim the gospel in foreign languages they had never learned. A September 1906 edition of *The Apostolic Faith*, the church newspaper, stated that the languages were Greek, Latin, Hebrew, French, German, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Zulu, and languages of Africa, Hindu, and Bengali, and dialects of India, Chippewa and other languages of the Indians, Esquimaux, the deaf-mute language (Hayford and Moore, pp. 80-81).

The Azusa Street phenomenon spread throughout Southern California. Seymour envisioned a series of Apostolic Faith missions (Robeck, p. 94). It “spread to all points in the greater Los Angeles area, assisted by a growing interurban trolley system.... Ultimately, new missions and preaching points spring up at the end of each streetcar line, in Long Beach, Pasadena, Anaheim, Whittier, and Monrovia” (Robeck, p. 95), as well as Highland Park and Santa Ana (Robeck, p. 204),

Henry S. Keyes M.D., who had done post-doctoral work in surgery at Harvard University, was a well-known and widely respected doctor in Los Angeles. He was on the board of the First Baptist Church but resigned to go with Pastor Joseph Smale to form the First New Testament Church. In July 1906, “Keyes’s sixteen-year-old daughter, Lillian, received the baptism of the Holy Spirit at the Azusa Street Mission and began to speak in tongues (allegedly in Chinese), write in tongues, and prophesied. She could also frequently be found on the floor of the church, ‘slain in the Spirit.’” When the local press questioned Dr. Keyes about his daughter, Keyes not only condoned his daughter’s behavior but claimed to have spoken and written in tongues himself. He actually wrote a message in tongues and had someone else write an interlinear interpretation. Seeking to verify Keyes’s claims that this was an actual language, the reporter submitted it to an “imminent oriental scholar,” who declared that is not a language he knew. After a series of incidents in which Lillian accused Smale of grieving the Holy Spirit and Smale complained to Dr. Keyes, Keyes and the associate pastor left First New Testament Church to form the Upper Room Mission (Robeck, pp. 199-202).

Lillian became a Presbyterian missionary in China, where she worked with her husband until 1954 (Robeck, p. 202), but as a condition of her acceptance as a Presbyterian missionary, she was required to sign a pledge that said, “I promise not to teach the gift of tongues is an essential mark of the baptism the Holy Spirit, and not to urge believers to seek the gift of tongues in preference to other gifts in connection with the baptism of the Holy Spirit, because it is contrary to my beliefs” (Robeck, p. 249).

In June 1906, Ansel H. Post, who received the baptism at Azusa Street, conducted tent meetings in Pasadena. The noise from the tent disturbed neighbors. In an attempt to quiet them down, someone on the second floor of the adjacent boardinghouse poured a bucket of cold water on the worshipers. It didn’t work. The owner of the boardinghouse asked the city council for relief. Post was told that he had to close the meetings at 10 PM, which he did, but that did not satisfy the neighbor, who demanded that the tent be relocated. When Post was offered another place, he refused, declaring that through a tongue and an interpretation, the Lord instructed him not to move. When the neighbors drew up a petition

and presented it to the city council, they rescinded his permit to hold tent meetings. When he refused to leave, he was arrested, tried, and found guilty. He was given 24 hours to rethink his position or spend 50 days in jail or be fined \$50. The next day he quietly moved his tent (Robeck, pp. 205-207).

Apostolic Faith meetings in Monrovia also disturbed the neighbors, but no arrests were made (Robeck, pp. 208-210). In Whittier, a 59-year-old woman seeking the baptism of the Holy Spirit fell on the floor, where she was allowed to remain in a trancelike state with periods of semi-consciousness for two days. By the time the group realized something was wrong, she was unconscious. Within days she died from what had been a stroke. “The incessant shouting, screaming and wailing that came from their meetings soon turned many in the town against them” (Robeck, p. 211). Several were arrested for disturbing the peace (Robeck, p. 212). One was sentenced to thirty-one days in jail, where he worked on a chain gang (Robeck, p. 213). Edward McCauley, an African-American who became a successful pastor of a racially integrated congregation, half white and half black, in Long Beach, was arrested twice in 1907 for disturbing the peace (Robeck, p. 271).

The movement spread up and down the Pacific Coast. By November 1906, Florence Crawford was designated “state director,” whose job it was to extend the influence of the mission by holding meetings along the West Coast of the United States as well as in Oklahoma and Indiana (Robeck, p. 96). The Azusa Street Mission commissioned and credentialed a score of evangelists who traveled to other parts of the West, including San Diego, the San Francisco Bay Area (San Jose and Santa Rosa), Salem, Oregon, and Spokane, Washington (Robeck, pp. 214-215). In 1907, Florence Crawford established an Apostolic Faith based in Portland, Oregon (Robeck, p. 216). Eventually, she left her husband and son in Los Angeles and moved with her daughter to Portland.

The movement spread across America. By April 1907, the first anniversary of the Azusa Street revival, there were Apostolic Faith congregations in Colorado Springs, Colorado, Denver, Colorado, Lamont, Oklahoma, Indianapolis, Indiana, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Chattanooga, Tennessee, Danville, Virginia, Akron, Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio, in a number of small towns in western Pennsylvania, New York City, Toronto, Canada, and northern Mexico (Robeck, p. 216). In the wake of this movement, some Holiness churches became Pentecostal churches, including the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) and the Church of God in Christ (Robeck, pp. 218-220).

The movement spread around the world. Initially, Seymour agreed with Parham that tongues were an actual human language given for missionary use, but by mid-1907, Seymour hesitated because God-given foreign languages had not been proven (Robeck, pp. 236-237). Nevertheless, they sent people to the mission field, providing them with a one-way ticket, believing that the Lord would return before these missionaries needed to come back home (Robeck, p. 239-40). The number of missionaries sent to the mission field during the first three years of the mission’s existence is “simply staggering” (Robeck, p. 241). Most of the people who went to the mission field intending to communicate the gospel through their newly given language lasted on the field between six months and a year, especially when their initial expectations were disappointed (Robeck, p. 243). Others got on the mission field, and discovered they did not have the ability to speak the native language, so they hired a translator or began to study the language (Robeck, p. 256-259).

The Apostolic Faith movement met opposition and criticism on the mission field—from other missionaries! Mrs. Jesse Penn Lewis, the popular Keswick Convention author,

wrote numerous articles claiming that the new movement of missionaries was being led by a demonic spirits, not by the Holy Spirit. As A. T. Pearson, the Presbyterian theologian, surveyed the reports coming from the mission field, he concluded that wherever tongues appeared, instead of edification, there was fanaticism, division, and hysteria. He believed that tongues were possible in 1907 but that the tongues of the Apostolic Faith workers were nothing more than demonically inspired imitations. In Germany, the “Berlin Declaration” declared in no uncertain terms that the Apostolic Faith movement was “not from on high, but from below” (Robeck, p. 245).

The rapid expansion of the Apostolic Faith movement is remarkable. What started out as a small prayer meeting of about 15 people, including children, grew to an internationally acclaimed congregation of hundreds in just a few months. On any given Sunday morning during 1906, Los Angeles crowds grew to as many as 1500 people. By late summer, members and sympathizers had established several other congregations in Los Angeles and surrounding communities. By September, the mission had sent a score of evangelists up and down the Western US. By December, they were in the Midwest and New York and had sent at least 13 missionaries to Africa. By early 1907, they had ministries in Monrovia, Liberia, Canada, Western Europe, the Middle East, West Africa, and several countries in Asia. By 1908, the movement had spread to South Africa, Central and Eastern Europe, and northern Russia (Robeck, pp. 6-8). Seymour constantly preached that the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues was to give people the power to testify to the risen, resurrected Savior (Robeck, p. 162). “The mission incessantly called for the missionizing of the world with an eschatological urgency that characterized the times” (Hayford and Moore, p. 91). No wonder the movement spread so rapidly. Spreading the message was in its DNA.

In the meantime, the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles lasted for about three years, suffered several divisions, dwindled to only a handful of people, and finally fizzled. In August, Bartleman left Azusa Street because of the decision to hang a sign with the Mission’s name on it. He thought it smacked of a needless organization that would lead to institutionalization (Hayford and Moore, p. 84). In 1907, some people left the Azusa Street Mission because they thought the teaching on divorce was too strict (Robeck, p. 284). In 1908, there was a very divisive dispute over whether to take a formal offering (Robeck, p. 289). Some thought the introduction of the piano was a sin of the flesh and others blamed it on the devil himself. People complained when the Mission was incorporated (Robeck, p. 290). The Azusa Street Mission was first and foremost an African-American congregation in which many Latinos, whites, and Asians participated, but by late July 1908, it was entirely controlled by African-Americans, although some white people still attended (Robeck, pp. 297-298).

In July 1907, Florence Crawford, who had established an Apostolic Faith mission in Portland, Oregon, was summoned back to Los Angeles because her daughter had broken her arm and the authorities were demanding that she receive medical attention. Crawford’s longtime friend Will Trotter had just been fired as director of the Union Rescue Mission in Los Angeles because he had spoken in tongues and identified with the Apostolic Faith movement. By the end of the summer, Crawford and her daughter, along with Trotter and his family, moved to Portland. By September 1907, Crawford had completely broken away from Seymour, claiming that he had compromised his teaching on sanctification, that is,



he no longer taught the Wesley position that entire sanctification is a second work of grace after conversion. There is no evidence that that was true.

Crawford formed an independent work in Portland, using the same name, Apostolic Faith. She also contacted the Apostolic Faith missions that, as state director, she had helped establish. Most if not all of these missions followed her lead, striking a critical blow to Seymour's undisputed leadership of the movement along the Pacific coast. "Strangely, neither Florence Crawford nor the other churches that went with her seem to have questioned the ethics of her move—or theirs" (Robeck, pp. 299-300).

The Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles published a newspaper called the Apostolic Faith. Clara Lum was in charge. In the summer of 1908, she transferred the newspaper from Los Angeles to Portland, leaving the Los Angeles Mission without its paper (Robeck, pp. 301-302). Seymour made several attempts to get the paperback, including legally establishing the Apostolic Faith Mission in Portland, as an "auxiliary" to the Apostolic Faith Mission in Los Angeles, but Crawford and Lum refused to give the paperback to Seymour (Robeck, pp. 301-305).

Robeck feels that Seymour's wedding may have been a factor in Lum's leaving LA. On May 13, 1908, Seymour married Jeannie Evans Moore, who had been the first person to speak and sing in tongues at the Asberry home and she had been a member of Seymour's ministry team from the beginning of the mission. Robeck suggests, "The unmarried Lum might have shared Florence Crawford's conviction that being single was to be preferred to the married state. She might have agreed with Crawford that the Lord was returning soon and marriage interfered illegitimately with the church's end-time task. Or she might have viewed sexual purity or separation within marriage as a more sanctified condition—and thus have thought that Seymour had compromised his sanctification." There is also a report that Lum fell in love with Seymour and had sought a marriage proposal from him. Seymour was advised against marrying a white woman, given the state of race relations in the United States at the height of the Jim Crow era. Thus, Seymour married the African-American Moore, provoking Lum to leave LA, and taking the newspaper with her (Robeck, pp. 307-310).

By 1909, the revival had finally fizzled, but the Azusa Street Mission did not close in 1909. For the Seymours, the years following the revival were extremely difficult. Other Pentecostal churches in Los Angeles, especially the Upper Room Mission, were thriving, while the Azusa Street Mission reverted to a small, largely African-American congregation, with a few Caucasians in attendance.

Several theological controversies affected the Pentecostal movement. The first serious dispute was the "finished work controversy" instituted by William F. Durham, a pastor in Chicago. From the beginning of Pentecostalism in Topeka, Kansas, the movement was almost exclusively dominated by a "three-stage" perspective: conversion, sanctification, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Durham was the first to challenge that view (Hayford and Moore, pp. 115-116). In 1907, he visited Azusa Street, where he received the baptism of the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues. When he returned to Chicago, his North Avenue Mission became the "Azusa Street of the Midwest." He set up multiple meeting places in Chicago (Hayford and Moore, pp. 109-110) and traveled widely as a frequent speaker at conferences and revivals, becoming one of the most influential Pentecostal leaders, but in 1910, he preached a message entitled "The Finished Work of Calvary" in which he challenged the idea of sanctification being a subsequent, second work of grace. Drawing

on his earlier experience and Keswick teachings, he “emphasized that sanctification was a matter of identification with Christ and that by faith in what was accomplished on the cross, Christians should live victoriously” (Hayford and Moore, p. 116). In other words, Durham was proposing just two stages: conversion and the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

In 1911, Durham traveled to Los Angeles and concluded that the Pentecostal leaders in the city were incompetent, partly because of their view of sanctification as a second work of grace. He preached the “finished work” theory of sanctification that God sanctifies believers at conversion by placing them “in Christ,” and then they mature in holiness as they grow in grace. While Seymour was away on an extended trip, the leaders of the Azusa Street Mission invited Durham to preach a series of sermons. Several months later, when Seymour returned, Durham asked for a show of hands from those who supported the continuation of the revival under his leadership. The response was overwhelmingly in favor of Durham. Seymour went to the Mission’s board and they decided to padlock the door against Durham. Durham charged Seymour with playing the “race card” and took the crowd with him, forming the Full Gospel Assembly on the corner of Seventh and Los Angeles Streets (Robeck, pp. 315-317). Over half of Seymour’s workers went with Durham, whose services were attended by 1000 people (Hayford and Moore, p. 118).

Many immediately embraced Durham’s finished work theory, especially those who had been influenced by A. B. Simpson and Dowie. E. N. Bell and others who later founded the Assembly of God denomination also accepted the two-stage rather than the three-stage view (Hayford and Moore, p. 117). After the Durham encounter, The Apostolic Faith Mission on Azusa Street never regained its former glory (Hartford and Moore, p. 119).

In early 1912, Parham, the founder of Pentecostalism, said that by teaching his “heresy,” Durham had committed “the sin unto death” and prophesied that he would die within six months. Durham contracted tuberculosis and died suddenly at age 39 on July 7, 1912. Parham saw Durham’s death as vindication of his sanctification position. “If Durham’s untimely death was God’s judgment, it was hard to tell from the events that followed. If anything, the finished work teaching gained even more ground and eventually became the doctrinal position of the majority of Pentecostals in the world.... Without question, the fabric of Pentecostalism was changed by the debate” (Hartford and Moore, pp. 119-120).

In 1913, the momentous Apostolic Faith World Wide Camp Meeting began in Los Angeles, during which a theological controversy developed concerning the formula to be used in baptism. Some insisted on baptism being done in the name of Jesus only, while others maintained their commitment to the traditional Trinitarian formula (Robeck, pp. 317-318). This controversy produced the “Oneness” Pentecostals, who openly challenged Trinitarian theology. According to this view, there is only one person in the Godhead and the titles Father, Son, and Spirit referred to ways the one God manifested Himself at various times. The newly formed Assembly of God (1914) split over this issue in 1916, when the Assembly of God lost 156 of its 585 ministers and over 100 churches (Hayford and Moore, pp. 122-123). As a result of this controversy, a number of “Oneness” (“Jesus only”) Pentecostal bodies were formed. After several mergers, the United Pentecostal Church International was formed in 1945 (Mead, p. 300).

“The bold attempts of Charles F. Parham in 1906, by Florence L. Crawford in 1908, and by William H. Durham in 1911 to take control of the Apostolic Faith movement, and the doctrinal challenge raised by the ‘apostolic’ revelation that arose during the 1913 camp

meeting [see the previous paragraph], hurt William J. Seymour deeply. Parham, Crawford, Durham, and those who promoted baptism in ‘Jesus’ name’ at the 1913 camp meeting were all white folks. When many of the white ministers in the predominantly black Church of God in Christ left the denomination in April 1914, and formed the Assemblies of God, not even the racially progressive Seymour was willing to trust many of his white Pentecostal brothers and sisters.... In 1915, when Seymour compiled *The Doctrine and Discipline of the Azusa Street Apostolic Faith Mission*, he blamed the “white brethren” for these divisions, acknowledging that some African-Americans had participated in them as well. From the time *The Doctrines and Disciplines* was adopted, no white person was allowed to serve in a leadership role in the apostolic faith until the racial climate changed (Robeck, pp. 318-319).

Seymour served as pastor of the Apostolic Faith Mission until his death from a heart attack on September 28, 1922. He is buried in the Evergreen Cemetery in Los Angeles. His wife succeeded him as pastor and led the dwindling congregation (Robeck, p. 315).

In 1930, Rutherford D. Griffith, a 78-year-old man who came to the Mission, argued that it was in violation of its *Doctrine and Discipline* because that document stated that the congregation’s leader should be a man. He managed to force the smaller Seymour faction of the congregation to worship upstairs, while he led most of the congregation in the sanctuary. In January 1931, the situation exploded into an argument that resulted in both parties throwing hymnals each other. The police were called and the Mission was padlocked. Griffith sued the Mission and the Mission sued Griffith. In June 1932, the courts ruled in favor of Mrs. Seymour, but by that time, the building had been demolished. The Seymour group moved back to the Asberry home where it all began. Jeannie Evans Seymour died on January 2, 1936 (Robeck, p. 320).

The Azusa Street Mission eventually folded, but it had an impact on churches around the world. Robeck agrees with the historian who concluded that all Pentecostal worship in the United States is in some sense the direct “heir to the shouts, hand-clapping and foot-stomping, jubilee songs, and ecstatic seizures of the plantation ‘praise houses’” (Robeck, p. 137) that has been promoted and spread through Pentecostalism.

Eyewitnesses who investigated the situation at the Azusa Street meetings said the “tongues” spoken were not languages by (G. F. Taylor, *The Spirit and the Bride*, 1907, p. 52, cited by MacArthur, p. 272). After years of first-hand research, including visiting charismatic groups in various countries, University of Toronto linguist Prof. William Samarin concluded, “In spite of superficial similarities, glossolalia [speaking in tongues] is fundamentally *not* language” (Samarin, *Tongues of Men and Angels*. New York: Macmillan, 1972, p. 227-28, cited by MacArthur, p. 13).

Those trying to find the original site of 312 Azusa Street will have a tough time. The church was torn down in the 1931. Today the area around that original church site is a district of downtown Los Angeles called Little Tokyo. The original site of the church itself is covered over by a brick plaza created by the renowned sculptor Isamu Noguchi in the early 1980s as part of a larger Japanese American culture and community center complex. Azusa Street was long ago reduced to an alley, at the beginning of which is a sign on a light pole that says, “Azusa St.” Under the streets sign is another sign that which reads “AZUSA ST. MISSION.” Two plaques mark the actual church site, but they are “decidedly hard to spot” (Mark Kendall, “Little Tokyo’s Pentecostal miracle.” *Los Angeles Times*, May 2, 2007, p. A23).

**Denominations** Pentecostal denominations were formed. The Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) claims to be the oldest Pentecostal denomination. In 1907, a small church named the Holiness Church changed its name to the Church of God and moved its headquarters to Cleveland, Tennessee (Mead, p. 283). In 1914, the Assemblies of God was founded in Hot Springs, Arkansas. Their current headquarters is in Springfield, Missouri (Mead, pp. 279-280).

The Church of God in Christ is the largest African-American Pentecostal body. Charles H. Mason organized the Church of God in Christ in Mississippi in 1897. In 1907, he went to Azusa Street in Los Angeles, where he experienced speaking in tongues. Later, he and others formed the Church of God in Christ in Memphis, Tennessee, which is where its headquarters and the All Saints Bible College is located. Their Charles H. Mason Theological Seminary is located in Atlanta, Georgia (Mead, pp. 284-285).

There are other traditional Pentecostal denominations in America. Between 1880 and 1926, no less than twenty-five Holiness-Pentecostal groups were formed (Kuiper, p. 389; in other words, a number of Holiness churches became Pentecostal). The United Pentecostal Church and other small Pentecostal denominations teach a Unitarian view of God and baptize in the name of Jesus only (Eerdmans', p. 619).

**International** Pentecostalism spread beyond the borders of the United States. Thomas B. Barrett carried the message from Los Angeles to Norway. Lewi Pethrus took it to Sweden. Alexander A. Boddy, an Anglican pastor, started Pentecostalism in England. Willis Hoover, a Methodist, began a Pentecostal movement in Chile. Eighty percent of the Chilean Protestants are Pentecostals (Cairns, p. 458).

*Aimee Semple McPherson* Aimee Semple McPherson (1890-1944) was born in Ontario, Canada. In December 1907, she was converted and received the baptism of the Holy Spirit in a revival meeting conducted by Pentecostal evangelist Robert Semple. In August 1908, Robert and Aimee were married. They planted a church in London, Ontario and went to Chicago (1909) where they stayed for a year working with William Durham. Durham spoke in tongues and Aimee interpreted (Hayford and Moore, p. 110). After that, Robert and Aimee went to China as missionaries. In 1910, after Robert died in Hong Kong, Aimee moved to New York City, where she and her mother worked in the Salvation Army rescue mission (Hayford and Moore, pp. 140-141).

In New York City, she met businessman Harold McPherson. They were married in October 1911. In 1915, the McPhersons purchased a tent and began a ministry of itinerant evangelism, crisscrossing the nation. In 1919, Aimee was ordained as an evangelist in the Assembly of God (Hayford and Moore, p. 145; in 1920, she was licensed in the Methodist Church and she concluded her affiliation with the Assemblies of God in 1922, Hayford and Moore, p. 146). When Harold decided that itinerant evangelism was not the life he wanted, the couple reached an agreement to separate. They never reunited and Harold divorced Aimee in 1921. With her mother and two young children, Aimee continued her evangelistic ministry. She preached salvation, the Pentecostal message of the baptism of the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues, and healing. By 1921, she had become a sensation (Hayford and Moore, pp. 141-142) with interdenominational appeal.

In 1918, Aimee settled in Echo Park, a subdivision of Los Angeles, where with great fanfare, the Angelus Temple was dedicated on January 1, 1923. It cost \$1,500,000. Her services were colorful, theatrical, and dynamic. For example, she dressed like a police officer, drove a motorcycle onto the stage, screeched to a halt, jumped off the bike, blew a

police whistle, and shouted, “Stop, You’re going to hell” (Hayford and Moore, pp. 142, 147).

On May 18, 1926, while swimming at a Southern California beach, Aimee suddenly disappeared. People were convinced that she had drowned and nearly a month later conducted an elaborate memorial service for her. Three weeks later, she wandered into the desert meeting up with the Douglas, Arizona police telling them she had been kidnapped and held for ransom in Mexico. When she returned to Los Angeles on June 26 a crowd of over 50,000 greeted her at the train station with another 100,000 lining the streets to the Angelus Temple. There were rumors she had had an affair. The district attorney charged her with perjury and obstruction of justice, charges that were later dropped for lack of evidence. The scandal did not affect her popularity, but her workload caused her to have a nervous breakdown in 1930 (Hayford and Moore, pp. 149-150).

In 1931, Aimee married David Sutton. The marriage lasted 2½ years and ended in divorce. Nevertheless, Angelus Temple thrived during the 1930s. In September 1944, Aimee succumbed to an apparent accidental overdose of a regular prescription medication (Hayford and Moore, pp. 150-151).

During the 1920s, McPherson “was without question, the most well-known Christian leader in America” (Hayford and Moore, p. 133). It has been said that she was the most popular evangelist, even surpassing the popularity of Billy Sunday. In 1927, McPherson founded the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. The “four” in the name “Foursquare” stands for 1) salvation, 2) the baptism of the Holy Spirit, 3) defined physical healing, and 4) the Second Coming of Christ. She also founded the Lighthouse of International Foursquare Evangelism (L. I. F. E.) Bible College (Mead, pp. 292-293). “Her ministry was one of the first bridges connecting Pentecostalism to mainstream America and was a harbinger of the shape of the post-World War II neo-Pentecostalism” (Hayford and Moore, p. 139).

*Oral Roberts* Granville Oral Roberts (1918-2009) was born in Oklahoma. His father was a poor Pentecostal holiness preacher. In 1935, he was healed of tuberculosis and stuttering (Hayford and Moore, p. 164). In 1938, he married a preacher’s daughter. He studied for two years each at Oklahoma Baptist University and Phillips University without receiving a degree. After pastoring four Pentecostal Holiness churches, Roberts became a traveling faith healer.

In 1947, Roberts said, he picked up his Bible and it fell open to 2 John 2: “I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth.” The next day, he bought a new Buick. Shortly after, he said God spoke to him directing him to heal the sick. Roberts resigned his pastoral ministry with the Pentecostal Holiness church in Enid, Oklahoma, moved to Tulsa, and established the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association. In 1948, he borrowed \$15,000 to buy a 2000-seat tent, which he used to conduct healing crusades. Over the years, he bought larger and larger tents (Hayford and Moore, p. 172).

Wanting to appeal to people outside of Pentecostalism, Roberts called for restraint in his crusades (Hayford and Moore, p. 173). In 1949, he began a radio broadcast that by 1952 was heard on over 300 stations. In 1954, he began a television outreach that by 1958 was on more than 130 stations (Hayford and Moore, pp. 173-174). In 1962, he established Oral Roberts University. In 1967, Billy Graham spoke at the dedication of ORU (Hayford and

Moore, p. 179). In 1968, Roberts left the Pentecostal Holiness Church and joined the Methodist Church. He had moved into the mainstream (Hayford and Moore, p. 180).

In 1981, Roberts started a medical school and hospital. In 1987, Roberts declared that God would “take him home,” if he failed to raise enough money to keep the medical school and hospital open. The medical school closed in 1989 (Hayford and Moore, p. 180).

The Roberts ministry was not without its controversy. In 1979, his son Richard and daughter-in-law Patti, who were being groomed to take over the ministry, were divorced. Three years later, his rebellious older son Ronnie committed suicide. In 1984, his son Richard and Richard’s second wife Lindsay had a son, who was the only heir to be named after him. Within hours after his birth, doctors discovered the child was having difficulty breathing. For over thirty hours, while doctors fought to save the baby, Oral, Richard, and others prayed. Kenneth Hagin and his wife and other ministers came to pray for healing. When Richard Oral died, Roberts called it the worst tragedy of his life.

Picking up where Aimee Semple McPherson left off, Roberts moved Pentecostals from the margin to the mainstream (Hayford and Moore, p. 163). His ministry helped prepare the way for the charismatic movement that later penetrated the Roman Catholic Church and mainline Protestant denominations (Hayford and Moore, p. 164).

## Neo-Orthodoxy

Classic Liberalism promoted the notion that the kingdom of God could be fulfilled in history by man’s ability to bring it to pass (Ryrie, p. 15). As was pointed earlier, World War I and the Great Depression shattered the idealism of liberalism. Between 1930 and 1950, Neo-orthodoxy replaced Classic Liberalism (Cairns, p. 445).

*Soren Kierkegaard* Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) developed an existential theological system, which strongly influenced Neo-orthodox thinking. “Human despair caused him to relate to a transcendental God in personal decisions and commitment by a ‘leap of faith’ rather than by a rational process. The idea of God confronting a person in crisis apart from human effort and reason reappears in Neo-orthodox” (Cairns, p. 445).

*Karl Barth* Karl Barth (1886-1968) initiated Neo-orthodoxy. He was born in Switzerland, the son of a Reformed pastor and a seminary professor (González, II p. 361). He received a liberal theological education in Germany (Cairns, p. 445). He served for twelve years as a pastor in Switzerland. During World War I, he became convinced that liberal theology was bankrupt (Eerdmans’, p. 597). The needs of his parishioners and the inadequacy of his liberal theology drove him to the Scriptures and the writings of John Calvin (Cairns, p. 445). His *Commentary on Romans* was published in 1919 (González, II, p. 362; his second and radically revised edition was published later, González, II, p. 363).

Barth taught theology in Germany from 1921 until 1935 when his opposition to Nazi religious policy forced him to return to Basel. He taught at the university there until 1962, after which he retired to write theological works (Cairns, p. 445). In 1927, he published the first volume of a projected work entitled *Christian Dogmatic*. Thirteen volumes were published between 1932 and 1967, but the work was never completed. It has been called “unquestionably the greatest theological monument of the twentieth century” (González, II p. 364). Ryrie, who wrote a small booklet to expose the errors of Neo-orthodoxy, said of Barth, “Whether we agree with him or not, he must be recognized as one of the greatest

theologians of our time, and all who meet him testify to the fact that he is, above all, a Christian gentleman” (Ryrie, pp. 20-21).

Neo-orthodoxy teaches the transcendence of God and the sinfulness of man. Instead of being an inspired, objective, historical, propositional revelation, the Bible is a witness to revelation. It becomes a revelation to an individual in the moment of crisis when the Holy Spirit uses it to bring about a personal encounter with God. “In fact, revelation is understood to be encounter rather than communication of information” (Cairns, p. 445).

As compared to Classic Liberalism, Neo-orthodoxy is a turn toward orthodoxy, hence the name “Neo-orthodoxy.” As compared to biblical Christianity, it is weighed and found wanting. Simply put, Neo-orthodoxy is not orthodoxy. It is a false or pseudo-orthodoxy (Ryrie, p. 6). For starters, their view of the Bible is not the Orthodox view of the Bible. According to Neo-orthodoxy, the Bible is a human book subject to criticism like any other book (Cairns, p. 445). It *becomes* the Word of God, when we recognize it as such (Ryrie, p. 23).

*Emil Brunner* Emil Brunner (1889-1966) “differed from Barth by accepting some general revelation of God in nature and by holding a less historical view of the virgin birth of Christ” (Cairns, p. 446). For Brunner, Adam was not an actual human being, but a representation of man at every stage of his development, including the present one. Man is not totally depraved. Sin is self-centeredness, because it is a contradiction of what God intended for man to be. Such a self-centered, sinful life can be expressed in an ascetic life, as well as a wanton life (Ryrie, p. 26).

*Reinhold Niebuhr* Reinhold Niebuhr (1893-1971) was a pastor in Detroit for thirteen years. Like Barth, he found theological liberalism inadequate for pastoral problems (Eerdmans’, p. 597). It is inadequate to meet the needs of auto workers (Cairns, p. 446). In *Mortal Man and Immoral Society* (1932) he reacted against theological liberalism and the optimistic humanism of the social gospel and, using Marxist ideas, he argued that because of the evil in man and in society, Christian political action called for giving each group within society enough power to defend itself against exploitation by other groups (Eerdmans’, p. 597). In *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (1941-1943), he criticized liberal and Marxist views of human nature (Eerdmans’, p. 598). For Niebuhr, Adam and Eve are imaginary, but sin is real. It is, however, more social than spiritual and evangelism is aimed at converting society, not individuals (Ryrie, p. 30). Redeeming love in man would bring about social answers to human social needs (Cairns, p. 446).

*Paul Tillich* Paul Tillich (1886-1965) was a German refugee, who for many years was a professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York. He was much more philosophical than Barth. For him, God was the non-theistic “ground of all being” with whom humans can have an experiential encounter. Cairns says that in his book *Honest to God*, John Robinson (1919-1983) popularized some of Tillich’s ideas about God, but ended up without a personal God and a historical revelation from Him (Cairns, p. 446).

*Rudolph Bultmann* Rudolph Bultmann (1884-1976) published an essay entitled *The New Testament and Mythology* during World War II (González, II, p. 369). He applied “form criticism” to the Scriptures “to extract the kernels of Revelation from the husks of myth.” He “demythologized the Bible,” concluding that little is known about Christ’s person, teachings, or life. Bultmann “made experience and ethics more important than doctrine” (Cairns, p. 446). In other words, according to Bultmann, what is behind the material written in the Bible is not historical reporting; rather it is preaching, argument, or

teaching. The genuine Christian faith is not in the realm of facts (Eerdmans', p. 598). There is no such thing as supernatural intervention in the world (González, II, p. 370). Jesus is not the Jesus of history, but the Christ of faith and present experience (Eerdmans', p. 598). Eerdmans' says that John Robinson's book *Honest to God*, "took up and supported some of Bultmann's claims" (Eerdmans', p. 599; González says that Robinson popularized the views of both Bultmann and Tillich, González, II, p. 370).

Neo-orthodoxy began to collapse in the 1950's. In the next decade, it was replaced by radical theologians, who developed the "God is dead" theology (Cairns, p. 446).

## Neo-Evangelicalism

*The Background* The word "evangelical" comes from the Greek word for "gospel." It was used during the Reformation for those who were opposed to Roman Catholicism (Lightner, pp. 13-14). Today, in Europe, it is a synonym for Protestant. In England, it designates theological conservatives, both inside and outside the Church of England. In America, it has been used of the Revivalists tradition in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Cary, HCT, p. 128).

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, evangelical Protestantism was the dominant religious ideology in America. In a sense, it was the unofficial religion. Chapel attendance was required at most universities. Evangelical piety was expected in the White House (Marsden, p. 4). In 1922, Fundamentalism was described as "the largest, most written about, most widespread religious doctrine in America" (Stokes, p. 50). In 1926, a reporter named H. L. Mencken said, "Heave an egg out of a Pullman window, and you will hit a Fundamentalist almost anywhere in the United States today" (Marsden, p. vii; see also Stokes, p. 11). "Yet within the span of one generation, between the 1890s and the 1930s, the extraordinary influence of Evangelicalism in the public sphere of American culture collapsed.... Few respected educational institutions of any sort in the northern United States would even tolerate fundamentalist teaching" (Marsden, p. 4). The Scopes trial in 1925 is often viewed by historians as the time when Fundamentalism began to drift into decline and become a subculture (Stokes, p. 12).

As has been pointed out, Fundamentalism came to be identified with an anti-scholarly, anti-intellectual, anti-cultural attitude. Neo-evangelicalism was a reaction to that development within Fundamentalism (Cary, p. 129). Theological conservatives broke away from Fundamentalism to reenter American cultural and intellectual life (Cary, p. 128). At first, they were called Neo-evangelicals, but eventually, they became known simply as "Evangelicals" (Cary, p. 129).

*The Beginning* The exact date of the beginning of Neo-evangelicalism is difficult to determine (Lightner, p. 35). Historians have traced the beginning to the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals (1942) of which Harold Ockenga was a founder (Marsden, p. 3). What is interesting about that is Bob Jones, Sr. and John R. Rice, both staunch Fundamentalists, joined the National Association of Evangelicals and not the American Council of Christian Churches, which Carl McIntire started in 1941. In 1942, the words "fundamentalist" and "evangelical" were interchangeable (Marsden, p. 48).

Ockenga used the term "new evangelicalism" in connection with Fuller Seminary in Southern California, and he popularized it in 1957 (Marsden, p. 3). According to Marsden, the "early Fuller" was a Fundamentalist institution with a thoroughly Fundamentalist



constituency. The men involved with the founding of Fuller did not intend to break with Fundamentalism; rather, they intended to reform it from within (Marsden, p. 3). Marsden's history of Fuller Seminary is entitled *Reforming Fundamentalism*. Thus, Fuller Seminary provided a leading role in the New Evangelicalism's attempt to reform Fundamentalism (Marsden, p. x).

*Dissatisfaction* The Neo-evangelicals were dissatisfied with Fundamentalism. In his book *Neo-evangelicalism*, Lightner describes the dissatisfaction (Lightner, pp. 36-41).

Harold Ockenga (1905-1985), the first president of Fuller Theological Seminary, was displeased with Fundamentalism because it had the wrong attitude, wrong strategy, and wrong result. Its wrong attitude was an unwarranted suspicion of everyone. Its wrong strategy was assuming that a pure church is possible, and its wrong result was that it lost every ecclesiastical battle.

Carl Henry (1913-2003), a professor at Fuller Seminary, was dissatisfied with Fundamentalism because it had too little concern for the whole counsel of God, a lack of dedication to producing scholarly books (relying instead on reprints of theological classics), too much criticism of denominations, too much identification with dispensational premillennialism, and having a bankrupt spirit (a harsh temperament, a loveless spirit, and an unnecessary spirit of strife; it was no longer a theological position, but rather a mood and disposition).

Edward Carnell (1919-1967), a professor and later president at Fuller, was disgruntled with Fundamentalism because it had become a mentality, not a movement; it was too rigid; it was too closely associated with dispensationalism with its intellectual stagnation; it was more concerned with the salvation of souls than in social impact; and it had a negative attitude, especially in the areas of a separated life and social norms.

*Definition* So, what is Neo-evangelicalism? Harold Ockenga, the man who coined the term, explained the essence of Neo-evangelicalism in a news release dated December 8, 1957. Here is that news release.

"The New Evangelicalism is the latest dress of orthodoxy as Neo-Orthodoxy is the latest expression of theological liberalism. The New Evangelism differs from Fundamentalism in its willingness to handle the social problems which Fundamentalism evaded. There need to be no dichotomy between the personal gospel and the social gospel. The true Christian faith is a supernatural personal experience of salvation and social philosophy. Doctrine and social ethics are Christian disciplines. Fundamentalism abdicated leadership and responsibility in the societal realm and thus became impotent to change society or to solve social problems. The New Evangelicalism adheres to all the orthodox teachings of Fundamentalism but has evolved a social philosophy.

"The New Evangelicalism has changed its strategy from one of separation to one of infiltration. Instead of static front battles, the new theological war is one of movement. Instead of attack upon error, the New Evangelicals proclaim the great historic doctrines of Christianity. The results have been phenomenal. The New Evangelical is willing to face the intellectual problems and meet them in the framework of modern learning. It stands doctrinally upon the creeds and confessions of the Church and grants liberty in minor areas when the discussion is promoted on the basis of exegesis of Scripture. The strategy of the New Evangelicalism is the positive proclamation of the truth in distinction from all errors without delving into personalities that embrace the error. The evangelical believes that Christianity is intellectually defensible, but the Christian cannot be obscurantist in

scientific questions pertaining to the creation, the age of man, the universality of the flood, and other moot Biblical questions. The evangelical attempts to apply Christian truth to every phase of life.

“Since I first coined the phrase ‘The New Evangelicalism’ at a convocation address at Fuller Theological Seminary ten years ago, the evangelical forces have been welded into an organizational front. First, there is the National Association of Evangelicals, which provides articulation for the movement on the denominational level; second, there is World Evangelical Fellowship, which binds together these individual national associations of some twenty-six countries into a world organization; third, there is the new apologetic literature stating this point of view which is now flowing from the presses of the great publishers, including Macmillan’s and Harper’s; fourth, there is the existence of Fuller Theological Seminary and other evangelical seminaries, which are fully committed to orthodox Christianity and a resultant social philosophy; fifth, there is the establishment of *Christianity Today*, a bi-weekly publication, to articulate the convictions of this movement; sixth, there is the appearance of an evangelist, Billy Graham, who on the mass level is the spokesman of the convictions and ideals of the New Evangelicalism. The strength of this movement is recognized by the *Christian Century*, America’s leading theologically liberal magazine, by its expression of fear that this movement may challenge the religious scene and change the religious climate in this nation. The New Evangelical believes that Christ is the answer; that He must be understood in a Biblical framework and He and His teachings must be applied to every realm of societal existence.”

In other words, Neo-evangelicalism held to the fundamentals of the faith, but not to the negative attitude, Dispensationalism, denominational separation, and intellectual stagnation of Fundamentalism. It was committed to a positive proclamation, denominational infiltration instead of separation, a scholarly approach (taking scientific questions such as creation, the age of man, and the flood seriously), and social involvement.

John F. Walvoord has put it like this: “It claimed the same theology as old time fundamentalism, but was an attempt to remedy its deficiencies. It, first of all, was opposed to separationism. The neo-evangelicals feel free to work in most Protestant denominations and do not believe in separation from them unless forced to leave. Neo-evangelicalism countered the oft-repeated charge of anti-intellectualism leveled at fundamentalism by an emphasis on scholarship and intellectualism in an endeavor to meet modernism on its own level scholastically. As against the charge of being anti-social and indifferent to contemporary issues, which was often laid at the door of fundamentalism, neo-evangelicalism emphasizes participation and taking a stand on social and moral issues as a necessary adjunct to neo-evangelical Christianity. Neo-evangelicalism also tends to evade some of the criticism leveled at fundamentalism by becoming one of its critics. By some neo-evangelicals, the most extreme kind of fundamentalist controversy was pictured as the norm. Neo-evangelicalism was loud in its denial of fundamentalist controversy and at the same time praised liberal theologians for their scholarship, cogency, and relevance. Strenuous efforts were made to attract the liberals and encourage them to listen to neo-evangelical presentations” (Walvoord, cited by Lightner, pp. 4-5).

*Fuller’s Founding* Since Neo-evangelicalism is so closely related to Fuller Seminary, to understand Neo-evangelicalism it is necessary to understand the founding and some of the history of Fuller Seminary. In 1947, Charles E. Fuller and others founded Fuller Seminary in Pasadena, California. The founders and first faculty members were

*Fundamentalists*. Most of them had been influenced by J. Gretchen Machen. Besides Charles Fuller, the founder, and Harold Ockenga, the first president, the charter faculty members were Carl F. H. Henry, Wilbur M. Smith, Everett F. Harrison, and Harold Lindsell ([www.SeekGod.ca/charmembers.htm](http://www.SeekGod.ca/charmembers.htm), accessed 9/11/2014; Lindsell, p. 106).

Charles E. Fuller (1887-1968) graduated from Pomona College (1910), studied at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (now Biola University), and later became chairman of the board of the Bible Institute (1928-1932). He was a Presbyterian who became a Baptist (1925). He was the speaker on *The Old Fashioned Revival Hour*, a weekly Sunday broadcast (1937 to 1968).

Fuller was a Dispensationalist, having learned it from R. A. Torrey at the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. He sent out dispensational charts to listeners of his radio broadcast. In 1946, when he was planning his school, he wrote to Lewis Sperry Chafer asking for suggestions for a young man, “preferably a graduate of Dallas Seminary,” to help head his new institution. He added that his son Dan was considering going to Dallas (Marsden, p. 20; instead of going to Dallas, Dan went to Princeton, partly because of its prestige and partly because Ralph Winter, his best friend from high school and Lake Avenue Church, was going there, Marsden, p. 21).

Harold Ockenga (1905-1985) studied under Machen at Princeton and was so deeply influenced by him that although Ockenga had been a Methodist, he adopted Machen’s Presbyterian theology. He even followed Machen to Westminster (Marsden, p. 34). Later he earned a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Pittsburgh. Ockenga agreed to serve as president *in absentia*. He also recruited the faculty.

Carl F. H. Henry (1913-2003) began as a journalist. He attended Wheaton College (B.A. and M.A.), where he was influenced by Gordon Clark, who was devoted to Machen. He earned doctorates at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary (Th.D.) and Boston University (Ph.D., 1949). In 1947, he wrote *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, in which he rejected liberalism and held to the fundamentals of the faith, but rejected the rigidity and disengagement of Fundamentalism. In 1956, at the urging of Billy Graham, he became the first editor of *Christianity Today*. He remained the editor until 1968.

Wilbur Smith (1894-1977) came from a family connected with Fundamentalism. His father was converted under the ministry of D. L. Moody, and his mother was the assistant to R. A. Torrey (Marsden, p. 35). He never earned a degree, not even a high school diploma. Before finishing high school, he entered Moody Bible Institute. Then he transferred to the College of Wooster, but before he finished, he became the pastor of a Presbyterian church. Nevertheless, he was an ardent dispensational premillennialist who recommended his students go to the Evangelical Theological College in Dallas (later Dallas Theological Seminary). In 1932, the Evangelical Theological College gave him a Doctorate of Divinity degree (Marsden, pp. 35-36). Wilbur Smith immensely admired Machen (Marsden, p. 35).

When Smith told Ockenga that he did not have a single earned degree, Ockenga told Smith that at Fuller, he wanted the practical application of Christianity. “The idea is to train young men to be able to preach, to emphasize the great verities of the word of God, to lead people to Christ. You are best able to be a model to such a new breed of preachers and to inspire them” (Marsden, p. 35, fn.). Smith left Moody Bible Institute (he thought it lacked vision) to join Fuller (Marsden, p. 25).

Everett Harrison (1902-1999) earned degrees at Princeton Seminary (Th.B., 1927), where he studied Greek under Machen, Dallas Theological Seminary (Th.D., 1938), and the University of Pennsylvania (Ph.D., 1950). He served as a missionary in China and as a Presbyterian pastor in Pennsylvania. He taught both at Dallas Seminary and Fuller Seminary. He was competent in Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, German, Latin, and French.

Harold Lindsell (1913-1998) obtained degrees from Wheaton College (where he was influenced by Clark, a devoted follower of Machen, Marsden, p. 45), the University of California, Berkeley, and New York University (Ph.D.). He taught at Columbia Bible College, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, and Fuller Seminary. He served as an editor of *Christianity Today* and was president of the Evangelical Theological Society (1971). He wrote *The Battle for the Bible* (1976).

The faculty at Fuller consisted of scholarly Fundamentalists, both dispensationalists and non-dispensationalists. In the words of Marsden, they were “conservative Republicans” and “respectable fundamentalists” (Marsden, p. 29). Lindsell, one of the four founding faculty members of Fuller, said Fuller Theological Seminary “was created for the express purpose of developing an apologetic for biblical inerrancy.” Along with it came other tides of a literate, scholarly mentality comparable to that of the old Princeton school of Hodge, Warfield, Green, and Machen” (Lindsell, p. 198).

The founders and first faculty members of Fuller Seminary were Fundamentalists, but they were *moderate Fundamentalists* in that they were not bent on ecclesiastical separation. Early in his life, Fuller led his Sunday school class in a Presbyterian Church to reorganize as the Calvary Church of Placentia (now the Calvary Church of Brea). Having separated from the Presbyterians, he was ordained by the Baptist Bible Union, an organization of dispensational Fundamentalist Baptists who had separatist tendencies (Marsden, p. 38), but as a board member of the Bible Institute, he went through an experience of dismissing a faculty member and as a result, moved toward the side of Fundamentalism that stressed a positive message rather than controversy (see Marsden, pp. 39-41, for details).

When Machen left Princeton Seminary to form Westminster Seminary, Harold Ockenga left Princeton as a student and went with Machen, but when Machen organized the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions in direct competition with the denomination’s board, although Ockenga was sympathetic, he did not break with the denominational board (Marsden, pp. 41-42). In 1943, when about 300 churches and Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary separated from the Northern Baptists, Carl Henry, who was teaching at Northern Baptist Seminary, regarded such separatism as premature and stayed with the Northern Baptists. At the time, he estimated that 85% of the convention churches were Evangelical (Marsden, p. 46). Wilbur Smith sided with Machen and even accepted a position on the executive committee of the Independent Board (Marsden, p. 41; so did Charles Woodbridge, who would later join the faculty of Fuller), but eventually he “strongly opposed Machen’s separatist course” and under pressure from the denomination resigned from the Independent Board (Marsden, pp. 42-43). Although Everett Harrison had impeccable Fundamentalist credentials, when he became the pastor of a Presbyterian Church that had experienced a split over Fundamentalism, he remained loyal to the denomination. That experience gave him “a taste of the resentment generated by separatists” (Marsden, p. 44). Along with Carl Henry, Harold Lindsell, who was also teaching at Northern Seminary, rejected separatism (Marsden, p. 46). All of these men were Fundamentalists, but they were not separatists. Marsden points out, “Some of the most

ardent Fundamentalists, such as William B. Riley, the pope of Minnesota Baptist Fundamentalism, were not separatists” (Marsden, p. 48).

These early formers of Fuller wanted to establish a *scholarly* institution. From the very beginning, Charles E. Fuller wanted Fuller Seminary to be “absolutely true to the fundamentals” and, at the same time, be a school of “high scholarship” (Marsden, p. 13). Those influenced by Machen were of the same opinion. Machen and his followers were convinced that “scholarship as well as piety” were “absolutely necessary for establishing a solid foundation for long-term evangelical survival and resurgence” (Marsden, p. 34). In February 1947, Fuller met with Ockenga, who felt scholarship was pivotal to the success of the whole evangelical movement. Thus, Fuller’s practical vision was combined with Ockenga’s “strategic enterprise” (Marsden, p. 24; see also p. 51). Carl Henry and Harold Lindsell attended Wheaton College, where they were influenced by Gordon H. Clark, who was intensely devoted to Machen. Fuller’s first news release described the seminary as a “research center for evangelical scholarship” and Fuller said he wanted his seminary to be “a Cal Tech of the evangelical world” (Marsden, p. 56).

These early formers of Fuller also wanted a *social emphasis*. They considered the opening of the Seminary to be “the beginning of a new age for evangelicals” (Marsden, p. 61). Ockenga delivered the convocation address, in which he declared that the mission of the Seminary was not just in training pastors and missionaries, but it was to be involved in the task of saving Western civilization. Marsden says this was a repudiation of the dispensationalist view that the church was a “refuge in a ruined culture” and an affirmation of the Calvinist-Puritan view that the church was to play a central role in civilization-building (Marsden, pp. 62-63).

Ockenga announced the Seminary would be “ecclesiastically positive.” He said, “We do not believe and we repudiate the ‘come-out-ism’” (meaning come out of denominations). Marsden says this was a direct attack on Carl McIntyre, who insisted that separation was basic to fundamentalism (Marsden, p. 64). McIntyre responded by having the American Council of Christian Churches pass a resolution condemning Ockenga’s address and Fuller Seminary for violating the command of Scripture to separate from apostasy (Marsden, p. 66).

Marsden observes, “A pattern was now set that would continue through Fuller Seminary’s first several decades. The school would aspire to be a force for renewal and broadening of fundamentalism and evangelicalism” (Marsden, p. 67).

Wilbur Smith, a dispensationalist, viewed civilization as beyond repair and that Christians were to preach the gospel, keep themselves pure, and wait for the Lord to return (Marsden, p. 75). While remaining premillennialists, Harold Ockenga and Carl Henry abandoned the dispensationalist preoccupation with the signs of the times as signs of the end and adopted a view of history more characteristic of Reformed theology, meaning that “Christians have the task of transforming culture to bring it more in conformity with God’s law and will” (Marsden, p. 76). They felt Fundamentalists were so preoccupied with personal and ecclesiastical separation that they had no social impact. Henry cited the controversy at Wheaton College concerning whether or not the game of Rook fell under the prohibition against card games. He also noticed the inconsistency among Northern and Southern Fundamentalists concerning smoking and mixed swimming (Marsden, p. 80; yet after leading a young man to Christ on a plane. Henry convinced the fellow to give him his pack of cigarettes and deck of cards, Marsden, p. 91). By social involvement, Ockenga and

Henry meant opposition to “aggressive warfare, racial hatred, intolerance, the liquor traffic, and exploitation of labor or management” (Marsden, p. 81).

Ockenga and Henry were not calling for the social gospel to replace evangelism. Personal salvation was the priority (Marsden, p. 82), but Christians also had the task of transforming society (Marsden, p. 79). Actually, they were rejecting the dispensational view of the “kingdom then,” as well as the liberal view of the “kingdom now.” In their opinion, the kingdom was partly realized now and would be completely realized when Christ returned. Kingdom work today included not only preaching salvation, but also exercising compassion in anticipation of the coming rule of Christ (Marsden, p. 81). “The reformers of Fundamentalism at Fuller Seminary remained faithful to what it been the central thrust of American evangelicalism at least since the days of Dwight L. Moody. While their agenda had expanded to include the rehabilitation of both scholarship and social consciousness, evangelism remained the *sine qua non* (absolutely necessary)” (Marsden, p. 93).

So with money from his father’s foundation and his own national radio broadcast, Fuller purchased a mansion in Pasadena and announced the opening of the Seminary on his radio broadcast in September 1947. Bill Bright (founder of Campus Crusade for Christ), who had attended Princeton Seminary the previous year, and 38 others made up the first class (Marsden, p. 54).

*Fuller’s Difficult Days* One of Fuller’s aims was to regain influence in the mainline Protestant denominations. That proved to be easier said than done. Marsden tells the story in great detail (Marsden, pp. 94-118; see also Lindsell, pp. 107-108).

In the fall of 1947, the Los Angeles Presbytery began taking steps to remove Harold Ockenga from the Presbyterian ministry if he continued with Fuller. That failed. Carl Henry was cut out of the retirement program of the Northern Baptist when he went to Fuller. In a bold move to get the Los Angeles Presbytery to accept Fuller, Fuller Seminary hired Bela Vasady, a highly regarded Hungarian Reformed theologian. Vasady was an admirer of Karl Barth and Neo-orthodoxy. He was also one of the founders of the World Council of Churches, an organization Fundamentalists thought was liberal, but he was definitely an Evangelical at heart. That did not work either. The Los Angeles Presbytery refused his membership!

That was bad enough, but more troubles erupted when Vasady wrote an article in which he lavishly praised ecumenism. Carl McIntyre pounced on that and on Charles Fuller for allowing it. Then Chester Tulga, another fiery Fundamentalist who was a member of the Conservative Baptist Fellowship, a group that had broken away from the Northern Baptist Convention, got upset over Vasady’s praise of ecumenism and his use of Neo-orthodox language in a speech. Letters of complaint poured into the Seminary. Some at Fuller feared the loss of potential Conservative Baptist students. The Seminary drew up a statement on inerrancy, which Vasady did not sign. When his contract was up, he left.

*Fuller’s Drift* At the beginning, Fuller’s aim was to *reform* Fundamentalism, but in the opinion of Fundamentalists, Fuller began to *drift* from Fundamentalism. Many Fundamentalists would say the drift began with the Vasady fiasco (see “Fuller’s Difficult Days” above and Lindsell’s account of Fuller below).

Another issue that greatly upset the Fundamentalists was Fuller’s handling of the Revised Standard Version published by the National Council of Churches (Marston, pp. 136-138). The release of the RSV *New Testament* in 1946 was not a problem for

Fundamentalists. John R. Rice, a staunch Fundamentalist, who was the editor of the *Sword of the Lord*, allowed his name to be used in an advertisement for it. The release of the RSV *Old Testament* was another issue. In Isaiah 7:14, instead of “a virgin shall conceive,” it read, “a young woman will conceive.” Rice retracted his endorsement. McIntyre held “Back to the Bible” meetings across the country. He reported that some pastors publicly burned the blasphemous translation. Whether or not one accepted the RSV immediately became a symbol of loyalty either to Fundamentalism or the ecumenical movement.

Although mildly divided on the merits of the RSV, the Fuller faculty defended it. William LaSor argued that “young woman” was an appropriate translation of Isaiah 7:14. The faculty even conducted a public debate on the RSV at Lake Avenue Congregational Church in Pasadena. Carnell and LaSor were for it and Archer and Lindell argued against it. Yet the faculty basically stood together on the issue. Archer, Harrison, Woodbridge, and LaSor planned to write a book with a balanced view on the subject.

But “balance” was not the road to popularity. “The Old-Fashioned Revival Hour” began losing contributions by the bushel. Charles Fuller assured his subscribers that while he objected to the RSV, the seminary professors ought to be free to examine it. Such distinctions were lost on most Fundamentalists. One member of The Old-Fashioned Revival Hour board resigned. Fuller lost 100,000 radio subscribers. He called for a moratorium on public discussion of the issue.

Until that issue arose, Carnell thought of himself as a great champion of Orthodoxy, but because of this issue, he began to think he needed to purge himself of this Fundamentalist illness. He concluded, “Jesus names *love*, not defense of doctrine as a sign of a true disciple” (Carnell, cited by Marsden, p. 138, italics his). This became a turning point for him personally and would soon put the seminary on a new course.

Then Carnell became president of Fuller Seminary.

*Fuller’s Departure* Fuller’s real *departure* from Fundamentalism took place during the presidency of Carnell (1954–1959). Edward John Carnell (1919-1967) graduated from Wheaton College (B.A.), where he majored in philosophy under the Calvinistic philosopher Gordon Clark, Westminster Theological Seminary (Th.B. and Th.M., 1944), Harvard University (Th.D., 1948), and Boston University (Ph.D.). After serving for three years on the faculty of Gordon College and Divinity School, he became a professor at Fuller Theological Seminary (1948), where he taught until his death in 1967. He also served as the second president of Fuller (1954-1959).

In his inaugural address, Carnell said the crowning glory of the seminary must be a spirit of tolerance. To Fundamentalists, talk of love and toleration smacked of liberalism. To them, when Christian leaders started talking about love, heresy could not be far behind (Marsden, p. 148). Wilbur Smith had been unhappy about Carnell’s appointment as president. Now he was fuming. Woodbridge was appalled that Ockenga did not demand a retraction or a resignation. Smith, Woodbridge, Henry, and Lindsell confronted Carnell, assuring him that he did not speak for them. LaSor and Ladd stood with Carnell. For the first time, the faculty was divided, not so much by doctrine as by attitude (Marsden, p. 149).

In a “step away from the fundamentalist orbit,” Carnell made league with Jewett, Ladd, and Dan Fuller to get the statement about premillennialism removed from the seminary’s statement of faith. Carnell argued that neither Calvin, Warfield, Hodge, nor Machen could have taught at Fuller Seminary. Charles Fuller objected but signed a statement that after

his death, the pre-millennial clause could be removed (Marsden, p. 150). By the way, Charles Fuller, Smith, Woodbridge, Henry, Lindsell, and Harrison were Pre-trib. Carnell, Ladd, Rodney, and Dan Fuller were Post-trib (Marsden, p. 151).

*Billy Graham* Billy Graham was a factor in the development of Neo-evangelicalism. In 1951, Wilbur Smith outlined his dream to Billy Graham for the need for a monthly Christian periodical. What he had in mind was a magazine devoted to biblical exposition and prophecy with religious news and reviews of important books, but “no attention to trash.” By 1954, Graham became convinced that such a substantial theological voice would be an important follow-up to his crusades.

When Lindsell suggested Carl Henry would be an excellent editor, Graham said, in effect, Henry might be too much of a Fundamentalist. Graham envisioned a periodical that would “plant the evangelical flag in the middle of the road, taking a conservative theological position, but a definite liberal approach to social problems. It would combine the best of liberalism and the best in fundamentalism without compromising theologically.” Graham added, “Its view of inspiration would be somewhat along the line of the recent book by Bertrand Ramm.” He was referring to Ramm’s book *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* in which he suggested a view of inspiration that allowed for a divinely guided development of the species (Marsden, pp. 158-159). Ramm’s book caused the greatest stir in Fundamentalism since the RSV controversy (Marsden, p. 159). At any rate, *Christianity Today* was born (1956), Carl Henry was its first editor, and Ockenga was chairman of its board.

In 1954, during his campaign in England, Graham received broader church support than his Fundamentalist supporters in America would have allowed him. That led him to the conviction he could make inroads into America’s major denominations “if he could only jettison the fundamentalist images of separatism, anti-intellectualism, and contentiousness.” He did not want to “tie his ministry to a narrow view of the implications of the inerrancy of Scripture for modern science. He would not identify evangelical Christianity with only the most conservative politics. His recent stand for racial integrating his crusades exemplified the point. Nor would he totally condemn the ecumenical movement” (Marsden, pp. 159-160).

The major explosion between the new Evangelicals and the strict Fundamentalists came when Billy Graham accepted an invitation to hold an evangelistic crusade in New York City under the auspices of the Protestant Council, a group that was predominately non-evangelical and even included out-and-out liberals. That meant sending converts back to their churches, no matter how liberal those churches might be (Morrison, p. 162).

Jack Wyrzten was irate (Morrison, p. 162). John R. Rice, who through the spring of 1956 had defended Graham from mounting Fundamentalist criticism, asked Graham to reaffirm the Fundamentalist statement of faith in the *Sword of the Lord*. Graham responded by asking that his name be dropped from the cooperative board of the *Sword of the Lord* (Marsden, p. 164). In 1957, Graham answered his critics in a speech to the National Association of Evangelicals. He said, “The one badge of Christian discipleship is not orthodoxy, but love.” Later that year, Carl Henry wrote that Fundamentalism as a theology must be distinguished from Fundamentalism as a temperament, meaning “a harsh temperament, a spirit of lovelessness and strife” (Marsden, pp. 164-165).

By the time Graham opened his New York crusade (1957), “it was all over for the classic Fundamentalist coalition, although the shouting continued for two more decades.



Polemics on both sides proliferated as the old fundamentalist community sorted itself into two camps. The pivotal question was what one thought of Billy Graham.... Separatism, accordingly, now became a chief test of ‘fundamentalism’” (Marsden, p. 165).

In his book *Reforming Fundamentalism*, Marsden notes, “Graham and Fuller Seminary were thrown into each other’s arms. They were fully agreed that they had to jettison the counterproductive negativism of extreme fundamentalism and that they had to be open to sympathizers in ecumenical old-line denominations” (Marsden, p. 167). In 1958, Graham became a member of the Board of Trustees of Fuller Seminary, thus giving his endorsement to Fuller as a leading institution in the emerging new Evangelical coalition. It was at this point that Ockenga released his press release giving the movement a distinctive identity by calling it “the new evangelicalism” (Marsden, p. 167).

The new evangelicals claimed they represented original Fundamentalism more faithfully than latter-day Fundamentalism, which had added separation, an unloving militancy, and an insistence on the details of Dispensationalism to the original evangelical defense of the fundamentals. For example, as editor of *Christianity Today*, Carl Henry envisioned a return to a standard much like the *Fundamentals* (1910). He lined up an array of scholars as contributors to *Christianity Today* (Marsden, pp. 169-170).

*Edward J. Carnell* As was mentioned earlier, Carnell was the second president of Fuller Seminary. He was a perfectionist who was “unable to compromise happily on any front,” and, at one point, he had a “psychological collapse” (Marsden, p. 174). Anxiety sometimes overwhelmed him (Marsden, p. 193). At one point, he suffered from “deep depression” (Marsden, p. 192). He said, “Ordinary responsibility as conversing with others overwhelms me with consternation.... Even suicide took on a certain attractiveness” (Marsden, p. 184).

When his mentor, Gordon Clark, reviewed his book *Christian Commitment* (1957) for *Christianity Today*, Clark thought that Carnell was weak on the doctrine of salvation by Christ alone (Marsden, p. 184). In his book *The Case for Orthodox Theology* (1959), Carnell defined Fundamentalism as “orthodoxy gone cultic” (Marsden, p. 188). He also said, “Fundamentalists defend the gospel, to be sure, but they sometimes act as if the gospel read, ‘Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, don’t smoke, don’t go to movies, and above all, don’t use the Revised Standard Version—and you will be saved.’” He repudiated Dispensationalism and separatism. “The way in which Carnell attacked separatism was, however, startling. He zeroed in on J. Gresham Machen, the apostle of intellectual fundamentalism, as the culprit. Machen, he said, manifested the very ‘cultic mentality’ that was the worst feature of fundamentalism” (Marsden, p. 189, italics his). He even raised questions about the necessity of holding to the inerrancy of Scripture (Marsden, p. 190).

The reaction was scathing. John R. Rice attacked Carnell’s book for claiming that not all Scripture was equally inspired, endorsing evolution, repudiating premillennialism, etc. Charles Fuller was inundated with mail. There were roundtable discussions at Wheaton College and Grace Theological Seminary. Bob Jones, Sr. broke with Charles Fuller over the Carnell book (Marsden, p. 191). Charles Fuller excused Carnell on the grounds that he had completed the book when he was suffering from a nervous breakdown and, hence, “did not always express himself too clearly” (Marsden, p. 192).

In 1961, Carnell was hospitalized and was only brought out of a deep depression by a major series of shock treatments (Marsden, p. 194). In 1962, he was hospitalized again, this time for five weeks. After his release from the hospital, he received weekly shock treatments (Marsden, p. 194).

Under Carnell, Fuller Seminary departed from Fundamentalism. The only question was, “How far would they depart?” “The original generation of Fuller’s founders were divided on how far to stray from fundamentalism, especially regarding the doctrine of Scripture; and even the more progressive among them were divided over whether the revolution should lead to classic Calvinism or a more pragmatic openness” (Marsden, p. 205). The conservative Neo-evangelicals at Fuller emphasized the doctrine of inerrancy as firmly as ever, limiting how far the break with Fundamentalism would go. The progressive Neo-evangelicals were willing to have a clean break from Fundamentalism (Marsden, p. 207).

Enter Dan Fuller.

*Daniel Fuller (born 1925)* Dan Fuller was the son of Charles Fuller. After graduation from South Pasadena High school, he enlisted in the U. S. Navy and began the officer training program at Occidental College. Later he transferred to the University of California at Berkeley to train in the Navy ROTC. He graduated from the University of California (1944) and was commissioned as an ensign in the U. S. Navy, where he served for fifteen months. After he was discharged, Fuller enrolled at Princeton Theological Seminary and graduated from Fuller Theological Seminary (B.D. in 1951 and Th.M. in 1952). He received a Th.D. from Northern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1957 and a D. Theol. degree from the University of Basel, Switzerland, in 1966, where he studied with Karl Barth.

Fuller served as Assistant Pastor at Park Street Church, Boston, Massachusetts from 1949 to 1950 and was a professor at Fuller Theological Seminary from 1953 to 1993. He supported Carnell’s challenge to Fundamentalists to stop relying on stock formulas and name-calling and to defend the truth intellectually (Marsden, p. 200). He felt that Fuller Seminary should revise its doctrinal statement to say that infallibility had to do with statements of faith and practice, not historical detail. He believed that Fuller should hire only the best evangelical scholars and that they should not be limited in their intellectual explorations by an arbitrary test of premillennialism (Marsden, p. 201) 1961, Dan Fuller became the Dean of the Seminary, a move that strengthened the progressive party (Marsden, pp. 205-206). At a planning meeting of the board on December 1, 1962 (known as Black Saturday), he played a critical role in advancing the progressive agenda, namely accepting the position that the Bible contains historical errors (see Marsden, pp. 208-215).

In the meantime, the Seminary needed a full-time president. Carnell had resigned in 1959 and Ockenga had once again served as president *in absentia*. Ockenga, Smith, and Billy Graham, who was on the search committee, were seeking a conservative, but they were up against the progressives. In the end, David Hubbard was chosen to be the next President of Fuller Seminary (Marsden, pp. 217-219).

*David Hubbard* David Allan Hubbard graduated from Westmont College, Fuller Theological Seminary (Th.M.), and St. Andrews University in Scotland (Ph.D. in Old Testament). He taught at Westmont College. Hubbard affirmed inerrancy. He explained the discrepancies as a matter of interpretation rather than inspiration and he was willing to tolerate differences of interpretation (Marsden, pp. 216-217). He served as President of Fuller for thirty years (1963-1993).

With the inauguration of Hubbard as president, Fuller Seminary was rapidly moving toward “reorganization for the new regime” (Marsden, p. 220). Wilbur Smith, who was concerned over the doctrinal trend, resigned the following summer. His greatest concern

was inerrancy (Marsden, p. 223). He went to Trinity Evangelical Divinity School to teach. Two trustees resigned over the inerrancy issue (Marsden, pp. 220, 223). Lindsell, who was unhappy over the inerrancy situation, left to assume a position at *Christianity Today* (Marsden, p. 223). Gleason Archer, another faculty member, deeply disturbed over the inerrancy issue, also went to Trinity (Marsden, p. 224). The 1964-65 Fuller catalog removed the statement on inerrancy, explaining that when faculty members signed the statement of faith, it was “without mental reservation and any member who cannot sign agrees to withdraw from the institution” (Marsden, p. 224).

Marsden explains the significance of these developments when he says, “Having broken with fundamentalism, the conservative wing of the new evangelicals needed a meaningful test to limit how far reforms of fundamentalism might go. Inerrancy could play that role. It was a distinctive of the fundamentalist movement yet shared by some of the conservative traditions. Unlike premillennialism, it was close to the center of the movement’s teachings. It was also logically connected to the critical question of authority, which was central to the debates with liberals and secularists” (Marsden, p. 227).

Under Hubbard’s leadership, Fuller dropped the distinctive fundamentalist agenda (Marsden, p. 230). Marsden documents the decline of beliefs in inerrancy, hell, and that premarital sex is always wrong among the students graduating from Fuller (Marsden, pp. 246-247). For example, in 1982, only 15% of the students believed in inerrancy (Marsden, p. 268). Eventually, the doctrinal boundaries of the new Evangelicalism became roughly those of the Nicene Creed (Marsden, p. 268).

*Opposition* Several former Fuller faculty members wrote scathing criticisms of Neo-evangelicalism in general and Fuller Seminary in particular.

In 1969, Charles Woodbridge wrote *The New Evangelicalism*. In it, he leveled four charges against New Evangelicalism, using people connected with Fuller as examples. 1) The New Evangelical *mood* is a toleration for false teachers (Woodbridge, p. 23; Hubbard’s inaugural address is an illustration) and a sometimes outright contempt for uncompromising Bible believers (Woodbridge, p. 26). 2) The New Evangelical *method* is Jesuit casuistry, that is, the teaching that the end justifies the means; doing evil that good may result (Woodbridge, p. 31). Illustrations include Christian schools inviting unbelievers to speak in chapel, Christian magazines advertising books by unbelievers, and ecumenical evangelistic crusades (Woodbridge, pp. 33-45). 3) The New Evangelicalism has produced a *new theology*. “First comes *toleration*. Then *cooperation*. Then *contamination*.... The mood of undue toleration toward false teachers and the resultant methodology of making common cause with them has energized in new evangelical circles, a new theology that 30 years ago would have been considered rank heresy.... *They questioned the canon of the Bible, in its inerrant authority, and the nature of its contents* (the first 11 chapters of Genesis)” (Woodbridge, p. 47, italics his). Clarence Bass, a professor at Bethel College, said, “Many of us admit the Bible unquestionably contains factual errors, but we still maintained that it is inerrant in divine purpose” and remarks, “This is not only blasphemous. It is also logically absurd. How can the Bible contain errors and yet be inerrant?” (Woodbridge, p. 50). 4) The New Evangelical *ethics* do not include separation from the world. Carnell defended dancing (Woodbridge, p. 56) and Ockenga and Billy Graham commended such movies as “Ben-Hur” and “The Ten Commandments” (Woodbridge, p. 55). Woodbridge laments that young people’s groups have stooped to “folk songs and ‘hootenannies’ and shoulder-shaking, guitar-strumming antics”

(Woodbridge, p. 61). Throughout his book, he cites numerous passages to support separation.

In 1976, Harold Lindsell, one of the original faculty members of Fuller Seminary, wrote *The Battle for the Bible*. In it, he defines inerrancy, defends it from the Scripture, and demonstrates that it was held throughout church history (Lindsell, pp. 17-71). Then he discusses the denial of inerrancy in the Lutheran Church (Lindsell, pp. 72-88), the Southern Baptist Convention (Lindsell, pp. 89-105), Fuller Theological Seminary (Lindsell, pp. 106-121), and other denominations and parachurch groups (Lindsell, pp. 122-140). After that, he writes a chapter in which he contends that once biblical inerrancy is surrendered, there are undesirable consequences that end in apostasy (Lindsell, pp. 141-159). He deals with the discrepancies in the Scripture (Lindsell, pp. 161-184) and how theological infection spreads (Lindsell, pp. 185-199). In the concluding chapter, he declares, “The label ‘evangelical’ has traditionally stood for a series of doctrinal convictions of which one has been biblical infallibility” (Lindsell, p. 210).

*“It is the basis of this book that biblical inerrancy is a theological watershed. Down the road, whether it takes five or fifty years, any institution that departs from belief in an inerrant scripture will likewise depart from all the fundamentals of the faith and, at last, cease to be evangelical in the historical meaning of the term.... How long will it be before it (Fuller Seminary) reaches the stage in which the atonement, the resurrection of Jesus in the same body, or the Second Coming are challenged?”* (Lindsell, pp. 120-121, italics added).

As was mentioned above, Marsden documents the decline of beliefs in inerrancy, hell, and no premarital sex among the students graduating from Fuller (Marsden, pp. 246-247; for a critical review of Lindsell’s book, see Donald W. Dayton “The Battle for the Bible: Renewing the Inerrancy Debate” available free at <http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=1823>).

*Conclusion* As has been pointed out, in 1973, George W. Dollar published a book entitled *A History of Fundamentalism in America*. In that book, he divided Fundamentalism into three camps: 1) militants, 2) moderates, 3) modified. According to Dollar, “a militant Fundamentalist of historic type is one who interprets the Bible literally and also all affirmations and attitudes not found in the Word of God” (Dollar, p. 283). He lists in this category Bob Jones University, Faith Theological Seminary, Central Baptist Seminary (Minneapolis), etc. He says the moderate Fundamentalist “accepts all the affirmations or doctrines in the Bible, but refuses to expose error, those who expose error, wrong attitudes, questionable habits and defections from Bible discipline” (Dollar, p. 284). In this category, he lists Dallas Theological Seminary, Grace Seminary, Talbot Seminary, and Western Seminary, Biola University, Tennessee Temple University, Moody Bible Institute, and Philadelphia College of the Bible. A modified Fundamentalist is one who has “a fundamental background and affirms the inspiration of the Bible, the sinfulness of man, the deity of Christ, His atoning death, His bodily resurrection and the return of the Lord. They are basically evangelical, but because of their surrender to New Evangelicalism, they are outside the mainstream of historic fundamentalism” (Dollar, p. 285). Under this category, he places Fuller Theological Seminary, Denver Seminary, and Trinity Seminary, as well as Wheaton College and Oral Roberts University. Other schools are listed under each of the three categories. He also lists the various mission boards under these three classifications. This was his estimation in 1973.

In 1974, Richard Quebedeaux wrote a book entitled *The Young Evangelicals*. He divided the then-current scene into Fundamentalists, establishment Evangelicals, and young Evangelicals. In the establishment Evangelical camp, he placed the Southern Baptists, *Christianity Today*, and Billy Graham. Among the young Evangelicals, he put Fuller Seminary and the late U.S. Senator Mark Hatfield.

These two men from opposite ends of the conservative theological spectrum divide theological conservatives about the same way. Dollar is to the extreme right and sees three groups of Fundamentalists. Quebedeaux is to the extreme left of the conservative spectrum and does something very similar.

Some on the right seem to be drifting further to the right. For example, Bob Jones University has become even more militant. Some on the left are drifting further and further away from historic Christianity, the latest issue being the subject of inerrancy and the development of a feminist theology. In the meantime, the Charismatic movement is the fastest-growing segment of conservative Christianity.

## **The Charismatic Movement**

The charismatic movement emphasizes the exercises of “the spiritual gifts,” especially speaking in tongues, outside the traditional Pentecostal churches. Before 1960, the phenomenon of tongues-speaking was fairly well confined to Pentecostal churches. The constituency of these churches was mostly lower-and lower-middle Americans. In 1960, all of that changed.

*Mainline Denominations* The charismatic movement is said to have begun on April 3, 1960, when Dennis J. Bennett, an Episcopal pastor, told his congregation that he had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. Bennett (1917-1991) was born in England, but his family moved to California when he was nine years old. He was the son of a Congregational minister. He says that because of the liberal theology of his church, Christ was presented as a great example and great teacher, but not as the Son of God, who was also a personal Savior. When he was 11 years old, as a result of hearing a speaker from Christian Endeavor, Bennett asked Jesus to come into his heart. As a married adult, he arose early and sat in the morning quietness, “to feel God’s nearness.” Concerning that experience, he said, “The assurance of love, warmth, and well-being that God’s presence brought, I found to be what life was all about” (Bennett, p. 9).

He attended a liberal seminary where the people did not believe in the miracles of the Bible, the virgin birth, or the deity of Christ (Bennett, p. 10; the University of Chicago, Bennett, p. 18). One professor was an atheist! He was ordained into the Congregational Church (1949), but being dissatisfied with its liberalism, he became an Episcopal priest (1952). In 1953, He became Rector of St. Mark’s Episcopal Church in Van Nuys, California. He was pastor of that church when he received the Pentecostal experience. As a result of that experience, he was asked to resign from the 2600-member congregation in Van Nuys. A short time later, he became the pastor of St. Luke’s Episcopal Church in Seattle. In 1963, his wife died and three years later, he married Rita Reed (1966). In 1981, he resigned from St. Luke’s to found and lead the Christian Renewal Association.

Bennett tells his story in *Nine O’clock in the Morning* (1970). He says it all started when a fellow Episcopal priest named Frank told him about a couple (John and Joan) in his church who said they had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Frank wanted Bennett

to meet them. When Bennett and his wife met the couple, he immediately sensed there was something different about them and his wife said, "I don't know what those people have, but I wanted it" (Bennett, p. 5). Feeling that there was something missing in his life and in the lives of the people in his congregation, Bennett began to study the New Testament, the Episcopal Prayer Book, and theology books to see what they had to say about the Holy Spirit. He repeatedly visited John and Joan.

Finally, he told the couple he wanted to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit. John laid hands on Bennett, prayed in tongues, and prayed in English for Bennett to receive the Holy Spirit. Bennett said he prayed for about 20 minutes when all of a sudden he began to speak in tongues (Bennett, p. 20; November 1959). He claims it was a real language, but he does not identify the language (Bennett, p. 21), except to say it was a "beautiful unknown language" (Bennett, p. 23). Bennett describes the experience as "the same Presence of the Lord that I had sensed when I first accepted Jesus, and that I had known when I used to get up early during my years in the business world; only the intensity in the reality of my present experience was far greater than anything I had believed possible" (Bennett, p. 24).

After Bennett was baptized with the Holy Spirit, his wife, Elberta, had the experience (Bennett, p. 40). Soon other people in his Episcopal Church had the experience, but he did not say anything about it publicly. Rumors began to spread. So, on April 3, 1960, he set aside his preaching schedule for the day and shared in the three-morning services what had happened to him (1,400 attended his Sunday morning services, Hayford and Moore, p. 189). He appealed to the people to dismiss the ridiculous rumors. The general reaction was open, until the end of the second service. At the end of that service, one of his assistants snatched off his vestments, threw them on the altar, and stalked out of the church saying, "I can no longer work with this man!" In the words of Bennett, "That blew the lid off!" Outside on the patio, one man stood on a chair shouting, "Throw out the damned tongues-speakers!" (Bennett, p. 61). One of the leaders of the opposition told Bennett, "You should resign!" Bennett, however, did not have to do so. Episcopal rectors cannot be forced to resign against their will as long as they are not guilty of any moral or canonical offense, but he did. At the 11 o'clock service, he announced his resignation and walked away from the parish he had served for seven years (Bennett, p. 62) and built from a membership of 500 (Bennett, p. 48) to 2600.

The publicity following his resignation spread the news far and wide. Bennett was interviewed on a local TV station. *Newsweek* wrote an article (Bennett, p. 69) and so did *Time* (Bennett, p. 72). Tongue-speaking began to jump denominational lines until it had affected just about every denomination. By 1963, a report in *Christianity Today* indicated that there were 2,000 Episcopalians who were said to be speaking in tongues in Southern California alone. More than 600 members of the Hollywood Presbyterian Church, the largest church in their denomination, were also reported to be speaking in tongues. Even members of the Reformed Church of America had the experience. It also infiltrated the Lutheran churches. The best known Lutheran pastor to receive the experience was Larry Christenson, pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church in San Pedro, California. Other denominations, including the Methodists and Baptists, followed suit. Most of these charismatics have remained in their denominations.

Unlike the classic Pentecostals, the charismatics were usually middle class, non-separatist, urban, ecumenical-minded, and theologically pluralistic in outlook. Classic

Pentecostal churches, on the other hand, especially originally, were made up more of workers meeting in store-front churches and were noisier in worship. They were also fundamentalist in theology and aggressively evangelistic.

*The Roman Catholic Churches* The Roman Catholic charismatic movement emerged from a student-faculty retreat in 1967 at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh. From there, it spread to Notre Dame University, where many of the faculty members as well as students, spoke in tongues. In 1975, 10,000 Roman Catholic charismatics met in Rome. Pope Paul VI spoke appreciatively to the assembly. In 1976, about 35,000 charismatic Roman Catholics met at Notre Dame for a conference.

*Charismatic Denominations* In the later part of the twentieth century, several charismatic denominations were formed, mainly Calvary Chapel and the Vineyard.

In 1965, Charles Ward “Chuck” Smith (1927-2013), a graduate of LIFE Bible College (a Pentecostal college), became the pastor of a small church of 25 people. In 1968, it broke away from the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. Smith was pastor of Calvary Chapel in Costa Mesa, California, until he died in 2013.

In his preaching, Smith went through the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. Sometimes he did it in three years and at other times, it took nine years. When he died, he was at Romans 4 (Christopher Goffard. “Pastor Chuck Smith dies at 86,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 3, 2013; <http://www.latimes.com/local/obituaries/la-me-1004-chuck-smith-20131004-story.html>, accessed July 27, 2014). Smith, and for that matter the Calvary Chapel movement, are charismatic in theology, but they do not make room for the exercise of spiritual gifts in their primary worship service. The gifts are exercised in smaller home meetings (Hayford and Moore, p. 259).

In 1969, Calvary Chapel became a hub of the Jesus Movement and out of that church grew a fellowship of churches. Goffard explains, “Membership skyrocketed after he [Smith] met a hitchhiking hippie, Lonnie Frisbee, who brought dozens of his hippie friends to Bible studies. Frisbee became Smith’s assistant and a bridge to the counterculture.” The emergence of Calvary Chapel paralleled—and helped to fuel—the so-called ‘Jesus movement’ of the late 1960s and early 1970s.”

In the documentary on Chuck Smith, called “What God Hath Wrought,” Smith is called the “Father of the Jesus Movement.” As was mentioned earlier, in 1971, Smith founded Maranatha! Music to promote the music of the Jesus Movement. It was through this new style of church music that Smith had an impact on the American church. Donald E. Miller, a professor of religion at USC, said Smith was “theologically conservative but simultaneously culturally avant garde.... He had a transformative impact on Protestantism” (Miller, cited by Goffard).

Many times over the years, Smith said, “Someday you’re going to read in the paper, ‘Chuck Smith died.’ That’s bad reporting. What it should say is, ‘Chuck Smith moved.’” Chuck moved on October 3, 2013.

## **The Third Wave**

John Richard Wimber (1934-1997) was born in Missouri and raised with no Christian influence. In 1946, his family moved to Loma Linda, California. His mother encouraged him to pour himself into music. After two years of college, he dropped out to pursue a

career in music. He arranged and played music with the Righteous Brothers (Hayford and Morris, pp. 252-253). He was also the keyboard player in the band *The Paramours*.

In 1963, Wimber was converted at a home Bible study conducted by a Quaker church in Loma Linda. Not long after his conversion, he ended his musical career, started working in a factory to make a living, and got involved in the Loma Linda Evangelical Friends church. Over the next six years, he led hundreds to Christ. In 1970, he joined the church staff as an associate pastor. From 1974 to 1978, he was the Director of the Department of Church Growth at the Charles E. Fuller Institute of Evangelism and Church Growth, crisscrossing the nation as a consultant for hundreds of churches in dozens of denominations. He was also an adjunct professor at Fuller Seminary (Hayford and Moore, p. 253-254).

Wimber was influenced by George Ladd. In his booklet *Kingdom Come*, Wimber explains, "At Fuller I was introduced to the writings of George Eldon Ladd, especially his books *The Presence of the Future* and *Critical Questions about the Kingdom of God*. From Dr. Ladd, I came to believe that the kingdom of God is, in fact, relevant to our lives today. As I read George Ladd's books and reread the Gospels, I realized that at the very heart of the gospel lies the kingdom of God and that power for effective evangelism and discipleship relates directly to our understanding and experiencing the kingdom today. This revelation remains the most significant spiritual experience since my conversion in 1963, because thereafter I explored the practical implications of the presence of the kingdom" (Wimber, pp. 7-8). According to this view, God's kingdom is more than a future hope; it is a present reality as well (Hayford and Moore, p. 254).

Wimber was also influenced by Peter Wagner. Wagner was a thoroughgoing dispensationalist and a dyed-in-the-wool cessationist (someone who believes that the sign gifts have ceased). Wagner's experience on the mission field contributed to a reshaping of his thinking. In Bolivia, he attended and was healed at a crusade conducted by E. Stanley Jones, a Methodist missionary to India. After pursuing studies in world missions at Fuller Seminary, Wagner became convinced that signs and wonders were an essential component of evangelism (Hayford and Moore, pp. 254-255).

In the meantime, in 1977, Wimber's wife Carol experienced the baptism of the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues. Carol led many of her friends into the same experience, but John remained unconvinced. Before long, however, Wimber "spoke in tongues for hours" at home alone (Hayford and Moore, pp. 255-256).

Wimber and his wife were part of a prayer meeting made up mostly of members of the Loma Linda Evangelical Friends church. When the denominational leadership learned of the charismatic activity in the prayer meeting, they called Wimber to ask what was going on. When Wimber refused to conduct the prayer meeting without tongues, he was asked to resign his membership of the church that he had served for nearly 14 years. As a result, the people in the prayer meeting decided to form a church. Not wanting to be independent, the group became connected with the Calvary Chapel association of churches. They planted the Calvary Chapel of Loma Linda in May 1977 (Hayford and Moore, p. 257). Wimber was the pastor of that church, which was later named the Anaheim Vineyard Christian Fellowship (see below) until 1994.

Wimber began to practice healing and deliverance. Then in May 1980, he invited Jesus Movement evangelist Lonnie Frisbee to give his testimony in a Sunday evening service. When Frisbee invited the Holy Spirit to fall on the congregation, "people began to fall,



shake, sob, cry out, speak in tongues, and pandemonium broke out as literally hundreds were Spirit baptized. It was so wild, but some people walked out and discussed while others stayed caught up in the wonder of it all” (Hayford and Moore, p. 261). From then on, Wimber allowed these “manifestations of the Holy Spirit” in the services.

What was happening in Wimber’s church caused a stir among Calvary Chapel pastors. In 1982, Chuck Smith and other leaders questioned Wimber about the practices in his church. It was agreed that given its emphasis on healing and spiritual gifts, the church ought to drop “Calvary Chapel” from its name. Wimber then joined the Vineyard Christian Fellowship, a small group of churches started by Kenn Gulliksen (Hayford and Moore, p. 263). Within a short time, Gulliksen turned the leadership of the eight or so Vineyard churches over to Wimber. About 30 other Calvary Chapels joined the Association of Vineyard churches. By 1983, Wilbur was the leader of a thriving group of 40 churches (Hayford and Moore, p. 264).

Also, in 1982, Peter Wagner invited Wimber to teach a course at the Fuller School of World Missions. The course was called “Signs, Wonders and Church Growth” or simply MC510. In class, students practiced what they were taught. It was dropped four years later because of the controversy over its charismatic emphasis. It was later restarted, but Wimber did not teach it. The publicity, however, brought national attention to Wimber (Hayford and Moore, p. 264).

By 1984, the Vineyard Christian Fellowship had an attendance of over 3,000. To accommodate the increased attendance, the church moved to Anaheim High School. The same year the church held its first series of annual conferences on power evangelism, which drew non-Pentecostals, although the meetings were, nevertheless, “Pentecostal-like.” People spoke in tongues, prophesied, and were healed (Hayford and Moore, p. 265-266).

Beginning in 1986, Wimber encountered some health problems, beginning with a heart attack, and in 1993 he was diagnosed with sinus cancer, followed by a stroke in 1995. He readily acknowledged that he could not fully explain why others were healed through his ministry yet he was not. In 1997, after a fall in his home, he died of a brain hemorrhage (Hayford and Moore, p. 267).

Many consider the Vineyard movement part of Pentecostalism or at least part of the charismatic movement. For example, in *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, the Association of Vineyard Churches is listed under “Pentecostal Churches,” saying that the Vineyard churches embrace Pentecostal theology regarding the spiritual gifts of healing and speaking in tongues (Mead, pp. 301-302). Wimber, however, rejected the charismatic label. From the beginning, Wimber did not call himself Pentecostal or charismatic. The people in the movement referred to themselves as “empowered evangelicals” (Hayford and Moore, p. 258). Wimber never emphasized either Spirit baptism or speaking in tongues; instead, he put the emphasis on what he called “power evangelism,” declaring that healing, miracles, and spiritual gifts made people more ready to receive the gospel of the kingdom of God (Hayford and Moore, p. 265). Peter Wagner called Wimber’s movement “The Third Wave of the Holy Spirit,” as compared to the Pentecostal and charismatic movements. In his book *The Quest for the Radical Middle: A Historical Survey of the Vineyard*, Bill Jackson defines the “radical middle” as being between Evangelicalism and Pentecostalism.

To be more specific, Wimber believed that Spirit baptism was not necessarily an event after salvation. He believed that the Holy Spirit was initially received at conversion, but

that could be followed by subsequent fillings, a view more compatible with evangelicals (Hayford and Moore, p. 265).

Wimber's teaching concerning the kingdom of God, signs and wonders, and intimacy with God (rather than discipline) influenced many Christians, both inside and out of the Vineyard movement.

## **Extreme Pentecostal/Charismatics**

The Pentecostal/charismatic movement has always contained elements of mindless emotionalism, but meetings and movements in various places have manifested extremes, including extreme emotional reactions (holy laughter) and extreme claims (raising people from the dead). In his book *Strange Fire*, John MacArthur documents some of the bizarre behavior of the extreme Pentecostal/Charismatic leaders (see the chapter entitled "Mocking the Spirit," MacArthur, pp. 3-18). Some of the most extreme examples are televangelist Jan Crouch, claiming that her pet chicken was miraculously raised from the dead and Benny Hinn telling his viewers to put the hand of their dead loved ones on the TV screen, so that they would be raised from the dead "by the thousands" (MacArthur, p. 13).

*The Word of Faith* One form of the "extreme" Pentecostal/Charismatic movement is the Word of Faith teaching of material prosperity, which is more like fulfilling the American dream than finding biblical spirituality. The roots of the Word of Faith movement are said to go back to Essek William Kenyon (1867-1948). He grew up in a Methodist household, but in his 20s, he declared himself an agnostic and, desiring to hone his acting skills, he attended the Emerson School of Oratory in Boston for one year (1892). In May 1893, Kenyon married Eva Spurling, who also claimed to be an agnostic. Shortly afterward, Kenyon attended the services of Clarendon Street Church pastored by A. J. Gordon. Both he and his wife were saved and later that year Kenyon joined the Free Will Baptist Church and pastored a small church in Elmira, New York.

In 1898, Kenyon founded the Bethel Bible Institute in Spencer, Massachusetts. It remained in operation until 1923. It became the Providence Bible Institute in Providence, Rhode Island, which later became Barrington College. Still later, Barrington merged with Gordon College, named after A. J. Gordon. In 1902, Eva left Kenyon, returned to him in 1910, and died in 1914. Kenyon married Alice M. Whitney and they had a son and a daughter.

In 1924, Kenyon moved to Oakland, California, where he claimed he was Dr. E. W. Kenyon. (He had no formal theological training and his doctorate was self-instituted.) In 1930, Alice left him, accusing him of having affairs with other women. He fled to Seattle, where he spent the last years of his life as an evangelist and writer.

In 1979, Charles Farah, president of Oral Roberts University, wrote *From the Pinnacle of the Temple*. In it, he traced Kenyon's roots to the metaphorical cult due to Kenyon's time at Emerson College. Daniel Ray McConnell, one of Farah's students, wrote his Master's thesis on Kenyon, published in 1988 (*A Different Gospel*). McConnell argued that Kenyon got his doctrine from the cults, Kenneth Hagin got his doctrine from Kenyon by plagiarizing it, and, therefore, the entire Faith movement was built on a cultic root. In his 1993 book *Christianity in Crisis*, Hank Hanegraaff reiterated McConnell's thesis.

In *Quenching the Spirit*, William DeArteaga, a charismatic, argued that Kenyon did not teach heretical doctrines but did gain some heterodox concepts from Emerson College.

In his 1994 thesis (published as *E.W. Kenyon: Evangelical Minister or Cult Founder?*), Geir Lie, a Norwegian scholar, argued that Kenyon's doctrine was pure, but he may have been influenced to a certain degree by the metaphysical cults.

In 1997, Dr. Dale H. Simmons wrote that Kenyon was influenced by the Higher Life movement of the late 1800s and New Thought. Simmons argued that Kenyon may have been unaware of the degree of similarity between both systems. In 1998, Joe McIntyre, a Word of Faith pastor and head of Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, wrote *E.W. Kenyon: The True Story*, in which he argued that Kenyon was in no way influenced by the cults ([http://christianity.wikia.com/wiki/Essek\\_William\\_Kenyon](http://christianity.wikia.com/wiki/Essek_William_Kenyon), accessed March 27, 2015).

Kenyon coined the slogan "What I confess, I possess" (MacArthur, p. 28). In other words, by a positive confession, believers can change their physical circumstances. To be healed, believers need to declare they have already been healed (Kenyon: "Confession always goes ahead of healing"). "By emphasizing the creative power of words and the notion that disease is spiritual, not physical, Kenyon provided the basic premise for later Word of Faith theology. Kenyon's teachings also laid the foundation for the Word of Faith emphasis regarding material prosperity" (MacArthur, pp. 29-30).

Kenneth E. Hagin (1917-2003), an Assembly of God minister, is considered to be the father (or grandfather) of the Word of Faith movement. He claims he experienced a dramatic conversion in 1933, reporting that he died three times in 10 minutes, each time seeing the horrors of hell and returning to life (Kenneth Hagin, *I Went to Hell* and *What Faith Is*). He taught that by the words they speak, Christians have control over their lives. If they speak sickness and poverty, they will be sick and broke. If they speak blessings and healing, they will be healthy and wealthy. He also taught that Jesus did not pay for our sins on the cross; He had to go to hell to finish the job of atonement. He taught that Christians are little gods.

Here are other things Hagin taught (cited at <http://forgottenword.org/hagin.html>). If God would allow a Christian to be sick, he would rather go to Hell than go to heaven and be with a God like that: "If you're that kind of God—me an innocent little baby—if you're that kind of God, I'd rather go to Hell than to be with you!" (Ken Hagin, "You Can Have What You Say," tape from his ministry). "The believer is as much an incarnation as was Jesus of Nazareth" (Kenneth E. Hagin, "The Incarnation," *The Word of Faith*, p. 13, December 12, 1980).

Kenneth Copeland (1936-) was converted in 1962. In 1967, he entered Oral Roberts University, where he became the chauffeur and pilot for Oral Roberts. Here are some of his teachings ([http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Wolves/copeland\\_exposed.htm](http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Wolves/copeland_exposed.htm), accessed March 28, 2015). "God's reason for creating Adam was His desire to reproduce Himself. I mean a reproduction of Himself and in the Garden of Eden He did just that. He was not a little like God. He was not almost like God. He was not subordinate to God even.... Adam is as much like God as you could get, just the same as Jesus.... Adam, in the Garden of Eden, was God manifested in the flesh" (Copeland, "Following the Faith of Abraham I"). That we do not have a god in us but that we are a God (Copeland, "You don't have a God in you. You are one!" *The Force of Love* audiotape).

"Word of Faith or prosperity theology sees the Holy Spirit as a power to be put to use for whatever the believer wills. The Bible teaches that the Holy Spirit is a person who enables the believer to do God's will" (Houdmann, cited by MacArthur, p. 9). "In the

Prosperity Gospel, wealth becomes the end, God the means to an end” (Stafford, cited by MacArthur, p. 266).

Other notables teaching a prosperity gospel include Joel Osteen, Joyce Meyers, and T. D. Jakes.

*Seed-Faith* Oral Roberts (1918-2009), who began a radio broadcast in 1947 and a television ministry in 1954, is credited with bringing the prosperity gospel into the mainstream. When he died, his obituary in *USA Today* was entitled “Oral Roberts Brought Health-and-Wealth Gospel Mainstream” (*USA Today*, December 15, 2009). Oral Roberts’ biographer describes how Roberts claimed he discovered the prosperity gospel. One day he happened upon 3 John 2: “Beloved, I pray that you may prosper in all things and be in health, just as your soul prospers.” He and his wife discussed the implications. Did it mean that they could have a new car, a new house, a brand-new ministry? Shortly after that experience, Roberts acquired a new Buick by unexpected means, which he concluded was a symbol to him of “what a man could do if he would believe God” (see David E. Harrell Jr. *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 66, cited by MacArthur, p. 156).

Subsequently, Oral Roberts invented the seed-faith concept. He taught that seed-faith giving was the means to prosperity. Money given to his ministry was like a small seed that would produce a bumper crop of material blessings from God. “It generated millions for Roberts’ media empire” (MacArthur, p. 156).

*Revivals* Various Pentecostal revivals have contained extremes, including the Toronto Blessing (at a Vineyard Church in Toronto, Ontario), the Brownsville Revival (at an Assemblies of God church in Pensacola, Florida), and the Lakeland Revival (at the Ignited Church, an Assemblies of God church in Lakeland, Florida).

The Toronto Blessing is the name, coined by British newspapers, of a “revival” that began in 1994 at the Toronto Airport Vineyard church, now the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship (TACF). In January 1994, pastors John and Carol Arnott invited Randy Clark of St. Louis, Missouri to minister at the church. Randy Clark had been influenced by the ministry of Rodney Howard-Browne, a South African preacher and the earliest known proponent of so-called “holy laughter.” Beginning on January 20, Clark preached at the Airport church for two months. The attendance at the first service was about 120. In that service, people fell on the floor laughing uncontrollably. During the first year, church membership tripled to 1,000. Toronto Blessing-type revivals spread to other cities in Canada, to places in America, such as Pensacola, Florida, and two other nations, including England and the Philippines.

The revival was characterized by weeping, falling, shaking, dancing, shouting, holy laughter (laughing uncontrollably), and crunching (a vomit-like heaving as a result of inviting God to cleanse one’s emotions). Lying on the floor, people laughed uncontrollably for an hour or more. People shook violently and called out animal like sounds described as barking or roaring. People were “slain in the Spirit.”

At first, John Wimber endorsed what was happening in Toronto, encouraging them not to “biblicize” the extra-biblical phenomena such as animal-like sounds. In 1996, however, feeling his cautions were unheeded, Wimber withdrew his endorsement. Not long after that, the Toronto church withdrew from the Vineyard Association as did some other Vineyard churches who agreed with what was happening in Toronto (Hayford and Moore, pp. 270-271).

The Brownsville Revival is named after a suburban of Pensacola, Florida. It is also known as the Pensacola Outpouring. In 1993, John Kilpatrick, the pastor of the Brownsville Assembly of God Church, began urging his congregation to pray for revival. He invited evangelist Steve Hill to speak on Sunday, June 18, 1995 (Father's Day). As the meetings continued, Hill canceled all plans for ministry, including a trip to Russia, and preached at Brownsville for the next five years. Like the Toronto meetings, in the Brownsville meetings people fell, shook, wept, and laughed (Hayford and Moore, p. 271).

In 1997, Hill, Kilpatrick, and Lindell Cooley, Brownsville's worship director, traveled to cities such as Anaheim, California, Dallas, Texas, St. Louis, Missouri, Lake Charles, Louisiana, Toledo, Ohio, and Birmingham, Alabama. The revival ended in 2000 when Hill moved on to pursue other works. In 2003, he founded a church in the Dallas area. After a long bout with cancer, he died in March 2014. Kilpatrick resigned as senior pastor in 2003 to form an evangelistic association. The church continued to hold special Friday night services until 2006.

It is said that between 1995 and around 2000, 4 million people attended the revival meetings at Brownsville. Steve Rabey said, "These people are putting the 'roll' back in 'holy roller.'" As with other such "revivals," these meetings were criticized for their excesses. J. Lee Grady, the editor of *Charisma Magazine*, was critical of the excesses and personal divisions within the leadership. In his book *Counterfeit Revival*, Hank Hanegraaff criticized the revival for "serious distortions of biblical Christianity," comparing the physical manifestations to pagan practices. Kilpatrick responded by issuing a prophecy, claiming "within 90 days the Holy Ghost will bring you (Hanegraaff) down," a prophecy that proved to be false (<http://www.pfo.org/nonproph.htm>). Years afterward, the Brownsville church was over \$11 million in debt due to the surge of people in the 90s and dramatic drop-off in donations and people attending in the 2000s.

The Lakeland Revival began at the Ignited Church, an Assemblies of God church in Lakeland, Florida. The pastor, Stephen Strader, invited Todd Bentley to speak for five days beginning on April 2, 2008. Bentley remained there for over six months. It was said that by May 29, over 140,000 people from over 40 nations had attended the meetings and 1.2 million had watched via the Internet. By June 30, over 400,000 people from over 100 nations had attended. Although there were "ecstatic manifestations" (visions and prophecies), the focus of the services was on healing, including at least 20 claims of people being raised from the dead.

Bentley was criticized for his unorthodox practices, such as shouting 'Bam, Bam!' while praying for the sick, knocking people down, and even kicking people. A man who was knocked over lost a tooth. An elderly woman was kicked in the face. Bentley claimed that the Holy Spirit led him to do these things! In June 2008, after ABC's *Nightline* broadcast an investigative report which was unable to independently verify any of the healings, Bentley took time off "to refresh and to rest." A week later, Bentley resumed the Lakeland meetings.

On August 11, Bentley departed the revival because he and his wife were separating. The revival continued with visiting speakers until October 12, 2008. After that, the worldwide interest faded.

*The Second Apostolic Age* Peter Wagner decided that apostles exist today and he was an apostle! In fact, he said, 2001 "marks the beginning of the Second Apostolic Age." He began to recognize his apostleship in 1995 when two prophecies proclaimed he had

received an apostolic anointing. His apostleship was confirmed by a consensus of panelists at the 1996 National Symposium on the Post-Denominational Church hosted by Fuller Theological Seminary. In 1998, his apostolic calling was again confirmed by another prophecy at a conference in Dallas (MacArthur, p. 86). Wagner claims he used his apostolic appointment to end mad cow disease in Europe (MacArthur, who points out that as late as 2009 mad cow disease still existed in Europe, MacArthur, p. 87).

In 2000, Wagner became the “Presiding Apostle” at the newly formed International Coalition of Apostles, a position he held until 2009, when his title changed to Presiding Apostle Emeritus (MacArthur, p. 87). When the coalition started, dues for new apostles were \$69 a month. In 2012, the base fee for an International Apostle was \$350 and the fee for an apostle living in North America began at \$450 a year or \$650 for a married couple. This is said to be the beginning of the New Apostolic Movement (MacArthur, p. 88). According to Wagner, those who reject this movement are like the Pharisees and are under demonic influence (MacArthur, p. 89).

Apostles of Jesus Christ do not exist today. No one today meets the qualifications for being an apostle of Jesus Christ. To be an apostle of Jesus Christ, one had to have seen the risen Christ (Acts 1:22; 10:39-41; 1 Cor. 9:1). Dreams and visions do not qualify. Wayne Grudem, a charismatic theology professor, acknowledges that “since no one today can meet the qualifications of having seen the risen Christ with his own eyes, there are no apostles today” (Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, pp. 905-6). Also, in the New Testament, apostles of Jesus Christ authenticated their apostolic appointment by exercising the miraculous sign gifts (2 Cor. 12:12). Wagner says the biblical qualifications for an apostle are: 1) seeing Jesus personally (1 Cor. 9:1), 2) doing signs and wonders (2 Cor. 12:12), and 3) planting churches (1 Cor. 3:10), but he says he chooses not to include those in his definition of an apostle, because, in his opinion, these are not non-negotiables (MacArthur, p. 93). In other words, this so-called modern apostle has decided that what the original apostles taught is negotiable!

Another indication that apostles of Jesus Christ do not exist today is that the church is built on the foundation of apostles and prophets (Eph. 2:19-20). The foundation of a building is laid first and the rest of the structure is built upon it. If each century were one story in a tall building, we are on the 21<sup>st</sup> floor. The foundation is under the first floor, not on the 21<sup>st</sup> floor.

It should be pointed out that, while the position of being an apostle of Jesus Christ was unique, the term “apostle” is used in the New Testament in a non-technical sense to refer to “apostles (messengers) of the churches” (2 Cor. 8:23). The apostles of the churches were different than the apostles of Jesus Christ. There were also false apostles, even in Paul’s day (2 Cor. 11:13-14). Roman Catholicism has claimed papal apostolic authority since its inception in the Middle Ages.

Grudem writes, “No major leader in church history—not Athanasius or Augustine, not Luther or Calvin, not Wesley or Whitfield—has taken to himself the title of ‘apostle.’ If any in modern times want to take the title ‘apostle’ to themselves, they immediately raise the suspicion that they may be motivated by inappropriate pride and desires of self-exaltation, along with excessive ambition and a desire for much more authority in the church than any one person should rightly have” (Grudem, p. 911).

From the beginning, Pentecostalism and the Charismatic movement have claimed that the gift of prophecy still exists today. The extreme is the claim that having the gift of

prophecy does not mean that every prediction a prophet makes will come true! For example, charismatic prophet Bill Hamon says, “Missing a few times in prophecy does not make a false prophet. No mortal prophet is infallible; all are liable to make mistakes” (Hamon, *Prophets, and Personal Prophecy*, p. 176, cited by MacArthur, p. 109). Kansas City prophet Bob Jones admits that in prophesying, he has made hundreds of mistakes. He is the “prophet” who used “prophecies” to seduce women sexually (MacArthur, pp. 110-111). I once heard Benny Hinn say on tape that God had revealed to him that Fidel Castro would die sometime in the 1990s. He also told his congregation in Orlando that the homosexual community in America would be destroyed by fire before 1995 and a major earthquake would cause havoc on the East Coast before 2000 (MacArthur, pp. 111-112).

In 1977, Oral Roberts claimed he saw a vision of a 900-foot-tall Jesus, who instructed him to build the City of Faith, a 60-story hospital in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Roberts said God told him that He would use the hospital to unite medical technology with faith healing and enable doctors to find a cure for cancer. In the early 1980s, when the City of Faith opened for business, only two out of the 60 stories were occupied. By 1987, the hospital was overwhelmed with debt. Roberts announced that the Lord told him that unless he raised \$8 million to pay the debt by March 1, he would die. Roberts was able to raise the needed funds, but within two years, he was forced to close the hospital anyway and sell the building to eliminate still-mounting debt. More than 80% of the building was never occupied. The promised cure for cancer never materialized (MacArthur, p. 112).

According to Scripture, fallible prophets are false prophets! A prophet is first and foremost, an individual who receives *direct* revelation from God (Num. 12:6-8). The revelation is given to him by a vision or a dream. In fact, a prophet in the Old Testament was called a “seer,” meaning he “saw” a vision. The gift of prophecy exists throughout the Old and New Testaments. Prophets wrote many of the books of the Old Testament. Even David is called a prophet (Acts 2:29-30) and, of course, the gift of prophecy is listed as a gift in the church of the New Testament (1 Cor. 12:28).

The test of a prophet is whether or not his prophecy is orthodoxy (Deut. 13:1-5) and accuracy (Deut. 18:15-22). Since prediction is the test of a prophet, a prophet must be able to foretell the future. That does not mean that every time he receives a revelation it is predictive in nature. Such is not the case. A simple reading of the Old Testament “prophetic” books will demonstrate that. It does mean, however, that a prophet must predict at least sometimes and that every time he does, his predictions must come to pass. If one does not receive direct revelation from God and does not at least on occasion accurately predict the future, he is not a prophet! Furthermore, if he ever makes a wrong prediction, he is a false prophet (Deut. 18:15-22).

Actually, as Ephesians 2:20 indicates, the gifts of apostle and prophet have ceased. Both were in the foundation of the church. There is another piece of evidence that the gift of prophet ceased. Second Peter 2:1 says, “But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there will be false teachers among you.” Notice that Peter says there were false *prophets* in ancient Israel and there will be false *teachers* among you. Instead of saying that like there were false *prophets* among the ancient Jews, so there are false *prophets* among believers, Peter pens, “even as there will be false *teachers* among you.” This suggests that the prophetic gift had already ceased. Second Peter was written in 64 AD.

In the final analysis, the Pentecostal, charismatic, extreme Pentecostal/charismatic movement is based and built on experience, from speaking in tongues to holy laughter. The experience, not the Scripture, becomes the be-all and end-all. The more experience is emphasized, the more the Word falls into the background. Biblical Christianity is not about having an emotional experience and certainly not about having an extremely emotional experience, such as holy laughter. The experience of the apostles is not what believers are to experience; the teaching of the apostles is what they are to experience. We are to preach the gospel so that people can understand that salvation is by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone, and we are to teach the Word so that believers can come to Christ-like spiritual maturity.

## Men of the Period

### Jonathan Edwards

*His Life* Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) was born in East Windsor, Connecticut. His father, Timothy Edwards, was the pastor of the church in East Windsor for 64 years, serving until he was 89 years old (Simonson, pp. 17-18). By age seven, Jonathan had taught himself Latin (Dodds, p. 179). When he was twelve years old, he wrote an essay on the habits of insects and another that was a remarkable study about rainbows (Dodds, p. 22). At thirteen, he was fluent in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. At sixteen, while at the Collegiate School of Connecticut (afterward Yale), he worked out a speculative philosophy on Being. In 1720, at the age of 17, he graduated college at the head of his class (Eerdmans', p. 438). He was a graduate student of theology at Yale until 1722. After serving as the pastor of a Scottish Presbyterian church in New York City for eight months (August 1722 to April 1723), he became a tutor (teacher) at Yale (Simonson, p. 17).

Edwards, who was 6 feet tall and then some, towered over his contemporaries. He was moody, socially blundering, and barricaded himself behind being shy. He had no talent at all for small talk and was given to introspection (Dodds, pp. 11- 12). His moods were unpredictable, "swiftly switching from intense creativity to paralyzed slumps.... The town saw Edwards' composed dignity. Only his wife and closest friends knew what storms slammed about inside the controlled exterior of him" (Dodds, p. 34, who says Edwards was a genius, p. 35). It never occurred to Edwards that he might have been snobbish, although he impressed some people that way (Dodds, p. 63).

According to Simonson, the closest one can pinpoint Edwards' conversion was January 12, 1723. Years later, Edwards wrote that it was on that day that he gave himself and all that he had to God. Yet even after that, he was overcome with melancholy because he was uncertain about his relationship with God, a concern that lasted three years. Simonson states, "Edwards' conversion was not an instantaneous happening, rather a succession of deepening disturbances that relentlessly quickened in him both the sense of his natural weakness, even wretchedness, and the sense of divine grace." Simonson goes on to say, "Neither his arrival at Northampton in 1727 to share the pulpit with his illustrious grandfather nor his marriage the same year to Sarah Pierrepont dissolved these antipodal feelings." Edwards thought of himself as one deserving "the lowest place in hell." Simonson adds, "Few persons in American intellectual history rooted their written word more profoundly in private experience. What Edwards repeatedly called 'a sense of the



heart' originated from this personal, experiential sense" (Simonson, pp. 19-22; by "sense of the heart," Edwards means the will, inclination, affections, Simonson, p. 23).

In 1727, Edwards married Sarah Pierrepont when she was 17 and he was 24 (it was customary for girls to marry before they were 16; life expectancy was 33, Dodds, p. 24). Also, in 1727, he became associate pastor at Northampton (Cairns, p. 367) with his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard. Two years later, he became the pastor. He spent thirteen or fourteen hours a day in his study (Eerdmans', p. 438). When he preached, he read a manuscript (Cairns, p. 367).

In 1735, under the preaching of Edwards, the Great Awakening broke out in Northampton. He believed that the Awakening was a genuine work of grace, expressing itself in both mental and physical excitement (Eerdmans', p. 438). For details, see "Revivalism" above.

For several reasons, Edwards fell out of favor with his church in Northampton. In 1742, he drew up a covenant for his congregation to sign, binding the signers to give daily evidence of their spiritual experience. Two years later, he demanded a verbal profession of faith as a necessary qualification for partaking of the Lord's Supper. This was controversial because years before, Solomon Stoddard, his grandfather and predecessor, allowed unconverted people to partake of the Lord's Supper. In 1744, some inquisitive children somehow came into possession of a handbook for midwives (called the "bad book"). Believing such reading was unsuitable for children, Edwards read their names before the congregation, but his list of names failed to distinguish between the apparent offenders and those who just witnessed what happened. Parents were outraged by his tactlessness. Some were also upset because of what they thought to be the material extravagance of the Edwards family. All these things led to opposition in the church and in the city (Simonson, pp. 63-64). By 1749, people were so hostile they gave up trying to hold communion services (Dodds, p. 136; for other causes of tension, see Dodds pp. 131-156). Miller says, "Nowhere else did the mass of the town hate a man as the citizenry of Northampton hated Edwards... He 'was cursed from one end of the valley to the other'" (Miller, cited by Simonson, p. 64).

In the summer of 1749, Edwards defended himself by writing a treatise entitled "*A Humble Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God, concerning the Qualification Requisite to a Complete Standing and Full Communion in the Visible Christian Church.*" It did not work. By a vote of 230 to 23, the Northampton church he had served for over two decades ratified the Council's recommendation to dismiss him (Simonson, p. 63).

After he was dismissed from his church in 1750, Edwards became a missionary in the frontier hamlet of Stockbridge, preaching to Housatonic Indians and the white settlers there. In January 1758, he reluctantly became President of the College of New Jersey (later Princeton University), but after being inoculated against smallpox in February, he died of the disease in March (Eerdmans', p. 438).

*His Works* Edwards was a prolific author (Eerdmans', p. 438). By far and away, his most famous work is his sermon entitled "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," preached in 1741 in Enfield, Connecticut. Beginning in the 1950s, "The Works of Jonathan Edwards" project at Yale University has been publishing his manuscripts, 73 volumes so far (as of June 2014). The entire collection of Edwards' works is available online through the Jonathan Edwards Center at Yale University website. Some of his more famous works include *Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God*, *A Divine and Supernatural*

*Light, Immediately Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God*. (1734), *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God* (1737), *Freedom of the Will* (1754, called his most important work, Eerdmans', p. 438), *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival in New England and the Way it Ought to be Acknowledged and Promoted*, and *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*.

*His Theology* Jonathan Edwards was a strict, five-point Calvinist. Like Calvinists, he held to the position that people are unable to believe the gospel. He taught, however, that people have the natural ability to believe, but not the moral ability, because they are unwilling. Therefore, Edwards preached that people should seek salvation in the hopes that God would sovereignly save them (see the discussion of his evangelistic preaching below).

For Edwards, the nature of religion consists not merely of speculative understanding but in will, inclination, and affections (Simonson, p. 13). Edwards followed the epistemology of the philosopher John Locke (1632-1704), who taught that the "materials" of reason and knowledge come from experience, which Locke called sensation (Simonson, p. 28). Thus, religion involves what Edwards called "the affections of the soul." By its nature, it is a matter of the heart. The redeemed heart will be inclined toward God and the unredeemed toward self (Simonson, p. 57). The distinguishing signs of true religion include the love of God and neighbor, the perception of moral excellence, the enlightened mind or sense of heart, humility, quietness, and mercy, a softened heart and tender spirit, a symmetry of spirit, and a spiritual appetite for the attainment of the soul. "No person could be ultimately certain of his regeneration" (Simonson, p. 59).

Edwards made a distinction between cognitive knowledge and sensible knowledge. The natural man has a "natural stupidity of the soul" and, without divine assistance, can never have sensible knowledge. Sensible knowledge is "intuited conviction," ideas inseparable from feelings, spiritual conviction, saving faith, and immediate light. Without sensible knowledge, a person lacks the full dimension of truth; he remains outside, detached, separated. From such knowledge comes an awakening that mere thinking cannot produce (Simonson, pp. 69-70).

Edwards says his problem with defining religious affections is that language is imperfect (Simonson, p. 92). The first limitation inherent in theological language is that words do not cause the light; neither do they imbue the heart with religious affections. The second limitation is its inadequacy in expressing the sense of the heart, even when it originates with religious language (Simonson, pp. 101-102). To say the same thing another way, words alone can never serve as the means of grace and words are inadequate to express gracious feelings (Simonson, p. 105). Nevertheless, words are important. They firmly fix in the mind the spiritual light of the Word (Simonson, p. 107). "Like Calvin, he enlivened his prose with the kind of sensory detail and surging cadences that quicken readers to something like spiritual awareness" (Simonson, p. 110). He regarded the sermon as the means for impressing "divine things on the heart and the affections" (Simonson, p. 111). Listeners to a logical exposition of doctrine were to respond with intellectual conviction, an experiential and immediate "sense" of divinity to which they were to respond with willing consent (Simonson, p. 112).

Simonson explains that Edwards used imagery to awaken people to their sinful condition and the kind of language that would convince sinners of God's justice in condemning them (Simonson, pp. 126, 129). Edwards preached about hell to awaken his listeners to themselves (Simonson, p. 123).

Simonson notes that, according to Edwards, “Faith is union. [He] held that only as we are first united in Christ will we be justified by God. The sequence is all-important: ‘Our being in him is the ground of our being accepted (justified).’ Justification by faith is the same as justification-by-being-in-Christ. Union in Christ is not the reward of faith; Union is faith. Furthermore, the man actively gives himself to this union. Edwards held that faith is ‘the soul’s *active* uniting with Christ;’ Christ, who first comes to man, now treats man as ‘capable of act and choice’ to come to him. ‘Such faith,’ said Calvin, ‘does not merely believe about Christ, it embraces him with the soul’” (Simonson, p. 42, italics his).

Edwards believed that “isles” in Isaiah 60:9 was a reference to America (Simonson, p. 150).

*His Evangelistic Message* Edwards never spelled out in any one treatise or single sermon his steps to salvation (Gerstner, p. 9). After examining the original manuscripts of Edwards’ sermons at Yale University and Andover Newton Theological Seminary, as well as his printed sermons, John H. Gerstner, a professor of church history at the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, systemized Edwards’ steps to salvation (John H. Gerstner, *Steps to Salvation; The Evangelistic Message of Jonathan Edwards*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958).

Gerstner begins his explanation of Edwards’ theory of the steps to salvation by pointing out that Edwards was a Calvinist who maintained the absolute sovereignty of God; he was a “predestinarian evangelist” who preached the necessity of human response so vigorously that some scholars maintain he had broken with the Calvinistic tradition (Gerstner, p. 13). Therefore, for Edwards, the first step in man’s salvation is taken by God. God calls man by nature, by conscience, and by the Word of God (Gerstner, p. 18). Edwards preached, “The consideration of hell commonly is the first thing that arouses sleeping sinners” (Gerstner, p. 28). Moreover, the best time to present the doctrine of hell to sinners is when they are children (Gerstner, p. 34), because it is easier to “terrify a child” than an adult (Gerstner, p. 36). That being the case, the proper place for revival to begin is with young people (Gerstner, p. 37).

This sinner’s first step to salvation is conviction. God is sovereign and can bring conviction immediately, but it is more reasonable to suppose that it is a prerequisite to salvation. God does not deliver people from great misery without first giving them a sense of it. Conviction requires time. It usually comes at the end of a long and arduous path of seeking. Edwards even exhorts people to think much about their sins, ranging back to childhood for material (Gerstner, pp. 40- 45).

In explaining the preaching of Jonathan Edwards, Simonson wrote, “Not until the sense of sin fills our consciousness are we prepared to hear the saving gospel” (Simonson, p. 127). Simonson makes similar statements, such as, “To know salvation is first to know the dark night of alienation” (Simonson, p. 135) and “Christianity begins with the doctrine of sin” (Simonson, p. 136).

The problem with conviction is thatAs was pointed out earlier (under Edwards’ theology), Edwards taught that the signs of true religion included the love of God and neighbor, perception of moral excellence, the enlightened mind or sense of heart, humility, quietness and mercy, a softened heart and tender spirit, a symmetry of spirit, and a spiritual appetite for attainment of the soul. Many years later, psychologist William James faulted Edwards for not giving signs of conversion that are truly discernible. According to James, Edwards’ signs of conversion were equally present in the natural man. He argued that if

the suddenly converted man is entirely different from the natural man, “there surely ought to be some exquisite class-marks, some distinctive radiance” that would identify him as radically different, but according to James, Edwards failed to supply convincing class-markers unique to Christian conversion and practice (Simonson, p. 61).

Edwards warned against extremes. He warned preachers, whose enthusiasm led them and their congregation into sheer emotionalism, to never despise learning and careful attention to reason. They were not to use “inspiration” to short-circuit study and sound doctrinal analysis. Whenever spontaneity replaced careful study, he was suspicious that more heat than light was being generated. So he cautioned against “too much heat.” On the other hand, he warned preachers, who were paying inordinate attention to intellectual abstraction and preached dull and indifferent ways. Edwards affirmed that people do not need to have their heads stored so much as their hearts touched. He said, “Ministers having light and heat united in them, will be like the angel of light, which for their light and brightness are called morning stars” (Simonson, pp. 112- 13).

*His Significance* Jonathan Edwards was a key figure in the Great Awakening. His sermon “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” has been called “the most famous sermon ever preached by anyone in America” (Simonson, p. 14), his autobiography is recognized as one of the greatest autobiographies in American literature (Simonson, p. 17), and he is considered America’s greatest eighteenth-century mind (Simonson, p. 24). In fact, it has been said he was one of the greatest minds America has ever produced (Kuiper, p. 344). His Calvinistic position delayed the liberal theology which was to dominate New England in the nineteenth century (Eerdmans’, p. 438).

### **Charles G. Finney**

Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875) was a Presbyterian minister, a leader in the Second Great Awakening, an opponent of Old School Presbyterian theology, an innovative revivalist, and an advocate of Christian perfectionism. He is called the “father of American revivalism” and “the pioneer of modern mass evangelism” (Houghton, p. 219). He was twice a widower and married three times.

*His Life* Finney was born in Warren, Connecticut, but grew up in raised in Oneida County, New York. He attended the Baptist Church in Henderson, where the preacher led emotional, revival-style meetings. Finney was six feet three inches tall with piercing eyes. He never attended college but studied as an apprentice to become a lawyer. After a dramatic conversion experience and “baptism into the Holy Spirit,” he gave up his legal practice to preach the gospel.

When Finney was 29 years old, he decided he must settle the question of his salvation. “So on October 10, 1821, he headed out into the woods near his Adams, New York, home to find God. ‘I will give my heart to God, or I never will come down from there,’ he said. After several hours, he returned to his office, where he experienced such forceful emotion that he questioned those who could not testify to a similar encounter. ‘The Holy Spirit ... seemed to go through me, body and soul,’ he later wrote. ‘I could feel the impression, like a wave of electricity, going through and through me. Indeed it seemed to come in waves of liquid love, for I could not express it in any other way.’ The next morning, Finney returned to his law office to meet with a client whose case he was about to argue. ‘I have a retainer from the Lord Jesus Christ to plead his cause,’ he told the man, ‘and cannot plead yours’” (from the *Christianity Today* article on Finney, at

<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/131christians/evangelistsandapologists/finney.html?start=1>, accessed 7/7/15). (His baptism of the Holy Spirit was not accompanied by tongues; it preceded the Pentecostal inception.)

*His Ministry* After his conversion, Finney prepared for ministry in the Presbyterian Church and was ordained in 1824. From 1825 to 1835, Finney was a revivalist in Jefferson County in upper New York State. “The zenith of Finney’s evangelistic career was reached at Rochester, New York, where he preached 98 sermons between September 10, 1830 and March 6, 1831. Shopkeepers closed their businesses, posting notices urging people to attend Finney’s meetings. Reportedly, the population of the town increased by two-thirds during the revival, but crime dropped by two-thirds over the same period.

“From Rochester, he began an almost continuous revival in New York City as minister of the Second Free Presbyterian Church (1832). He soon became disenchanted with Presbyterianism, however (due largely to his growing belief that people could, with God, perfect themselves). In 1834, he moved into the huge Broadway Tabernacle his followers had built for him. He stayed there for only a year, leaving to pastor Oberlin Congregation Church and teach theology at Oberlin College (1835). In 1851, he was appointed president, which gave him a new forum to advocate social reforms he championed, especially the abolition of slavery” (from the *Christianity Today* article on Finney). He served as President from 1851 to 1866. Oberlin was the first American college to accept women and blacks as students in addition to white men.

*His Innovations* Finney’s sermons were more like a lawyer’s argument than a pastor’s sermon. Contrary to the Calvinism of the time, he urged his listeners to accept Christ openly and publicly. “At Evans Mills, he was troubled that the congregations continuously said they were ‘pleased’ with his sermons. He set about to make his message less pleasing and more productive. At the end of his sermon, which stressed the need for conversion, he took a bold step: ‘You who have made up your minds to become Christians, and will give your pledge to make your peace with God immediately, should rise up’ The entire congregation, having never heard such a challenge, remained in their seats. ‘You have taken your stand,’ he said. ‘You have rejected Christ and his gospel.’ The congregation was dismissed, and many left angry.

“The next evening, Finney preached on wickedness, his voice like [was like] ‘a fire ... a hammer ... [and] a sword.’ But he offered no chance to respond. The next night, the entire town turned out, including a man so angry with Finney that he brought a gun intending to kill the evangelist. But that night, Finney again offered congregants a chance to publicly declare their faith. The church erupted—dozens stood up to give their pledge, while others fell down, groaned, and bellowed. The evangelist continued to speak for several nights, visiting the new converts at their homes and on the streets.

“He rode from town to town over what was known as the ‘burned-over district,’ a reference to the fact that the area had experienced so much religious enthusiasm that it was thought to have burned out. Newspapers, revivalists, and clergy took notice of the increasingly rowdy meetings—meetings unlike those of reserved Calvinists” (from the *Christianity Today* article on Finney).

Finney’s innovations were called “new measures.” Most of them were decades old, but he popularized them. These new measures included such things as publicizing meetings, organizing prayer meetings, canvassing for prospects, identifying sinners in attendance, and asking attendees to raise their hands in response to his questions (Hall, p. 37; Cairns

adds protracted meetings, colloquial language in preaching, and unseasonable hours for services, p. 419). He adopted the Methodists' "anxious bench," that is, he put a pew at the front of the church, where those who felt a special urgency about their salvation could sit. He allowed women to pray out loud in public meetings of mixed gender. He was known for his extemporaneous preaching. He publicly censured individuals by name in sermons and in prayer. Finney was involved in social reforms, particularly the abolitionist movement.

*His Theology* Finney rejected the unconditional election of Calvinism. He felt that the "Old Divinity" Calvinism was unbiblical and contrary to evangelism. Contrary to Calvinism, which insisted that only the elect can believe the Gospel, Finney taught that unbelief was "will not" instead of "cannot." His *Lectures on Systematic Theology* (1846) teach his special brand of "Arminianized Calvinism."

Finney taught the governmental view of the atonement. His "New Divinity," which was popular at the time, taught that Christ's death is not a "commercial transaction;" rather, it satisfied public justice.

Finney believed in salvation by grace through faith, but unlike Calvinism which taught that God sovereignly saves sinners and that all they can do is use the means of grace and pray that God will give them a new heart, Finney said, "Instead of telling sinners to use the means of grace and to pray for new heart, I call on them to make themselves a new heart and spirit, and press the duty of immediate surrender to God" (Finney, *Autobiography*, cited by Houghton, p. 219). In other words, regeneration is not the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit; it is an act of the human will (Houghton, p. 219).

Finney insisted that works were the evidence of faith. Finney said, "The impression of many seems to be, that grace will pardon what it cannot prevent; in other words, that if the grace of the Gospel fails to save people from the commission of sin in this life; it will nevertheless pardon them and save them in sin if it cannot save them from sin. Now, really, I understand the Gospel as teaching that men are saved from sin first, and as a consequence, from hell; and not that they are saved from hell while they are not saved from sin. Christ sanctifies when he saves. And this is the very first element or idea of salvation, saving from sin. 'Thou shall call his name Jesus,' said the angel, 'for he shall save his people from their sins.' 'Having raised up his Son Jesus,' says the apostle, 'he hath sent him to bless you in turning every one of you from his iniquities.' Let no one expect to be saved from hell unless the grace of the Gospel saves him first from sin" (<http://www.gospeltruth.net/cgfworhs.htm>, accessed July 7, 2015). In his *Systematic Theology*, he says, "I have felt greater hesitancy in forming and expressing my views upon this Perseverance of the saints than upon almost any other question in theology."

Finney's view of revival was that Christians could make it happen. All they had to do was fulfill certain conditions which were within their own power. This is in stark contrast to the Calvinists, who believe that revival is the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit. The Calvinists believed that revival must be "prayed down;" Finney believed that it could be "worked up" (Houghton, p. 219).

Like B. B. Warfield, A. H. Strong, and other nineteenth-century Christian thinkers, Finney was a post-millennialist (Cairns, p. 51).

Albert Baldwin Dod, a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, said Finney's book *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (1835) was theologically unsound. He was especially critical of Finney's view of the doctrine of total depravity. Lyman Beecher, a

Congregationalist, feared Finney was opening the door to fanaticism by allowing too much expression of emotion. Unitarians opposed Finney for using scare tactics to gain converts.

### **D. L. Moody**

*His Life* D. L. Moody (1837-1899) was born into a Unitarian family in Northfield, Massachusetts. His father died when he was four years old (Kuiper, p. 371). With little schooling, he left home when he was 17 to work in his uncle's shoe shop in Boston. Edward Kimball, a Sunday school teacher, led Moody to Christ. When he requested membership in the Mount Vernon Congregational Church, he was turned down for a year because of his ignorance of the Christian faith (Eerdmans' p. 536).

*His Ministry* In 1865, Moody moved to Chicago, where he became a successful businessman and an active worker in the Plymouth Congregational Church. Every Sunday he filled four pews and successfully recruited members for Sunday school. At the age of 23, he founded his own Sunday school, which he served as administrator and recruiter rather than as a teacher (Eerdmans' p. 536). He also became involved with the YMCA. He was president of the Chicago YMCA from 1865 to 1869. He raised funds for the first YMCA building in America (Cairns, p. 371). "It was in 1872, while visiting London in connection with his YMCA responsibilities, that he was first invited to preach. The result was so encouraging that Moody then felt called to preach to the urban masses, first in England, and then in the United States" (González, vol. II, p. 254).

In 1873-75, Moody conducted a preaching tour in Great Britain. By the time he returned to America, he was a preacher of international fame. After that experience, he devoted his life to conducting a revival campaigns. He was never a polished preacher (Eerdmans' p. 536). The meetings in the British Isles changed the nature of revival. Revival became "urban, professional, organized mass evangelism carried on outside the churches in great public halls.... His successors in this new type of evangelism were Reuben A. Torrey, Gypsy Smith, and Billy Sunday" (Cairns, p. 420, who also mentions Billy Graham).

The simplicity of Moody's language and his warmth and sincerity attracted great numbers. Ira D. Sankey was his singer and song leader. Moody and Sankey became household names in America. Through their ministry, thousands came to Christ (Cairns, pp. 371-372). Sankey introduced a new style of hymns, many of which were written by Fanny Crosby. He also added choruses to some of the older hymns (Kuiper, p. 220).

Moody had great organizational ability (Cairns, p. 372). During the last years of his life, he established two schools and a summer Bible conference at Northfield, Massachusetts (Eerdmans' p. 536). In 1886, he founded the Chicago Evangelization Society, out of which Moody Bible Institute developed in 1889 (Cairns, p. 420). Also, in 1886, the Student Volunteer Movement began under Moody's auspice in Northfield, Massachusetts, providing "an interdenominational agency under the leadership of John R. Mott (1865-1955) to recruit missionaries by the stimulation of interest in missions. By 1945 it had recruited 20,500 missionaries" (Cairns, p. 427).

On one occasion, when J. N. Darby was in Chicago, D. L. Moody invited him to give a series of Bible readings. They came to an abrupt end when the two clashed over the question of free will. Darby was a Calvinist; he believed that man's will was so perverted he could not "will" to be saved. Moody insisted that God appealed to man as a responsible person and would be condemned if he did not do so. "The controversy became so heated

one day that Mr. Darby suddenly closed his Bible and refused to go on, thus losing one of the greatest opportunities of his life” (Ironsides, p. 81).

*His Significance* The organization of his evangelistic meetings and the style of his preaching have had a long-term impact on mass evangelism. The Moody Bible Institute has produced graduates who have ministered all over the world.

### **C. I. Scofield**

*His Life* Cyrus Ingersoll Scofield (1843-1921) was born in Michigan, but when he was young, his family moved to Tennessee. He fought in the Confederate Army during the Civil War. After the war, he lived with his oldest sister and her husband in St. Louis, where he became a clerk in a law office. Eventually, without formal education, he passed the bar to become a lawyer (Gaebelein, pp. 18-21). In 1866, he married Leontine LeBeau Cerrè, a member of a prominent Catholic family in St. Louis.

Scofield moved to Atchison, Kansas, where he was elected to the state legislature (1871). He also served as a United States attorney for Kansas. In 1879, he returned to St. Louis (apparently without his wife; they were eventually divorced), was converted, which delivered him from excessive drinking, and assisted in the Moody St. Louis campaign. He joined the First Congregational Church and became acquainted with Dr. James H. Brookes, pastor of a Presbyterian church, editor of *The Truth*, and a firm believer in dispensational premillennialism (Gaebelein, pp. 21-23).

*His Ministry* In 1881, Scofield was licensed to preach; he organized and pastored the Hyde Park Congregational Church in St. Louis. Then in 1882, he became the pastor of a small Congregational church in Dallas, Texas (it became the First Congregational Church and later the Scofield Memorial Church). While he was a pastor in Dallas, Scofield invited Moody to preach, and Moody invited him to be a speaker at the summer Bible conferences in Northfield, Massachusetts (Gaebelein, pp. 24-25). In 1884, he married Hettie VanWark.

In 1888, Scofield wrote *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*. Also, in that year, he attended the Niagara Bible Conference where he met Hudson Taylor. Taylor’s approach to missions influenced Scofield in founding the Central American Mission (1890; now CAM International). In 1890, he started a Bible Correspondence Course which he directed until 1914 when it was taken over by the Moody Bible Institute.

Sometime during the 1890s, Scofield began identifying himself as C. I. Scofield, D.D., but there is no record of an academic institution granting him an honorary doctorate of Divinity degree. He did not include the D.D. in the information he provided *Who’s Who*.

In 1895, Scofield became the pastor of a church (Trinitarian Congregational) in East Northfield, Massachusetts, a ministry that lasted for seven years until the church in Dallas urged him to return, which he did in December 1902 (Gaebelein, pp. 25-27).

*His Reference Bible* After the Niagara Bible Conference closed, from July 23 to July 29, 1901, Scofield, Gaebelein, and others conducted a Bible conference at Sea Cliff, New York. As Gaebelein tells the story, “One night, about the middle of that week, Dr. Scofield suggested, after the evening service, that we take a stroll along the shore. It was a beautiful night. Our walk along the shore of the Sound lasted until midnight. For the first time, he mentioned the plan of producing a Reference Bible, and outlined the method he had in mind. He said he thought of it for many years and it spoken to others about it, but it had not received much encouragement. The scheme came to him in the early days of his ministry in Dallas, and later, during the balmy days of the Niagara Conference he had



submitted his desire to some brethren all of whom approved it, but nothing came of it” (Gaebelein, p. 47).

In 1902, with the financial backing of several wealthy individuals, Scofield resigned the pastorate in East Northfield, Massachusetts and returned to once again pastor the church in Dallas, a move that allowed him to spend time working on the Reference Bible (Gaebelein, pp. 48-49). Scofield worked on the Reference Bible from 1902 to 1908. It was published by Oxford University Press in January 1909 (Gaebelein, pp. 63- 64).

The original Scofield Reference Bible had seven consulting editors: Henry G. Weston (president of Crozer Theological Seminary, which at the time was a conservative Baptist institution), James M. Gray (Dean of Moody Bible Institute), William J. Erdman, W. G. Moorehead (a United Presbyterian seminary professor), Elmore Harris (a Baptist pastor, who founded the Toronto Bible Training College), A. T. Pearson, and A. C. Gaebelein. Scofield also received help from others, including Walter Scott and Charles R. Erdman (Gaebelein, pp. 16- 17).

### **C. S. Lewis**

*His Life* Clive Staples Lewis (1898-1963) was the most popular apologist for Christianity in the English-speaking world in the mid-twentieth century. He was born in Belfast and reared in a Christian home. He was educated at Malvern College under a private tutor who was an atheist. Because of the influence of his tutor, when he entered Oxford University in 1917, Lewis was an atheist. He was a professor at Oxford from 1920 to 1954 and became the Professor of Medieval and Renaissance English Literature at Cambridge from 1954 to 1963. Lewis was converted in 1931 (Eerdmans’ p. 605). He gave two-thirds of his income to charities. He became famous as a debater and defender of the Christian faith (Eerdmans’ p. 606).

*His Writings* Lewis wrote a number of works of literary criticism, which are classics in their field, the best-known being *The Allegory of Love*. He also wrote many books of theology and fiction with theological dimensions. His *The Screwtape Letters* (1942) became an international bestseller. Between 1950 and 1956, he published seven fairy tales about the world of Narnia, beginning with *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. His autobiography, *Surprised by Joy*, traces the story of his conversion (Eerdmans’ p. 606).

Lewis wrote, “I am trying here to prevent anyone saying the really foolish thing that people often say about Him: ‘I’m ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don’t accept his claim to be God.’ That is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic—on the level with the man who says he is a poached egg—or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You must make your choice. Either this man was, and is, the Son of God; or else a madman or something worse. You can shut him up for a fool, you can spit at him and kill him as a demon, or you can fall at his feet and call him Lord and God. But let us not come with any patronizing nonsense about him being a great human teacher. He has not left that open to us. He did not intend to” (Lewis, *Mere Christianity*).

### **Billy Graham**

*His life* William Franklin Graham, Jr. (1918-) is “undoubtedly the most successful Christian mass evangelist in history” (Eerdmans’, p. 623). Graham grew up on a family dairy farm, near Charlotte, North Carolina. He was raised in the Associate Reformed

Presbyterian Church. In 1933, when Prohibition ended, Graham's father forced him and his sister, Katherine, to drink beer until they got sick, which created such an aversion that both avoided alcohol and drugs for the rest of their lives.

After Graham was turned down for membership in a local youth group because he was "too worldly," Albert McMakin, who worked on the Graham farm, persuaded him to hear the evangelist Mordecai Ham. Thus, in 1934, when Graham was 16, he was converted during the Ham revival meetings in Charlotte. After graduating from high school González in 1936, Graham attended Bob Jones College in Cleveland, Tennessee. After one semester, he found it too legalistic in both coursework and rules. In 1937, Graham transferred to the Florida Bible Institute (now Trinity College of Florida). Florida Bible Institute was founded by Dr. W. T. Watson, who was pastor of a Christian and Missionary Alliance Church in St. Petersburg. Graham graduated from there in 1940. In 1943, he graduated from Wheaton College with a degree in anthropology and married Ruth Bell, a classmate and the daughter of Presbyterian missionaries to China.

*His Ministry* While attending Wheaton College, Graham was pastor of the United Gospel Tabernacle (1941), where he was paid \$5 per week. He also served briefly as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Western Springs, Illinois, not far from Wheaton (1943-1944). With financial support from that church, on January 2, 1944, Graham took over Torrey Johnson's failing radio broadcast, *Songs in the Night*. Graham recruited the bass-baritone George Beverly Shea as his singer for his radio ministry. In 1944, Torrey Johnson became the first president of Youth for Christ and Billy Graham, its first traveling representative (Cairns, p. 453). In 1947, at age 30, Graham was named president of Northwestern Bible College in Minneapolis—at the time, the youngest person to serve as a sitting president of any U.S. college or university. In 1949, Graham rose to national prominence when he led the Los Angeles Crusade.

The "Christ for Greater Los Angeles" evangelistic committee had organized several citywide campaigns since its start in 1944, featuring evangelists such as Hyman Appleman, Jack Shuler, and Charles Templeton. In 1949, they invited Billy Graham to be the evangelist (Carpenter, p. 216). The 1949 Los Angeles Crusade was deeply significant in Graham's life; it catapulted him to international prominence. The story of that meeting and several others that followed is in the book *Revival in Our Time*, with chapters written by a number of different men and including six sermons by Graham himself.

Graham was the evangelist for the annual Los Angeles evangelistic meeting. The three-week evangelistic crusade began on September 25, 1949, in a tent erected at Washington and Hill streets in downtown Los Angeles. The evangelistic team included Cliff Barrows, a graduate of Bob Jones University, and George Beverly Shea. Hundreds made decisions for Christ, but compared to other meetings the Graham team had conducted, nothing unusual took place during the three weeks of the Los Angeles Crusade (*Revival*, pp. 12-13).

The Crusade was scheduled to stop on Sunday night, October 16, but the committee decided to continue the meetings for another week (before it was over, it lasted eight weeks). At 4:30 on Monday morning, October 17, Stuart Hamblen, the son of the Texas Methodist preacher and a man who had conducted a radio broadcast in Los Angeles for 21 years, had a conversation with Graham in his room in the Langham Hotel. The following day Hamblen gave his testimony on the radio. It electrified the entire area. The night Hamblen gave his testimony to a packed tent, Graham did not have to preach. He just gave

an invitation. The press began to publicize the meetings. Three thousand seats were added to the tent, making a seating capacity of 9,000, but thousands were still turned away. Then came the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service as well as *Life* and *Time* magazines. Several well-known people made decisions for Christ, including Jim Vaus, an underworld figure (*Revival*, pp. 14-17).

During the meetings, there was little instrumental music or the singing of choruses. Cliff Barrows led the song service and George Beverly Shea sang old gospel songs (*Revival*, p. 18). A total of 350,000 people attended 72 meetings. There were 6,000 decisions, 3,000 of which were for conversion (*Revival*, p. 13). In the January 1950 issue of *Youth for Christ Magazine*, Graham wrote that the success of the Los Angeles Crusade was rooted in three things: the prayers of God's people, the power of the Holy Spirit, and the power of the Word of God (*Revival*, p. 17).

The Graham evangelistic team, including Cliff Barrows, George Beverly Shea, and Grady Wilson, arrived in Boston on December 30, 1949, for a nine-day evangelistic meeting at the Park Street Church pastored by Dr. Harold Ockenga. (Years later, at Ockenga's funeral service, Graham said, "Nobody outside of my family influenced me more than he did. I never made a major decision without first calling and asking his advice and counsel. I thank God for his friendship and his life.") Boston newspapers gave these meetings front-page space (*Revival*, p. 28).

The Boston meetings were held in the Boston Garden, which seated 14,000 people. When 16,000 filled the arena, fire officials closed the doors and turned away 10,000 more. As in Los Angeles, the meetings were extended. In the 18 days of meetings, in a city 74% Catholic and 15% Unitarian, 105,000 people attended the meetings and 3,000 professed faith in Christ, the same number of decisions that were recorded in the eight weeks of the Los Angeles Crusade (*Revival*, pp. 28-33).

In March 1950, the Graham evangelistic team held meetings in Columbia, South Carolina, population 100,000. During those meetings, there were 7,000 decisions for Christ (*Revival*, p. 43-45).

Later that month, Graham returned to New England, conducting meetings in each of the New England states. During those days, he preached to 65,300 people and saw 3,995 make a public profession of Christ. After that whirlwind tour, the team planned to conduct meetings for four nights in the Boston Garden. The closing meeting of the Boston campaign was conducted on the Boston Commons Sunday afternoon, April 23. In 1740, George Whitfield had spoken to 20,000 on the Common. Standing on the same spot and using the same text, Graham spoke to a crowd measuring 35,000 at the beginning of the service and numbering 50,000 by the time it concluded. By the time the New England tour was concluded, there had been 6,000 recorded decisions for Christ (*Revival*, p. 52-67).

In 1950, Graham founded the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association and initiated the *Hour of Decision*, his national radio broadcast. (The association relocated to Charlotte, North Carolina in 1999.) In 1952, he resigned as president of Northwestern College to devote himself to his evangelistic ministry (Eerdmans', p. 623).

In 1953, Graham ended segregated seating in his meetings. Sometime later, Graham told a member of the KKK that integration was necessary primarily for religious reasons: "There is no scriptural basis for segregation," Graham argued, "The ground at the foot of the cross is level, and it touches my heart when I see whites standing shoulder to shoulder with blacks at the cross." During the Apartheid era, Graham consistently refused to visit

South Africa until its government allowed integrated seating for audiences. During his first crusade there in 1973, he openly denounced apartheid. Graham also corresponded with imprisoned South African leader Nelson Mandela during the latter's 27-year sentence.

In 1957, two million people attended the Graham Crusade in New York City. 57,000 made decisions for Christ. In 1973, three million attended his five-day Crusade in Seoul, South Korea (Cairns, p. 455). In 1960, he started *Decision* magazine and later played a leading role in founding *Christianity Today*. Graham was also a leading figure in the World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin (1966) and Lausanne (1974) (Eerdmans', p. 623). On October 15, 1989, Graham received a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame. Graham was the only minister, functioning in that capacity, to receive one. On September 22, 1991, Graham held his largest event in North America on the Great Lawn of New York's Central Park. City officials estimated more than 250,000 were in attendance. In 1998, Graham spoke at a TED (conference) to a crowd of scientists and philosophers.

On June 24–26, 2005, Billy Graham began what he has said would be his last North American crusade, three days at the Flushing Meadows–Corona Park in New York City. But on the weekend of March 11–12, 2006, Billy Graham held the “Festival of Hope” with his son, Franklin Graham. The festival was held in New Orleans, which was recovering from Hurricane Katrina. Graham prepared one last sermon, *My Hope for America*, released on DVD and played around America and possibly worldwide between November 7–10, 2013, November 7 being his 95<sup>th</sup> birthday, hoping to cause a revival. It was aired on several networks, including FOX News.

Graham has conducted more than 400 crusades and preached to live audiences of nearly 215 million in 185 countries and territories on six continents. The first Billy Graham Crusade, held September 13–21, 1947, in the Civic Auditorium in Grand Rapids, Michigan, was attended by 6,000 people. Graham was 29 years old. In Moscow, in 1992, one-quarter of the 155,000 people in Graham's audience went forward at his call. In April 2013, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association started “My Hope With Billy Graham,” the largest outreach in its history, encouraging church members to spread the gospel in small group meetings after showing a video message by Graham. When Graham was 95, he wrote that “we are close to the end of the age.”

Graham had a personal audience with many sitting US presidents, from Harry S. Truman to Barack Obama. After meeting with Truman in 1950, Graham told the press he had urged the president to counter communism in North Korea. Later he always treated his conversations with presidents as confidential. Truman disliked him and did not speak with him for years after that meeting.

*His Writings* Graham has written a number of best-selling books, including *Peace With God* (1952), *The Secret of Happiness* (1955), *World Aflame* (1965), and *Angels* (1975).

Graham has expressed inclusivist views, suggesting that people without explicit faith in Jesus can be saved. In a 1997 interview with Robert Schuller, Graham said, “I think that everybody that loves or knows Christ, whether they are conscious of it or not, they are members of the body of Christ... [God] is calling people out of the world for his name, whether they come from the Muslim world, or the Buddhist world or the non-believing world, they are members of the Body of Christ because they have been called by God. They may not know the name of Jesus, but they know in their hearts that they need something they do not have, and they turn to the only light they have, and I think that they are saved and they are going to be with us in heaven.”

**Summary:** During the period of the American Church, denominations have grown, revivals have sprung up, missionaries have been sent to the ends of the earth, church music has changed, and various forms of “Christianity,” such as the Holiness movement, liberalism, Fundamentalism, Pentecostalism, Neo-evangelicalism, the charismatic movement, the Third Wave, and extreme Pentecostal/charismatics activities have flourished.

“In the beginning, the church was a fellowship of men and women centered on living for Christ. Then the church moved to Greece, where it became a philosophy. Then it moved to Rome and became an institution. Next it moved to Europe, where it became a culture. And, finally, it moved to America, where it became an enterprise” (Richard Halverson, Chaplain of the United States Senate). Unfortunately, much of American “Christianity” today is an enterprise. My wife calls it “corporate” church.

American Christianity has split and splintered into denominations and various theological groups. The basis for division is denominationalism, but each denomination, in turn, has been affected or has reacted to revivalism, Liberalism, Fundamentalism, or Pentecostalism. On top of all of that, para-church organizations have also affected the scene.



# THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH

As I was planning to teach this course on Church History, a woman who was planning on taking the class asked me if I was planning to talk about on what will happen in the future. I was surprised by the question. Is not a study of church history a study of what *has* happened in the past, not what *will* happen in the future? So why discuss the future of the church in a book on church history?

It is obviously true that church history is about history, but as was stated at the beginning, there are present and even future benefits in studying church history. Knowing what has happened in the past as well as what is happening in the present should give us some reasonable guesses about what will happen in the future.

## Where the Church is Now

History has been divided into pre-modernism, modernism, and postmodernism. During the pre-modern era, the truth was determined by *religion*. In the modern age, the truth was determined by *reason*. In the postmodern world, the truth is *relative*; there is no absolute truth. The church now exists in a postmodern world.

In the modern era, the issue was facts. Science was god. It was felt that science would solve all of our problems. Ethics were universal. People were the measure of all things. In the postmodern world, the issue is, "Tell me your story and I'll tell you my mind." Ethics are nonexistent. Morality is a cultural creation. People have no control over anything. The text means nothing; the reader means everything. People are taught by music and media.

Postmodernism has already affected the church. Its ideas, such as the relativity of truth, subjectivity of ideas, changing view of self, emphasis on narrative and story, transition from an oral culture to an aural/visual culture, and emphasis on entertainment, have gradually influenced worship since the 1960s and 1970s. The future of Christianity is probably going to focus on experience. Instead of a Christianity of conviction and ritual, there will be a form of Christianity where God is experienced. Theologian Dr. Marva Dawn offers a hopeful word for the church as it responds to the issues that postmodernity raises: "Instead of a fundamentalistic retrenchment into pre-modernity, I believe Christians can be at the forefront in offering to the world around us a better postmodernism, not one of fragmentation and chaos, but a genuine story of community and faith" (Dawn, cited by Bradley, p. 356).

## Where the Church is Headed

At any rate, here are some of my suspicions. (Keep in mind, I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet.)

1. As a secular society increases, the influence of the church on society will decrease. As secularism and pluralism become more prominent in American life, America will become a nation less and less influenced by Christianity. It does not take a prophet to see this coming. Just a few short years ago, Bible reading and prayer were customary at the

beginning of the school day. Now they are outlawed. Mosques are springing up all over the United States. Society will become more tolerant of many faiths.

2. As secularism increases, the government will be less favorable to churches. It will tax church property and eliminate the housing exemption for pastors.

3. As families become even more dysfunctional, the church will have people in it with all the problems people have who are outside it. High tech will produce a need for high touch, but having grown up in a high-tech home, people will be more dysfunctional than they are today. The church will look to psychology more and more to help people with problems. The home church movement will be more of an option for people in the future.

4. The church will become less and less doctrinally sound. For example, more and more Christians will accept evolution as a scientific fact and some sins as genetically caused. People in the church will get their doctrinal beliefs from a doctrinal buffet. At the same time, there will be a remnant of Orthodox Christians, who hold to the doctrine of the Trinity, Roman Catholic Christians, who look to Rome, Calvinists, Dispensationalists, Fundamentalists, and Pentecostals.

5. Overall the church will decline morally. Same-sex married couples will be accepted in the church.

6. The church will continue to adopt secular music forms.

7. As buildings and budgets have shaped and determined the church of the past, technology will impact the church of the future in unimaginable ways. Methodologies shape the church.

**Summary:** Secularism, pluralism, dysfunctional families, individualism, and technology will impact the church of the future in terms of its doctrinal beliefs, morals, music, and methodology.

In the midst of the decline, there may be revivals, but they will be weak and will not turn the overall situation around. Nevertheless, God will work and some will be saved and grow.

This much is certain: the Church will be here when the Lord comes. “The devil has employed every strategy to destroy the church; armies have marched against it; unbelieving scholarship has relentlessly assaulted it; internal bickering has rent it; and martyrdom has depleted its ranks from time to time. Yet the church marches forward in triumphal anticipation of the great consummation when the kingdoms of this world will be put under Christ’s feet and when the bride, without spot or blemish, will be given to the Bridegroom” (Hannah, p. 13).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, David R. "The Soteriological Impact of Augustine's change from Premillennialism to Amillennialism: Part One." *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, Spring 2002.
- Archer, Jr., Gleason L. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Chicago, Moody Press, 1964.
- Bangs, Carl. *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1985.
- Barber, John. "Luther and Calvin on Music and Worship" in the *Reformed Perspectives Magazine*, vol. 8, Num. 26, June 25 to July 1, 2006. This article is available online at [www.thirdmill.org/articles/joh\\_barber/PT.joh\\_barber.Luther.Calvin.Music.Worship](http://www.thirdmill.org/articles/joh_barber/PT.joh_barber.Luther.Calvin.Music.Worship).
- Barnabas, Stephen. *So Great Salvation*. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1957.
- Bartleman, Frank. *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles*. Los Angeles: Frank Bartleman, 1925.
- Blumhofer, Edith L. *The Life and Hymns of Fanny J. Crosby*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2005.
- Bradley, C. Randall. "Congregational Song as Shaper of Theology: A Contemporary Assessment," vol. 100: *Review and Expositor*. 2003.
- Cairns, Earle E. *Christianity Through the Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981 reprint (first printed in 1954; revised in 1967).
- Cary, Phillip. *The History of Christian Theology*, Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Augustine: Philosopher and Saint*, Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luther: Gospel, Law, and Reformation*, Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2004.
- Conwell, Russell H. *Life of Charles Haddon Spurgeon*. Boston: John K. Hastings, 1892.
- Chappell, Paul. *What is Biblical Fundamentalism?* Lancaster, CA: Striving Together Publications, 2005.
- Cook, William. *The Catholic Church: a History*, Audio Lectures, and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2009.
- Cook, William R. and Ronald B. Herzman. *Francis of Assisi*. Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2000.
- Coleman, Lyman. *The Apostolic and Primitive Church*. Boston: Gould, Kendall, Lincoln, 1844.
- Cooper, David L. *The Eschatology of the Visible Church*. Los Angeles: Biblical Research Society, 1945.
- Day, Richard E. *The Shadow of the Broad Brim*. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1934.
- Demarest, Bruce A. *Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of Christianity*. Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Carmel, New York, 1977.
- Dodds, Elizabeth D. *Marriage to a Difficult Man*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Dollar, George W. *A History of Fundamentalism in America*. Greenville, South Carolina: Bob Jones University Press, 1973.

- Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of Christianity*. Carmel, New York: Guideposts, 1977.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *After the New Testament: The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*, Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2005.
- Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Fox, John. *Fox's Book of Martyrs*. Philadelphia: The John C. Watson Company, 1926 reprint.
- Fergusson, Ben. E. "The Hermeneutical Principles of the Syrian School of Antioch and their Effects," a Master's thesis. Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1966.
- Gaebelein, Arno C. *The History of the Scofield Reference Bible*. Spokane, WA: Living Words Foundation, 1943, 1991 edition.
- Geisler, Norman L. and Ralph E. MacKenzie. *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2004.
- Gonen, Rivka. *Biblical Holy Places*. Herzlia, Israel: Palphot, 1987.
- González, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity*. Hendrickson: Peabody, Massachusetts, 1999.
- Grove, Richard. "Introduction Historical Background" in the reprint of *A Short Declaration of the Mystery of Iniquity* by Thomas Helwys. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Guelzo, Allen C. *The American Mind*. Course Guidebook. The Great Courses, 2005.
- Hall, Dan. *American Fundamentalism*. Memphis, TN: Magnifier Publications, 2005.
- Hannah, John D. *Our Legacy: The History of Christian Doctrine*. Colorado Springs: Navpress, 2001.
- Harl, Kenneth W. *The Fall of the Pagans and the Origins of Medieval Christianity*, Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2011.
- Harl, Kenneth W. *World of Byzantium*, Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2001.
- Harrison, R. K. *Introduction of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.
- Helwys, Thomas. *A Short Declaration of the Mystery of Iniquity*, edited and introduced by Richard Grove. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Henry, James O. and Wright Van Plew, eds. *For Such a Time as This: A History of the Independent Fundamental Churches of America*. Westchester, IL.: Independent Fundamental Churches of America, 1983.
- Houghton, S. M. *Sketches from Church History*. Edinburgh, Scotland, UK; The Banner of Truth Trust, 2011.
- Hustad, Donald P. "The Psalms as Worship Expression: Personal and Congregational." *Review and Expositor*, vol. 81, 1984.
- Ironside, Harry. *A Historical Sketch of the Brethren Movement*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1942.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. Peabody, MA, Prince Press, 2003.
- Kuiper, B. K. *The Church in History*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986.
- Kurfees, M. C. *Instrumental Music in the Worship*. Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Company, 1911.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of Christianity*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1955.

- Laudermilch, Kenneth. "Musical Integrity in the Church," *Reformation and Revival*, vol. 7:1, winter, 1998.
- Lightner, Robert P. *Neo-Evangelism*. Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Company, n.d.
- MacArthur, John. *Strange Fire*. Nashville: Nelson Books, 2013.
- Mann, Sylvia. *This Is Israel*. Herzlia, Israel: Palphot, 1985.
- Markos Louis. *The Life and Writings of C. S. Lewis*, Audio Lectures and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2011.
- Marsden, George. *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.
- McBirnle, William Steuart. *The Search for the Twelve Apostles*. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 1977.
- Mead, Frank S., Samuel S. Hill, and Craig D. Atwood. *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005.
- Mild, Warren. *The Story of American Baptists*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1976.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "Simon Magnus in Recent Research," *Religious Studies Review*, July 1977: 137-142.
- Noble, Thomas F. X. "Popes and the Papacy: A History," Audio Lectures, and Course Guidebook. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2006.
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Palmer, Phoebe. *Phoebe Palmer: Selected Writings*, edited by Thomas C. Oden. New York: Paulist Press. 1988.
- Parham, Sarah E. *The Life of Charles F. Parham*. Baxter Springs, Kansas: self-published, 1930.
- Parker, T. H. L. *John Calvin: A Biography*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.
- Pollack, J. C. *The Keswick Story: The Authorized History of the Keswick Convention*. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1964.
- Potter, G. R. *Zwingli*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Priest, Gerald L. "T. T. Shields the Fundamentalist: Man of Controversy," *Detroit Baptist Theological Journal* 10, 2005.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. *Life and Faith of the Baptists*. London: Kingsgate Press, 1946.
- Robeck, Jr. Cecil M. *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2006.
- Ropes, J. H. *The Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1934 with a new preface by D. E. Nineham. London: Oxford University Press, 2nd impression, 1960.
- Rupp, E. Gordon and Philip S. Watson. *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will in Salvation*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Ryrie, Charles C. *Christian Theology*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dispensationalism Today*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Neo-Orthodoxy*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1956.
- Sawyer, M. J. (Ph. D from Dallas Theological Seminary). "Wesleyan and Keswick Models of Sanctification." <https://bible.org/article/wesleyan-amp-keswick-models-sanctification>, 7/10/2014).
- Schaff, Phillip. *History of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1910.
- Shelley, B. L. *Church History in Plain Language*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Dallas: Word Publishers, 1995.

- Simonson, Harold P. *Jonathan Edwards: Theologian of the Heart*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans' Publishing Company, 1974.
- Smith, Michael A. *Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of Christianity*. Carmel, New York: Guideposts, 1977.
- Spurgeon, Charles H. *The Early Years*. Rev. ed. London: Banner of Truth, 1962.
- Stokes, David R. *The Shooting Salvationist*. Hanover, New Hampshire: Steerforth Press, 2011.
- Thiessen, Henry Clarence. *Introduction of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- Torrance, Thomas F. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1996 reprint of the 1948 edition.
- Unger, Merrill F. *An Introductory Guide to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956.
- Walvoord, John F. *The Millennial Kingdom*. Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Company, 1963.
- Ware, Timothy. *The Orthodox Church*. New York: Penguin Books, 1983 reprint.
- Warfield, Benjamin Breckenridge. *Calvin and Augustine*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1956.
- Wesley, John. *The Journal of John Wesley*. Chicago: Moody Press, n. d.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. New York: MacMillan and Co., 1889.
- Wheatley, Richard. *The Life and Letters of Mrs. Phoebe Palmer*. New York: Palmer & Hughes, 1876.
- Yamauchi, Edwin M. *Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of Christianity*. Carmel, New York: Guideposts, 1977.
- Valdes, Giuliano. *The Land of Jesus*. Florence, Italy: Bonechi and Steimatzky, 1991.
- Vedder, Henry C. *A Short History of the Baptists*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.
- Vos, Howard F. "The Music of Israel, Part 2," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. 107, number 425, 1950.
- Westin, Gunnar. *The Free Church through the Ages*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.
- Wendel, Francois. *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*. London: Collins, 1963.
- White, Charles. "Phoebe Palmer and the Development of Pentecostal Pneumatology," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, vol. 23, numbers 1 & 2, Spring-Fall, 1988, available at [http://wesley.nnu.edu/fileadmin/imported\\_site/wesleyjournal/1988-wtj-23.pdf](http://wesley.nnu.edu/fileadmin/imported_site/wesleyjournal/1988-wtj-23.pdf).
- Wimber, John. *Kingdom Come*. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Publications, 1988.
- Winter, Ernest F. (translator). *Discourse on Free Will: Erasmus & Luther*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1961.
- Woodbridge, Charles. *The New Evangelicalism*. Greenville, South Carolina: Bob Jones University Press, 1969.