David K. Bernard

A HISTORY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

The Post - Apostolic Age

to the Middle Ages

A.D 100 1500

Volume 1

A History of Christian Doctrine

Contents

Volume One

The Post-Apostolic Age to the Middle Ages,
A.D. 100-1500

Contents

Preface

This book surveys the history of Christian doctrine from approximately A.D. 100 to 1500. It generally follows chronological order and identifies the most significant events in church history, but the emphasis is on tracing doctrinal developments. To further this purpose, it discusses some events thematically rather than in strict chronological sequence.

We will use the words church and Christian in the most general sense, recognizing that the visible church structure is not necessarily the New Testament church as defined by message and experience. We will discuss the major groups of people who have identified themselves as Christian.

Occasionally material in this book may seem complex and foreign, but some treatment of details is necessary to provide background and to impart a feel for significant issues and problems. The main objective is to introduce the leading historical figures and movements in Christendom and to convey a basic understanding of their doctrines. This information will provide various perspectives on biblical issues and will aid in dialogue with people of different backgrounds. The reader will see when, how, and why certain biblical doctrines were abandoned and certain unbiblical doctrines embraced, and will see how God has worked to restore and revive fundamental truths that were largely forgotten.

7

This book arose out of teaching two semesters of

church history for five years at Jackson College of Ministries in Jackson, Mississippi. The rough draft was transcribed from lectures taped for the extension program of Kent Christian College in Dover, Delaware. Special thanks goes to Karla Christian, Vita Sharpe, Ruth Patrick, Connie Bernard, and especially Claire Tinney for transcribing this material. It was an immense project! After considerable additions, deletions, and revisions, this book is the result.

It is important to remember that only the Bible is our authority for doctrine. History cannot alter or replace biblical truth. Nor can history prove the validity of doctrine, but it can provide insight into how key doctrines were handled over the centuries. It can help to dispel the myth that our fundamental doctrines are of recent origin. The clear teaching of Scripture is enough to tear away the shrouds of nonbiblical tradition, but a historical survey can aid in the process.

8

A History of Christian Doctrine

Why is it important to study the history of doctrine in Christianity? We can identify several reasons. First, a study of this nature can help to confirm the apostolic doctrine as revealed in Scripture and to analyze the teachings of God's Word in light of discussions in church history.

A second purpose is to trace the development of false doctrines. If we conclude that some doctrines taught in Christendom today are erroneous, the question arises, Where did these false doctrines begin? Church history can help show us which doctrines were original, which were not, how false doctrines entered Christendom, and how they became, in some cases, part of the mainstream of historic Christendom.

A third benefit of this study is learning about the

1

The Study of Doctrine
in Church History

9

major denominations and movements, thereby providing a context for dialogue today. The goal is to identify each major category of Christendom and learn where it began, why it began, and what its distinctive, characteristic doctrines are.

Scope of Study

At the outset, let us define the boundaries of our study. We will start with the death of the apostles, or the

end of the apostolic era; therefore, we will begin with the second century A.D. By using the words church and Christianity, we will not make a value judgment as to the accuracy of the doctrines of various groups. Rather, we will use the words church, Christian, and Christendom in the most general sense, speaking of the visible structures known collectively as Christianity. When we speak of Christian doctrines we do not mean that a particular belief is correct or has been officially endorsed, only that some people within Christendom have believed and taught it.

We would expect to find true apostolic believers within the visible, historical church, or at least associated in some way with it at various times, but the visible church is not always identical to the invisible church, the true church, the church of God. We will focus on all those who have historically gone by the label of Christian, whether or not their experience and doctrine seem identical to that of the apostles in the first century.

Our study will be an overview, not an exhaustive investigation. We will not describe in great detail all the movements, personalities, and events in church history, but we will seek to give at least a survey of church histo-

10

A History of Christian Doctrine

ry, particularly focusing on doctrinal history. We will not place heavy emphasis on names, places, and dates, but we will look primarily at the origins of various doctrines and movements throughout the history of Christianity.*

Major Themes

1. A great falling away. It is evident when we study early church history that there was a great falling away, a great infusion of false doctrine. Indeed we find warnings and indications of this falling away in the New Testament itself. It contains admonitions to the early church not to embrace false doctrine as well as warnings concerning false prophets, false teachers, and false doctrines that were already creeping in among the churches. (See Matthew 7:15; Romans 16:17-18; I Corinthians 11:19; Ephesians 4:14; II Timothy 4:3; Hebrews 13:9; II Peter 2:1; I John 4:1; II John 10; Revelation 2:14, 15, 24.) It also predicts that in the latter days would come a great falling away, seducing spirits, and doctrines of demons. (See Matthew 24:11-12, 24; II Thessalonians 2:3; I Timothy 4:1.)

Even in the first-century church, then, problems had

already begun to develop. In Revelation 2 and 3, letters to seven churches in Asia Minor reveal serious errors of doctrine and practice in various local assemblies in the first century. In the second century, this process of doctrinal corruption accelerated. In short, we find a great influx of false doctrines over the centuries. That is not to say these doctrines polluted everyone, but widespread heresies and

The Study of Doctrine in Church History

*For a chronological list of important people, events, and dates in Christianity, along with important secular dates, see Appendix A.

doctrinal difficulties certainly existed in the first few centuries.

2. A faithful remnant. At least a few people in church history continued to hold onto the apostolic doctrine and the apostolic experience. In Matthew 16:18, Jesus said, "On this rock I will build my church," speaking of the rock of the revelation of who He was, Jesus Christ, the Messiah, the Son of the living God. He said "the gates of hell will not prevail against" the church, so as a matter of faith we can affirm that God has always had a people throughout history. (See Romans 11:2-5.) He has always had a church. The apostolic church as defined by the experience and message of the Scriptures has never entirely faded away.

This belief does not mean that as a matter of history we can necessarily identify a fully apostolic group known by a particular name at every decade throughout the hundreds of years of church history. It does not mean we can trace an unbroken historical succession of an organization or series of organizations. It does not mean that at every point in time a group of people taught every doctrine we believe to be biblical. We can find in various centuries, however, people who baptized in Jesus' name, people who received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and people who enunciated various doctrines that we think are important to being truly apostolic.

At some times, great numbers of people adhered to the apostolic faith; at other times, perhaps just a handful did so. For certain decades we may not have a historical record of anybody who was identical to the apostles in experience and teaching. But as a matter of faith, even when there may be historical gaps, we can affirm that

A History of Christian Doctrine

God had a people born of water and the Spirit, believers

who experienced biblical salvation.

3. A circular pattern. We can discern a trend of events in church history, and we can represent it by a circle. The church began with great evangelistic growth, with a great burst of power and fervor as recorded in the Book of Acts. Then came a gradual falling away into false doctrine, and as this falling away intensified, for the most part the visible church fell into apostasy, having little or no real experience with God.

This apostasy was not permanent, at least not in a historical sense. Over the centuries, particularly after the medieval period, we find a step-by-step restoration of various doctrines, beliefs, and experiences, returning closer to the original apostolic pattern.

It is not entirely accurate to say "the church" was restored, because the true church as defined by apostolic experience is what it is. The apostolic message has always been the same; the true church of God has always been defined in the same way. In that sense the church never needs to be restored. If there were people in a certain century who were filled with the Spirit, then they did not need restoration to that experience. When we speak about restoration, we mean a renewed understanding of certain doctrines and a widespread acceptance of certain works of God. Perhaps we can say the church has been renewed or revived (restored to health and vigor).

The church has always existed since the Day of Pentecost, but the visible or professing church has not always kept the teachings of God's Word. In some cases, the professing church structure, the majority, the mainstream, has gone into error, heresy, or perhaps even apostasy.

13

The Study of Doctrine in Church History

The process of doctrinal decline and restoration is the circular pattern we can discern. We can identify various doctrines that have followed such a trend: the apostolic church taught them with fervor; they fell into disfavor, were ignored, or were contradicted over the centuries; and then gradually more people returned to those doctrines. To generalize, historically speaking in Christendom we find a great falling away, an entering into apostasy, and then, at least among some professing Christians, a gradual restoration to more biblical doctrines. In the twentieth century there came a great revival of apostolic doctrine and experience, with multitudes accepting the full gospel message of baptism in Jesus' name and the baptism of the

Holy Spirit.

There are possible scriptural indications of this cyclic pattern, this falling away and gradual restoration. Isaiah 28:10-12 speaks of truth being built line upon line, precept upon precept. Joel 2:23-28 depicts various pests destroying the people and work of God but promises that gradually God will restore everything these pests have eaten.

Revelation 2 and 3 may provide a similar indication. It is important to recognize that this passage speaks of seven literal churches in the first century who had the problems described. But it seems clear that God inspired these letters for inclusion in the text of Scripture because these churches represent typical problems that can occur throughout church history. We can receive instruction today from the examples, problems, and recommendations for each of the seven churches.

Some commentators view these seven churches as

14

A History of Christian Doctrine

indicative in some way of the overall trend in church history. They note a burst of fervor initially (Ephesus and Smyrna), some falling away and compromise (Ephesus and Pergamos), a greater encroachment of false doctrine (Thyatira), widespread apostasy (Sardis), and then a great restoration along with continued apostasy before the coming of the Lord (Philadelphia and Laodicea).

When we integrate the three major themes that we have discussed, we conclude that the New Testament experience of salvation has always existed somewhere upon the earth. We cannot find a strict apostolic succession in the sense of historical figures or a continuous stream of pastors and leaders, so we cannot say that a particular organization is identical to the New Testament church as a matter of historical linkage. But we can make a partial argument for doctrinal succession.

That is, we can find various groups in church history who received the basic New Testament experience of salvation as described in the Book of Acts. When a group had essentially the same fundamental doctrine as found in the New Testament, we can consider it an apostolic church, or a New Testament church. In that sense, we can make somewhat of an argument of doctrinal succession throughout history. We cannot fill every gap, but we can find enough groups at different places and times scattered throughout history to give us confidence that God has

always had a people since the founding of the New Testament church. In this sense, the church is continuous.

Difficulties in Reconstructing Church History

There are several difficulties in trying to reconstruct church history. We cannot always know with absolute

certainty what ancient people believed about every point in question. Here are some reasons why.

1. Bias can affect writers and historians. Every doctrinal writer and church historian has his own presuppositions, which can affect his objectivity. Early writers were no exception. It was only natural for them to tend to slant things in their favor, sometimes deliberately and sometimes unconsciously. When they described the doctrine of someone they disagreed with, they often made it look foolish or illogical, because to them it was. Sometimes they simply did not understand a point their opponents made.

History is written by the victors. Whenever there were clashes in history, the people who won usually were the ones who left the record of what happened. Often the views of a minority are preserved only in the writings of their opponents. To see the difficulty here, we can imagine trying to understand and assess the Pentecostal movement solely by reading the documents of critics and skeptics. How accurately could some define the doctrine of Oneness, or explain the experience of the Holy Spirit baptism, if all he had were records of opponents who castigated, smeared, and misrepresented these teachings, whether intentionally or not?

We should also note that there is doctrinal bias among church historians today. We cannot evaluate church history simply by reading church historians. We must go back to the primary sources themselves and look at them from our perspective. Of course, another historian would say we have a bias, but at least we try to establish the "bias" of our doctrinal position from the Bible. We cannot depend totally on writings from church historians who

come with a different doctrinal perspective. Instead, we must read the original historical sources as much as possible to see what the writers said for themselves. By examining these writings from our point of view, we may uncover information, evidence, or possibilities that other

church historians have missed.

2. Writers of a certain age do not always represent the views of the majority of believers at that time. The writings that survive from a particular era may not have been written by the most influential leaders or teachers of the time. Before the invention of printing in the West in the 1400s, all documents had to be copied by hand. If later scribes deemed a manuscript to be unimportant or heretical, they had little desire to copy it repeatedly. Censors often destroyed writings later judged to be heretical. Generally, what has been preserved from early times are documents that fit the beliefs of the people who had the opportunity to preserve or discard them. Only a fraction of the writings from early times still exist, and it is difficult to say how representative the remnant is. If a writer was a known bishop, pastor, or other church leader, we have some reason to believe he represented a significant view in the church. If a writer is unknown or had no significant position in the church, it is quite possible that he was not truly representative of the church of his time. Perhaps he gained greater favor with later generations, who preserved his work, than he enjoyed in his own lifetime.

We should also consider that people who tend to write do not always reflect the piety and views of the average person. Particularly in ancient times, those who had the leisure and education to write scholarly treatises may

17

The Study of Doctrine in Church History

have had a different perspective from the average believer. Even in our own day, the works of major theologians are often much more liberal than the views of most lay members in their own denominations.

3. There is always the strong possibility of interpolations (insertions) in ancient manuscripts. The scribes who copied manuscripts by hand often changed statements, whether by mistake, misunderstanding, or deliberate alteration. They often felt free to add clarifications, "corrections," or simply their own views. Comparisons of different manuscripts of the same works reveal that interpolations were quite common.

Sometimes a scribe involved in a theological controversy would insert a few lines supportive of his own position into a book by an ancient, widely respected leader. The temptation was great to use such an authoritative figure to help resolve a dispute. On the other hand, if a

scribe found a questionable phrase in the work of such an author, he might feel it important to edit the work and strike the offending or potentially dangerous words. As a result, we are not always sure that we actually have the original words or views of a certain author. Sometimes we can only guess or suppose.

4. As already noted, false doctrines existed in the earliest times. Even if we were to find a nonbiblical document from the first century, its antiquity does not guarantee that it is truly apostolic or teaches the correct doctrine, for the New Testament reveals there were false teachers even in the first century. Moreover, documents from the second century were written approximately a century after the founding of the New Testament church, and one hundred years is a long time in doctrinal history. For

example, vast doctrinal changes, innovations, and movements have developed in the twentieth century: the entire modern Pentecostal movement arose in this century. People from all theological perspectives disagree with the earliest postbiblical writings on some points. For instance, evangelical Protestant scholars typically conclude that the earliest postbiblical writers did not clearly proclaim the doctrine of justification by faith but fell into legalism.

5. Early terms were often imprecise, especially in light of later controversies. For example, in the Middle Ages and during the Reformation great controversies arose over the Lord's Supper. The issue was whether the bread and the fruit of the vine were symbolic, or whether Christ's blood and body were physically present. Both sides in these debates appealed to writers from the first few centuries. For instance, a proponent of the doctrine of the real presence would find a writer who described the Lord's Supper as a partaking of Christ's body. But did the writer mean this statement to be figurative or literal? It is difficult to know for certain, since he wrote before the controversy existed.

Early writers did not anticipate later disputes and therefore did not guard against certain misinterpretations. We cannot demand of them a precision of terminology that was foreign to their time, nor can we make them speak of doctrinal issues that arose after their time. In some cases there is enough evidence to predict what position they would have taken had they lived during a certain

controversy. In many cases, however, they did not use certain definitive terms, or at least not with the connotation or precision of later times.

19

The Study of Doctrine in Church History

It can be anachronistic to cite certain writers in support of a particular doctrine, even though they may have used words that later acquired a certain theological significance. When we study ancient authors, we must determine what their words meant in the context of their writings and their times.

6. Sources for church history are neither authoritative nor infallible. Only Scripture can claim those distinctives. It is from Scripture alone that we must derive instruction for salvation, Christian living, and Christian belief.

Our sole authority is the Bible, the Word of God. God has inspired and preserved it for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness (II Timothy 3:16). If an ancient, well-respected source seems to teach a doctrine that is contrary to Scripture, we must choose the message of Scripture.

20

A History of Christian Doctrine

We begin our study at the end of the first century A.D. and the beginning of the second. Most of the apostles died long before the end of first century. John was the last one to die, in the late 90s. The first writers we will discuss, then, are postbiblical and post-apostolic.

They were not the second generation of leaders after the apostles, however, for we find those men in the New Testament as younger associates and co-workers of the apostles. The latter probably assumed prominence and leadership in the A.D. 60s through 80s. For instance, the apostle Paul was martyred in the 60s, and his successors were such people as Timothy and Titus. These men did not leave any written record, except what is incorporated in the New Testament, such as the Gospel of Mark and possibly the Epistle to the Hebrews.

21

2

Early Post-Apostolic Writers

A.D. 90-140

When we pick up after the New Testament, after the days of the apostles, then, we are actually dealing with the

third generation or later of pastors and church leaders.
We are already removed at least one generation from the
apostles.
Of course, the times overlap. Some of the people we will
discuss knew the apostles or heard them preach. But with
the possible exception of the successors of John, these writers
were not the direct successors of the various apostles.
The men we are speaking about, the generation of
leaders and writers after the completion of the New Testament
and the death of the last apostle, are often called the
Apostolic Fathers. This term is not accurate, however.
"Apostolic" signifies that they were followers of the apostles,
and "fathers" signifies that they were founding leaders.
Actually, in most cases they were not directly associated
with the apostles. Moreover, we should consider
Jesus Christ and the New Testament apostles and
prophets to be the foundation of the church, not these
men (Ephesians 2:20). It is more appropriate to call them
Post-Apostolic writers or Post-Apostolic leaders.
We will call the age in which these men wrote the
Post-Apostolic Age. It spans the time from approximately
A.D. 90 to 140, with some of the writings perhaps being as
late as 150.
Writings of the Age
We only have limited information from this time. Writings
survive from five authors whom we can identify, but
only the first four are significant:
1. Clement of Rome, bishop of Rome in the 90s. He
wrote a letter to the church at Corinth.
22
A History of Christian Doctrine
2. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. We have a brief letter
he wrote to the Philippians about 100. He was burned at
the stake at age 86. The Martyrdom of Polycarp was
written in a later age, about 155, and in its present form
contains both fanciful details and doctrinal errors.
3. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, whose writings date
from about 110. We have seven genuine letters from him.
He was martyred by being thrown to the lions.
4. Hermas, who wrote The Shepherd, c. 140-45, a
quite popular book in its day. He is otherwise unknown to
us, but tradition says he was from Rome. Apparently Hermas
did not hold any office in the church.
5. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis about 125. We only
have fragments preserved in the writings of later authors.
Aside from these identifiable writers, we have several

works whose authors are anonymous or who wrote under
a pseudonym.
1. The so-called Epistle of Barnabas (c. 100-20).
Historians agree that the author was not Paul's companion,
but someone who lived much later than his time, so it
is often more accurately called the Epistle of Pseudo-
Barnabas.
2. An anonymous book called the Preaching of Peter
(c. 110-30). Historians concur that it was not written by
Peter, but it is a story about him told as if by him. It is neither
authentic nor accurate.
3. Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, or Didache
(did´-ah-kee) in Greek, of which only one copy, dated
1056, survives. Scholars agree that it was certainly not
written by the twelve apostles, but it claims to reflect
their teaching. It is not a first-century document, as often
supposed. Internal and external evidence reveal that it is
23

no earlier than 120 and perhaps considerably later. It contains
doctrinal errors that do not reflect the original
teachings of the church.1
4. The so-called Second Epistle of Clement, a sermon
by an unknown author. It was traditionally ascribed
to Clement of Rome, but modern scholars concur that he
did not write it. Various historians date it from 100 to
150.

Teachings of the Age

These writings are our sources for what Christians
believed and taught in the age following the apostolic era.
While they are not always consistent with each other, we
can make some general observations and identify some
common themes, particularly in the writings of the
authors who were known church leaders.
For the most part, the writings are not speculative or
philosophical, but they adhere closely to the language of
Scripture. We do not find treatises on systematic theology,
in which an author discusses a certain doctrine in
detail and seeks to draw logical conclusions from various
passages of Scripture related to the chosen subject.
Instead, most of these documents are simply letters. They
were not intended as theological dissertations.
From the modern Apostolic Pentecostal viewpoint,
there is little objectionable or even questionable in these
letters. Most of the statements that Apostolics would
question or contradict appear in the anonymous or pseudonymous

writings.

Let us look briefly at what these authors had to say on important doctrinal subjects.

1. Monotheism. These writings emphasize the doc-

A History of Christian Doctrine

trine of one God, just as the Old Testament proclaims and the New Testament echoes. There is no mention of "trinity" or "three persons," nor do any other distinctively trinitarian terms or concepts appear. Instead, there is simply the teaching of one God and Lord of all.2

Pseudo-Barnabas and Hermas made a few statements that could refer to a preexistent Son, but they can also be interpreted in a manner consistent with Oneness. If they intended to make a personal distinction, their view would not be trinitarian, but binitarian (two persons) and subordinating the second person to the first.3

2. Deity of Jesus Christ. These writings strongly emphasize Christ's true deity, calling Him "the Scepter of the majesty of God," "the Lord our God," "our God, Jesus Christ," "the inseparable Spirit," "God, even Jesus Christ," "Christ our God," "our Lord and God," "Father," and "the Son of God."4 Ignatius was particularly fond of calling Jesus Christ "our God," and Polycarp heartily endorsed the epistles of Ignatius. In Epistle to Polycarp 3, Ignatius said, "Look for Him who is above all time, eternal and invisible, yet who became visible for our sakes, impalpable and impassible, yet who became passible [capable of suffering] on our account; and who in every kind of way suffered for our sakes."

These writings make a scriptural distinction between the Father and the Son, relating the Son to the Incarnation, the manifestation of God in flesh. They do not make a personal distinction with regard to the Holy Spirit. There are a few references to God acting as the Father, in the Lord Jesus Christ, and as the Holy Spirit, similar to what we find in the New Testament itself. (See II Corinthians 13:14; Ephesians 4:4-6; I Peter 1:2.) The Oneness

Early Post-Apostolic Writers

understanding and interpretation of these New Testament passages corresponds very well to similar statements in the Post-Apostolic Age.

We cannot say that these men were explicitly antitrinitarian, because as we will see, the doctrine of the trinity had not yet developed. Nevertheless, their terminology

and thoughts correspond closely to modern Oneness. Their emphasis on the oneness of God, the true deity of Jesus Christ, and the true humanity of Jesus Christ is the essentially the same as we find in the Oneness movement today and stands in sharp contrast to later trinitarian thought and expression.

3. The humanity of Christ and His saving work. These early writers unquestionably regarded Jesus as a real man who died for our sins and rose again. At the same time, they recognized that the Spirit of God dwells fully in Him by identity, so that He is our Lord, our God, and our Savior.

4. Faith, repentance, and water baptism. They stressed faith and repentance (the need to turn from the old life of sin), and they presented water baptism as the essential complement to repentance. They regarded it as necessary for the washing away of sins. Hermas wrote, "We descended into the water and received remission of our former sins," and Pseudo-Barnabas spoke of "that baptism which leads to the remission of sins."5 Moreover, just as in the Book of Acts, they baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.6 For instance, Hermas spoke of being baptized "in the name of the Lord" and "in the name of the Son of God." He stated that "no one shall enter into the kingdom of God unless he receive His holy name" and that we receive the name of the Lord at water baptism.

26

A History of Christian Doctrine

Clement, Ignatius, and Hermas all strongly emphasized the importance, sacredness, and power of the name of God, which they identified as Jesus.7

The Didache refers both to baptism in the name of the Lord and to baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It appears, however, that the latter reference is an interpolation or alteration from later times.8 Significantly, in the same manuscript of 1056 that preserves the Didache we find another trinitarian "correction," namely an alteration of a statement in II Clement that identifies Christ as the Spirit.9

These writings do not clearly express the doctrine of justification by faith, however. Clement taught that we are saved by the blood of Jesus and our faith in Him, not our works, but the Didache, Epistle of Pseudo-Barnabas, Shepherd of Hermas, and II Clement indicate that Christians can earn forgiveness or other merits by good works such as prayer, fasting, almsgiving, and strict morality. Significantly,

these works are by unknown authors, and the
first three express questionable ideas in other areas as well.
5. The manifestation of the Holy Spirit. These writings
mention the "full outpouring of the Holy Spirit" and
miraculous gifts of the Spirit; the Didache describes
prophets in the church of that day who spoke "in the Spirit."
10 It is evident that, just as in the Book of Acts, people
were receiving the Holy Spirit and exercising various spiritual
gifts.
6. Holiness of life. We find an emphasis on good
works, living a holy life, and being separated from evil
practices of the world.11 Hermas proclaimed that if a
Christian commits a major sin, he must seek a second
experience of repentance in order to be saved.
27
Early Post-Apostolic Writers
7. Church government and fellowship. It appears
that all the believers in a city were considered part of one
church, that each church was responsible for its own
internal affairs, and that each church had several ministers
but one senior pastor to lead it. Ignatius emphasized
that every church had a supreme pastor, or bishop, and
that all believers in the city needed to submit to his leadership.
These writings also reveal that there was close fellowship
and coordination among the churches and that
the bishops communicated with, admonished, and
advised one another.
8. The Scriptures. The Post-Apostolic writers accepted
both testaments as the inspired Word of God. They
quoted from twenty-three New Testament books—all
except Philemon, II and III John, and Jude—and there are
possible references to Philemon, II John, and Jude.12 They
did not have occasion to mention a few of the smaller
books of the New Testament, but it is clear that these men
were well acquainted with the books of our Bible and
regarded them as Scripture.
9. The Lord's Supper. They celebrated the Lord's
Supper. They did not speak of it as a sacrifice for sin, but
as the Eucharist, or thanksgiving offering. They also
expressed that partaking of the Lord's Supper pointed
toward the second coming of Jesus Christ.
10. The last things. We do not find any detailed
prophetic schemes in these simple writings, but there is
strong emphasis on the second coming of Jesus Christ. The
writers of the Post-Apostolic Age looked for His soon return.
Conclusions

The writers of the Post-Apostolic Age were mostly bib-
lical and apostolic in their approach. Oneness Pentecostals
will find some phrases in these writings that they
do not agree with, particularly in the writings of Hermas
and in the pseudonymous writings. Protestants in general
and Evangelicals likewise find some points of disagreement
with the Post-Apostolic writers. For instance, they
often say that their emphasis on water baptism and works
of holiness is legalistic and undermines justification by
faith.

For the most part, however, these writings display the
doctrine of the apostles, the doctrine of the New Testament.
This is especially true in the writings of the three
important writers who were bishops in the church at this
time—Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

In the immediate Post-Apostolic Age, A.D. 90 to 140,
we find adherence to the doctrines of the New Testament—
emphasis on one God, Jesus as the true God and
true man, repentance, water baptism in the name of Jesus
Christ as part of the salvation experience, the baptism of
the Holy Ghost, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, and
holiness of life. In short, we find a vibrant apostolic
church.

The writings are not of the quality of the New Testament.
We would not expect them to be, because they are
not inspired as the New Testament is. They are simple and
their total doctrinal content is comparatively scanty. As
far as we can tell, however, in the immediate Post-Apostolic
Age, believers as a whole still embraced the message
and experience of the apostles.

Early Post-Apostolic Writers

In the Post-Apostolic Age (c. 90-140) and the Age of
the Greek Apologists (c. 130-80), a number of groups
arose that separated from the mainstream church. These
groups and their distinctive doctrines are typically called
heresies, from the Greek word hairesis, meaning "choice"
and, by extension, "party, sect, schismatic group."

We will use the word heresy in this sense, recognizing
that some such sects in history grossly deviated from the
Word of God while others may actually have been closer
to the original teachings than the institutional church of
their day. In some cases, what historians have called

heresy may have been a reaction to unbiblical teachings
and conditions and not really a heresy in the biblical
sense of the word. (See Acts 24:14.)

3
Early Heresies

In this chapter we will discuss four early groups that
arose in opposition to the mainstream church. They had
their roots in the Post-Apostolic Age or before, they developed
their distinctive identities around this time, they
broke away from the institutional church in the second
century A.D., and leading Christian writers of the second
and third centuries condemned them as heretics.

The Ebionites

The first group we will discuss is the Ebionites. They
were Jewish Christians who continued to hold to their
Jewish culture and identity so much that it affected their
understanding of the gospel. It appears that their name
came from a Hebrew word meaning "poor" and was
applied to them because many of the early Jewish Christians
were poor. (See Romans 15:26.)

Of course, Christianity began among the Jews; all the
apostles were Jewish. While they continued to live as
Jews, they came to realize that Christ was the fulfillment
of the law, that they were justified by faith and not by the
law, and that there was no need to teach Gentile Christians
to keep the law of Moses. (See Acts 15; Galatians 3.)

Even in New Testament times, however, some Jewish
Christians insisted that keeping the law of Moses was necessary
to salvation and tried to force Gentile Christians to
be circumcised (Acts 15:1, 5). These Judaizers, as they
are known, rejected the ministry of Paul, and he sharply
rebuked their doctrine (Galatians 1:6-9; 3:1; 4:10-11, 17;
5:1-12; Philippians 3:2-3). He wrote the Epistle to the
Galatians particularly to oppose this false teaching.

Not surprisingly, the Judaizers refused to accept
Paul's letters as inspired of God. At first they were a fac-

A History of Christian Doctrine

tion within the church, but gradually they were forced out
of the church.

The most extreme of them said that Jesus was not
God manifested in the flesh but merely a man upon whom
the Spirit descended at His baptism. They considered
Him to be anointed by the Spirit and a great prophet in
the tradition of the Old Testament, but not truly God.

They believed His mission was to bring a revival of repentance, a restoration of Old Testament worship, and a renewed emphasis on the law of Moses. By these views they denied the fundamental doctrine of Jesus Christ and the New Testament message of salvation.

Some writers have applied the label of Ebionite to all Jewish Christians who continued to keep the law of Moses. Such people were not necessarily heretical, but the adjective heretical properly applies to all who made the keeping of the law necessary for salvation and especially to all who denied the deity and atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

Gnosticism

The Gnostics were powerful opponents of Christianity in the second century. Gnosticism originated in paganism as a combination of Oriental religion and Greek philosophy. The result was a form of mystical philosophy that was supposed to bring salvation.

As the Gnostics encountered various religions, they tried to absorb them by taking elements from them and mascarading as proponents of those religions. They took this approach to Judaism and also to Christianity with some degree of success during this time. In short, Gnosticism was eclectic, meaning that it selected ideas from

33

Early Heresies

various philosophies and religions, and syncretistic, meaning that it blended these ideas together to form new doctrines.

The most prominent Gnostic leaders were Saturninus, Basilides, and Valentinus. Second-century writers stated that Simon Magus, the Samaritan magician in Acts 8, was an early proponent of Gnostic ideas.

The Gnostics received their name from the Greek word gnosis, which means "knowledge." The essence of Gnosticism was the teaching of salvation by higher knowledge. The Gnostics held that, while a person could experience salvation by faith, the true way of salvation was by supernatural knowledge. This saving knowledge did not come through study of the Scriptures but through divine, mystical revelation, an idea similar to the concept of enlightenment as taught by some Eastern religions, including Hinduism and Buddhism.

The Gnostics based their doctrinal system on a strong dualism adapted from Greek philosophy. They believed that the world is composed of two distinct entities, spirit

and matter. Spirit is good, pure, and holy, while matter is evil. Originally we were pure spirit beings, but in a great conflict between spirit and matter we became entrapped in matter. In other words, we are good, holy, preexistent spiritual entities who somehow became entangled in evil matter and who need to be liberated from the world of matter.

This dualism greatly affected the Gnostics' doctrine of God. They said that the God who created this world of matter was actually inferior and antagonistic to us. He was not the supreme God, or else He would not have created such an evil thing as this world. The supreme God is

pure spirit, and out of Him came various emanations, a progression of lesser and lesser divine beings called aeons. The most inferior of these is Jehovah, also called the Demiurge. He is the Creator and in essence responsible for our current predicament because he created the world of matter in which we have become imprisoned. According to the Gnostics, the Redeemer, whom they identified with Christ, is the highest aeon or emanation from God. He came down to earth to redeem or emancipate us from the world of matter. He is not actually God Himself, because the supreme Deity is so pure that He could never have direct contact with this sinful world.

This view posed a problem for the Gnostics, however, for the Bible proclaims that Christ came in the flesh. If flesh is evil, how could this good emanation of God come in such an evil way?

The Gnostics tried to resolve this dilemma by the doctrine of docetism, which says that Christ was a spirit being only. He appeared to have flesh, but really He did not; He was purely spirit.

Some Gnostics further taught the doctrine of Cerinthianism, named for Cerinthus, an early proponent. This belief separates Jesus and Christ into two beings: Jesus, a normal man who was born, and Christ, a pure spirit. Christ came upon Jesus at His baptism and remained with Him until just before His death. Since this pure spirit could not participate in death, Christ left Jesus on the cross. This view resembles the doctrine of the extreme Ebionites.

The Gnostics classified people in three categories based on spirit, soul, and body. First, there are spiritual people, the spiritual elite, who are predestined to salvation.

Early Heresies

These are the ones who have gnosis, or spiritual knowledge. They are saved or liberated from the evil world of matter by their higher revelation. Then there is a second class of people called the "psychical," or "soulish," people. (The Greek word psyche means "soul.") These are the people who have faith, and if they continue to believe, there will be a way of salvation for them too. Finally, there is a third group of people, the carnal. They simply live in this fleshly, evil world and do not seek or receive deliverance. They are predestined to damnation.

This trichotomy, or threefold classification, does not emphasize ethics or morality. It provides no motivation for a person to try to become holy in his earthly life, for the flesh is unalterably evil. There is no incentive to practice ethics and morality, because the flesh will do whatever it is going to do. It is useless to worry about the flesh; rather, a person should just focus upon the spirit.

Some Gnostics became ascetics, denying and disciplining the flesh with fasting and severe punishments on the ground that the flesh is bad and needs punishment. Other took the very carnal route of libertinism, saying it does not matter what the flesh does. According to them, one should let it indulge in whatever it wants, for it is only the spirit that counts.

In this doctrinal system there was no true resurrection, for eternal life was only spiritual. In fact, there really was no doctrine of personal immortality. Somehow the spirits of the saved would be liberated to rejoin the universal spirit and become absorbed in it, a concept found in some Eastern religions such as Hinduism. The wicked would be annihilated, or wiped out of existence.

The Gnostics rejected the literal interpretation of the

A History of Christian Doctrine

Old Testament but interpreted it allegorically to fit their own doctrines. They also had a number of apocryphal books, books written to promote their doctrine that they claimed were part of the New Testament but that the church as a whole rejected.

While Gnosticism as an organized system developed after New Testament times, many of its ideas were already prevalent in that day. The writings of John and Paul refute many of these doctrines. John 1:1-14 and I John 4:2-3; 5:20 proclaim that Jesus Christ is the true God come in

the flesh and that this fact is a cardinal doctrine of the
church. Colossians teaches that in Jesus Christ all believers
(not merely an elite) can have full spiritual knowledge,
that Jesus Christ is the fullness of God incarnate
and not merely an emanation, that salvation is by faith in
Him, and that we are to avoid both ascetism and libertinism.
(See Colossians 1:9-10; 2:9-12, 20-23; 3:5-10.)
In sum, Gnosticism denied many essential doctrines
of Christianity, including the oneness of God, the Incarnation,
the Atonement, salvation by faith, and the new birth.
Today it may seem very foreign to us, and we may be surprised
to think that it could have ever been a powerful
rival to biblical Christianity, yet it was very appealing in
its day. Its mysticism gave it a strong affinity with Oriental
religions, and its advocacy of salvation by higher knowledge
aligned it with the philosophical approach of the
time.
As we will see in later chapters, many Christians were
affected by Gnosticism. Their thinking was influenced not
only by the Greek philosophy of the day but also by Gnosticism
and its emphasis on salvation by knowledge. Some
prominent teachers such as Origen borrowed many ideas
37
Early Heresies
from Gnostic teachings. Nevertheless, major Christian
writers of the second and third centuries, particularly Irenaeus,
strongly opposed Gnosticism.
Marcion
The third major heretical group began with a man
named Marcion. Many Christian writers of his day classified
him as a Gnostic, but his system was significantly different.
His theology did contain a number of Gnostic elements,
and like Gnosticism it incorporated both pagan
and Christian features. Nevertheless, he developed a doctrine
and a movement of his own.
The basis of Marcion's theology was a belief in two
deities—the Creator, or Demiurge, and the Redeemer. The
Creator is evil and the one who inspired the Old Testament,
which Marcion rejected. The Redeemer is good and
the only God Christians should worship. He came to this
world as Jesus Christ. He did not truly come in the flesh,
however, for Christ was a spirit being only. Here we see
Gnostic dualism and docetism mixed with biblical concepts
about the oneness of God and the full deity of Christ.
Marcion accepted as Scripture only ten of the Pauline
Epistles and a mutilated version of the Gospel of Luke. He

rejected the rest of the New Testament because of quotations from the Old Testament and contradictions to his doctrine.

Marcion taught that salvation is by faith in Jesus Christ, and his followers practiced water baptism "in the name of Jesus Christ."1 Here too we see echoes of biblical teaching. On the whole, though, Marcion's doctrine was not scriptural but heretical.

The Marcionites broke away from the mainstream

church around 144. Their emphasis on the supreme deity of Christ and their baptismal formula were not points of contention, however. Evidently, at this date the church as a whole still taught that Jesus was fully God (rather than a second person) and practiced Jesus Name baptism as in the Book of Acts and in the first century. When the Marcionites left the church, they continued to use the standard baptismal formula, even though it was later altered in the institutional church.

Another thing to note about the Marcionites is that they tended to asceticism. They taught strict discipline and even punishment of the body, and they rejected marriage.

Montanism

A presbyter named Montanus, from the region of Phrygia in Asia Minor, founded the fourth group we will discuss. Although considered heretical by leading writers of the second and third centuries, in some ways the Montanists were perhaps more biblical than some of their opponents. Unlike the other groups we have discussed, their overall theology was in harmony with Scripture. They were expelled from the institutional church around 177.

The Montanists placed great importance on personal holiness of life. They objected to the mainstream church because it seemed to be departing from the more strict, separated lifestyle of holiness and embracing more and more worldliness.

Another major emphasis of the Montanists, probably their most distinctive tenet, was the work of the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit. Again, they accused the mainstream church of gradually minimizing and losing

the miraculous gifts, such as prophecy and speaking in tongues. Tertullian, a leading writer in the early third century

who ultimately became a Montanist, proclaimed that speaking in tongues was an important mark of a valid church.

In turn, their opponents alleged that Montanus claimed to fulfill Christ's promise of the coming of the Comforter (Paraclete) in John 14. Of course, Jesus actually spoke of the Holy Spirit in that passage. It is not clear that Montanus actually claimed to be the Holy Spirit incarnate, however, for it seems that his critics made this charge because he gave prophecies in the first person. But this practice does not necessarily mean that he claimed to be the manifestation or incarnation of the Holy Spirit. Even today, when people give interpretations or prophecies they often speak from God's point of view, using the pronoun "I" in reference to Him. It is possible, then, that the opponents of Montanus took his statements out of context and so distorted their meaning.

It does seem that the Montanists went to excess in some areas, tending toward legalism and asceticism. Of course, self-denial is a scriptural concept (Mark 8:34-37). But when people begin to punish the body, to impose severe, nonbiblical restrictions of their own making, or to seek salvation by meritorious works, then they go beyond the bounds of Scripture.

At least some of the Montanists became extremists in this area. For example, they taught that a Christian should not remarry after his or her spouse died. The movement ultimately rejected marriage completely, saying that it was a concession to human sinfulness and that truly holy people would abstain from marriage and remain celibate.

40

A History of Christian Doctrine

Of course, both teachings deviated from the New Testament (I Corinthians 7:39; Hebrews 13:4).

Montanus stressed the priesthood of all believers. He tried to reform the ecclesiastical structure as the church seemed to become more and more hierarchical and to place more and more power in the hands of clergy as distinct from laity. The bishops, who originally were simply pastors of cities, were gradually extending their power over other churches in their areas. Montanus tried to call the church back to a more simple structure in which everyone was recognized as having a ministry in the church and could exercise spiritual gifts.

This group's major emphases—the work of the Holy Spirit, holiness, and the priesthood of all believers—were

apparently biblical and a corrective to emerging problems,
but it seems that they went too far in stressing these aspects.
Their problem was not doctrine as much as practice.
The Montanists placed strong emphasis on the doctrine
of the last things. They considered Montanus to be
the last great prophet before the end of the world, and
they looked for the soon coming of Jesus Christ and the
consummation of the age.
There is evidence that the Montanists were originally
modalists, meaning they held that God is absolutely one,
that Jesus is the one true God manifested in flesh, and
that God is not a trinity of persons.2 Moreover, they did
not baptize in trinitarian titles,3 so they must have
adhered to the original Jesus Name formula. This is not
surprising, for the doctrine of the trinity did not develop
until the third century.
Some third-century writers said that one faction of the
Montanists was modalist,4 so evidently others of them
41
Early Heresies
eventually embraced trinitarianism. In fact, as we shall
see, a famous third-century convert to Montanism named
Tertullian was quite instrumental in developing the doctrine
of the trinity.

Conclusion

Of the four major schismatic groups that challenged
the established church in the second century, the first
three—the Ebionites, the Gnostics, and the Marcionites—
were definitely heretical in their doctrine. The fourth
group, the Montanists, was possibly more orthodox than
the emerging leadership of the visible church in this time,
but they too went to extremes and were ultimately excommunicated
from the organized structure.
It is interesting to contrast the predominant formative
influences of these groups. The Ebionites were a heresy
based in Judaism, the Gnostics were rooted in paganism,
the Marcionites mixed paganism and Christianity, and the
Montanists drew their ideas from within Christianity.
Each group is an instructive example of how doctrines
can develop and emphases can change. The New
Testament itself shows how some of the fundamental
ideas of Ebionitism and Gnosticism emerged and began
deceiving believers. The doctrines of Marcion and Montanism,
while deviating to a greater or lesser extent from
the New Testament, still bear indirect witness to the original
apostolic teaching. That is, in tracing how they developed

we can see where they started from; we find influences
of the biblical doctrines of the oneness of God, the
deity of Jesus Christ, water baptism in the name of Jesus
Christ, the baptism of the Holy Spirit with tongues, the
gifts of the Spirit, and holiness of life.

42

A History of Christian Doctrine

The next generation of writers after the Post-Apostolic
Age were the Greek Apologists. They are so called
because they wrote apologies, or defenses of the faith, in
the Greek language. They used Greek because it was the
international language of commerce and culture in the
eastern Roman Empire, where Christianity began and
where it had the greatest strength in this age. The Greek
Apologists were active from about 130 to 180; their oldest
existing writings date from about 150.

Persecution of Christianity

To understand what motivated the Apologists to write,
we first need to understand the opposition that Christians
faced. Originally, Christians were persecuted by the Jews,

43

4

The Greek Apologists

A.D. 130-180

as we find in the New Testament (Acts 5:17-18; 7:57-59;
8:1-3; 9:1-2).

Next they were persecuted by the pagans, with the
first severe Roman persecution occurring under Emperor
Nero in the A.D. 60s. Tradition says both Peter and Paul
were martyred during the Neronic persecution.

From the time of Nero until the last great persecution,
under the reign of Emperor Diocletian, there were ten
major persecutions in all. Persecution finally ended in
313, when the Roman co-emperors Constantine and
Licinius promulgated the "Edict of Milan," which was
actually a concordat between them. It legalized Christianity
and instituted an official policy of toleration.

From Nero until about A.D. 250, most of the persecutions
were local or did not occur throughout the empire
simultaneously. In certain localities and times, persecution
were severe and some people were martyred, but there
was not a concerted official effort across the empire.

From 250 to 313, however, as paganism declined and
Christianity expanded, there were empire-wide attempts
to stamp out Christianity. Some of the persecutions during
this time became very brutal indeed. The harshest

persecutions were under the emperors Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian.

In many cases, pagan opposition to Christianity was based on misunderstandings and false, scurrilous rumors. Since Christians often met in secret to avoid persecution, it was easy for their opponents to spread malicious gossip about what they did when they gathered together. It was commonly reported that Christians murdered people, sacrificed babies, ate human flesh, drank human blood, conducted orgies, and so on.

In addition, pagan writers attacked Christianity on the ground that it undermined the state and the fiber of society. They advanced numerous intellectual objections based on the prevailing philosophies of the day, which were principally Greek in origin.

The Response of the Apologists

Throughout the second and third centuries, then, Christians felt the need to defend themselves—not physically but intellectually. They did not take up arms, for that was against their principles, and in any case, they had no means of doing so. But they did defend themselves in writing against pagan accusations and objections.

There was a need to respond publicly to correct the scandalous rumors. More substantially, there was a need to explain the doctrines of Christianity in order to defend it against pagan philosophical attacks.

The Greek Apologists sought to do just that. They wrote to dispel false accusations, to show that Christianity promoted a superior morality, and to demonstrate intellectually that it was the truth.

In trying to present Christianity to pagans, the Apologists drew extensively from Greek philosophy, which was the common intellectual ground upon which practically everyone in their society could meet. They did not appeal primarily to Scripture, because their adversaries did not accept Scripture.

The basic approach of the Apologists was to demonstrate that Christianity is a good philosophy—in fact, the best philosophy, the truest philosophy. Whenever possible, they employed and endorsed Greek philosophical terms and concepts in order to make Christianity seem

reasonable, attractive, and fitting to the pagans in the culture

of the day.
Major Writers
The major writers whose works survive from the Age
of the Greek Apologists are as follows:
1. Marcianus Aristides, a philosopher in Athens who
became a Christian. His Apology, addressed to Emperor
Antoninus Pius, is probably the oldest surviving work in
this category, dating to 150 and perhaps as early as 125
or 130.
2. The anonymous author of the Epistle to Diognetus,
which is generally dated about 150 although it may
be as early as 130. While not an apologetic writing, it was
once attributed to Justin, and it expresses some thoughts
characteristic of this time.
3. Flavius Justinus, or Justin, by far the most influential
and prolific Greek Apologist. Justin was born in a
Roman colony in Samaria and became a Greek philosopher.
After his conversion to Christianity he traveled as a
lay preacher, but he was never ordained as a minister. He
continued to call himself a philosopher and to wear the
philosopher's cloak. He resided in Rome on two different
occasions and was ultimately beheaded there for his faith.
Later writers often surnamed him Philosopher and Martyr.
Important works of Justin include his First Apology
(c. 150), Second Apology, Dialogue with Trypho the
Jew, and On the Resurrection.
4. Tatian of Syria, a disciple of Justin who eventually
became a Gnostic and founded an ascetic sect known as
the Encratites ("abstainers"). He wrote Address to the
Greeks (c. 150), and he compiled the Diatessaron, the
46
A History of Christian Doctrine
earliest harmony of the Gospels, of which only fragments
remain.
5. Melito, bishop of Sardis, of whose writings only
fragments remain. He authored Apology, or To Marcus
Aurelius (c. 170), On God Incarnate, The Key, Discourse
on the Cross, On the Nature of Christ, Discourse
on Soul and Body, and On Faith.
6. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch from 168 to 181
and author of To Autolycus, a pagan friend.
7. Athenagoras, a philosopher reportedly of Athens.
He addressed his Plea for the Christians (c. 177) to the
Roman emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, and
also wrote a treatise, On the Resurrection.
In addition, we have a few insignificant fragments

from and references to other authors, including Quadratus,
Claudius Apollinarius of Hierapolis, Miltiades, and
Ariston of Pella. Many works mentioned as being from
this time are lost.

It is significant that most of the writings that remain
are apologies addressed to pagans. We have only a few
doctrinal treatises and no sermons or letters to churches
such as have survived from the Post-Apostolic Age.
Moreover, with few exceptions, we do not have writings
from the leaders of the church in this age, again
quite unlike what has come to us from the Post-Apostolic
Age. The most important existing works do not come
from bishops, pastors, or other recognized leaders, but
from converted philosophers who held no offices in the
church. Their philosophical approach was probably very
different from what the average Christian heard in the
preaching and teaching of his local church. It is unlikely
that the writings we have are representative of church

47

The Greek Apologists

leaders, pastors, or average believers, especially near the
beginning of the age.

As a result, it is difficult to characterize this era. The
best we can do is to study the Greek Apologists, even
though it seems clear that they represented only a narrow
segment of the church: an intellectual elite who were not
church leaders and whose main concern was to make
Christianity seem acceptable in light of pagan thought. In
fact, most of our information comes from one man—
Justin—either directly from his writings or indirectly
from the people he influenced.

Let us examine what the Apologists taught. We will
look primarily at the writings of Justin but will note where
other writers differed from him.

God and the Logos

In the Age of the Greek Apologists, we find a progressive
shift away from the biblical doctrine of Oneness and
the substantially identical views of the Post-Apostolic
Age. The vague possible indications of a preexistent Son
by Pseudo-Barnabas and Hermas become explicit in this
age.

Near the beginning of the age stood Aristides, whose
doctrine of God was for the most part biblical Oneness,
and the Epistle to Diognetus, which still retained a predominantly
biblical view but began to separate God and
the Word. At the apex of the age, Justin and his disciple

Tatian clearly differentiated the Father and the Word as two distinct beings. By the end of the era, Theophilus and Athenagoras had begun to express a vague, undefined form of triadism (threefold nature of God), although the former still used some Oneness expressions. Melito still

maintained a predominantly Oneness view of God, but even some of his terms had become distorted, at least as they have come down to us.1

God's oneness. Like the writers of the Post-Apostolic Age, the Greek Apologists proclaimed that there is one God, not the many gods of the pagans. In contrast to Greek and Roman polytheism, they affirmed monotheism.

The doctrine of the Logos. Nevertheless, in this age we find a compromise of the pure monotheism of the Bible, particularly with the Apologists' doctrine of the Logos. Logos is a Greek term translated as "Word," and it represented a very popular Greek philosophical concept during this time. To the Greeks, the Logos was the reason of God or the reason by which the universe was sustained. It was not a god in a personal sense; rather it referred to the principles by which the universe operated.

Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the apostle John used this term in his Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:1, 14). As a monotheistic Jew, he used it in sharp contrast to prevailing pagan philosophies, drawing instead upon the Old Testament background of God's Word as God Himself in action and in self-revelation. (See Psalm 107:20; Isaiah 55:11.) There was no thought that the Word was a second person. (See Isaiah 44:24; 45:5-6; 46:5, 9.) While John surely knew how his pagan contemporaries used the term, under divine inspiration he used it in a unique way to point both Jews and Gentiles to Jesus Christ as the one true God manifested in the flesh.

To summarize the doctrine of the Logos in John 1, in the beginning God existed alone. At the same time, His

plan, His thought, His mind, His reason, His expression was with Him and was Him from eternity past. In the fullness of time God manifested himself in flesh. His plan, reason, and thought was expressed or uttered. God revealed Himself. John thereby identified Jesus as the one

true God of eternity past. He was not an afterthought, but the eternally foreordained revelation of God Himself.

As an analogy, before someone can speak a word or a message, the mind must first think it. First it is an unexpressed word; then, at the right time, it is uttered or expressed. Similarly God's mind, reason, plan, or Word was unexpressed in times past. The Incarnation was God's plan from the beginning, but it did not actually take place until the fullness of time.

The Greek Apologists, particularly Justin, Tatian, Theophilus, and Athenagoras, seized upon the Logos as a means of making Christianity palatable to the pagans of their day. They said, in effect, "The Logos you have been speculating about for hundreds of years is the basis of our faith. The Logos that controls the universe is actually Jesus Christ." But to do that, instead of using the context of the Old Testament and the Gospel of John, the Apologists went to Greek philosophy to develop, define, and explain their doctrine of the Logos.

To a great extent, the philosophy of the time was based upon the ideas of the Greek philosopher Plato. Plato taught that there are two worlds: the good, real world of ideas or forms and the imperfect, physical world of phenomena that reflects the world of ideas. The summit of the world of ideas is the one supreme, perfect God, who is uninvolved with the evil world of matter and who is impassible—incapable of emotional feeling and suffering.

The world of ideas serves as an intermediary between God and the physical world.

For people who were educated with these ideas, it was difficult to believe the biblical teaching that Jesus Christ is the supreme God Himself who came in flesh to suffer and die for the redemption of fallen humanity. The Gnostics dealt with the conflict between Greek philosophy and Christianity on this point by essentially following the former. To them God remained impassible but related to the world through a series of aeons, of which the Creator was one and the Redeemer was another.

Philo of Alexandria, a Hellenistic Jewish philospher who lived around the time of Christ, likewise struggled to reconcile Greek philosophy and Judaism. He had a motive similar to that of the Apologists: he sought to make Judaism seem reasonable and acceptable to pagans. His solution was to proclaim that God is one but also to

speak of the Logos as God's intermediary in creating the world.

His concepts were not always clear and were perhaps even contradictory in places. He referred to the Logos as the son of God, first-begotten of God, and even a second god, but he seemed to use these phrases metaphorically, for he did not describe the Logos as having personality distinct from God. In essence, he tried to fuse Greek and Jewish thought by employing the popular Greek concept of the Logos, identifying it with God's Word and wisdom as described in the Old Testament, and using this idea to explain how the one true God of the Bible could relate to the world without Greek concepts being violated.

Thus he said God created the world by His Logos, God speaks to the world by His Logos, and God interacts

with people by His Logos. He even found a way to include the revered Greek philosophers in the picture, stating that the one true God of the Bible who communicated with Moses also communicated with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle by the Logos. He always stopped short of making the Logos a second person, however.

The leading Apologists adopted Philo's approach in their own attempt to reconcile Greek thought with Christianity, with a significant new development: they clearly did make the Logos a second person. Such a notion was abhorrent to the Jewish mind, steeped in the absolute, uncompromising monotheism of the Old Testament (Deuteronomy 6:4-9; Isaiah 44:6-8; 45:21-22). However, it seemed plausible to Gentiles of the day, including the Apologists, whose background was polytheism (I Corinthians 8:5).

The Apologists explained that Jesus Christ is not the supreme God, not the Father, but a second person, the Logos, who is the same as the Logos of Greek philosophy. In this way they sought to convince pagans that Christianity was legitimate as a philosophy and ultimately to show them that it was actually the best and truest philosophy.

The Apologists' doctrine of the Logos was a departure from the strict monotheism of the Bible and of the earlier Post-Apostolic Age. It marks the beginning of a personal differentiation in the Godhead among Christian writers. We find no hint of this Logos doctrine in the earlier writings of the Post-Apostolic writers, although it bears some resemblance to the ideas of the Gnostics.

The Apologists equated the Logos with the Son. In other words, the Son is a second person in the Godhead, although they preferred to use the term Logos. Here we

find for the first time the doctrine of the preexistent Son expressed clearly and definitely.

In the New Testament, however, Son refers to the Incarnation. Jesus Christ is the eternal God, and His Spirit is the Spirit of God from eternity past, but Jesus was not the Son until He came in flesh in the Incarnation. (See Luke 1:35; Galatians 4:4; Hebrews 1:5.) God was revealed in the Son; God came in flesh as the Son (II Corinthians 5:19; I Timothy 3:16).

To put it another way, the Word of God, or the Logos, was revealed in the Son. Although Jesus is both Logos and Son, in scriptural terminology there is not an exact equation of the terms. The Logos is the eternal God Himself, the eternal Spirit, the eternal divine mind (John 1:1), but the Son is specifically God coming in the flesh. The Son of God is the authentic human being who was born of the virgin Mary, lived, died for our sins, and rose again.

The Apologists' belief in two persons is not the same as the modern doctrine of the trinity. In modern trinitarianism, the divine persons are coequal, but the Apologists taught that the second person is subordinate to the first person (subordinationism).

For example, Justin said the Logos is "another God and Lord subject to the maker of all things. . . . He . . . is distinct from Him who made all things—numerically, I mean." Following the Greek concept of God, Justin told Trypho, a Jew, that it was not the Father but the Logos who spoke and appeared to people in the Old Testament: "You must not imagine that the unbegotten God Himself came down or went up from any place. For the ineffable Father and Lord of all . . . remains in His own place, wherever that is."2

In the beginning, said the Apologists, God existed alone, but in order to create the world He first caused His Word to come out of Him. Originally, His Word was inherent in Him in an impersonal form, but He brought forth His Word as a second person. This event they identified as the begetting of the Logos or Son.

Once again the Apologists deviated from the scriptural

use of terminology. In the New Testament the term "begotten Son" refers to the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, and Hebrews 1:5-6 specifically relates this concept to the Incarnation. According to Matthew 1:18-20 and Luke 1:35, Jesus was not conceived by an earthly father, but the Spirit of God moved upon the womb of the virgin Mary. Therefore Jesus was literally begotten as a baby at that time and so was called the Son of God. The begetting refers to the Incarnation, not the eternal nature of Jesus Christ. The Apologists changed that understanding, however, by placing the begetting at a point in time before the creation of the world.

In sum, the Apologists interpreted John 1:1 much as Oneness Pentecostals do today. In the beginning the Word was God Himself, God's mind, God's reason inherent within Him. They deviated from Scripture by saying that before creation the Word came out of God as a second person begotten by God.

This belief contains another contrast to modern trinitarianism, which teaches that the divine persons are coeternal and that the term "begotten" refers to an eternal, ongoing process and relationship between the Father and the Son. Obviously, the Apologists did not think their second person was coeternal with the Father. The Word was created or begotten by the Father at a point in time,

54

and He retains an inferiority or subordination in rank.

The Holy Spirit. The Apologists did not explicitly distinguish a third person. They mentioned the Holy Spirit, but it is not clear how they viewed the Spirit. At times they seemed to identify the Spirit as simply the Spirit of the Father—the Father in emanation, not another person. At other times they seemed to identify the Spirit as the Logos, the second person. For instance, Justin said the Logos inspired the prophets of the Old Testament but also said the Spirit inspired the prophets.[3]

A few passages seem to identify the Spirit as a third person, some sort of created being inferior to the other two. In one passage Justin identified "the prophetic Spirit" as a third being to worship, after God and "the Son of the true God," while in another place he said that he worshiped God, the Son, "the other good angels," and "the prophetic Spirit."[4] Athenagoras spoke freely of the Father, Son, and Spirit.

Threefold references. Theophilus was the first

known writer to use the Greek word triados in relation to God. It is the genitive form of trias, which means "triad" and was later used to describe the trinity. He simply mentioned it in passing without trying to teach a doctrine:
"The three days [of creation] which were before the luminaries, are types of the Triados, of God, and His Word, and His wisdom."5 Elsewhere he identified God's wisdom with His Word and His Spirit.6 By contrast, trinitarians of the third and fourth centuries identified wisdom as the second person.
It is not clear whether Theophilus referred to three persons, but it does not seem likely in context. He did not use the term persons (plural) but used person (singular)
55

The Greek Apologists

in a manner incompatible with later trinitarianism, saying that the Word, which is God's power and wisdom, assumed the person of the Father, the person of God.7 Some people say this was the first Christian use of the word trinity (about 180), but most historians reserve that dubious distinction for Tertullian in the early third century, because he clearly did intend three distinct persons.
In this connection, Melito, bishop of Sardis, is quite intriguing. His writings do not display the same kind of philosophical thinking as the other Apologists. In fact, he made strong statements about the oneness of God and the deity of Jesus Christ. In two surviving fragments he described Jesus as "God put to death." Although two statements of his seem to indicate a preexistent Son, it does not appear that Melito followed the concepts of the other Apologists but was much closer in thought to the Post-Apostolic writers. Unfortunately, we do not have enough of his writings to make a definitive judgment.
Summary. In summary, the leading Greek Apologists made a personal distinction between the Father and the Son, or Logos. They taught a form of binitarianism (two persons in the Godhead), the second person being subordinate to the first. There is some indication of a threefold nature in God, or a third person, especially among two later Apologists, but they did not develop this idea to the point that historians consider it to be trinitarianism as we know it today.

Salvation

The saving work of Christ. Like the Post-Apostolic writers, the Apologists taught that salvation comes through the blood Jesus shed for our sins. They stressed

A History of Christian Doctrine

our responsibility and freedom of will to respond to God's offer of salvation. There is no hint of the later doctrine of predestination.

Faith, repentance, and water baptism. They taught the importance of faith, repentance, and water baptism, proclaiming them to be necessary to salvation. For example, Justin wrote, "Baptism . . . is alone able to purify those who have repented, and this is the water of life."8

The baptismal formula. We find a shift in the baptismal formula corresponding to the shift in the doctrine of God. At the beginning of this age, the church still baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. For example, The Acts of Paul and Thecla, a second-century work probably written by an unknown Asiatic presbyter, recounts a baptism using the words "in the name of Jesus Christ," apparently echoing contemporary practice. The Shepherd of Hermas was quite popular during this time, with some people even treating it as Scripture, and as we have already seen, it advocates baptism in the name of the Lord.

Around 150, however, Justin recited a threefold baptismal formula: "in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit."9 Significantly, it was not the later trinitarian formula—"in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"—but it specifically included the name of Jesus. By contrast, at the Eucharist, he said the presiding minister gave "praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."10 Apparently, Justin retained the actual name of Jesus in baptism out of deference to the older formula and also because he believed strongly in the power of the

The Greek Apologists

name of Jesus.11

It seems that he wanted to get away from the exclusive emphasis on Jesus because, as we have seen, he did not believe Jesus Christ is the supreme God. Since he viewed the Father alone as the supreme God, no doubt he thought it most important to invoke the Father. He probably included the Holy Spirit also because the only verse of Scripture that could possibly support the invocation of the Father is Matthew 28:19, and it also refers to the Spirit. He did not replace the name of Jesus with the title of

Son, however, perhaps so that his innovation would not be too controversial.

Historians usually cite Justin as the first person to mention a trinitarian formula. As chapter 2 notes, the sole copy of the Didache that we have, dated 1056, mentions both the trinitarian formula and the Jesus Name formula, but the former is probably not original, and historians generally consider Justin to be the oldest reference instead.12 Justin's formula does not offer much support to modern trinitarians, however. Not only is his formula different from theirs, still retaining the older invocation of the name of Jesus, but it was motivated by what trinitarians view as a heretical doctrine of God: subordination of the second person to the first.

The manifestation of the Holy Spirit. In every age, Christians have acknowledged the work of the Holy Spirit as part of salvation, but the controversial question is whether they should expect miraculous signs and manifestations of the Spirit. In this age, believers still expected the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit and acknowledged the spiritual gifts.

Justin wrote, "For the prophetical gifts remain with

A History of Christian Doctrine

us, even to the present time. . . . Now it is possible to see amongst us men and women who possess the gifts of the Spirit of God."13 Celsus, a Greek philosopher of this era who wrote against Christianity, observed that Christians gave prophecies and spoke in tongues, and Origen, a third-century writer who preserved his comment, made no attempt to contradict this observation but accepted the gifts for his day.14

Other Teachings

The Lord's Supper. The Apologists emphasized Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper. A few statements sound as if they could be advancing the later Roman Catholic doctrine that Christ's historical blood and body are physically present in the Eucharist. Since there was no clear definition, discussion, or controversy on this point, however, we cannot be certain.

The last things. These writings continue the earlier teaching of the second coming of Christ. We also find in them the first discussion of the Millennium, outside the Book of Revelation itself. The Apologists apparently believed in a literal thousand-year reign of Christ upon earth after His return (premillennialism).

Holiness of life. Since most of these writings did not
address Christians, they did not have much to say about
how Christians should live. Nevertheless, the authors
embraced and defended a holy lifestyle. They said Christians
should avoid worldly pleasures and practice godliness
in daily life. For instance, Tatian and Theophilus warned
against attending dramas because of their lewd content, and
Tatian objected to the wearing of ornaments. Athenagoras
wrote against abortion and remarriage after divorce.

59

The Greek Apologists

Conclusion

The most important point about the Apologists is that
they presented Christianity as a philosophy. This
approach proved to be dangerous because it introduced
pagan terms and ways of thought to the discussion of
Christian doctrine, leading people to formulate and evaluate
theology more by rationalism and Greek philosophy
than by Scripture itself. Moreover, this approach tended
to reduce Christianity to a moralism rather than a revelation
from God and a relationship with Him.

Instead of presenting Christianity as the revealed
Word and will of God, the Apologists tried to show that it
was a good philosophy and a good moral way of life—in
fact, the best way. Even though this appeal was true as far
as it went, and perhaps was helpful in gaining a hearing
from some pagans, it fell short of presenting the essence
of Christianity, and it sowed troublesome seeds for the
future.

Pagans who were intellectually persuaded by this
argument did not receive an adequate experience and
understanding of Christian realities, and Christians who
adopted this way of thought limited their own experience
and understanding. By accommodating to the language
and thought of their opponents, the Greek Apologists
actually began to inject pagan concepts into the discussion
of Christianity. This method was dangerous, and as
we shall see, it had disastrous consequences for Christian
doctrine.

60

A History of Christian Doctrine

The next period of time that we will discuss covers
several generations, from approximately A.D. 170 to 325.
We use 325 as the end date because it is the date of the
Council of Nicea.

This council marked a significant change in many

ways. It was the first ecumenical council in postbiblical times, meaning that delegates came from all across Christendom. (See chapter 8.) The Nicene Council helped bring about a fusion between church and state, and for several centuries afterward major doctrinal decisions were worked out in various councils.

We will call the period from 170 to 325 the Old Catholic Age. It is "old" in distinction to the Ecumenical Catholic Age, which began with the Council of Nicea and

61

5

The Old Catholic Age

A.D. 170-325

continued with subsequent councils. It is "catholic," not necessarily in reference to the Roman Catholic Church of today, but in the original sense of being universal, because at this time there were no major divisions in Christendom. Various groups classified as heretical had split off from the church, but the mainstream body was not formally divided into different denominations or branches. All the churches generally considered themselves part of the same group, even though there were significant differences from place to place and even though the original apostolic doctrine gradually diminished in the mainstream church.

The Old Catholic Age is characterized by theological discussion and the evolution of doctrine. The Post-Apostolic writers had written on biblical themes, and the Greek Apologists had engaged in some theological reflection, but it was really in the Old Catholic Age that theologians emerged. Various writers and teachers began to develop systems of doctrinal thought, particularly in response to certain heresies or opposing views.

Many doctrines and practices characteristic of the later Roman Catholic Church and the medieval age first made their appearance or first received widespread acceptance during this time. Church leaders and writers began to examine the doctrines of God and of Christ, and while they did not resolve the issues to general satisfaction, they began to hammer out a comprehensive theological system.

As we shall see, many innovations occurred during this age, some of which we will discuss in subsequent chapters. In this age we find the first explicit teaching of the doctrine of the trinity (Tertullian, c. 210); the first

62

mention of infant baptism (denounced by Tertullian); the
construction of the earliest known public church buildings
(c. 230); the first endorsement of baptism by sprinkling
(Cyprian, c. 250); and the first Christian hermits,
who paved the way for monasticism (Anthony, 270).
Despite important doctrinal changes, leading writers
still maintained the earlier emphasis on holiness of life,
affirming many specific standards of conduct and dress.
(See Appendix F.)

As described in chapter 4, Christians endured great
persecution during this age, with empire-wide persecution
beginning in 250 under Emperor Decius and not finally
ending until the agreement between co-emperors Constantine
and Licinius called the Edict of Milan in 313. As a
result of this intense persecution, many people were martyred,
and thousands of others fell away from the church.

In 312 the Donatist Schism occurred over the question of
how to treat people who had apostasized (renounced the
faith) but later repented. (See chapter 11.)

Three Major Schools

To analyze the Old Catholic Age, we will divide it into
three schools of thought classified roughly along geographical
lines. The first school is that of Asia Minor, and
its two main representatives were Irenaeus and Hippolytus.
Both men originated in Asia Minor, although they
conducted their careers elsewhere. Irenaeus moved to
Gaul, where he became the bishop of Lyons (178-200), so
he may reflect more the thinking in the western portion of
Roman Empire. His onetime disciple Hippolytus (170-
235) worked in Rome.

The second school we will discuss is that of North

The Old Catholic Age

Africa, where the primary language was Latin. The foremost
theologian of this area was Tertullian (150-225),
who began writing around 196. He was followed by his
disciple Cyprian. Tertullian never held a prominent official
position in the church—he was just a presbyter (local
minister)—but Cyprian became bishop of Carthage (248-
58) only two years after his baptism. Tertullian and, in the
next age, Augustine were the two most influential shapers
of Western theology.

The third school of thought was based in Alexandria,
Egypt, which was a major center of Hellenistic (Greek)
culture and philosophy. A leading thinker here was

Clement of Alexandria (150-215). After his death he
was eclipsed in significance by his disciple Origen (185-
254), who began writing around 215. These men conducted
a school for converts in Alexandria, and both were
heavily influenced by the prevalent Greek philosophy.
Origen was a prominent teacher and writer, although neither
he nor Clement ever rose above the office of presbyter.
Origen was the single most important molder of
Eastern theology.

The six men we have mentioned did more than anyone
else to shape the doctrines that emerged from their
age. As just noted, however, most of them never held a
prominent position in the church; their influence came
primarily by teaching and writing. In some cases, their
historical influence has been greater than their influence
during their own time.

In fact, some of these men were repudiated by the
church of their day or a significant portion of it. Hippolytus
was a rival to the bishop of Rome. He was defeated in
his efforts to attain that position, so he set up a schismat-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ic church in opposition to Callistus, the recognized bishop.
Interestingly, the Roman Catholic Church considers
Callistus a pope and Hippolytus an antipope, yet because
of his doctrinal teaching it has made Hippolytus a saint.
Tertullian became a member of the Montanists, whom the
church of his day rejected as heretics and excommunicated.
Cyprian led the opposition to Stephen, bishop of
Rome, on the subject of baptism performed by heretics,
holding that it was never valid. Origen was excommunicated
from his own local church by the bishop of Alexandria,
whereupon he moved to Caesarea and continued
teaching there. The Council of Constantinople in 553
declared him heretical.

In addition to these men, there were a number of writers
of lesser significance for the history of doctrine. Writing
in Greek were Novatian, who led a schismatic party
in opposition to the bishop of Rome; Gregory Thaumaturgus,
a student of Origen; Dionysius of Alexandria,
another student of Origen and later bishop; Julius
Africanus, a philosopher, historian, and friend of Origen;
Methodius, a bishop who wrote against Origen; Dionysius
of Rome, a bishop who wrote against the Sabellians;
Archelaus, a bishop who wrote against the Manicheans;
Peter, bishop of Alexandria around 300; and Alexander,

bishop of Alexandria who opposed Arius at the Council of Nicea.

Latin writers included Minucius Felix, a lawyer in Rome, probably of North African origin, who wrote an apology that used almost no Scripture; Arnobius, a teacher of rhetoric in North Africa and another apologist who exhibited little knowledge of Scripture; Commodian, a presbyter or perhaps a bishop in North Africa who

was a modalist; and Lactantius, a student of Arnobius and a prolific, elegant writer who in his old age tutored a son of Emperor Constantine.

There were also a number of minor writers in both Greek and Latin, most of whom are known only from fragments or references in the works of others. Finally, we have various anonymous and pseudonymous works, apocryphal writings (patterned after the Gospels, Acts, and Revelation), and miscellaneous documents.

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons

A tradition says that Irenaeus (died c. 200) was the disciple of Polycarp, who in turn was a disciple of John, but this tradition is dubious. Irenaeus himself simply says of Polycarp: "whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried (on earth) a very long time."1 When he was a small lad Irenaeus probably heard the aged Polycarp preach, but his recollections are not those of a student.

The major work of Irenaeus is Against Heresies (c. 182-88), a lengthy treatise that details and refutes a variety of Gnostic beliefs. Late in life he also wrote Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching. Unfortunately, there is some uncertainty about the original text of both books. Against Heresies survives only in a Latin translation of the Greek original, and Demonstration has come to us in only one manuscript (1265-89) of an Armenian translation (c. 600).

Church historians often consider Irenaeus to be the first true theologian of postbiblical times because, in opposition to Gnosticism and related heresies, he enunciated a comprehensive doctrinal system based on the New Testament. A central feature of his theology is his opposi-

tion to philosophical speculation. Even though his life overlapped the age of the Greek Apologists, he took a radically different approach from them. He did not start

with their Logos doctrine, which owed so much to Greek philosophy, but he started with the Scriptures, and he emphasized the apostolic tradition.

For the most part, he remained close to the Scriptures, but some passages in his work echo Justin. He evidently read Justin's books and perhaps even studied under him, and so was influenced to some extent by the Greek Apologists. Overall, however, we can characterize his theology as biblical and Christocentric (centered around Jesus Christ).

Doctrines of God and of Christ. Irenaeus taught that God is one and that Jesus Christ is truly God and truly man. He also taught a threefold revelation of God as Father, Son (Word), and Holy Spirit (Wisdom).

Many of his statements sound like those of modern Oneness, as when he emphasized that there is only one God, identified the one God as the Father, described the Word as the mind and expression of the Father, described the Son as the visible revelation of the invisible Father, taught that Jesus is God, identified the name of Jesus as belonging to the Father, and spoke of Jesus as Father and Spirit.2 "The Father therefore has revealed Himself to all, by making His Word visible to all. . . . The Father is the invisible of the Son, but the Son the visible of the Father. And for this reason all spake with Christ when He was present (upon earth), and they named Him God."3 He called Jesus "our Father," "Saviour," "the Son and Word of God," and "Spirit."4

On the other hand, Irenaeus followed the Greek

67

The Old Catholic Age

Apologists by equating the Son with the Word (Logos) in terminology. He adopted Justin's interpretation of several Old Testament verses in which God supposedly addressed the Word, and like Theophilus, he said that in Genesis 2:26 God spoke to His Word and Wisdom, or the Son and Spirit.5 It is not clear, however, whether he regarded the Son/Word and Spirit/Wisdom as aspects of God's nature, manifestations, or persons in some sense.

When Irenaeus spoke of the Father, Son, and Spirit, he used the language of manifestation; he did not speak of God's essense or eternal nature. For example, he wrote, "All receive one and the same God the Father, and believe in the same dispensation regarding the incarnation of the Son of God, and are cognizant of the same gift of the Spirit." The universal faith of the church as delivered by the

apostles is belief
in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven,
and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them;
and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became
incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit,
who proclaimed through the prophets the dispensations
of God.6
In summary, Irenaeus associated God's threefold selfrevelation
with dispensations, operations, or activities of
God. Trinitarian scholars generally conclude that he did
not contribute significantly to the development of trinitarian
dogma and that at most he believed in an economic
trinity, which means making trinitarian distinctions with
respect to God's operations in the world rather than His
essence.7

68

A History of Christian Doctrine

From the Oneness viewpoint, Irenaeus stands in
between the biblical doctrine of God and the later doctrine
of the trinity, but closer to the former. He did not
arrive at a halfway point like Justin and the Greek Apologists,
for he did not subordinate Jesus to the Father and
he did not make a clearcut distinction of two persons
(much less three persons).

The saving work of Christ. Like the writers before
Him, Irenaeus affirmed that Jesus Christ was a true man
and that He has redeemed us by His blood. He spoke of
the bread and cup of the Eucharist as the body and blood
of Christ. As with the Greek Apologists, we must not
make too much of this language, since it was still long
before the explicit teaching that the elements of the
Lord's Supper change into the physical body of Christ,
and long before the ensuing controversies on that subject.

Faith, repentance, and water baptism. Irenaeus
taught that faith, repentance, and water baptism are all
essential to salvation. He believed that water baptism is
part of the new birth, and he said of certain heretics,
"This class of men have been instigated by Satan to a
denial of that baptism which is regeneration to God, and
thus to a renunciation of the whole (Christian) faith."8
In this regard, Irenaeus simply enunciated what was
practically the universal teaching of the first five centuries
of Christianity. The leading teachers and writers all
held that water baptism is necessary for salvation—
effecting the washing away, remission, or forgiveness of
sins.

The baptismal formula. Irenaeus reported that some Gnostic heretics baptized with the utterance of the words "Into the name of the unknown Father . . . into Him who

descended on Jesus. . . ."9 In contrast, Irenaeus said, "We are made clean, by means of the sacred water and the invocation of the Lord, from our old transgressions," which indicates that he baptized in the name of Jesus.10 His Demonstration states, however, "We have received baptism for remission of sins in the name of God the Father, and in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who became incarnate and died and was raised, and in the Holy Spirit of God."11

It could be that Irenaeus changed his baptismal formula, or it could be that his standard formula was threefold. It is significant that, like Justin, he continued to use the name of Jesus. He did not use the modern trinitarian formula, and he still deferred to the earlier emphasis and insistence on Jesus' name. Clearly, even when people began modifying the formula, for many years they were careful to retain the name of Jesus.

The manifestation of the Holy Spirit. Not only did Irenaeus emphasize water baptism, but he emphasized receiving the Holy Spirit. He commented upon I Corinthians 6:9-11 and 15:49:

Now he says that the things which save are the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of God. . . . And then, again when (do we bear) the image of the heavenly? Doubtless when he says, "Ye have been washed," believing in the name of the Lord, and receiving His Spirit.12

Moreover, he asserted that speaking in tongues is the sign of a Spirit-filled person. Commenting on I Corinthians 2:6, he wrote:

The perfect man consists in the commingling and the union of the soul receiving the Spirit of the Father. . . . For this reason does the apostle declare, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect," terming those persons "perfect" who have received the Spirit of God, and who through the Spirit of God do speak in all languages, as he used himself also to speak. In like manner we do also hear many brethren in the Church, who possess prophetic gifts, and who through the

Spirit speak all kinds of languages, and bring to light
for the general benefit the hidden things of men, and
declare the mysteries of God, whom also the apostle
terms "spiritual," they being spiritual because they
partake of the Spirit.13

Some people argue that he merely alluded to miracles
he had heard about, but it seems clear that he regarded
tongues as the expected sign of being filled with the Holy
Spirit. He cited various reports simply to demonstrate the
diversity of tongues and prophecies throughout the
worldwide church. He further stated:

Those who are in truth His disciples, receiving
grace from Him, do in His name perform (miracles)
. . . drive out devils . . . see visions . . . utter prophetic
expressions . . . heal the sick by laying their hands
upon them. . . . The dead even have been raised up,
and remained among us for many years. . . . It is not
possible to name the number of the gifts which the
Church, (scattered) throughout the whole world, has
received from God, in the name of Jesus Christ. . . .
Nor does she perform anything by means of angelic

71

The Old Catholic Age

invocations, or by incantations, or by any other
wicked curious art; but, directing her prayers to the
Lord, who made all things, in a pure, sincere, and
straightforward spirit, and calling upon the name of
our Lord Jesus Christ. . . .14

It is evident that all across Christendom people in this
age received the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues. The
exercise of various miraculous, spiritual gifts was common,
expected, encouraged, and normative.

Holiness of life. Irenaeus taught that we should reject
worldly lusts and works of the flesh and instead be filled
with the Spirit. Since his existing works are doctrinal and
polemical, arguing against and refuting heresies, we do
not find a significant discussion of practical lifestyle
issues.

Hippolytus

Hippolytus (died 236) was a pupil of Irenaeus, but he
developed his own distinctive doctrinal views. He moved
to Rome, where he bitterly opposed two successive
Roman bishops, Zephyrinus and Callistus, was excommunicated
by Callistus, and started a rival, schismatic
church. He embraced trinitarianism along the lines of the
earlier teaching of Tertullian, and he vigorously opposed

the modalism of Sabellius. (See chapter 8.) His most important work is The Refutation of All Heresies.

Tertullian

Tertullian was the first major theologian to write in Latin, and he is often called the father of Western theology. A lawyer and teacher of rhetoric, he converted to

A History of Christian Doctrine

Christianity in middle age (c. 195). He soon became a local church presbyter in Carthage, North Africa, and began writing prolifically. We have about forty books of his, including apologies addressed to pagans, writings relating to Christian life and discipline, and doctrinal treatises, often written against heretics. About 207 he joined the Montanists, who had been expelled from the church in 177. He opposed a bishop of Rome in his day, probably Victor, for embracing modalism and rejecting Montanism.

Tertullian emphasized faith over reason and professed to reject philosophy. For instance, with regard to the death and resurrection of the Son of God he wrote, "It is by all means to be believed, because it is absurd. . . . The fact is certain, because it is impossible."15 Nevertheless, he built his theology upon that of the Greek Apologists and was thereby influenced significantly by Greek philosophy. Tertullian interpreted Scripture literally and even materialistically. For example, acknowledging a similarity of belief with the Stoics, he held that every soul has both a spiritual and a bodily substance.

Doctrines of God and Christ. Tertullian was the first Christian writer to call God a trinity (Latin, trinitas) and the first to speak of God as three persons (tres personae) in one substance (una substantia).16 Consequently, church historians generally consider Tertullian to be the father of Christian trinitarianism. "It may be said that he enlarged the doctrine of the Logos into a doctrine of the Trinity. . . . Tertullian was the first to assert clearly the tripersonality of God."17

Interestingly, his form of trinitarianism is not identical to the modern doctrine. Originally, he believed, God

The Old Catholic Age

existed alone as a unitary being. Sometime before the creation of the world, God beget the Word or Son as a distinct person, and thereby God became the Father.18 This second person is not as "noble" or as "powerful" as the Father, for while "the Father is the entire substance

[of the Godhead], the Son is a derivation and portion of the whole."19

He compared the relationship of the Father and the Son to that between the sun and rays from the sun. If we look merely at the rays we can call them the sun, but when we actually think of the sun itself we would not call the rays the sun. Similarly, if we think only of the second person in the Godhead, we can call Him God, but when we think of both the Father and Son together, the Father is the true God and the Son is in a secondary position.20

In teaching that the second divine person had a beginning in time and that this person was subordinate to the Father, he followed the Greek Apologists. Tertullian went beyond them, however, in clearly identifying the Holy Spirit as a third divine person and in emphasizing the trinitarian nature of God. He did not spend much time describing the third person, but he regarded the Spirit as emerging from the Father, remaining subordinate to the Father, and also being subordinate to the Son.21

Tertullian further believed that in the age to come the distinctions in the Godhead would cease. Just as the Son and Spirit originally came out of the Father, so in the end they would be drawn back into the Father.22 Unlike modern trinitarians, then, he did not believe that the persons of the trinity were coequal or coeternal.

He did speak of the three persons as sharing the one divine substance, what modern trinitarians call coessen-

tiality or consubstantiality. Even here, however, he was not completely consistent with later trinitarianism, for he argued that the angels share in the one divine substance much as do the Son and Spirit.23

This comparison shows that Tertullian's concept was a form of tritheism (belief in three gods). In fact, his opponents accused him of tritheism, although he tried to deny the charge by saying he believed in three divine persons but not three gods. The opponents seem more convincing, for in conjunction with his idea that every spirit has a bodily substance, Tertullian indicated that each person of the trinity has his own body.24

By Tertullian's own admission, "the majority of believers" rejected his doctrine of the trinity on the ground that it denied the cardinal Christian doctrine of monotheism (belief in one God) and contradicted the "rule of faith," which was a standard confession of fundamental doctrine

that all Christians made, probably at baptism. Tertullian retorted that his opponents were "simple," as the majority "always" is, insinuated that they were "unwise and unlearned," and stated that they did not understand the "economy" of God in that He is "three in one."25 Tertullian went on to record that his opponents, whom historians call the modalists, affirmed the absolute oneness of God and deity of Jesus Christ.

Tertullian's position seems elitist, reminiscent of the emphasis on the superior, hidden knowledge of the spiritually minded few as taught by the Gnostics and later by Origen, another early champion of the trinity. The majority of believers did not reject his doctrine of the trinity because they were ignorant or because it was too sophisticated for their simple minds, however, but because it

contradicted Scripture, their most ancient confessions of faith, and common sense.

In sum, Tertullian, more than any other person, is the originator of Christian trinitarianism, but his formulation is heretical by modern trinitarian standards. Namely, he denied coeternity, denied coequality, and had problems defining consubstantiality.

In his defense, trinitarian scholars usually say that it is not fair to judge him by the orthodoxy of a later time. In other words, the orthodox creeds and formulas had not yet been framed and adopted; the church was just beginning the process of developing and understanding trinitarianism. But this argument exposes the error of trinitarianism: it concedes that one cannot determine trinitarian orthodoxy by the Scriptures, which, as Protestants affirm, is the sole authority for doctrine. Rather one must trace the historical development of trinitarianism and then judge orthodoxy by various extrabiblical creeds.

Tertullian anticipated the later development of the doctrine of Christ, saying that Christ has two natures, human and divine. They have distinct properties but are united.

Doctrine of humanity (anthropology). In A Treatise on the Soul, Tertullian taught that the body and soul are formed together at conception by the natural process of procreation (the doctrine of traducianism). He opposed the doctrine of reincarnation or transmigration of souls.

He also taught that everyone is born with a nature of

sin inherited from Adam (the doctrine of original sin).
While we are marred by sin, there is still some awareness
of God in us. We are capable of responding to the grace of

God and being born again. We are not individually predestined,
but we have freedom of the will.

Doctrine of salvation. In his treatises On Repentance
and On Baptism, as well as in other works, Tertullian
emphasized the necessity of repentance and the new
birth, which consists of both water and Spirit. He taught
that in water baptism we are born of water, have our sins
washed away, and are prepared for the Holy Spirit. He
reluctantly allowed a second repentance, but no more, for
those who commit major sins after baptism.

Tertullian explained that God's grace has provided
salvation for us and that repentance is a gift from God. He
acknowledged that no one can pardon sin or grant the
Spirit except God, and he held that faith is the means by
which we receive the new birth. He insisted, however, that
saving faith must involve an active response: "'Unless a
man have been reborn of water and Spirit, he shall not
enter into the kingdom of the heavens,' has tied faith to
the necessity of baptism." He defended the proposition
that "without baptism, salvation is attainable by none,"
answering numerous objections.26

While Tertullian affirmed justification by faith, he
described repentance as earning forgiveness. It is the
"satisfaction" or payment God requires in order to forgive
sins at baptism and afterward. This language set the stage
for the later doctrine of penance.

Tertullian counseled that the baptism of children be
deferred till they are old enough to understand its significance.
He described the rituals that a baptismal candidate
underwent in his church, including being immersed three
times, tasting a mixture of milk and honey immediately
after baptism, and refraining from the daily bath for a

whole week after baptism. He admitted that there was no
"positive Scripture injunction" for these rules, even saying
that triple immersion was "a somewhat ampler pledge
than the Lord has appointed in the Gospel," but he
defended them on the basis of "tradition, and custom, and
faith."27 Following his trinitarian theology, Tertullian baptized
in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and

was the first known writer to cite Matthew 28:19 as giving the actual formula to use.

Tertullian believed in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues and the exercise of the spiritual gifts (charismata) of I Corinthians 12. He regarded them as signs of the true church, stating that they were the norm in his day. Writing against the Marcionites, he challenged them to produce such gifts if they were a true church:

The Creator promised the gift of His Spirit in the latter days, and . . . Christ has in these last days appeared as the dispenser of spiritual gifts. . . . Let Marcion then exhibit, as gifts of his god, some prophets, such as have not spoken by human sense, but with the Spirit of God. . . . Let him produce a psalm, a vision, a prayer—only let it be by the Spirit, in an ecstasy, that is, in a rapture, whenever an interpretation of tongues has occurred to him. . . . Now all these signs (of spiritual gifts) are forthcoming from my side without any difficulty.28

Christian living. Tertullian advocated a conservative lifestyle of holiness. The Shows instructs Christians not to attend the theater or other pagan shows and renounces

A History of Christian Doctrine

all killing of humans. On Exhortation to Chastity, On Monogamy, and On Modesty teach against all forms of sexual immorality as well as divorce and remarriage. In addition to its advocacy of fasting, On Fasting advises abstention from alcoholic beverages. On the Apparel of Women warns against immodest or extravagant dress, makeup, hair dye, elaborate hair arrangement, false hair, and ornamental jewelry; Tertullian similarly admonished men not to adorn themselves by these means. On the Veiling of Virgins holds that women should wear a veil, that they should not have close-cut hair, and that men should not have flowing hair. Some try to dismiss these teachings merely as Montanist extremism, but they appear to be characteristic of Christianity generally during this time, as evidenced by the corresponding teachings of Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, and others.

Cyprian

Like Tertullian, Cyprian strongly advocated trinitarianism, the necessity of water baptism as part of the new birth, and a conservative holiness lifestyle, including avoidance of immodest dress, makeup, jewelry, ornamentation,

and theater attendance. He too opposed the bishop of Rome in his day (Stephen), but unlike Tertullian, he became a bishop himself and remained an integral part of the institutional church.

Cyprian's conflict with Stephen occurred over the baptism of heretics. Stephen accepted the prior baptism of people in splinter groups if they later joined the mainstream church, but Cyprian insisted that they be rebaptized. Stephen especially valued baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, no matter who performed it, because of the

power of the name of Jesus. Cyprian rejoined that the Book of Acts taught baptism in the name of Jesus for the Jews only; everyone else must be baptized with the trinitarian formula.

An anonymous treatise on rebaptism from this time, probably written by a bishop opposed to Cyprian, strongly affirmed baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. The author stated that "heretics who are already baptized in water in the name of Jesus Christ must only be baptized with the Holy Spirit." He claimed that his position had the support of "the most ancient custom and ecclesiastical tradition" and "the authority of so many years, and so many churches and apostles and bishops." Moreover, not only heretics, but many people in the church, both "Jews and Gentiles, fully believing as they ought, are in like manner baptized" by "invoking the name of the Lord Jesus."[29]

Cyprian was the earliest advocate of baptism by sprinkling, but he still considered immersion to be the normal practice. He described baptism as a dipping but allowed sprinkling for the sick.[30] He also advocated infant baptism on the ground that all are born in sin.

The controversy between Cyprian and Stephen was significant for the development of ecclesiology, the doctrine concerning the church. Cyprian's view—that heretics must be rebaptized—ultimately prevailed, and so did his rationale, as follows. First, salvation rests in the institutional church, not outside it. Second, the authority of the church is invested in the bishops. Therefore baptism, which is necessary for salvation, is only valid if performed under a recognized bishop of the established church. Cyprian's ecclesiology became the doctrine of the

Roman Catholic Church, with an important qualification:
Roman Catholicism affirms the supremacy of the bishop
of Rome as the universal pope, while Cyprian denied it.
Cyprian acknowledged that the bishop of Rome was the
leading bishop, the first among equals, but denied that he
was the supreme arbiter of doctrine or church discipline.
Clement of Alexandria
The life of Clement of Alexandria (died c. 215) overlapped
with the age of the Greek Apologists, and he followed
in their tradition, relying heavily upon Greek terminology,
philosophy, and speculation and emphasizing
the doctrine of the Logos. Church historians often call
him the first of the "Greek fathers," the prominent theologians
of the Greek-speaking church, and he was
indeed the father of Alexandrian theology. His most
important works are The Exhortation to the Heathen
(for evangelism), The Instructor (for converts), and The
Miscellanies.
A pagan philosopher before his conversion, Clement
became superintendent of a school for new converts. He
stressed the importance of knowledge. In contrast to Tertullian,
he said that to know is greater than to believe, and
he was fond of interpreting Scripture allegorically. Perhaps
the best way to see the tendencies and results of his
theology is to examine the similar theology of Origen, his
more famous disciple and successor as superintendent of
the catechetical school.
Although Clement combined biblical revelation and
philosophical speculation, he still maintained a conservative
biblical lifestyle. Many of his stands on holiness of
life are quite similar to those of revival movements
81
The Old Catholic Age
throughout church history and to the Apostolic Pentecostal
movement of the twentieth century.
In The Instructor, Clement wrote strongly against
attending worldly shows; wearing makeup, hair dye, ornamental
jewelry, immodest clothing, extremely costly
clothing, or clothing associated with the opposite sex;
gluttony; drinking; dancing; and various sins of the
flesh.31 He taught women to let their hair grow freely but
men to cut their hair short.32 In this regard, he agreed
with the teaching of the New Testament, the early postapostolic
church, and contemporaries such as Tertullian.
Origen
Origen (died 254) is the chief representative of the

school of Alexandria. He spoke of Christianity as the
highest philosophy and stated that his purpose was to
synthesize, or blend together, the Bible and Greek philosophy.
Like Clement, he followed in the tradition of the
Greek Apologists, but he went further than they did. He
was a prolific writer whose major extant works are On
First Principles (his foremost doctrinal treatise),
Against Celsus (apology in response to a pagan attack),
and Commentaries (we have much of the material on
Matthew and John).

Origen's Commentary on John is the first significant
work of biblical exegesis (critical explanation and analysis).
Unfortunately, he and the entire school of Alexandria
were characterized by allegorical exegesis of Scripture.
That is, instead of simply reading Scripture according to
the ordinary and apparent meaning of its words and their
grammatical-historical definition, he typically sought for
a hidden, deeper, "spiritual" meaning. He was not content

to extract principles and make relevant applications from
biblical stories and parables, but he tried to make every
historical account and parable teach deep doctrinal truths
that are not apparent from the biblical context. Moreover,
he often denied the literal meaning.

As an example, Origen doubted that the story of
Christ's purging of the Temple was "real history." Instead,
the significance of the story is that the words of Jesus will
drive away "earthly and senseless and dangerous" tendencies
in "the natural temple," which is "the soul skilled in
reason." The money in the story represents "things that
are thought good but are not," while the sacrificial animals
are "symbolic of earthly things" (oxen), "senseless
and brutal things" (sheep), and "empty and unstable
thoughts" (doves).33

Obviously, someone who uses the allegorical method
can support any doctrine he wishes, for his interpretation
is not tied to the objective meaning of Scripture. Instead
of laying aside presuppositions and asking what the Bible
says to us, he approaches the Bible with his preexisting
beliefs and tries to find them in hidden parallels and
codes. Instead of bringing meaning out of Scripture, he
tries to put meaning into Scripture.

Origen's allegorical method of interpretation
stemmed from his view, shared by the Gnostics and
Clement of Alexandria, that knowledge is superior to

faith. Consequently, many historians have described
Clement and Origen's doctrine as a form of Christian
Gnosticism. Origen's views and emphases were similar to
those of the Gnostics in many ways, but he retained
enough basic Christian elements to be acceptable to
many.

Doctrines of God and of Christ. Although Tertullian
emphasized faith over reason while Origen emphasized
reason over faith, and although the former interpreted
Scripture literally while the latter did so allegorically, on
the doctrine of God both succumbed to the strong influence
of Greek philosophy and the Greek Apologists. Like
Tertullian before him, Origen taught that God is a trinity
of persons (Greek, hypostases) and that the Holy Spirit is
a third divine person.34 While he sometimes spoke of the
members of the trinity as being equal, he actually subordinated
the second person to the first and the third person
to the first and second.35 Tertullian in the West and
Origen in the East were the first and foremost champions
of trinitarianism in ancient Christendom, and both were
vital to its development and acceptance.

Origen introduced two related concepts that were
crucial to the progressive formulation of trinitarianism:
the doctrine of the eternal Son and the doctrine of the
eternal generation of the Son.36 The Apologists and Tertullian
had identified Father and Son as two persons, but
they taught that the Son was begotten at a certain time
before creation. Origen reasoned that if the Son is truly
God, He must be eternal, coeternal with the Father.
Consequently, the Son's begetting could not refer to a
point in time, but to an eternal process, to an eternal relationship
with the Father. There was never a time when He
was not. He has always been, and is always being, begotten
(generated) by the Father.

By these doctrines, Origen also moved towards the
later trinitarian doctrine of coequality of the Father and
the Son. He established equality in time, but He still
spoke of the Son as deriving His substance from the

Father, indicating a subordination of origin or existence.
Some statements of Origen seem to indicate that the two
persons are of the same substance, but to avoid modalism
he made a difference. For example, he said the Son "is a

separate being and has a separate essence of His own," is
"a second God," was "created" by the Father, is "inferior"
to the Father, and is not "the Most High God."37 Interestingly,
at the Council of Nicea, both those who said the Son
was inferior to the Father and those who said the Son was
equal to the Father, quoted Origen in support of their
position.

Origen taught that Christ has two natures, divine and
human, that are united. The divine nature is dominant and
deifies the humanity.

Doctrine of man (anthropology). Origen believed
that human souls were preexistent spirits who fell into sin
and consequently were placed in bodies of flesh. Actually,
then, our life is a kind of reincarnation. Here we see the
Greek philosophical influence and the kinship to Gnosticism.

Doctrine of salvation (soteriology). Origen believed
that Christ's atonement was real, and he spoke of Christ
as our propitiation before God, our redemption, and our
righteousness. He described Christ's death as a ransom to
the devil, which the devil could not keep. He extended
Christ's work of redemption to the angels and to the age
to come.

Origen said that the apostles preached the message of
redemption clearly in order to save people, most of whom
are somewhat dull spiritually, but the more zealous Christians
should seek the hidden meaning behind these statements
and attain true spiritual wisdom. The vast majority
85

The Old Catholic Age

of Christians know only Jesus Christ and Him crucified,
the Word (Logos) made flesh, and so are saved by faith in
Him. However, there is a higher way of salvation: receiving
the eternal Word, having faith in the eternal Reason
(Logos) that was with God and was God before the Incarnation.
38 In its truest form, then, Christianity proclaims
wisdom and reason as the way of salvation rather than
simple faith and redemption. Again, we hear an echo of
Gnosticism.

Origen taught repentance and water baptism for the
forgiveness of sins, and he advocated infant baptism. He
held that forgiveness was available after baptism if a person
would repent. Like Tertullian, he used the trinitarian
baptismal formula, invoking the Father, Son, and Holy
Spirit.

Doctrine of the last things (eschatology). Origen
spiritualized heaven and hell, regarding them not as

places but as conditions. He taught the ultimate salvation of everyone (universalism). Following Plato, he said every soul would undergo a time of purging. After this process, all sinners, including the devil, would ultimately be saved.

A History of Christian Doctrine

We call the period from A.D. 325 to 787 "ecumenical" because it was characterized by seven major church councils that formulated doctrine. It is "catholic" because Christendom still perceived itself as a whole, without official divisions such as denominations. In this age, especially in the fourth and fifth centuries, most of the distinctive doctrines and practices of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy developed. We can particularly identify major developments in five crucial areas.

1. Theology. Important controversies raged over the doctrines of God, Christ, human nature, and salvation, resulting in official formulations that define "orthodoxy." To this day, the three main branches of traditional Christendom—Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and

6

The Ecumenical
Catholic Age
A.D. 325-787

Protestantism—appeal to these creeds, especially those concerning God and Christ. The sacramental system of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy also began to take shape during this time. The canon of Scripture, while already recognized and used from the earliest times, was officially endorsed near the beginning of the age.

2. Ecclesiology. The church offices and hierarchical structure of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy developed in this age. In the West, the bishop of Rome successfully asserted supremacy as the pope.

3. Monasticism. The first Christian hermits had appeared in the Old Catholic Age, but in this age monasteries, the monastic way of life, and orders of monks and nuns became an integral part of Christendom.

4. Blending of pagan and Christian elements. With the wholesale "conversion" of pagans to Christianity under social, political, and legal pressure, as well as outright force, it was inevitable that pagan practices would infiltrate the church. Indeed, many superstitious, nonbiblical elements became standard during this time, establishing the pattern for medieval Catholicism.

5. Distinction between East and West. The eastern and western wings of Christendom had different languages (Greek and Latin, respectively), liturgies, and theological approaches. To some extent these differences were significant even in the Old Catholic Age, but with the fall of the Western Roman Empire and the establishment of the papacy, which the East never accepted, they became more pronounced. While the official split between Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy did not occur until 1054, their separate courses were set during this age.

A History of Christian Doctrine

This chapter presents an overview of the Ecumenical Catholic Age, while chapters 7-13 explore in greater detail the significant areas of development just identified.

Constantine and His Successors

The fourth century brought earthshaking changes to Christianity. The catalyst was Constantine I (the Great), the first Roman emperor to become a Christian.

The account of the conversion of Constantine has come to us in several versions, but the story focuses on the decisive battle in October 312 at Milvian Bridge near Rome in which he defeated Maxentius, his major rival to the imperial throne. Constantine's biographer, Eusebius, related the following account, taken from the emperor himself.

The day before the battle, Constantine appealed to the God of the Christians to give him victory over the pagan Maxentius. In response, God gave him and his army a vision of a shining cross in the sky with the inscription, "In this (sign) conquer." That night, Christ reportedly appeared to him in a dream and instructed him to make a standard in the form of a cross under which to fight. The account of Lactantius, tutor of the emperor's oldest son, makes no mention of a vision but says Constantine was instructed in a dream to place the sign of the cross on the shields of his soldiers.

In any case, Constantine won the battle; his opponent, Maxentius, drowned in the Tiber River. As a result, Constantine and Licinius, his brother-in-law, became coemperors, Constantine ruling in the West and Licinius in the East.

Encouraging a sinful ruler to massive bloodshed for

The Ecumenical Catholic Age

personal advancement instead of calling him to repentance does not sound like something the gentle, peacemaking Christ of the Gospels would do. Nor does Constantine's conversion resemble those in the Book of Acts, for it lacked repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, Constantine did not publicly embrace Christianity until 324, and he was not baptized until he was on his deathbed in 337. He delayed on the theory that he could continue his sinful lifestyle and then receive complete remission of sins in the end.

Historians generally conclude that, whatever personal experiences or beliefs he may have had, Constantine shrewdly perceived that paganism was dying, that Christianity was the wave of the future, and that he could use the latter as a means of consolidating his political power and unifying his diverse realm. He and his successors seized control of the church's hierarchy, appointed and deposed bishops, convened councils, dictated church decisions on a variety of matters, and banished dissenters.

In January 313, Constantine and Licinius held a summit in the northern Italian city of Milan. They reached an agreement, called the Edict of Milan, that guaranteed full religious freedom to Christians, like that afforded to adherents of other religions. This concordat marked the end of the persecutions, the most severe of which had occurred not long before, in 303-4 under the emperors Diocletian and Galerius.

In 324 Constantine defeated Licinius in battle, becoming sole emperor. Despite his solemn pledge not to do so, in 325 he had Licinius executed. In 326 he arranged the murder of two presumed rivals: Licinianus, his eleven-

year-old nephew and the son of Licinius, and Crispus, his own eldest son. There is considerable suspicion that he was also responsible for the death of his second wife, Fausta, in the same year.

In the meantime, Constantine realized that a great controversy over the deity of Jesus Christ threatened to divide his newly won empire, and in 325 he convened the first ecumenical council to resolve this problem. It met in Nicea, a crossroads in Bithynia (northwest Asia Minor), twenty miles from the imperial residence in Nicomedia. Constantine paid the expenses of the delegates and opened the council as the honorary presiding officer.

The Council of Nicea is a milestone of church history

for several reasons. (1) It was the first, but not final, official step in the formulation of orthodox trinitarianism. (2) It marked the beginning of the use of ecumenical councils to resolve doctrinal disputes. (3) To a great extent it helped effect the merger of church and state.

With regard to the last point, the Roman emperor powerfully influenced the decision of the council. Afterwards, he pronounced its decrees to be divinely inspired, promulgated them as laws of the empire, and made disobedience punishable by death. For the first time a political ruler convened an ecclesiastical council, became a decisive factor in determining doctrine, and instituted a church creed. For the first time Christendom adopted a creed other than Scripture and made subscription to it mandatory. And for the first time the state inflicted civil penalties on people who did not conform to church dogma.

When Constantine died in 337, his three sons divided the empire among them, but they soon began warring for

The Ecumenical Catholic Age

supremacy. After Constantine II and Constans were slain, Constantius became emperor. He began persecuting pagans and prohibiting their sacrifices, but he was not successful in stamping out paganism. His successor, Julian the Apostate, tried to reinstitute paganism and suppress Christianity. Upon his death, there came a series of Christian emperors. In 381, Theodosius I (the Great) made Christianity the official state religion; he outlawed all pagan practices and was largely successful in suppressing them. Christianity—but not the apostolic doctrine— reigned supreme. Greek and Roman paganism was completely dead by about 500.

By the fifth century, however, the Western Roman Empire was coming under great threat from invading barbarian tribes. In 410 Alaric and his army of Visigoths sacked Rome for the first time. Although they soon left, the city never recovered its power and prestige. In 451 Attila and his Huns invaded Italy, but he overextended himself. The emperor sent Pope Leo I with two other delegates to meet him at the gates of Rome, and they persuaded him to spare the city. The Vandals under Gaiseric sacked Rome in 455. The traditionally cited end of the Western Roman Empire came in 476, when a group of Germanic tribes led by the Herul chieftan Odovacar (Odoacer) conquered Rome. He deposed the last Western

emperor, Romulus Augustulus, and became the first barbarian king of Italy.

In 330 Constantine had established "New Rome," or Constantinople, as his capital. It was the site of an old Greek colony named Byzantium (now Istanbul, Turkey) on the west side of the strategic Bosporus Strait that separates Europe from Asia. When Rome fell, the Eastern

A History of Christian Doctrine

Roman Empire, subsequently known as the Byzantine Empire, continued on with its seat at Constantinople. The Byzantine emperor Justinian I (the Great) reconquered much of the territory of the old Roman Empire for a time, and in 529 he promulgated the famous Justinian Code, a compilation and revision of Roman law. The Byzantine Empire was a blend of Roman government, Greek culture, and Eastern Orthodox religion. It survived until its conquest by the Ottoman Turks in 1453.

The Further Spread of Christianity

Christianity had already spread throughout the Roman Empire before this age, and during this era it extended to European peoples living outside or invading the Roman Empire. In the second and third centuries it had reached the Gauls, Britons, and Germans, but the fall of the Western Roman Empire slowed its advance and even reversed it in some areas. In the sixth century, Christianity resumed its great expansion.

In the fourth century, Ulfilas, a bishop, spread Arian Christianity to the Goths, inventing the Gothic alphabet for evangelistic purposes and translating the Bible into Gothic. The Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Burgundians, Vandals, and other barbarian tribes quickly embraced this variation of Christianity. For a time, their military and political ascendancy posed a great threat to trinitarianism. In 496 the Franks under Clovis converted en masse to mainstream Christianity, and this example, along with various politicial circumstances, ultimately led the Germanic tribes that had embraced Arianism to convert to trinitarian Christianity.

In 432 Patrick, a native of Britain, went to Ireland as a

The Ecumenical Catholic Age

missionary and eventually converted the entire country. Around the same time pagan Germanic tribes invaded Britain. In 597, Pope Gregory I sent Augustine (not the famous theologian) to convert these Anglo-Saxons who

now inhabited England. He became the first archbishop of Canterbury, and in 663 the Synod of Whitby decisively aligned the English church with Rome.

Many Germanic peoples remained pagan for centuries, but various missionaries gradually advanced Christendom among them. The most noted missionary to Germany was Boniface, an Anglo-Saxon who began his work in 716. By the end of the eighth century most of the Germans, and most Europeans, were Christians, at least in name. The Slavs, including Russians, were the major exception; their Christianization did not come until the tenth century.

Major Schools and Writers

We can classify the major theological writers of the Ecumenical Catholic Age under three schools of thought: the Antiochene, the Alexandrian, and the Western.

1. The Antiochene School

Ephraem the Syrian (died 387) lived as a hermit in a cavern near the city of Edessa. Ordained a deacon, he refused the position of bishop. He wrote commentaries, sermons, and hymns in Aramaic.

John Chrysostom (345-407) was patriarch of Constantinople. Posterity gave him his surname meaning "golden-mouthed" because of his great oratorical ability. He is noteworthy for his expository, exegetical sermons and his advocacy of a conservative lifestyle of holiness in a worldly church age.

94

A History of Christian Doctrine

Theodore of Mopsuestia (died 429), a bishop, was the outstanding theologian of this school. He emphasized the distinction between Christ's deity and humanity, thus setting the stage for the great Christological controversy between Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria.

Theodoret (390-457), bishop of Cyrus, held a moderate Christological view similar to that of Theodore of Mopsuestia. He was condemned by the Council of Ephesus but exonerated by the Council of Chalcedon on the condition that he denounce Nestorius. He was also a church historian.

Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople (428-31), further advanced the Antiochene emphasis on Christ's two natures. He was condemned by the Council of Ephesus and banished on the ground that his doctrine divided Christ into two persons.

2. The Alexandrian School

Athanasius (295?-373), bishop of Alexandria, was the leader of the victorious party at the Council of Nicea and the foremost champion of orthodox trinitarianism. In the long struggles after Nicea over the doctrine of God, Athanasius received aid from three prominent theologians of Cappadocia: Basil of Caesarea (329-79), a bishop; Gregory of Nyssa (335-94), a bishop and the younger brother of Basil; and Gregory of Nazianzus (330-90), their friend, who served a short time as bishop of Constantinople. Using Greek philosophical concepts, these "Cappadocian Fathers" refined trinitarianism and made it broadly acceptable. Basil founded a monastery in 358, laying the foundation for such communities in the future.

Cyril of Alexandria (375-444), bishop, emphasized

the union of Christ's humanity and deity to the point that the humanity became abstract. He bitterly attacked Nestorius, and by unscrupulous, vicious, and even violent means he succeeded in discrediting and defeating his opponent.

Eutyches, a presbyter and abbot of a monastery in Constantinople, further stressed the Alexandrian concept of Christ's unified divine-human nature and indicated that His humanity became deified. He was condemned and deposed in 448 for teaching that Christ had only one nature (monophysitism).

3. The Western School

Hilary (315-67), bishop of Poitiers, was a strong defender of trinitarianism.

Ambrose (340-97), bishop of Milan and another important advocate of trinitarianism, was the imperial president of upper Italy when he was elected bishop by popular demand. He did not want the position, and in fact he had not yet been baptized. Submitting to the will of the people, however, he was baptized and eight days later consecrated as bishop. In 390 he defied Emperor Theodosius by refusing to serve him communion after he brutally killed thousands in Thessalonica. This action established a precedent of religious leaders asserting moral authority over civil rulers.

Jerome (340-420), a scholar and ascetic in Rome, is best known for his tranlation of the Bible into Latin, the Vulgate (405). It became the standard Western Bible for over a thousand years, and the Roman Catholic Church

regards the translation itself as inspired and authoritative.
Jerome was a strong advocate of monasticism.

Augustine (354-430), bishop of Hippo Regius in

A History of Christian Doctrine

North Africa, is the single most significant theologian of
ancient times. After living an immoral life as a young
man, he embraced Manicheism (a popular dualistic religion),
then Neo-Platonism (revived Greek philosophy),
and finally Christianity, converting in 386 and being baptized
by Ambrose in 387. He became a prolific writer and
crafted an original systematic theology that owes much to
the thought and method of Plato.

While Tertullian was the first Latin theologian, Augustine
is more properly considered the father of Western
theology, because many of his doctrinal formulations
became the authoritative, established orthodoxy in the
West. Roman Catholicism particularly follows his teachings
on the church and the sacraments (especially water
baptism), while the Protestant Reformers, notably Luther
and Calvin, adopted his views on sin, grace, and predestination.
Both Catholics and Protestants embrace his conception
of the trinity.

Leo I (the Great) (pope, 440-61) was the first bishop
of Rome to claim full papal powers and to receive
endorsement of his claims from the emperor. He was
influential in resolving the controversy over the doctrine
of Christ.

4. Other Writers

Eusebius of Caesarea (265-340), a bishop, is sometimes
called the father of church history because he was
the first writer to attempt a thorough history of Christianity,
in his Ecclesiastical History. A close associate of
Constantine, he wrote Life of Constantine, a onesided,
flattering, and even fawning biography of the emperor.

"Dionysius the Areopagite" (c. 500) was the pseudonym
of a Syrian monk who authored a number of mystical,

The Ecumenical Catholic Age

neo-Platonic works. They were extremely influential
because, until the fifteenth century, most people believed
they were written by Paul's convert in Athens of this name
(Acts 17:34).

Boethius (480-525), a Roman, blended Christianity
and philosophy, teaching salvation by Neo-Platonism. In
the Middle Ages, his writings were a major source of classical

philosophy and thus highly influential.

Benedict (480-549) founded a monastery at Monte Cassino and the Benedictine order of monks. His Rule, written in 540, sets forth principles and directives for monastic life, and it became the standard in the West on such matters.

Gregory I (the Great) (pope, 590-604) was the first bishop of Rome to exercise the full powers of the papacy. He endorsed and popularized many practices and beliefs of relatively recent development, setting the pattern in the West for the next five hundred years. He is a transitional figure, belonging more to the Early Middle Ages than to the ancient age.

Maximus the Confessor (580-662) was a monk who championed the doctrine of two wills in Christ, which ultimately prevailed at the Council of Constantinople in 680. He was exiled and persecuted for his teaching, reportedly by having his tongue and right hand cut off; hence the title of Confessor. He is sometimes called the father of Byzantine theology.

John of Damascus (675-754) represents the developed theology of the East, much as Augustine does in the West. The last of the ancient Greek theologians, he systematized and epitomized Eastern thought.

Other writers during this time include Didymus of

98

A History of Christian Doctrine

Alexandria, a blind man who followed Origen's theology and was the last significant teacher of the catechetical school; Cyril of Jerusalem, a bishop who defended trinitarianism against the Arians; Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, Cyprus, who specialized in identifying heresies and who vigorously opposed Origen's theology; the Greek church historians Socrates, Sozomen, Evagrius, and Theodorus Lector; and the Latin church historians Rufinus and Cassiodorus.

The Seven Ecumenical Councils

Let us briefly identify the seven great councils that define this age. They are called ecumenical because both Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy accept them as valid. Protestants generally accept all but the last, but consider only the first four to be of prime significance.

The councils were all convened by the authority of the state and were all held in the East. Only a minority of bishops could attend any given council. The Greek-speaking church was overrepresented and usually dominant,

but in some cases Western delegates played decisive
roles.

1. Nicea I, 325, was convened by Constantine I, near
the imperial residence at Nicomedia. It affirmed that
Christ is God and that the Father and the Son are of the
same substance, condemning the Arian view that Christ is
a lesser divine being. By implication it partially endorsed
the trinitarian views of Athanasius, spokesman of the winning
party, who taught that the Father and Son were distinct
but equal persons in the Godhead.

2. Constantinople I, 381, summoned by Theodosius
I, condemned Apollinarianism, the view that Christ's

99

The Ecumenical Catholic Age

humanity was incomplete, and it affirmed the deity and
distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. In doing so, it gave
final approval to the Athanasian, Cappadocian doctrine of
the trinity: the belief that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit
are three coequal, coeternal, consubstantial persons in
one Godhead.

3. Ephesus, 431, called by Theodosius II and dominated
by Cyril of Alexandria, condemned the views of
Nestorius, concluding that his emphasis on the two
natures of Christ wrongly divided Christ into two persons.

4. Chalcedon, 451, was held near Constantinople.
Summoned by the Eastern emperor Marcian at the
prompting of Pope Leo I, this council formulated what
became the orthodox expression of Christology: Christ
has two natures, divine and human, but is only one person.
It condemned both Nestorius and Eutyches.

5. Constantinople II, 553, convened by Justinian,
condemned the view that Christ had only one nature
(monophysitism).

6. Constantinople III, 680, under Constantine Progonatus,
condemned the doctrine that Christ had only one
will (monotheletism).

7. Nicea II, 787, under Empress Irene, endorsed the
worship of images. Technically, it said the worship given
to images is honor but not devotion.

In the next few chapters, we will turn to a more
detailed investigation of the development of Christian
doctrine. To do so, we will examine individual topics, in
some cases stretching back to the Old Catholic Age and
even before to trace various ideas, controversies, and
decisions on the major subjects.

100

The canon is the list of books accepted as Scripture, the books inspired by God. Jesus and the apostles accepted the Hebrew Scriptures, our Old Testament, as the Word of God. After the founding of the church on the Day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit inspired the apostles and their associates to write our New Testament. It is apparent that the early church accepted these writings as inspired as soon as they were written.

The early post-apostolic writers quoted both Old and New Testament books as the authoritative Word of God. At first, they did not attempt to justify their use of various books, but as time went on, they recognized a need to establish exactly which ones they should consider as Scripture. Several factors motivated them to a consideration of the canon.

101

7

The Canon of
Scripture

First and most pressing, some people, particularly those in heretical movements, began to challenge generally accepted views of what constituted Scripture. Some heretical groups, particularly the Gnostics, began to propose books of their own to include in Scripture. Other groups, particularly the Marcionites, began to reject portions of Scripture that had already been accepted historically. Spurious books, which falsely claimed apostolic authorship, also began to circulate.

Second, the church began to recognize its need to ensure the use of appropriate literature for doctrinal instruction, for combating false doctrines, and for evangelism.

Third, in times of persecution, pagan authorities strove to confiscate and destroy Scripture. Books were precious because they had to be copied by hand, and a local congregation often had only one copy of the Bible. Christians went to great lengths, even risking their lives, to protect copies of Scripture on behalf of the church. Those who handed over portions of Scripture to the authorities, even under duress, were considered traitors. Thus early Christians needed to know beyond doubt which books were worth preserving at all costs.

The canon was actually recognized from the earliest times at the grass roots. There was a near-universal acceptance of the books of Scripture in the local churches at various places all across Christianity. We should not

look primarily to formal lists or councils as the definers of the Scripture, for they simply ratified what had been the accepted practice for many years. From the earliest times, local churches and pastors used these books as Scripture.

A History of Christian Doctrine

The Old Testament

With respect to the Old Testament, the post-apostolic writers had clear guidance. They accepted the books that the Jews had historically deemed to be the Word of God. (See Romans 3:1-2.) In this they followed the example of Jesus and the writers of the New Testament, who used the Old Testament to establish their teaching without giving any indication that their Scriptures were any different from what the Jews universally accepted.

The New Testament definitely quotes as Scripture, or otherwise alludes to as authoritative, twenty-nine of our thirty-nine Old Testament books, or using the Hebrew enumeration, nineteen of twenty-four books. Of the remaining five Hebrew books, Ezra-Nehemiah and Ecclesiastes are possibly quoted or alluded to, and Lamentations was sometimes appended to Jeremiah, which is quoted. Only Esther and Song of Solomon definitely have no mention, and this means only that the New Testament authors had no occasion to use them for the specific purposes of their writings.[1]

Melito, bishop of Sardis about A.D. 170, produced the earliest Christian list of the Old Testament that we have, and it includes every book but Esther. Another list from about the same time or a little later (MS 54, published by Bryennios) lists all the books including Esther. The next list was drawn up by Origen, in the early third century, and his was identical to the Hebrew Bible except for an addition to Esther.[2]

Some Christian groups accepted as canonical or semicanonical a number of Jewish writings dating from about 200 B.C. to 30 B.C. and one from about A.D. 100. They are commonly called the Apocrypha. Some are additions to

103

The Canon of Scripture

biblical books. At the Council of Trent in 1546, the Roman Catholic Church officially accepted eleven of them as Scripture. The Protestants reject them as canonical.

Some writers in early Christendom, notably Tertullian and Augustine, gave full or partial endorsement to at least

some of the Apocrypha. Under the influence of Augustine, regional councils in North Africa in the late fourth and early fifth centuries endorsed the Apocrypha. Other writers, such as Origen and Athanasius, did not regard them as Scripture. Some did not deem them canonical but used them for study and preaching. Jerome, translator of the Vulgate (Latin Bible), insisted strongly that they were not the Word of God.

There are many reasons why the church as a whole did not accept these writings.3 (1) The Jews never accepted them. (2) They were writen after Malachi, the last of the inspired prophets of the Old Testament. (3) The authors were unknown men who did not claim inspiration, and some of the books falsely claim authorship by biblical men who lived long before they were composed. (4) Neither Jesus nor the New Testament writers ever quoted them or referred to them as Scripture. (5) They contain doctrinal errors, such as prayer for the dead, salvation by works, almsgiving as atonement for sins, and the preexistence of souls. (6) They contain inferior moral teaching, such as extolling the drinking of wine, commendation of suicide in some instances, and justification of seduction and deceit for a worthy cause. (7) They contain historical, chronological, and geographical errors. (8) They contain many fanciful passages.

To summarize, the books that received universal or near-universal acceptance as part of the Old Testament

104

A History of Christian Doctrine

are the same books that the Jews historically recognized and the same books that Protestants recognize today.

The New Testament

Turning to the New Testament, the post-apostolic church accepted as inspired the books that came with apostolic authority—written either by the apostles themselves or by associates who received apostolic approval of their writings. The early Christians realized that the apostles had unique authority as eyewitnesses and as people specifically commissioned by Jesus for this purpose.4 Christians of the first century had special qualifications for recognizing the canon, for they had personally received sound doctrine from the apostles and were personally acquainted with the writers of the New Testament. They had the unique ability to judge the authenticity and validity of the books in circulation at that time.

F. F. Bruce identified five criteria used in the early centuries of the Christian era to recognize which books God had inspired: apostolic authority, antiquity (age), orthodoxy (doctrinal correctness), catholicity (universal use), and traditional use.5 Antiquity and orthodoxy were subsidiary criteria to help determine apostolic authority.

The New Testament itself contains evidence of the reading, circulation, collecting, and quoting of inspired writings. The epistles of Paul were read to believers and circulated among the churches (I Corinthians 1:2; Colossians 4:16; I Thessalonians 5:27). John intended for Revelation to be read generally (Revelation 1:3). Paul quoted from Luke's Gospel (Luke 10:7; I Timothy 5:18). Peter recognized all of Paul's epistles as Scripture (II Peter

105

The Canon of Scripture

3:15-16). Jude apparently quoted Peter (II Peter 3:2-3; Jude 17-18).

The post-apostolic authors quoted extensively from New Testament books, relying upon them as scriptural authority. When we examine the writings of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius, Hermas, Pseudo-Barnabas, Papias, and the anonymous authors of the Didache and the Epistle to Diognetus, we find that from about A.D. 95-150 early Christian writers definitely quoted from twentythree New Testament books. These include all except four very short books—Philemon, II and III John, and Jude—and there are possible references to all of these but III John. Near the end of the second century, Irenaeus quoted from all the books except Philemon and III John.6

The earliest canonical list we have is the Muratorian Fragment (c. 170). It refers to at least twenty-two of the New Testament books and probably twenty-three.7 It does not list Hebrews, James, I Peter, and II Peter, but this could be due to a break in the manuscript. Looking to the earliest translations of Scripture, the Old Latin Version, translated about 200, included every book but the four just named. The Old Syriac Version, in circulation around 400 but based on a text from about 200, included every book but II Peter, II and III John, Jude, and Revelation.

In short, by about 150 we find numerous quotations representing every book of New Testament except one to four short personal letters. By about 200 we have clear post-apostolic witnesses to every book of the New Testament. In the early third century Origen referred to all twenty-seven books, identifying a few as disputed. In the early

fourth century Eusebius listed all twenty-seven books

with similar comments. Athanasius in 367 is the first known writer to list our New Testament canon exactly and without any qualification. Regional councils at Hippo (393) and Carthage (397 and 419) in North Africa, under the influence of Augustine, confirmed the same list.

It is important to note that these councils simply ratified what grass-roots believers as a whole had practiced for centuries:

The decisions of church councils in the fourth and fifth centuries did not determine the canon, nor did they even first discover or recognize it. In no sense was the authority of the canonical books contingent upon the later church councils. All those councils did was to give later, broader, and final recognition to what was already a fact, namely, that God had inspired them and that the people of God had accepted them in the first century.8

Twenty of our New Testament books were never seriously questioned or disputed. They are the four Gospels, Acts, the thirteen Pauline Epistles, I Peter, and I John. We have clear evidence from the earliest post-apostolic times that those who knew the apostles personally and heard their teaching accepted these books. These twenty books comprise seven-eighths of the New Testament text and teach in full all the New Testament doctrines. There was some question or opposition from various quarters about the remaining seven books—Hebrews, James, II Peter, II John, III John, Jude, and Revelation.9

Hebrews does not bear the name of its author, and for that reason some people were reluctant to accept it.

Gradually that opposition was overcome on the basis of Alexandrian tradition, which said Paul was the author. Modern scholars generally say that Paul was not the author because the style of Hebrews is significantly different from that of the thirteen epistles bearing Paul's name. They acknowledge, however, that its themes are so similar to those of Paul's writings that the author must have been a colleague or co-worker of Paul. This explanation would account for the book's acceptance from the earliest times as bearing Paul's authority and yet its stylistic differences from Paul.

Some questioned the Epistle of James because of its emphasis on works, thinking it contradicted the doctrine of justification by faith as expressed particularly in Paul's letters. Rightly understood, however, there is no contradiction, but a harmony. The Bible clearly teaches salvation by grace through faith. The Book of James simply stresses that when the Bible talks about genuine faith, it does not speak of mere mental assent or verbal profession; rather it requires an active, obedient faith that has a visible effect in our lives. The only way to demonstrate faith and show its validity is by works.

Some people questioned the authenticity of II Peter because of differences in style from I Peter. Probably the simplest way to explain the discrepancy is to note that a scribe named Silvanus recorded the first epistle (I Peter 5:12). It is likely that Peter dictated I Peter, that Silvanus smoothed out the grammar and offered elegant phraseology, and that Peter approved the final result. By contrast, Peter evidently wrote II Peter in his own hand without assistance.

II and III John were also questioned as to their gen-

A History of Christian Doctrine

uineness. They are both very small letters and were originally sent to individuals, so it is easy to see why they did not have a widespread circulation at first. After John's death at the close of the first century, people in the vicinity of the original readers probably began to realize the importance of what they had and began to distribute them more widely. As other churches began to receive them, some asked, If these letters are authentic, why have we not seen them before now? The strong similarity to the Gospel of John and I John in style and content ultimately resolved this question in favor of John's authorship.

Jude raised some questions by its citation of Enoch. The quote appears in an apocryphal book called I Enoch, and the question arose as to whether Jude thereby endorses a spurious book. But both I Enoch and Jude may have obtained this information from a common, more ancient source. If Jude indeed quotes from I Enoch, it simply recognizes that the book preserves an accurate tradition or records a truthful prophecy. This use does not necessarily mean an endorsement of all I Enoch's contents.

Finally, some objected to the Book of Revelation. Actually Revelation was one of the earliest books to be cited as Scripture. The most serious objections came in

the third century from people who resisted its doctrine of the Millennium. They felt that this teaching gave too much support to the Jews. The answer to this attack was that we have no right to discredit an inspired, apostolic book simply because we do not like some of its teachings. When we analyze the Christian writings of the second and third centuries, we find that they reproduce all but eleven verses of the New Testament.10 That is an amazing

testimony as to how much the early Christians used the New Testament books, how highly they regarded them, and how the text has been preserved over the centuries.

Many books written in early post-apostolic times were rejected by virtually everyone as not being inspired of God. These included numerous supposed gospels as well as some acts, epistles, and apocalypses. The early church rejected them as canonical because they did not have apostolic approval. Most were obvious forgeries, and they typically contained fanciful stories and heretical doctrines. They have almost no theological or historical value, but they do reveal various ideas and popular thinking of the time.

A few books were accepted by some, receiving temporary and local recognition. Examples are the epistles of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Ignatius. Other books were anonymous or pseudonymous. Even when people accepted these books as inspired, they typically gave them only semicanonical, secondary status, placing them in an appendix to the Scriptures or at the end of a list. Usually their limited acceptance came only because of a mistaken belief that they had apostolic authority.

Ultimately they were rejected as canonical for several reasons. Some obviously had only temporary or local application. Some were forgeries, such as the Epistle to the Laodiceans. In some cases, such as the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Pseudo-Barnabas, and the Didache, people realized that the authors were not apostles or their associates as some had supposed. It also became clear that just because a book was written near the end of the apostolic age, or shortly after the apostolic age, or by someone who had known the apostles, did not

mean it carried apostolic authority.

No major canon or council in the history of Christianity

ever endorsed these other books. Occasionally someone today will claim to publish the so-called lost books of the New Testament, but these books were never accepted by any significant group for a significant period of time. The books of our New Testament are the ones that believers historically accepted from the earliest times and that the various branches of Christianity have consistently ratified throughout history.

111

The Canon of Scripture

As we have seen, in the Old Catholic Age Tertullian, Origen, and others developed a trinitarian concept of God. Not everyone accepted this innovation, however. Historians use the label monarchians for people during this time who rejected the emerging doctrine of the trinity and continued the earlier emphasis on God's oneness. They derive the term monarchian from Greek words meaning "one rule," referring to the one, sovereign God who rules the universe.

Dynamic Monarchianism

Church historians distinguish two kinds of monarchians, dynamic and modalistic. The dynamic monarchians defended God's oneness by saying that Jesus is not God

113

8

The Doctrine of God

in the fullest sense of the word. Rather, He is a human being who somehow became divine by the anointing or indwelling of God's Spirit. Historians call their view "dynamic," meaning "changing," because of the idea that Christ's nature changed over time from simple to divine humanity. This view undercuts the true meaning of the Incarnation.

A modern Oneness Pentecostal author, William Chalfant, suggests that ancient and modern trinitarian writers have misunderstood the dynamic monarchians.1 Perhaps they did teach the true deity of Christ but emphasized His humanity in order to explain passages of Scripture that trinitarians relied upon. For instance, maybe they stated that the Son was inferior to the Father, meaning the humanity of Christ and not His deity. (See John 14:28.) Trinitarians could have misunderstood because they used the title of Son to refer to Christ's deity. Since none of the writings of the dynamic monarchians have survived, it is difficult to know exactly what they taught.

Based on the scant historical record preserved by their opponents, however, it appears that the dynamic monarchians deviated in a significant way from Oneness theology. The leading teacher of this group was Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch. He reportedly taught that God is one, that the Logos (Word) and the Spirit are not distinct persons from the Father, and that Jesus was a man made divine by the indwelling of the Logos (divine reason). He apparently did not consider Jesus to be God in the strict sense of the word, however; his opponent Malchion alleged that "he put a stop to psalms sung in honour of Christ."2

Modalistic Monarchianism

The second classification of people who opposed early trinitarianism—modalistic monarchianism, or modalism— was far more important. The modalists emphasized that God is absolutely one, with no distinction of persons. According to them, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not three persons but three ways, or "modes," in which God has manifested or related Himself to the world. In particular, Jesus Christ is the manifestation of the one God, the Father. The fullness of God is incarnate in Jesus.

According to renowned church historian Adolph Harnack and others, from A.D. 180 to 300 modalistic monarchianism was the most serious rival to trinitarianism.3 In fact, as Tertullian and other early trinitarians reluctantly acknowledged, during much of this time it was the view of the majority of believers.4

Before 180 there was no controversy over the doctrine of the trinity because no one explicitly taught in trinitarian terms. As discussed in chapter 2, most writings of the Post-Apostolic Age expressed biblical concepts and were compatible with Oneness doctrine. That began to change around 150 in the Age of the Greek Apologists with Justin's doctrine of the Logos as a second divine person. Not everyone accepted this innovation, however, for Justin alluded to people who rejected his position and who insisted that the Logos is "indivisible and inseparable from the Father."5

The modalists emerged as a group in the late second century in Asia Minor, where the church had been established in New Testament times. It appears that they adhered to earlier views on the Godhead but became identified as a group because they opposed the concept of

The Doctrine of God

a plurality of persons in the Godhead introduced by the Greek Apologists and further developed by early trinitarians. Irenaeus, the first prominent author of the Old Catholic Age, nowhere spoke against the modalists, although he was a contemporary from Asia Minor. As we have seen, he expressed many Oneness ideas but no clear concept of a trinity of eternal persons. He wrote against heresies, but apparently he felt no need to write against modalism because it expressed standard views of the time. The conflict between modalism and trinitarianism did not begin until around 200 because that is when clearly trinitarian ideas were first propounded.

To establish their teaching, the modalists appealed to passages in Isaiah, John 10:30, Colossians 2:9, and many other verses. Although no modalistic writings have survived intact, we have many descriptions and quotations of them by their trinitarian opponents such as Tertullian and Novatian.

How do the modalists relate to modern Oneness Pentecostals? First, there is no historical link; the two movements arose independently based on a study of Scripture. Second, we actually know very little about the modalists, and what we know comes from their opponents. We cannot be sure about their views on various subjects or about possible differences within their ranks. Third, many speculative things have been written about them, some of which appear to be distortions or errors, and it would not be fair to link Oneness Pentecostals to such characterizations. In short, people today should study and evaluate the Oneness doctrine based on what contemporary adherents

A History of Christian Doctrine

proclaim, not on second-hand reports of third-century teachings and controversies. Nevertheless, it is clear that the modalists affirmed the two points essential to the doctrine of Oneness, namely that there is one God with no distinction of persons and that Jesus is the manifestation in flesh of the true God in all His fullness.

In elaboration of their position, the modalists taught that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus, not another person. Likewise, the Logos is not a second person, as trinitarians and the Greek Apologists thought, but the mind of God and the activity of God. Thus the Logos and the Son are not identical in terminology; the Son relates exclusively

to the Incarnation, while the Logos relates both to
God in eternity and the Incarnation.

The modalists spoke of Jesus as the Son in that He is
a true man, God in the flesh. They spoke of Jesus as the
Logos in that He is the revelation of the eternal God, the
active expression of God in this world. The modalists
denied that the Son is a second person, that the Son is
eternal, and that the Son preexisted the Incarnation.
Jesus is eternal as the one true God, the Father, the Spirit,
the Logos, but when He became flesh He became the Son,
God incarnate.

The modalists are sometimes called Patripassians,
from Latin words meaning "the Father suffered." This
label stems from Tertullian's attempt to ridicule modalism
as follows: If Jesus is the Father incarnate, then the
Father was crucified and the Father died. How ridiculous
to imagine that the Father could die!

What made his argument so powerful in his day was
an important tenet of Greek philosophy, particularly
emphasized in Neo-Platonism: God is impassible, or

117

The Doctrine of God

incapable of emotional feeling and suffering. God is so
lofty that He cannot fully interact with this world; thus
the God who interacts with us cannot be the supreme
God. As we saw in chapter 3, this assumption rested at
the heart of Gnosticism.

In the Gnostic view, Jehovah, the Creator, is not the
true God but an aeon (an emanation from the true God, a
lesser divine being). Christ is the highest aeon, but still
only an emanation from the supreme God because God
Himself cannot interact with the world.

The Greek Apologists' views were similarly shaped by
this philosophical concept. For them, the true God is the
Father, but the God who interacts with us is the Logos, a
secondary God, a lesser God. In combating the modalists
and developing his doctrine of the trinity, Tertullian
embraced the same fundamental concept.

In view of this prevailing idea in the culture, Tertullian's
argument made much headway. It was difficult for
many people to believe the supreme God Himself actually
came to this world, suffered for us, and died. The modalists
protested that Tertullian wrongly characterized their
position. Like writers in the Post-Apostolic Age, they
indeed affirmed that God the Father suffered in Christ,
but they defended themselves against Tertullian's charge

as follows: The Spirit of God did not die, but Jesus died as
a man. Of course, the indwelling Spirit fully participated
in that agonizing experience.

Like the modalists, Oneness theologians today state
that God was in Christ at the Crucifixion. They do not say
that God's Spirit went unconscious, died, or ceased to
exist, for that is impossible, but the flesh died, and the
incarnate Spirit partook of that suffering in whatever way

118

A History of Christian Doctrine

a Spirit can. God was incarnate at the Atonement.

Tertullian's argument undercuts the full deity of
Christ even from a modern trinitarian perspective. He did
speak of the sufferings of God and the death of God,
meaning the second person, but thought it absurd to say
this about the first person. If there are three coequal persons
of God, however, and if it is unthinkable for the first
person to suffer or die, then it would likewise be unthinkable
for the second person to suffer or die. According to
Tertullian's logic, only the Father is the supreme God and
therefore incapable of suffering, while Jesus Christ is a
subordinate, inferior person and therefore capable of suffering.

Tertullian wrote a book against Praxeas, a leading
modalist teacher from Asia Minor who preached in Rome
about 190. Hippolytus wrote against Noetus, a disciple of
Praxeas and another prominent teacher of modalism.
Other modalists were Cleomenes, Epigonus, and Commodian,
a North African presbyter or bishop. Three
Roman bishops—Victor, Zephyrinus, and Callistus—sided
with modalism when controversy erupted. Catholics
today consider them popes.

Probably the most prominent modalist in the Old
Catholic Age was Sabellius, who preached in Rome in the
200s, and so the modalists are often called Sabellians. We
know very little about Sabellius himself, and it is impossible
to determine what he really believed in detail. Most of
the sources of information about him are trinitarians who
lived a century later.

Some historians distinguish Sabellius from the older
modalists by saying that Sabellius taught a successive revelation
of God: He was first the Father, then He became

119

The Doctrine of God

the Son, and finally he became the Holy Spirit. He did not
operate simultaneously as Father, Son, and Spirit, but successively.
If this is indeed what Sabellius taught, then it is

different from the older modalism and from Oneness today. Oneness theology holds that God is the eternal Father and Spirit and that when He came in flesh as the Son He did not cease to be Father and Spirit. Actually it appears that trinitarians misunderstood Sabellius on this point, as they sometimes do with Oneness believers today. Sabellius taught that we know God as Father in creation, Son in redemption, and Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, but this explanation does not require successive manifestations. It is probable that his doctrine aligned with that of the older modalists but his opponents misunderstood his views. Because of this distortion, it is not helpful to speak of Oneness believers as Sabellians, but we can say that Sabellius affirmed the two points essential to Oneness theology: the numerical oneness of God and the absolute deity of Jesus Christ.*

Ante-Nicene Developments

As chapter 5 discussed, the first theologically significant use of the word trinity and the first clear teaching of three persons in the Godhead came with Tertullian. It is evident that Tertullian himself evolved in his doctrinal understanding. One of his writings, Against Hermogenes, discusses only two divine persons, the Father and the Son, and says the Son emerged from the Father sometime prior to the creation of the world. At first, then, it

120

A History of Christian Doctrine

*See Appendix B for a list of modalists and others in church history who embraced the essential tenets of the Oneness view.

seems that he followed the teaching of the Greek Apologists. It is not until he wrote Against Praxeas, around 210, that we have the first clear evidence of trinitarianism, identifying three persons instead of just two.

He was soon joined by Origen, around 215-30, who championed trinitarianism in the East. Origen was the first to teach that the Son is eternal. He also taught that the Son is eternally being begotten by the Father, a concept possibly borrowed from Gnosticism.

At first the word person itself probably was not controversial, because it originally referred to a face, mask, or role played by an actor.6 Thus it was quite compatible with a Oneness or modalistic view. In fact, Sabellius used the original Greek term for person, prosopon, to describe God's manifestations. Unfortunately, early trinitarians

employed person (Latin, persona; Greek, hypostasis) to
mean a distinction of personalities and identities.
Although Tertullian and Origen both taught that there
were three divine persons, they actually said little about
the Holy Spirit. They devoted most of their discussion of
the Godhead to proving that the Father and Son are two
distinct persons. Against the modalists they emphasized
that Jesus is not the supreme God but a subordinate second
person.

Other writers brought greater emphasis on the Holy
Spirit as the third person. One of the first to do so was
Novatian, around 240-50, a staunch trinitarian who
opposed Sabellius. He also led a schism from the church
in Rome, insisting that backsliders could not receive forgiveness
for certain major sins.

Another man who shaped trinitarian theology during
this time was Bishop Dionysius of Rome, one of the few

The Doctrine of God

leaders before Nicea who held that the members of the
trinity are coequal and coeternal. In an attempt to
thwart Sabellianism, his contemporary, Bishop Dionysius
of Alexandria, made statements that were very
tritheistic and that greatly subordinated Jesus to the
Father. Dionysius of Rome challenged these statements,
promoting a trinity of coequal persons and convincing
Dionysius of Alexandria to modify his views. The outcome
was an agreement that the Son is not a creature
but truly a person of the trinity like the Father. This discussion
became an important foreshadowing of the
fourth-century trinitarian formulations of Nicea and Constantinople.

During the Old Catholic Age a shift occurred from
Oneness beliefs to a form of trinitarianism and from the
Jesus Name baptismal formula to a trinitarian formula. At
the beginning of this age, modalism was the predominant
view, but by around 300 a form of trinitarianism was dominant
in Christendom. By this time, people who held Oneness
concepts and who baptized in Jesus' name were in
retreat, probably in the minority, and in many cases
already separated from the institutional church into
groups that were considered heretical.

Trinitarianism was not yet in its modern form, however.
Most champions of trinitarianism in this age did not
believe that the persons of the trinity were coequal and
coeternal, and thus their views are heretical by modern
trinitarian standards. They typically divided the personality

of God in tritheistic fashion, and they denied the full deity of Jesus Christ by subordinating Him in deity to the Father.

Examples of tritheistic language are as follows: the

A History of Christian Doctrine

Father and the Son are "two separate persons" and "two different beings" (Tertullian); the Son is "one individual produced from a different one" (Hippolytus); the Word is a "second God," "a separate entity" and "a separate being [who] has an essence of his own" (Origen).7

Examples of subordinationistic language are as follows: the deity of Jesus was "created" (Tertullian and Origen); not as old, strong, noble, powerful or great as the Father, "a derivation," "a portion of the whole Godhead," and not "God Himself, the Lord Almighty" (Tertullian); "born" (Tertullian, Origen, and Novatian); "inferior" (Origen and Novatian); not eternal (Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Novatian); subject to the Father (Tertullian, Origen, and Novatian); "made God," a "second God," "a god," not "the most High God," and God only in a relative sense (Origen).8

Not only do these statements contradict the modern trinitarian doctrines of coeternity, coequality, and consubstantiality (coessence) of the three persons, but they stand diametrically opposed to the essential tenets of ancient modalism, modern Oneness, and the biblical teaching about God.

The Council of Nicea, A.D. 325

In the early fourth century a great controversy erupted in Alexandria, Egypt, between Arius, a presbyter, and Alexander, the bishop, over the deity of Jesus Christ. Alexandria was a major center of Greek culture and philosophy, which heavily influenced both sides of the debate. The controversy spread rapidly and threatened the unity of the institutional church. Although Alexander excommunicated Arius, Arius received support from

The Doctrine of God

some influential people, including Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia.

When Constantine succeeded in becoming sole emperor of Rome in 324, he publicly embraced Christianity. Politically, he saw Christianity as an effective tool of unifying his domain and therefore viewed the Arian controversy as a significant threat to his goal. To solve the

problem, in 325 he convened the first ecumenical council
of Christendom since Bible days, paying for the delegates
to come to the town of Nicea, near the imperial residence.
The central issue at the Council of Nicea was the identity
of Jesus Christ in relation to the Godhead. The main
questions were, Is Jesus truly God? and Are the Father
and the Son of the same essence? The council was not
strictly a debate over modalism versus trinitarianism,
although modalism was a factor. As things turned out historically,
it was more of a debate as to how to define the
second person of the trinity.
Some of the participants were basically modalistic or
Oneness in their thinking. In fact, one prominent member
of the victorious party, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, vigorously
promoted a form of modalism after the council,
and another, Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, was later condemned
for modalism. Moreover, many of the average
participants, who may not have really understood the theological
dispute, could have had predominantly Oneness
concepts.
The catalyst for the controversy, however, was the
doctrine of Arius. Essentially, he took the subordinationism
of the Greek Apologists and the early trinitarians to
an extreme. In fact, the Arians appealed to early writers,
particularly Origen, as support. The views of Arius also
124
A History of Christian Doctrine
resembled an extreme form of dynamic monarchianism.
He said there is one God, not a trinity, and that Jesus is
not truly God but, in effect, a demigod. He is a created
being of greater rank than humans but not equal to the
Father. The Arian position is equivalent to that of Jehovah's
Witnesses today.
At the Council of Nicea the leading spokesman against
Arius was Athanasius, a young archdeacon from Alexandria
who later succeeded Alexander as bishop. He taught
that there are three persons in one God and that these
three persons are coequal, coeternal, and coessential.
The debate centered on the Father and the Son; neither
side spoke definitively about the Holy Spirit. Primarily,
the Arians attacked the deity of Jesus while Athanasius
defended it, saying that Jesus is equal to the Father in
every way yet a second person.
Three factions developed at the council: a minority of
Arians, a minority of Athanasians, and a majority who did
not fully understand the issues involved but who wanted

peace. In general, this third group took an intermediate position, but it is difficult to characterize them as a whole. Historians sometimes call many in this group Origenists or Semi-Arians. The majority did not necessarily embrace the complete trinitarian doctrine of Athanasius, but they eventually voted with him in defense of Christ's deity and against the Arian view.

Athanasius considered all who opposed Arianism to be on his side, and some of his strongest supporters at this time were, or turned out to be, modalists. The creed that the Council of Nicea passed clearly rejected Arianism, but it did not definitely establish trinitarianism or reject modalism.

125

The Doctrine of God

Athanasius used four lines of reasoning to uphold the deity of Christ: (1) The Scriptures teach it. (2) The church has always worshiped Jesus. (3) To be our Savior, Jesus has to be God. (4) He is the Logos, and based on philosophical considerations, the Logos has to be God. He argued that Jesus is of the same essence as the Father. It is easy to see how Athanasius's position could appeal to a Oneness believer. Faced with a choice between Arius and Athanasius on the deity of Jesus Christ, Oneness believers would choose the latter. In fact, the Arians objected that the doctrine of Athanasius sounded too much like that of Sabellius.

When the council convened, Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia offered an Arian creed, which the assembled bishops immediately rejected. Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea proposed a compromise creed that satisfied almost everyone, but Athanasius and his group objected because it was ambiguous and did not resolve the issue. Wanting the widest agreement possible, Constantine pressed for inclusion of the word homoousios ("same essence") to describe the Father and the Son. His personal advisor, Bishop Hosius of Cordova, probably gave him this suggestion. In the end, persuaded by the oratory of Athanasius and heeding the bidding of the emperor, the council agreed to use the word homoousios, affirming that Jesus is of the same substance as the Father. The emperor pronounced the resulting creed to be divinely inspired, promulgated it as the law of the land, and insisted that every bishop at the council sign it or be deposed and exiled. Only Arius and two bishops refused to sign the creed, and they were exiled. Eusebius of Nicomedia and two other

A History of Christian Doctrine

bishops did not sign the attached condemnatory clause and were removed from office. Some of the signers had strong reservations, however, and some, such as Eusebius of Caesarea, promptly began interpreting it contrary to its intent.

The creed formulated by the Council of Nicea, which is not the so-called Nicene Creed used today, affirmed belief in

one God, the Father almighty, . . . and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only begotten; that is, of the essence [ousia] of the Father, God of God, light of light, very [true] God of very [true] God, begotten not made, being of one substance [homoousios] with the Father . . . and in the Holy Ghost.

This terminology is compatible with both Oneness and trinitarian thinking, although the clause "God of God" may erroneously imply a distinction of persons. Athanasius believed one divine person was begotten from another divine person, but a Oneness believer could use the same words to mean the one God came in flesh and therefore God who dwelt in Jesus is the same as God before the Incarnation.

The original creed directly refutes Arianism by saying that Jesus is of one substance with the Father. To the creed itself was appended a clause pronouncing an anathema (curse) upon various Arian statements. One of these can be seen as incompatible with modern Oneness terminology, for it denounces the view that there was a time when the Son was not, and Oneness theology says the

The Doctrine of God

role of the Son began with the Incarnation. The purpose of the clause was not to refute modalism, however, but the Arian idea that the divine nature of Christ had a beginning. Ironically, another portion of the anathema clause contradicts modern trinitarianism terminology, as well as that of Origen, for it denounces the view that the Father and Son are of a different hypostasis. As used here and in Hebrews 1:3, hypostasis basically means "substance," but trinitarians later began using it to mean "person" and affirming that indeed the Son is a different hypostasis from the Father.

In summary, the Nicene Council was a clear rejection

of Arianism but not a clear rejection of modalism. From a historical perspective, it was the first official step in the establishment of trinitarianism, but at the time that was by no means clear. From the trinitarian perspective of Athanasius, it vindicated the coequality and coessence of two divine persons, the Father and the Son, but some of his most vocal supporters did not accept the distinction of persons and some of his most vocal critics saw it as an endorsement of Sabellianism.

Post-Nicene Developments

The Council of Nicea did not end the controversy; the struggle continued for another sixty years, occasionally erupting in violence and bloodshed. In fact, during this time probably more professing Christians died at each other's hand than in all the persecutions by the pagan Roman emperors.9 In retrospect, given that the Athanasian doctrine eventually won out, Nicea was a watershed event, but at the time that was not at all apparent.

128

A History of Christian Doctrine

To a great extent, the debate hinged on religious and secular politics. The noted church historian Jaroslav Pelikan observed, "Doctrine often seemed to be the victim— or the product—of church politics and conflicts of personality. . . . The political history of these decades is in many ways more important . . . than the doctrinal history." 10 Bishops were deposed, exiled, and reinstated, depending upon which way the political wind blew. Athanasius himself was exiled at least five times and died in 373 with his doctrine seemingly defeated.

After Nicea, Arius made conciliatory overtures to Constantine, who held another council in Nicea in 327 that supported Arius. In 335 Constantine convened a council in Tyre that deposed and exiled Athanasius and reinstated Arius. The night before Arius was to be formally restored to fellowship at the church in Constantinople, he died. Athanasius considered this to be the judgment of God and circulated a gruesome story about the manner of his death, comparing it to that of Judas. The Arians (and some historians) claimed Arius was actually poisoned by the Athanasians.

In 337 Constantine was baptized on his deathbed by the Arian bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia. Upon his death, his three sons permitted the exiled bishops, including Athanasius, to return. In the West, Constantine II and Constans followed the Nicene doctrine, which prevailed

there; in the East, Constantius was a strong advocate of
Arianism, which prevailed there. In 339 Eusebius of Nicomedia
became bishop of Constantinople, and it became a
stronghold of Arianism for the next forty years.

In 353 Constantius became sole emperor, and the
empire became officially Arian. Liberius, bishop of Rome,

The Doctrine of God

was deposed and replaced by Felix II, an Arian. Liberius
signed an Arian creed to regain his position but later
returned to the Nicene view.

Much of the opposition to Nicea centered around the
word homoousios because the modalists had earlier used
it to describe their view of the absolute deity of Jesus as
the Father incarnate. Many bishops preferred instead the
word homoiousios, a difference of only one iota (Greek
letter). They are often called Semi-Arians because the literal
translation of this word is "like essence" or "similar
essence." Many of them were closer to Athanasius in
thought, however, and opposed Arianism. Their endorsement
of homoiousios was not so much a concession to
Arius as a rejection of Sabellius.

Thus while the opponents of Nicea were seemingly triumphant,
they soon split into factions. Some contended
that the Son was fundamentally different from (unlike)
the Father, some held that the Son was like the Father, and
some (the Semi-Arians) were willing to say He was like
the Father in every respect.

Historians generally conclude that a decisive factor in
the victory of trinitarianism was the eloquence and determination
of Athanasius himself. He perceived that the
Semi-Arians were actually closer to his position than to
Arianism and formed an alliance with them, once again
creating a majority. In this endeavor, he received significant
assistance from three prominent theologians from
Cappadocia—Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and
Gregory of Nazianzus—who, using Greek philosophical
concepts and terms, refined Athanasian trinitarianism to
make it broadly acceptable.

The Cappadocians stated that God is three

A History of Christian Doctrine

hypostases (persons) in one ousia (substance), making a
distinction between two Greek words that had been synonymous,
meaning "substance, essence, nature." This is
the orthodox definition of trinitarianism today, and it is

equivalent to Tertullian's earlier Latin formulation of three personae in one substantia.

In distinguishing person from substance, the Cappadocians drew from Plato's concept that everything in our world is a particular instance of a universal form in the unseen, real world of ideals. As an example, every human being is a personification of the ideal of humanity. Thus the Cappadocians taught that there is one substance of God but three individual particularizations: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Just as Peter, James, and John are three persons who share the same essence of humanity, so the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three persons who share the same essence of deity.11 Athanasius accepted the Cappadocians' formulation as valid, even though he felt that speaking of three hypostases divided the Godhead too much and even though the original statement of Nicea had condemned any division of the Godhead into more than one hypostasis. Many Semi-Arians, who thought that the Nicene terminology was too Sabellian, likewise accepted the Cappadocians' formulation.

The Cappadocians shifted emphasis from the deity of Christ to a threefold nature of God. Instead of simply presenting one God whom we encounter fully and personally in Jesus Christ, in the words of doctrinal historian Reinhold Seeburg they had "three personalities and an abstract, impersonal essence."12 Despite their denials, the Cappadocians' doctrine amounts to tritheism, belief in

131

The Doctrine of God

three gods. To them, God is obviously three; the mystery is how the three could be one. By contrast, Athanasius had emphasized the oneness of the Father and the Son; to him the mystery is how the one God could be a trinity.

The Cappadocians taught that the three persons are coequal, coeternal, and consubstantial, yet they, as well as Athanasius, still retained some subordinationism in their thinking. They spoke of the Father as the head of the trinity, the source, origin, and commander of the other two persons.13

They also maintained that each person fully participates in the work of the others, such as creation, redemption, and regeneration. How then can we distinguish them? Their answer was, and this is the standard trinitarian explanation today, that the Father is unbegotten, the Son is begotten (generated), and the Holy Spirit is proceeding

(spirated).14 But what do these distinctions mean, and what is the difference between each of them? The Cappadocians conceded that the answer lies outside human language or knowledge. Thus we are left with meaningless philosophical distinctions that actually explain nothing.

In sum, the very terms and relationships that supposedly define the three persons are themselves indefinable or incomprehensible. There is no objective, scriptural meaning. The doctrine of the trinity is reduced to an abstract philosophical construct based on circular reasoning as follows: How do we know the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three distinct persons? Because the Father is unbegotten, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit is proceeding. What does "begotten" mean in this context? We cannot know, but it is what makes the Son different

132

A History of Christian Doctrine

from the Father. What does "proceeding" mean? We cannot know, but it is what makes the Spirit different from the Father and the Son. Truly, as trinitarians then and now affirm, the doctrine of the trinity is a mystery that humans cannot understand.

After the Council of Nicea, there was also a serious controversy over the identity of the Holy Spirit. To this point, the focus of debate had been on the relationship of the Father and the Son. Both Arians and Athanasians made a distinction in the Godhead between the Father and the Son, saying that the Son is a second divine person. The same logic and methods of interpretation led to the conclusion that the Holy Spirit is yet another person. A great diversity of views arose. Some said the Holy Spirit is simply God Himself in spiritual manifestation, not to be distinguished as another person. Some said the Spirit is the impersonal energy of God. Others, such as Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, considered the Spirit a created being or an angel. Some, like Athanasius and the Cappadocians, held that the Holy Spirit is a third divine person.

The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381

To put a final end to the Arian controversy, as well as to resolve controversies over the nature of Christ and the identity of the Holy Spirit, Emperor Theodosius, a defender of Nicea, convened the first Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381. This council was the decisive moment theologically for the orthodox doctrine of the trinity, ratifying

and expanding the decision of the Council of Nicea.
The Council of Constantinople vindicated the doctrine
of Athanasius and the Cappadocians. Athanasius and

The Doctrine of God

Basil were dead by this time, but the two Gregorys were
present and exerted considerable influence. The council
affirmed that the Father and Son are distinct, equal persons,
and it further established that the Holy Spirit is a
third coequal person.

Many people today mistakenly assume that the doctrine
of the trinity received full expression and final
acceptance at the Council of Nicea, but that idea is based
on the faulty notion that the Nicene Creed came directly
from that council. Actually, the present Nicene Creed
reflects the decisions of both Nicea and Constantinople,
and it came into general use around 500. The truth is that
trinitarianism developed over two centuries, receiving initial,
partial support at Nicea but attaining final form and
complete official acceptance at Constantinople.

Developments after Constantinople

In the fifth century, there arose a real possibility that
Arianism could win the day after all. Although trinitarianism
had triumphed in the Roman Empire, the empire was
crumbling under barbarian attacks, and most of the barbarians
converted to Arian Christianity. That threat ended
in 496 with the conversion of the Franks to trinitarian
Christianity, soon followed by most of the other barbarian
tribes.

After Constantinople, a further controversy arose that
became a factor in the eventual split of the Eastern and
Western churches. Eastern theologians taught that the
Spirit proceeds from the Father only, while the Westerners
taught that the Spirit proceeds from both the Father
and the Son. Reflecting the Western view, the Synod of
Toledo in 589 inserted a statement in the Nicene Creed

A History of Christian Doctrine

known as the filioque clause ("of the Son"), but the Eastern
church never accepted it. It is a major theological distinction
between Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy.

In later theology, Augustine is the supreme representative
of the Western view of the trinity. Like Athanasius,
he focused primarily on the unity of God, stating that
each person possesses the entire divine essence under a
different point of view. He did not want to compare the

trinity to three humans, but he reluctantly spoke of God
as three persons because orthodox terminology was
already established. Augustine emphasized the coequality
of the persons and rejected the subordinationism retained
in the thinking of Athanasius and the Cappadocians.
Some of his analogies tend toward modalism, such as
when he compared the trinity to memory, intelligence,
and will in one human personality and to the human mind
remembering, understanding, and loving God. One wellknown
analogy is tritheistic, however: the trinity is like
one who loves (Father), the beloved (Son), and the love
between the two (Spirit).
The Athanasian Creed, which was not written by
Athanasius, came into being between the fifth and eighth
centuries, and it expresses the strong coequality taught
by Augustine. Only the West officially recognizes it
because it teaches the procession of the Spirit from the
Father and the Son, but aside from that point, it expresses
the basic tenets of the East as well. The Roman
Catholic Church and most historic Protestant churches
regard the Athanasian Creed as an important statement of
faith. Indeed, it is the most explicit and definitive statement
of trinitarianism from ancient times.
135
The Doctrine of God
From a Oneness viewpoint, the Athanasian Creed is a
good example of how trinitarianism is unscriptural, selfcontradictory,
and incomprehensible. For instance, it
indicates two begettings of the Son, saying the Son is
eternally begotten and was also born in time. It affirms
that the Father, Son, and Spirit are each God, yet there are
not three Gods but one God.
In the eighth century, John of Damascus brought further
refinements. Like Augustine, he rejected most elements
of subordinationism and said the three persons
were not like three men. He described their relationship
as "mutual interpenetration" (circumincession) without
commingling. In other words, the nature of each is fully
contained in the others and each participates fully in the
work of the others, yet each remains distinct.
Creeds
As we have seen, creeds played an important role in
ancient doctrinal controversies, especially those on the
Godhead. From early times, it appears that Christians
developed simple statements of faith, originally using
excerpts from Scripture. The purpose was to identify

what a convert needed to believe before he was baptized. (See Acts 8:36-37.) Then, as various heresies emerged, such statements became increasingly important to identify truth from error.

The earliest "rule of faith" (fundamental doctrines or statements that were accepted generally) focused on faith in the one God.15 From it developed various creeds in different locales. One of the oldest we have is the Old Roman Symbol from sometime in the late second century; it is the basis of the Apostles' Creed used today. The Old

Roman Symbol expresses faith in the one God; in the atoning work of Jesus Christ through His death, burial, and resurrection; and in the salvation provided through His gospel, namely, the forgiveness of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the future resurrection.

The Apostles' Creed, which was not written by the apostles, grew over the centuries as various statements were added in response to new doctrinal challenges. Most of it consists of scriptural language, and it can be viewed as compatible with the apostolic doctrine. However, its name is misleading, it does not speak to some important doctrinal issues facing the contemporary church, and it is often understood today as a trinitarian statement. On balance, then, its value for Oneness believers is minimal.

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy view the ancient creeds as authoritative sources of doctrine. In theory, Protestantism affirms the sole authority of Scripture, but in practice most Protestant churches appeal to the creeds as definitive and normative.

We must recognize, however, that only Scripture is authoritative for doctrine. (See Galatians 1:8-9; II Timothy 3:15-17; Jude 3; Romans 3:1-4.) We can use statements of faith to express our understanding of Scripture and to establish a basis for cooperative efforts, but we must not elevate the words of humans to the level of inspiration. Unlike the practice in the Ecumenical Catholic Age and in many Christian circles today, we cannot rely on creeds to establish doctrine or determine someone's salvation.*

*See Appendix C for the text of the major creeds we have discussed.

Summary
Briefly, here are the major steps in the development of
trinitarianism.
1. About 150 the Greek Apologists, beginning with
Justin, defined the Word to be the Son, described the
Word/Son as a second divine being begotten by God the
Father at a point in time before creation, and said that the
Word was subordinate to God. A threefold baptismal formula
was introduced, along with some vague notions of
threeness in relation to God.
2. About 210 Tertullian introduced the term trinity
and formulated the concept of one God in three persons.
In his trinity, the Father alone is eternal, and He is superior
to the other two persons.
3. About 215-30 Origen likewise promoted trinitarianism,
contributing the key doctrines of the eternal Son and
the eternal generation of the Son. He thereby prepared
the way to elevate the status of the second person,
although he himself still taught that the Father was superior
to the other two persons.
4. Under the influence of Athanasius, the Council of
Nicea in 325 rejected Arianism. It declared that the Father
and the Son are of the same substance, making them
equal.
5. The Council of Constantinople in 381 followed the
doctrine of Athanasius and the Cappadocians. It clarified
the status of the Holy Spirit and placed all three persons
on an equal footing.
6. Based in part on the theology of Augustine and produced
sometime in the fifth to eighth centuries, the
Athanasian Creed put in definitive form the doctrine of
the victors of Nicea and Constantinople. It declared the

138

A History of Christian Doctrine

coequality, coeternity, and consubstantiality of the three
persons.
Over two hundred years passed from the first teaching
of a plurality of divine persons (two) (c. 150) to the
full acceptance of the doctrine of the trinity (381). About
one hundred years passed from the introduction of trinitarianism
(c. 200) to the time it became dominant (c.
300), almost another century before it reached its definitive
form and received official acceptance (381), and yet
a third century before all significant political threats to it
ended (496).*
*For further discussion and documentation of the material

in this chapter, see Oneness and Trinity, A.D. 100-300 and
The Trinitiarian Controversy in the Fourth Century by
David K. Bernard. For a list of people who rejected trinitarianism
but upheld the deity of Jesus Christ, see Appendix B.
139
The Doctrine of God

By the end of the fourth century, the controversies
in the institutional church over the doctrine of God had
subsided. The attention of theologians shifted to other
areas, and new debates arose. The next major subject of
controversy was Christology—the doctrine of Jesus
Christ, particularly His humanity and the relationship of
deity and humanity in Him.
The Councils of Nicea and Constantinople established
that Christ is truly God, although they did so imperfectly
by identifying Him as the second coequal person of the
trinity. There was a consensus that He is not merely a man
and not a demigod. The next question became, How is He
a man? If He is truly God, then how did God manifest
Himself in the flesh?
141
9
The Doctrine of Christ
According to I Timothy 3:16, the true mystery of godliness
is the Incarnation. There is no mystery as to how
many gods there are, for Scripture reveals that God is
absolutely and indivisibly one (Deuteronomy 6:4). But
the mystery is, How did God come in the flesh? How was
the baby Jesus and then the man Jesus also God? In the
late fourth and early fifth centuries, theologians began to
wrestle with these questions.
Docetism
In the second century, the Gnostics taught docetism,
the doctrine that Christ was a spirit being only. They
denied that He was a man. All the early church leaders
and writers rejected this view and emphasized the real
humanity of Jesus Christ. They understood that if Jesus
were not truly human then we do not have an atonement
for our sins.
It is essential to Christianity that Jesus really was a
man, that God really came in the flesh. I John 4:3 says,
"Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come
in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of
antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and
even now already is it in the world."

Apollinaris

The great Christological debates of the fourth and fifth centuries began with the teaching of Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, who died about A.D. 390. Put simply, his view, called Apollinarianism, is that Christ had an incomplete human nature. He had a human body, but instead of a human spirit He simply had the divine Logos, which in trinitarian terms is the second person in the

Godhead. The Logos took the place of the human mind, so that Jesus did not have a distinct mind as a man but only the mind of God.

In other words, Jesus Christ was not a complete human being but merely God in a body. The Spirit of God animated His body; there was no inner human consciousness. Sometimes people today will say that Jesus is God in a body or that God put on flesh as a man puts on a coat. Such statements or analogies are incomplete, however. The Bible reveals that, in addition to a human body, Christ had a human will, soul, and spirit. For example, He stated in Gethsemane, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death" (Matthew 26:38). There He prayed, "Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42). At death He said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke 23:46). Jesus acknowledged that as to His humanity His mind was limited, even though as God He knew all things. Thus, in reference to the Second Coming, he could say, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13:32).

From these passages and others like them, it is evident that Christ's humanity was more than a body. He had both humanity and deity in His Spirit. From the Oneness viewpoint, the only way to explain the biblical distinction between the Father and the Son is to recognize and emphasize the full humanity of Jesus Christ.

Moreover, the Atonement depends upon His full humanity as well as full deity. If He were not fully human, how could He have purchased our redemption? How could He truly be our substitute? How could He be our

kinsman redeemer? How could He be the sacrifice of atonement for our sins?

People realized that the doctrine of Apollinaris undercut

not only the true humanity of Christ but also the Atonement. As a result, in addition to establishing the doctrine of the trinity, the Council of Constantinople in 381 condemned Apollinarianism.

The School of Antioch

In the fifth century, two theological camps developed contrasting emphases on Christology that resulted in conflict. The two schools were identified by their allegiance to two powerful, ancient churches in prominent Greekspeaking cities that were commercial and political rivals—Antioch in Syria and Alexandria in Egypt.

The school of Antioch promoted a literal interpretation of Scripture. The theologians associated with this school opposed philosophical speculation, mysticism, and allegorical interpretation of Scripture, which were characteristic of the school of Alexandria. The Antiochenes strongly rejected both docetism and Apollinarianism.

In contrast to these views, they emphasized the humanity of Christ and the distinction between humanity and deity in Christ. They said Christ was perfect in humanity as well as perfect in deity. They explained the relationship of deity and humanity in Christ by saying the divine Logos (the second person) dwelt in a full human being. Historians commonly evaluate their position as follows: the union of deity and humanity was not so much a union of essence as a moral or cooperative union. Christ was one person in appearance, but actually humanity and deity were separate yet cooperating in Him.

144

A History of Christian Doctrine

The chief theologian of the Antiochene school was Theodore of Mopsuestia, who died in 429. The clash over Christology came to a head, however, with the teaching of Nestorius, patriarch (bishop) of Constantinople beginning in 428.

Nestorius

Taken to an extreme, the Antiochene teaching would indicate that Christ is not really one person, but two. Such a conclusion would undercut the Incarnation. Instead of God becoming flesh (John 1:1, 14), somehow God merely lived alongside a man. At least, this is what the Alexandrians concluded about the teaching of Nestorius, although he held the standard Antiochene position.

Nestorius compared the Logos residing in the man Jesus to someone residing in a temple or house. Appealing to John 2:19, He said Christ is both God and the temple

of God. His opponents accused him of teaching two
persons of Christ, but Nestorius denied the charge.
One of the chief concerns of Nestorius was the glorification
of Mary by calling her theotokos, meaning "bearer
of God" or "mother of God." This title paid homage to
Mary and was a significant step in the development of the
worship of Mary. The justification for its use was this:
Jesus is God and man in one person, and this person was
born of Mary, so we can call Mary the mother of God.
Nestorius asked how God could have a mother, concluding
that Mary was not the mother of God but the
mother of Christ's humanity. She was the mother of the
baby Jesus but not the mother of the Spirit who dwelt in
that baby.
Nestorius argued for a clear distinction between the

The Doctrine of Christ

humanity and deity in Jesus. He did not insist upon a separation
in reality, which would make two persons, but he
wanted to make enough of a distinction so that he could
refer to Christ's humanity without automatically involving
His deity. Thus he said Mary is the mother of Christ,
speaking of Him as a man, but he did not want to say
Mary is the mother of God. Likewise, he said that Christ
died, but he did not want to say that God, as Spirit, died.

The Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431

Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, bitterly opposed Nestorius
and schemed against him. It appears that he was
motivated in part by ecclesiastical politics, jealousy, and
desire for power. According to Philip Schaff,

he scrupled at no measures to annihilate his antagonist.
Besides the weapons of theological learning and
acumen, he allowed himself also the use of wilful misrepresentation,
artifice, violence, instigation of people
and monks at Constantinople, and repeated
bribery of imperial officers.[1]

Cyril persuaded Emperor Theodosius II to convene
the third ecumenical council, the Council of Ephesus in
A.D. 431, to address this issue. Under the influence of
Cyril, the Council of Ephesus officially condemned Nestorianism
as heresy and removed Nestorius from office. The
council affirmed that Christ is one person and charged
that Nestorius divided the one Christ into two persons.
As a result of this action, the followers of Nestorius
broke away from the mainstream church and founded the
Nestorian Church. This group was responsible for intro-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ducing Christianity to China, although the Chinese Nestorian
Church was later completely wiped out. Descendants
of ancient Nestorianism include the Assyrian Church and
a group in eastern India.

Contemporary scholars are generally sympathetic
toward Nestorius, concluding that he did not separate the
humanity and deity of Christ nearly as much as his opponents
claimed. It appears that they distorted, misrepresented,
and exaggerated his position. Martin Luther concluded
that Nestorius was not a heretic and did not teach
two persons of Christ.

The School of Alexandria

The opponents of Nestorius and the school of Antioch
were theologians of the school of Alexandria. As we have
seen, the Alexandrians were significantly influenced by
Greek philosophy, and they commonly interpreted Scripture
allegorically. The Alexandrian theologians emphasized
the deity of Jesus Christ and the incarnation of the
Logos, and they felt the Antiochenes overemphasized the
humanity of Christ.

Athanasius was an early representative of Alexandrian
Christology, although he lived before the major controversy
and before the development of precise terminology on
the subject. He taught that two natures—deity and
humanity—were united into the one person of Christ, and
he spoke of Mary as the mother of God. According to him,
both natures participated fully in all the work of Christ,
including His suffering on the cross. Christ did not suffer
merely as to His humanity, but the incarnate divine Spirit
participated in the suffering.

Like Athanasius, the three Cappadocians championed

The Doctrine of Christ

the doctrine of two natures in one person, and they
strongly emphasized the union of the two natures, holding
it to be necessary to validate our redemption. For the
redemption of Christ to be effective, they argued, Christ
had to be fully human and His humanity had to be fully
united with His deity.

Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus went so
far as to teach that the humanity of Christ was commingled
with His deity. They said human nature is capable of
becoming divine, and in Christ's case, His humanity did
become divine. While they affirmed that Christ was fully

human, they focused more on His deity. To them, His human traits were somehow combined with or assimilated into His deity.

Cyril of Alexandria went even further in emphasizing, against Nestorius, the union of the two natures in Christ, speaking of Him as the God-man. Before the Incarnation, he said, it is possible to identify two natures in the abstract: the nature of God and the nature of humanity. Once the Incarnation took place, however, deity and humanity were so fused together in Christ that we can actually speak of one nature, a divine-human nature. Although the Council of Ephesus condemned Nestorius, it did not clearly state what the correct doctrine was, and it did not reconcile the opposing factions. In 433, the Antiochene theologian Theodoret wrote a compromise creed that asserted the two natures of Christ (against Cyril) but accepted Mary as the mother of God (against Nestorius). For a time, this confession brought peace, with each side interpreting the key phrases in its own way. Cyril assented to it but insisted on the continued condemnation of Nestorius, who was exiled.

Eutyches

The controversy flared anew, however, with the teaching of Eutyches, a monk in Constantinople who took the Alexandrian Christology to an extreme. He vehemently insisted that after the Incarnation Christ had only one nature. His human nature was impersonal, and it was absorbed into and deified by the Logos. Even His body is not the same as ours, but a divine body. Thus we can say God was born, God suffered, and God died.

In 448 a local council in Constantinople, called a synod, condemned the view that Christ had only one nature. Leo I, bishop of Rome, endorsed its decision, as did Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople. Supporters of Eutyches convened another synod in 449, at Ephesus, which vindicated him in a partisan and violent manner. Monks backing Eutyches attacked Flavian, who died a few days later of his wounds. Because of its violent spirit and onesided, unrepresentative participation, this council became known as the Robber Synod.

The Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451

Leo, the first bishop of Rome to claim full powers as pope, emerged as the chief spokesman for the doctrine that ultimately prevailed. He taught that Christ has two

natures but is only one person.

At Leo's insistence, in 451 the new emperor, Marcian, called a general council to resolve the controversy. It originally met in Nicea, but because of sharp contention among the bishops and the danger of violent outbreaks, the emperor ordered it moved to Chalcedon, near Constantinople, where it could be under direct imperial control.

It was the largest of all ecumenical councils, with

149

The Doctrine of Christ

about five to six hundred bishops in attendance, and it is second only to Nicea in importance.

The council embraced the views of Leo, following his language closely. For the first time, a bishop of Rome, a pope, played the decisive role in a major theological dispute, guiding the decision of an ecumenical council.

The creed adopted by the council states that Jesus Christ is "perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, that he has a rational soul and a body. He is of one substance [homoousios] with the Father as God, he is also of one substance [homoousios] with us as man." It then proceeds to call Mary "the mother of God" [theotokos]. It further teaches:

[Christ] is known in two natures, [which exist] without confusion, without change, without division, without separation. The distinction of the natures is in no way taken away by their union, but rather the distinctive properties of each nature are preserved. [Both natures] unite in one person and one hypostasis. They are not separated or divided into two persons but [they form] one and the same Son, Only-begotten, God, Word, Lord Jesus Christ.2

This creed stands against the doctrines of Arius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, and Eutyches. To summarize the council's decision, Christ has two natures, human and divine, but He is one person. This statement is the classical explanation of Christology for Catholics, Orthodox, and Protestants to this day.

To define orthodox Christology, the council employed two important words that had already been used to define

150

A History of Christian Doctrine

the trinity: homoousios and hypostasis. The former word had long been stripped of Sabellian connotations; here it describes an abstract substance that different persons, divine or human, can hold in common. The latter word

identifies not only the persons of the trinity but specifically the one divine-human person of Jesus Christ.

It is important to realize that this entire controversy took place in a trinitarian context. From the Oneness point of view, it is obvious that we must emphasize the distinction between Christ's humanity and deity. Otherwise, there is no way to explain the prayers of Christ, His submission to the Father's will, the Son's lack of independent knowledge and power, and so on. Oneness theology stresses that these examples and others like them do not prove a plurality of divine persons but simply demonstrate and arise from the authentic humanity of Jesus Christ. He was a real man in every way, and He underwent everything in the human experience, except for sin. His humanity, as well as His deity, was full and complete. Sometimes Jesus acted and spoke from the human perspective, as when He slept in a storm; and sometimes he acted and spoke from the divine perspective, as when He awoke and calmed the storm. On the cross, He cried from the depths of His humanity, "I thirst," "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Yet on the cross He also exercised the prerogative of God alone when He promised salvation to the repentant thief: "To day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (See Matthew 27:46; Luke 23:43, 46; John 19:28.)

From the Oneness perspective, then, neither Apollinarianism nor the Christology of Eutyches is a viable

151

The Doctrine of Christ

option. A trinitarian is more susceptible to believing that Christ has only one nature, because he can explain the prayers of Christ, for example, as one divine person praying to another.

For this reason, some trinitarians today accuse Oneness Pentecostals of being Nestorian, finding comfort in classifying them as heretics on two counts: the doctrine of God and the doctrine of Christ. The point is irrelevant, because Oneness believers are not committed to the councils; they appeal solely to the Scriptures. It does not really matter whether they are deemed heretical by Constantinople, Chalcedon, or both.

Nevertheless, it does seem that the basic concept of Chalcedon—two natures in one person—is compatible with the Oneness view. The technical terms nature and person are not suitable under all circumstances, however.

Derived from Greek philosophy and colored by trinitarian usage, they are inadequate to convey the full biblical concept of the Incarnation. For example, it is awkward to say one nature prayed to another, or one nature loved another, for we do not usually think of a nature speaking or loving. It is more accurate to say simply that Christ prayed as an authentic human and that the Son loved the Father as all humans are to love God. We cannot speak of persons in the Godhead, but we can say Christ is a person who lived on earth.

In short, Oneness believers do not accept the trinitarian presuppositions and concepts of Chalcedon, nor do they endorse Chalcedon's designation of Mary as the mother of God. But they do accept the basic idea that humanity and deity are united in the one person of Christ. Oneness believers find themselves in agreement with

many points that Nestorius made, since they too emphasize the distinction between Christ's humanity and deity. But they do not embrace the error that Nestorius was accused of, namely, that Christ was two persons or that the union of deity and humanity was one of convenience or appearance only. Then again, it seems likely that Nestorius himself did not hold such beliefs and that he was trying to express Christological beliefs similar to that of Oneness Pentecostals today. Oneness Christology clearly contradicts the more extreme Alexandrian views, corresponds more closely with Antiochene explanations, and can be harmonized with the basic concept of the Council of Chalcedon.

In the final analysis, rather than debating Christology in historical and philosophical terms, from the Oneness perspective it is preferable to pass over the ancient creeds and councils and go back to Scripture. Based on Scripture we can make four important affirmations regarding Christology. (1) Christ is full and perfect God, the one true God incarnate. (2) Christ is full and perfect man, without sin. (3) There is a distinction between deity and humanity in Christ. The way to understand the Gospel accounts is to realize that Christ is both human and divine; some scenes and sayings reflect His humanity and some His deity. (4) Deity and humanity are inseparably united in Christ. Christ is not a Spirit-filled person as we are, capable of living as a human apart from the Spirit. Rather, while we can distinguish deity and humanity in

Christ, both are so united that Christ is one person in every way. Jesus is God manifest in the flesh—not God merely by an indwelling, but by incarnation, identity, and essence.

The Monophysite Controversy

Chalcedon became the definitive statement of Christology, but as usual, the council did not end the controversy. Historians call the various opponents of the Chalcedonian formula the Monophysites, a label that comes from Greek words meaning "one nature."

The Monophysites insisted that Christ did not have two natures but only one. They held that after the Incarnation there was only one dominant nature, the divine. Humanity and deity were combined in such a way that Christ is fundamentally a divine being. One of the rallying slogans of the Monophysites was "God has been crucified."

The controversy continued in the East for a hundred years, marked by political intrigue, bloody riots, schisms, and internal divisions among the Monophysites. For instance, the patriarch of Alexandria was lynched in 457 for his views on Christology, and Christology became a factor in the circus competition between the Blues and Greens in Constantinople. Pelikan noted, "Even more than the christological controversies before Chalcedon the continuing debate after Chalcedon was shaped by nontheological factors, ranging from mob rule and athletic rivalry to military promotions and the domestic intrigues of the imperial household."3

Finally, in 553, the fifth ecumenical council was convened, the second one at Constantinople. It reiterated the decision of Chalcedon and condemned the view of the Monophysites, further explaining that the doctrine of two natures does not mean two persons or two faces as the Monophysites alleged.

Those who could not accept this decision fragmented into various churches that exist today, including the Coptic Church of Egypt (home of Alexandria), the Ethiopian Church (also called Coptic), the Jacobites (dissenters in Syria), and the Armenian Church. They are generally treated as part of Eastern Orthodoxy, and except for their doctrine of the one nature, their beliefs and practices are

the same as the Orthodox churches. They consider Pope Leo I and the Council of Chalcedon to be heretical and equivalent to Nestorianism.

In recent years, a strong Oneness Pentecostal church has arisen in Ethiopia from missionary efforts of the United Pentecostal Church International. Drawing from their Monophysite heritage, at least some leaders in this group reject Chalcedonian terminology, equating it with trinitarianism, and teach that Christ has a unique, divine flesh of heavenly origin. While true Monophysitism makes sense only in a trinitarian context, some of the language of Monophysitism emphasizes the deity of Christ and so appeals to Oneness thought.

The Monothelete Controversy

Even after the Second Council of Constantinople, some people had trouble accepting the doctrine of two natures in one person. They approached the problem in another way, but their point of view was similar to that of the Monophysites. Instead of saying Christ had only one nature they said He had only one will, a divine-human will, not two. They are called Monotheletes, from Greek words meaning "one will."

It is difficult to see how this belief harmonizes with Christ's prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, when He

The Doctrine of Christ

said to the Father, "Not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42). There the human will clearly submitted to the divine will. Some trinitarians explain that the will of the second person (Son) submitted to the will of the first person (Father), but this explanation does not harmonize well with the trinitarian doctrines of coequality and interpenetration of the persons.

The sixth ecumenical council, the third at Constantinople, met in 680 to deal with this issue. This council condemned the Monotheletes, stating that Christ has two wills, the human will and the divine will. The human will did not resist the divine will but was subject to the divine will at all times.

Interestingly, Pope Honorius I endorsed the Monothelete position, and this council pronounced an anathema against him. This fact poses a significant problem for Roman Catholics, who accept the decision of this council as divinely inspired yet also teach the infallibility of the pope. Moreover, in 682 Pope Leo II officially denounced Honorius as a heretic.

Many modern trinitarians use the concept of two wills to argue against the Oneness position. They point to Christ's prayers in Gethsemane and conclude that Christ and the Father must be two distinct persons because Christ had a will distinct from that of the Father. When Oneness believers respond that here we simply see the human will submitting to the divine will, these trinitarians ridicule the idea that a "nature" can have a will. Only persons can have wills, they say, so two wills mean two persons. Unfortunately for them, this argument actually attacks trinitarian orthodoxy, for the sixth ecumenical

156

A History of Christian Doctrine

council accepted by traditional Christendom held precisely that Christ has two wills but is only one person. In trinitarian terminology, the two wills represent the two natures in Christ; thus a nature can have a will.

While Oneness people do not have to use the technical term nature to establish their point, they can appeal to the reasoning of this council. There is only one divine will; in classical trinitarianism, the three persons participate fully in each other's work and share the same will. If God could have different or opposing wills within Himself, there would be no defense against outright tritheism. As this council shows, trinitarians cannot successfully argue that the two wills in Gethsemane prove two persons. To be consistent with their own doctrine, they must recognize, as Oneness believers maintain, that Christ's prayer in Gethsemane depicts His human will submitting to the one, undivided divine will.

Again, some people dissented from the decision of the council and broke away from the mainstream church. They became known as the Maronites, and their descendants exist in Lebanon today. Over the centuries, however, the Maronites abandoned their unique doctrinal position. Rather than realigning themselves with Eastern Orthodoxy, they joined the Roman Catholic Church under a special arrangement. This agreement allows them to observe their ancient rites and liturgies, instead of what developed in the West, and to maintain their distinct ecclesiastical identity and government under the authority of the pope.

Summary

We can summarize the historical development of the

157

The Doctrine of Christ

doctrine of Christ by looking at the first six ecumenical councils.

1. The Council of Nicea in 325 established the deity of Christ, rejecting Arius's belief that Christ is a demigod.
2. The Council of Constantinople in 381 established the full humanity of Christ, rejecting Apollinaris's theory of an incomplete human nature. At this point, the stage was set for the future debate over how deity and humanity coexist in Him.
3. The Council of Ephesus in 431 sought to resolve this problem by saying Christ is one person not two, thereby condemning Nestorius.
4. The Council of Chalcedon of 451 finished what Ephesus started and said Christ has two natures. The resulting formula condemns both Nestorius and Eutyches, saying that two natures, deity and humanity, are united in one person.
5. The Council of Constantinople in 553 reaffirmed the doctrine of two natures against the Monophysites and further explained that two natures do not mean two faces.
6. The Council of Constantinople in 680 affirmed, against the Monotheletes, that Christ has two wills but is not two persons.

These are the six ecumenical councils traditionally accepted by the three major branches of Christendom—Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Protestantism. With the important exception of the doctrine of the trinity established at Nicea and Constantinople and the adoption of inadequate terminology at Chalcedon, Oneness Pentecostals accept the fundamental concepts of Christology that these councils expressed.

158

A History of Christian Doctrine

After the controversies over the doctrine of God and the doctrine of Jesus Christ, the next great struggles in Christian thought were over the doctrine of humanity (anthropology), the doctrine of salvation (soteriology), and the doctrine of the church (ecclesiology).

Views of Human Nature

A scriptural understanding of human nature is an essential component of theology, and it is closely related to the doctrine of salvation. The crux of the matter is the Bible's teaching about the relationship between sin and human nature.

The Bible proclaims that all have sinned (Romans 3:23). It further states that all are "under sin" (Romans

10

The Doctrines of
Humanity and Salvation

3:9; 7:14; Galatians 3:22). This nature of sin comes from the disobedience of Adam (Romans 5:19), and the individual receives it at conception (Psalm 51:5). The unsaved are servants, literally slaves, of sin (Romans 6:20). Although Christians are not to live in sin, they must recognize that the nature of sin remains in them (I John 1:8; 2:1). All humans have the law (principle) of sin dwelling in them, but they can overcome it by the law of the Spirit (Romans 7:14-8:4).

These and other biblical statements gave rise to several key questions that were debated extensively in the fifth and sixth centuries. First, what does it mean to say that all are sinners, are under sin, or have a sinful nature? Is everyone born a sinner? Does having a sinful nature mean merely an ability to sin, an inclination or predisposition to sin, or a compulsion to sin? Are people born with guilt for Adam's sin, or does guilt arise only when they commit sinful acts?

Moreover, do people have a free will or not? Can they choose whether to sin or not? If they can choose, how are they slaves of sin? If they cannot choose, how are they accountable for sin? Do people determine their own destinies, or does God predetermine (predestine) who will be saved and who will be lost?

In this regard, pagans in the ancient world tended to emphasize fate or destiny. A common view was that whatever will be will be; humans have little or no control over their future. Everyone is subject to whims of the gods and to fate. The Stoics particularly promoted this concept, and the Gnostics taught that some people were predestined for salvation while some were predestined for damnation.

The early Christian writers reacted against this pagan way of thinking, because it undercut the foundation of Christianity, including repentance, discipleship, and holiness. They stressed the freedom of the will, including people's responsibility and accountability for sin and their need to believe on Jesus Christ and obey His gospel. Justin taught the freedom of the human will to choose salvation. Irenaeus taught that humans are born in sin but

have a free will. Writers of the Alexandrian school, such as Clement, Athanasius, and Cyril, emphasized the freedom of the will and presented sin as a freely chosen act rather than a hereditary condition. John Chrysostom denied inborn sin, insisting that each person has the ability to choose right or wrong. If he chooses right, then God will help him.

Tertullian strongly affirmed the sinfulness of human nature from birth (original sin). As a result he taught that everyone needs God's grace, but he did so in the context of the freedom of the will. Humans have the opportunity and responsibility to accept God's offer of salvation. Tertullian also taught traducianism, the view that a child receives its soul at conception from its parents. Just as the body comes from the union of the father and the mother, so does the soul. The alternative, called creationism, is that every time a child is conceived God immediately creates a soul and places it in the child. The Bible does not directly address this issue, although it excludes other alternatives, such as the preexistence or reincarnation of souls. (See Genesis 2:7; Hebrews 9:27.)

Tertullian used traducianism to explain the sinful nature. When Adam and Eve sinned, they died spiritually and acquired a sinful nature. Through the natural process

161

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

of generation, they passed both their physical and spiritual characteristics to their descendants, so that every human is born a sinner.

Cyprian, Hilary, and Ambrose similarly taught the universal sinfulness (depravity) of humanity. Ambrose asserted that God's grace always has to initiate salvation (prevenient grace).

The Greek theologians, including Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, and Cyril, agreed that the fall of Adam and Eve weakened the human will; thus people need the assistance of divine grace to be saved. They recognized that humans have a corrupt nature, but not actual guilt, from birth.

Augustine taught the doctrine of original sin that became the position of the Roman Catholic Church: everyone is born a sinner, which includes both the nature of sin (compulsion, dominion of sin) and the actual guilt of Adam's sin. Every human being will inevitably commit sins, and from birth every human being deserves eternal damnation.

The concept of inherited guilt, however, seems to contradict basic notions of fairness, especially when applied to infants. As we have seen, the Bible does indicate that every child is born with a sinful nature, which means he cannot be righteous in himself but will commit sinful acts. Universal human experience bears witness to this truth. The Bible also indicates, however, that people are accountable for sin only when they personally violate the law of God. (See Ezekiel 18:19-20; Romans 2:14-15; 5:13.) How could infants be personally guilty before God when they have not committed sinful acts? For that matter, how could young children be accountable before they

162

A History of Christian Doctrine

are able to understand fully the concepts of law, sin, and righteousness and to exercise faith and repentance? For adults, the question is moot, for their sinful nature has led them to commit sinful acts for which they are accountable. But the doctrine makes a signficant difference in the case of young children. If original sin means actual guilt, then babies who die would be lost in eternity, unless there is some special provision for them.

Indeed, Augustine taught, as does the Roman Catholic Church, that children who die cannot go to heaven unless they have first been baptized to take away the guilt of Adam that is in their lives. To moderate the horror of this doctrine, Catholics say that the unbaptized infant goes to limbo, a place where there is neither pleasure nor pain.

The Atonement

The writers of the second century (Post-Apostolic Age and Age of the Greek Apologists) believed that Christ died for our salvation and rose again to bring us victory, but they did not elaborate on the doctrine of the Atonement. The Epistle to Diognetus described Christ's death as a ransom.

Irenaeus said Christ's life was a recapitulation of all stages of human existence so that He sanctified each stage and provides salvation to people at every age. Irenaeus also spoke of Christ's death as our redemption.

Clement of Alexandria said the Logos became man so that we might become God (partake of the divine nature). Athanasius reiterated this concept of "deification," and it became an important theme in the Greek church. Athanasius also spoke of Christ's death as a substitute for our own.

163

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

Hilary was the first writer to call Christ's death a "satisfaction" offered to God. Origen described it as a ransom paid to the devil, which the devil was not qualified to keep. Ambrose saw His death as a sacrifice to God, satisfaction of divine judgment, and a ransom to the devil.

Gregory I gave perhaps the most complete expression of the Atonement in ancient times, saying that Christ's death was a sacrifice that paid our debt of death. Further elaboration came in the Middle Ages.

Pelagius

In the 400s, a man from the British Isles named Pelagius sparked great controversy over the doctrines of humanity and salvation. He taught that humans have an absolutely free will. They are free to do whatever they wish. They can live righteous lives even without divine help, or they can lead sinful lives.

If they choose the latter, then they need salvation from God. Even then, however, they turn to God by using their natural ability to choose. Salvation does not come solely by God's grace, but it is a cooperative effort between God and man. A sinner is not changed purely by the grace of God, in which God intervenes to change his life and enable him to overcome sin, but the sinner changes by choosing good over evil. Instead of needing a new birth (regeneration) in order to live a holy life, every human being has the potential to live a holy life of his own accord and by his own power.

Pelagius thus rejected the idea of original sin; people are not born with guilt or the dominion of sin or even a predisposition to sin. In theory at least, a person could live a sinless life by his own ability. In short, everyone is born

164

A History of Christian Doctrine

in a state of innocence like Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden and has the same unrestricted choice they did.

Pelagius did not believe that God's grace was absolutely necessary to enable someone to repent and live a holy life, but he understood grace as primarily the enlightenment of human reason. God moves on the human mind to help people understand what He wants them to do. Grace operates by showing a person what is good, and then he is able to do it of his own accord.

Under this view, God's grace is really a form of assistance; people can do without it if they wish. Moreover, they must make themselves worthy of divine assistance by taking

the right steps. They must show God that they are attempting
to live right in order for Him to interact with them.
This theory contradicts biblical passages concerning
the universal sinfulness of the human race, the grace of
God, and the new birth. Instead of salvation by grace—
the undeserved operation of God in a person's life—
Pelagius redefined grace as God's helping someone to do
what he can and should do on his own. Moreover, this
assistance has to be merited.
The doctrine of Pelagius created a great stir in the
Western church, but these issues did not signficantly
affect the Eastern (Greek-speaking) church. Historically,
the doctrines of humanity and salvation are preoccupations
of the West more than the East. In 431, however, the
Council of Ephesus, which was concerned more with
Christology than soteriology, condemned the views of
Pelagius as heresy.

Augustine

The leading opponent of Pelagius was Augustine,

165

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

bishop of Hippo Regius in North Africa. In these matters,
he laid much of the foundation for Western theology, particularly
the theology of Roman Catholicism, although
Catholics and Protestants alike see him as a great champion
of orthodoxy.
First of all, Augustine taught the doctrine of original
sin quite strongly. Every human being inherits both the
nature and the guilt of sin from Adam. Adam's sin is
imputed to all. When a baby is born, he is destined for
eternal damnation.
According to Augustine, the sinful nature dominates
every aspect of a person's being. Specifically, sensuality
rules the human spirit. As the supreme example, he cited
the sexual drive, which he regarded as part of the sinful
nature.
This concept underlies much of Catholic theology
today. The Catholic idea is that the more holy someone is,
the less connection he or she will have with sexuality.
Married couples are not supposed to "lust" after one
another. They are not to use an artificial means of contraception,
for that wrongly promotes sexual pleasure over
procreation.
From a biblical perspective, however, God created
humans with sexuality as a normal part of their nature.
There was nothing sinful about it. Of course, since the fall

of man, sin has affected all his being, including sexuality, which is often used in a sinful way. In marriage, however, it is wholesome (Hebrews 13:4).

Augustine taught that salvation is by grace alone. God's grace is necessary for salvation. No human being can save himself or contribute to his own salvation. He must have a sovereign act of God in his life to regenerate him.

Augustine further taught that the application of God's grace to a person's life begins with water baptism, which is essential for salvation. First of all—and Augustine was the first theologian to state this idea clearly—baptism removes the guilt inherited from Adam (but not the sinful nature itself). Second, it removes the personal sins that the person has accumulated in his life.

Under this view, baptism is suitable and indeed necessary for infants. Infants should be baptized to remove original sin and to begin the work of grace in their lives. Without baptism a person does not have the grace of God and does not have eternal life.

Ultimately baptism is not effective without a conversion of heart, but the inward conversion can occur later. As children grow up and embrace the truth, they do not need to be rebaptized but simply need to step into conscious possession of forgiveness and the Spirit. The same is true of adults who are baptized because of duress, coercion, or decision of a political leader.

Regarding justification, Augustine took what became the standard Catholic approach, saying that justification is the transformation of the natural man into the spiritual man. In Protestant theology, justification is simply the act of God in counting the sinner as righteous, but according to Augustine justification also includes the gradual process by which a person actually becomes righteous. In Protestantism, this latter work is called sanctification. Augustine considered the whole process to be part of justification.

Augustine insisted that justification is a work of God's grace. It is not a natural human development or a psychological phenomenon as Pelagius indicated. It comes by

the grace of God, beginning at baptism and continuing throughout the Christian's life.

As an integral part of his doctrine of grace, Augustine taught individual predestination to salvation, a view that

first surfaced with the Gnostics. God has elected some people to salvation; before they were born, God chose them to be saved and nothing can alter His choice. He bestows His grace upon them, and as a result they are saved—not by any act of their own but by the sovereign decision of God. Their human will simply conforms to what God has already decreed.

This grace is irresistible. Those whom God has predestined to be saved will inevitably be saved. They can do nothing to change their status. They are saved "whether they like it or not." Of course, Augustine did not put it in these terms because if the grace of God works in someone's life, by definition, he desires salvation. In sum, individual destiny does not depend on human choice or merit; it depends strictly upon God's choice. To those whom God has chosen to be saved, He grants them the grace of salvation.

This doctrine of predestination, called unconditional election, certainly establishes that salvation is purely by God's grace, for it leaves man with absolutely no role to play. It raises many additional questions, however.

What about those who are not elected to salvation? Augustine sometimes stated that God simply passes them by, but he also indicated that they are consigned to damnation based solely on God's choice. They will be eternally damned no matter what they do about it; there is nothing they can do to change that situation. The logical conclusion is that every person is predestined either to

salvation or to damnation, and this view is called double predestination.

How can someone know he is one of God's elect? Since justification is a gradual process, no one can be absolutely certain. Simply being baptized and joining a Christian church do not guarantee divine election. Only time will tell if a person will persevere in the faith.

Some people may seemingly begin in the faith, but they do not endure to the end and so are lost. The reason is that they are not truly part of the elect; God's grace is not truly working in their lives. That is the way God meant it to be. They cannot persevere because the grace of God is not motivating their religious actions.

People who believe they are elect and justified have every incentive to stay in the church and live a holy life, because the only way they know their status for certain is

if they continue. In theory, salvation is totally outside man, but in practice, people are urged to follow the teachings of the church throughout their lives.

The result is an emphasis on works. Since justification is a gradual process, not instantaneous, there is no point at which a person can conclude that he has been justified, is definitely one of the elect, and therefore has no further need to live a holy life. On the contrary, the best evidence of election and justification is an ongoing desire to live a Christian life. The salvation process will continue to work throughout the lives of the elect.

Augustine and his followers appealed to Scripture, such as Ephesians 1 and Romans 9, to support their position. The latter passage establishes God's sovereignty, but Romans 10 shows that God has chosen to offer salvation, not arbitrarily, but on the basis of faith. Scripture as a

169

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

whole refutes Augustinian predestination. Jesus Christ died for the whole world (John 3:16; I Timothy 2:6; I John 2:2). God desires for everyone to be saved (I Timothy 2:4; II Peter 3:9), and the offer of salvation extends to the whole world, to whosoever will (Revelation 3:20; 22:17). Each person must respond in faith to this offer (Romans 1:16-17). Salvation is by grace, but it comes only through faith (Ephesians 2:8). The saving grace of God works in a person's life as long as he continues to live by faith (Romans 11:19-22; I Corinthians 15:2; Hebrews 10:23-39).

While salvation is wholly an act of God, it is man's responsibility to allow God to perform that work in his life. Grace can be resisted. (See Acts 7:51.) A person can start out in geniune faith and be saved, but then depart from the faith and be lost. (See Galatians 5:4; II Peter 2:20-22; James 5:19-20.) God's grace is what saves us, but we have an individual responsibility and ability either to allow His grace to work in our lives or to refuse His grace.

Augustine's doctrine of predestination never was officially adopted by the Roman Catholic Church, but it did receive widespread acceptance. The early Protestants rediscovered it and made it a cornerstone of their theology, particularly Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli, and John Calvin. In that sense, Augustine stands as the father not only of much of Roman Catholicism but also of much of Protestantism as well.

In short, there were two opposite extremes in the fifth
century on the doctrines of humanity and salvation. On
one side, Pelagius said people have a totally free will and
can live a holy life by their own efforts. On the other side,

A History of Christian Doctrine

Augustine said all are born in sin and from birth deserve
damnation. They have no choice with respect to salvation;
God alone determines whether or not each individual
will be saved, and salvation is solely by His grace.

The Semi-Pelagians

Many people were not satisfied with either extreme. A
middle group formed, called the Semi-Pelagians. Most of
them could more properly be called Semi-Augustinians,
because they were much closer to the theology of Augustine.
They rejected his idea of predestination, however, on
the ground that it contradicted Scripture and was a new
doctrine.

They said, with Augustine, that humans are naturally
sinful or depraved; they are born as sinners. Contrary to
Augustine, they held that God's grace is general or universal.
God does not predestine certain individuals to be
saved or lost, but He offers His grace to every human
being. Everyone can potentially be saved.

They accepted scriptural statements about God's predestined
plan of salvation but said individual predestination
is based on divine foreknowledge. That is, God elects
those who are saved, but He does so based on His knowledge
of their response. He extends His grace to all
humanity; some accept it, while others reject it. God's
foreordained plan of salvation is for those who respond in
faith. In this way, the Semi-Pelagians simultaneously
affirmed the sinfulness of humanity, the necessity of the
grace of God, and human responsibility and freedom to
accept or reject God's grace.

The Semi-Pelagians taught that a person cannot overcome
sin by his own will. He must have God to free him.

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

But the sinner can desire deliverance, and he can believe
God. He can ask God to free him. Even though his will is
restricted by sin, it is not totally bound. He can desire to
do good, he can desire God's grace, and he can exercise
faith so that God will move in his life.

In essence, God comes to assist the weak human will.
When a person approaches God in faith, God will help

him. In a sense, the Semi-Pelagians described divine grace as cooperating with the human will. Saving grace does not precede the human will, however. Whereas Pelagius said salvation is completely a human choice and Augustine said it is completely a divine choice, the Semi-Pelagians took an intermediate view: humans decide but God's grace enables. People make the choice to be saved, and God gives them the power to implement that choice.

If this is so, who initiates the salvation process? Does God take the first step or does man? The Semi-Pelagians said it could happen either way. Sometimes God draws a person and that person responds, allowing God's grace to work in him. On the other hand, someone can of his own accord seek good and call upon God, in which case God will respond.

The Semi-Pelagians thus rejected Augustine's position that grace always precedes salvation. Augustine said that God must give grace before a person will even begin to seek Him. The Semi-Pelagians objected that God sometimes responds to the initial decision of a person, that sometimes a person begins seeking God of his own accord.

From the Augustinian perspective, the Semi-Pelagians compromised the doctrine of grace alone by arguing that the human will can cooperate with God's grace or even

172

A History of Christian Doctrine

precede God's grace. Some Semi-Pelagians emphasized the power of the human will to such an extent that they sounded almost like Pelagius himself.

Synod of Orange, A.D. 529

The views of the Semi-Pelagians were particularly strong in Gaul (France), and there the controversy was resolved, at least for a time. A synod was convened at Orange in 529 for this purpose. It was not an ecumenical council, for the problem primarily affected the Western church, and there were no representatives from the East.

First, the synod firmly rejected Pelagianism. It held that all humans are born as sinners.

Second, the synod rejected Semi-Pelagianism on the ground that God's grace always precedes and initiates salvation. No one ever begins the process on his own; whenever someone seeks salvation, it is because God has already been working in his life. God always takes the first step. His grace extends to everyone, and it is His grace that actually motivates people to respond. The first

impulse of desire for God is actually a result of God's grace.

Third, the synod rejected double predestination, particularly the idea that God predestines certain people to damnation. Such a notion it held to be contrary to God's goodness. He does not foreordain evil, and He does not wish for anyone to be lost.

The synod did not make a specific statment regarding the predestination of the saved, but it distinguished foreknowledge from predestination. God knows all things in advance, but His foreknowledge is not causative. He foreordains only what is good.

173

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

A person who is regenerated can fall from the grace of salvation. In such a case, his failure is due, not to God's choice, but to his own perverted will. When a person perseveres to the end, God deserves all the credit for his salvation. It is God's grace alone that has sustained him, not his abilities. If a person is saved, it is because of the grace of God, but if a person is lost, it is because of his own will. On the other hand, if a person has begun to follow God, he can persevere to the end if he will continue to live by faith. There is no need to worry whether he is one of the elect; he can have assurance of salvation by following the teaching of the church. Saving grace begins at water baptism, and a baptized person can have confidence in his ultimate salvation if he will continue in the faith.

Grace is universal; God desires the salvation of everyone. He extends his grace to all, but not all accept that grace. If a person is saved, he is saved by the grace of God based on the merits of Jesus Christ and not his own.

The Synod of Orange thus affirmed Augustine's doctrine of salvation by grace alone, particularly the prevenient grace of God. In essence, it endorsed a moderate form of Augustinianism.

The popes of the time supported the decision of the synod, which became the position of the Roman Catholic Church. In the Middle Ages, however, Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian ideas enjoyed a resurgence. In practice such views seem to have more influence upon the average adherent even today, for Catholicism relies heavily upon meritorious human works. In this regard, it does not follow Augustine's emphasis on salvation by grace alone, but it does follow his definition of justification as a lifelong process of becoming righteous.

A History of Christian Doctrine

As already noted, most of the early Protestants, such
as the Lutherans, Reformed, and Presbyterians, went further
than the Synod of Orange, completely accepting
Augustine's view of predestination and its logical corollary,
double predestination. For those Protestants who do
not accept this doctrine of predestination, such as the
Methodists, the Synod of Orange expresses their basic
views with one important exception: they typically consider
water baptism to be merely symbolic instead of the
essential first application of saving grace.

The decision of the Synod of Orange agrees with
Scripture in important ways. The Bible clearly refutes the
Pelagian idea that man can save himself by his own goodness,
that he can live a sinless life in his own power. (See
Romans 3:9-10, 23.) It also stands against the Semi-Pelagian
idea that man can initiate the salvation process or
assist God in his own redemption. (See Romans 3:11-12.)
As we have seen, Scripture does not teach unconditional
election, but salvation by grace through faith. God's
grace always initiates salvation, and His grace appears to
everyone to lead them to salvation. (See John 6:44;
Romans 1:20; 2:4; Titus 2:11.) At water baptism God's
grace is applied for the remission of sins; however, water
baptism does not stand alone. For it to be valid, personal
faith and repentance must accompany it, and Christian
initiation is not complete without the baptism of the Holy
Spirit. (See Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38; 8:12-17; 10:44-48.)
In summary, the Synod of Orange said that man is a
sinner, salvation is by grace, God initiates salvation, man
exercises his will to accept salvation, and saving grace
begins with water baptism. In theological terms, the
synod affirmed human depravity and salvation by grace

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

alone but rejected the concepts of irresistible grace and
double predestination. Somewhat paradoxically and
ambiguously, however, it avoided making a decision on
unconditional election.

Grace and Faith

Let us summarize the doctrine of salvation in ancient
church history by comparing it to the teaching of Scripture.
The Bible teaches that we receive salvation by grace
through faith and not by human works (Ephesians 2:8-9).
We are "justified [counted as righteous] freely by his

grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," and
we are "justified by faith without the deeds of the law"
(Romans 3:24, 28).

Writers in the Post-Apostolic Age acknowledged that
salvation was by grace through faith in Christ. Imprecise
and erroneous language arose, however, particularly in
the pseudonymous and anonymous writings, which indicated
that Christians could earn forgiveness for sins
through good works. In discussing sins committed after
baptism, Hermas (early second century) and Tertullian
(early third century) described acts of repentance as necessary
to earn a second chance from God.

Confession of sins from a repentant heart is indeed
necessary to receive God's forgiveness (Psalm 51:17;
Proverbs 28:13; I John 1:9). Repentance is the work of
God in a willing human heart. It is the condition of heart
necessary to be saved, but in no sense does it earn or
merit God's favor. Nevertheless, the notion of working
oneself back into God's favor grew stronger, until it dominated
the soteriology of the Middle Ages.

In the East, the Greek theologians emphasized human

176

A History of Christian Doctrine

free will, at the same time acknowledging human sinfulness
and the necessity of God's grace. They understood
human sinfulness as a corruption of nature and weakening
of the will, but not as actual guilt due to Adam's sin.
They spoke of God and man cooperating in salvation,
with man being able to initiate the process. Thus the
Greek church did not fully accept the views of the Synod
of Orange but remained Semi-Pelagian in outlook.

The Protestant Reformation forced the Eastern church
to address some of these issues more fully. In the seventeenth
century it acknowledged the Augustinian doctrine
that each person is guilty of Adam's sin and that baptism
removes this guilt, but it continued to reject predestination.
Western theologians placed greater emphasis on the
sinfulness of humanity, embracing Augustine's doctrine of
original sin, including guilt for Adam's sin. For a time, the
Western church affirmed the solution of the Synod of
Orange: God's grace is necessary for salvation, and God
must initiate the process. As chapter 12 discusses, however,
the emphasis on the sacraments as necessary means
of grace, including penance after baptism, undercut salvation
by grace alone.

Consequently, during the Middle Ages, the Roman

Catholic Church essentially adopted Semi-Pelagianism.
Today the soteriology of Roman Catholicism and Eastern
Orthodoxy is quite similar. It took the Protestant Reformation
to bring about a fresh look at the doctrines of
grace and faith.

The New Birth

The New Testament teaches that the full conversion
experience, or the new birth, consists of repentance,

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the
initial sign of tongues. (See Acts 2:1-4, 23; 10:44-48;
19:1-6.) This experience is the application of saving
grace and the expression of saving faith.

In the Post-Apostolic Age and even into the Age of the
Greek Apologists and the Old Catholic Age, we find ample
evidence for continued emphasis and experience of these
three elements. During the Old Catholic Age, we see significant
changes, however, and during the Ecumenical
Age the essence of each of these elements was almost
completely lost. As chapter 12 discusses, the three elements
collapsed into water baptism alone, which in turn
was distorted into a near-magical rite.

Repentance. The early Christians placed strong
emphasis on repentance, and this doctrine played a key
role in early controversies over the doctrine and structure
of the church as discussed in chapter 11. Even in the Old
Catholic Age, there was a general consensus that personal
faith and repentance were essential to a genuine conversion.
In the Ecumenical Catholic Age, however, many
factors combined to undermine this doctrine: the end of
persecution, the official promotion of Christianity, the
merger of church and state, the mass "conversion" of
pagans, and the practice of infant baptism.

Water Baptism. Throughout the Old Catholic Age and
the Ecumenical Catholic Age, water baptism was viewed
as efficacious in remitting sins and essential to salvation.
With the acceptance of infant baptism, however, it was
divorced from personal faith and repentance. Moreover,
with the development of the doctrine of the trinity as discussed
in chapter 8, the formula changed from the name
of Jesus Christ to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

A History of Christian Doctrine

We have already examined evidence for the original
Jesus Name formula from the Post-Apostolic Age to the

Old Catholic Age. In the mid third century Stephen, bishop of Rome, approved of baptism in Jesus' name, even if performed by schismatics, and an anonymous opponent of Cyprian strongly endorsed the practice.

Various anonymous and pseudonymous books from the second and third centuries also refer to Jesus Name baptism, including the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Acts of Peter and Paul, the Recognitions of Clement, and the Gospel of Philip. These writings are not always reliable doctrinally, but they preserve evidence of typical baptismal practices.1 Such writings had a greater chance of surviving censorship by later trinitarians than did the writings of prominent advocates of Jesus Name baptism.

In the fourth century, the formula had changed, but Ambrose still held Jesus Name baptism acceptable.2 By the end of the fourth century, however, those who continued to baptize in Jesus' name were, for the most part, outside the institutional church. The Council of Constantinople in 381 condemned Sabellian baptism, which it described as prevalent in Galatia. The Justinian Code of 529 condemned both antitrinitarianism and rebaptism. The Council of Constantinople in 553 again condemned Sabellian baptism. Other condemnations of Sabellian baptism or baptism under a single name also appear during the fifth and sixth centuries.3 These recurring condemnations indicate that some people continued to insist upon the Jesus Name formula.

Baptism of the Holy Spirit. As the evidence from Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen shows, people were receiving the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues at the

179

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

beginning of the Old Catholic Age. In the third century, Sabellius, Asterius Urbanus, and Novatian also described the supernatural gifts of utterance as normal and expected. 4 Novatian said of the Holy Spirit:

This is He who places prophets in the church, instructs teachers, directs tongues, gives power and healings, does wonderful works, offers discrimination of spirits, affords powers of government, suggests counsels, and orders and arranges whatever other gifts there are of charismata; and thus makes the Lord's church everywhere, and in all, perfected and completed.5

Even in the fourth century, tongues, interpretation of tongues, and other supernatural gifts were in evidence.

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, described tongues and interpretation of tongues as "agents of ministry" ordained of God.6 Ambrose, bishop of Milan, taught that all the gifts of I Corinthians 12 were part of the normal Christian experience.7

During the Ecumenical Catholic Age, as the emphasis on repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus faded, so did the experience of the Holy Spirit. Since the New Testament clearly teaches the essentiality of receiving the Spirit, however, people tried to assure themselves of salvation by claiming that the gift of the Holy Spirit comes automatically at the laying on of hands. Eventually this moment was identified with the act of water baptism, which was accompanied by the laying on of hands.

By late fourth and early fifth centuries, people in the

180

A History of Christian Doctrine

institutional church no longer expected to receive the Holy Spirit as recorded in the Book of Acts, although they knew that this experience had formerly occurred. John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, commented on I Corinthians 12:

This whole place is very obscure: but the obscurity is produced by our ignorance of the facts referred to and by their cessation, being such as then used to occur but now no longer take place. . . . Well: what did happen then? Whoever was baptized he straightway spoke with tongues. . . . They at once on their baptism received the Spirit. . . . [They] began to speak, one in the tongue of the Persians, another in that of the Romans, another in that of the Indians, or in some other language. And this disclosed to outsiders that it was the Spirit in the speaker.8

He referred to tongues not mentioned in biblical accounts, showing that he was aware of subsequent experiences. Augustine, Ambrose's disciple, gave similar testimony. He maintained that the church in his day no longer expected to speak in tongues when receiving the Holy Spirit but admitted that formerly they did:

For the Holy Spirit is not only given by the laying on of hands amid the testimony of temporal sensible miracles, as He was given in former days. . . . For who expects in these days that those on whom hands are laid that they may receive the Holy Spirit should forthwith begin to speak with tongues?9

181

The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

In short, in the second, third, and early fourth centuries, many people were born of water and the Spirit just as in the Book of Acts. By the end of the fourth century and beginning of the fifth, however, the institutional church had largely lost not only the biblical doctrine of God but also the biblical doctrine and experience of the new birth. From then through the Middle Ages, we have to look primarily outside the structure of the institutional church to find people who proclaimed and received the full apostolic message.*

*For a list of people in church history who baptized in the name of Jesus, see Appendix D. For a list of those who received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, see Appendix E.

182

A History of Christian Doctrine

Closely connected to the doctrine of salvation is ecclesiology, the doctrine concerning the church. To examine the development of this doctrine we must also study the development of the organizational structure of the church.

Worship Services

In New Testament times, Christians typically met in homes to worship. (See Acts 2:46; 5:42; 11:12; 12:12; 20:20.) When possible, they met in places specially prepared for worship. In times of persecution, particularly in Rome, they occasionally met in underground cemeteries (catacombs). We find the first evidence of specially constructed public church buildings around 230, but these were all destroyed in later persecutions. When

183

11

The Doctrine and
Structure of the Church

Constantine embraced Christianity, he began a program of constructing church buildings at state expense.

From the beginning, Christians met on the first day of the week. (See John 20:1, 19, 26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Corinthians 16:2.) In his Epistle to the Magnesians, Ignatius noted that Christians met to worship on the day of Christ's resurrection, "the Lord's day." (See Revelation 1:10.) He explained that this was not an observance of the Sabbath but a new covenant celebration of the Resurrection. The Didache similarly mentioned worship on the Lord's day. The Epistle of Pseudo-Barnabas and Justin

also named Sunday as the day Christians met to worship.
Since Sunday was a regular work day in the pagan
Roman Empire, they generally met early in the morning,
in the evening, or both. As part of his support of Christianity,
Emperor Constantine made Sunday a legal holiday
so that Christians could worship on their special day without
hindrance.

In his First Apology, Justin listed the following elements
of a typical worship service: reading of Scripture,
preaching or teaching, prayer (group and representative),
offering, and the Eucharist (for baptized believers
only). Bible reading was important, for in the days of
handwritten manuscripts, Bibles were rare and costly, and
most people did not own a personal copy. At first, worship
was simple and spontaneous, but over the centuries elaborate
rituals and liturgies (prescribed forms) arose, particularly
as the move of the Spirit diminished.

Church Government

The New Testament speaks of apostles, prophets,
evangelists, pastors and teachers (Ephesians 4:11). It

A History of Christian Doctrine

uses three terms interchangeably: bishop (overseer), pastor
(shepherd), and elder (presbyter). (See Acts 20:17,
28; Titus 1:5-7; I Peter 5:1-4.) The elders or bishops were
ministers who had leadership roles in the local church,
particularly in preaching and teaching (Philippians 1:1;
I Timothy 3:1-2, 5; 5:17; II Timothy 4:2-5; Titus 1:7-9). A
bishop was a local pastor; the use of this term to denote a
hierarchical official who has authority over pastors was a
later development.

Another local church office was that of deacon
(Philippians 1:1; I Timothy 3:8-13). The deacons did not
necessarily have a position of ruling, teaching, or
preaching, but they assisted the pastors in the business
of the church. The seven men chosen in Act 6 were probably
prototypes for the office of deacon mentioned in
I Timothy.

The Epistles speak of the elders or bishops of a city,
using the plural. Apparently there was a group of elders
for each church, not just one. We must remember, however,
that while the Epistles speak of one church in a city
(I Corinthians 1:2), the early Christians had no church
buildings and the believers in a city could not all gather in
one location for worship. For example, when Paul wrote
to the church in Rome, the believers apparently met in at

least five different homes (Romans 16:5, 10-11, 14-15). Probably the leaders of the various house groups were the elders of the church. They did not work in isolation but collectively.

The situation was similar to metropolitan areas today in which a group of pastors of local churches work in harmony and coordinate their efforts. Since the church in a city often had hundreds or even thousands of believers,

The Doctrine and Structure of the Church

we can also compare it to large churches today that have a number of ministers on staff.

While there were several elders for each city, it is logical to assume that, for effective organization and action, one acted as the senior leader or presiding elder—what we might call the senior pastor or the sectional presbyter. We find evidence of such an arrangement in the New Testament. In Revelation 1:20, the Lord gave John a vision of seven stars who were "angels" of seven churches in Asia Minor, and in Revelation 2-3, He addressed a letter of commendation, rebuke, or instruction to the "angel" of each church. The Greek word for angel simply means "messenger." Since there was no need for celestial spirit beings to receive such letters, in this context it seem clear that the "angel" of each local church was the human spokesman for God, or in other words, the senior pastor.

Originally, each congregation handled its own affairs, but the churches worked together closely to promote doctrinal purity, fellowship, and evangelistic efforts. Thus Acts and the Epistles reveal that there was a significant degree of organization among the churches, and they all looked to the apostles and elders for spiritual leadership. The apostles and elders exercised this authority by meeting together, making decisions, and sending representatives to investigate matters, communicate instructions, and receive offerings. (See Acts 8:14; 11:2-4, 22; 15:1-31; II Corinthians 8:16-24.) They developed means of approving, ordaining, and recommending pastors, evangelists, and missionaries, as well as withdrawing approval. (See Acts 13:2-3; I Corinthians 16:10-11; Colossians 4:10; I Timothy 1:20; 3:1-7; 4:14; II Timothy 2:17-18; III John 9-12.)

A History of Christian Doctrine

Originally, the leadership was invested in the apostles in Jerusalem. Peter, James, and John apparently had the

highest positions of authority, as "pillars" of the church (Galatians 2:9). It appears that James was the senior pastor in Jerusalem and chairman of the council of apostles and elders that met there. Perhaps we could consider him to be general overseer or superintendent of the church. (See Acts 15:13-29; 21:18; Galatians 2:12.)

As the church grew, various individuals served as overseers of churches, regions, or areas of ministry. Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles, while Peter was the apostle to the Jews (Galatians 2:7-8). Under Paul's direction, Titus was the overseer of the island of Crete (Titus 1:5). The church expanded from the most ancient centers of evangelism throughout outlying regions. For example, Paul resided in Ephesus for two years, during which he not only established the church there but also evangelized the entire province of Asia (Acts 19:9-10, 26). Metropolitan churches planted numerous other churches in surrounding towns and villages. As the number of churches multiplied, the pastors of newer and smaller churches looked for leadership to the pastors of mother churches— the oldest churches or the churches in the most powerful cities.

In the second century, the Didache described apostles, prophets, teachers, bishops, and deacons as existing in its day, with the first two traveling among the churches. The pattern of the Post-Apostolic Age was to have one bishop (presiding elder) for each city, considering all believers in the city to be part of one church. Ignatius described one bishop in charge of each church and elders and deacons who assisted him.

187

The Doctrine and Structure of the Church

The New Testament teaches submission to spiritual leaders (Hebrews 13:7, 17), and Ignatius placed great emphasis on submission to the bishop, elders, and deacons. He taught that believers should be subject to the bishop as to Christ, that people who break away from their bishop are in error, and that no one should celebrate the Eucharist or perform baptisms without the presence or approval of the bishop.

Scholars sometimes describe the church government of Ignatius as the monarchial episcopate, meaning that one bishop (pastor) governs each local church. This arrangement was not universal, although we have noted evidence for it in the New Testament. By the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian, it was the uniform practice.

At the time of Ignatius, there was no formal hierarchy beyond the local church, and the local church government was essentially congregational. Nevertheless, the post-apostolic writings show that the churches sought to maintain unity of doctrine and action. They recognized and submitted to the spiritual leaders among them, particularly the bishops of leading churches. Ignatius was the first to speak of the church as "catholic," or universal. According to Clement of Rome, the Didache, and Cyprian, initially the people of a congregation elected both bishops and deacons. Later, fellow bishops began to play a decisive role in the selection of a new bishop. When the state and church merged under Constantine, the state (emperor or other officials) appointed or ratified bishops. After the Western Roman Empire fell, the pope began to step into the power vacuum. Kings and popes contested the issue for centuries, but ultimately the pope won the right to appoint all bishops.

188

A History of Christian Doctrine

Gradually, there developed a hierarchy beyond the local church or individual city. The churches in the towns and villages surrounding a city began to submit to the pastor or bishop of that city. At first this deference was voluntary and the leading bishop exercised moral authority only, but eventually power was consolidated and the authority became ecclesiastical. The title of bishop came to mean the leader not just of one church or one city, but of a whole region.

The clergy became sharply distinguished from the laity, and three orders of clergy emerged: bishop (hierarchical ruler over pastors), presbyter (local pastor or priest), and deacon (local church official). Presbyters assisted the bishop and served as pastors in towns and villages. Deacons were subordinate to presbyters but could preach and baptize. Ultimately the bishops of major cities became known as metropolitans or archbishops— leaders of the other bishops.

In the fourth century, five churches were recognized as great mother churches: Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople. Jerusalem was the mother of all churches, Antioch had been the first center of missionary activity to the Gentile world, and Rome was the seat of the empire. Alexandria and Constantinople were great political, cultural, and economic centers. Alexandria was a focal point of Hellenistic (Greek-based)

scholarship, for Jews and then for Christians. Constantinople was Constantine's new capital, and after the fall of Rome, the remaining seat of imperial power.

The bishops of these five cities became the recognized church leaders. In the Eastern church they became known as patriarchs, from words meaning "father" and

"ruler." There was only one such bishop in the West—at Rome—and he became known as the pope, meaning "father."

This developing hierarchy paralleled the Roman government. The bishops were like prefects, the archbishops like provincial governors, the synod of bishops like the provincial assembly, and eventually the pope ruled like the emperor. As the Roman Empire collapsed, the Roman Catholic Church began to take its place.

Novatian versus Callistus

One important development was the bishop of Rome gaining preeminence. In the third century, many already regarded Rome as the leading mother church. In addition to its being the imperial capital, tradition held that Peter and Paul taught in Rome and were martyred there. Moreover, the Roman church was known for zealously resisting heretics and guarding doctrinal purity.

In the early third century, Bishop Callistus of Rome proclaimed himself to be the "bishop of bishops" and "supreme pontiff" (pontifex maximus), a title given to the emperor as ceremonial head of Roman paganism. By contrast, Tertullian and others asserted the equality of various mother churches. In fact, Tertullian and Hippolytus opposed several Roman bishops of this time, including Callistus, for promoting or sympathizing with modalism. The Novatian controversy, however, gave Callistus an opportunity to advance his authority.

The controversy arose in the third century over the possibility of repentance after baptism. The church taught that converts were to repent before water baptism, at which time all their sins were washed away. After bap-

tism, they were supposed to live a holy life. The question soon arose, What if a person returns to a life of sin after water baptism? Can he be forgiven again and restored to the church? The question was raised particularly in reference to major, public sins such as apostasy, adultery, and

fornication.

This question assumed considerable urgency as a result of the severe persecutions of the third century. When a wave of persecution came, some believers stood firm, maintained their faith, and were imprisoned or martyred. The church honored the memory of its martyrs. It also honored those who survived torture and imprisonment without denying the faith and gave them the title of confessor.

Other people were not so strong, however. When threats and persecution came they recanted the faith. Under duress, they apostasized, publicly renouncing Christianity and offering pagan sacrifices. When the current wave of persecution subsided, many of these people felt remorse, came back to the church, and sought repentance. They acknowledged their failure in a moment of weakness but professed their sincerity and their desire to be a Christian and be saved.

What was the church to do with these people? Naturally, those who had faithfully endured persecution tended to doubt the sincerity of the backsliders. They were prone to reject them, saying they could not be forgiven. There were also practical considerations: Would accepting these backsliders undermine the church's witness and its ability to withstand future persecutions?

Novatian, an early champion of trinitarianism, took the strict view that a person cannot repent of or be

191

The Doctrine and Structure of the Church

forgiven for certain major sins after baptism. The sin of apostasy is a prime example. When the institutional church began to accept lapsed believers back into fellowship, Novatian broke from the main body and formed a schismatic church in Rome. He rebaptized those who joined him and appointed opposition bishops in various places.

Most bishops and churches believed that the Bible offers a more compassionate response of forgiveness and reconciliation. (See James 5:19-20; I John 1:9.) They concluded that, even though these lapsed people were weak, they should be allowed to repent and should be accepted back into the church.

Callistus opposed Novatian, invoking his authority as the Roman bishop. He claimed that the council of bishops had authority over the granting of repentance, citing the keys that the Lord gave to Peter (Matthew 16:19). He pronounced

that these people could be forgiven and accepted
back in the church.

At this time Callistus had no recognized authority
beyond his own area, but for several reasons people
throughout the church began citing his decision as
authoritative: his conclusion was sound, it expressed
majority opinion, he was the bishop in the imperial capital,
and he was the bishop who had jurisdiction over the
foremost dissident. The actions of Callistus in the Novatian
controversy therefore enhanced the authority of the
Roman bishop and established a precedent for future doctrinal
disputes.

The Teaching of Cyprian

The North African bishop Cyprian greatly influenced

A History of Christian Doctrine

the development of hierchical ecclesiology. He contested
the views of Stephen, bishop of Rome, on the baptism of
heretics, so he did not consider the bishop of Rome to be
the supreme doctrinal authority, but his teaching was conducive
to the establishment of centralized authority.

Cyprian became involved in the controversy over
repentance after baptism. Teaching that repentance
should be allowed for major sins upon repentance and
public confession, he lent his support to the bishops of
Rome in his day, who were strong advocates of that position.
He buttressed his position by the following argument:

The church alone is the guarantor of salvation. No one
can be saved outside the church. Even if a person has
orthodox belief, if he is not in fellowship with a true
church he cannot be saved. People such as Novatian and
other schismatics cannot be saved. Even though they may
have separated from the church out of lofty motives, such
as a sincere desire to defend holiness, and even though
their belief may be orthodox in every way, if they break
away from the true church, they cannot be saved. Salvation
is available only in the visible, recognized, organized
church.

Under this doctrine, it becomes essential to know
what is the true church. How can someone know whether
a local church is part of the true church or an unsanctioned
schism? Cyprian answered that the legitimacy of a
local congregation is determined by the bishops. If the
bishops of the universal church endorse a local body, then
it is a legitimate church.

As a bishop himself, Cyprian had a personal interest

in this arrangement. In essence, he taught that the college

The Doctrine and Structure of the Church

of bishops controls the church. The authority of the church resides in the collective body of bishops. While Cyprian did not concede supreme authority to any one bishop, not even the bishop of Rome, he did acknowledge that someone needs to preside over the bishops and preserve the unity of the church. He identified the bishop of Rome as the appropriate leader. He did not teach that the bishop of Rome has sole authority or is infallible, but he described him as preeminent, the first among equals. Thus Cyprian took a major step in establishing the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Donatus versus Augustine

The next step in the development of Roman Catholic ecclesiology was the Donatist controversy, which was similar to the earlier Novatian controversy. It arose in North Africa in 312 over the restoration of believers who had recanted during the last great persecution, under Emperor Diocletian. The Donatists particularly opposed allowing a lapsed believer to become a bishop.

Donatus, bishop of Carthage in the fourth century, had a zeal for holiness. The Donatists were quite concerned because it appeared that many bishops were living lax or immoral lives. Some bishops had recanted in times of persecution, later repented, and then were reinstated to their positions.

The Donatists were appalled at this lack of discipline in the church. They emphasized that every believer must live a holy life and especially that the bishops must live a holy life. They contended that if a bishop was living an immoral life, the sacraments he performed could not be valid.

A History of Christian Doctrine

This stance created a powerful incentive to discipline immoral bishops, for it tied the salvation of the people to the morality of their bishop. If the bishop was living an immoral life, then he was not qualified to be a bishop, and all the sacraments he performed, including water baptism, were not valid. Since water baptism was regarded as essential to salvation, this would mean that the people baptized by such a bishop were not saved.

The views of Donatus understandably stirred up quite a controversy. Donatus started rival churches and

ordained bishops whom he considered to be truly holy. Augustine rose to the challenge of Donatism. Building upon the earlier views of Cyprian, he taught that the validity of the sacraments does not depend upon the bishop's life; it depends upon whether he is part of the catholic (universal) church. If a sacrament is performed within the recognized church, it is valid, regardless of the life of the bishop. Augustine's followers further maintained that a sacrament performed outside the church by a schismatic is not valid. Thus both sides of the Donatist controversy denied salvation to the other.

Like Cyprian, Augustine emphasized that salvation must come through the hierarchy and the visible structure of the one catholic church. Augustine was partly right in recognizing that a person's salvation does not depend on the secret life of the administrator of baptism but on the baptized person's faith in God and obedience to the gospel. (See Acts 2:38-39; 5:32; 16:31; Romans 10:8-11.) If the person being baptized truly repents and has faith in Jesus Christ, then God will remit his sins regardless of the condition of the preacher.

Instead of relying upon the doctrine of salvation by

The Doctrine and Structure of the Church

grace through faith to assure the baptized convert of salvation, however, Augustine relied on the authority of the church. Church authority became more important than personal faith. Separation from the catholic church was sinful, regardless of the spiritual condition or doctrinal position of the local church, pastor, or bishop. Thus all sacraments performed outside the institutional church were invalid.

Augustine also taught that there are two cities, or structures of authority, in life: the city of God, which is the church; and the city of the world, which is the state. Each city has authority in its own sphere. The church has supreme authority in religious matters, while the state has supreme authority in secular matters. The state should support the church in its efforts to establish God's kingdom on earth. The Millennium of Revelation 20 is the victorious church on earth in this age (the doctrine of amillennialism). This teaching helped consolidate the hierarchical structure of the church. It also helped consolidate the power of the state, and it provided a theological justification for the intermarriage of state and church that had begun with Emperor Constantine.

Pope Leo I

The next step in the development of the hierarchy came with Leo I (the Great), bishop of Rome from 440 to 461. Leo was the first bishop of Rome to be an important theologian. His views were decisive in shaping the Christology of the Council of Chalcedon. Historically, he is often considered the first pope because he was the first Roman bishop to claim to be the primate of all the bish-

ops and receive significant acceptance of that claim. Before this time, the bishop of Rome was highly respected and had been influential in deciding certain controversies. In Cyprian's view, the bishop of Rome was the presiding bishop, but the real authority of the church rested with all the bishops. Leo asserted supreme authority, however, on the ground that Peter and Paul founded the church of Rome and the bishop of Rome was their direct successor.

Significantly, Leo obtained imperial recognition of this claim from Valentinian III. Beginning with Constantine, the Roman emperor had actually controlled the church in many ways. The convening of councils and the appointment of bishops were under his control. The emperor's endorsement thus carried great weight.

At this time, however, the Roman Empire was disintegrating, particularly in the West. Rome had already been sacked by the Visigoths in 410. Leo turned Attila the Hun away from Rome in 451, but during Leo's tenure it was sacked by the Vandals in 455. Rome and all Italy came under barbarian rule in 476, not long after Leo's death. As a practical matter, then, the emperor no longer exercised absolute power during this time. Many churches successfully ignored the imperial proclamation and refused to submit to Leo. While most Western bishops gave general assent to Leo's claim, the Eastern bishops did not.

During the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic Church adopted the position of Leo. Therefore it holds today that Jesus made Peter His vicar (deputy) on earth and the prince of the universal church, basing this teaching on Jesus' words in Matthew 16:18-19: "Thou art Peter, and

upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the

keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Contrary to the Roman Church's interpretation of this passage, Jesus did not promise to build His church upon Peter but upon the revelation and confession of His true identity (Matthew 16:15-18). The keys He gave Peter represented the power to open the kingdom of God to people through the preaching of the gospel. Indeed, after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Peter was the first to preach the gospel of the New Testament to the Jews and then to the Gentiles (Acts 2; 10). Moreover, Jesus gave all His disciples power to bind and loose (Matthew 18:18), granting them authority to proclaim the Word and will of God and assuring them of divine backing when they did so.

The Roman Catholic Church maintains, on the basis on tradition, that Peter founded the church in Rome. It further maintains that he passed his authority to all subsequent bishops of Rome. Thus, in their view, Peter and all Roman bishops are popes—absolute rulers of the universal church—and their official pronouncements upon faith and morals are infallible (without error).

Leo's attempt to establish the papacy won a measure of acceptance in his day, and it ultimately prevailed in subsequent centuries. The first Roman bishop who successfully exercised full papal powers in the West, however, was Gregory I in 590.

198

A History of Christian Doctrine

Our discussion of the doctrines of salvation and the church in chapters 10-11 would be incomplete without an analysis of the sacraments. The sacraments portray the message of salvation, and they are administered by the church.

To investigate the meaning of the sacraments in the Ecumenical Catholic Age, we will use a nontechnical, functional definition of a sacrament as a sacred ceremony or rite of the church. Some people view the sacraments as symbols of God's grace, while others view them as means of grace. Augustine defined them as visible signs of invisible grace. At a minimum, we can say that the sacraments represent a spiritual work or the grace of God at work.

The medieval church identified seven sacraments, but

199

12

The Early Sacraments

this number was not definitely established in earlier times. Let us examine how the early sacraments and the interpretations of them came into being.

Baptism

All major branches of Christendom recognize water baptism as a sacrament even though there are differing views about its significance. As we have already seen, in the first five centuries after the New Testament there was a general consensus that baptism is part of salvation, part of the new birth, and the means for receiving the forgiveness, remission, or washing away of sins. The medieval church and the earliest Protestants, including Martin Luther, affirmed this view, as does the Roman Catholic Church today. Most Protestants today, however, see baptism as symbolic only.

In early post-apostolic times, Christians did not view baptism as a magical ceremony that automatically brought forgiveness of sins, but they believed its efficacy depended upon faith and repentance. The early postapostolic writings instruct people to repent of their sins and confess faith in Jesus Christ before they are baptized. If they will do so, then God will wash away their sins at baptism. Baptism is not merely a ceremony or a symbol, but God actually performs a spiritual work when someone is baptized. This view accords with the teaching of the New Testament itself. (See Acts 2:38; 22:16; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:11-12; I Peter 3:21.)

As time went on, various other views became associated with water baptism. For some, water baptism was the means of receiving the Holy Spirit as well as remission of sins. As long as people continued to receive the

200

A History of Christian Doctrine

Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, it was not difficult to distinguish water baptism from Spirit baptism. As the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit began to fade from the professing church, however, and as many people joined the church without seemingly any real experience with God, it became easy to say that they automatically received the Holy Spirit when they were baptized.

This idea clearly contradicts Scripture. In Acts 8, the Samaritans believed and were baptized, but they did not receive the Holy Spirit until later. In Acts 10, Cornelius and his household received the Holy Spirit before they were baptized in water. Nevertheless, as people in the

institutional church no longer received a definite experience
of the Holy Spirit, theologians began to conclude
that when the bishop laid hands on them at water baptism
they received the Spirit without any miraculous sign.
According to Roman Catholic theology today, when people
are baptized, including infants, they are born again
and filled with the Spirit.
Some theologians began to make a distinction
between inner and outer baptism. The inward work is the
washing away of sins, while the outward work is the ceremony
itself. The standard view was that the two works
occur simultaneously, but some theologians held that they
could be separated, at least in theory. Many Protestants
today have extended this reasoning, concluding that the
outward ceremony is simply a symbol of an inward work
that has already taken place.
The Bible reveals no such separation, however. Of
course, it is the blood of Jesus that washes away sin, not
physical water. Nevertheless, God has chosen the moment
of water baptism as a necessary expression of obedient

201

The Early Sacraments

faith and as the occasion when He responds to that obedient
faith by washing away sins.
Another interesting doctrine regarding baptism is the
"baptism of blood," which arose out of the severe persecutions
of the early centuries. In some cases, the Roman
authorities would arrest people who were in the process
of becoming Christians or who were sympathetic to
Christianity. They had to make a swift decision to identify
with Christ and be executed or to reject Christ and offer
pagan sacrifices. In addition, it was reported that at some
public executions bystanders were so moved by the faith
and joy of Christian martyrs that they immediately confessed
Christ and were in turn arrested and executed.
Were such people saved or lost? Theologians wanted
to affirm their salvation yet did not wish to compromise
the necessity of baptism. The solution, which became
part of Roman Catholic theology, was to teach the baptism
of blood, as follows: A person must be baptized to be
saved, and under normal circumstances the baptism must
be in water. If a person is martyred for his faith in Christ
before he can be baptized in water, however, then his martyrdom
serves as a baptism in blood.
Closely related to this doctrine is the "baptism of
desire," a later development. If a person sincerely desires

to be baptized but is physically prevented from doing so before his death, then God counts his desire as if it were actually fulfilled.

The baptism of blood and the baptism of desire sound plausible to the human mind, but the Bible does not explicitly teach them. Rather than undermining the authority of Scripture by creating nonbiblical doctrines for exceptional circumstances, it is preferable to leave unusu-

202

A History of Christian Doctrine

al situations in the hands of the merciful God. While we may have personal speculations, hopes, and opinions, we can only affirm as doctrine what the Bible plainly states.

Another development was infant baptism. Scripturally, the prerequisites for water baptism are personal repentance and faith (Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12; 18:8). Consequently, baptism is not suitable for infants, and there is no record of the apostolic or early post-apostolic church baptizing infants.

In the early third century Tertullian recommended delaying the baptism of small children until they could truly repent. Shortly afterward Origen and Cyprian advocated infant baptism, the first known writers to do so. Origen appealed to tradition, however, and some scholars believe Irenaeus alluded to the practice earlier.[1] As the concept of original sin received general acceptance, particularly Augustine's idea that infants are guilty of the sin of Adam, infant baptism became the norm.

Infant baptism helped popularize another innovation: sprinkling (aspersion) or pouring (effusion) instead of full immersion. In the New Testament water baptism was by immersion (Matthew 3:16; Acts 8:38-39). Indeed, only immersion preserves the signficance of baptism as a burial with Jesus Christ (Romans 6:4; Colossians 2:12). The very word baptize is a transliteration of the Greek word baptizo, which means to dip, plunge, or immerse. In early post-apostolic times, baptism was by immersion, and to this day the Eastern Orthodox Church practices baptism by immersion, even for infants.

In the West, however, sprinkling was gradually allowed for exceptional circumstances, and eventually it became the norm. In the second century, the Didache described immersion as standard but also

203

The Early Sacraments

allowed pouring if sufficient water was not available to immerse. In the early third century Tertullian insisted on

immersion, but by the middle of the century Cyprian allowed sprinkling for the sick. In the early Middle Ages immersion was still common, and it is still acceptable in the Roman Catholic Church, but today Roman Catholics are typically sprinkled.

Many Protestant churches that emerged from Catholicism continue the practice of sprinkling. The Lutherans, Reformed, and Methodists do, even though their founders—Luther, Calvin, and Wesley—acknowledged that the original method was immersion and expressed a preference for it. In most cases, tradition has prevailed over biblical precedent.

As the Didache and Cyprian indicated, it appears that the alternative of pouring or sprinkling arose out of convenience. Three practices that helped make sprinkling the first choice were deathbed baptism, infant baptism, and triple baptism.

First, as in the case of Constantine, many people deferred baptism until shortly before death so that they could live a worldly life but have assurance of forgiveness in the end. The debates over whether Christians could be forgiven for certain sins committed after baptism contributed to this delaying tactic. It was difficult to immerse people who were dying, so sprinkling became common in those cases.

Second, as infant baptism replaced believers baptism and the whole society became Christian in name, almost everyone who was baptized was an infant. Again, since it was awkward to baptize infants by full immersion, sprinkling became common.

204

A History of Christian Doctrine

Finally, the formula for baptism gradually shifted from the name of Jesus to the titles of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As chapter 4 discusses, the first documented compromise came with Justin in the mid second century, when he taught baptism in the name of the Father, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. Apparently he modified the baptismal formula to reflect his view that Jesus is not the supreme God but a second person subordinate to the Father. Later Irenaeus echoed the same formula.

In the third century, early trinitarians such as Tertullian and Origen baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. They used the baptismal formula to promote their doctrine of the trinity, and to drive the point home they typically immersed the candidate three times,

once for each member of the trinity. Triple immersion was somewhat cumbersome and inconvenient, providing yet another incentive to switch to sprinkling. Triple sprinkling into the trinity became standard procedure in the West.

Confirmation

A second sacrament developed out of baptism, called confirmation. The purpose of this ceremony is to confirm the faith of a baptized person and impart the Holy Spirit in a special way to enable the person to live a Christian life.

As long as baptism was restricted to believers there was no need for this sacrament, but when baptism was relegated primarily to infants it became important to have some ceremony in which a person announced his own desire to be a member of the church. According to Augustine's theology, when an infant is baptized he receives an infusion of grace, including the washing away of sins and

205

The Early Sacraments

the new birth, but obviously the infant has no knowledge or experience of the event. People felt a need for some kind of ceremony to emphasize the impartation of the Holy Spirit when a person is capable of understanding what is taking place.

The pattern of conversion in the Book of Acts is repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When people prayed for the Holy Spirit, typically hands were laid upon them (Acts 8:17; 9:17; 19:6). The laying on of hands did not replace the miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which was the object of the prayer, but symbolized God's grace working through the church and focused people's faith to receive at that moment.

The post-apostolic church continued the practice of laying on of hands. At baptism, the pastor (bishop or presbyter) would lay hands on the candidate so that he would receive the Holy Spirit as in the Book of Acts. Eventually, anointing with oil, first mentioned by Tertullian, was added to the ceremony. As time went on, the presbyter, or local church pastor, became distinguished from the bishop, or leader of presbyters in an area. As church tradition developed, any presbyter could baptize someone, but only the bishop of the area could anoint people with oil and lay hands on them to receive the Holy Spirit.

By this time, few people actually received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and the laying on of hands

became merely a ritual. Having the bishop perform the ceremony gave greater confidence that a spiritual work genuinely took place; his prestige and authority helped substitute for the lack of miraculous, scriptural evidence. The bishop was not always available when a baby was

A History of Christian Doctrine

born or an adult converted. The local presbyter would baptize such a person immediately. At a later date, when the bishop visited the local church, he would lay hands upon everyone who had been baptized, anointing them with oil. As a result, confirmation became a sacrament distinct from water baptism.

Today, in Eastern Orthodoxy, confirmation is still associated with water baptism and administered by the local priest. In Roman Catholicism, the bishop typically administers confirmation later in childhood, signifying the communication of the Holy Spirit to strengthen and perfect the Christian. In theory, the candidate has already been born again and filled with the Holy Spirit at baptism, but at confirmation there is an additional work of the Holy Spirit. Some Protestants who practice infant baptism, such as the Lutherans, also practice confirmation. After a child completes a course of doctrinal study, called the catechism, he is confirmed.

Penance

The sacrament of penance also evolved out of water baptism, and the practice of infant baptism was also crucial to its development. Originally, the baptismal candidate first repented of his sins, and then he was baptized. Thereafter he was to live a holy life.

When infant baptism became the norm, obviously there was no personal repentance at the time. All repentance had to come after baptism; thus repentance was transformed into penance, an ongoing sacrament subsequent to baptism. Indeed, the Rheims-Douay (Roman Catholic) Bible translates Acts 2:38 as, "Do penance. . ." instead of, "Repent. . . ."

The Early Sacraments

As we have seen, the original insistence on living a holy life after baptism led to serious disputes over how much forgiveness was available after baptism. These disputes caused people to classify sins as lesser or greater, anticipating the later distinction between venial and mortal sins. Novatian said there was no forgiveness for a

great sin committed after baptism, while Callistus said the bishops had the power to offer forgiveness in this situation. Tertullian allowed forgiveness in such a case if the sinner rendered "satisfaction" (payment) to God by works of repentance. Augustine held that one could pay for lesser sins by almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, but grave sins required confession to the bishop and performance of the satisfaction he specified.

From these thoughts, the sacrament of penance developed to take care of the sins that a person commits in the course of his life after baptism. He does so by confessing his sins to a priest, performing whatever work is necessary to remit the temporal punishment for those sins, and receiving absolution (release) from the eternal punishment for those sins. (In chapters 14 and 16 we will discuss the further development of this sacrament in the Middle Ages.)

The Eucharist

In addition to water baptism, Jesus Christ Himself instituted another sacrament: the Lord's Supper, also called the Communion (I Corinthians 10:16) or Eucharist. The latter name comes from the Greek word eucharisteo, used in Luke 22:17-19, which means "to give thanks." In obedience to the Lord's command, from the beginning the early church celebrated this sacrament as a thanksgiving for His atoning sacrifice (Luke 22:19). At first, it seems

A History of Christian Doctrine

that believers celebrated the Eucharist itself and then held a fellowship meal, called an agape ("love") feast. (See Jude 12.) Paul warned the Corinthians against banqueting, drunkenness, and other abuses associated with their observance of the Eucharist, probably at the fellowship meal that followed it. (See I Corinthians 11:20-22.)

Historically, the most important doctrinal issue regarding the Eucharist is its significance. Two basic views emerged, with some variations.

First we have the realistic view, or doctrine of the "real presence," according to which Christ's blood and body are physically present in the Eucharist. Under this view, the Eucharist becomes an incarnation. Christ actually comes in the Eucharist.

The end result of this thinking became the doctrine of transubstantiation ("change of substance"). The fruit of the vine literally turns into Christ's blood even though it does not change its outward appearance, and the bread literally turns into His body. Roman Catholicism formulated

this position, and Eastern Orthodoxy adopted it. The
Lutherans modified it to say that the elements do not
change but Christ's blood and body join them (consubstantiation).
Eventually, the realistic view led to the idea that the
Eucharist is a sacrifice for sin. Christ is killed anew and
offered up for the sins of the people. The presbyter is
more than a preacher; he becomes a priest who offers up
the sacrifice of Christ just as effectively as when Christ
was crucified. The Eucharist is a continuing sacrifice for
the living; later it was applied to the dead also.
Here we have the origin of the Roman Catholic mass.
The Eucharist is no longer simply a part of a worship

service centered around the preaching of the Word, but it
becomes the focal point of every service, the mass.
The alternative position is the spiritualistic or symbolic
view. According to this view, the fruit of the vine and
bread remain exactly that and nothing more, but they represent
the blood and body of Christ. The Eucharist is
therefore a sign of Christ's blood and body and a sign of
His spiritual presence. When believers celebrate the
Eucharist, Christ meets with them through their faith. He
is spiritually present, but He is not attached to the physical
elements, and the physical elements do not change
into the physical Christ.
The Eucharist reminds people of Christ's sacrifice
and encourages them to apply it to their lives. It has great
value and benefit insofar as it builds up their faith. It is
not an empty ritual, for Christ does meet with His people
and bestows His grace. The work does not take place by
virtue of the elements themselves but by faith. Most
Protestants today hold this view, some emphasizing
Christ's spiritual presence more than others.
The Scriptures support the symbolic rather than the
realistic position. At the Last Supper, Jesus offered bread
and the fruit of the vine to His disciples, saying, "This is
my body. . . . This is my blood of the new testament,
which is shed for many" (Mark 14:22-24). They could see
His physical body before them; it had not yet been broken.
His blood was still coursing in His veins; it had not
yet been shed. In that setting, the disciples surely distinguished
His physical body and blood from the elements of
the Eucharist, understanding that the latter symbolically
pointed to His future sacrifice. Jesus underscored the
symbolic nature of the ceremony by saying, "This do in

A History of Christian Doctrine

remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19). When we partake today, we look back to His one sacrifice.

When Christ died on the cross, His sacrifice was complete (John 19:30). Unlike the priests of the Old Testament, who offered sacrifices daily, "this he did once, when he offered up himself" (Hebrews 7:27). He "offered one sacrifice for sins for ever," and "by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Hebrews 10:12-14). We have no need of additional sacrifices, nor do we have any priest other than Jesus Christ. He is the "one mediator," our "high priest," and we can approach God directly in prayer based on Christ's atoning sacrifice. (See I Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 4:14-16; 9:15, 28.)

It is difficult to classify the earliest writers on one side or the other of this subject because they wrote before the great controversy in the Middle Ages. Their language was not always precise, nor did they write with the intent of taking a position. Sometimes expressions that sound realistic may simply be figurative or allegorical. Pelikan concluded:

No orthodox father of the second or third century of whom we have record either declared the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist to be no more than symbolic (although Clement and Origen came close to doing so) or specified a process of substantial change by which the presence was effected (although Ignatius and Justin came close to doing so.)[2]

Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Theodoret all used realistic language, while Clement of Alexandria,

The Early Sacraments

Origen, Athanasius, Eusebius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, and Augustine used symbolic or spiritualizing language. Some writers used both realistic and symbolic expressions, including John Chrysostom, Hilary, and Ambrose. Scholars still debate the intention and meaning of these various writers.

Cyprian and Cyril of Jerusalem spoke of the Eucharist as a sacrifice. Cyril of Alexandria said that the Eucharist is the body born of Mary, and Gregory of Nyssa said the elements are transformed into Christ's blood and body. By the fifth century, theologians commonly spoke of a transformation both of the elements and the partakers. In the eighth century, John of Damascus clearly stated the

realistic view, describing the Eucharist as an incarnation and an unbloody sacrifice offered by the priest for the dead and the living.

Interestingly, in 496, Pope Gelasius I emphatically rejected the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. His action poses a problem for Catholicism because of the later doctrine of papal infallibility. How could a supposedly infallible pope contradict a central tenet of Catholicism? Catholic apologists usually reply that infallibility attaches only to official pronouncements and Gelasius merely offered his personal opinion.

Summary

In summary, from the earliest times the church practiced water baptism and the Eucharist, two sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ. In each case, various nonbiblical rituals became attached to these sacraments, and the church developed liturgies for services.

In the Ecumenical Catholic Age, Christianity accepted

A History of Christian Doctrine

two additional rites as sacraments, confirmation and penance. Although they do not appear in Scripture, they evolved out of water baptism as baptismal practices began to change in unscriptural ways. In particular, the replacement of believers baptism by infant baptism left a huge gap in the experience of salvation, which the institutional church sought to fill by making confirmation and penance sacraments in their own right.

Throughout the Old Catholic Age and Ecumenical Catholic Age, the church proclaimed that water baptism is necessary for the forgiveness of past sins. Following the teaching of Augustine, it also came to see baptism as washing away guilt inherited from Adam. Eventually, it equated water baptism with the new birth itself, teaching that baptism is the first application of God's grace and is necessary for sanctification in the years ahead.

It is instructive to see how one nonbiblical doctrine or practice typically leads to another. What begins as a single deviation from the Bible can eventually lead to a gross distortion in many areas, almost totally obscuring the original meaning and purpose of Scripture.

As chapter 16 describes, the medieval church ultimately identified three additional ceremonies as sacraments: extreme unction, marriage, and ordination.

Although they were practiced in one form or another in the early centuries, the dogmatic elaboration of them as

means of grace belongs to medieval times. In chapter 13 we will discuss how pagan concepts influenced Christian sacraments, and in chapters 14 and 16 we will trace the evolution of the sacraments through the Middle Ages to shape Roman Catholicism.

213

The Early Sacraments

In discussing the development of doctrine, particularly the emergence of Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, it is helpful to examine pagan influences. Originally, there was a sharp conflict between Christianity and all forms of paganism. The primary reason was the exclusive claims of Christianity. Christians said they served the only true God. They proclaimed that Jesus is the true God manifest in the flesh, the only Lord, the only Savior, and that salvation comes only through Him.

By contrast, the other major religions of the Roman Empire—Greek paganism, Roman paganism, and various Middle Eastern religions—were based on polytheism, the belief in many gods.

The Romans allowed each nation in the empire to

215

13

Pagan Influences

worship its own gods as long as no one interfered with the worship of others. As a matter of civic duty and loyalty to the empire, everybody had to participate in the worship of the Roman deities. Eventually the Romans promoted worship of the emperor as a means of pledging allegiance to the empire.

Except for Jews and Christians, most people had no problem adding the Roman deities to their pantheon, for they already believed in many gods and accepted that different nations had different gods.

Since Christians refused to cooperate with this system, they were seen not only as religious heretics but, more importantly, as political subversives. Society considered them intolerant because they refused to accept everyone else's religion as valid, and the state viewed them as rebellious for refusing to participate in the civic religion. They were supposed to confess Caesar as Lord, but the Christians reserved the title of Lord for Christ alone.

In the first three centuries, Christians also refused to participate in warfare, holding that the killing of humans

was contrary to the teaching of Jesus. Tertullian, Origen, Hippolytus, and others affirmed their patriotism but said they could not in good conscience kill other people at the behest of the state.

Christianity was thus opposed to the fundamental religious, philosophical, and political structure of the Roman Empire and the ancient world. The empire persecuted Christians because they refused to practice the state religion and because they insisted on following a moral law higher than the laws of the state. The early Christians did not seek to overthrow the government, but they held dif-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ferent values and lived a different lifestyle from their pagan neighbors. Their world views were incompatible.

This situation changed completely with Emperor Constantine. As discussed in chapter 6, he and Licinius announced an edict of toleration that ended the persecution of Christianity. Then he himself publicly embraced Christianity and began to promote it as the preferred religion. His successors in the fourth century established Christianity as the official state religion and banned paganism.

In short order, thousands of pagans who were prominent citizens now found their status called into question. They stood to lose governmental positions, influence, and standing in the community. When the government began opposing paganism vigorously, their fortunes, their freedom, and even their lives were potentially at risk.

For most pagans, the solution was simple: they changed their religion. Most did not see it as a crisis of conscience to abandon their former religion, for they never thought of their religion as the only way or their gods as the only gods. For many, the very triumph of Christianity was sufficient proof that the God of the Christians was superior to their old gods.

The problem was that in most cases they did not undergo a genuine spiritual conversion. Instead of recognizing the error of their ways and renouncing their old beliefs and lifestyle, they merely added Christianity to their beliefs or translated their pagan ideas and practices into the new Christian context.

In the fourth century, multitudes of people converted to Christianity overnight, and in subsequent centuries barbarian tribes converted en masse. Most of these

Pagan Influences

converts did not truly repent of sin, and few people received the Holy Spirit. The way to convert was to change one's opinion, make a verbal profession, and submit to water baptism.

Not only did people convert en masse, but temples, idols, and priests were instantly converted into the Christian community. The government demolished most papan temples, but for a few it conducted ceremonies to purge them and consecrate them as Christian churches. (The Pantheon in Rome is a notable example.) Statues of pagan gods received the names of Christian saints and were consecrated into the church.[1] Many pagan priests converted and were immediately pressed into service as Christian priests. In many ways and places, this flood tide of paganism overwhelmed the structure of the church.

Before this time, the church had experienced many schisms and had begun to stray doctrinally, but the core was composed of people who were dedicated to Christian values. It took character, fortitude, and spiritual strength to survive the times of persecution. Suddenly this band of core believers was overwhelmed by an influx of pagans who came primarily out of personal motives. Probably many were convinced of the truth of Christianity, but few were regenerated and transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit. The empire became Christian, but in name only.

Therefore, while Christianity was seemingly victorious, it actually suffered a most serious defeat. As secular historian Will Durant expressed, "While Christianity converted the world, the world converted Christianity, and displayed the natural paganism of mankind."[2] Church historian Walter Nigg concurred: "As soon as Emperor Con-

stantine opened the floodgates and the masses of the people poured into the church out of sheer opportunism, the loftiness of the Christian ethos was done for."[3] Philip Schaff similarly observed, "By taking in the whole population of the Roman Empire the church became . . . more or less a church of the world. . . . Many heathen customs and usages, under alleged names, crept into the worship."[4]

Thus paganism dramatically influenced Christianity, particularly from the fourth century onward. Let us look at some important areas of pagan influence.

Polytheism

After the church became predominantly Gentile, polytheistic ideas from the pagan culture began to affect Christian thought about God. We see the influence of Greek philosophy and polytheism in the Apologists' doctrine of the Logos (mid second century), in the trinitarianism of Tertullian and Origen (early third century), in the views of Arius, and in the trinitarianism of Athanasius and the Cappadocians (fourth century). It is inconceivable that such ideas of plurality in God could have arisen directly from Jewish monotheism; even to this day the Jews recoil from any suggestion that God is a plurality of persons.

From the second century onward, however, converts from Christianity came almost exclusively from polytheistic backgrounds, and they were already accustomed to thinking of a plurality of gods. Polytheistic thought contributed to the emerging doctrine of trinity, made it easy for converts to accept trinitarianism after it became the norm, and influenced its interpretation in a tritheistic direction. Even when theologians tried to draw back from

219

Pagan Influences

outright tritheism, it was natural for the average pagan convert to think of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three gods.

Polytheism also contributed to the cult of saints that began to develop. The ancient Greeks had prayed to the dead; now many Christians began to pray to departed saints and martyrs. The Romans were fond of deifying men and then offering prayers and sacrifices to them; they had done so to dead Caesars and then to living ones. The church adopted essentially the same process by canonizing saints and then praying to them for help. Indeed, the Eastern church honors Constantine as a saint, calling him Isapostolos, "equal of the apostles." Many people also began to pray to angels.

In theory, true worship went to God alone while mere reverence was paid to saints, martyrs, and angels, but in practice the common people made little or no distinction. People who used to pray to a Greek or Roman deity who supposedly had charge of their city, occupation, or activity, now prayed to the patron saint of that city, occupation, or activity. Legends about gods or demigods became legends about Christian saints.5 Even the halos depicted around medieval saints have their origin in sun worship. Along with prayer to saints and martyrs came worship

of their statues, pictures, and relics—body parts, bones, clothing, and other items associated with the saints. Essentially people embraced pagan idolatry, which was based on the idea that the spirit of a god inhabits its statue. People who formerly prayed to the statue of a pagan deity now bowed before the same statue, only now it was the statue of a Christian saint. They also attributed magical powers to statues and especially to relics. Leading

theologians such as the Cappadocians, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Leo endorsed the worship of relics.

Constantine's mother, Helena, supposedly discovered by miraculous means the cross of Christ, which became an object of worship. She built the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem on the spot where she found it, allegedly the site of Christ's crucifixion and burial. Many other people boasted "splinters of the True Cross"—so many, in fact, that theologians claimed the cross had the miraculous ability to multiply itself without diminishing.

Goddess Worship

Another significant pagan influence was the worship of fertility goddesses, which figured prominently in the ancient religions of the Middle East. Ancient agricultural societies felt a need to invoke divine aid to ensure that they would have bountiful crops, growing flocks and herds, and many sons to work in the fields. Their solution was to worship goddesses of fertility.

The ancient Babylonians worshiped Ishtar as their principal goddess. To the Phoenicians and Philistines, she was known as Astarte (Greek) or Ashtoreth. The plural form of this name, Ashtaroth, appears in the Old Testament, where it refers to the many local fertility goddesses of the Canaanites. (See Judges 2:13; I Samuel 7:3-4.) Similarly, the Egyptians had Isis, the Greeks had Aphrodite, and the Romans had Venus.

In the Middle Eastern religions, the fertility goddess was associated with a consort or lover, emphasizing her fertility. In Babylonian mythology, Tammuz was the consort of Ishtar. He died, but Ishtar rescued him from the

underworld, and he came back to life again. This story supposedly explained the change of seasons, with the death of Tammuz causing winter and his rebirth bringing

spring. Annually the Babylonians mourned the death of Tammuz and then celebrated his resurrection. Ezekiel 8:14 describes "women weeping for Tammuz." Similar consort gods were Osiris in Egypt, Baal in Canaan, and Adonis in Syria and Greece.

The goddesses were often associated with divine sons also. Some myths identified Tammuz as the son of Ishtar as well as her consort. Other divine mother-son combinations were Isis and Horus (Egypt), Cybele and Attis (Phyrgia), and Aphrodite and Adonis (Greece). Devotees worshiped pictures and statues of the mother holding or nursing her son. When Nestorian and Catholic missionaries first went to China they were amazed to find people worshiping statues of mother and child.

The Greek goddess Artemis, known to the Romans as Diana, was originally the virgin goddess of nature, and yet she helped women in childbirth. The Ephesians worshiped her as the goddess of motherhood and fertility.6 (See Acts 19:24-35.) They honored her as both a virgin and a mother.

The goddesses were given extravagant titles of devotion. For example, the Egyptians called Isis the "great mother, mother of God, queen of heaven," and the Babylonians called Ishtar the "holy virgin, virgin mother, mother of God, queen of heaven."7 Similarly, Cybele was the "great mother" and "our lady." According to the mythology, these goddesses were quite promiscuous; the adjective of "virgin" simply meant that they were not married and that they were considered sacred. The Old Testament

222

A History of Christian Doctrine

alludes to the worship of the mother goddess as the "queen of heaven" (Jeremiah 7:18; 44:18-19, 25).

In the Ecumenical Catholic Age, many people began to worship Mary the mother of Jesus just as they had formerly worshiped goddesses. They applied many of the same titles to her, such as mother of God, queen of heaven, and our lady. They made statues and pictures of mother and child much like earlier pagan representations. As chapter 16 discusses, the worship of Mary eventually become one of the dominant features of the medieval church.

Festivals

Many pagan festivals were also incorporated into Christianity. The early Christians celebrated Easter in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, but over the

years it was combined with pagan fertility rites. Eggs and rabbits became associated with Easter because they are symbols of fertility: the egg signifies new life, and the rabbit signifies great fertility. The very name of Easter in English comes from the old Germanic goddess of the spring and the dawn.

May Day was another festival taken from fertility rituals. The May pole was a symbol of fertility, and pagans danced around it on May Day to ensure fertility. By the sixth century, the August harvest festival of Artemis became the Feast of the Assumption of Mary.8

The celebration of Christmas also owes much to pagan rituals. Nothing in Scripture indicates that Jesus was born on December 25, but under the Julian calendar, December 25 was the winter solstice, the shortest day of the year. People celebrated that event as the birthday of

223

Pagan Influences

Mithras, the unconquerable sun, because the days started getting longer after this point. This date was also shortly after the Saturnalia, a seven-day Roman festival in honor of the god Saturn, which was characterized by unrestrained immorality.9

On pagan festivals such as these, nominal Christians felt a powerful temptation to revert back to their old heathen customs and immoral celebrations. The church decided to Christianize this celebration by removing the immoral elements and honoring the birth of Christ.

The Eating of the God

In many preliterary societies, people would eat an animal in order to gain its qualities, such as strength or courage. They would worship a sacred animal and establish a taboo against touching it, except to eat it in a sacred ritual. They believed this "eating of the god" ceremony caused the spirit of the god to work within them.

The widespread worship of the Greek god Dionysius contained a similar element. For two days the worshipers would drink and dance themselves into a frenzy. The height and center of their ceremony was to seize upon a goat, a bull, sometimes a man (seeing in them incarnations of the god), to tear the live victim to pieces . . . then to drink the blood and eat the flesh in a sacred communion whereby, they thought, the god would enter them and possess their souls.10

In the ancient Middle East there were a number of "mystery religions," each dedicated to the worship of a

certain god. The devotees depended upon this god for sal-

vation and took part in secret rites open only to initiates. They were known as mysteries because outsiders could not participate or even be told what took place. Some of the mystery religions involved animal sacrifices and eating the flesh and drinking the blood of sacred animals.

There were a number of similarities to Christian ceremonies, but it is not clear who borrowed from whom.

Justin acknowledged that the worshipers of Mithras had a ceremony much like the Eucharist but claimed they took the idea from Christianity.11

With their pagan background, it is understandable that many converts would view the Eucharist as an eating of Christ in order to receive His power. This idea ultimately developed into the doctrine of the real presence.

Biblically, however, the Lord's Supper arose out of the Jewish Passover, a symbolic commemoration of God's deliverance of His people. From this perspective, the symbolic understanding of the Lord's Supper is more appropriate.

The Priesthood

The development of the priesthood also owed much to pagan influences. People began to view Christian ministers much like priests in pagan religions. As worship became ritualized and as the sacrifice of the mass became the central feature of each service, preachers became priests.

The New Testament describes all Christians as saints, kings, priests, and servants of God. (See I Corinthians 1:2; I Peter 2:9, 16; Revelation 1:6.) Everyone in the body of Christ has gifts and a vital role to play. (See Romans 12:4-8; I Corinthians 12:12-31.)

In the Ecumenical Catholic Age, however, a sharp distinction arose between clergy and laity. The clergy were considered more holy, and they were responsible for the functioning of the church. Like pagan priests, they set themselves apart visually by adopting special vestments and tonsure (partial or complete shaving of the head).

Celibacy

To further set themselves apart in holiness, many priests took vows of celibacy (abstaining from sexual relations and marriage). While this practice was foreign

to the Old Testament priesthood, it existed in many pagan religions. The Cynics of Greece were an example. In addition, the gross immorality of the pagan world caused many Christians to go to the opposite extreme, concluding that celibacy was more holy than married life.

From early times we find a high respect for celibacy among Christians. In the second century the Marcionites and ultimately the Montantists advocated celibacy for all Christians. Theologians appealed to Paul's advocacy of the single life in I Corinthians 7. While Paul noted that a single person such as he could serve God with fewer distractions, he made clear that this was his personal opinion and not a commandment from the Lord. He recognized marriage as the norm (I Corinthians 7:2). Moreover, he gave his advice because of "the present distress" and because "the time is short" (I Corinthians 7:26, 29). His advice is particularly relevant in times of severe persecution and its logic is obvious in Paul's case, considering that his ministry was full of travel, deprivation, and hardship.

At first celibacy was respected, but then it was pre-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ferred on the ground that the celibate person was more holy. Finally it became mandatory. In the West, all priests had to take a vow of celibacy. Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome endorsed this rule. In the East, priests could marry, but the bishops could not. At the Council of Nicea in 325, some bishops proposed a rule that no presbyters could marry. The decision at that time was that men who were already married before ordination could live with their wives, but no ordained man could marry.

Some priests and nuns went to great lengths to prove how strong they were in maintaining celibacy. They would sleep together and supposedly maintain purity to demonstrate that they could endure the most rigorous temptations. Unfortunately, many of them succumbed to temptation, for it is not God's will for Christians to subject themselves deliberately to temptation as a test of faith. This practice became a matter of spiritual pride, yet so many failures occurred that it was eventually banned.

In an effort to become more holy, some Christians withdrew into the desert as anchorites, or hermits. Others joined together in celibate monastic communities as monks or nuns. There is no Old or New Testament precedent for this practice, but again, it was a prominent feature of pagan religions. For example, the Romans had

their Vestal Virgins, and from ancient times to the present, Eastern religions such as Hinduism and Buddhism have had priests, monasteries, and hermits.

Hermits

The first Christian hermits arose in the late third century in Egypt, where the climate and temperament of the people seemed particularly suited to this lifestyle. The

Pagan Influences

leading figure in this movement was Anthony, around 270. Becoming a hermit—going off to live alone in a desert cave, hole in the ground, or cell—grew common, particularly in the East. In some cases, a hermit would erect a pillar and live on top of it for years.

Monks and Nuns

Monasticism arose and became widespread in the fourth and fifth centuries, particularly in the West. A group of people would form a monastic community in which they would live together as celibates, raise their own crops and generally become self-sufficient, conduct group prayers, and pledge themselves to strict disciplines. Basil founded a monastery in 358 that became a prototype for the future.

Jerome was one of the most zealous advocates of monasticism. He lived an ascetic life and practically denounced marriage. Unfortunately, his writings are filled with harsh, hateful words against his theological opponents. Around 540, Benedict founded a monastery at Monte Cassino and the Benedictine order of monks. His Rule for monastic life became the standard in the West. It set forth a threefold vow: perpetual adherence to the monastic order, poverty and chastity, and absolute obedience to the abbot (head of the monastery). Among other things, it prescribed seven hours a day of prayer, singing, and meditation; two or three hours of religious reading; and six to seven hours of manual labor or instruction of children.

Asceticism

The hermits, monks, nuns, and even some of the laity

A History of Christian Doctrine

placed a great premium on asceticism—rigid self-denial, severe discipline, or punishment of the body. As with celibacy, they thought such extreme disciplines would make them more holy and would secure forgiveness of sins and merits with God. The New Testament does speak of denying selfish, worldly lusts and advocates disciplines

such as prayer and fasting, but the goal is not to punish the flesh or to earn merits. It teaches that we are saved by faith, not works, and it warns against asceticism. (See Romans 3:26-27; Colossians 2:16-23.) I Timothy 4:1-3 issues a particularly strong condemnation of those who insist on celibacy and asceticism.

Christian ascetics carried their punishment of the body to extremes, not only praying repetitive prayers for hours and fasting for extended periods but also whipping themselves (self-flagellation), wounding themselves (self-mutilation), wearing hair shirts, and so on. Some, like Origen, even castrated themselves to ensure celibacy.

The living conditions in the monasteries were usually quite primitive and severe. The monastic lifestyle consisted of celibacy, hard labor, frequent fastings, many prayer times during the day, deprivation of sleep, coarse clothing, and plain meals. The monks would typically arise very early to pray, and in some monasteries they were awakened in the middle of the night to pray. Some had strict rules of silence that they observed most of the day.

The hermits generally lived by begging. The following practices were common among them: exposing themselves to the elements, wearing minimal clothing, eating only bread and water, living with vermin (bringing rats or

229

insects into their caves and exposing their bodies to them), living in silence for years, refusing to look upon a woman's face, refusing to lie down to sleep for years, chaining themselves to immovable rocks, carrying heavy weights, binding themselves with great chains, and never bathing.12

The most famous of the so-called pillar saints was Simeon Stylites, who lived for thirty-six years, without coming down, on a pillar sixty feet high with a circumference of a little more than three feet. A railing prevented him from falling while asleep, and a ladder enabled followers to bring food and take away waste. He preached to the crowds who gathered to see him, and hermits imitated him for centuries.

Despite these efforts, many ascetics testified that they continually strugged with erotic thoughts and demonic attacks. More than a few went completely insane.

Holiness of Life

The effect of these practices was to distort the true
biblical meaning of holiness, undermine justification by
faith, and substitute human works for the work of the
Holy Spirit. Moreover, this way of thinking relegated holiness
to an elite, leaving the average person to have little
hope of, and therefore little concern for, living a holy life.
A few writers, such as Chrysostom and Jerome,
warned against worldly attitudes and conduct, immodesty
of dress, makeup, and the like. Overall, however, the
church in the Ecumenical Catholic Age abandoned most
inward and outward standards of biblical holiness, substituting
legalism and superstition for the masses and asceticism
for the spiritual elite.

230

A History of Christian Doctrine

Summary

Christianity in the Ecumenical Catholic Age adopted a
host of other pagan elements in addition to those we have
mentioned, including candles, holy water, and prayer for
the dead. The practices we have discussed had precedents
in pre-Christian religions as well as parallels in Hinduism,
Buddhism, and other major religions of the East. It
seems that they descended from an ancient common
source, which some authors identify as Babylon. When
the massive influx of pagans came into the church, along
with them came the baggage of pagan ideas. Many of
these doctrines and practices are what distinguish Roman
Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy from earlier Christianity.*
Some theologians explained certain parallels, such as
the mother and child statues in pagan lands, as a divine
preparation for the truth of Christianity. Others explained
them as demonic counterfeits or imitations, such as
pagan eating of the god rituals. While the devil certainly
does pervert truth and devise imitations of the genuine, in
the cases we have cited it seems clear that the practices
originated in paganism, not the mind of God, and were
later incorporated into Christendom.

Sometimes a truth God originally gave to humanity
has been distorted in pagan religions but transmitted
properly through Old Testament Judaism and New Testament
Christianity. Examples are the offering of sacrifices
to atone for sins and the anticipation of a Savior or Messiah.
We should also acknowledge that some practices

231

Pagan Influences

*See Appendix G for a list of distinctive doctrines and practices

of Roman Catholicism, along with approximate dates of development or official endorsement.

which originated in paganism have been divorced from their original connotations or transformed by Christian meaning so that their use is unobjectionable or at least a matter of Christian liberty. Examples are the celebration of Christmas, the names of the planets, and the names of the days of the week.

232

A History of Christian Doctrine

The past few chapters have traced various strands of doctrine and practice that led to what we know today as Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy. Now we will examine the product and extension of this development, particularly in the Roman Catholic Church—the institutional church of the Middle Ages in Western Europe.

For all practical purposes, the Western Roman Empire disintegrated in the fifth century, leaving a great power vacuum. Various barbarian tribes took over pieces of the empire, and Europe began to splinter. To a great extent, the Roman Catholic Church stepped into the vacuum as the remaining source of unity and authority across Western Europe. As we have already seen, the basic doctrines, practices, and structure of Roman Catholicism emerged in the fourth and fifth centuries, but

233

14

The Early Middle Ages

A.D. 600-1100

in the Early Middle Ages they jelled into the Roman Catholic Church much as we know it today.

From 100 to 600 most theologians were bishops. Through the ecumenical councils, particularly those in the 300s to 500s, they formulated doctrine. From 600 to 1500 most theologians in the West were monks, and by and large, they devoted themselves to preserving the doctrine of earlier centuries. Theology as a discipline suffered a decline, and superstitious elements came to the forefront.

Gregory I

In 590 Gregory I (the Great) was elected as pope. Although Leo I had earlier claimed universal authority as pope and received imperial endorsement of that claim, Gregory was the first bishop of Rome who actually exercised that authority successfully. As far as power and authority are concerned, we may regard him as the first true pope.

Gregory is also highly signficant for theology, for he systematized contemporary thought and established the pattern for the Roman Catholic Church over the next five hundred years. In a theological sense, he was the first medieval pope.

Gregory's theology was not a radical break with the past. What he did was emphasize, legitimize, and popularize many doctrines and practices that had already developed or were then developing.

The common people already believed and practiced many things that theologians and councils had not yet addressed, including the pagan, superstitious elements discussed in chapter 13. Gregory put the official stamp of approval on many of them. While not an innovator, he

234

A History of Christian Doctrine

used the papal authority to integrate these elements into the theology of the Roman Catholic Church, particularly purgatory, the sacrifice of the mass, and the worship of saints, angels, relics, and images.

First, Gregory stated that tradition was equal in authority with the Scriptures. Therefore, the official pronouncements of the church were just as valid as those of the Bible. Just as the Holy Spirit had inspired the writers of Scripture, so the Holy Spirit inspired the church fathers (ancient writers), councils, and popes collectively to proclaim truth and to develop new understandings of truth. In particular, the decisions of the ecumenical councils are authoritative. For both doctrine and practice, one could appeal to the Bible, the councils, the creeds, and the consensus of the church fathers.

Gregory acknowledged the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, penance, and the Eucharist. He placed great emphasis on penance, explaining that it consists of four elements. First comes contrition, or sorrow for the sin that a person has committed. Second is confession of that sin to a priest. Third is absolution, in which the priest pronounces that the person is absolved, or forgiven, of his sin. Finally, the person has to render satisfaction, that is, perform works to remit the temporal penalty for his sin. In short, all sin has a penalty. Even though God forgives a person, he still must pay the price for those sins by good works or suffering. If he does not completely pay for his sins by appropriate works in this life, he will do so after death in a temporary abode called purgatory, before he can go to heaven.

Technically, a person does not work to receive forgiveness, which is a gift of God for eternity, but he works

to pay the temporal price for sin. When the priest pronounces that God has forgiven him, he has assurance of salvation, namely that he will not go to the lake of fire when he dies. Nevertheless, he still has to pay a penalty that the blood of Jesus did not.

The priesthood controls the system of penance. The individual does not go to God in prayer and ask for forgiveness directly, but he goes to the priest. The priest pronounces God's forgiveness but then requires the penitent to offer a certain number of repeated prayers or do certain works to provide the necessary satisfaction. If someone does not go through the priest, he cannot obtain forgiveness. Penance became a system whereby the church controlled the forgiveness of sins in the life of a Christian. The individual had to perform the satisfaction meted out by the priest to whom he confessed his sins.

Purgatory had become a popular concept by this time, and Gregory gave official endorsement to it. Purgatory is a temporary place of purging for souls who are ultimately destined for heaven. This concept originated in Greek philosophy; centuries before Christ, Plato taught that after the death of the body, the soul goes to a place of purging. Origen likewise held that all souls would be purged and ultimately be saved. Augustine tentatively raised the possibility of purgatory.

In medieval theology, purgatory is not for everyone. If a baptized person commits a great sin, does not confess it, and then dies, he will go to the lake of fire for eternity. On the other hand, if he confesses his sins, receives absolution from the priest, but does not render the proper satisfaction before he dies, upon death he will go to

purgatory to pay that penalty. After a time of suffering proportionate to his sins, he will go to heaven.

Under this scheme, sins are divided into two categories: mortal and venial. This classification was prefigured in the debates over repentance after baptism, going back to Hermas and Tertullian, and in the theology of Augustine. Mortal sins are those that cause a person to go to hell if he dies without confessing them. Venial sins are daily transgressions and imperfections. Even if a person

does not confess them, he will be saved after spending time in purgatory to pay for them. The purpose of purgatory is to purge Christians from all their venial sins and to complete the payment for their mortal sins that they confess but do not finish paying for in earthly life.

Thus a person faces one of three destinies upon death. Hell, or the lake of fire, awaits the pagan as well as the baptized Christian who does not undergo the sacrament of penance for his mortal sins. Purgatory is the temporary destiny of the vast majority of Christians, who live a sinful life but submit to the sacramental system of the church; heaven is their ultimate destiny. Finally, a very few saintly people will enter directly into heaven upon death. This third alternative is available primarily to those who live celibate, ascetic lives.

Regarding the sacrament of the Eucharist, or the mass, Gregory taught that it is a sacrifice for our redemption. In the mass, the priest offers up the blood and body of Christ for the sins of the people. The benefits include forgiveness of sins, blessings for the body, and assistance to dead loved ones in purgatory.

Turning to church government, Gregory taught that the pope is the head of the church, and the church is a

temporal state similar to a secular state. It rightfully exercises power in the political, economic, and military realms. Under the hierarchy, the priests control the church and rule over the people. They exercise authority over body and soul through the sacraments.

Salvation comes through the sacraments. Baptism washes away original sin; it is absolutely necessary, should be administered to infants, and can only be done by the priest. Penance and the Eucharist take care of the sins in the daily life of Christians, and only the priest can conduct them. If a person refuses to cooperate with the priest and refuses the sacraments, he cannot be saved. The sacraments are effective by the authority of the church and the priest; personal faith is not a factor. In practice, it does not matter whether the individual truly has a relationship with God; as long as he submits to the church and receives the sacraments, the sacraments will be effective by the power of the church. This theology divorces the sacraments from the biblical concept of obedient faith and makes them magical ceremonies.

Gregory promoted the worship of saints, angels,

relics, and images, which was quite popular at this time.
Although true worship belongs only to God, a person can
venerate the saints, meditate upon them, call upon them
for assistance, and ask them to present petitions to God
for him. In this way, the saints become mediators between
living Christians and God. As part of venerating the
saints, an individual can pray to them, bow to their statues
or pictures, kiss the feet of the statues, and so on. In
practice, the technical distinction between veneration and
worship seems to have escaped the common people.
Invoking the saints' aid is effective because of their

A History of Christian Doctrine

personal holiness. They not only paid for all their sins, but
they did many extra good works. Their holiness far outweighs
their sins, leaving them with a superabundance of
good works and merits. No only did they enter heaven
directly upon their death, but they have treasuries of
extra merit that they can use to benefit others. When
someone prays to them, they can perform miracles or
transfer merits to that person's account. In a way, then,
they become almost like co-redeemers with Christ.

In summary, Gregory was traditional in doctrine,
accepting the ecumenical councils, the doctrine of the
trinity, the Chalcedonian doctrine of Christology, and
most of the teaching of Augustine. He did not seek innovation
in any of these areas. He offered nothing new
except that he accentuated popular beliefs and practices
of the time and elevated them to the status of church doctrine.
Most significantly, he explicitly placed church tradition
on an equal basis with Scripture.

In practice, Gregory's system of the sacraments, particularly
penance and the Eucharist, was Semi-Pelagian.
Man becomes a co-worker with God in salvation. Salvation
is not purely by God's grace, but man's works play a
role in earning salvation.

We should also note that Gregory's view of the church
and the priesthood was quite hierarchical. This was the
standard view of the Roman Catholic Church throughout
the Middle Ages and, to a great extent, even to this day.

The Carolingian Renaissance

In the eighth and ninth centuries a significant political
development occurred in Western Europe. The king of the
Franks, Charlemagne ("Charles the Great"), established a

The Early Middle Ages

great empire and a dynasty. His empire extended over modern France, much of modern Germany, and other lands. In a sense, it was a partial revival of the Western Roman Empire, and indeed it later became known as the Holy Roman Empire. Charlemagne's dynasty was known as the Carolingian Dynasty, since the Latin form of Charles is Carol.

Like the Roman emperors, Charlemagne exerted quite a bit of control over the church. He established a close church-state relationship similar to earlier times. As long as Charlemagne was alive, he dominated both church and state.

The reign of Charlemagne brought political stability and peace after years of chaos under barbarian invasions and fragmented government. With it came a renewal of culture, education, and theology. Historians often call the era of Charlemagne and his immediate successors the Carolingian Renaissance.

A number of doctrinal controversies occurred during this period of renewed theological activity. Charlemagne took an active role in many of them, issuing decisions and enforcing his views.

Doctrinal Controversies

The first important controversy of Carolingian times was the adoptionistic controversy. Some Spanish theologians began teaching the doctrine of adoptionism, which is somewhat reminiscent of Nestorianism. According to this view, Christ is the eternal Son according to His deity, but as a human He is an adopted Son. His human Sonship was the result of an adoptive act by God, perhaps at His conception, birth, or baptism. Charlemagne reject-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ed this doctrine in favor of traditional Christology, and the church followed his leadership.

A second dispute was the iconoclastic controversy, which literally means the "breaking of images." Image worship had grown more and more common. Some people opposed this practice as idolatry and the making of graven images contrary to the Ten Commandments. They felt that the church should destroy all images used in worship. In 787, the Second Council of Nicea, held in the East beyond Charlemagne's empire and without consulting him, approved the salutation and reverence of images of saints, angels, and Christ. It distinguished the veneration of them from the true worship that belongs to God

alone.

Charlemagne rejected Nicea II, holding that the veneration
and adoration of images was in error. As a compromise,
however, he prohibited the destruction of images,
saying they were useful as works of art, illustrations of
biblical stories, and objects to motivate piety.

After the demise of the Carolingian dynasty, the Eastern
position of venerating images took full hold in the
West also. Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy
today both promote the veneration of images, treating
Nicea II as the seventh and final ecumenical council.
Eastern Orthodoxy, however, allows only the use of
flat pictures, called icons, and denounces the use of statues.
Roman Catholicisim typically prefers to use threedimensional
statues. Protestants reject the veneration of
either icons or statues.

Next we have the filioque controversy, which chapter
8 has already mentioned in connection with the trinity.

241

The Early Middle Ages

The dispute was whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from
the Father only or from the Father and "from the Son" (filioque).
According to orthodox trinitarianism as taught in the
East, the Son is begotten of the Father and the Holy Spirit
proceeds from the Father, so that the second and third
members of the trinity have an individual relation with the
first member. The members are coequal and coeternal,
yet there is still a hint of subordination. The Father is the
head of the trinity—the first among equals, so to speak.
The Son and Spirit are somehow eternally dependent
upon Him.

In the West theologians concluded that the Spirit proceeds
from both the Father and the Son, based on John
14:26; 15:26. The Synod of Toledo in 589 endorsed this
teaching, and so did Charlemagne. Although in theory the
members of the trinity are coequal and coeternal, in a
sense the Father is first, the Son comes from Him, and the
Spirit comes from the other two.

The East vigorously opposed the idea that the Spirit
proceeds from the Son, denouncing it as an innovation
that detracted from the dignity of the Spirit. Westerners
saw it as necessary to create a proper balance in the trinity,
establishing a one-to-one relationship between each
member.

In 1054 a formal split occurred between the Eastern
and Western churches over this issue, with the pope and

the patriarch of Constantinople issuing mutual anathemas. Even today, Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism are separate entities, although they are similar in many ways.

Actually, there was much more to the split than the

A History of Christian Doctrine

filioque doctrine. Many cultural and political factors were involved, including the separate political allegiances of the East and West as well as the struggle for power within the church. Chapter 15 discusses in brief the subsequent development in the East.

There was also a controversy over the miraculous birth of Jesus. By this time, the glorification of celibacy and the worship of Mary had converged to the point that almost everyone believed Mary was a perpetual virgin. So Augustine had taught. Even after she married Joseph, she remained celibate. The brothers of Jesus that Scripture mentions were not the children of Mary but cousins of Jesus or sons of Joseph by a previous marriage. The question that arose was how the birth of Jesus affected Mary's physical virginity.

In other words, did the birth of Jesus physically open the womb of Mary, or did the baby miraculously pass through the closed womb? In an extraordinary zeal to maintain not only Mary's celibacy but also her technical physical virginity, a monk named Radbertus asserted that Christ's birth process was miraculous. Ambrose, Jerome, and Gregory I had propounded this view. Another monk named Ratramnus said Jesus was born just like any other baby. Ultimately the church accepted the doctrine of the miraculous birth of Jesus.

This controversy exemplifies two characteristics of medieval theology: (1) a distorted view of holiness by an emphasis on celibacy and asceticism and (2) a preoccupation with abstract, nonbiblical, trivial, and even absurd issues.

Then there was a controversy over predestination. A monk named Gottschalk emphasized the Augustinian

The Early Middle Ages

theory of predestination. He proclaimed double predestination, bringing Augustinianism to its logical conclusion, and he attacked the prevalent Semi-Pelagian interpretation of the sacraments. To his opponents his position seemed to make the sacraments unnecessary. If God has already

determined who will be saved and who will be lost, without regard to human choice or action, then it would seem pointless to participate in the sacraments. Why do penance when one's eternal destiny is already predetermined?

The church condemned Gottschalk's teaching and affirmed the essentiality of the sacraments. In theory, most of his opponents embraced a Semi-Augustinian position like that of the Synod of Orange, speaking only of a predestination to salvation and that based on foreknowledge. So held Gottschalk's bitter enemy Hincmar, archbishop of Reims. The theologian John Scotus Erigena affirmed single predestination. In practice the church did not follow the logical consequences of predestination but embraced a form of Semi-Pelagianism.

Finally, there was a controversy over the Eucharist. Radbertus taught the doctrine of the real presence of Christ, and in doing so he became the first theologian to teach clearly the concept of transubstantiation. At the priest's words, God changes the consecrated elements into the historical body and blood of Christ. Ratramnus opposed this view, but again the Roman Church ultimately supported Radbertus.

The controversy broke out again around 1050, when Berengar, an archdeacon, taught that the elements are emblems of Christ's spiritual presence. Against him, Lanfranc, an abbot, contended for the realistic view, and Berengar was forced to retract his teaching. In 1215 Pope

A History of Christian Doctrine

Innocent III and the Fourth Lateran Council made transubstantiation the official doctrine.

Papal Supremacy

The secular power of the papacy received tremendous impetus from the Donation of Pepin in 754. Pepin, king of France and father of Charlemagne, conquered much of Italy and gave it to the pope. This act established the pope as a significant temporal sovereign.

Under Charlemagne and his successors, the state had exerted control over the church so that it amounted to an imperial theocracy. Nevertheless, the long-term trend was to increase power of the papacy, including papal supremacy over the state as well as the church. When the Carolingian dynasty declined, the papacy again assumed control over both church and state. Instead of the state directing the church, the pope began to direct kings and princes, not only with regard to church matters but state matters as well.

The Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, a collection of forgeries that mysteriously appeared in the ninth century, promoted papal theocracy and the rights of bishops and clergy against secular government. It consisted primarily of ecclesiastical laws supposedly written by early Roman bishops.

The most significant document recorded the Donation of Constantine, by which he allegedly gave the pope sovereignty over Rome and Italy. Universally accepted as genuine in the Middle Ages, it bolstered papal claims until proven a forgery by Catholic humanists in the fifteenth century.

The Nadir of the Papacy

The secular power of the papacy led to great corruption, as individuals and families jockeyed for this position

The Early Middle Ages

of unparalleled influence and wealth. During the period from 867 to 1049—around two hundred years—the papacy sank to the depths of degeneracy, a time often called the nadir (low point) of the papacy. Secular and religious historians, including Catholics, acknowledge this sad fact.1

During the late ninth, tenth, and early eleventh centuries, the papal office was typically secured by politics, bribery, and even violence. The popes were elected by the consent of the Roman clergy, nobles, and populace, who were swayed by bribes, threats, family ties, and promises of favor and influence by papal candidates. Matters of theology and church government were settled by warfare, murder, bribery, and raw politics. Many popes of this time led lives of utter debauchery and scandal. Most of their reigns were short; many died violent deaths.

In 897, Pope Stephen VI so hated a predecessor, Formosus, that he had his corpse dug up, condemned by a trial, stripped, mutilated, and cast into the Tiber River. Stephen himself was overthrown by political revolution in Rome and strangled in jail that same year. Marozia, the daughter of a chief official in the papal palace, had her lover enthroned as Pope Sergius III in 904. For many years, a period known as the pornocracy, she was the power behind the throne. Her illegitimate son, reputedly by Sergius III, was elected as Pope John XI in 931, and in 955 her grandson became Pope John XII at age eighteen. John XII was one of the most immoral of all the popes. He conducted orgies in the Lateran Palace. An ecclesiastical council accused him of bribery, murder, adultery, incest, making the papal palace a brothel, and

making a boy of ten a bishop. He refused to answer the

A History of Christian Doctrine

charges and instead went hunting. The council convicted and deposed him, but John was able to organize an army and restore himself to power by force.

Boniface VII murdered Benedict VI and John XIV in order to become pope and expropriate the papal treasury. In 1012 Benedict VIII bought the papacy by bribery and made it hereditary for a time. When he died in 1024, his brother, John XIX likewise bought the papacy. A layman, he passed through all the clerical degrees in one day. Upon his death in 1033 his nephew, Benedict IX, became pope at age twelve, again by the family's money. He and his cohorts repeatedly committed murder, adultery, and robbery in public, until finally the people of Rome drove him out of the city. He later returned, and after emptying the papal treasury, sold the office to Gregory VI in 1045. The price was one or two thousand pounds of gold or silver.

Gregory VII (Hildebrand)

Fortunately for the Roman Catholic Church, eventually a powerful reformer came on the scene—Hildebrand. Upon the election of Leo IX in 1049, Hildebrand became the leading papal advisor and power behind the throne. He reigned as pope in his own right from 1073 to 1085, taking the name of Gregory VII. First as advisor and then as pope, he instituted a great moral reform of the papacy, clergy, and church structure.

As one might expect, the lower clergy had also degenerated during the nadir of the papacy. Many priests were married, contrary to the ideals of the church; even Pope Hadrian II (867-72) had formerly been married and his wife still lived when he became pope. Much worse, many other priests lived openly with concubines. Some

The Early Middle Ages

brought mistresses into their household under the pretext of their being sisters or housekeepers. Priests and even bishops promoted their illegitimate children, often under the guise of calling them nephews and nieces. Bribery and simony (the sale of church offices) was common at all levels.

Gregory outlawed clerical marriage. He reformed ecclesiastical law to penalize such abuses as simony, concubinage, and lay investiture (appointing laymen to church offices). He also arranged for the election of the

pope by the college of cardinals (leading bishops).
Gregory VII firmly reestablished papal supremacy and
authority. In the years preceding his reign, the popes had
lost much respect and were treated as one among many
secular rulers. They were subject to all the political and
military intrigues that other monarchs endured. By bringing
a high moral tone back to the papacy, Gregory was
able to establish papal supremacy once again. He did not
depend on moral persuasion alone, however, but he
organized papal armies and dominions, reestablishing
control by military and political force.

Gregory VII strongly affirmed that the pope is the
head of the universal church and that he has power over
all earthly rulers. He demanded that all Catholic kings
acknowledge his authority over them as well as over the
church. He maintained that no ruler could be crowned
except by consent of the pope, and that no ruler could
have any say over the appointment of bishops.

His unyielding position led to a dramatic conflict with
the German (Holy Roman) emperor, Henry IV. Gregory
deposed five of Henry's counselors for simony and threatened
him with excommunication; Henry in turn convened

a council to depose Gregory. Gregory then excommunicated
Henry, deposed him, and marshalled against him all
the political, military, and religious power at his disposal.
Henry's allies deserted him, forcing him to submit to
Gregory. He made a pilgrimage to Gregory's castle, waiting
barefoot in the snow for three days as penance for his
rebellion against the pope. The emperor acknowledged
the pope's supremacy and right to depose him, and thereupon
regained his throne.

The reconciliation was only temporary, however.
Henry was able to muster allies, win military victories,
and appoint an antipope. Italy and Germany were
engulfed by civil war as pope fought antipope. Gregory's
armies suffered reversals, and he died in exile, but Henry
was ultimately defeated and also died in exile.

This conflict highlights two powerful weapons of the
pope in the Middle Ages, excommunication and interdict.
Excommunication means a person is expelled from the
church and cannot receive the sacraments. Today an
excommunicated person can simply join another church,
but in those days there was only one state church, which
taught that salvation came only through its sacraments. A

sentence of excommunication was therefore tantamount
to eternal damnation unless the person repented and
came back on the church's terms.

If a king rebelled against the pope, he was subject to
excommunication. For a king who believed in the doctrine
of the church, excommunication was a powerful and
effective threat. Even if the king was not concerned about
his soul, excommunication released his subjects and vassals
from their oath of loyalty to him. Thus the pope had
great ability to undermine a king in his own country.

249

The Early Middle Ages

The ultimate weapon against a rebellious king was
interdict, a sentence imposed on an entire country. The
pope would forbid all the priests in that country to conduct
any sacraments whatsoever. They could not baptize
babies as they were born, solemnize marriages, offer
mass, hear confession, grant penance, or say last rites
over the dead. The dead could not be buried in consecrated
graves. The whole country was at risk of eternal
damnation. Even if the leaders cared nothing about the
pope or religion, there was great potential for a massive
revolt of the populace.

By his moral reforms and furtherance of supreme
papal authority, Gregory VII set the stage for the Roman
Catholic Church throughout the rest of the Middle Ages.
In particular, in the next century, the papacy would reach
the zenith of its power.

250

A History of Christian Doctrine

The Crusades Shortly after the reign of Pope Gregory VII, the Crusades
began. They were military expeditions from 1095
to 1291 in which Catholic Europeans attempted to conquer
the Holy Land from the Muslims. Their effects were
primarily military, political, and economic, but they had a
religious motivation, and they did much to shape the later
Middle Ages.

In 622 Muhammad had founded Islam in Arabia as a
monotheistic religion. Its adherents, called Muslims, worship
Allah as God, honor Muhammad as the greatest
prophet, and consider his book, the Qur'an (Koran), to be
the supreme scriptures. The early Muslims spread their
religion by force, quickly conquering Arabia, the Middle
East, and North Africa. The Byzantine Empire held them

251

15

at bay in Eastern Europe until 1453. From 711 to 715 the Muslims conquered Spain, and they threatened Western Europe until Charles Martel, grandfather of Charlemagne, defeated them at the Battle of Tours (France) in 732. They controlled Spain until their defeat in 1212, but they were not totally expelled until the 1400s.

In 1070 the Seljuk Turks took Jerusalem from the Fatimid dynasty of Egypt and began to mistreat Christian pilgrims and holy places. They also threatened the Byzantine Empire and the commercial activities of Italian cities. The Catholics of the Middle Ages felt it was their Godgiven duty to take away the Holy Land from the "infidel," reestablish Christian control, and protect the Holy Sepulcher.

Beginning with Urban II in 1095, a series of popes called for Western European kings, nobles, and knights to invade Palestine, promising that God would grant them victory. Traveling priests made the Crusades their sermon topic, urging the people to respond to the call to arms. Peter the Hermit helped instigate the First Crusade, which attracted many peasants, while Bernard of Clairvaux's preaching helped bring about the Second. In all, there were nine crusades.[1]

Urban II and later popes offered a plenary (full) indulgence for anyone who went on a crusade. An indulgence was a payment for the temporal penalty of sins; it fulfilled the part of penance called satisfaction. A plenary indulgence covered one's whole life. A person who received such an indulgence would still need to confess his sins, but he would not have to perform any further works of penance for the rest of his life. The reason was that he had already done the ultimate holy work of fighting for the Holy Land.

252

A History of Christian Doctrine

This arrangement was attractive to many people because after the crusade they could live a sinful life without having to worry about paying the penalty for their sins. Moreover, they had license to plunder and expropriate territory, and they hoped to become rich, famous, and powerful by their exploits. By going on a crusade they seemingly could obtain the best of this world and the best of the world to come at the same time.

Many Crusaders did not wait till they reached the Holy Land to begin their plunder and massacre. As they

traveled through Eastern Europe, they began pillaging, raping, killing, and particularly persecuting Jews. They needed provisions for their long journey, and they were eager to begin accumulating spoils of war. In fact, the Fourth Crusade never reached the Holy Land but conquered Constantinople, the seat of the Byzantine Empire, and established a Latin kingdom there for a time. Although the Byzantines were Eastern Orthodox Christians, the Crusaders considered them enemies because they did not pay allegiance to the pope.

When warriors did reach Palestine, they began a campaign of looting and killing there. Initially they killed many Christian Arabs, assuming from their appearance that they were Muslims. They eventually engaged the Muslims in great battles and seiges. The First Crusade conquered Jerusalem; they slaughtered seventy thousand Muslim men, woman, and children in the city and herded Jews into their synagogue to burn them alive. The Crusaders established a Catholic kingdom in Palestine, but ultimately the Muslims were able to defeat and expel them. The last Latin kingdom in Palestine fell in 1291. Perhaps the greatest tragedy of these campaigns was

253

The Later Middle Ages

the Children's Crusade. Preachers whipped up children into a religious frenzy, saying that children were of the essence of the kingdom of God and that God would be with them. They urged the children to march toward Palestine, trusting God to give them provisions and transportation across the Mediterranean.

On one occasion thirty thousand children set out for the Holy Land; another time twenty thousand children went. They believed they were doing the will of God and that God would miraculously grant them victory. One group marched to the seaside expecting God to part the waters for them, but He did not. Sadly, none of the children ever made it to Palestine. Many were kidnapped and sold as slaves, and many died of disease, starvation, and perils along the way.

One positive result of the Crusades is that they opened up contact and trade with the Middle East. At that time the Muslim civilization was more advanced than Western Europe. The Muslims had goods from the East that were rare or unavailable in the West, including silk, sugar, spices, and various fruits. They also had greater scholarship. Muslim scholars preserved many ancient

Greek classics that were mostly forgotten or destroyed in the West. The exposure to the Muslim world brought a revival of education, philosophy, and culture to Catholic Europe.

Innocent III

The power of the papacy reached its highest point under Pope Innocent III, who reigned from 1198 to 1216. He is generally considered the most powerful pope in history, exerting greater authority over secular as well as reli-

gious matters than any other. He backed the Fourth and Fifth Crusades and authorized the formation of two important religious orders, the Franciscans and the Dominicans.

In the early thirteenth century, Innocent announced a crusade, complete with the promise of a plenary indulgence, against the Albigenses, a large separatist group in southern France that rejected papal authority. Catholic armies attacked town after town, executing everyone who refused to pledge allegiance to the papacy. When the town of Beziers in southern France refused to surrender its heretics, the crusaders conquered it and massacred twenty thousand men, women, and children.

The Inquisition

The campaign against the Albigenses led to the establishment of the Papal Inquisition. The Inquisition was a tribunal of the church from the thirteenth through fifteenth centuries that sought to regulate doctrine. In the twelfth century, the church proclaimed the death penalty for heresy and began establishing procedures to investigate heretics. The Papal Inquisition was fully established by the Council of Toulouse in 1229, which also forbade the laity to possess a copy of the Bible.

Relatively mild at first, it judged certain books and doctrines as acceptable or unacceptable. It soon received a well-deserved reputation for terror, becoming deeply involved in the persecution, torture, and killing of socalled heretics.

The zenith of the Inquisition came in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Many people were accused falsely by political opponents, greedy officials, or jealous neighbors. Since a convicted person often forfeited his possessions

to the church, state, or his accuser, many people had a financial interest in the investigations.

In 1252 Pope Innocent IV authorized the use of torture
for suspected heretics, and later popes condoned it
also. In 1280, Pope Nicholas III threatened to excommunicate
all laymen who "discuss[ed] matters of the
Catholic faith" or who failed to report a heretic to the
authorities.2

The Inquisition operated under the authority of the
pope and was not accountable to civil authorities. An
accused person had no guaranteed rights; he was at the
mercy of the inquisitor. A common method of determining
whether a person was guilty or innocent was to torture
him. If the person was innocent, it was commonly
believed that God would protect him from pain or harm.
If he confessed under torture, which most people did,
then he was guilty. If he refused to confess, perhaps he
was innocent, but even then it was often said that he was
able to resist only because of demonic influence.

Methods of torture included flogging, putting people
on the rack to stretch their body and break their bones,
throwing them in a dungeon, roasting their feet, and
much more. Punishments included severe penance, fines,
banishment, imprisonment, and execution. The church
historically refused to shed blood, but it now devised a
method of technically abiding by the rule yet exterminating
heretics: it burned them at the stake.

The Spanish Inquisition, established in 1478 by King
Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, was modeled after the earlier
Papal Inquisition, but it was under the control of the royal
government. It too was responsible for widespread atrocities
and executions. The most notorious inquisitor was

256

A History of Christian Doctrine

Tomas de Torquemada, a Dominican priest appointed as
grand inquisitor in 1483. He issued harsh punishments and
instigated the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492.
The Spanish Inquisition did not officially end until 1834.

Boniface VIII

Pope Boniface VIII declared 1300 to be a year of
jubilee and offered a plenary indulgence to everyone who
made a pilgrimage to Rome that year. The resulting offerings
at St. Peter's were staggering. In 1302 he stated, "It
is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature
to be subject to the Roman pontiff."3 This was the
official Catholic doctrine of the later Middle Ages.

The authority of the papacy continued to advance theologically.
Ultimately the First Vatican Council proclaimed

the doctrine of papal infallibility: when the pope speaks
ex cathedra (officially) on matters of faith and morals,
he is authoritative and without error.

Although the papacy reached the peak of its power in
both religious theory and political reality, before long it
came under increasing attack from secular and religious
sources. In fact, shortly after the absolute statement of
Boniface, the papacy was severely crippled.

The "Babylonian Captivity" and Papal Schism

From about 1309 to 1377, the papacy fell almost totally
under French control, and this period is often called the
"Babylonian Captivity" of the papacy. France dominated
much of Western Europe at this time, and the French
kings were able to influence the selection of the popes.
Some of the popes so elected were French, and they

naturally promoted French interests and paid heed to the
French government. French influence grew so strong that
the papal residence was moved to Avignon in southern
France. For almost seventy years the popes ruled from
there instead of Rome.

The papal court in Avignon became noted for luxury,
venality, and immorality. John XXII and other popes of
this time openly sold ecclesiastical offices.

The move to Avignon brought the papacy under the
military and political control of the French kings. The
pope no longer had his own power base or army to compete
with secular monarchs. Instead, he became more or
less a pawn in the hands of the French.

Naturally this arrangement stirred up great resistance
and resentment in the rest of Europe and particularly in
Rome. In 1377, Gregory XI returned to Rome but soon
died. Under the murderous threats of a Roman mob, the
cardinals elected an Italian pope. The French cardinals
revolted at this shift of power and declared the election
invalid because of duress, whereupon the college of cardinals
elected a French pope, who took up residence in
Avignon again.

The period from 1378 to 1417 is called the Papal
Schism. There were two sets of rival popes, in Avignon
and Rome. Each claimed to be the only pope, the sole
head of the church and of all Catholic states. Each pronounced
eternal damnation on all who followed the other.
This schism posed an acute dilemma for each

Catholic country, city, and individual. Everyone's eternal destiny supposedly depended upon which pope he acknowledged, but how were people to discern the true pope? The situation was confusing for sincere people and

A History of Christian Doctrine

quite disillusioning. Influential archbishops, bishops, kings, nobles, and future saints were lined up on both sides. There was no certain way to tell which pope would be legitimate in the eyes of history.

Many people decided that both popes were motivated primarily by political, economic, and selfish interests. They concluded that neither was entitled to the supremacy that both demanded, that God's judgment would not fall upon those who rejected such self-serving and corrupt claims, and that their eternal salvation did not depend on the vagaries of secular politics. The papacy, and Catholicism as a whole, lost much respect and influence because of the Babylonian Captivity and the Papal Schism.

The Council of Pisa in 1409 attempted to resolve the schism by deposing both rivals and electing a new pope, but it only complicated matters: now there were three popes. Finally, the Council of Constance (1415-17) successfully ended the schism with the election of Martin V.

The Renaissance Popes

Perhaps a strong figure like Hildebrand could have reversed much of the damage caused by the Papal Schism, but before long the papacy degenerated further into moral corruption equaled only by the two hundred years before him. This new low point came during the Renaissance.

The Renaissance (literally, "rebirth") was a cultural renewal in Europe from the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries, particularly in Italy. It was a period of great revival and restoration of Greco-Roman culture. Many famous Italian artists, architects, sculptors, writers, and

The Later Middle Ages

composers emerged during this time, deriving inspiration from ancient Greece and Rome. They included such men as Dante, Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Titian, Raphael, Tintoretto, Botticelli, Petrarch, and Boccaccio.

The popes of this time were worldly minded, and they participated fully in the Renaissance. On the positive side they became great patrons of the arts, but on the negative

side they grew extremely corrupt, immoral, and pagan.
Many of them had mistresses and children before their
ascension to the papacy. Some consulted astrologers.
They openly practiced simony and nepotism (appointing
relatives, sometimes children, to high office). They were
deceitful, treacherous, and politically motivated.
Sixtus IV and Julius II were warrior popes who fought
to restore and increase papal territory. Innocent VIII celebrated
the marriages of his children and grandchildren in
the Vatican. Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia) had numerous
children and mistresses, apparently some while he was
pope. His son and right-hand man, Cesare, committed
several murders to advance the family's interests. Leo X
(Giovanni de' Medici), the pope at the time of the Reformation,
was made an abbot at eight and a cardinal at fourteen.
His court was luxurious, immoral, and thoroughly
secular.
In order to raise money for their grand architectural
and artistic projects, as well as their personal support,
these popes sold indulgences, sending traveling emissaries
among the populace. Leo X sold indulgences to
finance the construction of St. Peter's Basilica in Vatican
City.
Eastern Orthodoxy
For centuries, the Eastern (Greek) and Western
260
A History of Christian Doctrine
(Latin) churches had gone their separate ways, with the
Great Schism occurring in 1054. The result was Orthodoxy
in the East and Catholicism in the West. While
Roman Catholicism was consolidated as one church
under the pope, Eastern Orthodoxy developed into different
churches in each land, such as the Greek Orthodox
Church, Russian Orthodox Church, Bulgarian Orthodox
Church, Romanian Orthodox Church, and so on.
These national churches conducted their own internal
affairs but maintained fellowship with one another and
submitted to the overall leadership of the patriarchs
(highest bishops). The patriarch of Constantinople
became the first among equals in this oligarchy, but he
never acquired supreme powers like the pope.
Leading Orthodox theologians in the Middle Ages
were Simeon the New Theologian, a mystical writer, and
Gregory Palamas, a systematic theologian.
The major differences between Eastern Orthodoxy
and Roman Catholicism were as follows: (1) The East

refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the pope and, when it was later proclaimed, the doctrine of papal infallibility. (2) As discussed in chapters 8 and 14, the West accepted the procession of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son, while the East held that the Spirit proceeded from the Father only. (3) The East never fully accepted the doctrine of purgatory. (4) Although the East venerated Mary, they did not fully embrace later Western doctrinal developments regarding her, such as her immaculate conception. (See chapter 16.) (5) The East allowed the veneration of icons but not statues, while the West used statues. (6) The Eastern church practiced baptism only by immersion whereas the standard practice in the West

261

The Later Middle Ages

became sprinkling. (7) A married man could become a priest in the East, but not in the West after Gregory VII. (8) There were also differences of liturgy and church administration.

As far as fundamental doctrine, the differences between Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism were relatively minor. Both accepted the same seven sacraments as means of grace, the necessity of water baptism for the remission of sins, and the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The most important differences related to culture, church politics, and secular politics. Today, the mutual anathemas have been removed, but the division remains.

For most of its separate history, the Eastern church has lived under the shadow of Islam. For centuries the Byzantine Empire slowly declined as it fought off the Turks. In 1453, the Turks finally conquered Constantinople; today the city is known as Istanbul, the capital of Turkey. From that point on Eastern Orthodoxy lost most of its political power, and its theological development was stunted as it struggled for survival against Muslim overlords. Today, the Orthodox are a minority in the Middle East, the location of their most ancient and once most powerful churches. Orthodoxy wields its greatest political influence in Greece, which was liberated from Muslim rule in the 1820s. The Orthodox Church is also quite prominent in Russia and several other countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern European communist bloc, including Ukraine, Belarus, Romania, Bulgaria, and Serbia. Historically, it has worked closely with the state, often being subservient to it after the pattern set under the

A History of Christian Doctrine

Roman and Byzantine Empires. The Russian Orthodox
Church, for example, was largely under the control of the
czars and then the communists.

Under Vladimir I, Russia formally converted to Christianity
in 988, and it followed the Orthodox tradition.

After the fall of Constantinople, the Russian Orthodox
Church proclaimed that Moscow was the new seat of
Christendom. Originally, it said, central authority was in
Rome, but when Rome deviated doctrinally and the Western
Roman Empire fell that authority was transferred to
Constantinople. Upon the fall of that city, the locus of
church authority and the depository of pure apostolic
truth became Moscow.

Eastern Orthodoxy remained in relative theological
isolation for centuries. The Protestant Reformation did
not have a major impact in Orthodox lands, but it did provoke
some theological reflection and response. Most of
the criticisms that Protestants directed against Roman
Catholicism also applied to Eastern Orthodoxy. For the
most part, Eastern Orthodoxy condemned Protestantism,
particularly Calvinism.

Monasticism and Religious Orders

Monasticism was an important feature throughout the
Middle Ages. The Abbey of Cluny, a Benedictine
monastery in France founded in 910, led a great revival of
monasticism. The monasteries were important repositories
of culture and learning. Monks were prominent theologians
and teachers, and monks produced most manuscripts
of the Bible, as well as other literature.

For the common people in feudal society, life was a
struggle for survival, consisting mostly of hard work with

little leisure time. Nobles and knights had a more privileged
lifestyle, but they were often poorly educated and
were preoccupied with politics and warfare. By contrast,
many monks were dedicated, secluded, and deeply pious;
they had the opportunity to study and access to literature
that was generally unavailable.

Over time, monasteries became important centers of
political and economic power as well as education and
culture. Some monasteries became enormously rich
through gifts, bequests, and annual income. Often a
nobleman would endow a monastery in order to earn

merits and to ensure that the monks would say prayers and masses for his soul after death. The abbots of large monasteries became every bit as influential as nobles and bishops. Some monks lived quite corrupt, luxurious, and immoral lives, contrary to their original purpose.

In reaction to this worldly trend, in 1209 a rich young nobleman named Francis of Assisi renounced his wealth and founded a religious order called the Franciscans. They took vows of poverty and, partially emulating the Waldenses (a separatist group), they traveled from place to place preaching.

Shortly thereafter, Dominic, a Spanish churchman, founded another important order, the Dominicans, whose primary purpose was preaching and study. Many of them became influential theologians, notably Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus. The Dominicans were later placed in charge of the Inquisition.

These two orders were established as mendicant (dependent upon alms), and their members were called friars. They became powerful missionary organizations, and they brought a renewal of preaching, which had been

264

A History of Christian Doctrine

restricted to the bishops but now became standard for all clergy. Both Francis and Dominic were later made saints. Some of the mendicant friars sounded almost like Protestants in their emphasis on preaching the gospel, and some had spiritual experiences with God. There are even reports of speaking in tongues among medieval mendicant orders. Some of them, notably Bernardino (a Franciscan) and Savonarola (a Dominican), preached against worldliness, persuading people to give up gambling, dancing, immodest dress, false hair, jewelry, makeup, worldly music, and worldly sports and amusements. 4

Other religious orders established in the Middle Ages were the Augustinians, Premonstrants, Carthusians, and Carmelites. Three military orders, who took monastic vows and bore arms, arose out of the Crusades but were later disbanded: the Knights of St. John (Hospitalers), Knights Templar, and Teutonic Knights.

Scholasticism

Medieval theologians felt a keen responsibility to uphold the authority of Scripture and church tradition. Dissent was strictly controlled. While various controversies arose, particularly over matters in which the church

had no official position, there was not the independence
of thought and questioning of authority that occurred
after the Reformation.

The theologians of the later Middle Ages (c. 1100-
1500) sought to systematize the doctrines that had been
handed down to them, resolve unanswered questions,
and add technical details. Most of them were monks or
friars, and most were associated with teaching positions

or universities. Their movement is called Scholasticism,
and they are called the Schoolmen.

The Schoolmen started from the assumption that traditional
church doctrine was correct. On the whole, they
did not truly investigate or question doctrine. They
affirmed the authority of Scripture, the writings of the
early church fathers, the church councils, and the papal
decrees; they considered these to be expressions of
divine law that no one should challenge.

The Early Schoolmen

The early Schoolmen particularly adopted this
approach of accepting traditional doctrine. Their theological
endeavors consisted mainly of reiterating the accepted
teachings, categorizing them, and developing a systematic
theology to incorporate all of them. From a
Protestant perspective, only rarely did they provide a
fresh understanding of important issues.

The theology of this time seems quite sterile, rigid,
and repetitious because it was confined by the straitjacket
of "orthodoxy"—an orthodoxy that in many cases was
far from scriptural. The goal was not to uncover truth but
to prove what was already decreed to be truth and to systemize
this body of truth. While this characterization of
the early Schoolmen may be somewhat harsh and oversimplified,
to a great extent it is accurate.

Since the great issues of theology were already settled,
the Schoolmen were reduced to debating philosophical,
abstract, and even meaningless issues. For instance,
they seriously discussed questions such as the following:5
Is the understanding of angels brighter in the morning or
evening? Who sinned most, Adam or Eve? What hour of

the day did Adam sin? Can several angels be in one place
at the same time? Could God have become incarnate as a
female? In the resurrection will man receive back the rib

he lost in Eden, and will he recover all the clippings of his fingernails? If a mouse nibbles on the consecrated wafer of the Eucharist, does it partake of the body of Christ? Do the lost sin in hell? The Schoolmen tried to be exhaustive in their theology.

Probably the major debate during this time was over realism versus nominalism, a philosophical question that went back to Plato and Aristotle. Bitter controversies arose over this issue.

Some of the Schoolmen adopted the philosophy of Plato and applied it to Christianity. They embraced Plato's teaching of realism: everything that exists is an imperfect manifestation of an objective, perfect reality in the unseen, eternal world of ideas and spirit. For example, in the world of ideas there are objective, perfect ideals of humanity, beauty, and truth. The humans, beauty, and truth that we encounter in the physical world are only imperfect reflections of the real world of ideas.

The alternative view was nominalism, which stemmed from the philosophy of Aristotle. According to this position, universal concepts such as humanity, beauty, and truth have no objective reality in the spirit world. Rather, they are simply intellectual extractions or generalizations that we derive from common experience and observation. We develop an idea of beauty, for instance, but it is subjective, existing only in our minds; it is not an external standard in eternity.

One of the most prominent of the early Schoolmen was Anselm, who served as archbishop of Canterbury

267

The Later Middle Ages

(1093-1109), the highest ecclesiastical office in England. Anselm adopted realism. He is characterized by his statement, "I believe in order to understand." He accepted the doctrines of the church as they were given to him, and he sought to understand and explain them.

Using realism, Anselm formulated the ontological argument for the existence of God: We have the idea of a perfect God in our minds, and a necessary element of perfection is existence. Therefore, God must exist. The idea can only come from an objective reality in the eternal world.

Another prominent Schoolman was Peter Abelard (1079-1142), whose teaching led to the founding of the University of Paris. He had a tragic, immoral love affair with a student, Heloise, and later became a monk. In contrast to Anselm, he sought "to understand in order to

believe." Unlike most of the Schoolmen, he advocated basing one's beliefs on what a person could rationally comprehend. Interestingly, Abelard was accused of Sabellianism and twice condemned as a heretic. He employed trinitarian terminology, but his definition of the three persons seemed to reduce them to manifestations.

Other prominent theologians during this time were Alexander of Hales, a strong proponent of penance; Hugo of St. Victor, the first great German theologian; Albertus Magnus, the greatest of the German scholars; Peter the Lombard, father of medieval systematic theology; and Bonaventure, a theologian and mystic. These men adhered to the orthodox Catholic position.

The doctrine of transubstantiation continued to cause some controversy until the Fourth Lateran Council, held in Rome in 1215. Under Pope Innocent III, the council elevated transubstantiation to the status of official church

A History of Christian Doctrine

doctrine on a par with the doctrines of the trinity and Christology. Henceforth there could be no further debate on the issue.

Another significant discussion during this time concerned the Atonement. Probably the most popular view, dating back to Origen and Ambrose, was that Christ atoned for our sins by making payment to the devil. The devil owned us because we were in sin, but Jesus Christ died to pay the devil his price, thereby redeeming us. This position raises many questions, however. Did the devil ever have a right to us? Did he legitimately rule the human race? When Jesus Christ arose from the dead did He take back His payment from the devil? Did He cheat the devil?

In one of the few truly significant contributions of medieval theology, Anselm developed a more biblical view in response to these questions. Using a legal approach, he explained that God's law required punishment for all sins. Christ's death was not a payment to the devil but satisfaction of the demands of God's holy law.

Abelard said that the purpose of Christ's death was to reveal God's love and to awaken a reciprocal love in us. His opponents charged that under this view Christ's death was not strictly necessary, but Abelard responded that it was, for Christ thereby took the punishment of our sins. This exchange of ideas on the Atonement foreshadowed the twentieth-century debate between fundamentalists

and modernists. Fundamentalists and evangelicals teach the substitutionary Atonement, for which Anselm was the first to provide a full explanation. Modernists and liberals reduce the Atonement to a moral influence, employing Abelard's idea.

The Later Middle Ages

Thomas Aquinas

The most prominent and brilliant theologian of the Middle Ages was Thomas Aquinas (1225-74). He was the official theologian of the Dominicans. The Roman Catholic Church later canonized him and made him an official "doctor of the church," meaning that he is an authoritative theologian for Roman Catholicism. He organized Scholasticism into a comprehensive theology, and he, more than anyone else, epitomizes traditional Roman Catholicism as it emerged from the Middle Ages.

Thomas Aquinas developed his theology along the lines of the philosophy of Aristotle. It is sometimes said that Augustine is the Christian Plato, while Aquinas is the Christian Aristotle. The two of them are the greatest of Catholic theologians, and Aquinas followed Augustine closely on many points.

Aquinas was exhaustive in his approach, and many Catholic and Protestant theologians have drawn from his definitions and explanations. He considered the doctrine of the trinity to be the foundation of theology. The discussion of medieval theology in chapter 16 largely follows the teaching of Aquinas.

The Later Schoolmen

The later Schoolmen, those of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, began to question some traditional teachings and follow new directions, but they had to do so subtly. If they held nonstandard views, they usually paid lip service to the accepted doctrines but then modified them by redefining terms.

An example was John Duns Scotus, who toyed with heretical teachings in disguised fashion. He emphasized

A History of Christian Doctrine

the authority of Scripture and the church and so stayed in the good graces of the hierarchy.

William of Occam, a nominalist, was not as subtle. He disagreed with papal supremacy, and he held that the Bible was supreme in authority over tradition. He thus prepared the way for later Protestant thinking. He was able to maintain

peace with the church by saying that the doctrines of
the church are identical to the doctrines of the Bible. While
he accepted traditional doctrine, he theoretically did so
based on the Bible rather than tradition. His method
marked a shift, and others would later use it to reject traditional
doctrines that they did not find in the Bible.

Mysticism

Not everyone approached theology in a dry, rationalistic,
philosophical way. A strong component of medieval
piety was mysticism, the search for union with the divine
through deep meditation or contemplation. In the ninth
century John Scotus Erigena was an early medieval mystic
who taught that salvation consists of unity with the
world of ideas.

Another leading mystic was Bernard of Clairvaux,
founder of an influential French monastery in 1115.
Sounding almost like a Protestant, he emphasized a personal
relationship with Jesus Christ, and he spoke of loving,
worshiping, praying to, and experiencing Christ.
Many of his statements are quite foreign to modern
Protestants and Pentecostals, however, for he described
spiritual experiences in extremely mystical, ecstatic, and
even sensuous terms, such as kissing Christ on the lips.
Bernard was a strong supporter of the papacy and
Catholic orthodoxy, and a bitter enemy of Abelard.

271

The Later Middle Ages

Catherine of Siena was another mystical writer. She
supposedly received the stigmata, or the wounds of
Christ, in her body, and she was later canonized. Influential
politically, she helped persuade Pope Gregory XI to
return from Avignon to Rome in 1377, ending the Babylonian
Captivity of the papacy.

In the later Middle Ages, Meister Eckhart was a mystical
writer who was condemned as a pantheist. Thomas
à Kempis wrote one of the most famous religious books
of all time, a devotional work entitled The Imitation of
Christ, which is still sold today.

There was continued emphasis on asceticism. Monks,
nuns, and penitents often inflicted severe punishments
and deprivations upon their bodies in order to attain holiness.
Mystical experiences were often associated with
these painful disciplines. Processions of flagellants sometimes
appeared: people marched down the streets whipping
their bare backs in a form of penance.
Such practices, as well as many of the events discussed

in this chapter, are difficult for the modern mind
to comprehend. They become somewhat more understandable
in the overall context of medieval theology,
which we investigate in chapter 16.

272

A History of Christian Doctrine

In this chapter we examine the theological system of
the Schoolmen as well as popular piety of the Middle Ages
shortly before the Reformation. While we will describe
Roman Catholicism as of that time, we should remember
that most of these beliefs and practices still characterize
the Roman Catholic Church today.

The Sacraments

In the twelfth century the sacraments were definitely
established at seven in number: baptism, confirmation,
the Eucharist, penance, marriage, holy orders, and
extreme unction. In Catholic theology the sacraments are
the means of grace; salvation is applied to a person
through these ceremonies. The grace of God does not

273

16

The Medieval
Doctrinal System

operate primarily through individual prayer and faith but
supremely through the church, the hierarchy, and the
clergy by means of the sacraments. The sacraments are
essential to the saving work of God in a person's life, for
they restore man to his original state of righteousness by
imparting the redemptive merits of Jesus Christ.

The biblical steps of repentance, water baptism in the
name of Jesus Christ, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit
had long ago faded from the institutional church, yet people
still desired some specific assurance of salvation. The
sacraments helped meet that need for a tangible religious
experience.

From the clergy's point of view, the sacraments
served to bind individuals to the church. If they wanted to
be saved, they had to submit to the visible church structure.

Water Baptism

Throughout the Middle Ages baptism was administered
to infants and to the rare adult convert. Immersion
was still common, but eventually the standard method
became triple sprinkling "in the name of the Father, and
of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The later medieval theologians
held that the mention of each person of the trinity
was essential to the rite and thus to salvation.

Baptism was held to confer regeneration, forgiveness
for the original sin inherited from Adam, and in the case
of an older baptismal candidate, remission for actual sins
committed to that point. It was essential to salvation,
although the baptism of desire or the baptism of blood
could substitute for water in cases of necessity. Unbaptized
infants who died went to limbo.

A History of Christian Doctrine

Confirmation

A child received confirmation when he grew old
enough to embrace the faith for himself, typically at age
seven but now usually twelve. Only a bishop could administer
this rite. Its purpose was the communication of the
Holy Spirit to strengthen the church member.

The Eucharist

The Eucharist, or the mass, was the central feature of
the weekly church service, and many pious individuals
partook of it daily. The mass was considered a sacrifice
for the sins of believers. Its purpose was to strengthen
sanctifying grace, the grace of God that works in a person's
life. Every time someone partook of the mass, he
received a fresh infusion of the grace of God. The mass
also served to remit venial sins.

Gregory I and later theologians identified "seven
deadly sins," or capital sins, as the sources of all evil.
They were lust, greed, gluttony, envy, pride, sloth, and
anger.

Sins were further classified as mortal or venial. A mortal
sin was a willful transgression of the law of God. If a
person died with unconfessed mortal sin in his life, he
would be eternally damned.

Then there were venial sins—relatively minor deviations
from God's law, the general sins of humanity. Since
everyone committed venial sins regularly, it was difficult
or impossible to confess them, but if a person would submit
to the church and its rituals his venial sins would be
covered. The Eucharist was particularly helpful in this
regard. Simply by going to mass a person received forgiveness
for venial sins.

The Medieval Doctrinal System

The mass was a sacrifice of the blood and body of
Jesus Christ. The same body that hung on the cross was
invisibly but materially present. The bread and wine actually
changed substance; only the "accidents" (outward

impressions to the senses) remained the same. (Aristotle had distinguished substance from accidents.) God allowed this intangible transformation so that people would not be repulsed by the eating of human flesh and drinking of human blood. In short, the Eucharist was a sacrifice for the sins of the participants and their dead loved ones.

In 1220 Pope Honorius III proclaimed that as a consequence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, the consecrated wafer of bread should be worshiped as Christ Himself. After the priest pronounced the words of consecration, he would elevated the host (wafer), and the people would bow in worship. Technically, true worship (adoration) belonged only to God, while mere veneration belonged to Mary, the saints, and statues. In the case of the consecrated host, however, people were to worship it with the worship that is due to God alone.

Medieval priests took great care of the consecrated elements. They could not be casually discarded but were supposed to be entirely consumed. Lest the people accidentally spill the blood of Jesus, in the twelfth century the custom arose of withholding the wine from the laity, reserving it for the priest alone. Christ's blood and body were both present in each element, so the people still received the full benefit of the Eucharist.

Every Catholic was to attend mass once a week. Once a year was absolutely mandatory. The first Communion of a child, taken after confirmation, was a special celebration.

276

A History of Christian Doctrine

Penance

A person was supposed to have the attitude of repentance at all times, but penance was a distinct sacrament for sins committed after baptism, particularly mortal sins. Penance consisted of four elements: contrition (sorrow for sin), confession (to the priest), absolution (priestly pronouncement of God's forgiveness), and satisfaction (payment for the temporal penalty of sin).

When penance originally emerged in ancient church history, a person had to render satisfaction first, and then the bishop (later the priest) would grant absolution. The penitent would do what was required and report back to the religious authority. But eventually this order was reversed. The priest would pronounce absolution and specify works of penance. If the sinner did not perform them he was still assured of eternal forgiveness and ultimate

entrance into heaven, but he would have to suffer in purgatory until he paid complete satisfaction. What originated as an attempt to ascertain that a person's repentance was genuine (reminiscent of John the Baptist's injunction in Luke 3:7-8 to produce fruit of repentance), became part of a merit system that evaded the need for genuine repentance and holiness in this life.

Theoretically, the priest announced God's forgiveness, but in practice it appeared that the priest was the one who forgave the sinner. Thus the priest wielded enormous power over the lives of the people. He could demand confession of the most intimate details of one's sin, and an unscrupulous priest could use this information for personal advantage.

Forgiveness took away the eternal suffering for sin, but works of penance were necessary to meet the temporal

penalty. Either the sinner inflicted sufficient suffering upon himself, or he underwent this suffering in purgatory. For the soul in purgatory, devout loved ones on earth could attend mass, perform penance, and pay the priest to celebrate mass for the dead, thus helping meet the penalty and releasing the soul from purgatory earlier than otherwise.

The fourth element, satisfaction, is usually what we think of when we discuss penance. The priest would prescribe the satisfaction required, consulting penitentials (lists of predetermined penances for specific sins). Penance usually included prayers, such as hundreds of repetitions of the "Hail Mary" or "Our Father" prayers. Other forms of penance were various good works, monetary contributions, fastings, pilgrimages to sacred shrines, and punishments of the body.

People could also perform satisfaction without it being specifically required. In this way they could store extra merits that would be available when they needed them later. A good example was going on a crusade. A life filled with extra good works would enable a person to spend only a short time in purgatory, or in rare cases, skip purgatory altogether.

The practice arose of hiring someone else to do one's penance. Once a person confessed his sins and obtained the prescribed satisfaction from the priest, he could pay someone else to perform the satisfaction for him.

A similar practice was the sale of indulgences, from which the church profited directly. An indulgence was a

pronouncement that sins had been paid for. Technically, an indulgence did not remit the sin itself, for that still required contrition, confession, and absolution, but it met the requirement of satisfaction.

By purchasing an indulgence or performing some specified deed to obtain one, the sinner could avoid other works of satisfaction. He could buy an indulgence before or after the commission of a sin, and he could buy one for a loved one in purgatory. He could even obtain a plenary indulgence to cover all the sins of his life and so never worry about penance again (except for confession).

Pope Innocent III made confession mandatory at least once a year at Easter. Of course, people were urged to confess more often in the case of mortal sins.

Extreme Unction

Extreme unction, often called last rites, involved an anointing with oil (hence the word "unction") just before a person's death (hence the word "extreme"). Originally it had a basis in James 5:14-16, which instructs the elders of the church to pray for a sick person and anoint him with oil. In Scripture, the object is divine healing, but after the miraculous power of God left the institutional church no one expected such a miracle to take place. Instead, the priest anointed a sick person with oil in anticipation of his death.

In this, as in many other cases, we see traces of the original apostolic pattern preserved in the rituals of the Roman Catholic Church. What was once a living reality became a magical ceremony and an empty form. The words of II Timothy 3:5 apply: "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof."

Water baptism and confirmation are similar examples. Although theologians correctly taught that baptism was for the remission of sins, they divorced it from faith, repentance, and the name of Jesus. Instead of believers

actually experiencing the powerful cleansing of God in their lives, babies were unknowingly sprinkled in a lifeless ritual. Likewise, theologians held that the Holy Spirit was imparted by the laying on of hands at confirmation, but the rite substituted for an overwhelming, supernatural experience with God accompanied by the sign of tongues.

In theory, when the priest administered extreme unction, God would heal the dying person if He so willed. In practice, people ceased expecting that such a miracle would take place. Instead, the ceremony became a last opportunity to confess sins and receive forgiveness for them.

When a person became deathly ill or suffered a deadly injury, he possibly did not have an opportunity for the sacrament of penance before he died. Extreme unction served to cover his sins between his last penance and his death, in effect becoming a substitute for penance. If he was able, the dying person could confess his sins to the priest. He would not have time to perform satisfaction, but he would do so in purgatory. If the person was already unconscious when the priest came, the last rites would still be effective for his soul. Even if he was already dead, the theory arose that his soul would linger at the scene for a time.

Through baptism, the mass, penance, and extreme unction, the Roman Catholic system tried to cover all the sins of a person's life. There was a sacrament for every contingency and every sin.

Once again, we see the form without the power. The New Testament pattern is to be born of water and of the Spirit and then live a holy life by the power of the

indwelling Holy Spirit (John 3:5; Acts 1:8; Romans 8:1-4). Forgiveness is available upon personal confession of sins to God, but the norm is for the Christian to live a victorious, overcoming life (I John 1:9; 2:1). Under the Catholic system, however, a daily life of sin was the expectation, and the sacraments became man-made attempts to compensate for the lack of biblical spirituality and holiness.

Ordination

The remaining two sacraments—ordination and marriage—were mutually exclusive and were unlike the others. The first five were designed for everyone; indeed, they brought salvation. The last two were not essential for everyone, nor even meant for everyone, but it was expected that people would choose one or the other. And if a person chose one, he could not choose the other.

Ordination to ministry has roots in the New Testament and was practiced from the earliest times. (See Acts 6:6; 13:3; I Timothy 4:14; II Timothy 1:6.) It was not originally considered a sacrament like baptism or the

Eucharist, however.

In the Middle Ages, the indispensable role of the clergy in administrating the sacraments, and therefore salvation, prompted theologians to classify ordination itself as a sacrament. When the bishop ordained a priest by the laying on of hands, the priest received grace to rule the church and perform his sacred duties. Without ordination he could not administer valid sacraments, but with it he could baptize, hear confession, celebrate mass, and administer last rites. The efficacy of these sacraments did not depend upon his personal faith or holiness but upon his ordination.

281

The Medieval Doctrinal System

This doctrine was helpful in assuring the people of salvation. Even though they did not feel the grace of God during the administration of sacraments, and even though in many cases their priest was obviously unworthy, immoral, or incompetent, they could pin their hopes on the sacrament of ordination. It carried an almost magical power that validated the power of all the other sacraments, which were essential to salvation.

Those who received ordination could not marry and they had to remain celibate. In practice, however, this rule was widely violated, as discussed in chapter 14. Even the hierarchy and the papacy were not immune from the sins of fornication, adultery, and homosexuality. Clergy at all levels were commonly known to have mistresses and illegitimate children. Some convents were well known as brothels, sometimes serving nearby monasteries.1 Medieval literature abounds with jokes about immoral clergymen. Celibacy was an idealistic theory, but it did not work in practice.

Marriage

Marriage was instituted by God Himself (Genesis 2:18, 24-25), but the New Testament does not indicate that it should be a distinctly church ceremony. It was a divinely ordained, civil institution that preceded the law of Moses as well as the church.

Medieval theologians concluded that marriage was a sacrament because its primary purpose was spiritual, namely to multiply church membership. Grace was conferred to unite the two people in marriage and to preserve the union until death. Marriage could not be dissolved except by death. Divorce was allowed only for adultery,

282

but even then remarriage was forbidden. When national
laws later allowed secular divorce, a divorced and remarried
person was considered to be an adulterer and could
not take Communion. Children of such a marriage were
illegitimate, with all the social and legal ramifications of
such a designation.

This strict stance against divorce did not solve the
problem of human immorality and infidelity; people just
worked around the prohibition. Prominent citizens frequently
acquired mistresses and justified the arrangement
by reasoning that they were still married to one wife.

Another loophole was the annulment. In theory, an annulment
was appropriate if a marriage was never valid from
the start—for example, if it never had been consummated
physically or if there never had been mutual consent.
Over the centuries an involved ecclesiastical procedure
arose for investigating circumstances that could justify
an annulment. People with great political clout, or
who spent considerable time and money, could often have
their marriage declared null and void, even if they had
been married for years and had many children. They
would try to find some technical impediment that would
justify setting the marriage aside. Today, psychological
theories are often employed to prove that the couple was
somehow incompatible from the start or incapable of giving
full, mature consent.

The Doctrine of Mary

The doctrine of Mary continued to develop throughout
the Middle Ages and into the modern age. Prayer to Mary
and worship ("veneration") of Mary were extremely popular,
even exceeding prayer to and worship of Christ Himself.

283

The Medieval Doctrinal System

In essence, Mary was elevated to divine status. Everyone
agreed that she was sinless and that because of her
superabundant merits she could grant miracles to petitioners.
Many people reported seeing visions of Mary and
receiving miracles by praying to her.

Bernard of Clairvaux said Mary was so beautiful that
God Himself had desire (concupiscentia, "lust") for her,
and a hymn described God as looking on her with passion.
Various writers allegorized the Song of Solomon as a
bridal song for the Holy Spirit and Mary. The Schoolmen
called her the "mother of God, queen of heaven, queen of
angels, empress of the world, mediatrix, door of heaven,

and tree of life."2

Scripture reveals that Mary was a virtuous and blessed woman, but, unlike the case of Jesus, it does not exempt her from the general statement that all have sinned (Romans 3:23). To the contrary, Jesus explicitly placed her on a par with all other faithful believers. On one occasion, when people informed Him that His mother and brothers were waiting to see Him, He pointed to His disciples and said, "Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matthew 12:47-50). Another time, a woman who was listening to the teaching of Jesus exclaimed that His mother was specially blessed. He responded, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it" (Luke 11:27-28).

Mary needed salvation just as much as anyone else, and she obeyed the Lord's commands just as the other disciples. She was among the 120 who prayed together in Jerusalem at Christ's command until they were baptized with the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:14; 2:1).

284

A History of Christian Doctrine

Nevertheless, following the teaching of Augustine and others, the Roman Catholic Church affirmed that Mary never sinned. Eventually, the church also concluded that, unlike everyone else, she was born without original sin (the guilt of Adam and Eve).

Theologians enunciated this belief as the doctrine of the immaculate conception, which does not refer to the virgin conception of Jesus but to the conception of Mary. This doctrine means that Mary was conceived without sin in the womb of her mother. She did not inherit original sin. Supposedly this doctrine was necessary to guarantee the sinlessness of Christ, on the theory that if Mary had a sinful nature then He would have inherited it from her. But the only way to maintain this logic is to say that Mary's mother, grandmother, and so on back to Eve were all sinless. At some point, we must realize that God caused a miraculous conception to take place that brought forth a sinless human from a mother who had a sinful nature. In the Bible, this sinless conception occurred in the womb of the virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Spirit, but in Catholic theology it occurred in the womb of Mary's mother.

Pelagius had taught that Mary was sinless and was conceived without original sin, but he did not believe anyone

had original sin and he believed anyone could potentially live a sinless life, although few did. In the twelfth century, the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary became popular. Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, and the Dominicans denied it, while Duns Scotus and the Franciscans championed it. The controversy was not finally resolved until 1854, when Pope Pius IX declared the immaculate conception of Mary to be official church doctrine.

The Medieval Doctrinal System

Another common belief was that, at the end of her life, Mary was bodily assumed into heaven without seeing corruption. Pope Pius XII made the assumption of Mary an official doctrine in 1950.

One of the best ways to gain insight into medieval thought concerning Mary is to examine stories told by the common people. The accounts we will mention were widely circulated in the Middle Ages as true, and they reveal the mindset of the people.3

According to one story, a widow's only son was captured in warfare, so she prayed to Mary for his deliverance. After praying for many weeks without a response, she went to church and stole the sculptured babe from the arms of the statue of Mary. Thereupon Mary appeared to the widow's son, freed him from his captors, and gave him a message for his mother: "Now that I have returned your son to you, return my son to me."

In another case, a monk became ill. Mary appeared to him and gave him milk from her breast. He was thereby healed.

A robber always prayed to Mary before embarking on his thefts, asking for her help in his endeavors. He was finally caught and hanged, but at the hanging he was miraculously supported by the unseen hands of Mary. The people noted this miracle and set him free.

A monk was struggling with temptation but could not seem to get victory. Finally he prayed to Jesus, "Lord, if Thou free me not from this temptation, I will complain of Thee to Thy mother."

In yet another story, Satan persuaded a youth to deny Christ but could not get him to deny Mary. When the youth repented of his sin of denying Christ, Mary interceded on his behalf and persuaded Christ to forgive him.

A History of Christian Doctrine

It was typically said during this time, "If you do not receive an answer to your prayer, go to Mary. If Mary will

agree with you, then she will go to Christ and ask on your behalf. Christ will never refuse a request from His mother, so you are sure to get an answer."

As these examples show, Mary became the supreme mediator in popular piety. People prayed to her more than to God or Christ. They were often afraid to approach God directly, but they felt comfortable praying to a mother goddess figure. The Bible, of course, teaches that Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and man and that we should boldly present our petitions before God's throne of grace (I Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 4:15-16). Nevertheless, Mary became the focus of popular devotion and still remains so among Catholics to this day. The personal motto of Pope John Paul II is "Totally yours," referring to Mary.

Merit System

As the doctrine of the sacraments and the worship of Mary show, the medieval church was based on a system of merits. The theory of salvation was as follows: God is the one who effects a person's conversion. His power causes people to be saved, yet people can exercise their own will to prepare for the grace of God. Justification is a gradual process by which the infusion of God's grace gradually improves human nature. Because of this progressive work of God, a person can perform good works, and as a result of these works he can claim eternal life.

Salvation is thus a cooperative effort. God is the one who enables a person, but the person actually produces the good works that God requires for salvation.

287

The Medieval Doctrinal System

This concept is essentially Semi-Pelagian. While salvation is by the grace of God, it is not solely by the grace of God. While justification is by faith, it is not by faith only but by faith and works. God gives the grace of salvation, but the person must use this grace to perform good works that make him deserving of salvation.

By contrast, the Protestant Reformers taught salvation by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone. God looks at an unworthy sinner and counts him worthy (justifies him), not on the basis of his works but as an act of pure grace to be received by faith. The early Reformers, such as Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, eliminated all possibility of salvation by works by embracing Augustine's doctrine of predestination (unconditional election). Some later Protestants, such as the Anabaptists,

Arminius, and Wesley, rejected this doctrine of predestination but still affirmed salvation by grace through faith and not works. They taught that a person must accept God's gracious offer of salvation by an active, living faith. Faith is the condition for receiving salvation, but it does not constitute human works that earn salvation. Saving faith will issue forth in good works, but these works are the result, not the ground, of salvation.

Under the medieval Catholic system, salvation was based on merits, and a person could accumulate more merits than were necessary for his personal salvation. These extra merits could then be used for other purposes. Of course, Jesus Christ had abundant merits because he lived a sinless life, and the saints similarly possessed many extra merits because of their specially holy lives. These additional merits enabled them to grant petitions and perform miracles.

The extra merits of Christ and the saints constituted a heavenly treasury that the pope could dispense as he desired. If he wished to deliver a soul from purgatory, he could designate some of the superabundant merits of the saints for that purpose. He could also issue indulgences based upon these merits. The pope thus claimed power not only in this world but also in the world to come.

A disadvantage of the merit system was the lack of assurance of salvation. Even though a person cooperated with the church, there was always a nagging question: Do I have enough good works? Have I done enough to pay for my sins? Am I truly saved or not? While the church promised eternal life in heaven someday, the common person faced the prospect of countless years in purgatory. He experienced no freedom from guilt and no personal relationship with God.

The church member could not identify a personal experience of the new birth. He had no consciousness of living by faith or by the grace of God. He did not experience an overcoming, holy life by the power of the Holy Spirit. Rather, he lived a sinful life, just as everybody else, but he hoped that he was performing enough good works to ease the terrors of the afterlife. He labored under a system of works that placed him under bondage.

Popular Piety

Again, let us examine some popular medieval stories to see what the average people believed and how

medieval doctrines affected their lives.4 As with the stories about Mary, we find them to be full of superstition, magic, and paganism, far removed from the faith and morals of the Bible.

The Medieval Doctrinal System

Many stories reflect the doctrine of transubstantiation and the centrality of the mass. According to one account, a priest tried to seduce a woman by keeping a wafer in his mouth after mass. Since the wafer was actually Christ, he felt it would have great power to attract the woman. God refused to cooperate with his evil scheme, however, but miraculously blocked his exit from the church. The priest removed the wafer and buried it; later he dug it up to find that it had turned into the bloody figure of a crucified man.

A woman placed a consecrated wafer in her beehive to reduce death among the bees. The bees built a tiny chapel for their "Guest."

In another tale, a child offered a piece of bread to the baby Jesus in a nativity scene. The babe thanked him and invited him to paradise. Three days later the child died.

Yet another widely circulated legend concerned the alleged duplication of a notable biblical miracle: Pope Leo IX supposedly parted the Aniene River just as Moses had parted the Red Sea.

The worship of saints and relics grew incredibly. By the tenth century twenty-five thousand saints had been canonized. There were patron saints for almost every activity, illness, and domestic animal.

Churches boasted numerous relics. St. Peter's Basilica in Rome claimed to have the bodies of Peter and Paul. Various churches claimed to have the head of John the Baptist (several), the foreskin from Christ's circumcision (five), some of Christ's blood, His umbilical cord, some of His baby teeth, the tears He shed at the tomb of Lazarus, the lance that pierced His side, His coat, hairs from His beard, the corpse of Mary Magdalene (three), a claw from the devil, Noah's beard, pieces of Christ's cross, cradle,

A History of Christian Doctrine

and tomb, bits of manna, pieces of the original tables of the Ten Commandments, and so on.5

Conclusions

Several important elements characterized the medieval church: (1) Tradition was the most important source of medieval theology. (2) The system of merits

formed the basis of soteriology and ecclesiology. (3) Abstract philosophical reasoning largely replaced biblical exegesis and synthesis. (4) Mysticism, superstition, and paganism largely replaced scriptural experiences with God. (5) To a great extent, the clergy and hierarchy were corrupted by power, money, and sexual immorality.

We must acknowledge that there were many sincere, honest, and moral people during this time, including common people, priests, bishops, popes, and theologians. Many sincerely believed the doctrines of the church and were genuinely pious.

Nevertheless, doctrinal and moral corruption was widespread, not merely because of the universal sinfulness of humanity but because the theological and ecclesiastical system itself was tragically flawed and far removed from biblical Christianity. The average person did not have a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and did not strive to live according to biblical holiness, but simply cooperated with the sacramental system and hoped for the best.

There were some dissenters, however, and some who sought to return to biblical doctrines and practices. (See chapter 17.) Ultimately, the entire system was challenged by the Protestant Reformation beginning in 1517.

291
The Medieval Doctrinal System

In the sixteenth century the Protestant Reformation caused a dramatic break with medieval theology. This revolution did not erupt in a vacuum; many factors contributed to it. From a Protestant perspective, we can say that it was a revival sent by God, but we must still ask, What made people particularly receptive to God at this time? What made them start questioning traditional Catholic theology? What made them examine the Scriptures with a fresh approach? This chapter will identify a number of contributing factors and discuss certain people and movements that served as forerunners to the Reformation.

Causes of Dissent

As early as the twelfth century, there was some organized opposition to the Roman Catholic structure. For

293
17
The Road to the
Reformation

several reasons, there was the beginning of widespread skepticism.

First, the Crusades raised questions by bringing new influence from the Muslim world and from ancient Greek philosophy preserved by the Arabs. This contact made people realize that there were other systems of thought outside the Roman Catholic Church. Other societies were based on different fundamental beliefs and functioned as well as or better than medieval Europe.

Second, the corruption of the clergy and the papacy caused great disillusionment and questioning. The conflicts with secular rulers, the political intrigue, the "Babylonian Captivity," the Papal Schism, and the immorality of many popes, including the Renaissance popes of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, all contributed to skepticism. With such degeneration, people began to think perhaps something was fundamentally wrong with the system and its claims.

Third, there were many economic abuses, including ecclesiastical taxation, absenteeism, simony, and the sale of indulgences. These abuses significantly affected nations, cities, and individuals, and people began to see them as cynical methods designed to raise money for the church and its officials.

The medieval church had the power to impose taxes outside the civil government. Entire countries were threatened with interdict if they did not collect taxes for the papacy.

Absenteeism refers to the practice of appointing a bishop, abbot, or other official solely to provide him with the income associated with the position. The officeholder would not live in the area or perform the functions of the

294

A History of Christian Doctrine

office. The church would tax the local residents for the income, or the church would dominate the local economy by its income-producing activities, but the beneficiary would be a foreigner who cared nothing for the people under his spiritual charge.

Associated with absenteeism was simony, the rampant practice of buying and selling offices. Many carnal people who had no spiritual qualifications would purchase an office or otherwise obtain it through political influence in order to enjoy the prestige, power, and income of the position.

The rise of nationalism was a fourth factor. The

foundation of the Roman Catholic Church had been laid
when the Roman Empire ruled Christendom. There was
one empire and one church. After the empire fell, political
chaos ensued, but the church helped maintain a common
European identity. Charlemagne's empire, later known as
the Holy Roman Empire, underscored the sense of unity.
It eventually became mostly German in character, and distinct
nations, such as England and France, emerged on
the scene.

People began to identify themselves more as Englishmen
or Frenchmen than Europeans. They were concerned
more about their own national interests than in
the unity of church or empire. The English, for instance,
began to resent attempts by Italian popes to control English
politics or siphon off English money in order to promote
interests that were often contrary to those of England.
Many people began to think that the church should
not have secular power.

The most important cause of dissent was theological
and spiritual conviction. Throughout the Middle Ages,

295

The Road to the Reformation

dissenting individuals and groups protested on the basis
of their own understanding of the Bible and their own
relationship with God. As time went on, these dissenters
grew in number and proved to be impossible to suppress
completely.

In 1456, the invention of the printing press in the
West by Johann Gutenberg facilitated the spread of dissent.
For the first time, the Bible and other literature
could be published cheaply and made available to the
masses. The common people were able to compare the
teachings of the church with Scripture in a way that few
had been able to do before.

Doctrinal tracts, treatises, and books could now be disseminated
rapidly all across Europe. Before this time,
preaching was the primary means to present ideas to the
multitudes, but the opportunity to do so was limited and
easily curtailed by persecution. Now, dissenters could present
their views to thousands via simple tracts, and it was
almost impossible to completely destroy all the literature.
Without the printing press, it is doubtful that the Reformation
could have succeeded to the extent that it did.

With these factors in mind, let us examine significant
dissenters in the Middle Ages.

The Waldenses

The Waldenses emerged as an organized alternative to
the Roman Catholic Church in the late twelfth century.
Founded by Peter Waldo, the group suffered severe persecution
under the Inquisition. Waldo was a preacher who
proclaimed a simple message of returning to the Bible.
He or his followers rejected as unbiblical much church
tradition, including the papacy, the hierarchy, purgatory,

A History of Christian Doctrine

the saints, penance, and most of the sacramental system.
He also insisted upon preaching in the language of
the people. Until Vatican II in the 1960s, the Roman
Catholic Church conducted all its services in Latin,
including the preaching. By medieval times, however,
Latin was no longer the speech of the people; they spoke
French, German, Spanish, English, Italian, and so on.
Latin was used only in ecclesiastical and scholarly circles.
Most people understood only a little of the church liturgy;
services became empty, meaningless rituals for most.
Waldo maintained that the essence of Christianity was
not ritual but the preaching of the gospel and faith in the
Word of God. Therefore, church services should be conducted
in the vernacular.

Taking the Sermon on the Mount seriously, the
Waldensians advocated a simple, biblical lifestyle. They
rejected warfare, oaths, immodest clothing, ornamental
jewelry, dancing, and taverns. They taught chastity, honesty,
moderation in eating and drinking, avoidance of
anger, and avoidance of great wealth.[1] The Humiliati, a
group in Lombardy closely associated with the Waldenses,
likewise abstained from ostentatious dress.[2]

In many ways, the Waldenses foreshadowed and anticipated
the Protestant Reformation. A few of them survived
into the sixteenth century and aligned with the
Reformation.

The Albigenses

The Albigenses were another dissenting group that
originated in the late twelfth century. Their name comes
from the town of Albi in southern France, where they
were particularly strong. They rejected the hierarcy,

The Road to the Reformation

veneration of images, indulgences, and much of the
sacramental system. Opponents charged that they denied
the trinity, the deity of Christ, and other cardinal doctrines.
They too were severely persecuted; ultimately the

Inquisition completely wiped them out.

Somewhat like the Waldenses, the Albigenses embraced a simple lifestyle of separation from the world based on the Sermon on the Mount. They were also known as Cathari, from a word meaning "pure," referring to their emphasis on holiness and opposition to the religious corruption of their day.

Unlike the Waldenses, the Albigenses taught a dualism apparently drawn from Persian thought, perhaps via Manicheism: spirit is pure and flesh is evil. Based on this concept they promoted celibacy, vegetarianism, and other ascetic disciplines. As a result, they were not forerunners of Protestantism in the same way as the Waldenses.

Marsilius of Padua

A number of individuals also opposed important doctrines of the Catholic Church. In the fourteenth century, Marsilius of Padua taught that the supreme authority of the church rests in its councils, not in the pope. That view was standard in the Ecumenical Catholic Age, but in the Middle Ages it directly challenged the papal system.

For a while, this view found a significant following, and several church councils sought to exercise supreme authority. The conciliar movement was short-lived, however, for the popes soon reasserted their authority and dominated the councils. They consented to and followed the councils when necessary for political and ecclesiastical reasons, but they never submitted as a matter of

298

A History of Christian Doctrine

theology. Today the pope enjoys unchallenged authority as head of the church.

John Wyclif and the Lollards

Also in the fourteenth century, John Wyclif of England proposed radical changes, in many ways sounding like Peter Waldo. He openly attacked the papacy, transubstantiation, penance, and the sale of indulgences.

He and his associates completed the first translation of the Bible into English, for like Waldo he wanted the common people to understand the Word of God. Until this time in Western Europe the Bible was available primarily in Latin and therefore accessible only to churchmen and scholars.

Wyclif and his followers, the Lollards, suffered great persecution. He escaped execution, but after his death officials dug up his body and burned it.

John Huss and the Hussites

Another forerunner of the Reformation was John Huss in Bohemia in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Influenced by the views of Wyclif, Huss opposed papal supremacy and other doctrines on the ground that they were not biblical but merely traditional. The Council of Constance summoned him to defend his beliefs, and he agreed to do so if his king, Sigismund, would guarantee his safety. The king did, but when Huss appeared he was promptly arrested and convicted of heresy. The council explained that an oath made to a heretic was not binding and ordered his execution. Huss was burned at the stake.

Much like the Waldenses, the Hussites advocated a

simple lifestyle, rejecting gambling, dancing, and immodest dress; some of them opposed warfare and oaths.3 They joined the Protestant Reformation when it came. Known as the Bohemian Brethren, in the eighteenth century many joined with a Pietistic Lutheran group to form the Moravians. A small denomination today known as the Unity of the Brethren traces its descent from Huss.

Savonarola

Another man who sought to reform the church was Girolamo Savonarola, a Dominican friar who preached in northern Italy in the late fifteenth century. He denounced not so much the doctrine of the church but its immorality, including the degeneracy of the popes and the worldliness of the people. He specifically preached against such things as gambling, dancing, obscene books, jewelry, false hair, immodest dress, makeup, worldly music, and worldly amusements, and he inspired a revival of holiness in Florence.4

Not surprisingly, Savonarola aroused the ire of the church leadership. Eventually he was arrested and hanged. Like many dissidents and would-be reformers of the Middle Ages, he paid for his convictions with his life.

The Catholic Humanists

Within the Catholic Church, there were some scholars who did not openly attack church doctrines but began to undermine them in subtle ways. A group of such men shortly before the Reformation were known as the Catholic humanists, the most noted of whom was Erasmus. They are so called, not because they resembled modern secular humanists, but because they approached

doctrine from the position of human rationalism. Instead
of appealing primarily to tradition (like the Schoolmen)
or the Bible (like "heretics" we have discussed), they tried
to evaluate beliefs according to human reason. Moreover,
they dedicated themselves to serious scholarship in matters
that had long been neglected.

Their approach led to a more liberal stance. To a great
extent, they were forerunners of Catholic modernists
today who remain in the Catholic Church but question or
redefine much of the supernatural and mystical in its
teachings.

In a manner reminiscent of Pelagius, the Catholic
humanists taught that man can improve himself by his
own power and grace is a divine stimulus to help him do
what he is capable of doing. The supreme value of Jesus
is in His example for us. If we live as He lived, then we
can have a good and moral life.

The humanists questioned or criticized traditional
doctrines such as the full deity of Christ, transubstantiation,
and penance. They employed philosophical arguments
against traditional doctrine, and they proved some
important ecclesiastical documents to be forgeries,
notably the Donation of Constantine.

Erasmus provided a significant service to all Christianity
by publishing the first Greek New Testament in
1516. Noting that the Latin Vulgate, the authoritative
Bible of the Catholic Church, was a translation from
Hebrew and Greek, he determined to reconstruct the
original text of Scripture and study it directly. The English
King James Version was based primarily on the third edition
of Erasmus's Greek New Testament.

In many ways, the humanists sowed seeds that later
301

The Road to the Reformation

bore fruit among the Reformers—notably in the thinking
of Zwingli. When the Reformation came, however, they
refused to join it but drew back into Catholicism and
defended the system they had once criticized. Nevertheless,
they helped create a climate that was conducive to
the Reformation.

Martin Luther

Despite great dissenters such as Waldo, Wyclif, and
Huss, the Reformation did not take place with them but
with Martin Luther. He is the man who began the Protestant
Reformation in 1517. Although he initially sought

only to reform the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church from within, the intransigent response of the pope and the logic of Luther's own views rapidly moved him to break away totally and found the Protestant movement.

Historically, he is unique as the man who successfully precipitated the break with Rome. Theologically, he is unique in that he clearly enunciated the doctrine of justification by faith and made it the basis of his entire theology. Other groups and individuals before him had attacked many of the same elements of Roman Catholicism as he did, and some of them operated to a great extent on the basis of justification by faith, but they did not clearly express their opposition to the Catholic Church in those terms. It was left to Luther to proclaim the central principle by which the entire Catholic system was attacked and upon which the entire Reformation was built.

We must credit Luther for his insight, determination, and dedication to the doctrine of justification by faith and not by works. Others rejected various unbiblical aspects

302

A History of Christian Doctrine

of the medieval church, but he went to the heart of the matter. He laid the axe to the root of the medieval system by denouncing righteousness by works and merits.

Apostolic Doctrines

As we have seen, the medieval church was not a monolith. People in various ages stood against error and sought to return to biblical truth. Due to severe persecution, the need for secrecy, and the destruction of historical records, no doubt many such people have passed from history with little or no trace. The people of whom we have knowledge surely represent only the tip of the iceberg. What about the apostolic doctrines of repentance, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues, holiness of life, and Oneness? The evidence for their existence is sparse, but it is there.

Many factors have limited the available evidence from the Middle Ages: persecution by church and state, censorship, lack of educated people to transmit records, unavailability of printing to preserve records, and lack of understanding of the significance of certain practices. For example, some people probably baptized in Jesus' name simply because they read about it in Acts, and some probably began speaking in tongues as they prayed in faith

and repentance. But they may not have had the opportunity or ability to record, preserve, and transmit their experiences. They may not have realized the full biblical significance of their experiences or the importance of proclaiming them publicly and preserving them for posterity. Observers and historians may have overlooked,

ignored, or rejected these practices, or they may not have understood the value of recording, collecting, and transmitting such facts.

As we have already discussed, there were significant efforts to return to biblical repentance and biblical holiness. (See also Appendix F.) Moreover, we find some evidence of people receiving the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues. Some have reported speaking in tongues among the Waldenses and Albigenses, for example.5 There is also evidence for speaking in tongues among the Franciscans and other mendicant orders.6 It is no surprise that where there was a hunger for repentance and holiness there was also an outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

There were also scattered examples of people who questioned the doctrine of the trinity and expressed a modalistic or Oneness understanding. Some writers find evidence for Oneness concepts in the early Middle Ages among the Priscillianists, Euchites, and Bogomils.7 Peter Abelard (1079-1142), Gilbert de la Porree (1070-1154), and William of Conches (1080-1154) all described the Godhead in terms of manifestations or modes rather than the orthodox trinitarian persons.8

We also find references to baptism in Jesus' name and discussions of its validity. The Venerable Bede in England (673-735), the Council of Frejus (792), and Pope Nicholas I (858-67) all proclaimed that baptism solely in the name of Jesus was valid.9 Such decisions indicate that the matter was a living issue in their day—some people still baptized in the name of Jesus. Peter the Lombard, Hugo of St. Victor, and Thomas Aquinas all discussed the practice.10 Bonaventure and Aquinas acknowledged that in earlier times the church had often baptized in Christ's

name alone, but since the Fourth Lateran Council it was necessary to mention each member of the trinity.11

While the later Schoolmen ruled against Jesus Name baptism, they were aware of the issue. The witness had

not totally died, and where there was a witness, we can
presume that at least some people understood and
accepted that witness.

After the Protestant Reformation, evidence for all
these apostolic doctrines exploded.12 The renewed
emphasis on the Bible and justification by faith led many
people to repentance, water baptism in the name of
Jesus, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and holiness of life.
A grand process began of restoring biblical truths to the
understanding of Bible believers.

The twentieth century has seen the culmination of this
restoration. Today we can reach back beyond the Reformation,
the Middle Ages, the Ecumenical and Old
Catholic Ages, the Age of the Greek Apologists, and even
the Post-Apostolic Age to embrace the doctrine and experience
of the New Testament church. History informs us
in many ways, but it need not separate us from the message
of the apostles.

305
The Road to the Reformation

Appendix A
Dates in the History of Christianity
All dates before A.D. 150 are uncertain, and many
dates afterward, particularly dates of birth. A single date
for a person refers to an event or a writing during his
career. For people identified by an official title, such as
emperor, king, bishop, or pope, inclusive dates refer to
their term of office. For others, inclusive dates identify
their birth and death.

Secular History Church History
B.C. 27-A.D. 14 Emperor B.C. 4 Birth of Christ
Augustus
14-37 Emperor Tiberius A.D. 30 Crucifixion; Pentecost
37-41 Emperor Gaius (Caligula)
41-54 Emperor Claudius 46 Paul's first missionary journey
48 Council of Jerusalem
54-68 Emperor Nero 64-68 Neronic persecution
65 Execution of Peter and Paul
69-79 Emperor Vespasian 70 Fall of Jerusalem
79-81 Emperor Titus
96 Clement I, bishop of Rome
?-110 Ignatius, bishop of Antioch
69-155 Polycarp
140 Hermas
307

Secular History Church History
140 Marcion
150 Justin (writes First Apology)
156 Montanus
170 Melito, bishop of Sardis
168-81 Theophilus, bishop of Antioch
178-200 Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons
? Noetus of Smyrna
190 Praxeas
150-215 Clement of Alexandria
150-225 Tertullian (196, begins writing)
185-254 Origen (215, begins writing)
215 Sabellius
170-235 Hippolytus
200-58 Novatian
230 Earliest public church buildings
248-58 Cyprian, bishop of Carthage
249-51 Emperor Decius 250 Empire-wide persecution
260-72 Paul of Samosata, bishop
of Antioch
270 Anthony (becomes a hermit)
284-305 Emperor Diocletian 303-13 Diocletian persecution
312 Battle of Milvian Bridge 312 Donatist Schism
313-24 Co-emperors 313 "Edict" of Milan
Constantine and Licinius 250-336 Arius
324-37 Constantine sole 265-340 Eusebius
emperor 295-373 Athanasius (367, affirms NT)
325 Council of Nicea
315-67 Hilary
329-79 Basil (358, founds monastery)
330-90 Gregory of Nazianzus
335-94 Gregory of Nyssa

308
A History of Christian Doctrine
Secular History Church History
310-90 Apollinaris
381 Christianity becomes state
religion of Roman Empire
381 Council of Constantinople
387 Ephraem the Syrian (death)
340-97 Ambrose (390, defies emperor)
340-420 Jerome (405, completes
Vulgate)
345-407 John Chrysostom
410 Alaric sacks Rome 354-430 Augustine (386, converts)
412 Pelagius

428-31 Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople

429 Theodore of Mopsuestia (death)

431 Council of Ephesus

432 Patrick's mission to Ireland

375-444 Cyril of Alexandria

448 Eutyches (deposed as abbot)

390-457 Theodoret

440-61 Pope Leo I (the Great)

451 Pope Leo turns Attila 451 Council of Chalcedon from Rome

455 Gaiseric sacks Rome

476 End of Western Roman 480-525 Boethius Empire 500 "Dionysius the Areopagite"

529 Justinian Code 529 Synod of Orange

480-549 Benedict (540, writes Rule)

553 Second Council of Constantinople

570-632 Muhammad 590-604 Pope Gregory I (the Great)

622 Birth of Islam 597 Augustine's mission to England

580-662 Maximus the Confessor

Appendix A

Secular History Church History

663 Synod of Whitby (England)

680 Third Council of Constantinople

711-15 Muslims conquer Spain 716 Boniface's mission to Germany

732 Battle of Tours 675-754 John of Damascus

752-987 Carolingian dynasty 754 Donation of Pepin

768-814 Charlemagne, King 787 Second Council of Nicea of Franks (800, crowned 810-77 John Scotus Erigena emperor) 865 Radbertus (death)

868 Gottschalk (death)

868 Ratramnus (death)

882 Hincmar (death)

910 Abbey of Cluny founded

949-1022 Simeon the New Theologian

988 Christianization of "Russia"

1054 East-West Schism

1066 Conquest of England 1059-61 College of cardinals founded by William 1073-85 Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand)

1093-1109 Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury

1097-1141 Hugo of St. Victor

1079-1142 Peter Abelard

1100-60 Peter the Lombard

1096-1291 Crusades 1091-1153 Bernard of Clairvaux

(1095, Pope Urban II (1115, founds monastery)
launches First Crusade) 1150 Universities of Paris and Oxford
1152-90 Frederick I 1176 Peter Waldo and Waldenses
Barbarossa, Holy Roman 1100s Albigenses
Emperor 1198-1216 Pope Innocent III
1182-1226 Francis of Assisi (1209,
founds order)
1170-1221 Dominic (1220, founds
order)

310

A History of Christian Doctrine

Secular History Church History
1193-1280 Albertus Magnus
1212 Muslim defeat in Spain 1208-29 Albigensian Crusades
1215 Magna Carta 1215 Fourth Lateran Council
1229-31 Papal Inquisition begins
1245 Alexander of Hales (death)
1221-74 Bonaventure
1225-74 Thomas Aquinas
(1272, finishes Summa Theologiae)
1265-1308 John Duns Scotus
1290-1343 Marsilius of Padua
1285-1349 William of Occam
1309-77 Papal "Babylonian Captivity"
1318-59 Gregory Palamas
1321 Dante (completes Divine
Comedy)
1370 Catherine of Siena (begins Letters)
1300s-1500s Italian 1378-1417 Papal Schism
Renaissance 1330-84 John Wyclif
1369-1415 John Huss
1418 Thomas à Kempis (writes
Imitation of Christ)
1380-1444 Bernardino of Siena
1453 Fall of Constantinople, 1452-98 Girolamo Savonarola
End of Byzantine Empire 1478-83 Spanish Inquisition begins
1456 Gutenberg (first Bible 1466-1536 Desiderus Erasmus (1516,
printed) first Greek NT printed)
1492 Columbus discovers 1483-1546 Martin Luther
America 1517 The Reformation begins
Note: The major sources for the foregoing dates are
Christian History 9, no. 4 (issue 28: "The 100 Most

311

Appendix A

Important Events in Church History"); Otto Heick, A History
of Christian Thought; William L. Langer, ed., An

Encyclopedia of World History; New Grolier Multimedia
Encyclopedia; and in a few cases, Philip Schaff, History
of the Christian Church; and Tony Lane, Harper's
Concise Book of Christian Faith. In many cases the
sources differ by a year or sometimes several years.
312
A History of Christian Doctrine
Appendix B
Oneness Believers in History
This list consists of people for which we have documented
evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups
the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily
know about or endorse all the doctrines of the
people included (after the apostles). It appears that the
people on this list affirmed the absolute oneness of God
and the full deity of Jesus Christ and that they were nontrinitarian
(by orthodox trinitarian standards). For documentation,
see The Oneness of God and Oneness and
Trinity: A.D. 100-300 by David Bernard, as well as this
text.
Century Group or Individual
1 Apostolic church
2 Post-apostolic leaders, including Clement of Rome,
Ignatius, Polycarp; some Montanists; modalists
3 Modalists, including Noetus, Praxeas, Epigonus,
Cleomenes, Sabellius; probably the Roman bishops
Victor, Callistus, and Zephyrinus; Commodian,
probably a bishop in North Africa; "the majority of
believers" in Tertullian's day
4 Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and followers; believers
in Antioch, probably including Eustathius, the
bishop there; Priscillian and followers; Sabellians
313
Century Group or Individual
5-15 Sabellians, Priscillianists; possibly other heretics
such as Euchites and Bogomils; some theologians
such as Peter Abelard, William of Conches, and
Gilbert de la Porree
16 Michael Servetus, many Antitrinitarians, some
Anabaptists
17 Some English Baptists, William Penn and some
Quakers
18 Isaac Newton, Emmanuel Swedenborg, Isaac Watts
19 Some New England Congregationalists, John
Miller (Presbyterian), John Clowes (Anglican)
20 Oneness (Apostolic) Pentecostals, some Charismatics,

some Sabbatarians, some Baptists including
Frank Stagg, some Neo-Orthodox theologians
314
A History of Christian Doctrine
Appendix C
Ancient Creeds
1. The Old Roman Symbol (c. 200). This is the
original form of the so-called Apostles' Creed.
I believe in God the Father almighty;
And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord;
Who was born by the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary;
Was crucified under Pontius Pilate and was buried;
The third day He rose from the dead;
He ascended into heaven; and sitteth on the right
hand of the Father;
From thence [there] He shall come to judge the quick
[living] and the dead;
And in the Holy Ghost;
The forgiveness of sins;
The resurrection of the body [literally, flesh].
2. The Apostles' Creed (500s-600s). Contrary to
its name, the apostles did not frame this creed, but it is
based on the Old Roman Symbol. Its phrases come from
the late second through fifth centuries. It reached its
present form in the sixth and seventh centuries and was
officially adopted in Rome sometime in the ninth through
eleventh centuries.
315
I believe in God the Father almighty, creator of heaven
and earth;
And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord. He was
conceived by the Holy Spirit, born from Mary the virgin,
suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, was
buried, and descended to the underworld. On the third
day He rose again from the dead, ascended to heaven,
and sits on the right hand of God the Father almighty.
From there He will come to judge the living and the dead.
I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic church,
the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection
of the flesh, and eternal life. Amen.
3. The Original Creed of Nicea (325). The Council
of Nicea adopted this statement. The last paragraph, the
condemnatory clause, is not actually part of the creed
itself.
We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of
all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten
of the Father, the only begotten; that is, of the essence
[ousia] of the Father, God of God, light of light, very
[true] God of very [true] God, begotten not made, being
of one substance [homoousios] with the Father; by whom
all things were made both in heaven and on earth; who for
us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate
and was made man; he suffered, and the third day he
rose again, ascended into heaven; from thence he shall
come to judge the quick [living] and the dead.
And in the Holy Ghost.
But those who say, "There was a time when he was

not," and "He was not before he was made," and "He was
made out of nothing," or "He is of another substance"
[hypostasis] or "essence" [ousia], or "The Son of God is
created" or "changeable" or "alterable"—they are condemned
by the holy catholic and apostolic church.

4. The Present Nicene Creed (c. 500). Tradition
says the Council of Constantinople (381) modified the
original Nicene formula and produced the Nicene Creed
in use today, which is therefore sometimes called the
Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. Scholars have established,
however, that the present Nicene Creed actually
stems from a fourth-century baptismal creed used in
Jerusalem, which was influenced by the original creed of
Nicea. It replaced the original Nicene Creed around 500.

We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of
heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible.
And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son
of God, begotten from the Father before all ages, light
from light, true God from true God, begotten not made,
of one substance [homoousios] with the Father. By Him
all things were made. For us men and for our salvation He
came down from heaven, was made flesh from the Holy
Spirit and Mary the virgin, and became man. He was crucified
for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered, and was
buried. He rose again on the third day, according to the
Scriptures, and ascended into the heavens. He sits on the
right hand of the Father and will come again with glory to
judge the living and the dead. His kingdom will not end.
And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver, who
proceeds from the Father. Together with the Father and

the Son He is worshiped and glorified. He spoke through
the prophets. And in one holy catholic and apostolic
church. We confess one baptism for the remission of sins.
We look forward to the resurrection of the dead and the
life of the age to come. Amen.

5. The Athanasian Creed (c. 500). Contrary to its
popular name, this creed had nothing to do with Athanasius,
but it reflects the theology of the West, particularly
Augustine. Estimates of its date vary from the 400s to the
700s. It is also called the Quicunque Vult, after its first
words in Latin.

Whoever wants to be saved must first of all hold the
catholic faith. Unless one keeps this faith whole and inviolate,
he will without doubt perish eternally.

Now this is the catholic faith: that we worship one
God in trinity and trinity in unity—neither confusing the
persons, nor dividing the substance. For the Father's person
is one, the Son's another, and the Holy Spirit's another.
But the deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is one.
Their glory is equal and their majesty coeternal.

Whatever the Father is, such is the Son and such also
the Holy Spirit. The Father is uncreated, the Son uncreated,
and the Holy Spirit uncreated. The Father is infinite, the
Son infinite, and the Holy Spirit infinite. The Father is eternal,
the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit eternal. Yet there
are not three eternals but only one eternal—just as there
are not three uncreateds nor three infinites but only one
uncreated and only one infinite. Likewise, the Father is
almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Spirit almighty—
yet there are not three almighties but only one almighty.

318

A History of Christian Doctrine

Thus the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy
Spirit is God—yet there are not three Gods but only one
God. Thus the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy
Spirit Lord—yet there are not three Lords but only one
Lord. For just as Christian truth compels us to acknowledge
each person by Himself to be God and Lord, so the
catholic religion forbids us to speak of three Gods or
Lords.

The Father is neither made nor created nor begotten
from anything. The Son is from the Father alone—not
made nor created but begotten. The Holy Spirit is from
the Father and the Son—not made nor created nor begotten
but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three
Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not

three Holy Spirits. And in this trinity no one is before or after another; no one is greater or less than another, but all three persons are coeternal and coequal with each other. Thus in all things, as has been said, both trinity in unity and unity in trinity are to be worshiped. This is how to think of the trinity if you want to be saved.

But for eternal salvation it is also necessary to believe faithfully in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For correct faith is believing and confessing that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is equally God and man. God He is, begotten from the Father's substance before time; man He is, born from His mother's substance in time. He is both perfect God and perfect man, composed of a rational soul and human flesh. He is equal to the Father, as God; less than the Father, as man.

Although He is both God and man, yet He is not two but one Christ. He is one, however, not by the conversion of His deity into flesh, but by the taking up of His humanity

into God. He is one indeed, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For just as rational soul and flesh make one man, so also God and man make one Christ.

He suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose from the dead, ascended into the heavens, and sat at the right hand of the Father. He will come from there to judge the living and the dead. When He comes, all men will rise again with their bodies and will render account for their own deeds. Those who have done good will go to eternal life, those who have done evil to eternal fire.

This is the catholic faith. Unless one believes it faithfully and firmly, one cannot be saved.

Sources: The Old Roman Symbol is from Otto Heick, A History of Christian Thought, 1:88. The original creed of Nicea is from Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, 1:28-29. The remaining creeds, which are translated into more modern English, come from Tony Lane, Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith, 35, 51, 73-74. For the Greek and Latin originals, see Schaff, Creeds, 2:45-71. Punctuation and capitalization have been modified for uniformity.

A History of Christian Doctrine

Appendix D

Baptism in Jesus' Name in History

This list includes only people for which we have documented evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people included (after the apostles). For documentation, see The New Birth by David K. Bernard.

Century	Group or Individual
1	Apostolic church
2	Early post-apostolic church, Marcionites, some Montanists, Modalists
3	Many in the institutional church; "heretics"; opponents of Cyprian; Sabellians; endorsement by Stephen, bishop of Rome
4	Sabellians, endorsement by Ambrose
5-6	Sabellians
7	Endorsement by Bede
8	Endorsement by Council of Frejus
9	Endorsement by Pope Nicholas I
12	Mention by Peter Lombard and Hugo Victor
13	Mention by Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas
16	Some antitrinitarians, some Anabaptists, people known to Martin Luther

321

Century	Group or Individual
17	Some English "heretics," some Baptists
19	Some Plymouth Brethren, John Miller (Presbyterian)
20	Some trinitarian Pentecostals, Oneness Pentecostals, some Sabbatarians, some Charismatics

322

A History of Christian Doctrine

Appendix E

Speaking in Tongues in History

This list includes only people for which we have documented evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people included (after the apostles). For documentation, see The New Birth by David K. Bernard.

Century	Group or Individual
1	Apostolic church
2	Early post-apostolic church, Justin, Irenaeus, Montanists
3	Tertullian, Novatian, Sabellians
4	Endorsement by Hilary, endorsement by Ambrose
12	Some Waldensians, some Albigensians, some Franciscans, some among other mendicant religious orders

16 Some Anabaptists, including some Mennonites; Prophecy movement in England
17 Camisards; some Quakers; some Jansenists; some Pietists, including some Moravians
18 Some Methodists, some from the 17th-century groups mentioned above

323

Century Group or Individual

19 Some in American revivals and camps, Irvingites, some Plymouth Brethren, Readers, some Lutherans, some in the Holiness movement, the "gift people" in New England, other Christians
20 Pentecostals, charismatics from every denomination

324

A History of Christian Doctrine

Appendix F

Holiness Teaching in History

1. People Who Emphasized Practical Holiness.

This list includes only people for which we have documented evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people included (after the apostles). For documentation, see Practical Holiness: A Second Look by David K. Bernard, as well as this text.

Century Group or Individual

1 Apostolic church
2 Post-apostolic church, Montanists, Greek Apologists
3 Ante-Nicene writers, including Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria
4 Some post-Nicene writers, such as John Chrysostom
12 Waldenses, Humiliati, Albigenses
14 Hussites
15 Bernardino of Siena and followers, Savonarola and followers
16 Anabaptists, including Mennonites, Hutterites, Amish; Calvinists
17 Puritans; Quakers; Pietists, including Moravians and Brethren; Baptists

325

Century Group or Individual

18 Methodists
19 Holiness movement
20 Early trinitarian Pentecostals, early Fundamentalists and Evangelicals; Oneness Pentecostals

2. Teachings. Here are examples of various teachers

or groups who have taken a position against the following worldly practices. These lists are representative and do not necessarily include everyone who has taken such a stand. Some of the groups originally held the position but no longer do, and in other groups only some of the members held or hold the position. For documentation, see Practical Holiness: A Second Look by David K. Bernard.

Worldly theater: Tatian, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Apostolic Constitutions, John Chrysostom, Calvinists, Puritans, Spener and Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, Pentecostals.

Movies: H. A. Ironside; R. A. Torrey; Moody Church; Roman Catholic Archbishop George Mudelein; Holiness movement; Pentecostals, including Apostolic Faith, Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), Assemblies of God, United Pentecostal Church International; Baptists, including Baptist Bible Fellowship, John R. Rice, Liberty Baptist College.

Television: Holiness movement; Anabaptists, including Amish, Hutterites; some Evangelicals, including Malcolm Muggeridge and Joe Bayly; some independent Baptists, including Bill Gothard; some trinitarian Pentecostals, including David Wilkerson; United Pentecostals.

Personal ornaments: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Tatian, Commodian, Cyprian, Apostolic Constitutions, John Chrysostom, Waldensians, Humiliati, Hussites, Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvinists, Puritans, Quakers, Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, Pentecostals.

Makeup: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Commodian, Cyprian, Apostolic Constitutions, Savonarola, Holiness movement, Pentecostals.

Immodest dress: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Waldenses, Humiliati, Hussites, Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvinists, Puritans, Baptists, Quakers, Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Wearing clothes of the opposite sex: Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Holiness movement, some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Short hair on women and long hair on men: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Apostolic Constitutions, John Chrysostom, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Holiness

movement, some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Alcohol: Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Apostolic Constitutions, Anabaptists, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Tobacco: Anabaptists, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Abortion: Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, Apostolic Constitutions, Roman Catholic Church, Holiness movement, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Warfare: Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Lactantius,

Appendix F

Waldenses, Anabaptists, Quakers, early Pentecostals.

Astrology: Didache, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Lactantius, Apostolic Constitutions, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Worldly sports and amusements: Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Apostolic Constitutions, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, Tatian, Chrysostom, Bernardino, Savonarola, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Gambling: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Apostolic Constitutions, Bernardino, Savonarola, Hussites, Calvin, Puritans, Pietists, Quakers, Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Dancing: Clement of Alexandria, Commodian, Apostolic Constitutions, Waldenses, Hussites, Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvin, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

A History of Christian Doctrine

Appendix G

Development of Roman Catholicism

Here is a partial list of nonbiblical doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church along with the dates of their official adoption, or in the case of some practices, the date of their widespread acceptance. Where there was a discrepancy between sources, the earlier date was chosen. Most of the dates before 1000 are approximate. Sources are Loraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism; Will and Ariel Durant, The Story of Civilization; and Otto Heick, A History of Christian Thought.

Practice or Doctrine Date of Acceptance

Prayers for the dead (beginning of practice) 300

Making the sign of the cross 300

Use of wax candles in worship 320
Veneration of angels, dead saints, and images
(practice) 375
Trinity (Council of Constantinople) 381
The mass as a daily celebration 394
Mary called "Mother of God" 431
Priestly dress 500
Feast of the Assumption of Mary
(celebrated by some) 500s
Extreme unction 526

329

Practice or Doctrine Date of Acceptance
Purgatory (Pope Gregory I) 593
Latin language for all prayer and worship 600
Prayers to Mary, dead saints, and angels 600
Title of pope as the universal bishop 610
Use of penitentials (lists of penances for each sin) 700s
Kissing the pope's foot (Pope Constantine) 709
Temporal power of the pope (Boniface III) 750
Veneration of the cross, images, and relics
(doctrine) 787
Use of indulgences 800s
Baptism by sprinkling replacing immersion 800s
Holy water 850
Veneration of St. Joseph 890
College of cardinals instituted 927
Baptism of bells (John XIV) 965
Canonization of dead saints totaling 25,000
(John XV) 995
Fasting on Fridays and during Lent 998
The mass as a sacrifice, with obligatory
attendance 1000s
First plenary indulgence 1040
Prayers for the dead (doctrine) 1070s
Celibacy of the priesthood (Gregory VII) 1079
Rosary (invented by Peter the Hermit) 1090
Sacraments fixed at seven 1100s
Ave Maria (Hail Mary) prayer 1100s
Sale of indulgences 1190
Transubstantiation made an essential doctrine 1215
Confession to a priest made an annual obligation 1215
Adoration (worship) of communion wafer
(Honorius III) 1220

330

A History of Christian Doctrine
Practice or Doctrine Date of Acceptance

Papal Inquisition 1229
Bible forbidden to laity
(on Index of Forbidden Books) 1229
Festivals 1264
Feast of Corpus Christi 1311
Communion cup officially forbidden to laity 1414
Seven sacraments officially sanctioned 1439
Tradition declared equal in authority to Scripture 1545
Apocryphal books declared to be Scripture 1546
Immaculate conception of Mary (Pius IX) 1854
Syllabus of Errors (proclaimed by Piux IX and
Vatican I) 1864
It condemned freedom of religion, speech,
conscience, and press; condemned scientific
discoveries not approved by the church; and
asserted the pope's temporal authority over
all civil rulers.
Papal infallibility in faith and morals (Vatican I) 1870
Public schools condemned (Pius XI) 1930
Assumption of Mary (Pius XII) 1950
In addition to these nonbiblical doctrines and practices
there are many others, such as monks, nuns, monasteries,
convents, Lent, All Saints Day, fish day, incense,
holy oil, Christopher medals, charms, novenas, and so on.
Vatican II (1962-65) revised some traditional practices. It
allowed masses in the vernacular, eating of meat on Fridays,
and greater use of the Bible, and it eliminated a
number of saints who were deemed legendary.
331
Appendix G
Notes
Chapter 2. Early Post-Apostolic Writers, A.D. 90-140
1M. B. Riddle in Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and
A. Cleveland Coxe, eds., The Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF)
(1885; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 7:375. Unless
otherwise indicated, all quotations of Ante-Nicene writings are
from this ten-volume set. For further discussion and documentation,
see David K. Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, A.D. 100-
300 (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1991), 48-55.
2See, for example, Clement of Rome, First Epistle to the
Corinthians, 19, 20, 30, 59, 60; Ignatius, Magnesians 8; Hermas,
Shepherd, Commandment 1; II Clement, 20. For full discussion,
see Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, 29-59.
3See Hermas, Shepherd, Similitude 9:12; ibid., Vision 2:4;
Pseudo-Barnabas, Epistle, 5-6. For discussion, see Bernard,
Oneness and Trinity, 40-41, 56-57.

4Clement of Rome, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 16; Ignatius, Ephesians 7, 17; Ignatius, Magnesians 15; Ignatius, Smyrnaeans 1, 15; Polycarp, Philippians, 6, 12; II Clement 1. For full discussion, see Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, 29-59.
5Hermas, Shepherd, Commandment 4:3; Pseudo-Barnabas, Epistle, 11.
6Otto Heick, A History of Christian Thought (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965) 1:53, 87; Kirsopp Lake, "Baptism (Early Christian)," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics 2:389; J. F. Bethune-Baker, Introduction to the Early History

332

of Christian Doctrine (London: Methuen & Co., 1933), 25, 378. For further discussion, see Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, 41-42, 121-28.
7Hermas, Shepherd, Vision 3:3-7; ibid., Similitude 8:6, 9:13-16, 28; Clement of Rome, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 58-64; Ignatius, Ephesians, 1, 3, 7, 20; Ignatius, Romans, salutation.
8J. V. Bartlett, "Baptism (New Testament)," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics 2:378; Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, 53-55.
9The only manuscript in which the Didache appears, copied by one Leo in 1056, also contains II Clement, in which an important passage has been changed to reflect trinitarianism. The original text of II Clement 9 identifies Christ as "Spirit" before the Incarnation, while the 1056 edition instead says Christ was "Logos" before the Incarnation. See ANF 7:517, 519; 10:228, 253.
10Clement of Rome, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 2; Ignatius, Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, superscription, 12; Ignatius, Epistle to Polycarp, 2; Didache 1:5, 11:7.
11Clement of Rome, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 29, 35, 39, 58; Ignatius, Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, superscription.
12For a fuller discussion and documentation, see David Bernard, God's Infallible Word (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1992), 89.
Chapter 3. Early Heresies
1Cyprian, Epistles 72:4.
2Canon 7 of the Council of Constantinople in 381 identified the Montanists as modalists. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2d. ser. (Reprint,

333

Notes

Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) 14:185. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations of Nicene and post-Nicene writings are from this set of volumes.

3Didymus, On the Trinity 2:15, cited in Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1963) 3:98-99.
4Hippolytus, Refutation of All Heresies 8:12; 10:22; Pseudo-Tertullian, Against All Heresies 7:2, cited in Jaroslav Pelikan, The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1971-89) 1:104.
Chapter 4. The Greek Apologists, A.D. 130-180
1For a full discussion, see Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, 61-90.
2Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, 56, 127.
3Justin, First Apology, 6, 13, 33, 36, 38.
4Ibid., 6, 13.
5Theophilus, To Autolycus 2:15, 18.
6Ibid. 2:10, 22.
7Ibid. 2:22.
8Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, 14.
9Justin, First Apology, 61.
10Ibid., 65.
11Justin, Second Apology, 6; Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, 85.
12Thus one article in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (ERE) cites Justin for the first use of a threefold formula, and another suggests that the Didache originally referred only to baptism in the name of the Lord. Kirsopp Lake, "Baptism (Early Christian)," ERE 2:389; J. V. Bartlett, "Baptism (New Testament)," ERE 2:378.
13Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, 82, 88.

A History of Christian Doctrine
14Origen, Against Celsus 7:9, quoting Celsus, True Discourse; Origen, Commentary on John 2:6.
Chapter 5. The Old Catholic Age, A.D. 170-325
1Irenaeus, Against Heresies 3:3:4. In this and subsequent quotations, parentheses represent brackets in the ANF edition.
2Ibid. 1:10:1, 2:1:1, 2:3:2, 2:28:4-5, 3:10:2, 4:1:1, 4:6:6; 4:17:6; 4:31:2. For a full discussion, see Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, 93-104.
3Irenaeus, Against Heresies 4:6:5-6.
4Ibid. 3:10:12, 4:31:2.
5Ibid. 3:16:7, 4:20:1.
6Ibid. 5:20:1, 1:10:1.
7Heick 1:108-9, 127; Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1910) 2:569.
8Irenaeus, Against Heresies 1:21:1.
9Ibid. 1:21:3.

10Irenaeus, Fragments from the Lost Writings of Irenaeus, 34, ANF 1:574.

11Irenaeus, Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, 3.

12Irenaeus, Against Heresies 5:11:1-2.

13Ibid. 5:6:1.

14Ibid. 2:32:4-5.

15Tertullian, On the Flesh of Christ, 5.

16Heick 1:127. See Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 2, 4, 12. Earlier, Theophilus, a Greek Apologist, had used a similar Greek word, triados, in passing, but his meaning was not clear and he did not use it in a doctrinal way to teach that God is three persons.

17Louis Berkhof, The History of Christian Doctrines (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1937), 65, 83-84.

335

Notes

18Tertullian, Against Hermogenes, 3, 18; Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 5, 7.

19Tertullian, Against Hermogenes, 18; Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 9, 26.

20Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 13.

21Ibid., 3-5, 8.

22Ibid., 4.

23Ibid., 3.

24Ibid., 7.

25Ibid., 3.

26Tertullian, On Baptism, 12-13.

27Tertullian, The Chaplet [On the Crown], 3-4.

28Tertullian, Against Marcion 5:8.

29Treatise on Re-Baptism by an Anonymous Writer, ANF 5:665-78.

30Cyprian, Epistles 70:1, 75:12.

31Clement of Alexandria, The Instructor 2:1-2, 4, 6-7, 11; 3:5, 11.

32Ibid. 3:2-3, 11.

33Origen, Commentary on John 10:16.

34Ibid. 2:6.

35On First Principles 1:3:7 speaks of equality, but Commentary on John 2:2, 6 makes the Son dependent upon the Father and the Spirit dependent on both Father and Son.

36Origen, On First Principles 1:2:2, 4.

37Ibid. 1:2:1; Origen, Commentary on John 1:23; Origen, Against Celsus 5:39, 8:14-15.

38Ibid. 2:3; Origen, On First Principles, preface:3.

Chapter 7. The Canon of Scripture

1Bernard, God's Infallible Word, 80-81, 191-92.

2F. F. Bruce, The Canon of Scripture (Downers Grove, IL:

InterVarsity Press, 1988), 70-75.

A History of Christian Doctrine

3For further discussion, see Bernard, God's Infallible
Word, 84-86.
4See Matthew 10:40; 16:19; 18:18; 28:19-20; Luke 6:13;
9:1-2; 10:16; 24:46-49; John 14:26; 16:13; 15:27; 17:20;
20:23; Acts 1:21-22; I Corinthians 11:2 Ephesians 2:20; II
Thessalonians 2:15.
5Bruce, Canon, 256-63.
6See Ante-Nicene Fathers, vols. 1, 2, and 7.
7Ante-Nicene Fathers 5:603-4.
8Norman Geisler and William Nix, A General Introduction
to the Bible, rev. ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 231.
9Ibid., 298-301.
10Ibid., 430-31.

Chapter 8. The Doctrine of God

1William Chalfant, Ancient Champions of Oneness (Hazelwood,
MO: Word Aflame Press, 1979), 105-13.
2Malchion, Epistle against Paul of Samosata, 2.
3Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma (London: Williams
and Norgate, 1897) 3:51-54; Heick 1:149.
4Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 1, 3; Novatian, The Refutation
of All Heresies 9:2, 5.
5Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, 128.
6Berkhof, 79.
7Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 4; Hippolytus, The Refutation
of All Heresies 9:5; Origen, Commentary on John 1:23;
Origen, Against Celsus 5:39.
8Tertullian, Against Hermogenes, 3, 18; Tertullian, Against
Praxeas, 2, 9, 26; Origen, On First Principles, preface:4,
1:2:1, 3:5:6-7; Origen, Commentary on John 2:2-3; Origen,
Against Celsus 5:39, 8:14-15; Hippolytus, The Refutation of All
Heresies 10:28-29; Hippolytus, Against the Heresy of One

Notes

Noetus, 14; Novatian, Treatise concerning the Trinity, 27, 31.
9Will and Ariel Durant, The Story of Civilization (New
York: Simon and Schuster, 1935-75) 4:8.
10Pelikan 1:193, 207.
11See, for example, Basil, Letters, 38.
12Reinhold Seeberg, Textbook of the History of Doctrines,
trans. Charles Hay (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publishing Society,
1904) 1:232-33.
13Basil, On the Spirit 16:38, 47; Basil, Letters, 105; Gregory
of Nyssa, On the Holy Spirit; Gregory of Nyssa, On "Not Three

Gods"; Gregory of Nazianzus, Oration on Holy Baptism, 43.

14See Basil, On the Spirit 16:37-38; Basil, Letters, 38; Gregory of Nyssa, On the Holy Spirit; Gregory of Nyssa, On the Trinity; Gregory of Nazianzus, Third Theological Oration, On the Son 29:3; Gregory of Nazianzus, Fifth Theological Oration, On the Holy Spirit, 8-10.

15Tertullian, Against Praxeas, 3.

Chapter 9. The Doctrine of Christ

1Schaff 3:944.

2Tony Lane, Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984), 50, brackets in original.

3Pelikan 1:266-67.

Chapter 10. The Doctrines of Humanity and Salvation

1See Bernard, Oneness and Trinity, 122.

2Ambrose, Of the Holy Spirit 1:3:43.

3Chalfant, 78-80.

4Ibid., 133, 135, citing Epiphanius and Pseudo-Athanasius regarding Sabellius; Asterius Urbanus, Extant Writings, 10.

5Novatian, Treatise concerning the Trinity, 29.

6Hilary, On the Trinity 8:33.

338

A History of Christian Doctrine

7Ambrose, Of the Holy Spirit 2:8.

8John Chrysostom, Homilies on First Corinthians, 29.

9Augustine, On Baptism, Against the Donatists 3:16:21.

Chapter 12. The Early Sacraments

1In Against Heresies 2:22:4 he spoke of people of all ages being born again through Christ, including infants. Elsewhere, he taught that baptism was essential to the new birth.

2Pelikan 1:167.

Chapter 13. Pagan Influences

1Durant 4:75. See Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of Christianity, rev. ed. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1953, 1975) 1:209.

2Durant 3:657.

3Walter Nigg, The Heretics (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 102.

4Schaff 3:125.

5Durant 3:436.

6Ibid. 2:183.

7Ibid. 1:200, 235.

8Ibid. 2:183.

9Ibid. 3:66, 524, 558.

10Ibid. 2:187.

11Justin, First Apology, 66.

12Durant 4:58-60.

Chapter 14. The Early Middle Ages, A.D. 600-1100
1Schaff 4:279-99; Durant 4:537-41.
Chapter 15. The Later Middle Ages, A.D. 1100-1500
1Durant 4:585-613.
339
Notes
2Ibid. 4:780-1.
3Klotsche, 158.
4Durant 5:64, 150, 156.
5Schaff 5:593-94, 658.
Chapter 16. The Medieval Doctrinal System
1Durant 4:806.
2Schaff 5:831-2.
3Durant 4:746-47.
4Ibid. 4:737.
5Ibid. 4:743-44; Schaff 5:846-49; Pelikan 3:183.
Chapter 17. The Road to the Reformation
1Latourette 1:452-53.
2Schaff 5:211.
3Ibid. 7:181-82.
4Ibid. 7:321; Durant 5:150, 156.
5Carl Brumback, What Meaneth This? (Springfield, MO:
Gospel Publishing House, 1947), 92.
6"Tongues, Gift of," A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James
Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898) 5:796;
"Tongues, Gift of," Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. H. B.
Hackett (1870; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971) 4:3310-11.
7Thomas Weisser, After the Way Called Heresy (By the
author, 1981), 115.
8Durant 4:940, 950-51.
9"Baptism," A Dictionary of the Bible 1:241.
10Ibid.
11Schaff 5:709.
12David K. Bernard, The New Birth (Hazelwood, MO: Word
Aflame Press, 1984), 272-77, 288-98.
340
A History of Christian Doctrine
Select Bibliography
Primary Sources
Deferrari, Roy J., et al., eds. The Fathers of the Church. New
York: Fathers of the Church. N.d.
Irenaeus. Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching. Translated
by Joseph P. Smith. Westminster, MD: Newman.
1952.
Lightfoot, J. B., and J. R. Harmer, editors. The Apostolic
Fathers. 1891. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker. 1988.

[Greek and English].

Richardson, Cyril, et al., trans. and eds. Early Christian Fathers. New York: Macmillan. 1970.

Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, eds. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 1885. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1981.

Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st and 2nd series. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1976.

Schaff, Philip, ed. The Creeds of Christendom. 6th ed. 1931. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker. 1983.

Secondary Sources

Bainton, Roland. Early Christianity. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand. 1960.

Berkhof, Louis. The History of Christian Doctrines. Grand Rapids: Baker. 1937.

341

Bernard, David K. God's Infallible Word. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1992.

——. The New Birth. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1984.

——. Oneness and Trinity, A.D. 100-300. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1991.

——. The Oneness of God. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1983.

——. Practical Holiness: A Second Look. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1985.

——. The Trinitarian Controversy in the Fourth Century. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1993.

Bethune-Baker, J. F. An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine. London: Methuen and Company. 1933.

Boettner, Loraine. Roman Catholicism. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed. 1962.

Brown, Harold O. J. Heresies: The Image of Christ in the Mirror of Heresy and Orthodoxy from the Apostles to the Present. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday. 1984.

Christian History. Vol. 9, no. 4. Issue 28: "The 100 Most Important Events in Church History."

Dorner, J. A. Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1870.

Durant, Will and Ariel. The Story of Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1935-75.

Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. London: Williams and Norgate. 1897.

Harvey, Van. A Handbook of Theological Terms. New York:

Macmillan. 1964.

Hastings, James, ed. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1951.

342

A History of Christian Doctrine

Heick, Otto. A History of Christian Thought. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1965.

Johnson, Paul. A History of Christianity. New York: Atheneum. 1976.

Klotsche, E. H. The History of Christian Doctrine. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Baker. 1945, 1979.

Lane, Tony. Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1984.

Langer, William L. ed. An Encyclopedia of World History. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1968.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. A History of Christianity. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1953, 1975.

Lebreton, Jules, and Jacques Zeiller. A History of the Early Church. New York: Collier. 1962.

New Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia. Version 5.0. Grolier and Online Computer Systems. 1987-92.

Nigg, Walter. The Heretics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1962.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1971-89.

Quasten, Johannes. Patrology. Westminster, MD: Newman. 1963.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. 3rd rev. ed. 1910. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1947.

Wolfson, H. A. The Philosophy of the Church Fathers. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1970.

343

Select Bibliography

344

Index

345
Index

Liberius, 129

Original sin, 76, 162-66
Osiris, 222
Paganism, 42, 44-45, 88, 92,
215-32, 234, 289-91
Papacy, 81, 156, 190-98, 234,
245-50, 254-61, 289, 294
Papal Schism, 258-59, 294
Papias, 23, 106
Patriarchs, 189-90, 261
Patrick, 93
Patripassianism, 117-19
Paul, 21, 32, 37, 44, 105, 108,
187, 197, 226
Paul of Samosata, 114
Pelagius, 164-65, 167, 170, 173,
175, 285, 301
Penance, 77, 207-8, 235-37,
277-79
Pepin, 245
Persecution, 43-44, 63, 102,
126, 128, 191, 194, 255-57,
303
Person, 55, 84, 121, 128, 132,
151, 156-58
Peter, 44, 105, 108, 187, 197-98
Peter of Alexandria, 65
Peter the Hermit, 252
Peter the Lombard, 268, 304
Philo, 51-52
Philosophy, 34, 45, 46, 49-52,
60, 64, 67, 73, 81, 84-86, 95,
117-18, 126, 130-2, 147,
236, 291, 294
Pisa, Council of, 259
Pius IX, 285
Pius XII, 286
Plato, 50, 52, 86, 97, 130, 236,
267, 270
Polycarp, 23, 25, 29, 66, 106,
110
Polytheism, 49, 52, 219-21
Post-Apostolic Age, 21-29, 31,
47, 62, 115, 176, 178, 187
Praxeas, 119
Preaching of Peter, 23
Predestination, 35-36, 160, 243-

350

A History of Christian Doctrine

161, 176, 179, 190, 203-6,
208, 211, 216
Teutonic Knights, 265
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 95,
145, 212

Theodoret, 95, 148, 211, 221
Theodorus Lector, 99
Theodosius I, 92, 96, 99, 133
Theodosius II, 100, 146
Theophilus, 47, 48, 50, 55, 59
Thomas à Kempis, 272
Thomas Aquinas, 270, 273-85,
287-89, 304
Timothy, 21
Titus, 21, 187
Toledo, Synod of, 134, 242
Tongues, 40, 70-71, 78, 180-81,
303-5, 323-24
Torquemada, Tomas de, 257
Toulouse, Council of, 255
Traducianism, 76, 161-62
Transubstantiation, 209, 244-45,
268-69, 276, 290
Trent, Council of, 104
Triad, 48, 55
Trinity, 26-27, 42, 56, 62, 68-69,
72-76, 84-85, 95-97, 99-100,
113-38, 156-67, 205, 219,
242, 270
Tritheism, 75, 122-23, 131-32,
219-20
Turks, 93, 262
Ulfilas, 93
Universalism, 86
Urban II, 252
Valentinian III, 197
Valentinus, 34
Valerian, 44
Vatican I, 257
Vatican II, 331
Venus, 221
Vestal Virgins, 227
Victor, 73, 119
Vladimir I, 263

A History of Christian Doctrine

A History of Christian Doctrine,

Volume Two

The Reformation to the Holiness Movement,
A.D. 1500-1900
by David K. Bernard

All Scripture quotations in this book are from the King James Version of the
Bible unless otherwise identified.

Contents

Preface

This book surveys the history of Christian doctrine
from approximately A.D. 1500 to 1900. It generally follows
chronological order and identifies the most significant
events in church history, but the emphasis is on
tracing doctrinal developments. To further this purpose,
it discusses some events thematically rather than in strict
chronological sequence.

We will use the words church and Christian in the
most general sense, recognizing that the visible church
structure is not necessarily the New Testament church as
defined by message and experience. We will discuss the
major groups of people who have identified themselves as
Christian.

Occasionally material in this book may seem complex
and foreign, but some treatment of details is necessary to
provide background and to impart a feel for significant
issues and problems. The main objective is to introduce
the leading historical figures and movements in Christendom
and to convey a basic understanding of their doctrines.
This information will provide various perspectives on
biblical issues and will aid in dialogue with people of different
backgrounds. The reader will see when, how, and
why certain biblical doctrines were abandoned and certain
unbiblical doctrines embraced, and will see how God
has worked to restore and revive fundamental truths that
were largely forgotten.

This book arose out of teaching two semesters of
9
church history for five years at Jackson College of Ministries

246

in Jackson, Mississippi. The rough draft was transcribed
from lectures taped for the extension program of
Kent Christian College in Dover, Delaware. Special thanks
goes to Claire Borne for transcribing this material. It was
an immense project! After considerable additions, deletions,
and revisions, this book is the result.

It is important to remember that only the Bible is our
authority for doctrine. History cannot alter or replace
biblical truth. Nor can history prove the validity of doctrine,
but it can provide insight into how key doctrines
were handled over the centuries. It can help to dispel the
myth that our fundamental doctrines are of recent origin.
The clear teaching of Scripture is enough to tear away the
shrouds of nonbiblical tradition, but a historical survey
can aid in the process.

A History of Christian Doctrine

In the sixteenth century, the Protestant Reformation
brought dramatic changes to Christianity and instituted
the modern era. Beginning with Martin Luther in 1517,
significant numbers of people in Western Europe challenged
and soon rejected many important features of
medieval theology. In addition to Roman Catholicism and
Eastern Orthodoxy, there emerged a third branch of
Christendom, called Protestantism.

The Road to the Reformation

A number of individuals and groups had already
repudiated some Roman Catholic practices and beliefs,
but they had not successfully threatened the entire system.
In the twelfth century, two strong groups had arisen

The Protestant
Reformation

1

as alternatives to the institutional church of the Middle
Ages. The Waldenses, or Waldensians, sought to return to
a more biblical theology and a more holy lifestyle. The
Albigenses, or Albigensians, also desired a purer, more
simple life but brought elements of Persian dualism into
their thinking.

In response, the Roman Catholics established the
Inquisition to root out "heretical" beliefs and people.
Although no one knows how many people were imprisoned,
tortured, or executed, a crusade called by Pope
Innocent III in the early thirteenth century slaughtered
twenty thousand men, women, and children in the town of

Béziers, France, because it refused to surrender its heretics. Under its first grand inquisitor, the Dominican monk Tomás de Torquemada, the Spanish Inquisition burned at the stake about two thousand people.[1] The Inquisition was successful in exterminating the Albigenses, and it severely curtailed the Waldenses.

By the early sixteenth century, the times were ripe for the Reformation. Undeniably the hand of God was at work. In addition, volume 1 of A History of Christian Doctrine discusses several important reasons for the beginning of widespread skepticism and the greater willingness to question traditional doctrines:[2]

• The Crusades raised questions by bringing new influence from the Muslim world and from ancient Greek philosophy preserved by the Arabs.

• The corruption of the clergy and the papacy caused great disillusionment and questioning.

• The Catholic Church was guilty of many economic abuses, including ecclesiastical taxation, absenteeism, simony, and the sale of indulgences.

12

A History of Christian Doctrine

• The rise of nationalism made people less willing to submit to the Roman pontiff, especially in political matters.

• Mysticism, an emphasis on subjective religious experience, helped undermine the authority of the church.

• Nominalism, the philosophical view that universal concepts and ideas have no objective reality, also helped undercut the church's authority.

• The Catholic humanists, led by Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) of Rotterdam, questioned and reinterpreted many traditional doctrines, proposed ethical reforms, and proved as forgeries some supposedly ancient documents that the church and pope used to support their claims of political power.

• Theological and spiritual conviction was undoubtedly the most important factor.

• The invention of the printing press in 1456 by Johann Gutenberg facilitated the spread of dissent. For the first time, the Bible and other literature could be published cheaply and made available to the masses. The common people were able to compare the teachings of the church with Scripture in a way that few had been able to do before. Now, dissenters could present their views to thousands via simple tracts, and it was almost impossible

to destroy all the literature. Without the printing press, it is doubtful that the Reformation could have succeeded to the extent that it did.

Despite earlier dissenters such as Peter Waldo, John Wyclif, and John Hus (or Huss), the Reformation did not take place with them but with Martin Luther. Although Luther initially sought only to reform the doctrines and

The Protestant Reformation

practices of the Roman Catholic Church from within, the intransigent response of the pope and the logic of Luther's own views rapidly moved him to break away totally and found the Protestant movement.

Historically, he is unique as the man who successfully precipitated the break with Rome. Theologically, he is unique in that he clearly enunciated the doctrine of justification by faith and made it the basis of his entire theology. Other groups and individuals before him had attacked many of the same elements of Roman Catholicism as he did, and some of them operated to a great extent on the basis of justification by faith, but they did not clearly express their opposition to the Catholic Church in those terms. It was left to Luther to proclaim the central principle by which the entire Catholic system was attacked and upon which the entire Reformation was built.

Martin Luther and His Ninety-five Theses

Martin Luther was born in 1483 in Eisleben, Germany, to a family of peasant background, but by the time he was eighteen they apparently had some money, for he enrolled at the University of Erfurt, the best in Germany at the time. As a young man, Luther enjoyed life and lived exuberantly, but he was a pious Catholic. He first saw a complete copy of the Bible at the university at age twenty. In 1505 Luther earned the master's of arts degree and, following his father's wishes, began to study law. That summer, however, his life changed drastically. Shortly after a close friend was unexpectedly killed, Luther was caught in a sudden thunderstorm and almost struck by lightning. In his fright he made a vow to St. Anne that if she would deliver him he would become a monk.

A History of Christian Doctrine

After surviving the storm, he entered the Augustinian monastery at Erfurt over the opposition of his father. There he began a systematic study of theology and became a priest. In a few years his superior transferred

him to the monastery in Wittenberg, where he lectured on philosophy at the University of Wittenberg and earned a doctorate of divinity. Eventually he became a noted professor of theology there, as well as a preacher and pastor.

In 1510 Luther took a pilgrimage to Rome and performed various acts of devotion in sacred places. For instance, at a staircase supposedly taken from Pilate's judgment hall, he walked up the steps on his knees in order to obtain an indulgence promised by Pope Leo IV in 850. He wished his parents were already dead so that he might release their souls from purgatory by saying masses in the holy city.

Luther expected Rome to be the epitome of the highest ideals of the Roman Catholic Church. Instead he found a corrupt, cynical system dominated by secular and ecclesiastical politics, pleasure, and materialism. He saw first-hand the worldliness of the Renaissance papacy and heard about the shocking crimes and immorality of Alexander VI, pope from 1492 to 1503, who had numerous mistresses and illegitimate children. Luther returned to Germany disillusioned.

The pope at the time, Julius II, was a warrior who used military force to extend papal power. He amassed a great fortune through his office, lived in splendor and luxury, wore priceless jewels, and lavishly patronized the arts, including the work of Michaelangelo and Raphael. His successor, Leo X, who reigned at the time of the Reformation itself, was made an abbot at eight and a

15

The Protestant Reformation

cardinal at fourteen. A member of the powerful de' Medici family, he pursued pleasure, lived extravagantly, and promoted numerous relatives to high and lucrative ecclesiastical positions despite their immorality.

As a monk, Luther was conscious of his sinfulness and greatly concerned about his personal salvation. Living under fear and guilt, he sought assurance of salvation through strict personal disciplines, including frequent confession to a priest, fasting, prayer, and even whipping himself. He never found peace or security in these practices, however.

As he studied the Scriptures, he came across Romans 1:17, which seemed to leap out at him: "The just shall live by faith." The statement burst upon his consciousness like a light as he realized that he could never be saved by his works but needed to trust in God's grace for the forgiveness

of sins. He concluded that justification by faith is
an act of God that makes the sinner righteous apart from
his own works.
In the words of the noted church historian Philip
Schaff, "This experience acted like a new revelation on
Luther." Schaff explained its significance for Protestantism:
The Pauline doctrine of justification as set forth in the
Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, had never
before been clearly and fully understood, not even by
Augustine and Bernard, who confound justification
with sanctification. Herein lies the difference between
the Catholic and the Protestant conception. In the
Catholic system justification is a gradual process conditioned
by faith and good works; in the Protestant

16

A History of Christian Doctrine

system it is a single act of God, followed by sanctification.
It is based upon the merits of Christ, conditioned
by faith, and manifested by good works.3
Luther's doctrine of justification by faith was the key
insight that sparked the Reformation. Although for a time
he remained a Roman Catholic priest and monk, his life
took a radically different direction. He began to teach and
preach in accordance with his new understanding of the
Book of Romans. He gradually began to realize that something
was seriously wrong with the Catholic system,
which emphasized meritorious works, penance, prayer to
the saints, relics, indulgences, and so on, rather than simple
faith in Jesus Christ.
The catalyst that brought Luther's thinking to a culmination
was Pope Leo's program to sell indulgences to
complete the construction of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome,
which was to become the greatest cathedral in the world.
To raise the enormous sums required, the pope sent
agents throughout Christendom for an aggressive sales
campaign. Actually, in Germany, half the proceeds went to
retire the debt that the archbishop of Mainz, Germany's
highest ecclesiastical official, had incurred in purchasing
his post.
The sale of indulgences was a major source of revenue
for the popes of this time. According to medieval
Catholic theology, every person faced both temporal and
eternal punishment for his sins. The remedy was the
sacrament of penance, in which the sinner confessed his
sins to a priest, received absolution (forgiveness) for the
eternal punishment, and performed satisfaction (works

of penance prescribed by the priest) for the temporal

punishment. Most people expected to suffer for a time in purgatory as well.

There was an alternative, however. Drawing upon the heavenly treasury of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, the pope could grant an indulgence to cover the temporal penalty. Typically he prescribed a certain pious act or payment of a certain fee. By purchasing an indulgence in this way, a person could render immediate and complete satisfaction for his sins, or he could help deliver a dead relative from purgatory.

In 1517, the papal sales agent in Germany, Johann Tetzel, was particularly crass in his methods. He played upon the emotions of people, appealing to them to deliver their loved ones from the tormenting flames of purgatory so they could enter heaven. He promised that when they heard the coins clink in the iron collection chest, their loved one's soul would be released from purgatory. He also assured those who purchased indulgences that upon death they would enter directly into heaven without having to suffer for years in purgatory. As one might imagine, Tetzel was enormously successful in raising funds for the pope.

Many theologians looked askance at these tactics, and Martin Luther began to preach against trusting in indulgences. Finally Luther decided it was time for further action. On October 31, 1517, he posted on the door of the castle church in Wittenberg ninety-five theses opposing the sale of indulgences. This was the accepted method for inviting academic debate.

This event is traditionally seen as the beginning of the Reformation, although at the time Luther did not envision a split from the Roman Catholic Church. His purpose in

posting the theses was to conduct an academic inquiry that would curtail the sale of indulgences and reform the thinking of the church. He did not engage in a frontal attack on the fundamental doctrines of Catholicism; the ninety-five theses dealt primarily with indulgences and the theory underlying them. Luther expected that members of the hierarchy would look favorably upon his points and halt excessive tactics like those Tetzel employed.

This first step was actually quite mild. What Luther
did not fully appreciate at the time, however, was that he
struck at the heart of the pope's financial system. Instead
of getting a sympathetic hearing from the hierarchy as he
had hoped, he was denounced as a deadly threat. Luther
was ordered to stop speaking on the subject.
Luther refused to be silenced. Many of his colleagues
and students at the university had already embraced his
ideas. He engaged in public debates and began writing
treatises to support his views. The ninety-five theses were
widely distributed in tract form. Many people began to
rally to his cause, for many already had similar reservations
about the sale of indulgences and the worldliness of
the church.
One thing quickly led to another. If the sale of indulgences
was wrong, the entire system of merits was questionable.
If the system of merits was wrong, then the
sacramental theology of medieval Catholicism was fundamentally
flawed.
It soon became clear that the problem was not merely
one of excessive practices but erroneous theology. To
establish the proper theological foundation, Luther began
to develop further his central insight: justification by
19
The Protestant Reformation
faith. We are counted as righteous in God's sight not by
our good works, but by our faith in Jesus Christ. This doctrine
shook Roman Catholicism to the core.
It is probable that some sort of break was eventually
inevitable under any circumstances, but the Catholic hierarchy
grossly mismanaged the entire dispute. They issued
ultimatums to Luther to stop spreading his views. Finally,
in 1520, when it was evident that Luther would not
retract his statements, Pope Leo X issued a papal bull
(official pronouncement) threatening excommunication,
or expulsion of Martin Luther from the church for heresy.
His books were to be burned, and if he did not repent in
sixty days, he was to be burned as well.
The pope next began to pressure Luther's ruler, Elector
Frederick the Wise of Saxony, one of the princes who elected
the Holy Roman emperor. He was supposed to punish
Luther or send him to Rome for punishment. Frederick
was sympathetic to Luther, however, and deferred action.
Luther responded defiantly to the pope, denouncing
him as a heretic and the Antichrist. He even said that no
one who abided by the bull could be saved.4 On December

10, 1520, he gathered in Wittenberg with a large group of colleagues and students, built a bonfire, and burned the papal bull. The break with the Roman Catholic Church was a reality.

In June 1520, Charles V, the twenty-year-old king of Spain, was selected as the new Holy Roman emperor. The pope urged him also to enforce the bull of excommunication. The German princes were not enthusiastic about upholding papal authority, however. They had long felt that the Italian popes were meddling in their internal affairs, and they sensed an opportunity to curtail intrusive

20

A History of Christian Doctrine

papal power. Some also sympathized with Luther for theological reasons.

Charles summoned Luther to appear at his first diet (meeting of the German princes), held in 1521 in Worms, and promised him safe conduct. Of course, in the previous century John Hus had been burned at the stake despite a similar promise regarding a similar summons, on the ground that a promise made to a heretic was not binding.

At the diet, representatives of the pope denounced Luther as a heretic and demanded that he recant. After requesting a day's delay, Luther responded that he did not accept the supreme authority of popes or councils but would recant only if someone could prove to him from Scripture that he was in error. His exact words are not known for certain, but it is traditionally reported that he said, "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen." He knew his life was at stake.

The next day, Charles V decided against Luther. True to his word, Charles gave him safe conduct for twentyone days but said that afterwards he would treat Luther as a heretic. On the way back home, Luther was suddenly "kidnapped" by armed horsemen under the direction of Elector Frederick and secretly detained almost one year at Wartburg Castle for his own safety. During this time he translated the New Testament into German, which helped make the Bible available to everyone and also aided greatly in the standardization of the German language.

When Luther finally emerged out of hiding, he had such support from the German people and many of the German princes that he was able to preach and teach openly. Even though for the rest of his life he was still

21

The Protestant Reformation

under the sentence of death, he was able to give crucial leadership for many years to the movement he started, until his death in 1546.

The Spread of the Reformation

At this time the major powers of Western Europe were Spain, France, England, and the Holy Roman Empire. The empire was a conglomeration of semi-independent German states that included modern Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Bohemia, Austria, and parts of Italy. Russia was beginning to emerge as a power in Eastern Europe, and there were a number of smaller states.

As we have seen, the Protestant movement began in Germany, where it initially had the greatest impact. Soon the Germans began choosing between Lutheranism and Catholicism. Each state became characterized by the religious choice of its ruler. The Holy Roman Empire was riven by controversy, political infighting, and eventually religious warfare, with Lutherans and Catholics each trying to gain control over the other.

In 1529 the princes of the Holy Roman Empire gathered for a diet in the city of Speier. The Catholics under Emperor Charles V dominated the Diet of Speier, which forbade Lutheran teaching in the Catholic states of Germany but proclaimed tolerance for Catholicism in the Lutheran states. The Lutheran princes protested against this decision, but they were in the minority and lost. The princes who protested became known as Protestants. The rivalry and fighting continued.

Finally, the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 settled the matter. Charles V granted each state the right to choose and maintain its own religion. The northern and eastern

22

A History of Christian Doctrine

German states were Lutheran, while the southern portion of the empire, such as Bavaria (southern Germany) and Austria, remained Catholic. Lutheranism also became dominant in Scandinavia.

In Switzerland, the second major branch of Protestantism arose, called the Reformed. It began in 1523 in Zurich with Ulrich Zwingli, a noted preacher and pastor who, like Luther, had previously entertained doubts about the Catholic system. He differed with Luther in regarding the Lord's Supper as symbolic only, with no real presence of Christ in the elements.

Zwingli died in 1531 and was soon eclipsed in significance

by John Calvin in Geneva, whose theology was quite similar. Calvin's comprehensive theological writings laid the foundation for the Reformed wing as it exists today. It gained ascendancy in Switzerland and the Netherlands (as the Reformed), in Scotland (as the Presbyterians), and for a time in England (as the Puritans).

The Reformed also gained a significant following in other European countries, including France, the native country of Calvin. The king and nobles upheld Catholicism and severely persecuted the Protestants there, known as the Huguenots. The most notorious example was the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572, in which thousands of Huguenots were brutally killed, to the immense satisfaction of the pope. Many of France's Protestants fled the country. Eventually the remaining Huguenots were protected by the Edict of Nantes in 1598.

Spain remained solidly Catholic; the Reformation never gained a significant foothold. The most severe persecutions under the Inquisition took place there

before and during the Reformation. Italy, home of the papacy, also remained Catholic, although there were sizeable pockets of dissent, especially in the north.

The third major wing of Protestantism in the sixteenth century was the Anabaptist, which had its beginning with some followers of Zwingli in 1525. They renounced infant baptism and sought to restore the doctrine, practice, government, and lifestyle of the early church, before its merger with the state under Emperor Constantine. The Anabaptists never became a majority in any country but were scattered across Europe, particularly in areas where the Reformed were strong. Unlike Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and the rest of Protestantism, they held it wrong to become a state church.

The fourth major branch of Protestantism was the Anglican, or Church of England, which began with King Henry VIII in 1534. Initially Henry denounced Martin Luther as a heretic, but he soon came into conflict with the pope over divorcing his first wife. He broke with Rome for personal and political reasons, naming himself rather than the pope as the head of the Church of England. Although he resisted theological change, eventually the leading Anglican theologians embraced the essential tenets of Protestantism. His daughter, Queen Mary I

("Bloody Mary"), tried to turn the country back to
Catholicism and severely persecuted the Protestants.
Under Queen Elizabeth I, however, England was permanently
established as a Protestant state.

By about 1600 the Protestant Reformation had
reached its greatest extent in Europe. Northern Europe
had become mostly Protestant, particularly Lutheran.
Central Europe was a mixture of Lutheran, Reformed,

Anabaptist, and Catholic. England was Anglican. Southern
(Latin) Europe remained Catholic.

In 1618 the Thirty Years' War began. It was the last
serious attempt to make all of Germany Catholic. The
Peace of Westphalia in 1648 ended the war, finally settling
Europe's religious conflicts and curtailing much of the
pope's political power.

Looking at the major countries of modern Europe,
Roman Catholicism continued to dominate the areas of
France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, southern Germany
(Bavaria), Belgium, Austria, Poland, and Lithuania. Great
Britain, most of Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands,
Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Iceland, and Finland were
predominantly Protestant.

In Eastern Europe, Eastern Orthodoxy continued to
hold sway in its traditional domain, including modern
Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Greece, Romania, Bulgaria, and
Serbia. These lands were not affected significantly by the
Reformation. The areas of modern Hungary, Czech
Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Croatia were predominantly
Catholic, but most had significant Protestant
minorities. Albania and Bosnia-Hercegovina were predominantly
Muslim. These Eastern European lands,
except the areas of the former Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia,
were part of the Ottoman Empire at this time
and thus under Muslim control.

In less than twenty years from Luther's ninety-five
theses, then, four major wings of Protestantism emerged:
the Lutherans, Reformed, Anabaptists, and Anglicans.
Clearly, the stage had been set for theological revolution.
Many people everywhere had begun to doubt traditional
medieval doctrine. Luther was the one who struck the

decisive blow, but in a short time the movement developed
momentum that took it far beyond the original ideas

of Luther himself. We turn to a discussion of these developments in chapters 2-7.

Postscript

It is ironic that some Protestants today denounce the Oneness Pentecostal movement for the "revelation" of Jesus Name baptism and the oneness of God and for departing from "historic orthodoxy." Actually, however, Oneness Pentecostals explain that their teaching does not derive from extrabiblical revelation but from a rediscovery of biblical truth as illuminated by the Holy Spirit. They also affirm that traditional majority beliefs can never be the arbiter of orthodoxy, but Scripture alone. This defense is precisely the one that Protestants employ for Martin Luther and his "new revelation," to quote Philip Schaff. As Schaff's further comments exemplify, they typically say that no one since apostolic times accurately taught the doctrine of justification by faith until Martin Luther, and they further maintain that this formulation is the essential core of the doctrine of salvation. In his own defense, Luther rejected appeals to councils and popes—the "historic orthodoxy" of his day—and insisted that he be judged by Scripture alone. Protestants who wish to be consistent with their own history and theology cannot label Oneness Pentecostals as heretics or cultists simply because they do not follow historical tradition but claim to embrace biblical truth largely forgotten and abandoned. Instead, they should engage them in a respectful scriptural discussion with the goal of ascertaining the truth.

26

A History of Christian Doctrine

As we have seen, Martin Luther based his theology on the doctrine of justification by faith, which led him to reject the Roman Catholic system. A few months before the posting of his famous ninety-five theses, he had actually prepared ninety-seven theses that were more comprehensive and more explanatory of his early theology. But it was the ninety-five theses that precipitated the break with Rome.

When Luther's goal of stopping the sale of indulgences and reforming the thinking of the church was thwarted by unyielding opposition from the hierarchy, he was led step by step to consider the entire scope of Catholic theology. In a few years he was attacking the

27

Martin Luther and

sacramental system and the papacy itself in the strongest
of terms. To him, the Roman Catholic Church was the
Babylonian harlot in the Book of Revelation.

Justification by Faith

The fundamental insight of justification by faith is the
basis not only of Lutheranism but also of the entire
Protestant movement. In opposition to the Roman
Catholic doctrine of justification by faith and works,
Luther emphatically stated that justification is by faith
alone. In his German translation of the Bible Luther
insisted on adding the word "alone" to Romans 3:28, so
that it said, "A man is justified by faith [alone]."

Justification means to be counted as righteous by
God. When a person believes on Jesus Christ, God
imputes the righteousness of Christ to him. Instead of
looking at his sins, God sees only Christ's righteousness
and rewards him accordingly.

The watchwords of the Reformation are grace alone,
faith alone, Scripture alone, and Christ alone (sola gratia,
sola fide, sola Scriptura, sola Christus). In other
words, salvation is solely by the grace of God, not by
human action. It is solely by faith in God, not by works of
man but by trusting in God. Scripture alone is the authority
for doctrine, the sole authority for our salvation.
Christ is the only atonement for our sins; we can find salvation
only in him.

Theology of the Cross

Martin Luther characterized his theology as the "theology
of the Cross." From start to finish salvation is a work
of God's grace purchased by Calvary. Jesus Christ's atone-

ment on the cross is what makes salvation available to us.
Luther contrasted his theology of the Cross with other
concepts, which he called the theology of glory. Only if we
teach that salvation is strictly by God's grace on the basis
of the Cross, do we have the theology of the Cross. If we
add anything by making human works part of the salvation
process, then we detract from what Jesus did for us
and instead we glorify man. Man becomes a co-redeemer,
resulting in a theology of glory that exalts human accomplishments.
Luther's entire theology revolved around justification
by faith alone and the theology of the Cross.

Supreme Authority of Scripture
Luther rejected tradition as our authority and said
Scripture is our sole authority for doctrine. Consequently,
the Protestant Reformation reemphasized the study of the
Bible, seeking answers from it instead of the church hierarchy.
The renewed emphasis on Scripture was a significant
departure from both Catholic theology and practice. In
1229 the Catholic Church had forbidden the laity to read
the Bible, because they were not theological experts.
They would not understand it but would only become confused.
Instead they were to accept the interpretations and
pronouncements of the church as authoritative.
Indeed, the Bible was generally available only in
Latin, the dead language of church ritual and scholarship,
not in the language of the people. Likewise, the entire
liturgy was in Latin and therefore generally incomprehensible
to the average person who attended mass.
Luther declared that the Bible, the liturgy, and the
preaching should be in the language of the people. He
29
Martin Luther
believed that the average person could understand the
basic message of Scripture (the doctrine of the perspicuity
of Scripture), and he translated the Bible into German
to make it available to them.
Although he elevated Scripture above tradition, Luther
was quite conservative in implementing this principle. He
said believers should only reject views and practices that
clearly contradict the Scriptures, but they are free to
retain all others. Unlike many later Protestants, such as
the Anabaptists, he did not favor discarding all traditions,
liturgy, and practices not found in the Bible. If a tradition
is clearly erroneous in light of Scripture, then Christians
must throw it out, but if the Bible does not specifically
address the matter then they are free to retain it.
Luther indicated that the authority of Scripture does
not rest in the canon, the list of books that have been historically
accepted, but in the gospel message. What
makes Scripture authoritative is its presentation of the
gospel of justification by faith. Portions of Scripture have
greater or lesser value depending on how much they present
the gospel.
The Old Testament is not as relevant as the New Testament
because the New Testament presents the message
of justification by faith more clearly. Even within the New
Testament, some books are more important than others.

For example, Luther called the Book of James "an epistle of straw" because he believed it did not fully harmonize with the doctrine of justification by faith alone.1 He considered James problematic because it emphasizes that faith can only be shown by works, and his Catholic opponents were fond of quoting James 2:20: "Faith without works is dead."

30

A History of Christian Doctrine

The Book of James reveals that faith is not merely mental assent but a living relationship with God that cannot help but produce works. If there are no works of faith in a person's life, that is evidence his faith is not genuine. Luther's rejection of the correlation between works and faith in James reveals his willingness to interpret Scripture by his doctrine of justification by faith. He thus compromised his teaching that Scripture is the sole authority for doctrine.

Luther acknowledged that we must interpret Scripture by the illumination of the Holy Spirit but said the Spirit would not teach anything other than the gospel. When some Protestants began to emphasize the move of the Spirit, prophecy, and the need for a spiritual understanding of Scripture, he rejected them as "enthusiasts" (or "fanatics"), saying they did not adhere to the gospel. They in turn criticized him as a man of letter and not of the Spirit. In theory he was open to an anointing of the Spirit, but in practice he restricted the possibilities of the work of the Spirit to what would conform to his understanding of justification by faith.

Law and Gospel

Luther looked at the law (the Old Testament, particularly the law of Moses) and the gospel as radically different. He said that the gospel replaces the law, so he saw a sharp discontinuity between the way God dealt with people in the Old Testament and the way God deals with people today.

He identified the purposes of the law as civil and theological. God gave the law of Moses to establish civil regulations and to lead people to the truth of justification by

31

Martin Luther

faith in Christ. Now that we have come to this truth, we no longer need the law.

He acknowledged that the moral law contained in both testaments shows a justified person how he is supposed

to live in order to please God. But he did not put
great emphasis on law, whether Old Testament law or the
moral law of both testaments. To him, the moral guidance
of the law is helpful, but it is not of the essence of salvation
or the gospel.

Doctrine of Humanity

Luther taught that all humans are sinners from birth
(original sin). They are born in sin, bound by sin, and destined
for eternal damnation. They can only will to do evil.
No one can choose good of his own accord, much less
actually do good.

Not only are we sinners by our actions, but we are sinners
by our nature. The sinful nature means that we are
inclined to do evil and in fact bound to do evil, and it further
means that we cannot even desire to do good or to
seek after God. The only way for someone to desire God
is for God's grace to work in him first.

In short, we have only a passive capacity to let God
turn our will toward Him. We cannot exercise our will to
choose God, but when God comes with His grace, He can
change our will.

Doctrine of Salvation

Luther's doctrine of humanity logically leads to the
doctrine of individual predestination (unconditional election),
and that is exactly what he taught. Like Augustine
in the fifth century (after all, he had been an Augustinian

32

A History of Christian Doctrine

monk), he said a person is saved only by God's prior,
unconditional choice.

Luther was driven to this position by his desire to
secure his doctrine of justification by faith against any
possibility of compromise. He concluded that if a person
could use his will to choose God, then he would be cooperating
with God in salvation, and that would mean justification
by works. Even though a person acknowledges
that God's grace must work first, if he has a responsibility
to accept or reject the message of salvation, in Luther's
thinking it would dilute or destroy salvation by grace
alone. He considered that any decision to accept God's
grace, or any agreement with God, would be a work and
therefore contrary to faith.

Consequently, he taught that God predestines who
will be saved and who will be lost. God sends grace to the
individuals he has chosen, changes their will, and gives
them faith. Then they are justified by the faith that God

has given them. They cannot resist this choice; it is purely by the grace of God with no human input whatsoever. From a Wesleyan, Holiness, or Pentecostal perspective, Luther's views on predestination, grace, and faith are erroneous. By scriptural definition, faith is man's positive, active response to God. Accepting God's grace is not only possible but necessary. Doing so is not a meritorious human work that brings salvation, but it is the essence of saving faith. In the Bible, it is impossible to separate saving faith from the obedience of faith.2 In Luther's attempt to avoid a theology of glory (salvation by works), then, he defined faith itself as a gift of God that operates apart from an individual's will. He thought this definition was necessary to avoid the

33

Martin Luther

works-righteousness system of the Roman Catholic Church. While his definition of faith certainly eliminates meritorious works, it does so at the unscriptural expense of eliminating the human will itself. Thus one's perception of choosing to repent becomes merely an illusion. Luther defined justification as the decree of absolution that God pronounces upon sinners. He viewed the sinner as coming before God, unholy, unrighteous, and undeserving, and God as pronouncing him to be righteous. In other words, Luther taught that God washes away sins strictly on the basis of the Cross and through the faith God imparts to those He has chosen to save. Thus justification has nothing to do with the individual himself. It does not change the person internally. It is merely an objective act of God, purchased by Calvary, and applied by God according to His predetermined choices. In summary, Luther taught that a person's salvation is not primarily something that happens inside him, but outside him. It was historically purchased by Calvary and it was decreed for him through the mechanism of predestination. There is no experience of salvation by the person himself at the moment of justification. The person continues to commit sin as before, but now as a justified sinner. In an exaggerated phrase to emphasize this point, Luther wrote to his junior colleague Philip Melanchthon, "Sin boldly!"3 He was not actually promoting a sinful lifestyle, but he sought to underscore his belief that no matter how much a Christian sins, God's grace covers him and he should not allow guilt to assail him. Luther was an advocate of morality, but his theology did not

emphasize holiness of life. He focused on justification to the neglect of sanctification. His central theme was that

we cannot do anything to save ourselves; we must believe that God has elected and justified us. What we are, what we have done, or even what we are going to do is irrelevant to our salvation; God's choice alone is the determining factor.

The goal of Luther's doctrine of salvation was to help people overcome the doubt, fear, and pharisaism associated with the medieval system of works righteousness, but it went too far by taking away human responsibility altogether. Luther did not intend to lead people into a sinful lifestyle, but he regarded it as inevitable that people will continue to sin habitually after they become Christians. Since salvation rests solely in God's choice, there is nothing they can do about it, so they simply need to renounce any guilt feelings over sinning.

Luther did speak of a continuing work of God that leads into actual righteousness. Yet this progressive righteousness has no bearing on a person's standing in the sight of God, but merely with the ongoing Christian life. Thus he taught that salvation progressively transforms us, a process some later Protestant writers called sanctification. As a Christian grows in grace, he will become actually righteous in his actions. In this connection, the law—the moral law of both testaments, the natural law of God as revealed to conscience, and the principle of love— is helpful in showing Christians the path to follow in order to please God.

Doctrine of the Church

Luther's view of the church was positive—he called it "mother church"—but it was different from Roman Catholicism. While he felt it necessary for people to be

linked to the church, he rejected the authority of the pope and the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The supreme authority is the Word of God, not the pope or the priesthood. Moreover, every believer is a priest in the sight of God (the universal priesthood of believers). Jesus Christ has become our high priest; therefore we need no other earthly mediator. Each Christian can go to God directly for himself.

Luther did not, however, totally abandon the idea of confession to a priest. He still considered confession of

sins to a minister to be appropriate and helpful in many cases, but a person's relationship with God is not based on the minister. Each person has his own relationship with God as a priest. No one has to go through another person to be justified in the sight of God or receive forgiveness of sins.

Not only is every Christian his own priest to God through Christ, but every Christian is a priest to others. There is no radical distinction between clergy and laity, for everyone can intercede and minister on behalf of others. Not every Christian fills the role of publicly preaching the gospel, however. A person must be called to the preaching ministry. This call is typically approved by the prince, the magistrate, or the congregation. The secular government and the church government need to recognize a person's calling to preach and then ordain him.

Turning to public worship, the central focus of the medieval service was the mass (Eucharist). Only the priest and perhaps a choir sang in Latin, and often there was no preaching unless the bishop came to speak. Luther placed renewed emphasis on congregational singing and wrote hymns in German for that purpose, including "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God." He also made

36

A History of Christian Doctrine

the preaching of the Word the most important element of the service.

Church and State

To a great extent, Luther accepted a strong relationship between the church and the state. Of course, he rejected the supremacy of the pope over both church and state, but he retained the strong connection between church and state that had characterized Christianity since the time of Emperor Constantine in the fourth century.

Luther saw a parallel between law and gospel and state and church. As sinners we are subject to the law of the state, but as Christians we look to the church for the message of salvation through the gospel. Christians should not use the state to promote the church's goals, and the state should not use the church to promote the state's goals. Nevertheless, the state has an obligation to support the church, and secular rulers have a right to participate in the government of the church. In practice, Luther cooperated closely with the German princes in the operation of the church.

As a result, in lands where it gained political control,

the Lutheran Church became the official state church. It was supported, at least in part, by taxes the government collected for this purpose. Even today, in some European countries, this practice prevails.

Doctrine of God

Luther retained the traditional medieval doctrine of God, including trinitarianism. He disliked the philosophical language used to define the trinity, however, particularly the word homoousios ("same substance"),

Martin Luther

which in the Nicene Creed describes the relation between the Father and the Son.4 When exposed to the work of Michael Servetus, who denied the trinity but upheld the deity of Jesus Christ, Luther confessed having had doubts of his own but rejected the book as "wicked":

Visionaries like the writer do not seem to fancy that other folks as well as they may have had temptations on this subject. But the sting did not hold; I set the word of God and the Holy Ghost against my thoughts and got free.5

The Sacraments

Luther abandoned the Catholic interpretation of the sacraments, with its emphasis on merit. He defined a sacrament as a physical act chosen by God to be a sign of His promise. In order for a ceremony to be a valid sacrament there are two requirements: it had to be instituted by Christ and it must be bound up with the promise of the gospel. In other words, it has to be related to justification by faith.

Using these criteria, he reduced the seven sacraments of medieval Catholicism to only two: baptism and the Eucharist. He did not oppose the others but did not regard them as sacraments.

The Lutherans continued to practice confirmation and, of course, marriage and ordination. Luther strongly objected to penance with its requirement of works, but he was willing to allow confession to a priest (minister) as helpful but not essential. The Lutherans abandoned the administration of last rites (extreme unction).

A History of Christian Doctrine

Water Baptism

Luther held that baptism confers the remission of sins and is necessary to salvation. In this regard he adhered

not only to the position of the Roman Catholic Church but to the teaching of the first five centuries of Christianity. Luther's Small Catechism (1529) explains the significance of water baptism, citing Mark 16:16 and Titus 3:5-7:

It works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to all who believe, as the Word and promise of God declare. . . . It is not water, indeed, that does it, but the Word of God which is with and in the water, and faith, which trusts in the Word of God in the water.6

The Augsburg Confession (1530), an early statement of orthodox Lutheranism, says that original sin brings "eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit. . . . Of baptism they [the churches] teach that it is necessary to salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered."7

How did Luther reconcile the necessity of water baptism with justification by faith? While many Protestant teachers today denounce the belief that baptism is necessary to salvation on the ground that it contradicts justification by faith, Luther did not see a contradiction between these two doctrines. He affirmed that God has ordained baptism for the washing away of sins, and faith is the means by which we receive this divine work at baptism. Faith makes baptism effective.

Like the Catholics, Luther continued to insist upon baptism for infants, but he had some difficulty explaining

39

Martin Luther

how this practice is consistent with justification by faith. At first he said that baptism operates by the faith of the parents when they bring their child to baptism. Eventually, though, he appealed to his doctrine of predestination for the answer. A person is saved because God has elected him and imparted saving faith to him. There is no difference between an infant and an adult in this regard. Neither one exercises his own will, but he only exercises what God has given him. Thus denying baptism to infants because they cannot consciously believe is a form of justification by works.

When we turn to the baptismal mode and formula, we see how Luther and his followers failed to implement fully the authority of Scripture over tradition. He expressed a preference for baptism by immersion based on Romans 6:4 and the meaning of the Greek word baptizo ("dip"), but he said immersion was not necessary, and Lutherans

typically sprinkle instead.8

In The Babylonian Captivity of the Church (1520), Luther described some people in his day who insisted on using "the words, 'I baptize you in the name of Jesus Christ.'" He defended the validity of their baptism since "it is certain the apostles used this formula in baptizing, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles."9 Once again, however, he deemed the formula nonessential. He did not regard the mode or formula as connected with justification; therefore they were relatively unimportant.

The Eucharist

The other sacrament that Luther acknowledged was the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper. On several points, however, he opposed Roman Catholic Church practices of the time.

First, he insisted that the laity receive both the bread and the cup in order to benefit fully from the sacrament. The Catholic practice at the time was to withhold the cup from the laity. Since Catholics believed that the wine literally changed into the physical blood of Christ, they did not want to risk spilling His blood by passing it around. Only the officiating priest drank from the cup, and he had to drink all the contents so that they would not be disposed of improperly.

Second, Luther denied that the Eucharist was a new sacrifice of Christ for the remission of the sins of the participants and denied that partaking of it counted as a good work that helped render satisfaction for sins. Such beliefs detracted from the Cross and from justification by faith.

Finally, Luther opposed transubstantiation, the doctrine that the elements actually turn into the blood and body of Christ. His alternative view was so close, however, that most Protestants since his time have had difficulty in seeing the difference.

Under the Catholic view the elements completely turn into the historical blood and body of Christ even though they still look like bread and wine. Luther ridiculed this notion, for the bread and wine were obviously still bread and wine. But since Jesus said, "This is my blood" and "This is my body," the blood and body of Christ must join with the bread and wine. The elements still are bread and wine, but they also invisibly contain the real blood and body of Christ. Later writers termed this view as consubstantiation, meaning the substances are joined together

rather than being completely transformed into something different.

41

Martin Luther

To maintain this doctrine, Luther developed an unusual view of Christ's body. Christ physically ascended to heaven, but because He was both human and divine his physical body took on some attributes of the divine. One attribute of deity is omnipresence (being everywhere present). Christ's physical body shares in this attribute to the extent that it can be ubiquitous, or many places at one time. While it is in heaven, it can also be everywhere people celebrate the Eucharist. It is not confined to one location or one celebration at a time.

Luther bitterly attacked other Protestants, such as Ulrich Zwingli, who held that the elements in the Lord's Supper are symbolic only. He denounced Zwingli as a heretic, a heathen, and of the devil. He said he would rather celebrate the Eucharist with the Catholics than with Protestants who held to a symbolic or spiritual view.

Summary and Evaluation

Five central tenets characterize the theology of Martin Luther, and to this day they distinguish Protestants from Roman Catholics:

1. Justification by faith instead of faith and works.
2. Sole authority of Scripture instead of equal authority of tradition and Scripture.
3. Rejection of papal authority instead of papal supremacy over the church as well as the state when possible.
4. Universal priesthood of believers instead of a professional priesthood who alone can administer the sacraments and therefore serve as the mediators of salvation.
5. Two sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist

42

A History of Christian Doctrine

instead of seven sacraments as means of grace.

People in prior centuries had challenged the medieval church in one or more of these areas, but the one who caused the formal break and who clearly proclaimed each of these distinguishing points, notably justification by faith, is Martin Luther. He is truly the founder of the Protestant Reformation.

Nevertheless, several points of Luther's theology are troublesome to Evangelicals and Pentecostals. For example, Luther's explanation of faith means something far different from what most Evangelicals and Pentecostals

think today. In Lutheran theology, saving faith is not a conscious decision or a freewill response to the gospel message. Rather, it is something God grants to a person apart from his personal choice. The person is a passive recipient of irresistible grace; he cannot help but exercise the faith that God has given him.

When some proposed delaying baptism until a person could exhibit conscious faith, Luther denounced this idea as salvation by works. If a person has to respond of his own will, then it would be a work.

Evangelical Protestants today face a hard choice when they object to the teaching that baptism is necessary to salvation. If they use the doctrine of justification by faith alone as their means of doing so, they reject the meaning of this doctrine as taught by Luther. On the other hand, if they use Luther's notion that conscious acceptance of baptism is a meritorious work and therefore neither necessary nor effective, then they must also affirm that any act of choice—such as repeating the "sinner's prayer"—is also a meritorious work and therefore neither necessary nor effective.

43

Martin Luther

In short, Luther's radical definition of justification by faith alone can only be maintained logically if a person also embraces his doctrine of individual predestination. In his system, connecting salvation to any human choice would mean salvation by works.

From a biblical perspective, the principle of justification by faith is truly the heart of the gospel, but Luther's definition of faith is seriously deficient. Making a conscious choice is inherent in any meaningful, scriptural definition of faith. Once a person accepts this biblical truth, then he will understand that responding to the commands of the gospel is not a meritorious human work that earns salvation, but an act of faith. God is the one who performs the work of salvation in a person as he exhibits his trust in Him by meeting the conditions of His Word.

Although Luther's theology often attacked the teachings of Catholicism, in many ways he still remained as close to the Catholic Church as possible. On baptism, for example, he still held that it was for the remission of sins, including original sin. The Lutherans still practiced infant baptism by sprinkling in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Luther still affirmed the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, although in a slightly different

way. The Lutheran Church still maintained a close relationship with the state. In worship and liturgy it retained everything possible, rejecting only what the Bible absolutely forbids, such as the veneration of statues. Luther retained so many Catholic traditions because of his intense, almost exclusive focus on justification by faith. According to his definition of the doctrine, other things were not of primary importance. Instead of letting Scripture have authority over all tradition, as his own doc-

trine called for, he let tradition override much of Scripture because he reduced the essential message of Scripture to the skeleton of justification.

As a result, the doctrines of the inspiration, the inerrancy, and the canon of Scripture suffered. Faith itself became a shadow of its biblical essence due to its link with predestination. Repentance was devalued, believer's baptism rejected, and holiness of life relegated to secondary importance.

Luther's conservatism caused him to reject in the strongest of terms the innovations of later Protestants, as shown by his harsh treatment of Zwingli. He himself took a dramatic leap, but once he had done so, he acted as if he were set in concrete. When others tried to develop his principles further, Luther refused to budge. He was vehement in his condemnation and unwilling or unable to capitalize fully on his own insights.

He especially opposed the Anabaptists because of their stand against infant baptism, and he advocated violent persecution and execution of them. When the theological and political ferment he had instigated eventually produced peasant revolts against the German princes, Luther supported the princes completely. He failed to see that just as he had broken with the authoritarian structure of the church, so many people wanted to throw off the authoritarian political structure. He wrote an infamous treatise entitled Against the Murderous and Thieving Hordes of Peasants, in which he said, "Let everyone who can smite, stab, and slay" them.10 The rulers did exactly that in quelling the revolts.

In his later years Luther regrettably exhibited anti-Semitism, which contributed to this deadly poison in

German culture to such an extent that even the Nazis

sometimes quoted his more intemperate remarks to justify their position. Initially Luther had high hopes that when the church was reformed, Jews would convert to Christianity in large numbers. When they did not, he turned against them, advocating that their books be burned and they be expelled from the country.

Luther's views on holiness fell short of the scriptural ideal. His medieval German peasant heritage influenced him more than Scripture in some ways, including his use of coarse language, his violent reaction to opposition, and his love of beer.

On the other hand, he did much to dispel faulty concepts of holiness that were prevalent from ancient times, such as the equation of sexuality with sinfulness and the identification of holiness with legalism, monasticism, and asceticism. For example, he left his monastery, rejected celibacy, married a former nun, and established a loving marriage and a happy home.

A notorious example of how Luther's theology adversely affected practical Christian living is found in his dealings with Philip of Hesse, a German prince. Philip had entered into an arranged marriage for political purposes, but over the years he engaged in many adulterous affairs. After he became a Lutheran, he felt condemned but did not have the power to change his ways.

He fell in love with a seventeen-year-old girl and concluded that marrying her would cure him of adultery. However, divorce was also considered a grave sin. What was he to do?

Luther advised him to marry the girl without divorcing his wife. Although acknowledging both divorce and

46

A History of Christian Doctrine

bigamy to be sinful, Luther felt that bigamy in this case would be the lesser of two evils, citing Old Testament examples of polygamy.

Luther further advised keeping the second marriage a secret, since it was against the law. When the truth became widely rumored, Luther recommended telling "a good, strong lie."11

In this instance, his views on the inescapable sinfulness of Christians and the church's duty to support the state left him blind to the true solution: calling the prince to repentance (after the manner of John the Baptist) and encouraging him to overcome sin by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Luther's thinking is inevitable, however, if one believes that Christians are habitual, helpless sinners yet remain justified by an external faith that God grants them unconditionally, regardless of their personal attitude towards God, sin, and righteousness. Even though Luther wanted people to live a holy life, in the final analysis his doctrine allowed them to disobey God's will flagrantly and with impunity.

Despite Luther's unquestioned greatness, from an Apostolic Pentecostal perspective his theology is seriously flawed on a number of points.

Luther is somewhat of a contradictory figure, being so farsighted and progressive in some ways yet so limited and reactionary in others. Some historians have described him as the first modern man but also the last medieval man. Theologically, it was important for the Protestant Reformation not to stop with Luther but to pursue further reformation and rediscovery of the truths of Scripture.

47

Martin Luther

Having noted Luther's many limitations, we must credit him for his insight, determination, and dedication to the doctrine of justification by faith. Others rejected various unbiblical aspects of the medieval church, but he went to the heart of the matter. He laid the axe to the root of the medieval system by denouncing righteousness by works and merits. Even Catholic theologians today typically acknowledge that Luther offered much-needed correctives. Modern society as a whole, and Bible-believing Christians in particular, are deeply indebted to the life and teaching of Martin Luther.

48

A History of Christian Doctrine

The second major branch of Protestantism, the Reformed, began with Ulrich Zwingli in Zurich, Switzerland, around 1523. Zurich was a prominent city located in the German-speaking region.

Zwingli was born in 1484 in Wildhaus, Switzerland, and in the local dialect his first name was Huldreich. He studied in Bern, Vienna, and Basel, earned a master's degree, and entered the Roman Catholic priesthood at age twenty-two. He became pastor in Glarus after paying over one hundred guilders to buy off a rival candidate, and later he became chaplain of a monastery at Einsiedeln. A patriot, Zwingli placed the interests of his country

above those of the Roman Catholic Church hierarchy and its Italian leadership. In his day the Swiss were renowned warriors and often served as mercenaries in foreign wars and at the behest of the pope. Zwingli preached against participation in these wars as ultimately harmful to Switzerland. Despite the opposition that this view aroused, he became a prominent preacher and public figure.

Zwingli was influenced by the teachings of the Catholic humanist Erasmus, who questioned or reinterpreted some medieval doctrines without leaving the church. As early as 1516 while at Einsiedeln, before Luther's break with Rome in 1517, Zwingli had begun to turn from Catholic theology to the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith. He did not undergo a dramatic conversion like Luther, but through a study of Scripture and the exercise of reason he gradually came to change his views. By 1518 he was attacking the sale of indulgences and other abuses, and he read with excitement the early writings of Luther.

At this time, the office of people's priest (pastor and pulpit preacher) came open at Grossmünster Cathedral, the leading church in Zurich, and Zwingli was considered for the position. He admitted that he had been unfaithful to his vow of celibacy while at Einsiedeln (as well as at Glarus), but he promised to reform. His sin was hardly unique: his chief rival for the position had fathered six sons! The bishop of Constance, whose diocese included Zurich, raised seventy-five hundred guilders in one year (1522) by charging priests four guilders each time they wanted absolution for the sin of fornication.[1]

Zwingli was chosen as pastor of Grossmünster and

began serving in 1519. He immediately started preaching on Protestant themes. By 1522 his opposition to Rome was obvious, and he was challenged to defend his views in public disputations. In 1523, in preparation for three major debates with Catholic apologists, he framed sixtyseven articles, or conclusions. Although not as famous or as significant historically as Luther's earlier ninety-five

theses, these conclusions were much more thorough and comprehensive in setting forth the essential Protestant doctrines. They challenged the entire system of Roman Catholicism, including the papacy, the mass, priestly celibacy, indulgences, confession, and penance.

Perhaps 1523, then, is the best year to identify the formation of Reformed theology. It was distinct from Lutheranism yet closely aligned with it in opposition to Roman Catholicism.

Zwingli became the religious leader of Zurich and the unofficial political leader as well. He set up a presbyterian system of representative church government and instituted numerous ecclesiastical and political reforms. Under his leadership, the hiring of Swiss as mercenaries was banned, Lenten fasting was eliminated, and priests were given permission to marry. Zwingli himself married secretly in 1522 and openly in 1524, and in so doing was finally able to overcome his besetting sin of fornication.

Zwingli's influence and the Reformed movement spread rapidly in Switzerland and nearby lands. Some early Reformed leaders were Johann Oecolampadius (1482-1531) in Basel, Berthold Haller in Bern, Pierpaolo Vergerio in Italian-speaking Switzerland, Martin Bucer (1491-1551) in Strassburg (then Germany, now France), Guillaume Farel (1489-1565) in Geneva (French-speaking

51

Ulrich Zwingli

Switzerland), followed there by John Calvin and then Theodore Beza (1519-1605), Pierre Viret in Lausanne, and Peter Martyr Vermigli (1500-62), an Italian who taught theology in Strassburg and England. Heinrich Bullinger (1504-75) was Zwingli's successor in Zurich.

Zwingli was influenced by Luther, but he was not simply a disciple of his. While indebted to Luther, he developed much of his thought independently, and in some instances his theology owes more to the ideas of the Catholic humanists.

In 1529, Zwingli and other Swiss Reformers met with Luther and some German Reformers in the town of Marburg to discuss doctrinal differences and to explore the possibility of joining forces ecclesiastically and politically. The discussion, known as the Colloquy of Marburg, foundered on their differing views of the Lord's Supper. Zwingli did not regard the difference as a barrier to fellowship, but Luther was not even willing to concede that Zwingli was a Christian.

Like Luther, however, Zwingli had little use for Reformers more radical than himself. When the Anabaptists emerged around 1525 from among his followers in Zurich, he opposed them despite initially sympathizing with many of their views. He allowed and approved of the execution of early Anabaptist leaders by the city council of Zurich.

The Reformed movement did not succeed in converting all of Switzerland; the country was divided between Protestants and Catholics. Each side vied for total supremacy and, in the territory under its control, denied religious liberty to the other.

At Zwingli's urging, the Protestants advanced militari-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ly against the Catholics, seeking to extend their domain. He accompanied the troops as chaplain and strategist. Although armed, he did not actually fight. At Cappel in 1531 he was wounded on the battlefield while attending to a dying soldier. Captured by the victorious enemy that day, he was killed by a captain who recognized him. His body was burned and the ashes mixed with those of a pig and scattered.

On hearing of Zwingli's death, Luther, who had already called him a "gross heathen," dismissed him as "the devil's martyr." He remarked that Zwingli perished "in great and many sins and blasphemy" and expressed regret that the Catholics were not successful in totally suppressing his followers.[2]

We now turn to Zwingli's theology. It is characteristically Protestant, but we will particularly examine its unique features or areas of strong emphasis.

The Scriptures

First of all, Zwingli believed that the Bible is our sole authority for doctrine. Like Luther he rejected the Catholic idea that Scripture and church tradition are equal in authority. Moreover, he taught that Scripture is infallible.

More than Luther, Zwingli emphasized the role of reason, yet he made it subject to the Scriptures. Human reason teaches us that God exists, but we can only learn about God through Scripture. Thus the natural mind cannot develop theology on its own. The best it can do is to realize that there is a God, but to understand who God is, what He requires of us, and what the truth is about Him, we must look to divine revelation (the Bible), not reason.

Ulrich Zwingli

Predestination and Salvation

Like Luther, Zwingli taught that salvation is by grace through faith, not works, and believed strongly in the doctrine of predestination. For the leading Protestant Reformers, faith is not a freewill response to God's grace, but a foreordained, irresistible choice on God's part. God unconditionally decides who will be saved and then grants saving faith to those He has selected. Faith becomes an abstract philosophical concept that exists and operates apart from the individual.

Thus salvation comes by predestination, which rests on the providence of God. Like Luther, Zwingli championed this view because it refuted every form of salvation by works. To him, it was the only way to avoid the works righteousness of the Catholic system. He explained his belief as follows:

We are saved by faith, not by works. Faith is not by human power, but God's. He therefore gives it to those whom he has called, but he has called those whom he has destined for salvation, and he has destined this for those whom he has elected, but he has elected whom he willed, for this is free to him and open.3

Zwingli taught that a person is either part of the elect or part of the reprobate. The elect are those God has chosen to be saved, and His act of choice is called election. Those God has allowed to be damned are called reprobate, and God's decision not to choose them is called reprobation.

How does someone know whether he is one of the elect or not? Zwingli's response was that, humanly speaking, we can only look at the outward signs of election. A

A History of Christian Doctrine

desire for the things of God is evidence of God's grace at work in a person's life. If a person is baptized, comes to church, prays, partakes of the Lord's Supper, and endeavors to live a godly life, he is manifesting signs that God's saving grace is present. Otherwise, there would seem to be no reason why he would want to do these things.

In theory, then, election occurs without reference to human action, but in practice there is a strong incentive for people to perform works that give them assurance of election. While some may conclude that the doctrine of predestination provides a license to sin, the early Reformed Protestants were motivated to follow many

godly disciplines as signs of election. Of course, they interpreted their actions as being prompted by God's electing grace, not by their own human desires. Unlike Luther, Zwingli believed that some noble pagans could be among the elect, such as the Greek philosophers whom ancient theologians admired so much. All the elect are saved by Christ's atonement, but some of the elect may not be part of the visible church. Pagans will be judged on a different basis from Christians, so it is possible that in pagan lands some people could be part of the elect without their understanding it and without the visible church knowing it.

Zwingli taught the doctrine of original sin—that all people are born in sin and therefore can only be saved by the unconditional grace of God. He believed, however, that infants who die unbaptized are part of the elect.

Law and Gospel

Zwingli had a somewhat different approach from Martin Luther to the relationship of the law and the gospel.

Luther emphasized the discontinuity between the two, stressing that the gospel has replaced the law. For Zwingli there was much greater continuity. The law naturally developed into the gospel. The gospel is the same as the moral law, or the law of love, or the natural law as revealed to the conscience; it just comes under a different name.

According to Zwingli, God has revealed His basic will throughout the Scriptures. We know it now in its fullest extent as the gospel, but actually we can find the elements of the gospel in the Old Testament and its moral teachings. Instead of saying the law has been replaced by the gospel, it is better to say that the law flows into the gospel. The gospel is the most complete expression of God's eternal moral law.

Zwingli classified the Old Testament law under three categories. First, we have the moral law. Some teachings of the law are moral in nature and they are eternal. They are part of the gospel. Second, there is the ceremonial law, which consists of types and shadows pointing to Christ. Now that Christ has fulfilled them, we need not observe them literally. Finally, there is the civil law. God gave some components of the law of Moses to regulate the civil affairs of the nation of Israel, and they do not have direct bearing on the church. They are instructive,

however, and in some cases they provide guidance for the Christian state.

The purpose of the gospel is to make us whole and enable us to obey the moral law. It is not as if the law has simply been abolished and rendered irrelevant under a totally different system, but the gospel saves us and enables us to fulfill what has always been God's moral

law. It liberates us from the consequences of having broken the law and then gives us power to obey the moral law.

We see in Zwingli a greater emphasis on sanctification and holiness of life. In Luther's theology, the law for all practical purposes is irrelevant, even though he said it shows us how to please God. But here we have a characteristic of the Reformed movement: a greater emphasis on the need to obey God's moral law, to follow the teachings of Old and New Testament, to be holy in daily life. As a practical example, Zwingli's wife ceased wearing jewelry after their marriage.4

The Church

Zwingli taught that the true church is the company of the elect, those whom God has chosen. It is invisible because we do not really know who the elect are. We can observe the signs of election, but only God knows the heart.

The visible church consists of those who confess Christ, obey His commandments, and show the reasonable signs of election. When we see people who have been baptized, confess Christ, go to church, partake of the Eucharist, and live a Christian life, as far as we know they are elect, but only God knows for certain.

Zwingli used this distinction between the visible and the invisible church to explain backsliding. If someone backslides from the church and stays away permanently, then he was part of the visible church but never part of the invisible church. If he were truly elected by God he would have persevered to the end. A person's permanent departure from the church is conclusive evidence

that he was never truly elect.

Zwingli taught that the local congregation has the authority and the obligation to discipline members. If someone professes to belong to the church, he needs to

live up to the standards of the church. If he does not, the
church has the right and responsibility to discipline him
and, if need be, to expel him. As much as possible, the
visible church and the invisible church should be harmonized
so that those who profess to be Christians actually
try to live up to what they profess.

Zwingli also said the church must be subject to the
civil law. Like the Lutherans and Catholics, but not quite
to the same extent as either, Zwingli advocated a close
relationship between church and state. As we have seen,
he was able to gain ascendancy in Zurich, converting the
city to the Reformed movement and establishing what
almost amounted to a theocracy. The civil government of
Zurich operated according to the teachings of the church
and enforced them, regulating the conduct of its residents
whether or not they were professing Christians.

With respect to church services, Zwingli abandoned
the Roman Catholic liturgy and many traditional features
of public worship such as the use of candles and incense.
Instead he sought to devise a liturgy based on the specific
teachings of Scripture. By contrast, Luther retained most
of these traditional elements.

Although an accomplished musician, singer, and composer,
Zwingli banned music in church, including congregational
singing. He was displeased with the poor quality,
hypocrisy, and monetary compensation associated with
church music in his day, and he found no express scriptural
mandate for music in the church. He further

58

A History of Christian Doctrine

believed that true worship was private and should be
inaudible.5

The Sacraments

Like all Protestants, including Luther before him,
Zwingli reduced the seven medieval sacraments to two:
baptism and the Eucharist. He took a different approach
from both Catholics and Lutherans by saying the sacraments
are acts of initiation or pledge but do not convey
real power in themselves.

For the Catholics, the sacraments are actually the
means of grace, the means of salvation. The Lutherans
similarly held that something truly occurs in the administration
of the sacraments: in baptism God's grace brings
the forgiveness of sin, and in the Eucharist God's grace
brings the physical presence of Christ. In contrast to both
positions, Zwingli made clear that the sacraments are

simply symbols that identify people with the church. They do not confer inward spiritual grace.

To protect his flank against the Anabaptists, who regarded the sacraments as purely symbolic, Zwingli tried to make a distinction as follows: the sacraments are not merely signs of events that have already taken place, but of events that occur at the time of the sacraments. They do not merely look back to the past but function as a pledge in the present.

For instance, baptism signifies that a person is joining the church at that time, although baptism itself does not cause him to become part of the church. It is an act of identification. Similarly, in the Eucharist, a person continues to identify with the church through an ongoing pledge. Thus the sacraments are signs or ceremonies that

59

Ulrich Zwingli

inform the whole church of the participant's faith. The real significance is not an inward work in the individual but a corporate effect.

When the Anabaptists began to teach against infant baptism, at first Zwingli was inclined to agree, since he did not believe infants had to be baptized to be saved, but soon he became a strong advocate of infant baptism. He justified this traditional practice by an analogy to circumcision. In the Old Testament, male babies were circumcised to enter into the old covenant along with their parents, and Colossians 2:11-12 describes baptism as part of our spiritual circumcision.

What Zwingli missed in the analogy, said the Anabaptists, was that baptism is part of the new birth, not physical birth. Thus it should be part of a person's spiritual birth, linked with repentance and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It should be administered to people who come to birth spiritually, not naturally.

Zwingli agreed with Luther that the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and he argued that Matthew 28:19 does not give us the actual formula to use. Nevertheless, like Luther and contrary to his own principle of discarding tradition, he retained the trinitarian formula. He explained:

The disciples baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. . . . Nowhere do we read that the disciples baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Therefore it is evident that the words in Matthew 28 were not instituted as a form, and the

theologians have made the biggest mistake of their
lives in their exposition of this text. Not that I forbid

baptism according to that form. Not at all. I am simply
pointing out that according to their true and natural
sense these words of God do not impose a strict baptismal
form. If they did, the disciples would not have
used a different form when they baptized.6

Like Luther, Zwingli carried his reformation to a point
and then stopped. He went much further than Luther, but
like him, he refused to embrace additional logical developments
based on his own principles. After a certain
level, he remained with tradition instead of continuing to
follow the Scriptures. He was almost as adamant in
opposing those who carried some of his ideas further,
namely the Anabaptists, as the Catholics and Lutherans
were in fighting him.

Regarding the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist, Zwingli
taught that it is a time of thanksgiving and rejoicing.
Christ is not bodily present in the bread and the wine, but
He is spiritually present in the ceremony. By faith Christ
meets invisibly with His people.

In opposition to Luther, Zwingli said Christ's physical
body is not ubiquitous: it cannot be in many different
places at the same time. His glorified body is in heaven
and remains in one physical location as all physical bodies
must. Therefore, it cannot also be in the bread and the
wine; the presence of Christ in the Eucharist cannot be
physical but is purely spiritual.

Speaking in Tongues

While teaching that baptism is only a nonessential, outward
"ceremonial sign," Zwingli held that the "inward baptism
of the Spirit" is necessary to salvation. He admitted

that speaking in tongues sometimes accompanies this
baptism as a sign but argued that this outward sign is not
essential. His discussion indicates that he knew about
instances of tongues speaking in his day and had no
objection to it: "The outward baptism of the Spirit is an
external sign, the gift of tongues. . . . This sign is not
necessary to salvation, for it is given infrequently and
only to a few."7

Summary and Evaluation

In summary, Ulrich Zwingli agreed with Martin Luther

on the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, including predestination and the strange twist it gives to the definition of faith. He went much further than Luther in almost every other area, particularly in rejecting traditional practices.

Zwingli's principle regarding tradition was to reject everything that the Scriptures do not clearly teach. Whereas Luther was content to retain everything that Scripture does not explicitly condemn, Zwingli wanted to discard everything that Scripture does not explicitly command, even if it had been traditional for hundreds of years. We see these contrasting principles at work in their differing approaches to liturgy.

The sacraments are another prime example of the contrast. While Luther continued to view baptism and the Lord's Supper much as the Catholics did, Zwingli made a radical change by teaching that they were simply symbolic. On the doctrine of water baptism, however, he went too far in one respect and not far enough in another. He dropped the scriptural significance of baptism as being for the remission of sins, yet he retained the nonbiblical

traditions of infant baptism, sprinkling, and the trinitarian formula. Nevertheless, the trend of his theology was to be much more radical than Luther and much more willing to throw away unbiblical tradition.

In one sense, however, we see a regression, at least from the Lutheran point of view: Zwingli downplayed the sharp distinction between law and gospel that Luther insisted upon. Zwingli tried to show that the gospel is the culmination of the law, which the Lutherans saw as a dangerous trend that could lead people back into an overemphasis on works. But from the Reformed point of view, it was a corrective in leading people to place more emphasis on holiness of life.

The comparison of Luther and Zwingli underscores our earlier assessment of Luther: Luther was fundamentally conservative on every issue except justification by faith. On that point he was the most radical of the major Reformers in proclaiming assurance of salvation despite the continuing presence of sin in a person's life.

In chapter 6 we will discuss another Reformed leader who was to have an even greater impact than Zwingli, namely, John Calvin. Followers of Reformed Protestantism are often known as Calvinists because of Calvin's

monumental work in developing and systematizing
Reformed theology. Nevertheless, we should not neglect
the earlier contributions of Ulrich Zwingli. He is the
founder of the Reformed movement, and his work foreshadowed
most of Calvin's theology. Calvin enunciated,
expanded, and refined Reformed theology in his voluminous
writings, but the basic tenets were quite similar to
what Zwingli had previously espoused and outlined.
63
Ulrich Zwingli

The third major branch of Protestantism in the
1500s was the Anabaptist movement. The Anabaptists are
not as widespread today as the other three branches, but
historically they were quite significant. Although they
never attained the stature of the Lutherans, Reformed, or
Anglicans, they offered a distinct theological alternative.
The movement began among followers and supporters
of Zwingli in Zurich, Switzerland. We can trace early
Anabaptist thought back to 1523—the same year Zwingli
articulated his Reformed theology by his sixty-seven conclusions—
but the Anabaptists became a separate movement
two years later, in 1525, when they began to baptize
adults who had previously been baptized as infants.
Everyone saw this action as a clear break from the
Reformed Church as well as the Catholic Church. In the
65
The Anabaptists
4
words of Philip Schaff, "The demand of rebaptism virtually
unbaptized and unchristianized the entire Christian
world, and completed the rupture with the historic
church. It cut the last cord of union of the present with
the past."1
Early leaders were Conrad Grebel (c. 1498-1526),
Felix Manz (d. 1527), George Blaurock, Ludwig Hätzer
(1500-29), and Balthasar Hubmaier (d. 1528), the movement's
earliest theologian. After a public debate with
Zwingli in early 1525, the first rebaptism took place on
January 21 when Grebel baptized Blaurock.
The movement spread rapidly in Switzerland, Germany,
and Austria, in some cases arising spontaneously.
Soon Anabaptists were also in Belgium, Holland, England,
and Eastern Europe. Among the Czechs, some of
the Hussites became Anabaptists.
Many other leaders also emerged, including Hans

Denck, Pilgram Marpeck, John Hut, Melchior Hofmann, Obbe and Dietrich Philips, Jacob Hutter, Michael Sattler, and Menno Simons. The earliest Anabaptist statement of faith was the Schleitheim Confession of 1527.

At first, Anabaptist leaders thought Zwingli favored their views. Hubmaier said Zwingli agreed that infants should not be baptized. Zwingli also indicated support for their desire to separate church and state. They urged him to institute rapid reforms such as eliminating the traditional liturgy of the mass and the use of images in worship. Zwingli decided to wait for governmental approval, however. Consequently, he drew back from these more radical reformers and soon took a stand against them.

The Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed all classified the Anabaptists as heretics and tried to paint them as

political revolutionaries and religious extremists. The primary reason was their break with the historic church and their advocacy of separation of church and state.

The other religious groups, beginning with the Reformed, persecuted the Anabaptists severely. There was little thought of toleration, and since the other groups did believe in the union, or at least the close cooperation, of church and state, they used the power of the state in an attempt to exterminate their theological opponents.

At the beginning of the movement, the government of Zurich arrested the leaders and pronounced the sentence of death by drowning upon all who insisted on rebaptism— a punishment deemed particularly appropriate.

Conrad Grebel was imprisoned but escaped and died of the plague in 1526. The first execution for heresy of a Protestant by Protestants was that of Felix Manz, who was drowned in the Limmat River in 1527.

Other Reformed Swiss cities, such as Basel and Bern, adopted the same policy. Many Anabaptists were killed and many others fled. When they entered Catholic and Lutheran lands, however, they faced similar persecution. The Diet of Speier in 1529—a meeting of German Catholic and Lutheran princes—decreed that all Anabaptists be put to death by sword, fire, or other means as soon as they were captured, without judge or jury. The most severe persecutions took place under the Catholics. Since they did not want to "shed blood," they did not behead the Anabaptists but instead burned them at the stake.

Zwingli had Hubmaier tortured on the rack and thereby obtained a recantation, but it was only temporary.

The Anabaptists

Soon Hubmaier and Blaurock were both burned at the stake in Austria, and the former's wife was drowned in the Danube. Hätzer, who allegedly had fallen into adultery, was beheaded in Constance, Germany. By 1530, two thousand Anabaptists had been executed, often with severe torture.2 So many Anabaptists were killed or scattered that they did not have an opportunity to gain ascendancy in any area.

For the most part, the Anabaptists lived simple, pious, modest, and productive lives. Typically they were hardworking farmers, trying to support themselves and be left alone. After persecution drove most of them out of Switzerland and adjoining areas, many of them eventually established rural communities in places where they were tolerated, especially northern Germany, the Netherlands, Russia, and America.

Revolutionary Anabaptists

The intense persecution of Anabaptists by both Catholics and Protestants caused the Anabaptists to scatter and hindered their ability to organize, develop a consistent theology, and maintain unity. It also created a dilemma as to how they should respond. Most Anabaptists were pacifists who believed there was nothing they could do except endure persecution or flee. A few, however, were radicalized by the persecution and decided to resist violently.

The most notable example was in the German city of Münster, capital of the state of Westphalia, where a group of radical Anabaptists won political power in 1533-34 and immediately found themselves besieged by a Catholic army. They decided to defend themselves and made Jan

Beukels of Leiden their king.

The new government began to regulate morals strictly. However, since there were many unattached women due to the flight of many men, it started allowing polygamy, appealing to Old Testament examples. Jan of Leiden acquired a harem and exercised dictatorial authority.

The government also imposed some communistic rules, such as the confiscation of wealth for the war effort, the redistribution of necessities for the poor, and

the reassignment of arable land according to the size of households.

Many Anabaptists in Germany and Holland tried to come to the aid of the besieged city, and for a brief time it seemed that the revolutionary element might dominate the movement. Both Catholic and Lutheran cities united against the Münster kingdom, however, fearing a widespread revolt. Ultimately the Catholic army captured the city in 1535 and massacred the inhabitants. The victors tortured Jan of Leiden and two other leaders until they died, clawing their bodies with red-hot pincers, pulling out their tongues, and finally driving daggers into their hearts.[3]

The rise and fall of the Münster kingdom forever discredited revolutionary violence among the Anabaptists. The movement repudiated all use of force and reaffirmed its original commitment to pacifism. It also abandoned any effort to establish a theocracy or communism. This tragic event had the positive effect of returning the Anabaptists to their theological roots and to moderate leadership.

Unfortunately, opponents used this violent interlude in an attempt to discredit the entire movement with the

excesses of the Münster kingdom. Persecution escalated, and many pacifists were executed in the name of suppressing revolution. The movement suffered a severe decline.

Menno Simons (1496-1561), a Dutch Catholic priest who formally converted to Anabaptism in 1536, became the most prominent leader of the movement after the debacle at Münster. He rallied the disheartened Anabaptists and reemphasized the original commitment to nonviolence.

Restorationism

Anabaptism was not monolithic; there were many doctrinal variations, particularly in the early years. Nevertheless, we can identify key themes and characteristic views.

The impetus for the Anabaptists was the search for purely scriptural Christianity. They took an approach similar to that of Zwingli but went much further, attempting to establish all doctrine and practice from Scripture alone. They decided to discard everything not found in the Bible. Instead of holding onto as much tradition as possible as the Lutherans did, they wanted to eliminate as

much tradition as possible, keeping only what Scripture clearly teaches.

The Anabaptists searched for the original form of Christianity. More than a reformation, they wanted a restoration. They tried to leapfrog over the intervening centuries and go back to the beginning of the church. For them, the turning point in church history was the conversion of Emperor Constantine to Christianity and the resulting merger of church and state. From that time forward, the doctrine and practices of the church were

unduly influenced by the state and thereby polluted. The establishment of Christianity as the state religion caused millions of pagans to enter into the church without genuine conversion, fatally corrupting its doctrines and practices. The church as a whole became apostate.

Consequently, they said, we cannot simply try to adjust Catholicism, or even Lutheran or Reformed theology. Instead, we must go back to the early church. We must restore the original, apostolic Christianity.

Even before the Reformation, this restoration impulse had surfaced periodically. The Waldenses of the twelfth century had the same goal of returning to original, pure Christianity. The Franciscans, the mendicant order of monks established by Francis of Assisi, sought to go back to a simple, pristine Christian lifestyle characteristic of the apostles. At the beginning of the Reformation, the development of a prophetic movement among the Lutherans as well as the peasant revolts in Germany were motivated to some extent by restorationism.

The Anabaptists desired the restoration of New Testament Christianity not only in theology but also in liturgy, church government, and lifestyle. They sought to purify and rectify all aspects of the church according to the apostolic pattern.

Separation of Church and State

As part of their desire for original Christianity, they advocated the total separation of church and state. This idea distinguished them from all other forms of Christianity in their day. The other branches favored the concept of a state church and established one whenever possible. Notable examples are the Orthodox in Greece and Russia,

the Catholics in France, Italy, and Spain, the Lutherans in

Germany and Scandinavia, and the Reformed in Switzerland. When they had the opportunity, these groups tried to gain control of the government and use the state's power to promote their religion. While everyone else seemed to be stuck in this medieval mode of thinking, the Anabaptists harked back to the earliest Christian thought and at the same time prefigured the modern era by advocating freedom of religion and conscience.

A cynic might conclude that the Anabaptists held this position because they were the only group who never had an opportunity to gain political power, except for the disastrous and short-lived experiment at Münster. But there was a sincere theological reason for the Anabaptists' position: they found no precedent in the New Testament for merging church and state, for the church to use the state's power for its purposes, or vice versa. They understood Jesus to teach a strict separation between the two. (See Matthew 22:21; John 18:36.) The church should not seek support from the state, nor should the state coerce people to join the church or obey its religious rules.

Believers' Baptism

The Anabaptists received their name, meaning "rebaptizers," because they rejected infant baptism and advocated baptism of believers only. This view was not their main tenet, but it was their most visible one. Their opponents gave them this label because they baptized believers who had previously been baptized as infants, but the Anabaptists did not choose this designation for themselves. They did not consider that they were rebaptizing anyone; rather, they believed they were baptizing

72

A History of Christian Doctrine

people for the first time. To them, infant baptism is not scriptural; therefore it is invalid and no baptism at all.

As we shall see, the Anabaptists placed supreme emphasis on faith, repentance, and holiness. According to their understanding of these doctrines, infants cannot have faith or repent, both of which are scriptural prerequisites for water baptism. Consequently the Anabaptists only baptized those who repented and confessed faith in Jesus Christ.

As long as people simply discussed and advocated these positions they did not incur strong opposition, but when they actually began rebaptizing people, persecution began. The other churches invoked the Justinian Code of 529, which pronounced the death penalty for rebaptism,

as justification for executing the Anabaptists. Justinian was a Byzantine (Eastern Roman) emperor who for a time was able to reunite most of the territory of the old Roman Empire under his rule. His code became a basis for subsequent legal systems in the West, and his prohibition on rebaptism was designed to deter splinter groups who sought converts from the Roman Catholic Church.

It is amazing to realize that the first rebaptisms occurred in 1525, only eight years after the beginning of the Reformation. While Luther and Zwingli were still examining how far they were willing to buck tradition, the Anabaptists were making literal application of the principle of sola Scriptura across the spectrum of Christian belief and practice.

The Church

The Anabaptists taught that the church is composed of believers who have separated themselves from the

73

The Anabaptists

world and who embrace a godly lifestyle. The church is a congregation of holy believers. To join the church a person must repent of sin, place his faith in Jesus Christ, and begin living a new life. Contrary to the practice of the other branches of Christendom, they did not consider anyone to be a church member simply because his family was Christian, he was born in a Christian state, or he was baptized as an infant. Instead they taught that becoming a Christian is an individual, personal decision and experience. Carrying the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers to its ultimate conclusion, they held that the basic form of church government should be congregational, not hierarchical. In this type of structure, each local congregation makes its own decisions rather than having its affairs controlled by the state or officials of a general church organization.

By contrast, the Roman Catholic Church was strictly hierarchical and to a great extent so were the Lutherans and Anglicans. The Reformed developed a modified form of government, called presbyterian, which was a hybrid that provided for some involvement of the laity. The Anabaptists were unique in holding that the local congregation should control its own affairs, determine its membership, enforce its discipline, and choose its leadership.

In their understanding, the body of Christ is composed of self-governing congregations that have fellowship with one another.

Freedom of the Will

Consistent with their view that saving faith involves conscious, personal repentance from sin and commit-

ment to Christ, the Anabaptists emphatically rejected the concept of individual predestination (unconditional election). Here again, they departed radically from the other Protestants of their day, particularly Luther and Zwingli. They considered predestination—including its corollary, unconditional eternal security—to be an evil doctrine that actually encourages people to live in sin. If a person believes God has predestined him for salvation no matter what he does, they argued, then he will tend to live a sinful lifestyle.

They believed in the doctrine of original sin. Instead of teaching that infants are guilty before God or that people require irresistible grace (predestination) to be saved, however, they taught that all are born with the sinful nature, or the inclination to sin. But the sacrifice of Christ has delivered infants from the guilt of original sin.

Conversion Experience

More than any other sixteenth-century Christian group, the Anabaptists emphasized a conversion experience. The Catholics and most Protestants believed they were Christians from birth and could not identify any specific time or experience when they consciously became Christians. Even the devout among them typically described a gradual growth of faith and a gradual awakening. From their earliest consciousness they felt that they were Christians and had faith in God.

The Anabaptists, however, insisted on a definite experience of conversion. They could identify a time when they turned away from sin and yielded themselves to God—a specific point of repentance and exercising faith in God.

In general, they did not see water baptism or the baptism of the Holy Spirit (in the sense that Pentecostals know it) as part of conversion. Their theology of the new birth stopped at repentance.

Nevertheless, the experience of many Anabaptists went further than their theology of conversion. As one might expect of a group that emphasized the restoration of the apostolic pattern, repentance, a genuine conversion

experience, and holiness of life, many Anabaptists
received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues. Speaking
in tongues occurred among them in both Switzerland
and Germany at various times.4

In Holland, Menno Simons apparently was familiar
with tongues, for he described the experience of Cornelius
without noting anything unusual about it: "You see,
kind reader, here you are plainly taught that Peter commanded
that those only should be baptized who had
received the Holy Ghost, who spoke with tongues and
glorified God, which only pertains to the believing, and
not to minor children."5

While we cannot say that speaking in tongues or the
baptism of the Holy Ghost was characteristic of the movement
as a whole, or a tenet of its theology, we know that
many Anabaptists did speak in tongues.

Holiness of Life

The Anabaptists also stressed sanctification, although
they did not typically use that term. They considered the
Lutheran and Reformed doctrine of justification by faith
alone to be inadequate in that it did not emphasize the
reality of regeneration, or new birth. They held that when
a person is born again, he receives power to resist sin. He

76

A History of Christian Doctrine

is not forced to live in sin any longer; he does not have to
sin every day. In fact, he should not sin.

Moreover, if he continues to sin habitually, living a
hypocritical, unrepentant life, the church should remove
him from its fellowship. The church should consist only of
those people who sincerely seek to live for God and to
display holiness in their lives.

In other words, salvation must purify the actual
lives of Christians as well as modify their thinking. Genuine
conversion, and the Reformation itself, should not
only change people's theology but also transform their
lives. The focus is not primarily on profession but on
lifestyle.

The unregenerate live sinful lives, but the regenerate
(believers) are to live holy, godly, overcoming lives. For
specific guidance on holy living, Christians should study
the New Testament and apply its teachings literally. In
particular, Christ's Sermon on the Mount provides important
instructions for the church.

For example, Jesus said, "Swear not at all" (Matthew
5:34), so the Anabaptists refused to take oaths, whether

in conversation or in legal proceedings. The other Christian groups developed rationales for taking oaths, but the Anabaptists decided they should simply follow Christ's words literally, without qualification. Since they were committed to telling the truth always, there was no need to swear in order to convince others of their truthfulness in certain situations. To them swearing by oath promotes two levels of honesty and suggests that a Christian cannot be trusted in ordinary conversation.

In like manner, they adopted pacifism based on a literal, unqualified understanding of the words of Jesus: "Ye

The Anabaptists

have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. . . . Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you" (Matthew 5:38-39, 43-44).

Consequently, the Anabaptists refused to take human life. They considered warfare to be part of the worldly system and wanted nothing to do with it. God has not called us to shed blood, they said, but He has called us to peace. Some resisted being drafted into the military, while others served in noncombatant roles. Hubmaier was an exception: he defended the government's right to use the sword.

Some Anabaptists promoted communal living and sharing of goods, based on early examples in Acts, but in general the movement held this to be an acceptable choice but not compulsory. They did cite the examples in Acts to teach that Christians should assist one another voluntarily.

The Anabaptists promoted modesty of lifestyle and dress. They opposed the wearing of jewelry and gaudy decorations. Hubmaier said Christians should be "respectably dressed" at the Lord's Supper, citing I Peter 3:3, which prohibits adornment.6 Simons denounced professing Christians who wore jewelry and extravagant dress: "They never regard that the exalted apostles Peter and Paul have in plain and express words forbidden this all to Christian women. And if forbidden to women, how much more to

men who are the leaders and heads of their wives!"7
The Anabaptists advocated moderation, tried to avoid
extremes, and sought to live a quiet and simple life. They
opposed various worldly practices such as gambling, wild
parties, drunkenness, and the debauchery characteristic
of many professing Christians of their time. Many of them
abstained totally from alcoholic beverages, despite the
prevalence of beer and wine at European dinner tables.
They did not establish a new form of works righteousness,
however. They were quite clear in teaching that holiness
is not a means of obtaining salvation but a vital
expression of the new life in Christ that results from salvation.
The emphasis was on holiness but not legalism. Of
course, there is always the danger of legalism when people
emphasize holiness, and some Anabaptists did develop
a legalistic orientation that persists even today.
Historically, the Anabaptists affirmed salvation by
grace through faith but insisted that when a person is
saved he does not remain in his former condition. A
regenerated person has been changed, transformed, and
empowered. The true convert is different from what he
was before; if there is no difference, then something is
lacking in his salvation experience.
In sum, works of holiness are not necessary to obtain
salvation, for we receive salvation as sinners saved by
grace. Once we are saved, however, God empowers us to
lead a transformed life, and holiness is a necessary
expression of that new life.
The Anabaptists looked for the soon coming of the
Lord. They believed the events of Revelation were drawing
near: Christ would return to earth, destroy the
ungodly by His judgment, and establish His kingdom on
79
The Anabaptists
earth. The hope of the Second Coming sustained them in
persecution and motivated them to holiness.

Worship

In the attempt to restore New Testament liturgy, the
Anabaptists conducted their worship services simply,
without many rituals or traditional forms. They decided to
adhere strictly to the New Testament in their services.
Taking a cue from Zwingli, at first they did not have
congregational singing because they were not sure they
could justify it by the New Testament. As time went on,
they concluded, like Luther, that congregational singing is

a vital and scriptural part of public worship.

In the Roman Catholic Church, corporate worship was a spectator sport: the people who attended mass simply observed what took place and followed directions. Beginning with Luther, the Protestants sought greater congregational involvement, and eventually the Anabaptists did so more than anyone else. Instead of elaborate ritual, they emphasized praying, singing, and preaching. In the words of one secular historian, "The congregation sometimes shouted and danced, and always sang hymns with great fervor. Preaching was even more important than in more conservative forms of Protestantism, and more emotionally charged with hopes of heaven and fears of hell."8

All the Protestants placed more emphasis on preaching than the Catholics had. For Catholics, the central feature of the worship service was the Eucharist—the offering of Christ's blood and body as a sacrifice. The Lutherans still adhered to much ritual and placed emphasis on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The

Reformed made preaching the clear focus of the service. Even more so, the Anabaptists placed emphasis on preaching, and later Protestants followed this tendency.

The Sacraments

The Anabaptists acknowledged the two Protestant sacraments—the Lord's Supper and baptism—and regarded both as symbolic only. They said Christ is not bodily present in the Lord's Supper; it is simply a commemoration of what Jesus did for us by dying on the cross.

In connection with the Lord's Supper, they instituted the practice of washing one another's feet, based on the command of Jesus in John 13:14-15: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." In this instance, as was typical of them, they interpreted the New Testament, and particularly the teachings of Jesus, as literally as possible.

As we have already seen, water baptism was the immediate cause of the Anabaptists becoming a separate movement, but it was not the central feature of their theology. They did not regard it as part of the new birth or a means of grace but as a symbol of God's cleansing, a public confession of faith, and an act of joining the church.

Typically they distinguished inner baptism from outer
baptism, holding that only the former is the new birth and
that it must occur in order to receive the latter. Thus forgiveness
(remission) of sins comes before water baptism.
Nevertheless, they taught that baptism of believers
is still necessary; it is a command for everyone to obey.
Citing Acts 2:38, Hubmaier said, "It is not enough that a

person confesses his sins and amends his life, but beyond
that it is necessary that he let himself be baptized in the
name of Jesus Christ. . . . Those who believe are obliged by
the authority of this passage to let themselves be baptized."
Against Zwingli, he quoted Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38, concluding,
"If now faith alone would be enough, then Christ
and Peter would have added baptism in vain. . . . It follows
that every Christian is obligated to let himself be marked
with the outward water of baptism."9 The Waldecki Catechism
(1778) of the Mennonites, says, "Is baptism
essential to salvation? Yes. He that believeth and is baptized
shall be saved. Mark 16:16."10
Initially, the Anabaptists baptized by immersion or
pouring. Ultimately, they came to see immersion as the
scriptural norm.

The Doctrine of God and
the Baptismal Formula

Most of the Anabaptists accepted the traditional doctrine
of the trinity, but some did not.11 For instance, Ludwig
Hätzer wrote a hymn affirming that God is one
person, not three persons.12 He was accused of denying
Christ's full deity, however.
It is difficult to identify precisely what some of these
nontrinitarians believed—whether they affirmed, diminished,
or completely denied the full deity of Jesus Christ.
It appears that all three positions were represented. In
sixteenth-century England, some Anabaptists fell in each
category:
Contemporary documents show how very many of
the Anabaptists had lost all faith in the doctrine of the

Holy Trinity. Some were reviving the Sabellian heresy
[affirming the full deity of Jesus Christ], and denying
that there was more than one Person in the Godhead;
others were teaching a form of Arianism, denying the
Divinity of the Second Person, while others again

maintained that Christ was "a mere man."13

As we might expect, there is also evidence that some Anabaptists baptized in the name of Jesus Christ instead of with the trinitarian titles. Although Hubmaier was a trinitarian and used the trinitarian formula, one of his statements about water baptism implies that the Jesus Name formula was also in use and was acceptable: "It rather takes place in the name of God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, or in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."14

He cited Acts 2:38 frequently to show that repentance must precede water baptism, but he interpreted "in the name of Jesus Christ" to mean by the authority of Jesus Christ. Simons similarly explained that the phrase simply refers to Christian baptism.

In Poland, the Minor Church, a split from the Reformed, embraced both Anabaptism and antitrinitarianism and became known as the Polish Brethren. Ultimately, as described in chapter 5, this movement denied the full deity of Jesus Christ, but at first it appears that some nontrinitarians affirmed His deity.15

Some of the Polish ministers taught that baptism is necessary to salvation, and some insisted on baptizing in the name of Jesus Christ. Against them, Peter Morzkowski, a Polish Brethren pastor, defended the threefold formula:

83

The Anabaptists

Now, concerning the words that the baptizer uses, of what importance is it to say those words, which until recently the whole Christian world has believed to derive from Christ as the form for the administration of baptism? To them, however, whom this displeases, because the Apostles are perceived to have opposed this precept, who are said to have baptized not by these words but only in the name of Christ, it is appropriate to adduce here those words of Irenaeus [d. c. 200]: "In the name of Christ there is understood he who has anointed and he himself who is anointed, and the unction itself wherein he is anointed."16

A Polish Brethren Catechism and Declaration of Faith, compiled by George Schomann in 1574, defines baptism as "the immersion in water and the emersion of a person who believes the gospel and exercises repentance in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, or in the name of Jesus Christ. . . ."17

Anabaptists Today

Most Anabaptists today are Mennonites, followers of Menno Simons. They are most numerous in Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States. They are characterized by pacifism, separation from the world, and simplicity of lifestyle.

Traditionally the Mennonites have emphasized modesty in their mannerisms, dress, and appearance. Typically, the women wear dresses and not pants, do not wear jewelry or makeup, do not cut their hair, and wear a head covering (following their understanding of I Corinthians 11:1-16). Today, some have relaxed these stands. A doc-

A History of Christian Doctrine

trinal book published by the Mennonites in 1952 explains their position:

In recent years the Mennonite Church has had to resist the unnatural and unscriptural practice of women cutting their hair. . . . Mennonites have for centuries placed much stress on simplicity of life. Considerable emphasis fell on the external appearance of the Christian; the wearing of jewelry, for example, is proscribed. . . . In the liberation of the present era this Mennonite "Biblicism" with its ordinances and restrictions may seem like a neo-legalism. It is not so intended. The obedience of love is never legalism; it is loveless conformity to a code which is legalism. A joyful awareness of the centrality and foundation of Christ's redemption and of God's grace will prevent this simple and earnest obedience to Christ's Word from degenerating into a formalistic legalism. Furthermore, the "danger" of taking the Bible too seriously is far less grave than the peril of secularism and worldliness.18

In recent years a significant number of Mennonites have been baptized with the Holy Spirit, especially in Third World countries. It has been estimated that as many as twenty-five percent have spoken in tongues.

The Hutterites are a smaller branch of Anabaptism in existence today. Followers of Jacob Hutter, they began in Moravia (part of the Czech Republic), and they live communally. Quite conservative in lifestyle, they wear plain clothing and refuse to own televisions, considering them to be an excessively worldly influence.

The Anabaptists

Some people known as Brethren also have an Anabaptist heritage, particularly the Swiss Brethren. Some have both Anabaptist and Pietist roots, such as the Church of the Brethren, also known as the Dunkers because they baptize by triple immersion.

The Amish, originally led by Jacob Ammann, are a conservative split from the Mennonites. Believing that the main body was becoming too worldly, they determined to maintain the lifestyle of the preindustrial world. They reject modern mechanical inventions such as automobiles and farm machinery but are known as successful farmers. In dress, they are exceedingly plain, typically avoiding colored clothing, ribbons, and other decorations. The men do not shave, and the women have long hair. In some cases, they seem to have focused on legalistic details, such as disputes over whether it is acceptable to wear buttons or to allow chrome on their buggies.

The break with the Mennonites came over the shunning of backsliders—refusing to have fellowship with them in order to bring them to repentance. All Anabaptists historically practiced the ban (excommunication of sinful members), but some, particularly the Mennonites, further practiced shunning. The Amish chose to be much stricter in having no dealings with someone who has departed from the faith.

Summary and Evaluation

In many ways, the Anabaptists took the original principles of the Protestant Reformation—such as justification by faith, the sole authority of Scripture, and the priesthood of all believers—and carried them to their logical conclusions. They were able to do so because they

86

A History of Christian Doctrine

were motivated by a thoroughgoing restorationism rather than simply a desire to reform the existing church. On a number of issues, including the sacraments, holiness of life, and rejection of tradition, they took their cue from Zwingli, but they advanced far beyond him.

Of the major branches of sixteenth-century Protestantism, the Anabaptists were by far the closest to the later Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal way of thinking. To a notable extent, they foreshadowed these later movements. The Baptists in seventeenth-century England also adopted many of the same concepts, although there was no direct historical succession. Even the mainline churches in America today, Protestant and Catholic, have

adopted important principles first embraced by the Anabaptists, such as separation of church and state and toleration for people of different religious views. In many ways Anabaptists seem to have been several centuries ahead of their time.

On the other hand, there were numerous excesses and false teachings. That was probably unavoidable given the unprecedented mass availability of theological writings via the printing press, the sudden emergence from a thousand years of ecclesiastical apostasy, and the chaos resulting from intense persecution.

Time and again, Apostolic Pentecostals find themselves in accord with Anabaptist views, including the following: the need to restore apostolic doctrine and practice, apostasy of the church under Constantine and afterwards, separation of church and state, freedom of conscience, importance of personal faith, genuine repentance and conversion, rejection of unconditional election and unconditional eternal security, communion as a

87

The Anabaptists

memorial, foot washing, believers' baptism, baptism by immersion, demonstrative worship, centrality of preaching, congregational church government, pacifism, avoidance of swearing, practical holiness in lifestyle and dress, and anticipation of the Lord's soon return.

Oneness Pentecostals today would argue that the Anabaptists needed to add only three key elements to attain their goal of restoring the apostolic church: the oneness of God, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of speaking in tongues. Even so, there is evidence that Oneness views of God, the practice of water baptism in Jesus' name, and the reception of the Holy Spirit all surfaced in the early Anabaptist movement.

With regard to the role of water baptism as part of conversion, it seems that the Anabaptists were pointed in the wrong direction by Zwingli's symbolic view. The other choice offered them—the mystical view of the Catholics and Lutherans, which divorced baptism from genuine faith—was so foreign to their scriptural emphasis on conversion that it apparently blocked them from considering that baptism could indeed play a vital role in conjunction with faith. Nevertheless, they did stress the necessity of baptism for the convert.

The restorationism of the Anabaptists was imperfect,
but it is remarkable for the rapidity and scope of its development,
especially in contrast to the rest of Protestantism.
The advances were sufficiently great that, within
a few short years from the beginning of the Reformation,
it seems there were genuine Apostolic believers as
defined by the experience of Acts 2:38.

A History of Christian Doctrine

Historians typically use the term "Radical Reformation"
to speak of the Anabaptists and others who went
even further in rejecting Catholic and Protestant tradition.
Since we have already discussed the Anabaptists in
chapter 4, we will now turn our attention to other individuals
and groups. As used here, the adjective "radical" is
not pejorative but simply describes those who carried the
Protestant Reformation to its limits, in some cases closer
to Scripture but in others away from Scripture.

When discussing the Radical Reformation, many historians
use a threefold classification: Anabaptists, Spiritualists,
and Rationalists. In this context, the Spiritualists
are not people who tried to contact spirits of the dead but
those who emphasized spiritual experience or the inner

The Radical
Reformation

5

spiritual life. Mainline Protestants regarded them as mystical
and believed they did not place enough emphasis on
doctrine.

The Rationalists are so labeled because they rejected
various aspects of traditional theology as being incompatible
with reason. From the viewpoint of mainline Protestantism,
they elevated human reason above divine
revelation.

From an Apostolic Pentecostal perspective, some of
these people brought needed correctives. Some did not
elevate experience above doctrine but sought a balance of
worship "in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). Some did not
elevate reason above revelation but concluded that, when
examined logically, some traditional doctrines are not
supported by Scripture.

All three segments of the Radical Reformation generally
agreed on the following doctrinal points: separation
of church and state, rejection of infant baptism, regeneration
or life in the Spirit instead of merely confessing justification

by faith alone, rejection of predestination, restorationism, importance of discipleship (practical holiness), and congregational church government. They typically concluded that in practice the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine of justification operated as a new system of indulgences that encouraged its adherents to continue in sin.

In addition, many in the Radical Reformation deviated from traditional Catholic and Protestant orthodoxy by teaching soul sleep (sleep or death of the soul prior to the resurrection), the harrowing of hell (descent of Christ into hades to deliver the righteous souls of the Old Testament), or the divine humanity of Christ (Christ's flesh

was celestial, unlike ours, or not inherited from Mary). For instance, among the Anabaptists, Melchior Hofmann and Menno Simons taught that Christ's flesh was celestial, as did several of the Spiritualists we will discuss.

Early German Spiritualists

Shortly after the Reformation began in Germany, some people attempted to take it far beyond the intentions of Luther himself. Many of them sought a greater experience with God and a more biblical, spiritual way of life.

One of these men was Luther's colleague Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt, professor and dean of theology at Wittenberg. On Christmas Day in 1521, while Luther was hiding in Wartburg Castle, Carlstadt celebrated what is generally considered to be the first Protestant communion. At the urging of many of Luther's followers, he deleted the Catholic references to the Eucharist as a sacrifice, refused to elevate the host for adoration, and offered both elements to the laity. It appeared that the Lutherans were poised for sweeping and rapid changes in theology, practice, and lifestyle.

Upon hearing about the volatile situation, Luther returned to Wittenberg despite the personal risk and regained control of the movement. He reinstituted the traditional mass with its Latin liturgy (for a time), slowed the pace of reform, and blocked many proposals for radical change.

Carlstadt continued to move forward in his thinking, however, and soon split with Luther. He rejected infant baptism as unscriptural, taught that the Eucharist was symbolic only, and espoused pacifism. He advocated the

The Radical Reformation

priesthood of all believers so strongly that he ceased wearing his priestly and academic garb. Carlstadt soon lost his influence in mainstream Lutheranism, but the Anabaptists drew inspiration from some of his teachings.

About the same time, the Protestant movement in Zwickau, a large and prosperous German town, took a radical turn under the leadership of Nicholas Storch, Thomas Dreschsel, and Marcus Thomas Stübner, whom Luther derisively termed "the Zwickau prophets." Inspired by the Hussite and Waldensian movements of the Middle Ages, they "preach[ed] a radical Biblicism characterized by direct revelation in visions and dreams, Spiritpossession, the abandonment of infant baptism, [and] belief in the millennium."1

The Zwickau prophets sought to follow the Bible literally, but they also insisted upon the illumination of the Spirit as necessary to understand Scripture. Luther denounced them as fanatics who minimized the written Word; they, in turn, rebuked him as a man of letter only and not the Spirit. Some of the followers of the Zwickau prophets joined the Anabaptist movement when it emerged shortly afterward.

Thomas Müntzer, a pastor who served in Zwickau for a time, was greatly influenced by the Zwickau prophets, and he in turn inspired some Anabaptists. Like the Zwickau prophets, he renounced infant baptism, followed a spiritual hermeneutic (interpretation of the Bible), and embraced the gifts of the Spirit. He believed in "direct instruction from the Holy Spirit in the form of vision, dream, ecstatic utterance, or inspired exegesis."2 Müntzer claimed that he and others received the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as promised in Joel 2, and he

A History of Christian Doctrine

integrated it into his theology by teaching a threefold experience of salvation. First, a person must undergo spiritual despair; next he must take up the cross of Christ personally; and then he can and must receive the Holy Spirit. He made a distinction between inner and outer baptism, saying only the former is essential to salvation.

In opposition to Luther, he stressed that faith must be experiential. It is not a work of God apart from the recipient's active involvement, nor is it merely an intellectual comprehension of the historic event of the Atonement. He

gave a "vigorous and systematic defense of Spirit-possessed faith as opposed to the merely historic faith of the Wittenbergers [early Lutherans], which he proceed[ed] to expose as false."3

Müntzer preached against social injustice and advocated radical reform of society for the benefit of the common people, most of whom lived in poverty. He justified the use of force to deliver people from oppression, and he hoped his preaching would help ignite a social revolution that would usher in the Millennium.

The preaching of Müntzer helped instigate the Great Peasants' War of 1524-25 in Germany and Austria. He supported the revolt and tried to channel it in a theological direction but failed. The insurrection was crushed, and he was captured and executed.

Carlstadt was sympathetic to the aims of the revolt, but he sought to moderate it and was sidelined. Balthasar Hubmaier and others who were soon to become Anabaptists also encouraged the rebellion.

Luther sided with the rulers in opposition to the peasants, and the Lutherans and Reformed denounced Müntzer, Carlstadt, other Spiritualists, and the Anabaptists for

93

The Radical Reformation

revolutionary violence. The Anabaptists as a movement were not guilty, for the revolt predated them. Early Spiritualists, particularly Müntzer, bore some responsibility, but the peasant wars were caused by historical forces far greater than a few individuals, and they were not primarily religious in nature. Moreover, if we must criticize the Spiritualists for condoning force in an attempt to liberate the poor and oppressed in a dictatorial, inequitable society, we must even more severely criticize the Lutherans and Reformed for their harsh, violent repression of all opposition, both civil and theological, and their attempts to extend their own religious views by conquest.

It seems clear that at least some of the followers of the Zwickau prophets and Thomas Müntzer received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, for they sought and experienced the miraculous gifts of the Spirit as recorded in the New Testament, including what historians call ecstatic speech (tongues, interpretation of tongues, prophecy). It is also probable that when Luther wrote in 1520 about people who baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, he referred to some Spiritualists, for the only active Protestants at that time were

Luther's own followers and Spiritualists who had been inspired by him.

If this supposition is correct, then not long after the Reformation began, some people both baptized in the name of Jesus and received the Holy Spirit. Moreover, since some of these Spiritualists were inspired by the Hussites and Waldensians, who had come into existence in the Middle Ages, it may be that they obtained these teachings from people in those movements who had already embraced them.

A History of Christian Doctrine

Caspar Schwenckfeld

Another Spiritualist was Caspar Schwenckfeld (c. 1487-1561), a German nobleman and knight of the Teutonic Order who converted to Lutheranism. He attempted to reconcile Catholicism and Lutheranism by finding a middle way between them. Later, he saw his teaching as providing middle ground between the Lutherans and Anabaptists.

Schwenckfeld placed emphasis on prayer and personal devotion. Like other Spiritualists and like the Anabaptists, he was dismayed by Lutheranism's seeming lack of power to instill morality in its followers. Consequently, he promoted both justification by faith and progressive sanctification.

Schwenckfeld was a trinitarian, but he had an unusual view of the Incarnation. He confessed that Christ had two natures but called His human nature "uncreaturely." He also believed that when Christ died He descended into hades and delivered the souls of the patriarchs.

Much of the early conflict between Catholics and Protestants, as well as among Protestants, centered on the sacraments, particularly the Eucharist. Schwenckfeld proposed that everyone focus on the spiritual reality instead of the physical elements. Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, but in a spiritual rather than a physical way. Moreover, He is present only for those who believe. The Eucharist is spiritually nutritious but does not contain the physical body of Christ.

Not finding ready acceptance of these views, Schwenckfeld and his followers, the Schwenckfelders, eventually decided to suspend the Eucharist altogether until a consensus emerged in Christianity on its meaning. Instead they focused on spiritual communion with the Lord.

The Radical Reformation

As one might suppose, Schwenckfeld took a similar approach to water baptism, regarding the outward ceremony as unimportant but seeking a baptism of the Spirit. He opposed infant baptism.

Schwenckfeld was unsuccessful in his attempt to reconcile various branches of Christianity. Luther rejected Schwenckfeld's view as inadequate, expressing his contempt by consistently calling him "Stenkefeld," meaning "Stinkfield."

Sebastian Franck

Another Spiritualist who held some views like those of Schwenckfeld was Sebastian Franck (1499-c. 1542) of Strassburg. He was a pacifist, held Christ's flesh to be of heavenly origin, and under the influence of Michael Servetus, moved away from trinitarianism while upholding the deity of Jesus Christ. He believed that the outward church broke up in the early centuries, so that no group in his day fully replicated the apostolic church, but the spiritual church was present among the outward churches and even among pagans. His writings have preserved the views of many contemporary Anabaptists and Spiritualists.

Michael Servetus

One of the most amazing men the Reformation produced was Michael Servetus. His theology is unique; he could be considered both a Spiritualist and a Rationalist. Only fourteen years after the beginning of the Reformation, he applied a thorough restorationism to the doctrine of God, denying the trinity while upholding the full deity and humanity of Jesus Christ. Because of his special

96

A History of Christian Doctrine

interest to Oneness Pentecostals, we will discuss him in some detail.

Life. Michael Servetus is the Latin name of Miguel Serveto alias Reves, a Spaniard who was born in 1511 (or possibly 1509) to a noble, devoutly Catholic family. At age fourteen he entered the service of Juan de Quintana, a Franciscan friar and doctor at the University of Paris who became the confessor of Emperor Charles V. As a teenager, Servetus spent two years studying law at the University of Toulouse in France. There he saw the complete Bible for the first time and participated in a student Bible study group. The Scriptures led him to a life-transforming experience.

In 1530 Servetus accompanied Quintana to Italy for the coronation of Charles V in Bologna. Then he apparently traveled to Germany with the imperial party for the

Diet of Augsburg, where leading Protestants presented
their views to the emperor. Soon afterward, Servetus left
the service of Quintana and appeared in Basel, Switzerland,
debating doctrine with Protestant leaders there. He
also spent time in another city along the Rhine River, the
German city of Strassburg (now Strasbourg, France).
Servetus's study of the Bible in Toulouse convinced
him that the Roman Catholic Church was in serious error.
His trip to Italy, which exposed him to elaborate religious
ceremony, worldliness in high church circles, and adulation
of the pope, further confirmed his opinions. While
sympathetic to the Protestants' criticism of Catholicism,
he concluded that they were wrong on some important
points as well, particularly the trinity, predestination, and
infant baptism.

In 1531, at age twenty, Servetus published On the

The Radical Reformation

Errors of the Trinity in Strassburg, which challenged
the traditional doctrine of the trinity. It is remarkable for
its originality and scholarship. The next year, he published
Two Dialogues on the Trinity.

Forced to flee for his life because of his unorthodox
views, Servetus went to France, where, under the name of
Michel de Villanueve (after his home town), he became a
prominent medical doctor, author, and editor. He was a
colleague of the famous anatomist Vesalius, and he was
the first in the West to discover and record the pulmonary
circulation of the blood (through the lungs from the right
to the left side of the heart). He began an extended correspondence
with John Calvin, the Reformed leader in
Geneva. He sent Calvin a manuscript copy of his major
work, The Restitution of Christianity, which he secretly
and anonymously published in early 1553.

As the title of the book indicates, Servetus wanted
not merely to reform but to restore Christianity. He concluded
that the church fell into apostasy in the fourth
century with the adoption of trinitarianism at the Council
of Nicea, the merger of church and state under Constantine,
and the consolidation of ecclesiastical power under
the pope. Like the Reformers, he viewed the Roman
Church as the system of the Antichrist, and he listed
sixty signs of the reign of the Antichrist, including the
doctrine of the trinity, the baptism of infants, the mass,
and transubstantiation. He further considered the
Protestants essentially as offshoots of the same system,

with no organized group accurately representing the true church. He believed that this system would soon fall and the present age would end in the 1500s. He saw his role as heralding the restoration of true Christianity, although

he felt he would probably die in the attempt.

Tipped off by one of Calvin's friends in Geneva, who probably acted at the behest of Calvin himself, the authorities in France arrested Servetus on charges of heresy. While under arrest he managed to escape, apparently with the help of influential friends. The Catholic tribunal condemned him to die and burned him in effigy along with his books.

Servetus hid for several months and eventually decided to flee to Italy. On the way, he made the fatal mistake of passing through Geneva and remaining there for a time. While in church one Sunday, he was recognized and reported to Calvin, who immediately had him arrested and tried for heresy. With the approval of Calvin, the Protestant city council of Geneva condemned him to die on two counts: denying infant baptism and denying the trinity. On October 27, 1553, at age forty-two, he was burned at the stake. Amid the smoke and flames he cried out his last words: "O Jesus, Son of the eternal God, have pity on me!"4 He died after one-half hour.

Calvin's colleague Farel noted that a shift of one word—moving the adjective "eternal" from before "God" to before "Son"—would have saved him. Thus, the dying cry of Servetus was "one last gesture of defiance to man and confession to God."5

Doctrines of God and Christ. In his first book, Servetus began his discussion of the Godhead by identifying Jesus Christ as a true man. The Son is not an eternal person but a man. The Son is a human like us in every way except sin, although He had a spiritual body and soul from heaven. The Son of God came into actual existence at the Incarnation, but we can speak of His preexistence

in the mind of God. In this sense, in his last book, Servetus was willing to speak of the generation of the Word or Son before creation.

Servetus explained that the titles of Father, Word, and Holy Spirit refer to the one God in three manners of acting— essentially, modes or manifestations. The Word is

God's self-expression, which began at creation. The Word is not the same as the Son because the Son refers to the Incarnation. The Holy Spirit is God in activity, God exercising His power.

There is only one hypostasis of God, not three.6 (The Greek hypostasis originally meant "substance or being," but trinitarians used it to mean "person.") Servetus was willing to use the Latin word for "persons," but only in the original sense of "manifestations" or "dispositions" (to him, the equivalent of the Greek oikonomia).

As a consequence of his doctrine, Servetus believed that Jesus Christ is not only the Son of God but also God. He is the revelation of the Father, the total deity, in flesh: [Christ] "is really the Father now. . . . He himself is the face of the Father, nor is there any other Person of God but CHRIST; there is no other hypostasis of God but him. . . . They [trinitarians] say that one portion, I say that the whole Nature, of God is in him. In him is the whole Deity of the Father. . . . He is God and the Lord of the world. . . . The Father is in the Son."7

From Colossians 1:19 and 2:9 Servetus taught that "the whole fulness of God, the whole of God the Father together with all the fulness of his properties, whatever God has, this dwells fully in this man."8

Because of some of Servetus's later statements, Calvin and others accused him of being a pantheist. Roland Bainton, his foremost modern biographer, concluded, however: "He is rather an emanationist. God confers being, essence, particularity upon all that is and God sustains all things."9

Doctrine of Salvation. Servetus taught salvation by grace through faith. Grace "makes us free from sin, justifies us freely, pours out the Holy Spirit upon us, bestows the kingdom of heaven on us." In opposition to Luther and Calvin, he strongly rejected "the servitude of the will" and the associated doctrine of predestination (unconditional election). He criticized Luther's doctrine of justification by faith for minimizing the value of good works and the supremacy of love. He denied that anyone could be saved by works, but he sought a middle ground between Catholicism and Lutheranism that would uphold salvation by faith yet give due regard to sanctification and love. The truth, he said, is that we receive eternal life through grace and faith, and "the reward of glory is increased by works of love." We begin with faith and are

made perfect in love.10

Servetus affirmed the necessity of being born again of water and Spirit. For Servetus, like the Catholics and Lutherans but unlike the Reformed and Anabaptists, water baptism is essential to regeneration. He did not believe that unbaptized infants would die lost, however. The age of accountability for sins is about twenty, and baptism is only for those who repent and believe. It should be administered by immersion, and preferably at age thirty in imitation of Christ.

Servetus did not give specific attention to the baptismal formula, but he believed the full name of God was

invested in Christ. He explained that Matthew 28:19 does not teach three beings, but one:

In the name of the Father because he is the prime, true, and original source of every gift. In the name of JESUS CHRIST, because through him we have the reconciliation of this gift, "neither is there any other name under heaven wherein we must be saved." And in the name of the Holy Spirit, because all that are baptized in that name receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.11

Here he identified "Jesus Christ" as the only saving name of Acts 4:12, and like Justin and Irenaeus in the second century he cited that name instead of the title of "Son."

In a letter to Calvin, Servetus referred to John 3:5 and Acts 2:38 to establish the necessity of repentance and baptism, and he urged Calvin to be baptized and receive the Spirit:

Regeneration, I maintain, comes through baptism. . . . Is it not written that we are born anew by water? . . . As a prelude to baptism Peter required repentance. Let your infants repent, then; and do you yourself repent and come to baptism, having true faith in Jesus Christ to the end that you may receive the gift of the Holy Spirit promised therein.12

While Servetus taught the necessity of receiving the Holy Spirit, some of his statements indicate an automatic reception of the Holy Spirit at baptism. Elsewhere, however, he linked receiving the Spirit with faith. He further described a tangible, emotional experience of receiving the Spirit.

Servetus did not identify speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit, but he did indicate that

the true church would have miraculous gifts of the Spirit.13 In one intriguing reference, Calvin indicated that Servetus claimed to speak in tongues, but in the context Calvin probably meant a naturally acquired linguistic ability.14

It is interesting to note that, much like Calvin, Servetus rejected transubstantiation but taught that we receive spiritual nourishment through the Eucharist.

As a sample of Servetus's views as well as his strong language, here is an excerpt from a letter to Abel Poupin, a minister in Geneva, which was read at his trial:

Your gospel is without the one God, without true faith, without good works. For the one God you have a three-headed Cerberus [in Greek mythology, the three-headed dog that guards the entrance to Hades]; for faith a fatal [deterministic] dream, and good works you say are vain shows. Faith in Christ is to you mere sham, effecting nothing; man a mere log, and your God a chimera of subject [enslaved] will. You do not acknowledge celestial regeneration by the washing with water, but treat it as an idle tale, and close the kingdom of heaven against mankind as a thing of imagination. Woe to you, woe, woe!15

Sympathizers. At first, Servetus seemed close to convincing many people of his view. In Strassburg, some people "lauded it to the stars." The Reformed leaders there, Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito, were initially friendly, and "Capito was thought to favor his views." Oecolampadius, the Reformed leader in Basel, wrote to Ulrich

Zwingli that some of the Strassburgers had accepted Servetus's views. Sebastian Franck wrote to a friend, "The Spaniard, Servetus, contends in his tract that there is but one person in God. The Roman Church holds that there are three persons in one essence. I agree rather with the Spaniard."16 Servetus himself claimed that Capito assented to his views in private and that Oecolampadius first seemed to accept them but later withdrew approval.17

James Ropes and Kirsopp Lake of Harvard University summarized the situation in early Protestantism as follows:

Until now it had not been quite clear what attitude the newly reformed part of Christendom would finally take toward the traditional trinitarian dogma. It had indeed been, as one may say, provisionally retained in the Augsburg Confession in 1530, but the leaders of Protestant thought were plainly wavering about it, in

view of its lack of clear scriptural support. . . . Luther
disliked the terms in which the doctrine was stated,
and left them out of his catechisms; Calvin had disapproved
of the Athanasian Creed and spoken slightingly
even of the Nicene, and had only lightly touched
upon the doctrine in his Catechism; Melanchthon in
his Loci Theologici in 1521 had hardly mentioned the
doctrine except to pronounce it not essential to salvation;
while Zwingli and Farel, Bucer and Oecolampadius,
were far from being sound upon it.18
Later, when Servetus was tried in Geneva, some individuals
were sympathetic to his doctrine. Vergerio, a minister
from Italy, wrote:

It is to be regretted that the scamp has supporters
among the doctors and among those who are not just
nominally for the Gospel, but wish to be considered as
pillars. I say what I know not what I suspect. I have
heard it from themselves, not from others, recently
and not a long time ago. . . . A friend has written me
from Basel that Servetus has supporters there.19
Paul Gaddi of Cremona similarly wrote to Calvin, "The
heresy that flourishes the most of all, is the doctrine of
the proud and Satanic Servetus. . . . How much rather
ought you to come forward against this diabolical spirit,
who is looked on by so many as having the highest
authority in matters of doctrine."20
A number of prominent people opposed the execution
of Servetus, both before and afterwards, some because of
sympathy with his views, others on humanitarian and religious
grounds, and others out of opposition to Calvin.
Historians identify followers of Servetus in Italy, Poland,
Lithuania, and Germany.21 In most cases, however, they
are so called simply because they rejected trinitarianism;
apparently most did not also uphold the full deity of Jesus
Christ as Servetus did.
Three professors of the University of Basel—Borrhaus
(Cellarius), Curio, and Castellio—were suspected of
embracing Servetus's views.22 Under a pseudonym, an
Italian wrote a work entitled Apology for Michael Servetus
that championed his teachings. Some Waldenses in
northern Italy became Anabaptists, and some of them
were favorable to the views of Servetus.
Matthew Gribaldi, a professor of law at Padua, and
John Valentine Gentile, who was beheaded in Bern,

The Radical Reformation
espoused many of Servetus's views, but the former
veered into tritheism and the latter into subordinationism.
Another antitrinitarian, John Campanus, developed a
binitarian theology. Ultimately, most antitrinitarians of the
time became Arian or unitarian. No permanent group followed
the specific teachings of Servetus.

Summary and Conclusions. The theology of Michael
Servetus was original and unique. His writings contain
inconsistencies, errors, ambiguities, and repetition, but
considering that he practically invented his theology from
scratch by age twenty, the results are still amazing. He was
the equal of the foremost Reformers in intellect, scholarship,
and spirituality, although his chief opponent, John
Calvin, was more controlled in temperament and more
systematic and lucid in writing. It took extraordinary brilliance
and strength of personality to stand alone against
"orthodoxy" and develop a biblical theology far more
advanced than that of any contemporary.

On the doctrine of God, Servetus was essentially biblical.
Despite some questionable ideas, faulty expressions,
and doubtful analysis of certain historical views, the two
key features necessary to a genuine Oneness theology
clearly emerge: (1) There is one God with no distinctions
in His essence. (2) Jesus Christ is the true God, the
Father, the fullness of the Godhead incarnate. Apostolic
Pentecostals today are not followers of Servetus, but the
sixteenth-century Reformers would have gladly burned
them alive along with him.

On the doctrine of salvation, Servetus was sound theoretically
on grace, faith, repentance, the necessity of
water baptism, and the necessity of the Holy Spirit, but it
is not clear what he actually experienced. His theology of

A History of Christian Doctrine
the name and identity of Jesus Christ and his discussion
of Matthew 28:19 lead us to expect that he was baptized
with the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ. He testified
to a definite experience in the Holy Spirit and valued
the miraculous gifts of the Spirit; it would not be surprising
if he spoke in tongues.

He exhibited human failings by dabbling with astrology,
deceit under pressure, insolent remarks, and arrogance.
He seemed to delight in objecting to everyone
else's doctrines, even those closest to his own, and in ridiculing

opponents. In the end, however, he died humbly and bravely, with conviction and faith. His martyrdom stands as an eloquent plea for religious tolerance and freedom of conscience, and above all as a testimony of faith in Jesus Christ.

When Servetus first challenged the doctrine of the trinity, the Reformation was quite young, and there were indications that the Reformers were somewhat uncomfortable with the doctrine. It seems that God was trying to restore biblical patterns of thought in this area as well as others. The Reformers faced a crucial decision: retain traditional orthodoxy as much as possible or follow the logical implications of their own emphasis on Scripture alone and reconstruct the doctrine of God from the Bible instead of the creeds. Unfortunately, they chose to follow tradition, not wanting to give the Catholics additional ammunition against them. Indeed, "Oecolampadius, at a conference in Zurich with Zwingli and Henry Bullinger, Capito and Bucer, expressed his alarm at the effect Servetus might have upon their relations with the Catholic cantons."23 Instead of taking a further step of reformation or restoration, the Reformers completely

rejected Servetus and thereby consolidated the power of trinitarianism.

Faustus Socinus and Unitarianism

Some historians identify Servetus as the father of unitarianism, but as the term is typically used, it refers to the denial of both the trinity and the deity of Jesus Christ. By contrast, Servetus affirmed the full deity of Jesus Christ. He helped bring about a critical discussion of the trinity, but he was not responsible for the movement we will now discuss.

Unitarianism began in Italy and developed further in Poland. In Italy, many of the Protestants began as Reformed, progressed to Anabaptist views while retaining belief in predestination, and then eventually became Rationalists. Many began questioning the doctrines of the trinity, the deity of Christ, and the Atonement.

At first, the antitrinitarians subordinated Jesus to the Father, but soon they concluded that Jesus is not God at all but only a prophet. They viewed His death not as a substitutionary sacrifice but merely an expression of God's forgiving love.

Camillo Renato (c. 1500-72) was an early leader during

this development, and Laelius Socinus (Sozini) (1525-62) was the key exponent of unitarian thought. Faustus Socinus (1539-1604) of Siena, Italy, nephew of Laelius, gave clear, specific formulation to these emerging views on the Godhead and the Atonement, and he became the most prominent antitrinitarian leader in Italy and later Poland. The views of Laelius and Faustus Socinus gave rise to what is known as Socinianism, a form of unitarian thought.

108

A History of Christian Doctrine

Faustus Socinus emphasized that the Bible is not contrary to reason, hence the term Rationalist. He denied the true deity of Jesus Christ, identifying Him as a man only. He retained language of devotion to Christ and adoration of Him on the ground that God allowed Him to share in divinity by an adoptive act.

Socinus rejected the explanation that Christ's death was the satisfaction required by the justice of God to redeem us. He argued that God could forgive us without any sacrifice, so that Christ's death was not strictly necessary. Moreover, His resurrection and ascension were more important than His death, for they proclaimed the eventual triumph of God's love. He is our Savior because He has shown us the way to salvation, which we can attain by imitating Him.

Socinus believed baptism to be irrelevant to salvation and discipleship. He taught the death of the soul with the body, and he was a pacifist.

For the last twenty-five years of his life, Socinus moved to Poland, where there was much antitrinitarian thought among the Reformed and Anabaptists as well as in neighboring Lithuania. It appears that initially some antitrinitarians affirmed the deity of Jesus Christ, but under the influence of Socinus and others, the Polish antitrinitarians as a whole eventually denied the deity of Christ. Due to their earlier Anabaptist convictions, however, for a long time they continued to place importance on water baptism, unlike Socinus himself. The Anabaptists of Poland were the strongest of all in their insistence on immersion as the only proper mode, and the antitrinitarians continued the practice of baptizing or rebaptizing believers by immersion.

109

The Radical Reformation

In Poland, antitrinitarianism began with a range of

views, including affirmation of the deity of Christ, subordinationism (subordination of Christ to the Father), and tritheism (belief in three gods). It gradually evolved into the direction of ditheism (belief in two gods), then adoptionism (teaching that Christ is a man who shares in divinity by God's adoptive act), and finally complete unitarianism (denial of the deity of Christ). There was a similar evolution of views from an early rejection of infant baptism, to the practice of rebaptism, and ultimately to a renunciation of baptism altogether.

Unitarianism eventually captured much of the Protestant movement in Poland, which was initially Reformed and then Anabaptist. It also spread and intensified in Transylvania (Hungary and Romania). Ultimately, however, Catholicism overcame most of the Protestantism in this region through political power and the work of the Jesuits.

The Unitarian Church of Romania is a remnant of the sixteenth-century antitrinitarianism that developed in Italy and Poland. The modern Unitarian-Universalist Church did not stem directly from these roots but emerged in the late eighteenth century out of Congregationalism in New England. Nevertheless, its founders owed much to the ideas of the earlier unitarianism and embraced essentially the same view of God and the Atonement. The modern denomination affirms the salvation of all people and is tolerant of all beliefs. It has renounced all distinctively Christian and supernatural teachings, even to the extent of regarding the existence of God as an optional belief. It aspires only to be an ethical humanism.

110

A History of Christian Doctrine

Summary and Evaluation

The Radical Reformation encompassed an exceedingly diverse array of beliefs and practices. Many of them were serious deviations from Scripture, but many were important restorations of biblical truth. Some people in the Radical Reformation had a Oneness view of God, some baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and some received the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of tongues. It is not difficult to suppose that some individuals or groups experienced both baptism in Jesus' name and speaking in tongues and so had a genuinely apostolic conversion. We can also assume that the evidence available represents only the tip of the iceberg, for the majority of such information was undoubtedly suppressed by the

intense persecutions, the fragmented and diverse character
of the various movements, and the failure to fully
understand, appreciate, or record religious practices and
spiritual experiences among the common people.
Most of the Radical Reformers emphasized both the
Bible and the Spirit and sought to incorporate both into
their lives. This approach received widespread acceptance
among the common people and bears great affinity
to the modern Pentecostal movement. As George
Huntston Williams has stated, the Radical Reformation
was "the reflection and the interpretation of the widespread
pentecostal or revivalistic and charismatic experience
of the new, largely popular, conventicular
[characterized by religious meetings, often illegal or
secret] forms of Christianity."24
111
The Radical Reformation

As we have seen, the Reformed branch of Protestantism
began with Ulrich Zwingli in Zurich, Switzerland.
Zwingli died early in the history of the movement, however,
and the man who did more than anyone else to formulate,
systematize, and propagate Reformed theology was
John Calvin. Born in Noyon, France, in 1509—his French
name was Jean Cauvin—he emigrated to Geneva, Switzerland,
becoming leader of the Protestants and de facto
head of government in that French-speaking city. His
voluminous writings—both systematic theology and Bible
commentaries—made him the foremost leader of the
Reformed movement as a whole and the epitome of
Reformed theology.
Raised as a Roman Catholic, Calvin converted to
113
John Calvin and His
Reformed Theology
6
Protestantism in 1532. His thinking was initially influenced
by the Catholic humanists and then even more so
by Martin Bucer, German leader of the Reformed movement
in Strassburg. Bucer unsuccessfully attempted to
reconcile Lutheranism and Zwinglianism and aligned himself
with the latter.
Calvin published his major work, Institutes of the
Christian Religion, in 1536, when he was twenty-six
years old. Throughout his life he continued to revise and
expand this book, issuing the final edition in 1559. The

first edition relied somewhat upon Luther and was much
smaller than the later editions, but it presented the essential
features of Calvin's theology, which remained virtually
unchanged throughout his life.

The publication of the Institutes drew the attention of
many people, some of whom hailed it as the most definitive
theological work of the Protestant Reformation. Guillaume
Farel, the Reformed leader in Geneva, was so
impressed that when Calvin paid a visit there in 1536, he
prevailed upon him to stay. He was promptly elected as
pastor and assumed the role of religious and political
leader of the city-state.

He was expelled by political enemies in 1538 but
returned in triumph in 1541. Despite further political
intrigue and struggle, he remained as leader in Geneva
until his death in 1564.

Institutes of the Christian Religion became one of
the best known books in Christian theology, and its closely
reasoned, logical presentation was instrumental in converting
many people to Reformed Protestant belief. The
standard text for the Reformed tradition, it clearly distinguishes
this branch of Protestantism from the Lutherans

114

A History of Christian Doctrine

and Anabaptists as well as the Catholics.

Largely as a result of Calvin's influence, to this day
the Reformed churches are characterized by an emphasis
on systematic theology. Historically, most of the major
Protestant works of systematic theology have been written
by Calvinists and most leading theologians in the
modern Evangelical movement are Calvinists of one sort
or another.

The Existence and Nature of God

Calvin stated that, through nature and conscience,
everyone can know there is a God. The existence of God
is evident even to those who do not have the Bible. Since
all humans are sinners, however, we cannot truly know
God in His essence and purity, and since we are finite we
cannot truly comprehend His infinite nature. The only
way we can know God personally and understand His
character is through His self-revelation.

God's revelation consists in accommodating Himself
to the limitations of the human mind. We find in Scripture
many descriptions of God that do not exhaust His fullness;
they are partial revelations because of the limits of
our vocabulary and thinking. For example, the Bible

speaks of God's ears, eyes, hands, and heart, but we are not to think of Him as a giant human being. Rather God uses these analogies to express Himself on our level of thinking and in terms that we can understand. Even when God reveals Himself to us, we cannot fully know Him because of our sinfulness and finiteness.

Calvin condemned all forms of idolatry. He specifically rejected the Catholic use of statues as idolatrous.

He emphatically taught that God is a trinity. Perhaps

John Calvin

early on he had some doubts about this doctrine, for he conceded that the terminology used to define the trinity is not scriptural and he disapproved of the Athanasian Creed, the most definitive trinitarian statement from ancient Christendom. As we have seen, however, he engaged in a heated controversy with Michael Servetus over the trinity and successfully prosecuted him for heresy, securing the death penalty. As a result, Servetus was burned at the stake outside Geneva, although Calvin wanted him to be beheaded instead.

Calvin asserted the sovereignty and providence of God. He rules the universe and intervenes in all its affairs.

The Bible

Like all Protestants, Calvin affirmed the sole authority of Scripture. He relied considerably on the ecumenical councils and the writings of early theologians, however. He did not regard them as strictly authoritative in the same sense as Scripture, yet he often appealed to them as a source of early Christian understanding about God and thus very important to the development of theology. Turning to the value of traditional practices, Calvin's opinion was closer to that of Zwingli than Luther. Like the former, he said we should discard all nonbiblical tradition, retaining only what the Bible clearly teaches.

Angels and Demons

Calvin systematically progressed through the various doctrines of the Bible. He affirmed the existence of angels, describing them as servants of God. He likewise taught that demons existed and defined them as fallen angels.

A History of Christian Doctrine

Humanity

According to Calvin, humans are two-part creatures composed of body and soul. The soul, also called the spirit,

is invisible, immaterial, and immortal. This view of the soul is the standard Western and Christian concept, expressed in Greek philosophy and first clearly enunciated in Christian theology by Tertullian.

Calvin denied that the soul goes to sleep or dies when the body dies, doctrines that were current in the Radical Reformation. Rather, after a person dies physically, his soul lives on in consciousness, awaiting his resurrection, judgment, and eternal destiny. Unlike Tertullian, who believed that a person's soul comes into being through the procreative process (the doctrine of traducianism), Calvin taught that God creates a new soul each time a new human being comes into the world.

He also taught that all human beings are born under sin. They are completely bound by sin. They are totally depraved, which means sin has corrupted every aspect of the human life. It does not mean, however, that people have no good qualities or that they are as evil as they can possibly be.

We inherit the sinful nature from our forefathers, and we particularly inherit the guilt of Adam. Thus the infant is destined for eternal damnation unless he is a recipient of God's grace. Here Calvin differed from Zwingli, who denied that an infant was born with actual guilt and condemnation. Total depravity does not mean the human intellect has been destroyed, but it has been marred by sin. Likewise the human will has been so corrupted by sin that a person never chooses to serve God of his own accord.

117

John Calvin

Predestination

The logical corollary of total depravity is predestination (unconditional election). If total depravity as defined by Calvin is correct, then salvation could never depend in any way on human choice. If God ever gave humans a choice in regard to salvation, they would always choose wrong and so would never be saved. The only way God can save us in view of our sinfulness is by unconditional election.

Predestination is often regarded as the center of Calvin's theology, but he did not present it as such although he did teach it and emphasize it. Controversies between Calvinists and others often focused on the doctrine of predestination, and followers of Calvin elaborated upon it, expanded it, and drew out its logical consequences. Thus later Calvinists actually made more of this

doctrine and discussed it in greater detail than Calvin himself did.

Calvin defined predestination as God's eternal decree by which He determined with Himself what He willed to become of each person. A person is not saved because he makes a choice; God has determined his eternal destiny before he is ever born.

Calvin clearly taught the concept of double predestination. That is, God has foreordained all human beings to one of two alternatives. Some are predestined to election: God has chosen them to be saved. All others are predestined to reprobation: God has not elected them to salvation, so they are consigned to damnation. Human choice plays no role in either case.

A common way to explain the scriptural statements about predestination is to say that election to salvation is

based on God's foreknowledge of human choice. (See Romans 8:29.) Calvin emphatically rejected this idea. God does not merely know the future and act accordingly; He actually predetermines the eternal destiny of each individual apart from that person's will.

Opponents of Calvin accused this doctrine of making God unjust. He responded that we cannot judge God as unjust, for He determines what justice is. By definition, whatever God does is right, because He is God. We cannot criticize the doctrine of predestination by our concept of what is fair. If it seems to contradict our notions of justice, then our ideas are faulty.

Calvin's detractors could hardly disagree that God is the determiner of right and wrong. He is just and holy, and we cannot stand in judgment of Him. Our concepts are faulty in comparison to His. (See Romans 9:14, 20-21.) They had a counterargument, however: God is the one who has given us our concept of justice through creation, conscience, and the revelation of His Word. If the doctrine of predestination seems to contradict our most fundamental ideas of justice and fairness, we should reexamine our theology. Perhaps the doctrine of unconditional election violates our God-given sense of fairness because it is based on a misinterpretation of Scripture.

Calvin struggled with this problem and concluded that predestination is a mystery. He even went so far as to call the decree of reprobation "an awful decree" (decretum horribile).1 He could not explain predestination to his

own satisfaction, or reconcile it with our perception of human freedom, but said we must affirm it because the Bible teaches it. That was his final answer to the various objections raised to his doctrine.

John Calvin

Law and Gospel

Calvin built on Zwingli's concept of the gospel as the continuation of the law of Moses. Instead of adopting Luther's emphasis on the radical disparity between the law and the gospel, Calvin emphasized continuity between the two and the logical progression from Old to New Testament.

He identified portions of the law as either ceremonial or moral. The ceremonial law, such as the animal sacrifices, is void. It has been fulfilled by Christ and abolished. There is no purpose in the ceremonial law today. The moral law of the Old Testament is still in effect, however. It was never abolished but is fully in force.

The first purpose of the moral law is to show us our sinfulness. Second, it restrains the wicked, helping to keep order in society. A third purpose for the law is to reveal the will of God to those who believe. In sum, the law shows the sinner that he is a sinner, acts as a restraint upon those who want to sin, and serves as a guide for those who want to live for God.

Christ has abolished the curse of the law, meaning the penalty of the law. He has abolished the ceremonial law, but not the moral law. The Old and New Testaments form a whole, with no conflict or contradiction between them. The Old Testament contains the promise, while the New Testament contains the fulfillment, but they are substantially the same. The moral law is continuous from the old covenant to the new.

As a result of this teaching, the Reformed movement placed more emphasis on ethics than the Lutherans did. In theory, both Luther and Calvin said that Christians should follow the moral law, but Luther focused on the

replacement of the law by faith while Calvin focused on the preservation of the moral law.

A characteristic of Calvinism, especially in the early stages, was to underscore the importance of morality, ethics, holiness of life, and strict discipline. Indeed, Calvin said the fundamental rule for Christian living is

self-denial. In our relationship to God, we should submit
to the will of God, seeking to do His will and not our own.
In relationship to others, we should not seek to please
ourselves but to serve them.

Jesus Christ

Calvin affirmed the deity and humanity of Jesus Christ
in the context of trinitarianism. Against Servetus he
championed the doctrine of Jesus Christ as the eternal
Son. He spoke of Jesus as prophet, priest, and king, using
these titles to identify and describe the ministry of Jesus.
Like the Council of Chalcedon, Calvin affirmed that
Jesus has two natures, human and divine, but is one person.
He stressed the importance of not confusing the two.
The two natures are not blended together in a way that
would eliminate their distinct attributes. For example, the
humanity of Christ does not prevent His Spirit from being
omnipresent. Even though Christ is God the Son incarnate,
God the Son is omnipresent. The humanity is not
omnipresent, but the deity is omnipresent. The humanity
does not limit the deity, and neither does the deity change
the humanity. The divine nature does not transfer its
attributes to the humanity; thus the physical body of
Christ is not omnipresent.

In this way, Calvin opposed Luther's teaching of the
physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Luther held

John Calvin

that, by virtue of His divine nature, Christ's physical body
can be many places at the same time. The humanity of
Christ so partakes of the deity that, although His body is
not actually omnipresent (everywhere present) like His
Spirit, the physical body can be distributed to many
places at once. Calvin rejected this doctrine as a confusion
of the two natures in Christ with their distinctive
properties.

Salvation

Calvin embraced the fundamental Protestant tenet of
justification by faith. He defined justification to mean that
God declares the sinner to be righteous. From that point
on, the justified Christian should show fruits of his justification.
Justification and regeneration occur simultaneously.
When God justifies a person, He also regenerates him,
causing him to be born again and giving him a new
nature. Now he has the power to do good works, and the
existence of good works is a test of whether a person
truly has been justified and regenerated.

The death of Jesus Christ makes salvation available.
Christ's death is a satisfaction, a sacrifice to satisfy the
demands of God's holy law, and it has purchased the salvation
of the elect. Salvation is applied to each individual
believer by the work of the Holy Spirit.
Salvation is imparted through faith. Faith includes
knowledge of God, agreement with God's truth, and trust
in God. In line with Calvin's doctrine of predestination, he
said faith is a gift God grants to the elect. It is not something
that humans choose to exercise, but it is something
that God chooses for us.

122

A History of Christian Doctrine

In sum, God first elected those He wanted to save.
Then Christ purchased their salvation by His death. Next
God imparts faith to those He has chosen. Finally,
through their faith, God declares them justified and the
Holy Spirit regenerates them.
From the Apostolic Pentecostal perspective, Calvin
was correct in teaching that the death of Christ, faith, and
the work of the Holy Spirit are all necessary to our salvation.
Since Calvin divorced these elements from the will
of the individual, he viewed them as operating only on a
theoretical level. Therefore, Calvin's view of faith is not
what it appears to be in Scripture or in personal experience,
namely, our positive response to God's grace.
Rather it is merely something that God demands and provides
at the same time. He imparts it automatically to
those He has elected to save.
The result is almost a mechanical system. God establishes
a plan whereby these various elements are necessary
and then He provides each of them. Humans are idle
spectators who cannot affect matters one way or another.
In Calvinism, the essential events of salvation occur outside
humans and without their involvement.

The Church

Calvin's doctrine of predestination greatly influenced
his doctrine of the church. He said there is the visible
church, or those who profess Christ, and the invisible
church, those who are truly elect. Not everyone who
makes a profession is elect, but the visible church gives
birth to the elect. The elect are in the visible church.
Calvin did not explicitly espouse the salvation of some
people outside the visible church, as Zwingli did,

123

John Calvin

although it is easy to take the doctrine of predestination in that direction.

How can we know if someone is truly one of the elect or not? We cannot know with absolute certainty, but we can look at the fruit in people's lives and see evidence of the saving grace of God at work in them.

We can identify marks of a true church. A true church will have the preaching of the Word of God and the administration of the sacraments, namely, water baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The personal holiness of the members is not necessarily a mark of the true church, however. The reason is that not everyone who is a member of the visible church is really one of the elect. If we observe sinners in the church, we may actually be looking at some who are reprobate. Moreover, even the elect are still sinners; they still commit sinful acts from time to time.

In short, we cannot judge a church by the actions of individuals, but we can judge it by whether it proclaims the gospel and administers the sacraments. If it does, then it is a true church. While not every member is one of the elect, we can expect that many people within that church are elect.

One might assume that the doctrines of justification and predestination as taught by Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin would result in great assurance of salvation, and for some this was undoubtedly so. They had confidence that they were saved no matter what happened and no matter what they did or did not do.

In practice, however, many wrestled with a dreadful doubt: How can I be sure that I am one of the elect? The only answer was to examine their actions and the motives

behind them. If a person attended church faithfully, participated in the sacraments, and sought to live according to God's will, then surely God's grace was working in His life. If he rejected these Christian disciplines, however, apparently he did not desire the things of God, which would indicate that God's saving grace was not at work in his life.

The result was a powerful motivation for people to live according to the teachings of the church, for only then could they convince themselves and others that they were part of the elect. Ironically, a doctrine that in theory completely eliminated any human response as part of salvation,

actually resulted in great emphasis on the need for godly living.

Unlike Luther, Calvin believed it was important to return to a more biblical pattern of church government and organization as well as doctrine. He concluded that the ideal structure as exemplified by the New Testament church was somewhere in between the hierarchical church government of the Catholics and the Lutherans on the one hand and the congregational church government found among the Anabaptists on the other hand. That is, there should be both ministerial and lay participation in the government of the church.

This concept led to the presbyterian form of church government, named from the Greek word presbuteros, meaning "elder." The Presbyterians, as the Reformed in Scotland became known, ordained ministers who served as pastors and preachers, and they also ordained lay members as elders. These lay elders had a permanent position not only in the local church but in the church at large.

125

John Calvin

Under the presbyterian system, the governing bodies of the organization are composed of ministers and elders from various churches. Decisions such as the placement of pastors and the discipline of members are not made exclusively by a clerical hierarchy or by a local congregation, but by representatives of both clergy and laity in the regional organization.

The Sacraments

Calvin recognized the two sacraments of Protestantism and again took a middle position between the Catholics and Lutherans on the one hand and the Zwinglians and Anabaptists on the other. In departing from the earlier teaching of Zwingli he made an original contribution to the Reformed movement, which largely adopted his views. Many Lutherans were also attracted to his position on the sacraments because it seemed more in line with Protestant thought, whereas Luther's understanding of the sacraments was almost Catholic.

Calvin defined the sacraments as outward signs. They are not the actual channels by which God bestows His saving grace, as the Catholics and Lutherans held. On the other hand, they are not merely symbols either, which is what Zwingli and the Anabaptists believed.

Instead, the sacraments are efficacious: they produce

results. Strictly speaking, they are not the means of salvation;
they do not justify or bestow grace. Nevertheless,
they are effective by the operation of the Holy Spirit.
Water Baptism and Spirit Baptism
Water baptism is for the remission of original sin
(guilt from Adam), past sin, and future sin. God uses this

126

A History of Christian Doctrine

means, but He is not limited to it. The blood of Christ
washes away sins at baptism, but even without baptism
the blood of Christ can still wash away someone's sins. In
short, Calvin held that baptism is necessary but not
essential:

We, too, acknowledge that the use of baptism is
necessary—that no one may omit it from either
neglect or contempt. In this way we by no means
make it free (optional). And not only do we strictly
bind the faithful to the observance of it, but we also
maintain that it is the ordinary instrument of God in
washing and renewing us: in short, in communicating
to us salvation. The only exception we make is that
the hand of God must not be tied down to the instrument.
He may of himself accomplish salvation. For
when an opportunity of baptism is wanting, the
promise of God alone is amply sufficient.2

This position acknowledges the importance of water
baptism far more than most Evangelicals do today. Calvin
did not reduce it to a mere symbol, but he was careful to
uphold the priority of faith and the sovereignty of God:

At whatever time we are baptized, we are washed
and purified once for the whole of life. . . . [Forgiveness]
at our first regeneration we receive by baptism
alone. . . . In baptism, the Lord promises forgiveness
of sins: receive it, and be secure. I have no intention,
however, to detract from the power of baptism. I
would only add to the sign the substance and reality
inasmuch as God works by external means. But from

127

John Calvin

this sacrament, as from all others, we gain nothing,
unless in so far as we receive in faith.3

Baptism is an "initiatory sign." It gives assurance of
forgiveness and the "knowledge and certainty" of regeneration
by the blood of Jesus. Baptism itself does not confer
grace, but the Lord "effectually performs what he
figures."4

Calvin strongly affirmed infant baptism, which fit well with his beliefs in original sin and salvation by predestination. He also said the validity of baptism does not depend on the personal holiness of the baptizer. Either immersion or sprinkling is acceptable. Calvin recognized that immersion was the original form in the New Testament, but he deferred to tradition, and Calvinists typically sprinkle.

Calvin also retained the traditional trinitarian formula. Unlike Luther and Zwingli, who acknowledged that the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, Calvin argued that "in the name of Jesus" merely refers to Christian baptism without specifying the formula. He denied that the disciples of John the Baptist at Ephesus were baptized in water a second time, saying the account in Acts 19 means only that they were baptized with the Holy Spirit.5

In discussing Acts 19, Calvin described the baptism of the Spirit as an experience accompanied by a miraculous sign: "The baptism of the Holy Spirit, in other words, the visible gifts of the Holy Spirit, were given by the laying on of hands."6 He believed, however, that the miraculous gifts of the Spirit ceased in ancient times and were no longer available:

It is notorious that the gifts of the Spirit, which were then given by the laying on of hands, some time after ceased to be conferred. . . . We therefore deny not that it [laying on of hands for confirmation] was a sacrament to the apostles, but we hold it to be one which was abrogated when the reality was taken away.7

The Lord's Supper

In Calvin's theology, the Lord's Supper is a visible sign of the union with Christ that comes through the Spirit. Even as baptism is the outward sign of the remission of sins, so the Lord's Supper is the outward sign of union with Christ. The actual union with Christ comes through faith by the work of the Holy Spirit, not through some mystical transformation of the elements of the Lord's Supper. Just as the blood of Christ washes away sins in baptism, so the Holy Spirit effects a union between Christ and the believer in the Eucharist.

This union is spiritual and not physical. The Lord's Supper is not merely a symbol or a remembrance, as the

Zwinglians and the Anabaptists taught, for it is a visible sign of a spiritual reality that is actually taking place at that time. On the other hand, Christ is not bodily present as the Catholics and the Lutherans taught, but the Spirit raises us up to the body of Christ. The Spirit joins us to Christ in the spiritual realm.

Church and State

In Calvin's view, God's divine authority is the basis of all law, including civil law. Ideally, then, the civil law should be patterned after divine concepts. Since the New

John Calvin

Testament does not have much to say about civil law, for the most part Calvin drew upon Old Testament patterns and principles.

In Geneva, Calvin instituted what almost amounted to a theocracy in which the church ruled through the state. As shown by the execution of Servetus, he was willing to use the power of the state to promote religious laws and doctrines, based on Old Testament precedent.

Calvin urged Christians to participate in government and if possible to mold society according to Christian principles. If they are not in control, they still must submit to the authority of the state. There is an exception, however: in the case of tyranny, Christians have a moral right to overthrow the government.

Christian Discipline

Calvin stressed the importance of godly living, including self-discipline, the work ethic, moderation, selfdenial, and the avoidance of ornaments and luxuries. His own personal life was simple. He wrote in the Institutes:

He who makes it his rule to use this world as if he used it not, not only cuts off all gluttony in regard to meat and drink, and all effeminacy, ambition, pride, excessive show, and austerity, in regard to his table, his house, and his clothes, but removes every care and affection which might withdraw or hinder him from aspiring to the heavenly life, and decks the soul with its true ornaments. . . . Let us remember by whom the account [of our stewardship] is to be taken—viz. by Him who while He so highly commends abstinence, sobriety, frugality, and moderation, abominates luxury,

A History of Christian Doctrine

pride, ostentation, and vanity; who approves of no administration but that which is combined with charity,

who with His own lips has already condemned all
those pleasures which withdraw the heart from chastity
and purity, or darken the intellect.8
Under Calvin, the government of Geneva passed and
enforced strict laws to regulate the lifestyle of all inhabitants
in accordance with his teachings. The following
quotes from historians cite specific examples:
Dancing, gambling, drunkenness, the frequentation
of taverns, profanity, luxury, excesses at public
entertainments, extravagance and immodesty in
dress, licentious or irreligious songs were forbidden,
and punished by censure or fine or imprisonment.
Even the number of dishes at meals was
regulated. . . . Reading of bad books and immoral
novels was also prohibited.9
Any manifestation of Catholicism—such as carrying
a rosary, cherishing a sacred relic, or observing a
saint's day as holy—was subject to punishment. Women
were imprisoned for wearing improper hats. . . . Consistory
[governing body of the church, composed of ministers
and lay leaders] and Council joined in the
prohibition of gambling, card-playing, profanity, drunkenness,
the frequenting of taverns, dancing, . . . indecent
or irreligious songs, excess in entertainment,
extravagance in living, immodesty in dress. The allowable
color and quantity of clothing, and the number of
dishes permissible at a meal, were specified by law.

131

John Calvin

Jewelry and lace were frowned upon. A woman was
jailed for arranging her hair to an immoral height.
Theatrical performances were limited to religious
plays, and then these too were forbidden.10
The renowned Swiss watchmaking industry got its
start in Geneva when jewelers had to find new ways of
making money after the Calvinists disapproved of the
wearing of ornaments. Bernardino Ochino, leader of a
Catholic monastic order who became a Protestant,
resided in Geneva for three years and described in glowing
terms what he saw:
The Holy Scriptures are constantly read and openly
discussed. . . . Every day there is a public service of
devotion. . . . Cursing and swearing, unchastity, sacrilege,
adultery, and impure living, such as prevail in
many places where I have lived, are unknown here.
There are no pimps and harlots. The people do not

know what rouge is, and they are all clad in a seemly fashion. Games of chance are not customary. Benevolence is so great that the poor need not beg. The people admonish each other in brotherly fashion.11

The Calvinists did not merely rely upon the power of persuasion and the Holy Spirit to instill holiness. Nor did they advocate freedom of religion. They employed torture, execution, and banishment to enforce their discipline. For example, from 1542 to 1546 in Geneva, there were fiftyeight judgments of death and seventy-six decrees of banishment. In 1558 and 1559, there were 414 cases of punishment meted out in a population of 20,000.12

132

A History of Christian Doctrine

Summary and Evaluation

The theology of John Calvin took the Reformation further than the positions of Martin Luther, but not as far as the Anabaptists sought to go. On several important issues, such as the sacraments and church government, Calvin stood between the Lutherans and the Anabaptists. He embraced the school of thought established by Ulrich Zwingli but differed from him on a number of points. In these areas Calvin's views generally prevailed in the Reformed movement and nudged it a little closer to Lutheranism.

In contrast to Luther, Calvin placed greater emphasis on the kind of life a Christian should lead. As a result, there were significant differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed in lifestyle, with the early Calvinists insisting to greater degree on certain principles of holiness. There was also a contrast regarding church government. Luther felt that church government is irrelevant or of minor consideration as long as the gospel is preached. The church is free to follow tradition or to use whatever structure is best under the circumstances. Calvin said it is important to restore biblical church organization as much as we can ascertain it from the Scriptures.

In some ways, Calvin did not go as far as later Calvinists. Calvinism today is commonly associated with two doctrines that Calvin taught but did not emphasize or develop as much as his followers did. Those doctrines are predestination, which he held in common with Luther and Zwingli, and the presbyterian form of government. In his treatment of these subjects, Calvin stood between Luther and the later Calvinists.

133

John Calvin

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of John Calvin for the Protestant Reformation. He is just a step behind Martin Luther in historical significance. He, more than anyone else, defined and systematized Reformed theology, which is a major branch of Protestantism to this day, and he influenced the entire Protestant Reformation. The Reformed churches (originating in continental Europe), the Presbyterians (originating in Scotland), the Puritans and their successors in the Church of England, and many Evangelicals today trace their theological roots to John Calvin.

Calvin's influence on Western civilization is likewise great. Historians credit much of the political, economic, and technological success of Western Europe and North America to Protestant virtues, especially those championed by Calvin such as the work ethic, self-discipline, moderation, thrift, and honesty.

Despite the many admirable qualities of Calvin's doctrine and lifestyle, from an Apostolic Pentecostal perspective one cannot help but view his grand theological system with some sense of loss. The strict logic and rigid structure seem to close off avenues of the Spirit and alternative understandings of Scripture. Calvin appears to have been less open than Luther or Zwingli to the simple yet nontraditional message of Scripture (e.g., his failure to see that the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus), and he rejected important insights from the Radical Reformation.

He did much to solidify and perpetuate the doctrine of predestination, which undermines true biblical faith. Most significant from the Apostolic point of view, Calvin slammed the door shut to further restoration of scriptural

134

A History of Christian Doctrine

truths such as the oneness of God, baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the gifts of the Spirit.

135

John Calvin

The fourth major branch of Protestantism to emerge in the sixteenth century was the Church of England. Adherents are known as Anglicans; in America they are called Episcopalians. The latter term refers to the hierarchical form of church government, in which bishops

(Greek, episkopos) lead the church.

In fourteenth-century England, John Wyclif (1330-84) was an important forerunner of the Reformation, preaching many doctrines later associated with the Protestants. He opposed the papacy, transubstantiation, penance, and the sale of indulgences. He and his associates were the first to translate the complete Bible into English. His followers, known as the Lollards, were severely persecuted and suppressed.

The Reformation in Great Britain

7

Shortly after Martin Luther took his stand against Rome, a number of Englishmen began to embrace the Reformation. One of them, William Tyndale (1494-1536), was the first to translate the New Testament directly from Greek to English and the first to print a portion of the Bible in English. He also translated much of the Old Testament, but before he could complete his work he was martyred by strangulation. Most of the King James Version is based on his efforts.

Henry VIII and the Church of England

No single great theologian like Luther or Zwingli served as a catalyst for the English Reformation. The person who precipitated the break with Rome was King Henry VIII, a most unlikely figure, for he had vigorously denounced Luther as a heretic and in return had received from the pope the title of "Defender of the Faith." The factors behind the breach were personal and political.

For economic and diplomatic reasons, as a teenager and heir to the throne Henry VIII was espoused to Catherine of Aragon, daughter of the Spanish monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella. Because Catherine was the widow of Henry's older brother, Catholic law prohibited such a union with Henry, based on an interpretation of the Old Testament teaching against incest. In order to overcome this obstacle, Henry VIII's father, Henry VII, obtained from Pope Julius II a papal dispensation, which was a special exception granted by virtue of the pope's authority as head of the church and vicar of Christ.

Unfortunately, Catherine never produced the male heir that Henry VIII desired. He eventually tired of her, became enamored of Anne Boleyn, and decided to end his

A History of Christian Doctrine

marriage with Catherine so that he could marry Anne. Since Catholic law did not allow divorce, Henry asked Pope Clement VII for an annulment, a statement that the marriage was invalid from the start. His reason was that the marriage violated the laws against incest and that even the pope did not have the authority to set aside such a grave impediment.

It was an audacious maneuver to disavow the dispensation he had previously sought and acted upon, but as the powerful king of an influential nation, Henry expected the pope to accommodate his desires as well as help ensure the future stability of the English throne. The wishes of an even more influential monarch were also involved, however: Catherine was the aunt of Charles V, the Holy Roman emperor. Charles was both a defender of Catholicism against the Protestants and a serious political rival to the pope. At the time of Henry's request, Pope Clement was actually a military captive of Charles, who sacked Rome. Clement desperately needed his support and could not afford to displease him. Moreover, granting Henry's request would undermine the institution of marriage as well as the validity of papal dispensations.

When the pope refused to annul the marriage, Henry took a series of steps that overturned Rome's authority in his realm. In 1531, he had the English clergy to declare him the head of the church in England. In 1532, with papal approval he appointed Thomas Cranmer as archbishop of Canterbury, England's highest ecclesiastical office. Cranmer served as chaplain to the Boleyn household and was sympathetic to Henry's wishes.

In 1533, Henry secretly married Anne Boleyn, and

139

The Reformation in Great Britain

under his direction Parliament declared that the English church could decide its own marital cases without need of papal dispensations or rulings. Henry's case was referred to the archbishop of Canterbury. Cranmer annulled Henry's union with Catherine and pronounced his marriage to Anne to be valid.

In 1534 Parliament declared the king to be the supreme head of the Church of England, formally separating from Rome. Prominent Catholics who opposed this move, including former chancellor of the realm Thomas More, were executed. Soon Henry dissolved the monasteries, which were important centers of wealth and power and whose monks took orders directly from Rome. He

transferred the bulk of the assets of the monasteries to the crown and royal favorites.

Henry's goal was the consolidation of political and ecclesiastical power under himself; he was not interested in reforming the practices and doctrines of the church. He sought to operate the church as always, substituting his authority for that of the pope.

At first, then, England was Protestant in name but essentially Catholic in practice and doctrine. Even after the Church of England became definitely Protestant in theology, some members, called Anglo-Catholics, remained close to Catholicism with regard to liturgy, tradition, and the role of the sacraments. Typically they regarded the Roman Catholic Church as a true church but believed the Church of England to be more pure or at least the rightful authority in England. Over the years, a number of prominent persons from this camp rejoined the Roman Catholic Church, but many remain in the Church of England today.

140

A History of Christian Doctrine

Developments after Henry VIII

As long as Henry VIII ruled, the Church of England did not undergo much theological change. Gradually, however, Protestant doctrines gained ascendancy, particularly under Henry's successor, Edward VI, his son by the third of his six wives (Jane Seymour). During the reign of this young king, the Book of Common Prayer was published, drafted by Cranmer in 1549. It became the standard for English liturgy and is still used in one form or another by many English-speaking Protestants. One example of its use is in the traditional wedding ceremony. Another is the Lord's Prayer, which is usually recited according to the Book of Common Prayer ("Forgive us our trespasses") instead of the King James Version ("Forgive us our debts").

Also during Edward's reign and under his authority, the Forty-two Articles of Religion were issued (1553). Largely the work of Cranmer, they set forth the doctrines of the Church of England, charting a Protestant course. When Edward died as a teenager, Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine, ascended the throne. A devout Catholic who resented the ecclesiastical maneuvering that cast aside her mother, she attempted to reconvert England to Roman Catholicism. Much persecution ensued, and the queen became known as Bloody Mary

because of her use of torture and execution against Protestants. Among those burned at the stake was Thomas Cranmer. By this time, however, nationalistic sentiment and Protestant theology were entrenched too strongly for Mary to succeed.

Mary was followed by Elizabeth I, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, and a Protestant. In her day, the

Church of England was firmly established as Protestant. In 1571 Elizabeth promulgated the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, a modification of the earlier Forty-two Articles.

Anglican Doctrine

The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, still largely based on the work of Cranmer, became the fundamental position of the Church of England. While retaining some Catholic elements, overall these articles embraced a moderate form of Calvinism. They crystallized Anglican theology and defined the Church of England as a Protestant body.

The Thirty-nine Articles emphasized the supreme authority of Scripture, as did the rest of the Protestant movement. The Anglicans maintained a close tie to their Catholic heritage, however, by affirming the value of tradition. They did not go so far as to say tradition and Scripture are equal in authority, which is what the Catholic Church held, but they adhered to tradition as much as possible. Like Luther, they sought to retain all tradition unless it conflicted directly with Scripture. Moreover, they held that where Scripture is silent the church has authority to establish a binding tradition.

For example, they said the church has the authority to develop liturgy (traditional forms of worship), and no one has the right to change them on his own. Since the Scriptures do not prescribe a certain order for service, the authority to do so rests with the church.

Once the church has exercised its authority in this way, each individual believer and each local church must conform. If change is to come, it must come by the

church as a whole. The emphasis is on corporate tradition more than the conscience and freedom of the individual.

For the most part, the Church of England remained quite liturgical, like the Catholics and Lutherans. Those who emphasized traditional rituals became known as

"high church," while those who adopted a more evangelical style of worship became known as "low church."

The Anglicans adopted the central tenet of Protestantism, namely, justification by faith alone. Despite the strong Anglo-Catholic element, this fact clearly identified them as Protestants, as did their rejection of papal supremacy and their retention of only two sacraments (baptism and the Lord's Supper).

In the process of establishing their Protestant identity, the Anglicans adopted much of the theology of John Calvin. For example, they embraced his spiritualistic conception of the sacraments. They also adopted his distinction between the visible and the invisible church, using it to explain how sin could exist in the church. That is, notorious sinners may be part of the visible church but not the invisible church (those who are saved).

The Anglicans tended to identify the Church of England as the one, true, visible church of God in England. As dissenting groups arose to advance the English Reformation further than the Anglicans were willing to go, the Anglicans tried to destroy them.

John Knox and the Presbyterians

In Scotland, John Knox became the outstanding Protestant leader. He fled to Geneva to avoid Catholic persecution, and there he became a devoted disciple of Calvin. He returned to Scotland in 1559, whereupon his

143

The Reformation in Great Britain

preaching became an important factor in swaying the nation to Protestantism. In 1560, the Scottish Parliament officially adopted Protestant articles of faith written by Knox and others, and banned the Catholic mass.

Under Knox's influence, the Church of Scotland became strongly Calvinistic in doctrine and presbyterian in government; its adherents became known as Presbyterians. Many Scots emigrated to Northern Ireland and later to the United States, establishing strong Presbyterian churches in these nations.

The Puritans

From the beginning of the English Reformation, a number of people believed that the Reformation was not going far enough within the Church of England. They regarded the Roman Catholic Church as apostate and wanted to divest the Church of England of all Catholic elements. Over the years the ranks of dissenters grew, and most of them embraced strict Calvinism. Instead of the

episcopal government of the Church of England, they favored the presbyterian form. Because of their demand that the church purify itself in accordance with New Testament practices and doctrines, they became known as Puritans.

When King James VI of Scotland also became King James I of England, the Puritans believed their time had come, for James had been reared as a Presbyterian and shared their Calvinistic theology. They presented him with a petition asking for changes within the church. James favored episcopal church government, however, because he believed it supported the authority of the king while other forms would undermine that authority. He

granted only one of the Puritans' requests: the production of a new English translation of the Bible in 1611, which became known as the Authorized, or King James, Version.

Under James's son and successor, Charles I, an intense political struggle ensued between king and Parliament. The nobles and traditional, episcopalian Anglicans supported the king, while the urban middle class, some of the rural gentry, the Puritans, and the more radical Protestants supported Parliament. Soon the conflict erupted into open warfare.

During this time, Parliament convened the Westminster Assembly, composed mostly of Puritans, to advise it on religious matters. In 1646, the assembly adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith along with longer and shorter catechisms. These documents were formally adopted by the Church of Scotland and became defining statements of Presbyterianism. Solidly Calvinistic, the Westminster Confession features some elements, such as covenant theology, that are more characteristic of later Calvinism than the teachings of John Calvin himself. (See chapter 10.)

After a long civil war, King Charles was defeated and executed in 1649. The victorious Parliamentary army established a commonwealth with Oliver Cromwell, its general, as lord protector. He became a virtual dictator. Following Puritan principles, Cromwell sought to reform the morals of the country, purify the Church of England, and dismantle the episcopal form of government in favor of the presbyterian and congregational forms. At the same time, he allowed greater religious freedom for various dissenting groups than ever before.

A prominent Puritan pastor and author during this

time was Richard Baxter. Another famous Puritan was John Milton (1608-74), poet and author of Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained, and other well-known works. The Puritans stressed personal faith, repentance, and conversion. Like the Calvinists in Geneva, the Puritans sought to live a godly life both inwardly and outwardly: Their clothing was modest, somber, and unadorned; their speech was grave and slow. They were expected to abstain from all profane amusements and sensual pleasure. The theaters, which had been closed in 1642 because of war, remained closed till 1656 because of Puritan condemnation. Horse races, cockfights, wrestling matches, bear or bull baiting, were forbidden.[1] They even rejected wedding rings, saying they were a Catholic custom.[2]

The intentions of the Puritans were good, and their emphasis upon holiness of life was commendable, but they went too far in attempting to enforce personal morality upon secular society. Like earlier Calvinists but unlike the Anabaptists, they used the state's power to impose their views and way of life upon unbelievers. Ultimately this experiment in legislated morality ended in failure, for holiness can never be established by the dictates of the law but only by personal regeneration. The English people as a whole rejected Puritanism, and after the death of Cromwell the monarchy was restored under Charles II.

Even after they lost power over church and state, some Puritans still remained in the Church of England.

Their successors constitute an evangelical wing that exists today.

Separatists and Congregationalists

Early on, some Puritans concluded that it would be impossible to purify the Church of England and began to separate themselves from the organized church. They became known as Separatists or Independents. Like the Anabaptists, the Separatists believed that the church consists only of believers and that each local assembly should govern itself. Unlike the Anabaptists, however, they retained infant baptism.

Among such people there arose a "prophecy movement" in the 1500s. This group emphasized the moving of God's Spirit, and many spoke in tongues.3

The earliest attempt to establish an independent congregational church in England occurred under the leadership of Robert Browne in Norwich in 1580. It ultimately ended in failure, with Browne returning to the Church of England. Nevertheless, similarly minded people eventually gave rise to the movement known as Congregationalism after its advocacy of the congregational form of church government. The most influential of the Puritan Independents was John Owen (1616-83), an advisor to Cromwell.

Fleeing persecution, many Separatists emigrated to Holland, and from there some went to North America. The Pilgrims who founded Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1620 were Separatists. Soon many Puritans from England settled in the area also, and Separatists and Puritans joined to form New England Congregationalism. In the twentieth century these Congregationalists merged with

several other groups to form the United Church of Christ.

The Baptists

Among the Separatists, some people began to reexamine the doctrine of baptism and to conclude that baptism is for believers only. This was particularly true of an independent group led by John Smyth that met in the London area but relocated to the Netherlands. They concluded that they had not been baptized properly and that, due to erroneous beliefs on the subject, no one else was qualified to baptize them. Thus, in late 1608 or early 1609, Smyth baptized himself and about forty adults, beginning the Baptist movement.

Soon Smyth became better acquainted with the Mennonites in Holland, decided that their baptism was legitimate, and sought to join forces with them. (He died before his group actually did so.) Some of his followers, however, rejected this move, and in 1611 their leader, Thomas Helwys, published the first English Baptist confession of faith. This group soon returned to England and founded the Baptist movement there.

In many ways the Baptists held beliefs similar to those of the Anabaptists, but there was no direct historical succession. It appears that the early Baptists were influenced by Anabaptists in both England and Holland,

but for the most part they arrived at their beliefs by an independent study of Scripture. They were not converted to organized Anabaptism but emerged from an Anglican, Puritan, Separatist background to form their own distinct movement.

The central tenet of the Baptists was that the church is a community of believers. It is joined by personal

148

A History of Christian Doctrine

choice, and it should only accept those who show evidence of regeneration.

To them, water baptism is a public confession of faith and the means of visibly joining the local church. Thus they rejected infant baptism and practiced baptism for believers only. They further insisted that only immersion, not sprinkling (aspersion) or pouring (effusion), is the scriptural mode.

To some extent, however, the name Baptist is a misnomer, for they did not believe that baptism is necessary for salvation. According to them, it is not part of, but subsequent to, conversion. John Smyth's Short Confession of Faith in XX Articles (1609) states that baptism is merely "the external sign of the remission of sins."4 Nevertheless, if someone from another church wished to join them, he had to be baptized by them. And indeed, some Baptists did teach the necessity of baptism; according to one seventeenth-century report, "Daniel Roberts, teacher to the Baptists at Reading, in Berkshire, did affirm, 'That baptism of water, that is to say elementary water, doth wash away sin.'"5

Other important beliefs of the Baptists were the necessity of basing all doctrine and practice on Scripture alone, the congregational form of church government, separation of church and state, and freedom of conscience. They held that the local church has the right to call out and ordain its own ministers. Soon they began to emphasize the responsibility of the church to send out missionaries.

The earliest Baptists, including Smyth and Helwys, did not accept the Calvinistic system of predestination that generally characterized the Puritans and Separatists

149

The Reformation in Great Britain

from which they developed. For instance, John Smyth and his followers taught that people do not inherit guilt from Adam and that infants who die are saved.6 From about

1630 to 1640, however, other Baptists emerged who did adhere to Calvinism.

The non-Calvinistic (Arminian) Baptists became known as General Baptists because they held that Christ died for everyone, while the Calvinists were called Particular Baptists because they restricted the Atonement to the predestined elect. These groups remained separated until the nineteenth century.

Today, both views are represented within the ranks of Baptists. The vast majority agree on one aspect of Calvin's system, however: the perseverance of the saints, or unconditional eternal security, popularly known as "once saved always saved." A minority who think that a believer can lose his salvation through unbelief and disobedience are called Freewill Baptists. (See chapter 10 for further discussion of Calvinism versus Arminianism.)

The early Baptists were trinitarian and baptized with the trinitarian formula. As they studied the Scriptures, however, some of them questioned traditional trinitarian theology, and some began to baptize in the name of Jesus Christ. For instance, Propositions and Conclusions concerning True Christian Religion, written by John Smyth and his followers at Amsterdam in 1612-14, shows evidence of dissatisfaction with traditional trinitarian terms and concepts and expresses views that could easily be understood as modalistic:

God is one in number. . . . These terms, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, do not teach God's substance,

but only the hinder parts of God: that which may be known of God. . . . God [is] manifested in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[7]

The Somerset Confession, printed at London in 1656, was "the earliest important effort at bringing Particular and General Baptists into agreement and union." It does not even attempt to define God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit but simply says, "We believe that there is but one God" and "We believe that Jesus Christ is truly God." Moreover, it expresses acceptance of, and perhaps a preference for, the Jesus Name baptismal formula:

It is the duty of every man and woman, that have repented from dead works, and have faith towards God, to be baptized (Acts 2:38; 8:12, 37, 38), that is, dipped or buried under the water (Rom. 6:3, 4; Col. 2:12), in the name of our Lord Jesus (Acts 8:16), or in

the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt.
28:19).8
The 1660 Standard Confession of the General Baptists,
formally titled A Brief Confession or Declaration of
Faith, discusses the Godhead and water baptism in similar
terms. In separate articles it proclaims faith in "one God
the Father," "one Lord Jesus Christ," and "one holy Spirit,
the precious gift of God." Then it quotes I John 5:7, which
ends, "These three are one." Significantly, no distinctively
trinitarian language appears:
Early in the history of General Baptists, individual
leaders raised questions concerning the doctrines of

151

The Reformation in Great Britain

the Trinity. . . . Their biblicism led some to reject the
term Trinity as noncanonical. . . . The ambiguity of the
Confession of 1660 has been regarded as evidence of
some uncertainty on the subject of the Trinity.9
This confession says that before people can be recognized
as ministers they must first "repent of their sins,
believe on the Lord Jesus, and [be] Baptized in his name
for the remission of Sins." It then provides the following
instruction for baptism:
Baptise (that is in English to Dip) in the name of
the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, or in the name of the
Lord Jesus Christ; such only of them, as profess
repentance towards God, and faith towards our
Lord Jesus Christ, Acts 2:38. Acts 8:12. Acts 18:8.10
Later Baptist confessions omit baptism in the name
of Jesus and begin speaking of the "Trinity," indicating
that tradition finally won the day. Even near the end of
the eighteenth century, however, we still find Baptists
who baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Robert Robinson
(1735-90), a prominent English Baptist, noted that
Acts makes no mention of the Father, Son, and Holy
Ghost in connection with water baptism but only the
name of "Jesus Christ" and further commented sympathetically:
Many Christians taking it for granted, that the
apostles thoroughly understood the words of the Lord
Jesus, and supposing the form of words of local and
temporary use, administer baptism in the name of

152

A History of Christian Doctrine

Christ, and think themselves justified by the book of
the Acts of the Apostles.11
Thomas Weisser has documented that in the seventeenth

century many Baptists, including Francis Cornwell, baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ and many held a modalistic concept of God (three manifestations or offices rather than persons).12 Weisser has also found evidence of Baptists in America, including Daniel Hibbard, who baptized in Jesus' name in the late 1700s and early 1800s.13 Interestingly, Francis Cornwell called Acts 2:38 the "everlasting Gospel" and Christ's "Gospel-Commandment." He further stated that when the twelve disciples at Ephesus in Acts 19 spoke in tongues and prophesied, they received the promise of Acts 2:38, "the gifts of his holy Spirit, and "gifts meet for the ministery."14 Baptists typically regarded the miraculous gifts of the Spirit as having ceased. Propositions and Conclusions (1612-14) puts the miraculous Spirit baptism in the past only:

The outward gifts of the spirit which the Holy Ghost poureth forth, upon the Day of Pentecost upon the disciples, in tongues and prophecy, and gifts, and healing, and miracles, which is called the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire (Acts 1:5), were only a figure of and an hand leading to better things, even the most proper gifts of the spirit of sanctification, which is the new creation; which is the one baptism.15

A few confessions indicate, however, that people should seek a definite experience of the Holy Spirit. The

153

The Reformation in Great Britain

True Gospel-Faith (London, 1654) says, "God gives his Spirit to believers dipped through the prayer of faith and laying on of hands."16 It also cites several references in Acts to Jesus Name baptism but never mentions the trinitarian formula. The Standard Confession admonishes baptized believers to go on to receive the Holy Spirit and then live a holy life:

It is the duty of all such who are believers Baptized, to draw nigh unto God in submission to that principle of Christ's Doctrine, to wit, Prayer and Laying on of Hands, that they may receive the promise of the holy Spirit. . . . Unless men so professing, and practicing the forme and order of Christ's Doctrine, shall also beautifie the same with a holy and wise conversation, in all godliness and honesty; the profession of the visible form will be rendered to them of no effect; for without holiness no man shall see the Lord.17

Much like the Puritans, Baptists began to emigrate to the New World in search of freedom of religion. Unfortunately they found that the Puritans in Massachusetts established freedom for themselves but no one else. To remedy the situation, Roger Williams, who helped begin the first Baptist church in America in 1639, founded the colony of Rhode Island, which granted freedom of conscience to all.

In 1678 a jailed Baptist preacher in England wrote the most popular English book of all time aside from the Bible. It was Pilgrim's Progress by John Bunyan (1628-88).

154

A History of Christian Doctrine

George Fox and the Quakers

In the seventeenth-century, another important group arose out of the English Reformation: the Society of Friends, popularly known as the Quakers. George Fox (1624-91) founded it in 1652. He taught that each Christian could have a personal experience with God and receive an inward direction or guide from Him, which he called "the Inner Light." At the same time, he sought to base all teaching on Scripture alone.

At a typical Quaker meeting, there was no preacher or leader. The people would all sit down, pray, meditate, and wait for the leading of God's Spirit. Anyone who felt inspired could preach a message, read a passage of Scripture, or share a testimony.

In the early days, the Spirit of God often moved in their midst. Many of them literally trembled under the power of God; hence the nickname Quakers. A number of them received the Holy Spirit with the sign of speaking in tongues.18 In his Book of Miracles, Fox recorded miraculous healings among them and even some instances of the dead being raised.

Much like the Anabaptists, Fox proclaimed the life of holiness, particularly stressing honesty, simplicity, and humility. He taught that Christians can live victoriously over sin. Following him, the Quakers were plain of speech, refused to wear jewelry or wigs, were pacifists, and refused to take oaths. They emphasized the equality of everyone and especially sought to help the downtrodden. Fox advocated absolute democracy, proper care of the mentally handicapped, just treatment of American Indians, and the equality of men and women.

To express their strong belief that everyone should be

treated equally, the Quakers always addressed people by
the second person singular pronouns thou and thee. In
the English language of the day, these forms were considered
appropriate only for social equals or inferiors. It was
necessary to address someone of a higher social class by
the plural pronouns you and ye. The Quakers refused to
use these and other formal terms to pay homage to someone's
class or position.

William Penn, an important Quaker leader, founded
the colony of Pennsylvania (the name means "Penn's
Woods") as a refuge for Quakers and other groups. In The
Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers, he
identified some of the key characteristics of the Quakers
as loving one another, loving enemies, refusing to fight,
speaking truth with no oaths, refusing to pay tithes to
support the state church, not respecting persons, and
using plain speech. He emphasized the need of conversion,
regeneration, and holiness.19

In No Cross, No Crown he wrote against luxuries,
gluttony, fine clothing, worldly pleasures, jewelry, worldly
books, makeup, and worldly plays, and instead he advocated
self-denial, temperance, and moderation. He stated,
"No pain, no palm; no thorns, no throne; no gall, no
glory; no cross, no crown."20

The Quakers considered water baptism and the
Lord's Supper to be spiritual in nature. They did not
practice either sacrament literally, holding that these ceremonies
in the Bible simply teach us to receive spiritual
cleansing and to practice spiritual communion among
believers.

Taking their cue from Scripture, the early Quaker
leaders refused to speak of God as a trinity or as three

persons. Instead, they emphasized that God is one and
that Jesus Christ is God manifested in the flesh. George
Fox taught that the Father, Christ, and the Holy Spirit
were not distinct from eternity but that Christ is in the
Father and the Father in Him. Moreover, the Spirit proceeds
from the Father and Son. He further explained:

As for the word trinity, and three persons, we have
not read it in the Bible, but in the common prayer
book, or mass book, which the pope was the author
of. But as for unity we own it, and Christ being the

brightness of the Father's glory, and the express
image of his substance (of the Father) we own; that
which agrees with the Scriptures.21
In England, William Penn "found himself a prisoner in
the Tower of London for denying the Trinity. . . . To be
freed from the Tower, Penn had to show that he did not
deny Christ's divinity but only his distinction from God
the Father."22 In defense of the Quakers on this issue, Penn
affirmed the deity, humanity, and atoning work of Christ
and explained:
[Quakers] believe in the holy three, or Trinity of
Father, Word, and Spirit, according to Scripture. And
that these three are truly and properly one; of one
nature as well as will. But they are very tender of quitting
Scripture terms and phrases, for schoolmen's
such as distinct and separate persons and subsistences,
etc. are; from whence people are apt to entertain
gross ideas and notions of the Father, Son, and
Holy Ghost.23
157
The Reformation in Great Britain
Thomas Weisser has reproduced statements of early
Quaker leaders, including Penn, Francis Howgill, and
George Whitehead, in which they clearly affirmed that
Jesus is God and that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are
simply one God and not three persons.24
In later times, the Quakers became more traditionally
Protestant in doctrine and more formal in experience.
Some today are evangelical, while many have become
quite liberal.
Ann Lee (1736-81), founder of a small group known
as the Shakers, was deeply influenced by the Quakers.
She advocated purity of life, enthusiastic worship, healing,
and tongues, but she went to extremes by teaching
communal living and celibacy and claiming to be the second
coming of Christ. She emigrated to America in 1774
with a few followers, and they established communes, but
after her death the movement became formal and withered
away.
Summary and Evaluation
To a great extent, the English Reformation recapitulated
the progress and division of the Continental Reformation,
yet with its own unique characteristics. The highchurch
Anglicans resembled the Lutherans, the Puritans
were strict Calvinists, and the Baptists and Quakers were
remarkably similar to the Anabaptists. This rich and

diverse theological heritage was in turn transmitted to America.

Among the groups that emphasized a return to simple biblicism, particularly the Separatists, Baptists, and Quakers, we find evidence that God sought to restore the scriptural truths of the oneness of God, water baptism by

158

A History of Christian Doctrine

immersion in Jesus' name, the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and holiness of life. Many Baptists baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, but relatively few were baptized with the Holy Spirit. Many Quakers were filled with the Spirit, but they did not practice water baptism. Some people in both groups grasped the truths of the deity of Christ and oneness of God.

Clearly, the hand of God was at work, and probably at least a few people received the full Acts 2:38 experience. As far as the Apostolic message is concerned, however, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Great Britain were a time of preparation for a greater work of God yet to come.

159

The Reformation in Great Britain

The Roman Catholic Church did not remain static during the Protestant Reformation; it continued to develop and it formulated a vigorous response. The changes it underwent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are often called the Catholic Reformation, or sometimes the Counter Reformation.

While to some extent the Catholic Reformation was a reaction to the Protestant Reformation, it was more than that. Not only did the Catholics try to defend and solidify doctrines that were under attack, but they also sought to reform morals and practices to conform to stated Catholic ideals.

As Catholic historians and theologians today acknowledge, there were numerous abuses and moral failures in

161

The Catholic
Reformation
8

the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages.1 While asserting that the fundamental Catholic doctrine was correct, they admit that many leaders committed wrongs and that the system was often corrupt.

Before the Reformation began, the Catholic humanists, the foremost of whom was Erasmus, were already questioning certain doctrines and practices and proposing ethical reforms. While not directly promoting new doctrines, they felt free to depart from both tradition and the literal meaning of Scripture. They promoted the "philosophy of Christ," and believed that the Logos (Word) spoke through ancient pagan philosophers. Erasmus even spoke of "St. Socrates."

The Reformation made moderation impossible for the humanists, forcing them to choose sides. They remained with the Catholic Church and affirmed many doctrines they had previously questioned or rejected.

In addition, some Catholic leaders sought to reform the system without altering doctrine. A notable example was Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros in Spain. When the Protestant Reformation came, the immediate reaction of the pope and hierarchy was to resist. Several theologians assumed the task of refuting Protestant leaders, both in oral debate and in written rebuttals. John Eck (1486-1543) was a prominent professor who personally debated Luther and Carlstadt. He later wrote against Melanchthon (Luther's younger colleague) as well as the Reformed leaders Zwingli and Bucer. Nevertheless, the Protestant Reformation provoked serious thinking about reform even among many who remained loyal to the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Reformation was characterized by two

162

A History of Christian Doctrine

key elements: theological scholarship and repression of dissent. Learned men arose to articulate the Catholic position, develop well-reasoned defenses, and correct inconsistencies and abuses. People who deviated from traditional orthodoxy, however, were not allowed to remain in the church. If they wanted to reform the church, they had to do so from within, in submission to its doctrines and leadership.

The Trial of Galileo

A notable example of the repression of dissent occurred with the trial of Galileo Galilei. Galileo was a noted scientist and astronomer who made effective use of a new invention, the telescope, in his research. Following the theory of Copernicus and based on his own astronomical observations, he concluded that the earth revolved around the sun rather than vice versa. In 1616 the Roman

Catholic Church labeled this view as heresy because of passages of Scripture that speak about the rising of the sun and about the sun standing still in Joshua's day. Catholic theologians interpreted these statements as references to astronomy when, in actuality, they simply use the language of phenomena. That is, they describe reality not in scientific terms but in the way it appears to the human eye. Even today, we typically speak of the sun rising and setting although we know the sun does not literally revolve around the earth.

The Catholic hierarchy, however, concluded that Galileo's scientific discoveries contradicted Scripture and therefore were heresy. In 1633 he was forced to recant his beliefs and cease teaching them, although he still believed them.

163

The Catholic Reformation

As Galileo's case shows, the Catholic hierarchy insisted that everyone conform strictly to official church dogma and interpretation. They did not allow dissent even in matters of science, much less theology. No doubt they felt this stance was necessary to maintain Catholic identity under the intense pressure of the Protestant Reformation.

The Dominicans

The Dominicans, an order of teaching and preaching monks founded in 1220, dominated Catholic theology in the early sixteenth century. They based their views largely on Thomas Aquinas, the foremost theologian of the Middle Ages and a Dominican.

An important Dominican theologian was Thomas de Vio Cajetan (1468-1534). He met with Luther at Augsburg in an unsuccessful attempt to resolve his protests. He wrote a series of influential commentaries on the Bible and on Thomas Aquinas, and he advocated the literal method of interpreting Scripture.

Francisco de Vitoria (1492-1546), another significant Dominican, did theology by commenting on Thomas Aquinas. He analyzed Spain's conquest of the New World. Spain was a leading world power and a stronghold of Catholicism. Spanish conquistadors overthrew the mighty Inca and Aztec empires, brutally massacring thousands of Indians and conquering much of what is now Latin America. They forced many of the native inhabitants to convert to Christianity on pain of death, and Catholic priests accompanied them as missionaries.

Many people justified the conquest of the New World
on the basis that the inhabitants were heathens and sav-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ages. Since they had sinned grossly against God by practices
such as human sacrifice, it was only right that they
be destroyed. Moreover, the Catholics were doing them a
great favor by bringing Christianity to them. While identifying
some reasons that could justify conquest in certain
cases, de Vitoria rejected most of the popular rationales
and in the process helped lay foundations for international
law.

The last great Dominican theologian of the age was
Domingo Báñez (1528-1604). He asserted that the
authority of church tradition was superior to that of
Scripture.

The Society of Jesus

Soon the Dominicans had to share their leading role
with a new order of monks called the Society of Jesus, or
the Jesuits, with whom they developed a strong rivalry.
The founder was Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), a
Basque priest from Spain who had dreams, visions,
trances, and ecstatic experiences. In one vision he
claimed to see God the Father and God the Son; in others
he perceived the trinity in a symbolic form.

Pope Paul III officially approved the Society of Jesus
in 1540. It had three goals: reform the church, especially
by education; fight heresy, especially Protestantism; and
preach the gospel to pagans. The members took a special
vow of obedience to the pope. They considered themselves
soldiers of God, and their leader was called a general.
They were to obey him and "reverence him, as is
befitting, as they would Christ, if He were present in person."
2 Ignatius insisted on such loyalty to the church that
he wrote, "To make quite sure of our orthodoxy, if the

The Catholic Reformation

hierarchical church pronounces to be black that which
appears to be white, we ought to hold it to be black."3
The Jesuits were not accountable to the church hierarchy
but reported directly to the pope. They became his
personal army for obtaining important information and
for maintaining control outside the regular chain of command.
The Jesuits soon developed into a powerful and
effective tool of the pope for reforming the church and
opposing the Protestants.

The Society of Jesus was extremely well organized and well disciplined. It attracted and developed many intellectuals who were skilled at refuting their opponents, both Protestant and Catholic. They became well known for close theological reasoning and even hairsplitting. The Jesuits became the most significant force in the Catholic Reformation. They were so successful in combatting Protestant ideas that they swayed areas such as Poland, Bohemia, and Moravia back to the Catholic fold. Peter Canisius (1521-97) and Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) were important Jesuit theologians who wrote against the Protestants. The latter took part in the tribunal that condemned Galileo.

The Society of Jesus also established strong missionary endeavors in pagan lands, especially India, Vietnam, China, Japan, Brazil, Ethiopia, and Congo. Francis Xavier (1498-1552), one of the original companions of Ignatius, was a noted missionary to India and Japan.

Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) followed Francis Xavier and established numerous missions in China by allowing converts to retain their own culture, including Confucian ideas. His successors even allowed the practice of Confu-

A History of Christian Doctrine

cian rites. The church condemned this approach in 1742 and lost most of its Chinese constituency.

The most significant Jesuit theologian of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Most of his theology is the accepted Jesuit view to this day.

Because of the Jesuits' tight organization and political strength (secular and ecclesiastical), many Catholics as well as Protestants feared them. In the 1700s France, Spain, and Naples expelled the Jesuits from their domains. In 1773 the pope dissolved the Society of Jesus, but it was fully restored in 1814.

Other New Movements

Teresa of Avila (1515-82), a Spanish mystic, was a Carmelite nun who spent many hours in prayer and fell into trances that left her paralyzed for days and sometimes months. In her forties she began to hear inner voices and see visions. She founded the first convent of Reformed (Discalced) Carmelites, which reinstituted strict rules, such as the requirement of perpetual solitude, that the Carmelites had relaxed over the years.

A close friend of Teresa's and a Spaniard like her,

John of the Cross (Juan de la Cruz) (1542-1605) established
Reformed Carmelite houses for men. He subjected
himself to severe disciplines and deprivations. Like Teresa,
he was a mystic who saw visions and spent hours
seeking communion with God. Both Teresa and John
were canonized (made saints) after their deaths.
In Italy, some Franciscans sought to return to the
strictness of the original rule of Francis of Assisi. They
eventually became a separate order called the Capuchins.

The Catholic Reformation

One of their early leaders, Bernardino Ochino, converted
to Protestantism.
The mystical tendencies in Catholicism developed
into quietism in seventeenth-century France. Adherents
to this view believed that perfection consists of a continuous
state of contemplation. They were indifferent to
everything but God and did not worry about salvation or
works. The church condemned them in 1699.

Probabilism

Bartolomé Medina (1528-80), a Dominican from
Spain, advanced a new ethical theory called probabilism.
He taught that just as it is proper to hold a probable opinion
in theology, it is also proper to follow a probable
course of action.
Most theologians agreed that some doctrinal issues
are unresolved, and in such cases one may advocate a
view that appears to be correct even though there is not
absolute certainty about it or even though others have
some objections. Medina extended this concept to moral
choices. When faced with a certain decision, it is permissible
to act according to what is probably right, even
though there is some uncertainty about it.
Some theologians, particularly among the Jesuits,
took Medina's theory to an extreme that he himself had
not taught: If there is a reasonable doubt about whether
something is sinful or not, then it is permissible to act as
if it were not sinful. If a person can think of some plausible
justification for a certain action, then he can safely act
upon that justification and ignore contrary reasons, even
if the rationale he adopts is not the most likely one. Reasoning
such as this gave the Jesuits a reputation for casu-

A History of Christian Doctrine

istry (subtle but misleading or false application of ethical
principles).

Of course, the Bible teaches a different approach.
"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Romans 14:23). If a
person has doubts about something, he should not do it.
As applied to questionable actions, probabilism is a prime
example of how theology can distort and evade the teaching
of Scripture.

Predestination

Just as there was a controversy over predestination in
the Protestant ranks, so there erupted a similar controversy
over this doctrine within Catholicism. The Dominicans
typically emphasized the necessity of God's grace
and thus were prone to think in terms of predestination,
while the Jesuits usually emphasized human free will.
A Jesuit from Portugal named Luis de Molina (1536-
1600) brought attention to this matter by teaching that
the human will is necessary in the salvation process. He
acknowledged that salvation is by God's grace and the
process must start with God's grace. God does not
bestow His grace merely on a select, preordained few,
however, but makes it available to all. The difference
between those who are saved and those who are lost
does not rest in the choice of God but in the choice of
humans. God's grace comes to everyone, but people
decide whether or not to believe God and therefore to be
saved.

Leading Dominicans such as Báñez opposed this view,
drawing from Augustine, the first theologian to promote
the doctrine of unconditional election, and from Thomas
Aquinas, who similarly affirmed the predestination of the

169

The Catholic Reformation

elect although he linked it to God's foreknowledge of
human choice.

Ultimately, in an effort to end this controversy, Pope
Paul V declared in 1606 that neither side taught heresy.
Either view was acceptable within the church.

Nevertheless, a Dutch bishop named Cornelius Jansenius
(1585-1638) vigorously attacked Molina's doctrine
in a book published after his death. He advocated a strict
interpretation of the doctrine of Augustine, teaching double
predestination: God predestines everyone either to be
saved or to be lost. His decision is absolute, and there is
nothing humans can do in regard to it. Grace is irresistible
and infallible. If God chooses to save someone, He
bestows grace upon that person.

Because Jansenism, as it became known, was quite

radical in promoting double predestination and denouncing any other view, several popes condemned it.

Jansenism involved more than just this doctrine, however. It was also a reform movement that issued a call to purity, holiness, and spirituality. Through Jansenism, a noted mathematician named Blaise Pascal (1623-62) had a spiritual conversion. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a number of Jansenists received the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues.4

The Council of Trent (1545-63)

In the sixteenth century, the Protestant Reformation threatened to engulf much of Europe. As a result, the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church soon felt a need to affirm traditional doctrines against the Protestants, to refute what they considered to be the errors of Protestantism, and to eliminate corrupt practices in the Catholic

170

A History of Christian Doctrine

Church that left it vulnerable to Protestant criticisms. The Renaissance popes immediately before and at the start of the Reformation had allowed the papacy and hierarchy to descend to low levels of morality as they pursued political and military power, wealth, and worldly pleasures. Eventually, however, the popes began to realize the urgent need for major reforms throughout the church at all levels. Consequently, in 1545 Pope Paul III convened the Council of Trent in northern Italy. Under the direction of several popes and guided theologically by the Jesuits, it met in three major sessions, with the last one ending in 1563. Pope Pius IV confirmed the council's decrees in 1564.

The Council of Trent was a defining moment in the history of the Roman Catholic Church as it faced several crucial issues. Politically, the pope sought to reassert his authority, particularly over the increasing power of the Holy Roman emperor. Theologically, the church had to decide how to respond to the Protestants. Some bishops felt they could win back many Protestants if the church would grant some of their demands and make some doctrinal compromises with them. Others said the only way to survive was to condemn the Protestants wholeheartedly. Ecclesiastically, there was general agreement that some reforms of the system were desperately needed.

The Council of Trent had several important results. First of all, it emphasized and solidified the power of the pope over the Holy Roman emperor and also within

the church hierarchy. While the doctrine of papal infallibility was not formally adopted until 1870, the council recognized that the pope had the supreme authority to interpret and implement its decisions.

Second, it implemented moral and institutional reforms from the top down. The impetus did not come from the grassroots, but the pope and hierarchy realized the need for reform and instituted changes that filtered down to all levels of the church. This reformation was strictly traditional and orthodox, specifically a reformation of morals, religious life, and church government, not of doctrine, liturgy, or basic institutions.

Third, the Council of Trent took a strict stand against the Protestants and in the process clearly defined Roman Catholic identity. The canons of the council repeatedly denounce distinctive Protestant positions, stating of anyone who holds them, "Let him be anathema [cursed]."

Not long before, Pope Paul III had revived the Inquisition, and the council strengthened it and set it in motion against the Protestants. Created in the twelfth century but lying dormant at the beginning of the Reformation, the Inquisition was a system of ecclesiastical tribunals that operated independently of secular law. Its purpose was to judge and destroy heresy. Although the worst abuses occurred before the Reformation, the Inquisition banned and burned books, and it excommunicated, fined, imprisoned, tortured, and even executed heretics.

The Catholic Church had earlier banned certain books and even forbidden the Bible to the laity in 1229, but in 1559 the Inquisition promulgated the first official Index of Forbidden Books. These books were considered heretical and thus were banned. Moreover, no Catholic could publish or read a book that did not have the imprimatur, or stamped approval, of the church. Both the Inquisition (in milder form) and the Index survived until

Pope Paul VI transformed the former into the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1965 and suppressed the latter in 1966.

Let us examine important features of the Council of Trent.

Moral Reform

The moral reforms instituted by the council were quite significant. It passed a number of rules designed to eliminate common abuses of the system. For example, it sought to eliminate absenteeism, the practice of a bishop receiving an office and yet not actually living in or serving his designated area but simply collecting the income. The council also outlawed simony (the buying and selling of offices); helped to end nepotism (appointment of relatives), which even the popes often practiced; and made efforts to stop irresponsible ordination. In the Middle Ages it was common to bestow high ecclesiastical offices upon young boys from prominent families and to hasten them through the various clerical rankings so that they could technically qualify for the highest offices. To curtail such abuses, the council set strict qualifications for each office and guidelines for ordination to the priesthood and advancement through the various levels in the hierarchy of the church. The purpose was to ensure that religious appointments would be based on moral and theological criteria rather than political, social, and monetary influences.

Further reforms were designed to equip priests with a greater understanding of Scripture and doctrine by increasing their theological education. The hope was that they would thus be better able to respond to the challenge

173

The Catholic Reformation

of the Protestants, who appealed to the Bible for their authority and disseminated translations in the language of the people.

Trent also introduced the use of the confessional box, which gave parishioners greater privacy and shielded priests from temptations during confession. The council reiterated and enforced the traditional rules against clerical concubinage and marriage. And the council acknowledged that the sale of indulgences had led to many "abuses." As a result, the sale of indulgences from town to town—the immediate cause of the Reformation—finally ended. Indulgences were now generally granted for good works other than donations.

The Scriptures

With respect to theology, the Council of Trent proclaimed that Scripture and tradition are equal in authority, in opposition to the Protestant view that Scripture alone is authoritative. Just as God inspired the Scriptures to teach doctrine, so God inspired leaders throughout the

history of the church to introduce additional doctrines and practices. The collective writings of the early church "fathers," the decisions of the ecumenical councils, and the decisions of the popes constitute this authoritative church tradition.

The council included as part of the Bible the Apocrypha, books from the intertestamental period that the Jews and the Protestants excluded. In the early centuries, some church writers had regarded them as Scripture, but no official church council had included them. In the Middle Ages they were commonly considered as scriptural to some extent. For the first time, the Council of Trent offi-

A History of Christian Doctrine

cially pronounced eleven books of the Apocrypha to be Scripture. The result is that the Roman Catholic Bible today includes in the Old Testament seven extra books and four additions to existing books.5

An important reason behind this decision was that some passages from these books offered support for Catholic beliefs and practices under attack by the Protestants, such as salvation by works and prayer for the dead. While Catholics defended these practices by appealing to tradition, the use of these books gave them an appeal to "Scripture" as well.

The council also pronounced that the interpretation of the church was authoritative. An individual did not have the right to his own interpretation of Scripture; whenever the church proclaimed a certain interpretation of a scriptural passage, then all Catholics had to accept it. A prominent example was Matthew 16:16-18, where Peter confessed Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God, and Jesus responded, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." According to official Catholic teaching, Jesus identified Peter as the foundation rock of the church. He made Peter His personal vicar and ruler of the universal church, and He further conferred the same unique authority upon Peter's alleged successors, the bishops of Rome. Thus no Catholic could deny that the pope is the undisputed ruler of the church, adopt any other explanation of Matthew 16:18, or publish or read anything to the contrary.

The council further declared that the Vulgate, the traditional Latin translation of the Bible, was the official Bible of the church. Moreover, the translation process was inspired like the original writing so that the translation

itself was infallible. Since that time, other translations
have been endorsed, including the Rheims-Douay Bible in
English.

Sin and Salvation

The crux of the dispute with the Protestants was the
doctrines of sin and salvation. The Council of Trent
affirmed the doctrine of original sin, agreeing with the
leading Reformers on this point. Every human being is
born in sin, inheriting both a sinful nature and guilt from
Adam.

In order to remove the guilt of original sin, a newborn
baby should be baptized as soon as possible. An unbaptized
infant who dies goes to limbo, a place where there is
neither pleasure nor pain. All who deny that baptism
remits original sin and all who reject infant baptism are
accursed.

The single most important issue dividing Protestants
and Catholics was the doctrine of justification. Trent said
that justification is a process initiated by God's grace
("prevenient grace," the grace that precedes salvation),
which humans can accept or reject. The sacrifice of Jesus
Christ purchased our justification, and we receive it by
God's grace, not our works. "Justifying faith" is more than
"confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins for
Christ's sake," however, and in addition, we are not justified
by "faith alone."6 Good works also play an important
role in maintaining and increasing our justification:

If any one saith, that the justice received is not
preserved and also increased before God through
good works; but that the said works are merely the

fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not a
cause of the increase thereof: let him be anathema. . . .
If any one saith, . . . that the said justified, by the good
works which he performs through the grace of God
and the merits of Jesus Christ . . . does not truly merit
increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of
that eternal life . . . let him be anathema.7

Trent presented justification as gradual. The Protestants
looked at justification as instantaneous: at the
moment of faith God freely counts a person as righteous
on the basis of Christ's sacrifice. By contrast, the
Catholics at Trent held that the term encompasses both

the remission of sins and progressive sanctification. Protestants saw sanctification as a separate work, and those who embraced predestination did not consider that sanctification has any bearing on one's standing as a saved person. Catholics said one's right standing with God depends not only on the righteousness of Christ but also on the person's own righteousness that he develops by letting God work in him.

No one can know if he is predestined to salvation. Consequently, each person must continue to follow the sacramental system, particularly the sacrament of penance for sins committed after baptism. Through good works such as penance, he fulfills the law of God and merits eternal life.

In short, according to Trent, justification begins by faith, but it is increased by good works. Both faith and works are necessary to the process of justification over the course of one's life. Trent thus rejected the idea that salvation is purely unmerited. Rather, each person merits

177

The Catholic Reformation

salvation by actually becoming good. Of course, it is by God's grace that a person becomes good. Nevertheless, under this view salvation is by faith and works and not by faith alone.

While the Catholic Church accepted predestination as an allowable view in the controversies between Dominicans and Jesuits, and while Trent cautioned against trying to delve into the mysteries of predestination, it denounced various Calvinistic views on the subject, including the following: humans have totally lost their free will due to Adam's sin, they cannot cooperate with God in receiving His grace, they cannot resist God's grace, they cannot fall from grace, and a justified person must believe that he is predestined to salvation.

The Sacraments

The Council of Trent endorsed the seven sacraments of the medieval church: baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, ordination, and marriage. God confers grace through these sacraments. Water baptism is necessary to salvation, for it washes away sins and effects regeneration. Penance is necessary for sins committed after baptism.

Interestingly, the council left open a door of reconciliation so that Protestants could easily return to the Catholic fold as long as they were baptized into the trinity:

If any one saith, that the baptism which is even given
by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son,
and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing
what the Church doth, is not true baptism: let him be
anathema.8

A History of Christian Doctrine

Thus a Protestant could have a valid baptism and so be
regenerated. To be saved he needed to submit to the teaching
and authority of the Roman Church, but he would not
need to be rebaptized. Although Trent was harsh in its condemnation
of Protestantism, this concession made it possible
for Catholics in the twentieth century to speak of
Protestants as "separated brethren" and to conclude that
they may be saved while remaining in their churches. Even
today, however, the Catholics base this broader acceptance
and unity on confession of and baptism into the trinity.9
The council reaffirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation,
the belief that at the celebration of the Eucharist the
bread and wine turn into the physical body and blood of
Jesus Christ, and it asserted that each time Christ is
offered afresh as an atoning sacrifice. Moreover, each element
contains the full humanity and divinity of Christ. By
implication, this view justifies the Catholic practice of
worshiping the consecrated host. It also makes unnecessary
the partaking of both elements. The laity are to partake
of the bread only; if anyone says they ought to
receive both, he is anathema.

Other Doctrines

On a number of other contested issues, the Council of
Trent reaffirmed the traditional doctrines and practices of
the medieval church. These include the Latin mass; the
doctrine of purgatory; the invocation and veneration of
the Virgin Mary and the saints; the veneration of relics
and images; and the value of indulgences.

Summary and Evaluation

In doctrine, liturgy, and outlook, the Council of Trent

The Catholic Reformation

maintained continuity with the past yet reinvigorated the
Roman Church and shaped it for the next four hundred
years. For instance, the Tridentine mass promulgated by
this council became the universal Latin liturgy until Vatican
II instituted a modern liturgy in the vernacular, and
even then some splinter groups and traditionalists insisted
on retaining the mass of Trent.

While the Council of Trent did not signal a break with
the past, it did define doctrinal positions that the Catholic
Church had not previously addressed with such explicit
formulations. Many aspects of the church's philosophy
and practice had evolved over the centuries with little theological
opposition, but events now forced a clear enunciation
of beliefs. In this way, the council set the direction
for the future. In addition, though it did not eliminate all
abuses, it did curtail a number of evils for which the
church had been justly and severely criticized, and since
that time the church has generally held to the reforms.
As a pivotal point in Roman Catholic history, the
Council of Trent has few rivals. At the end of the sixth
century, Pope Gregory I established the direction of the
Roman Catholic Church for the next five hundred years
by his endorsement and incorporation of many popular
beliefs and practices. After the papacy reached a nadir of
corruption and immorality in the ninth through eleventh
centuries, Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand) set a new standard
of morals. His reforms greatly enhanced papal
power and authority and influenced the church to the
Renaissance. Then in the sixteenth century, the Council of
Trent set the tone for the Roman Catholic Church all the
way to the twentieth century, particularly defining the
Catholic identity as opposed to Protestantism. Not until
180

A History of Christian Doctrine

the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) did the Catholic
Church adopt a significantly new attitude and outlook,
and even then it continued to affirm the doctrines of
Trent.
181

The Catholic Reformation

As we have seen, by 1534 the Reformation produced
four major wings of Protestantism. Three of
them—the Lutherans, the Reformed, and the Anglicans—
became large state churches in parts of Europe. In the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these movements
crystallized their theology into their classic positions.
While they sprang into existence almost overnight, and
certain key doctrines characterized them from the start,
they worked through a number of theological controversies
before attaining their final form.
In this chapter we will discuss the development of
Lutheran theology after Martin Luther to the Formula of

Concord in 1577. This document records the resolution
of the important controversies within the Lutheran camp

in the sixteenth century, and it is the expression of orthodox
Lutheranism to this day.

Philip Melanchthon

The first systematic theologian of Lutheranism was
Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560), a younger colleague of
Martin Luther who joined the University of Wittenberg
faculty in 1518, just after the Reformation began. At first,
he was heavily influenced by Luther, and his early writings
echo Luther's views almost identically.

In 1521 (age twenty-four) he published the Loci communes
rerum theologicarum, translated Commonplaces
or Basic Theological Themes, which was the first
Protestant systematic theology. In 1530 he wrote the first
major Lutheran creed, the Augsburg Confession, which
had the approval of Luther himself. This creed came
about at the Diet of Augsburg, where Emperor Charles V
asked the Protestants to state their beliefs, and specifically
how they differed from Catholicism.

Over time Melanchthon was influenced by Catholic
humanism and Reformed Protestantism and gradually
changed some of his views, particularly after Luther's
death. In several instances he moved from Luther in the
direction of John Calvin. In addition, his spirit was different
from Luther in that Luther always emphasized correct
doctrine above unity while Melanchthon sought unity
above complete agreement in doctrinal areas.

Melanchthon was an influential figure because of his
systematic writings and his early association with Luther,
but also because he epitomized an important trend in
Lutheran ranks. Consequently, he was often at the center
of controversy between strict Lutheran traditionalists and

those who advocated some change of views.

One example of the evolution of Melanchthon's views
is the doctrine of unconditional election. Originally he
taught, like Luther, that humans do not have a free will
and that everyone who is saved is predestined without
regard to human choice. Later in life he began to teach
that three causes are at work simultaneously in conversion:

the Word of God, the Spirit of God, and the human will. We cooperate with or assent to the work of the Spirit and the Word in our salvation. We have the ability to perform external righteousness but not to merit salvation, and we have the ability to will for God to draw us. God draws, but we must desire for Him to do so. Melanchthon did not explicitly deny predestination, but traditionalists attacked his teaching as a compromise of Luther's doctrine. They charged that it would make humans co-redeemers. Melanchthon denied that humans could assist God in salvation but insisted that the human will does play a role in conversion.

Another example of Melanchthon's shift was on the Eucharist. Initially, he adhered to Luther's view that Christ is bodily present in the elements. Eventually, however, he adopted an approach like that of Calvin, rejecting the physical presence and saying that the purpose of the sacrament is to fortify our faith spiritually.

Melanchthon also embraced some Calvinistic language regarding water baptism. He said baptism is "an external sign and blessing of divine promises" and it "signifies repentance and forgiveness of sins through Christ."[1] Nevertheless, he retained a strong view of baptism's role: "The Holy Spirit is given when we receive baptism; John 3 and Titus 3 clearly call baptism a bath of

185

new birth through the Holy Spirit."[2] He used the trinitarian formula.

Melanchthon's original Loci said it was unprofitable, unnecessary, and even dangerous to try to investigate the doctrine of the trinity and indicated that it was not essential to salvation.[3] Sometime later, Melanchthon confessed to "reading [Michael] Servetus a great deal," but he ultimately rejected Servetus's doctrine of the oneness of God in vehement terms and approved of his execution. Nevertheless, in several private letters he acknowledged his own questions and hinted that his private views were not altogether orthodox:

I have little doubt that great controversies will one day arise on this subject. . . . On the subject of the Trinity—you know, I have always feared that serious difficulties would one day arise. Good God! To what tragedies will not these questions give occasion in times to come: Is the Logos an hypostasis [person]? Is the Holy Ghost an hypostasis? For my own part I

refer me to those passages of Scripture that bid us
call on Christ, which is to ascribe divine honors to
him, and find them full of consolation. . . . I find it
after all of little use to inquire too curiously into that
which properly constitutes the nature of a Person,
and into that wherein and whereby persons are distinguished
from one another. . . . To me Tertullian seems
to think on this subject as we do in public, and not in
the way Servetus interprets him. But of these things
more hereafter when we meet.4

The final edition of his Loci (1555) gave extended

186

A History of Christian Doctrine

treatment to the doctrine. He made it an essential component
of theology and tried to explain it, but he had difficulty
distinguishing a person from a being and came close
to tritheism by comparing the persons of the trinity to
human persons:

Now the first article of faith is that there is one
unified eternal omnipotent Being, and nevertheless
that there are three divine eternal omnipotent persons,
eternal Father, eternal Son, and eternal Holy
Spirit. . . . Person is not a part of a detachable thing,
but is instead an essence, a living thing in itself, not
the sum of many parts, but a unified and rational
thing, which is not sustained and supported by any
other being as if it were but an addition to it. You are
a person.5

Despite privately saying it was not very productive to
analyze what makes the persons of the trinity distinct, he
tried to do so, but the result is philosophical abstraction
rather than meaningful biblical truth. He said there are
only two distinctions among the persons—their "essential
nature" and "their activities and functions toward us":

The Father is the procreator; the Son is begotten
of the Father and out of the Father's being and
through eternity the Son is the essential and full
Image of the Father. The Holy Spirit proceeds from
the Father and Son and is the love and joy in the
Father and Son. . . . Every activity, be it creation or
anything else, is an activity of all three divine persons.
Nevertheless, in accordance with the order of

187

Lutheran Orthodoxy

the persons, each person has his own distinctive
work.6

Throughout much of Melanchthon's career, wars raged between Catholics and Protestants. In 1547, the Catholic Emperor Charles V defeated and imprisoned two leading Protestant princes, Philip of Hesse and Elector John Frederick of Saxony. Charles sought to impose a compromise creed on the Protestants, called the Augsburg Interim. He demanded that all Protestant leaders sign it.

Many refused as a matter of conscience and were killed or exiled. Although the creed did not totally embrace Catholicism, it did renounce some important tenets of Lutheranism in favor of Catholicism. Melanchthon and others could not accept the Augsburg Interim, but he was willing to make some compromises, so a revision was made, called the Leipzig Interim. It included both Lutheran and Catholic elements. Melanchthon and some Lutherans accepted this compromise.

Ultimately, due to the Lutheran sentiments of the populace, these efforts at compromise failed, and in 1555 the Peace of Augsburg granted the Protestant states in Germany freedom of religion. Understandably, the Lutherans who had refused to sign and suffered accordingly were indignant against Melanchthon and others who had signed. In response, Melanchthon explained that certain doctrines (such as justification by faith) are essential and must not be compromised, while other doctrines are not essential and so can be compromised if necessary.

Let us now turn to a discussion of eight major contro-

A History of Christian Doctrine

versies in the Lutheran movement prior to the Formula of Concord, many of which directly involved Philip Melanchthon.

The Antinomian Controversy

The first controversy we will discuss was over antinomianism, which comes from Greek words meaning "against law." It seemed to start innocently enough with the teachings of John Agricola (1494-1566), an early colleague of Martin Luther, on the subject of repentance. He held that, logically speaking, repentance follows faith. A person is first justified by the faith God gives him, and by this faith he then receives God's work of repentance. If repentance came first then it would seem to mean something more than faith would be required for justification. Melanchthon responded that repentance comes

before faith. While justification is by faith alone, repentance prepares the heart to believe, for how could anyone be saved without repentance?

Since the Lutherans had already excluded any kind of choice, response, obedience, or action from their definition of saving faith, the role of repentance was indeed problematic. Either someone could be saved without repentance, or something more than mental faith would be required for salvation.

Faced with this choice, Agricola later became even more explicit in stating that repentance is not necessary for salvation. Consequently, it is not necessary to preach the law or teach morality. The only necessary, sufficient, and important message is salvation by faith. Christians need no law, commandments, or moral guidance. They are saved by faith, and from that moment they are led by

inner spiritual impulses.

Later advocates of this position went even further than Agricola, saying that since good works are in no way necessary for salvation we need not be concerned about them. Christians are not subject to any form of obedience. The law is of no use to them.

The Formula of Concord denounced antinomianism. It affirmed that Christians are saved by faith alone, but they need God's moral law to teach them how to live. Good works are not irrelevant, for the faith that saves will produce good works. Christians are saved by faith alone but not by the faith that is alone.

Antinomian ideas are still current within Protestantism, especially among some who believe in unconditional election, unconditional eternal security, or "freedom" from holiness teachings. A recent dispute among evangelicals over "Lordship salvation" is reminiscent of Agricola's views. One side says we are saved simply by confessing Jesus as Savior. Neither godly sorrow nor a decision to forsake sin is necessary, although both are desirable. Repentance is only a synonym for faith, which in turn is only a mental acknowledgment. The other side says that genuine repentance is essential; a person must confess Jesus both as Savior and Lord of his life if he is to be truly born again.

The answer to the question of whether repentance precedes or follows faith depends on one's definition of faith. If it is merely a mental understanding or process,

then it does not encompass the entire salvation experience of the New Testament, which includes repentance.

In a scriptural sense, however, saving faith is a relationship with God that includes obedience to the gospel and

Christian initiation. In short, if by faith one means simply an acceptance of the teachings of Scripture, then faith is the first step, followed by repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. If by faith one means a proper and complete response to the gospel, then it includes all the foregoing elements.

Controversy over Inward Justification

Andrew Osiander (1498-1552) sparked a second controversy in sixteenth-century Lutheranism. Unlike most Lutherans, he was somewhat mystical or inclined toward inward spiritual experiences. Although Luther himself had had a dramatic conversion, his definition of justification by faith minimized an inward experience, focusing rather on Christ's historic work and God's predetermined choice. Moreover, Luther denounced the "enthusiasts" for placing too much emphasis on spiritual experiences.

Osiander reacted against the Lutheran tendency to minimize personal spirituality by teaching that justification is a work of the indwelling Christ. It is not merely an abstract theological concept whereby God imputes legal righteousness to a person without his experiencing something personally. Instead, it is Christ coming to dwell in the believer and thereby imparting His own righteousness to him. Righteousness comes by the Spirit of Christ.

The Formula of Concord rejected the idea that justification comes through the indwelling Christ. Rather it is an objective act of God, based strictly on Calvary. Christ is our righteousness not just by His Spirit but by His flesh, that is, according to both His natures. The essence of justification is a legal recognition by God, not an inward experience. Although both justification and regeneration occur at the

same time, the emphasis is not on an inward transformation but on a change of legal status in the sight of God.

Controversy over Essentials

The next controversy arose over the implications of signing the Augsburg and Leipzig Interims. The issue was which doctrines are essential and which are not. Theologians call it the adiaphoristic controversy, from a word

meaning "nonessentials."

As we have seen, Melanchthon argued that some doctrines are not essential and therefore can be compromised. In opposition to him, some of the more strict Lutherans, particularly Matthias Flacius, said everything is essential when it comes time for a confession of faith. When faced with signing a statement of what one believes and taking a stand for truth, nothing can be discarded. Melanchthon responded that this concept leads back to the authoritarian approach of the Catholic Church, with the church forcing everyone to conform on every iota. There is no room for Christian liberty.

The Formula of Concord said some things are essential and others are not. Some doctrines are essential to true Christianity and to salvation. Other doctrines should be believed but they are not essential to believe. On the other hand, there are circumstances in which everything becomes essential.

Controversy over Good Works

The fourth controversy arose over the teachings of George Major (1502-74), who took the opposite extreme from the antinomians and asserted that good works are necessary to salvation. He reasoned that faith is neces-

192

A History of Christian Doctrine

sary for salvation and faith necessarily produces good works; thus good works are necessary for salvation. This conclusion, however, undercuts the basis of Lutheran theology and the entire Protestant Reformation.

The response of orthodox Lutheranism was that salvation is by faith alone. We cannot say good works are necessary to salvation, but good works are important.

Since Luther questioned the value of the Book of James, his followers probably neglected its scriptural insights, but it helps illuminate the proper course to follow between the antinomian error and the Majoristic error. It teaches that the kind of faith that saves is the kind of faith that always produces works. We cannot say that works are necessary to obtain or even to retain salvation, but we can say the kind of faith that saves will always have works as evidence. If a professed Christian does not exhibit good works, then either he did not have genuine faith and regeneration from the start, or else he has departed from saving faith along the way. Works are never a means of obtaining salvation, but works are a necessary evidence of salvation.

Controversy over the Human Will

The synergistic controversy—synergy refers to an interaction or cooperation of two or more elements—stemmed from Melanchthon's idea that conversion comes by the Word, the Spirit, and the human will. The implication is that a person is not saved strictly because God has predestined him, but a person is saved as he assents to God's work of salvation in him.

Flacius and other strict Lutherans accused Melanchthon of betraying Luther's original views. They asserted

that salvation is solely by predestination and no human will is involved.

In championing this position, Flacius went to the extreme of saying that we are sinners by nature and thus do not bear the image of God in us but the image of the devil. Originally Adam and Eve were created in the image of God, but they lost that image when they sinned. Now we are in the image of the devil, so there is no way we can even assist in salvation.

The Formula of Concord rejected the notion that humans bear the devil's image, but it did reaffirm the original teaching of Luther with regard to predestination. It said we are born in sin but sin is not of the essence of human nature; it was introduced by the devil. We are sinners but not demonic or devilish.

Nevertheless, the human will can never lead people toward good, so it can play no part in salvation. The Spirit and the Word alone cause conversion in the heart of a person. Humans do not have a choice with regard to salvation, but they have freedom of choice and action in everything else.

Controversy over the Eucharist

As chapter 2 describes, Martin Luther insisted that Christ's blood and body are physically present in the Eucharist. Zwingli and the Anabaptists considered the Lord's Supper to be simply a symbol, while Calvin taught that Christ's presence is spiritual rather than physical.

Some Lutherans adopted the spiritualistic view of Calvin. Melanchthon favored this position but refused to take an open stand. The Formula of Concord affirmed the original teaching of Luther, known as consubstantiation.

Controversy over the Person of Christ

The Eucharistic controversy led to a dispute over the union of human and divine in Christ. To uphold consubstantiation, Luther taught that Christ's humanity and deity are so interrelated that His physical body can be many places at one time, specifically in various Eucharistic celebrations. Some Lutherans followed the thinking of Calvin on this point and said Christ's humanity can only be one place at a time.

The Formula of Concord affirmed the view of Luther. Christ's humanity participates in the omnipresence of His divine nature to the extent that His body can be in many places at once.

Controversy over Predestination

Finally, some Lutherans departed from the doctrine of predestination (unconditional election). We have already seen one aspect of this disagreement with respect to the role of the human will in salvation.

The Formula of Concord endorsed the doctrine of predestination with one qualification. It affirmed the doctrine of election; namely, God has unconditionally elected or predestined everyone who will be saved. The Formula was silent on the subject of reprobation, however. The Lutherans drew back from stating the idea of double predestination, namely, that God has predestined the unsaved to go to the lake of fire.

Logically, if single predestination is true then double predestination must be true as well, for if salvation comes only by God's election and God refuses to elect some people to salvation, then in effect He has chosen them for damnation. But it sounded too harsh to say God sends

195

Lutheran Orthodoxy

some people to hell for no reason other than His choice.

The Book of Concord

The Formula of Concord was a largely successful attempt to end controversies and to bring together a divided church. In that sense it followed the spirit of Melanchthon in seeking unity, but doctrinally it adhered closely to the original teaching of Luther. It also helped maintain a clear distinction between Lutheranism and Calvinism.

In 1580, the Book of Concord was published. It contained the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Small and Large Catechisms, the Formula of Concord, and three other writings by Luther and Melanchthon.

These are the essential documents of Lutheranism.

George Calixtus and the
Syncretistic Controversy

After the Formula of Concord, another controversy stemmed from the teaching of George Calixtus (1586-1656) in Germany. It is called the syncretistic controversy; syncretism refers to drawing doctrines from various sources and merging them together. The goal of Calixtus was to reconcile the various branches of Christianity. If they could not agree on all doctrines, at least he wanted them to agree that each of the others was a true Christian church.

To a great extent, his dream has been fulfilled in the twentieth century. At the time, however, this proposal was quite radical. Various groups were literally fighting for their very survival, and many people suffered intense per-

secution for their beliefs. They were not disposed to view other groups as brethren but considered them heretics. The Protestants said the Roman Catholic Church was the great whore of the Book of Revelation and the pope was the Antichrist. The Catholic Church excommunicated the Protestants, saying they were eternally damned, heretical, and reprobate. Even within the ranks of Protestantism, one group denounced the other, not merely as wrong in doctrine but as heretical, false, and not a true church at all. For instance, Martin Luther condemned the Reformed and the Anabaptists as heretics and no better than heathen. The Lutherans and Reformed persecuted the Anabaptists, and the Anglicans persecuted the Baptists and Quakers.

In this environment, Calixtus proposed a distinction between fundamental doctrines and secondary doctrines. As long as a group agrees on the fundamental doctrines, we should recognize it as a true Christian church, a saved group of people, even though we may disagree with it on secondary doctrines.

Realizing that an outward organizational union might not be feasible, Calixtus proposed that all Christians should at least recognize one another as fellow Christians and confess an inner spiritual communion. Eventually outward communion could follow.

The question this proposal raises is, What are the fundamental doctrines? Calixtus defined them as the beliefs required for salvation. He made a distinction between

heresy, the denial of a fundamental doctrine necessary to salvation, and error, a wrong doctrine that does not affect salvation. But how do we determine what is necessary to believe in order to be saved? Calixtus replied that we

should look to the consensus of the first five centuries. Whatever the early Christian writers agreed upon must be fundamental, and that is what we should agree upon. The implication is that the Bible reveals more than what is necessary for salvation. But instead of simply looking at what the Bible itself identifies as essential, this approach in effect appeals to postbiblical writers as the supreme arbiters of truth.

From the Protestant perspective, there were problems with this proposal. First, it seemed to compromise the sole authority of Scripture by its reliance upon nonbiblical writings. Second, by the test Calixtus proposed, the doctrine of justification by faith would not be essential because the postbiblical writers did not clearly teach it. In fact, in the third through fifth centuries, a number of prominent writers clearly contradicted the Protestant understanding of justification by faith, describing good works as meritorious. Moreover, most Protestants did not believe water baptism is essential for salvation, while the consensus of the first five centuries was to emphasize its essentiality.

Consequently, the Protestants as a whole and the Lutherans in particular (Calixtus's primary audience) did not accept this proposal. Some Lutheran theologians argued that everything Scripture reveals is fundamental, which would make almost every deviation a heresy. Other theologians did not take such a strict view. They acknowledged that some people in other churches are saved but said it would be wrong to recognize those churches as true churches, as true expressions of apostolic Christianity.

In practice, most Protestants of the time seemed to

adopt the latter view. The Lutherans, for example, refused to consider the Reformed as a true church but conceded that some Calvinists were saved.

Today the various branches of Protestantism tend to follow the basic philosophy of George Calixtus. Moreover, the mainline Protestants and the Catholics take a similar

approach toward each other.

Doctrine of Scripture

Luther and the early Lutherans assumed the inspiration of Scripture, but later Lutherans realized the need to develop this doctrine further. They affirmed the divine origin, inspiration, and authority of Scripture. They said inspiration is a special act of the Spirit, connected specifically with the writing of the text rather than with the writer. Moreover, inspiration is full and verbal (extending to every word). In opposition to rationalism, they stressed the revealed nature of Christian doctrine.

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit

Traditional Lutheran theology and experience did not leave much room for the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the sign of speaking in tongues. This is especially true in the age of confessional orthodoxy—the mid 1500s through the 1600s.

As time went on, however, many Lutherans began to hunger for a deeper, more fervent personal relationship with God. In the 1700s, this desire gave rise to the Pietist movement, including the Moravians, and among these people there are reports of speaking in tongues, particularly in Germany. (See chapter 11.)

In the 1800s there were several recorded outpourings

199

of the Holy Spirit upon Lutherans. Speaking in tongues occurred among the Lutheran followers of Gustav von Below in Germany in the early part of the century.7 In 1841-43 the Readers (Läsare) of Sweden likewise spoke in tongues.8 Today, under the influence of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements, many Lutherans have received the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of tongues.

Summary

We will briefly summarize and evaluate Lutheran and Reformed orthodoxy together at the conclusion of chapter 10.

200

Like the Lutherans, the Reformed movement underwent a period of consolidation, crystallization, and evolution before it reached its classic expression as held by Reformed and Presbyterian churches today. This process lasted from the early sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth century.

The earliest significant Reformed creed was the First

Helvetic [Swiss] Confession, written by Heinrich
Bullinger and others in 1536. (Bullinger was Zwingli's
successor in Zurich.) All the Reformed cantons of
Switzerland adopted this confession.
In 1566 it was superseded by the Second Helvetic
Confession, a more detailed treatise written by Bullinger
and adopted by almost all of the Reformed churches in

Reformed
Orthodoxy
10

Europe. Another widely accepted Reformed document
was the Heidelberg Catechism, produced in 1563 in the
Palatinate, a German Reformed state.

Further Development of Predestination

The most notable development of the Reformed theologians
of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was
their elaboration and extension of the doctrine of predestination.
Although Augustine, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin
all taught unconditional election, the Calvinists' preoccupation
with and detailed exposition of this doctrine
caused people to identify it supremely with the Reformed
movement.

Calvin taught predestination as part of the doctrine of
salvation. He did not present it as the centerpiece of his
theology, and he confessed difficulty in understanding
why God used this method, but he felt constrained to
teach it by his perception of Scripture.

In contrast, later Calvinists such as Beza, Vermigli,
Knox, and especially Jerome Zanchi (1516-90) derived
predestination from the very nature of God. Given God's
foreknowledge, providence, omniscience, and omnipotence,
they said predestination is the only possible outcome.
It is a logical necessity; there is no possible
alternative. This approach made the doctrine of predestination
the cornerstone of their theology.

Some theologians, such as Theodore Beza (Calvin's
successor), further concluded that God's decrees of election
and reprobation occurred before Adam sinned. In
other words, before sin ever entered the human race God
had already decided to send some people to the lake of
fire for eternity. This position is called supralapsarianism

A History of Christian Doctrine

("before the lapse"), while the contrary view is infralapsarianism.
The infralapsarians accused the supralapsarians of

making God unjust. Once human beings sinned, they
argued, God had no obligation to save anyone, so we cannot
object if He chose to save only a certain number. If
predestination occurred before sin, however, God would
become the author of sin and He would eternally punish
the lost for something He caused and they could not
avoid.

We should note, however, that if the nature of God
indeed required predestination, then the supralapsarian
position would appear to be correct. From a non-Calvinist
perspective, the powerful argument against supralapsarianism
thus not only defeats that position but the entire
doctrine of predestination as well.

Unlike the Lutherans in the Formula of Concord,
Calvinist theologians were quite willing to say that God
has predestined some people to be lost. They emphasized
double predestination: God has predetermined the eternal
destiny of every human being, either to be elect or
reprobate.

The later Calvinists also taught the doctrine of the
limited atonement, which Calvin implied but never explicitly
stated. According to this view, Christ did not die for
the whole world but only for the elect, those God had chosen
in advance.

In summary, later theologians pushed the Calvinistic
system to its ultimate conclusions and consequences, and
perhaps beyond. Debates over various aspects of predestination
overshadowed other issues that were important
in the original theology of John Calvin.

203

Reformed Orthodoxy

The Synod of Dort

A Dutch Calvinist named Jacob (James) Arminius
(1560-1609) challenged the doctrine of predestination. In
1610 his followers published the Remonstrance, which
rejected predestination, and they became known as
Arminians or Remonstrants. The Calvinists debated the
issues heatedly and finally resolved them at the Synod of
Dort (modern Dordrecht, Netherlands) in 1618-19.

The Synod of Dort completely affirmed predestination,
establishing five points that have become the classic
expression of orthodox Calvinism. These points logically
depend upon one another so that if one falls they all fall,
with the possible exception of the last. A simple way to
identify them is by the acronym TULIP (appropriate for a
Dutch synod!).

1. Total depravity. Humans are completely sinful, totally depraved. Sin affects all their being so that only the grace of God can save them. Not only do humans have a sinful nature (which the Arminians taught), but specifically, they are so sinful and sin so affects every aspect of their being, including the will, that if they had a choice to serve God they would always choose not to do so. But total depravity does not mean they can never imagine, desire, or do good things. In short, total depravity has a technical meaning in Calvinism: sin has so corrupted the human will that only the sole choice of God (unconditional election and irresistible grace) can save people.

2. Unconditional election. God elects certain people to salvation based on an internal decision within Himself. There are no conditions to this election. He does not choose people because of their works, their response, or His foreknowledge of their choice.

3. Limited atonement. Jesus Christ died only for those God previously elected. He did not die to save everyone in the world, and His sacrifice does not extend to every individual.

4. Irresistible grace. A person cannot resist God's saving grace. Those whom God has elected will inevitably be saved. Of course, God molds the person's will so that he desires salvation and does not wish to resist. If a person could resist God's grace, due to his total depravity he would resist it. If God gave a choice, no one would ever be saved.

5. Perseverance of the saints. Those whom God has elected will endure to the end and be saved. They cannot fall from grace. This point is often called unconditional eternal security or, popularly, "once saved always saved." God's choice alone determines salvation from start to finish, regardless of an individual's attitude, choices, or actions after conversion.

Arminianism

In contrast to these five key points of orthodox Calvinism, Arminius taught the following:

1. Universal prevenient grace. Humans are sinners, but God gives grace to all to enable them to make a choice regarding salvation. "Prevenient" refers to grace that precedes salvation. Arminius did not deny that sin has corrupted the human will and every other aspect of human nature, but he said God has provided a remedy on

the basis of the Cross.

Because of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, God bestows grace upon the whole human race. "The grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to

all men" (Titus 2:11, NKJV). (See also Acts 17:30; Romans 2:4.) This grace does not inevitably save them, but it draws them, woos them, illuminates their mind and conscience, and overcomes the effects of the sinful nature to the extent that they have the ability to accept or reject God's plan. Arminius explained:

Those who are obedient to the vocation or call of God, freely yield their assent to grace; yet they are previously excited, impelled, drawn and assisted by grace: And in the very moment in which they actually assent, they possess the capability of not assenting.1

2. Election based on foreknowledge. God elected to save those who would accept His plan of salvation. God knows all things, including the future, but His foreknowledge is not the same as predestination. Although He knows everything that will happen, He does not foreordain or cause everything to happen. Salvation is by the grace of God, but humans must accept his plan for their lives. In the words of Arminius:

All unregenerate persons have freedom of will, and a capability of resisting the counsel of God against themselves, of refusing to accept the Gospel of grace, and of not opening to Him who knocks at the door of the heart; and these things they can actually do, without any difference of the Elect and of the Reprobate.2

Arminius offered an interesting answer to the question of how repentance and faith relate to each other,

which, as we saw with the Lutherans, is a difficult one for those who believe in unconditional election: "Repentance is prior to [saving] faith in Christ; but it is posterior to that faith by which we believe that God is willing to receive into his favour the penitent sinner."3

The Arminians pointed out that many passages of Scripture speak of salvation as something that people accept or reject. The call to salvation extends to everyone, to "whosoever will," not just to the elect. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that

whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life" (John 3:16, NKJV). "Whoever desires, let him take the water of life freely" (Revelation 22:17, NKJV). The Bible does speak of predestination in relation to the plan of God. For example, God predestined the Cross and the church. He guarantees the destiny of the church, but people choose whether to be in the church or not. We can speak of the unconditional election of the church collectively, but when we speak of individuals, we must say that God's election is based on His foreknowledge of their choice. (See Romans 8:29-30.)

3. Universal atonement. Jesus truly died for the whole human race. The Atonement makes provision for everyone to be saved, but each person must apply those benefits personally. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son" (John 3:16, NKJV). "And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world" (I John 2:2, NKJV). "The Lord is . . . not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance" (II Peter 3:9).

A Dutch Arminian, Hugo Grotius (1588-1645), developed the governmental theory of the Atonement, which

207

Reformed Orthodoxy

most Arminians did not embrace, however. He said Christ did not die to pay for our sins but to show that, although God is ready to forgive us, He considers sin to be so serious that it always has consequences.

4. Grace can be resisted. People can and do reject God's saving grace. Even though God's grace has appeared to all humanity, obviously some people are not saved. Some people will go to the lake of fire at the last judgment. The reason is that they have resisted the Holy Spirit. (See Acts 7:51.)

5. No definite position regarding the perseverance of the saints. Arminius refused to be dogmatic about whether a saved person could ever lose salvation. He said either view is orthodox but also pointed out that the majority of the church has always acknowledged the possibility of falling from grace.4

Later Arminians generally affirmed that it is possible to fall from grace. Just as a person must respond to God's grace initially, so he must continue to ratify that choice by faith. If at any point he departs from God in unbelief and disobedience, then he is no longer walking in God's grace, and he will ultimately be lost if he remains in that

position.

Many passages of Scripture emphasize the need to continue in the faith or warn of the danger of falling away. (See, for example, Romans 11:17-23; Galatians 5:4; Hebrews 2:1-4; 10:38-39; 12:14-15; James 5:19-20; II Peter 2:20-22.)

Some people today reject the doctrine of predestination yet adhere to the fifth point (perseverance). Many Baptists fit into this category. They believe that humans must make a decision to be saved, but once someone has

made such a choice he can never rescind it.

As a practical matter, predestination, and particularly unconditional eternal security, encourages the thought that Christians will inevitably sin on a regular, perhaps daily, basis but need not be overly concerned about it. After all, their lifestyle is irrelevant to their salvation. If someone leaves the church and lives in gross sin, what is commonly called "backsliding," the proponents of unconditional eternal security typically say he was never truly saved from the start. His faith was deficient—perhaps a "historic" faith rather than a living faith. If, however, he truly is one of the elect, eventually he will come back to God. In the meantime he is still saved; Jesus is still his Savior although not his Lord at that time.

On the other hand, if a person in the church expresses doubts about his personal salvation, others typically assure him to accept it by faith and not to doubt whether his faith or experience is genuine. In this way perseverance becomes a meaningless truism: if someone endures, he was elect from the start; if someone does not endure, he was reprobate (or at least not saved) from the start.

As a result of the Synod of Dort, predestination became the touchstone of Calvinist orthodoxy. If someone did not accept the five points, he was not an orthodox Calvinist, even though Calvin himself had not made predestination the central focus of his theology.

Covenant Theology

Another idea that became commonly associated with Calvinism was covenant (or federal) theology, even though Calvin himself did not teach it. It arose in the sixteenth century with Zacharias Ursinus (1534-83) and

others, and it was developed further in the seventeenth by

Johannes Cocceius (1603-69) and then by the Puritans. According to this view, we are to interpret Scripture on the basis of God's covenant relationships with humanity. Moreover, God still relates to people on the basis of covenants. Some Puritans considered that the state (closely aligned with the church) was also in a covenant with God.

According to covenant theology, in the beginning God established the "covenant of works" with Adam and Eve. If they would keep the garden and obey His command, they would live perpetually. Since they failed to keep their side of the covenant, they fell under sin, and God instituted a new covenant: the "covenant of grace." This covenant provides salvation by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone to those whom God has elected.

In the nineteenth century, a related doctrine arose among the Plymouth Brethren in England with J. N. Darby. He taught dispensationalism, which divided God's redemptive workings into dispensations, or ages. In each age, God offered salvation on a different basis. Traditionally, dispensationalists taught that under the law of Moses God required "works" in the form of obedience to the law as necessary for salvation, but in the New Testament church He requires faith apart from any kind of obedience. 5 Today's dispensationalists have modified their position to say that in every age salvation is by grace through faith.

Covenant theologians and dispensationalists oppose each other's view, but in many ways their fundamental premises are the same. Both tend to minimize the "obedience of faith," saying that to require an obedient response

210

A History of Christian Doctrine

as part of saving faith would be to advocate salvation by works. A more scriptural approach is to recognize that God has dealt with humanity in various ways in different ages and has made different covenants with people, but in every age salvation is by grace through faith based on Christ's atoning sacrifice. And in every age, saving faith includes obedience to God's plan for that day.

The Westminster Confession

As we discussed in chapter 8, when the Church of England broke away from Rome at first it did not have a strong Protestant theology of its own. As time went on, the leaders began to adopt most of the tenets of Calvinism, such as Calvin's teaching on the sacraments.

The Puritans, the element within the Church of England
that wanted to purge it completely from nonbiblical
beliefs and practices, were strict Calvinists. They adopted
predestination and most embraced the presbyterian form
of church government, although many preferred the independent,
congregational form.

The Westminster Confession (1646) is a statement
of Calvinism adopted by the English Puritans who favored
presbyterian church government. It is the prime confession
of faith among Presbyterians today. The Reformed
churches that originated in continental Europe look to
earlier confessions in Latin and their national languages,
such as the French Confession of Faith by Calvin and his
student De Chandieu (1559), the Belgic Confession
(1561), and the Second Helvetic Confession (1566).

The Westminster Confession is thoroughly Calvinistic,
but it adds some features not prominent in Calvin's
writings. It teaches the inspiration of the original text of

211

Reformed Orthodoxy

Scripture, which Calvin taught, but it goes further than he
did in explicitly stating the inerrancy of Scripture, which
is a logical consequence of inspiration. It also strongly
emphasizes predestination and derives it from the nature
of God Himself.

The Westminster Confession clearly differs from
Calvin on the doctrine of the Sabbath. Calvin taught that
the Sabbath was a shadow of things to come and was fulfilled
and abolished in Christ. He distinguished between
the ceremonial law and the moral law, saying only the latter
is binding on New Testament believers. He identified
the Sabbath as a ceremonial foreshadowing of the rest we
find in Christ, so that Christians are not obligated to keep
it literally.

Later Calvinists decided that the Sabbath is still in
force. They placed great emphasis on the Ten Commandments,
concluding that all of them are moral in nature
and thus binding on Christians. Therefore they rejected
the idea that the literal Sabbath has been abolished in
Christ. Instead, it has been transformed; under the new
covenant Sunday is the Christian Sabbath. The Sabbath
law of the Old Testament still applies, but to Sunday not
Saturday.

Following the Westminster Confession, later Calvinists
imposed Sabbath laws on Sunday. Consequently, they
deemed it a sin to work, play, buy, or sell on Sunday. In

colonial America the Puritans passed "blue laws" to prohibit public buying or selling on Sunday, and remnants of these laws survived past the middle of the twentieth century. Scripture does not record that God ever changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, however. In the mid

A History of Christian Doctrine

1800s, the Seventh-day Adventists developed in America in large part by seizing on this flaw in the Presbyterian position, and they advocated Sabbath observance on Saturday. From a new covenant perspective, both attempts to impose a literal Sabbath keeping upon the church are mistaken. (See Acts 15:19-29; Romans 14:5-6; Galatians 4:9-11; Colossians 2:16-17.)

Christians have spiritual rest in the Holy Spirit; in that sense every day is a Sabbath day. (See Isaiah 28:11-12; Matthew 11:28-29; Hebrews 4:9-11.) Of course the Bible does teach that Christians should assemble themselves together, and they should set aside times for worship and for rest, but there is no legal requirement as to a certain day.

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit

Like orthodox Lutheranism, orthodox Calvinism was not very hospitable to the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. This was especially true since Calvin taught that the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues was no longer available.

Nevertheless, a Spirit-filled movement arose among the Huguenots (French Protestants), who were Calvinistic although they did not totally embrace the strict post-Calvin orthodoxy. In the 1600s, spiritual revival swept a group of Huguenot peasants in southern France who resisted the efforts of King Louis XIV to convert them to Catholicism. Many were imprisoned, tortured, and martyred. Observers reported that people spoke in tongues; uneducated farmers and young children prophesied in pure, elegant French; there was enthusiastic, demonstrative worship; and people were "seized by the Spirit."6

Reformed Orthodoxy

These people became known as the Camisards. Another name given to them was the "prophets of the Cevennes," referring to the mountains in their region. This movement survived in France into the 1700s. A number of Camisards fled to England to escape persecution, and they sparked a revival there in the 1700s. Their

English converts also spoke in tongues.7

In the 1800s, Edward Irving, a Church of Scotland (Presbyterian) pastor, began to preach in Scotland and England that the miraculous gifts of the Spirit are available to the church today. Under his ministry, many people spoke in tongues. (See chapter 13.)

Summary and Evaluation

From the mid sixteenth century to the mid seventeenth century, the major branches of Western Christianity solidified according to the configuration that exists today. The Roman Catholics reaffirmed and expounded their position by the Council of Trent (1563). The Lutherans consolidated their position by publication of the Book of Concord in 1580. The Anglicans formulated the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (1571). The Reformed movement in continental Europe adopted the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), and Presbyterians in Great Britain adopted the Westminster Confession (1646). The latter statement is considered orthodox Calvinism today, but it departed significantly from Calvin's original spirit.

The Anabaptists had an early statement of faith in the Schleitheim Confession (1527), but of all the groups we have discussed they were the least rigid. For one thing, they did not place the same emphasis on orthodoxy and

214

A History of Christian Doctrine

organizational control as the other groups; for another, they were so persecuted and splintered that they did not have the opportunity to develop a monolithic structure like the others. In smaller groups, of course, they did develop various confessions of faith.

The latter half of the sixteenth century, then, saw the official enunciation of the classic denominational positions, and the seventeenth century was one of confessional orthodoxy for Western Christendom. The major branches of Christendom placed emphasis on correct doctrinal formulation and precise theological identity. While attention to theology is vital, an overemphasis on doctrinal positions to the neglect of spiritual experience can be stultifying and even deadly. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (II Corinthians 3:6). Thus the need was great, both in continental Europe and in Great Britain, for a spiritual revival in the eighteenth century.

215

Reformed Orthodoxy

In the late seventeenth century, a movement called Pietism arose in Germany in reaction to the cold theological orthodoxy of the day. It was not primarily a theological response but a refocusing on spirituality and practical Christian living.

As chapters 9 and 10 have discussed, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries both Lutherans and Calvinists participated in numerous theological controversies and placed much emphasis on orthodox confessions. They expended great energy in formulating detailed doctrinal statements, identifying and opposing heresy, and excluding and persecuting people with different views.

To many, it seemed that the theologians were splitting hairs over abstract doctrines while neglecting the basic

truths of Scripture and Christian living. Common people and even pastors began to think Protestantism was drifting away from personal faith in God and becoming an intellectual, philosophical system with little relevance to biblical and practical Christianity. For the most part, they accepted the doctrines considered orthodox, but they wanted to shift away from academic debate and theological disputes toward a personal experience and relationship with God.

Spener and the Pietists

Pietism had many roots and contributors, but its immediate catalyst was Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705), a German Lutheran. He wrote an influential book in 1675 called Pia Desideria (Pious Desires or Heartfelt Desires), from which the movement got its name. (Piety refers to genuine religious impulses, feelings, or desires.) In the book he stated six "pious desires," or "proposals to correct the condition of the church," that became the basis for this movement. These six points are as follows:

1. More extensive use of the Scriptures, including Bible study in small groups. Instead of relegating theological discussion to professional theologians, academic experts, councils, synods, and treatises, believers should study the Scriptures in small groups and house meetings. Not only should ministers preach theology from the pulpit; people should study the Bible at home.

2. Reemphasis on the spiritual priesthood of all believers. In theory the Protestant movement taught that

all Christians are priests to God, but in practice most churches seemed to adopt the Catholic attitude that theology and ministry were only for the professional clergy. Spener wanted to give the laity positions of spiritual

responsibility in the church, letting them have an active part in its life and ministry.

3. Emphasis on spiritual experience and practice in Christian life rather than mere knowledge. More than engaging in formal discussions and disputes, people need to experience God for themselves. They need to learn how to live as Christians, how to walk in holiness.

4. Conducting controversies in a spirit of charity. People should not study theology for the primary purpose of debating doctrinal opponents, and in theological discussions they should remember and adhere to the overriding principle of love.

5. Training of pastors in devotional literature and practice. The education of ministers focused almost exclusively on doctrinal formulations to the neglect of practical instruction relative to their role of leading people in the Christian life. Spener wanted preachers and pastors to study devotional literature as well as theological treatises and to receive training on conducting worship, discipling believers, and leading people into greater spirituality.

6. Renewed focus on the purpose of the pulpit to edify the people. The purpose of preaching should be to instruct, inspire, and feed the believers rather than give discourses on obscure doctrines. All too often, the typical sermon was high and lofty in tone, heavy in theology and academics, and polemical in nature. For instance, the minister might preach on the doctrine of predestination, on why the Calvinists (or Lutherans) were in error, on the limited atonement, or on supralapsarianism. Spener desired practical preaching that benefited the lives and hearts of people.

Spener was careful to affirm his orthodoxy on the classic Lutheran positions. He upheld justification by faith, the Lutheran doctrine of sacraments, the essentiality of baptism, and consubstantiation.[1]

Spener was concerned about the moral laxity in his day. He called Christians to a life of personal holiness,

advocating "a self-discipline which included abstinence from cards [associated with gambling], dancing, and the theatre and moderation in food, drink, and dress."2 He specifically warned against jewelry, finery of dress, and drunkenness and said the mark of a Pietist was a willingness to "give up freedom in questionable little things."3 The Pietists generally dressed in plain clothing and refrained from worldly amusements, oaths, warfare, and lawsuits.4

While Pietism began among the Lutherans, it soon spread to the Calvinists. The Pietists generally affirmed the theology of their mother churches but embraced the six principles Spener articulated. Moreover, they stressed repentance and an experience of conversion that changed people's lives. In practice, then, there was a significant difference of attitude and lifestyle from that of their coreligionists.

Pietism also generated a missionary zeal that heretofore had been lacking among Protestants. While the Catholics had long sent missionaries to non-Christian lands, the Protestants had expended most of their energy on establishing their own doctrinal identities, throwing off the yoke of Catholicism, and fighting each other's alleged heresies. Moreover, the doctrine of predestination that most of them embraced tended to discourage sacrificial missionary efforts, for missionary or no missionary,

God had already predetermined the exact number of pagans who would be saved.

Church of the Brethren

Although the Pietist movement operated within the existing denominational structure, it did result in the formation of two significant new groups: the Church of the Brethren, which arose among the Reformed, and the Moravians, which arose among the Lutherans. The Brethren, also known as the Dunkers because of their practice of triple immersion, originated in Schwarzenau, Germany, in 1708 and quickly spread to America. They were influenced by both Anabaptism and Pietism.

The Brethren followed mainstream Protestant theology. They taught five practical points of Christian living: pacifism, temperance (including abstinence from alcohol), simplicity of life (avoiding luxuries and unwholesome amusements while emphasizing stewardship of personal and family life), brotherhood of all people, and obedience to Christ above creeds.

Zinzendorf and the Moravians

The roots of the Moravians go back before the Pietist
movement to the Bohemian Brethren, or Unitas Fratrum
(Unity of the Brethren), who were disciples of John Hus
in Moravia and Bohemia. (Hus was a fifteenth-century
forerunner of the Reformation; Moravia and Bohemia are
part of the Czech Republic today.)

Fleeing persecution, some of the Brethren from
Moravia moved to Germany and settled on the estate
of Nicolas Ludwig, Count von Zinzendorf (1700-60) in
1722, where they founded the village of Herrnhut. A

221

The Pietists and the Methodists

fervent Pietist who was devoted to Jesus Christ, Zinzendorf
at age twenty-two organized these believers and
infused them with Pietist sentiments. He soon became
their bishop.

On August 13, 1727, a decisive event occurred at
Herrnhut, which Moravian historians have described as a
"signal outpouring of the Holy Spirit," "a modern Pentecost,"
and a Moravian "baptism of the Holy Spirit," comparing
it to Joel 2, Acts 8, 10, and 19. Zinzendorf called it
"the day of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the
congregation" and "the Pentecost." In the words of a participant,
"The Holy Ghost came upon us and in those days
great signs and wonders took place in our midst."5

Extraordinary prayer preceded and accompanied this
move of God. Children prayed fervently and wept. Many
people prayed all night long, and "great emotion prevailed."
Pastor Rothe reported that on Sunday, August 10,
the whole congregation fell to the dust "overwhelmed by
a wonderful and irresistible power of the Lord" and experienced
an "ecstasy of feeling." They prayed, sang, and
wept till midnight, and then they instituted a twenty-fourhour
prayer chain.6

This spiritual revival resulted in a flood of new songs.
Nearly all these hymns addressed Jesus, adoring Him as
God.7 Soon afterward, in 1732, the Moravians sent forth
their first foreign missionaries, taking the first significant
step for Protestant missions.

The foregoing accounts do not explicitly mention
speaking in tongues, but historians report that tongues
accompanied the move of God among the Moravians in
the 1700s and 1800s.8

For the most part, the doctrine of the Moravians was

222

A History of Christian Doctrine
Lutheran. They stressed, however, the primacy of devotional
and moral life over theological formulations.

John Wesley

While spiritual renewal was taking place on the European
continent in the eighteenth century, a parallel development
occurred in Great Britain and extended to
America. The key figure in this revival was John Wesley
(1703-91), a high-church clergyman of the Church of
England.

John and his younger brother Charles (1707-88) had
a strong desire to serve God and discipline their lives for
His will. At Oxford University, Charles and two other students
founded what came to be known as the Holy Club,
and soon John became its leader. The purpose of the club
was to structure the members' devotional life and academic
study. They challenged each other to meet goals for
self-discipline, personal devotions, and study. They
received the nickname of Methodists because of their systematic
methods.

During this time Wesley formed much of his theology,
but an important spiritual experience was yet to come. In
1735, George Whitefield (1714-70) became a member of
the club.

Also in 1735, the Wesleys sailed to America to serve
as missionaries in the new colony of Georgia. On the voyage,
they met a group of Moravians, who impressed John
greatly with their spirituality. He noted their calm assurance
and songs of praise during storms, while he himself
was terrified of death and did not have personal assurance
of salvation.

In 1736 Charles returned to England ill. John Wesley

223

The Pietists and the Methodists

followed him not long afterward, having achieved little
success as a missionary. In his frustration, he recalled
that the Moravians had something he did not. He sought
counsel from a Moravian in London, who instructed him
in repentance, conversion, and the joy of salvation. Shortly
afterward, he attended an informal Anglican meeting in
the Aldersgate area of the city. While someone read
Luther's preface to his Commentary on Romans, Wesley
had a dramatic spiritual experience in which he trusted
God for salvation and felt a strong assurance from God.
Wesley continued his association with the Moravians
for a while. For example, on January 1, 1739, John and

Charles Wesley, Whitefield, and other friends met with the Moravians for all-night prayer. John Wesley reported, "The power of God came mightily upon us, insomuch that many cried for exceeding joy, and many fell to the ground."9 Wesley also traveled to the Moravians in Germany and met with Zinzendorf.

Wesley continued to be impressed by the spirituality of the Moravians, and he adopted some of their ideas and methods. Ultimately, however, he deemed them too mystical (spiritually subjective), and he disagreed with their philosophy of quietism, or detachment from everyday life and uninvolvement with the world. While Wesley certainly advocated separation from worldly influences, he believed Christians should interact vigorously with the society around them.

From this point on, Wesley felt his mission was to bring revival to the Church of England. He did not intend to form a new organization, nor did he oppose the Anglican church structure, but he worked to renew and strengthen fellow believers. He regarded the Anglicans as

224

A History of Christian Doctrine

already saved, but he found something lacking in their Christian life, and he wanted to lead them into a deeper Christian experience.

Wesley's Theology

For the most part, Wesley continued to embrace standard Anglican theology and church government. He opposed any attempt to bypass the sacraments or the preaching of the Word. True to his original high-church views, he considered water baptism to be a vital part of Christian conversion and regeneration.10 He also acknowledged immersion as the biblical mode but was content with sprinkling.

On one significant point he departed from the majority Protestant view of the day: he rejected predestination and embraced the Arminian position. He taught that God bestows grace upon the whole human race to lead them to salvation (universal prevenient grace), but only those who respond in faith will be saved. He also held that Christians could fall from grace.

The most distinctive aspect of Wesley's theology is his doctrine of sanctification and Christian perfection. Up until this time, most Protestants had emphasized the doctrine of justification to the neglect of sanctification (holiness), but Wesley placed the latter on a par with the

former. He taught that just as we are justified by faith, so we are sanctified by faith.

In Wesley's theology, sanctification is a process of Christian growth that begins at justification but is not complete at that time. The goal of this process is entire sanctification, or Christian perfection.

Christian perfection means purification from inward

sin. It does not mean a Christian reaches a point in life where it is impossible for him to sin or where he no longer needs God's grace. But the wholly sanctified person no longer willfully breaks God's law. He attains a purity of motives, desires, and thoughts.

The wholly sanctified person is still subject to ignorance, mistake, external temptation, and infirmities of the flesh, and these things can lead him into sin if he allows them to do so. But God has progressively purged and transformed his inward nature, the sinful nature inherited from Adam, until it is no longer a source of temptation. Wesley taught that Christians should not be content with the initial experience of justification or conversion but should live a holy life with the goal of being purified from inward sin. He taught that Christians can attain such perfection in this life, but he acknowledged that most Christians did not.

Many later Wesleyans identified Christian perfection as a specific experience, a second work of grace. Just as conversion and justification is an identifiable moment and a definite experience (the first work of grace), so they said Christians should seek an additional experience in which God instantaneously purges them of inward sin. Wesley himself sometimes spoke of Christian perfection as an instantaneous experience, but he emphasized the continual growth process beginning with justification and continuing throughout the Christian life. At some point, a Christian can attain Christian perfection, but the process of sanctification, or Christian growth, still continues afterward.

According to Wesley, the Christian can and should live a life of victory over sin. That view was radical because

until then the Protestants—with the exception of the Anabaptists, who made little impact in England—had essentially said Christians are justified sinners. That is,

they are still in bondage to sin and will commit sinful acts habitually. The only difference is that they are now continually justified.

The Catholics also assumed that Christians still sin habitually. Their solution was to confess their sins periodically and do penance. There was little incentive to overcome sin.

Wesley's doctrine of sanctification, by contrast, says the Christian can overcome the life of sin through periodic self-examination, godly discipline, methodical devotions, and avoidance of worldly pleasures. Sanctification is not an automatic cure for sin; the sanctified person still bears the responsibility to overcome. He cannot expect to live a victorious life if he continues to involve himself in various worldly activities that could overcome him.

Wesley stressed the need to obey the practical teachings of Scripture on matters of lifestyle and dress, and he established specific guidelines for avoiding worldly influences and unnecessary temptation. He "forbade the ladies of his congregation to wear rich dresses or gold ornaments. . . . [He] thought it a sin to go to fairs, to wear jewelry or fine clothes, to attend the theater or to dance."[11] Members of his United Society pledged to abstain from (among other things) drinking, suing Christians, wearing gold and costly clothing, worldly diversions, unwholesome music and literature, and borrowing without the probability of repayment.[12] He taught against the use of tobacco and alcohol.[13]

In Advice to the People Called Methodist with

The Pietists and the Methodists

Regard to Dress, he told his followers to dress neatly but plainly.[14] In Thoughts on Dress, he quoted I Timothy 2:9-10 and I Peter 3:3-4 and then commented:

Nothing can be more express; the wearing of gold, of precious stones, and of costly apparel, together with curling of hair, is here forbidden by name. . . . Whoever, therefore, says, "There is no harm in these things," may as well say, "There is no harm in stealing or adultery."[15]

Critics accused Wesley of propagating a new form of salvation by works. They asked, How godly does someone have to live before he is saved? Under this system, how can anyone know he is saved?

In response, Wesley affirmed that we are both justified and sanctified by grace through faith. God is the one

who enables us to overcome sin as we believe on Him. We
cannot earn salvation by works or by a life of holiness,
but part of God's work of salvation in us is to empower us
for holiness. If we do not walk in sanctification, we are
not implementing what God has provided for us. Holiness
is a matter of doing the will of God and using the grace
He has given us.

Instead of unconditional election and unconditional
eternal security, Wesley taught the doctrine of assurance.
Namely, the Spirit of God testifies to us that God has forgiven
us and that we are His children, and He assures us
that by God's grace we can endure to the end. (See
Romans 8:16-17, 35-39.) We have an inner witness; we
can know we are saved as long as we continue to walk by
faith.

228

A History of Christian Doctrine

George Whitefield remained strongly Calvinistic and
broke with Wesley over the issue. He and most Calvinists
in the movement rejected Wesley's doctrine of Christian
perfection also. Augustus Toplady, author of "Rock of
Ages," vigorously attacked Wesley for his Arminianism,
but the hymn promotes his view of sanctification.

The Methodists

Eventually, the Methodists became a separate denomination
because the Church of England as a whole did not
embrace John Wesley's message and because of Wesley's
organizational ability. He began organizing Methodist
bands or societies patterned after the original club at
Oxford. The people in them made a commitment to live a
holy life, avoid worldly pleasures, engage in various devotions,
meet together, and become committed and
accountable to one another.

These Methodist bands sprang up all over the country.
Wesley ordained clergy for them to ensure that the message
of sanctification would be preached and that his followers
could receive sacraments. The Church of England
refused to acknowledge these ordinations, so the
Methodists developed their own churches and ministers.

The Methodist revival inspired many new hymns.
Charles Wesley was a prolific hymn writer, and he communicated
Methodist theology through his songs. Notable
hymns of his are "O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing,"
"Christ the Lord Is Risen Today," and "Jesus, Lover of My
Soul." A later hymn with a Wesleyan theme is "Blessed
Assurance" by Fanny J. Crosby. And "Rock of Ages" refers

in Wesleyan terms to both justification and sanctification:
"Let the water and the blood, from thy wounded side

which flowed, be of sin the double cure, save from wrath
and make me pure."

George Whitefield became a powerful preacher who
attracted multitudes to open-air meetings in which they
repented publicly in tears. At his urging, Wesley adopted
the same method, also with great success. When a clergyman
tried to bar him from conducting an outdoor meeting
in his parish, Wesley replied, "The world is my parish,"
which became a Methodist motto. Wesley, Whitefield, and
others conducted great revival meetings in England and
America in which thousands were converted.

Methodist ministers preached with great fervor, and
the audience responded with high emotion and physical
demonstration, much like Pentecostals today. Historical
accounts describe people weeping, crying out, shaking,
jerking, falling, and dancing under the power of God,
resulting in the label of "shouting Methodists." There was
strong conviction of sin, joy upon repentance, and ecstasy
in worship. One unsympathetic historian wrote,
"Extreme emotional disturbances, ecstasies and bodily
seizures of various sorts were common in the Wesleyan
Revival of the eighteenth century in England," with people
in Wesley's meetings exhibiting "violent motor reactions
. . . convulsions and shakings" and screaming.[16]

Over time, the Methodists became a large, influential,
mainline denomination. Perfectionism was their distinctive
doctrine, but gradually that emphasis faded. Today
the Methodists are indistinguishable in lifestyle and worship
from the other traditional Protestant denominations.
From the beginning the Methodists were doctrinally
diverse like their parent, the Church of England, although
they were Arminian. Thus, as the perfectionist and

revivalist fervor dissipated, there was little to keep them
on their original course. Sadly, they fulfilled the fears of
Wesley himself, who said he did not doubt that a people
called Methodist would continue to exist but feared they
would not maintain their original spiritual identity.

Speaking in Tongues among the Methodists

As we might expect of a movement that emphasized
personal conversion, repentance, holiness of life, and

freedom of worship, there are numerous reports of speaking in tongues among the early Methodists. In the 1700s, many people received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues in both England and America in the revivals of Wesley and Whitefield.17 For example, Thomas Walsh, one of Wesley's foremost preachers, recorded in his diary on March 8, 1750, that he spoke in tongues.18

There is no record of Wesley personally speaking in tongues, but it would not be surprising if he did, based on his early connection with the Moravians and his own accounts of dramatic spiritual experiences. Perhaps he did not recount speaking in tongues because he considered it too private, or too controversial, or of no general theological import. Significantly, however, he believed the gifts of the Spirit had practically disappeared but a fully restored church would have them again.19

When a certain Dr. Middleton wrote that the gift of tongues was absent from later church history, Wesley replied that he was mistaken. He noted that many ancient Christian writings are no longer extant, that many Christians wrote no books, that the ante-Nicene writers did not say tongues ceased with the apostles, and that the lack of a record does not mean a lack of the

231

The Pietists and the Methodists

experience. He concluded, "Many may have spoken with new tongues, of whom this is not recorded; at least, the records are lost in the course of so many years." In reply to the objection that tongues did not exist in his day, he noted, "It has been heard of more than once, no farther off than the valleys of Dauphiny" [southern France].20

This discussion indicates that Wesley himself had not spoken in tongues by this time, for here would have been a natural place to mention it. On the other hand, Wesley did not refer to speaking in tongues among his own followers, although he surely knew of its occurrence. Probably he avoided reference to his own group because they were the ones under question and he sought to defend them by citing other examples.

Revival in England

The Methodist movement made a profound impact on Great Britain. Coupled with the continuing influence of Puritanism, it helped spark a spiritual revival in the country. Many of those involved were not Methodists but were other Nonconformists, that is, associated with other churches that operated independently of the Church of England.

This revival had a positive influence upon personal devotion, church life, contemporary culture and morals, and social conditions. We can note only a few examples. Isaac Watts (1674-1748) a Congregational pastor, became the founder of the modern hymn with the publication of Hymns and Spiritual Songs in 1707. Prior to his time, the English churches had used psalms in public worship, with limited musical styles. Two of his bestknown hymns are "Joy to the World" and "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross."

Watts firmly upheld the deity of Jesus Christ but had great difficulty in understanding and accepting the doctrine of the trinity. In The Glory of Christ, he stated, "The Deity itself personally distinguished as the Father, was united to the man Christ Jesus, in consequence of which union, or indwelling of the Godhead, he became properly God," and he described the Holy Spirit as the active energy or power of God but not a distinct person.21 Shortly before his death he wrote A Solemn Address to the Deity in which he acknowledged Jesus as God manifested in the flesh but indicated that the idea of three persons in God was nonbiblical and incomprehensible.

In 1780, Robert Raikes began the first Sunday school. He started it in Gloucester for poor children who had no religious or moral instruction. This tool of evangelism and discipleship proved so effective that it has become associated with Christianity worldwide.

Many Christians worked fervently for the improvement of social conditions, including the abolition of slavery. John Newton, former captain of a slave ship, wrote the hymn "Amazing Grace" after his conversion. In 1807, due in large part to the untiring efforts of an evangelical Anglican, William Wilberforce, the slave trade was abolished in Great Britain.

The Great Awakening

Revival also came to North America, where it became known as the Great Awakening. This spiritual movement was remarkable for its mass evangelism, revival meetings, and personal conversions, all of which became characteristic of conservative American Protestantism.

The Great Awakening began in 1734-35 with the

preaching of Jonathan Edwards (1703-58), a Congregationalist

and a strict Calvinist. Although he believed strongly in unconditional election, he preached powerful sermons such as Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God that called people to make decisions for Christ and resulted in numerous conversions. As with the Methodist revivals, physical demonstrations such as falling, shaking, crying, and shouting accompanied these meetings. George Whitefield also held a series of successful revival campaigns across America in 1740. The universities of Princeton, Brown, Rutgers, Dartmouth, and Pennsylvania began as seminaries under the impetus of the Great Awakening.

The Great Awakening emphasized a personal experience with God and personal devotion. It greatly affected the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, although many traditionalists in both groups opposed it and some church splits resulted. The Great Awakening also spurred the growth of the Baptists and Methodists.

Here we see the beginnings of American revivalism, meaning an emphasis on special revival meetings, altar calls, decisions for Christ, repentance, and an identifiable conversion. Whereas European revivalists focused primarily on personal conversion, American revivalism emphasized right doctrine as the proper framework for right experience. It was not merely emotionalism, but it promoted the preaching of conservative doctrine in contrast to liberal trends.

Revivalism spread particularly along the frontier, in places like Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio. The Methodists were at the fore of the frontier revival. They were well known for circuit-riding preachers, who trav-

234

A History of Christian Doctrine

eled on horseback from town to town where there were no resident pastors.

By and large, the blacks in America—both slave and free—embraced Christianity, particularly the conservative, revivalist variety of the Baptists and Methodists. The first major black denomination was the African Methodist Episcopal Church, formed by members who began withdrawing from a Methodist church in 1787 due to racial discrimination. In 1816 it was formally organized, and a prominent Methodist bishop, Francis Asbury, consecrated Richard Allen as its first bishop.

Emmanuel Swedenborg

Before we leave the eighteenth century, we should discuss

a interesting theological figure of that era named
Emmanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772). He was a brilliant,
accomplished scientist and philosopher in Sweden.
Although he was a Lutheran and he never preached or
started a church, he developed his own unique theology
and attracted a following.

Central to Swedenborg's theology was an affirmation
of the full deity of Jesus Christ coupled with a denial of
the traditional doctrine of the trinity. He explained his
views as follows:

There is a God, and . . . He is one. . . . The one
God is called Jehovah. . . . Jehovah God descended
and assumed human nature, in order to redeem and
save mankind. . . . There is a divine trinity which consists
of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These three,
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are three essentials of
one God, which make one, as soul, body, and activity
235
The Pietists and the Methodists
make one in man. . . . In the Lord God the Saviour
Jesus Christ there is a divine trinity, consisting of the
creative divinity, which is called the Father, the divine
humanity, which is called the Son, and the proceeding
divinity, which is called the Holy Spirit. . . . In Jesus
Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.
22

He denied that there were three eternal persons in the
Godhead. He taught that the Son is not an eternal person
but the human manifestation of the one God. Moreover, in
heaven we will see only one God, namely Jesus Christ,
and anyone who expects to see another divine person is
in false doctrine.

Swedenborg taught that Christ's humanity was divine.
Although He was born of Mary, His humanity was of heavenly
origin. Instead of teaching that Christ's death was a
substitutionary sacrifice to meet the requirements of
God's justice (propitiation), he presented it as the epitome
of divine love and a spiritual battle with Satan. He further
held that Christ's work of redemption was not
complete at Calvary but required that He descend into
hell to defeat the devil.

On the doctrine of salvation, Swedenborg strongly
opposed predestination. He affirmed salvation by grace
through faith in Jesus Christ but criticized the Lutheran
doctrine of justification by faith alone as giving inadequate
attention to the importance of love. He believed

that baptism is spiritual and not literal.

Although he based his teachings on Scripture, Swedenborg claimed to receive numerous visions that confirmed his views. He described visits to the place of

departed souls and discussions there with famous theologians such as Luther and Calvin. According to his account, people who have died can still change their ultimate destiny, and some of them, such as Luther, did change their doctrinal views after hearing the expositions of Swedenborg and angels.

Followers of Swedenborg became known as the Swedenborgians, and they founded three small groups that exist today: the General Convention of the New Jerusalem, the General Church of the New Jerusalem, and the General Conference in England. Helen Keller was a famous convert.

Summary and Evaluation

The eighteenth century was one of great spiritual renewal among many Protestants in Europe and America. It saw a significant restoration of the biblical message of true repentance and holiness, mighty outpourings of the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and some attainment of a more biblical understanding of the oneness of God.

Shortly before the century began, the Pietist movement started with an emphasis on spiritual experience and devotional life. It brought much-needed correctives to orthodox Protestantism. Much of Protestantism today, including Evangelicalism, still needs the same correctives. The Pietists, particularly the Moravians, exerted great influence far beyond their own ranks in at least two ways: they turned the attention of Protestantism to missions, and they played a significant role in the spiritual development of John Wesley.

Wesley ranks as the most significant Protestant

leader after Luther and Calvin. While they sought to restore biblical insight on the doctrine of justification, Wesley was the first Protestant leader to succeed in restoring proper emphasis to the doctrine of sanctification. The Lutherans taught that Christians should abide by the moral law but affirmed their continued justification even if there was little or no evidence of sanctification. The Calvinists paid more attention to Christian discipline,

but over time their doctrine of predestination and perseverance likewise undercut the zeal for holiness. The Anabaptists sought a balance of justification and sanctification, but they were a distinct minority and were not a significant factor in England. Thus it was Wesley who restored sanctification to its proper biblical role.

Scripture does not support, however, the concept of sanctification as a second work of grace that purifies the sinful nature. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, some spiritual descendants of Wesley would modify this view while retaining the emphasis on holiness and victory over sin.

Wesley founded one of the most prominent Protestant denominations, the Methodist Church, and indirectly served as the impetus for the Holiness movement of the nineteenth century. (See chapter 13.) From the Holiness movement, in turn, came the Pentecostal movement in the twentieth century.

As both the Pietists and the Methodists exemplify, speaking in tongues has accompanied every major revival movement that has stressed a personal experience of conversion, repentance from sin, holiness of life, and devotion to Jesus Christ. This is true even though most such

238

A History of Christian Doctrine

groups in history did not initially have a place in their theology for tongues, nor did they specifically seek tongues. Nevertheless, in the groups we have discussed, God graciously poured out His Spirit upon thirsty, seeking souls and worked to lead them step by step into the fullness of biblical truth.

The ultimate result of this process is the Pentecostal movement. Today's Pentecostals and Charismatics are pietistic in orientation, and they owe a great historical debt to John Wesley. In them, the spiritual impulses of the eighteenth century live today and have extended to their ultimate biblical conclusions. In particular, the Oneness Pentecostals have preserved the devotion, worship, and practical holiness that the original Pietists and Methodists stressed, while advancing further into the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the revelation of Jesus Christ as the almighty God.

239

The Pietists and the Methodists

The nineteenth century saw many significant developments

in Christianity. Fundamental shifts in politics,
science, and philosophy in the seventeenth through nineteenth
centuries had a dramatic impact upon theology.
People began to change the way they thought about
everything, including God, religion, and life.

The Impact of the Enlightenment

The revolution of Western thought in the eighteenth
century is known as the Enlightenment, or the Age of
Reason. It promoted belief in human progress and perfectibility
based on the exercise of reason. Let us briefly
identify some of its influences and their impact upon religion.

241

The Nineteenth
Century

12

In politics, two important events occurred in 1789. In
Europe, the French Revolution overthrew the monarchy
and separated the church from the state. Indeed the revolutionary
government actively worked against religion.

In North America, the United States adopted the Bill
of Rights, which guaranteed many rights vital to the life of
the church including freedom of religion, speech, press,
and assembly. It also prohibited the government from
favoring or supporting a particular denomination or religion,
which set a new standard for tolerance and equality.

Up to the sixteenth century, science in Western
Europe was the handmaiden of theology and philosophy.
Medieval ideas about science came primarily from writings
of the ancient Greeks and Romans and from theoretical
reasoning. Science was limited by opinions of
long-dead authorities and the Catholic Church's interpretation
of Scripture.

In the seventeenth century, science entered a new era
with the modern scientific method of experimentation
and empirical investigation. Galileo Galilei (1564-1642)
said the only source of scientific knowledge is our experience
and observation, not theory based on preconceptions.
With the telescope, he confirmed Copernicus's
hypothesis that the earth revolves around the sun rather
than vice versa, and his experiments with pendulums and
falling bodies disproved notions about physics that dated
from before Christ. For instance, medieval scientists
accepted the ancient Greek theory that objects of different
weights will fall at different speeds, but Galileo
proved by experiments that, given the same air resistance,
they fall at the same speed.

Francis Bacon (1561-1621) similarly overthrew tra-

ditional assumptions regarding philosophy and science, advocating that knowledge must come by experimentation. The ideas of Galileo and Bacon were quite disturbing, because people thought of truth as given, absolute, and revealed, needing only to be systematized and explained. The approach of Galileo and Bacon said, in essence, that scientific truth was largely unknown, and the only way to discover it was by experience.

Some people began to apply this new approach to theology. Before, people believed that God had already revealed all theological truth. As medieval scientists appealed to ancient authorities, so theologians appealed to Scripture and tradition. Now, however, some people began to think that perhaps not all theological truth had been revealed and not all accepted ideas were true, but they needed to explore theology a step at a time and let it evolve by trial and error.

Similar developments took place in philosophy. René Descartes (1596-1650) of France began a school of philosophy known as rationalism. He sought to establish everything by rational deductions. He started by doubting everything; the only thing he could not doubt was that he was thinking. From that premise, he concluded that he must exist. His classic statement was, "I think; therefore I am." He then reasoned from his perceptions that his body existed and the world existed; therefore the Creator must exist. Eventually, from the existence of God, he affirmed the basic doctrines of Christianity.

While he continued to support the Roman Catholic Church, his supreme authority was individual human reason and rational knowledge. Instead of starting with Scripture as the source of revealed truth, he started with

himself. He concluded that Christianity is true because it is reasonable.

Others, however, would use the same method to draw very different conclusions. For example, another rationalist philosopher, Baruch Spinoza (1632-77), embraced pantheism.

Another philosophical tradition, known as empiricism, began with the Englishman John Locke (1632-1704). He taught that we derive all knowledge from sense

perception and experience, and he developed his philosophy
by experience. When a child is born, he said, its mind
is blank. There are no innate ideas. Everything the child
learns comes from inward and outward experiences.
Locke applied this approach to religion and concluded
that experience shows Christianity to be the most reasonable
religion. It teaches the best morality and is the
best way to live; therefore it is correct. While he upheld
Christianity, like Descartes his supreme authority was no
longer Scripture. Instead, he appealed to experience.
Others applied Locke's method in ways that undercut
Christianity. For David Hume (1711-76), the result was
skepticism about objective truth. For many others, the
ultimate theological result of rationalism was Deism, an
attempt to reduce all religion to its most basic, universally
held, and reasonable elements. Thomas Jefferson once
identified himself as a Deist.
The Deists sought to remove all "myths" from religion,
such as the accounts of miracles, and to affirm only
what makes sense to human reason. They concluded that
the existence of the world requires a Creator—hence the
label Deist—but He is not concerned with present human
affairs and does not involve Himself with the universe. He

A History of Christian Doctrine

is like a watchmaker who creates a watch, winds it up,
sets it on a table, and lets it tick by itself from that time
forward. So God created the world, established natural
laws by which it operates, and lets it continue on its own.
Under this approach, morality is determined by what
is reasonable, by what is best for humanity. Moreover, revelation
becomes unnecessary; the human mind can discover
and comprehend all that is valuable about
Christianity.
Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), a German philosopher,
asserted that we derive all knowledge from experience
but that the human mind has certain innate
structures for receiving and organizing data. He defined
morality by a universal principle he called the categorical
imperative, which is a modification of Christ's Golden
Rule (Matthew 7:12). It says we should do only those acts
that we would be willing to choose as universal rules for
all humanity. Reason is the source of the rule, and religion
is an aid to fulfilling it. Kant reduced Christianity to
moralism and salvation by works, saying that if we do our
best to live a moral life, then God will take care of our

deficiencies and failures and cover us by His grace.
Another German philosopher, Georg Hegel (1770-
1831), spoke of the principle of rationality in the universe,
which he called the "spirit." He maintained that
truth progressively unfolds through the clash of opposite
ideas, a process called the dialectic. First, we understand
an aspect of truth, called the thesis. Then we see an
opposing viewpoint called the antithesis. When we combine
these two seeming contradictions, we attain a higher
level of truth called the synthesis. There is no absolute,
ultimate truth, but we must continually struggle for truth.

The Nineteenth Century

We must realize that there is always more to learn and
that truth is gradually evolving.

In a way Charles Darwin (1809-82) applied Hegel's
dialectic to biology, introducing the theory of evolution.
While he believed in God, his views made it easier for
people to deny the God of creation and become agnostics
or atheists.

Karl Marx (1818-83), an atheist, applied Hegel's
approach to sociology and economics. The result was
dialectical materialism: through the clash of economic
and social classes, society gradually progresses toward
the ultimate goal of communism. Followers of Marx substituted
an earthly utopia of communism for salvation,
heaven, and eternal life.

Liberal Theology

The emphasis on reason challenged the Christian
reliance on revelation. In response, some theologians of
the nineteenth century accepted key tenets of rationalism
but tried to defend and retain Christianity in some form.
They sought to modify theology in accordance with the
dictates of human reason and experience. In the attempt
they reduced Christianity to supernatural rationalism or
moralistic philosophy. Much like the Greek Apologists of
the second century, when the liberal theologians of the
nineteenth century adopted the ideas and methods of
their secular opponents, they lost some of the essentials
of biblical Christianity.

Associated with liberal theology was historical criticism,
or higher criticism, of the Bible, in which scholars
studied the Bible as they did uninspired literature. While
some of the methods yielded positive, productive results,

A History of Christian Doctrine

many scholars employed them in a way that undermined the Bible's message. They typically denied the miracles of the Bible and questioned the accuracy of biblical accounts. Leaders of this type of destructive criticism of Scripture were F. C. Baur (1792-1860), David Strauss (1808-74), Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), and the Tübingen school, all of Germany. These methods came to full fruition in the twentieth century.1

For an understanding of the sources and trends of liberal theology, we will briefly examine three key Protestant theologians of the era: Schleiermacher, Kierkegaard, and Ritschl.

Friedrich Schleiermacher

The starting point for liberal theology was Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) of Germany. Brought up as a Moravian, he became a Reformed pastor. Like the Moravians, he emphasized religious feeling as prior to knowledge or ethics, and like the Reformed, he developed a precise theological formulation of his views.

Schleiermacher taught the need for absolute dependence upon God, and he insisted upon the centrality of Christ in Christianity. He defined salvation as the transformation of the self into total God-consciousness and the church as the community of the God-conscious.

He emphasized the need to belong to the church and to do theology in light of church tradition and confessions, particularly those of the Reformation. The church has six essential, immutable elements: Scripture, preaching, baptism, the Eucharist (spiritual communion with Christ), the power of excommunication, and prayer. The goal of the church is to establish the kingdom of God on earth.

247

The Nineteenth Century

Schleiermacher built his theology, however, on reason and experience rather than revelation. Because he could not explain them rationally within the context of typical human experience, he rejected the literal doctrines of Christ's virgin birth, resurrection, ascension, and return in judgment. While acknowledging Jesus as our redeemer and not just our teacher, he rejected the substitutionary atonement. Instead, Christ's death is an example to us of love, forgiveness, and reconciliation. He suffered persecution and death, but instead of reacting sinfully He responded with total God-consciousness.

Schleiermacher taught that Jesus Christ was divine in that he was sinless and thus totally submitted to and united

with God. Jesus is the supreme example for us to follow
so that we too can unite with God.

While some of his teachings undercut the full deity of
Jesus Christ, Schleiermacher recognized that the traditional
doctrine of the trinity was not biblical: "The original
faith-constituting impression made upon the disciples,
even as they grasped it in thought and reproduced it, was
not connected with any knowledge of a Trinity."2
Instead, trinitarianism is a product of pagan influences
and evolution of doctrine. It originated in a time of
"mass-conversion from heathendom," so it was easy "to
speak of a plurality or distinction in God," and "unconscious
echoes of what is pagan could find their way in."
Consequently, "we have the less reason to regard this doctrine
as finally settled since it did not receive any fresh
treatment when the Evangelical (Protestant) Church was
set up; and so there must still be in store for it a transformation
which will go back to its very beginnings."3
He pointed out the erroneous logic of trinitarianism.

A History of Christian Doctrine

For example, despite trinitarian protests, the concept of
the eternal generation of the Son from the Father makes
the former dependent upon, and therefore inferior to, the
latter. Moreover, "the idea of Origen [is] that the Father is
God absolutely, while Son and Spirit are God only by participation
in the Divine Essence—an idea which is positively
rejected by orthodox Christian teachers, but
secretly underlies their whole procedure." As another
example he asked, Is Christ's "divine nature" equal to the
whole divine essence? If not, does each member of the
Trinity have his own divine nature outside his participation
in the divine essence?4

He concluded that the traditional doctrine of the trinity
is not necessary. What is "essential" about the doctrine
is the "union of the Divine Essence with human nature,
both in the personality of Christ and in the common Spirit
of the Church." These stand independently of the doctrine
of the trinity.5

Schleiermacher proposed the following understanding
of the Godhead: "Son of God" is not a divine title only, but
it refers to whole human-divine person. "Father" and "Holy
Spirit" refer to "God, Supreme Being." "In Jesus Christ
divine nature and human nature were combined into one
person." "The existence of God in the Redeemer is posited
as the innermost fundamental power within Him." While

not fully committing himself, he acknowledged that a Sabellian (modalistic) interpretation would explain all the biblical statements of Christ and the apostles.6

Søren Kierkegaard

Another theologian who blended rationalism with revelation was Søren Kierkegaard (1813-55) of Denmark. He

is also regarded as an important philosopher, the inspiration for existentialism. This philosophical movement emphasizes the existence and experience of the individual, saying that only by personal experience do we know reality.

Kierkegaard tried to combine his existential philosophy with Christianity, teaching that humans are totally free and responsible for their own acts. The individual must pursue truth, advancing through three stages of life by means of "leaps." The first stage is the aesthetic, in which people pursue pleasure. The second is the ethical stage, where they follow universal principles. The third and highest stage is that of religion. At this point, a person becomes conscious of sin and seeks absolute truth. Entering this stage requires a leap of faith into the unknown, irrational, and eternal; only faith (a direct relationship with absolute truth) can save.

In this way, Kierkegaard advocated a personal relationship with God, but he gave short shrift to other aspects of theology. There was little room in his theology for the doctrine of the church and the doctrine of grace. He exaggerated individualism, and he rejected doctrinal formulations in favor of the individual's inner experience and relationship with God.

Albrecht Ritschl

Albrecht Ritschl (1822-89) of Germany, son of a Lutheran bishop, was a third important source of liberal theology. He taught a subjective theory of the Atonement. According to him, the death of Jesus was not an objective payment for our sins but simply a demonstration of God's love for us and a motivation for us to love God in return.

It acts upon us subjectively by making us realize that God has set us free from sin.

In short, Jesus Christ does not actually take away our guilt by an atoning sacrifice, but His example shows us that we do not have to live under guilt any longer. Once

we understand this concept, guilt loses its power to separate us from God. We simply get rid of guilt and follow after God. Salvation takes place within us as we accept God's love and reconcile ourselves to Him.

Ritschl thus emphasized the love of God to the point of completely rejecting divine wrath and judgment. In his scheme everyone is saved; people simply need to recognize this fact and live accordingly. His theology stripped the doctrines of sin, grace, atonement, salvation, and judgment of almost all their biblical meaning and reduced Christianity to a moral philosophy.

The Social Gospel

In the latter half of the nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth, liberal theology led to a movement in the United States called the social gospel. A prime exponent was Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918). Simply stated, the gospel of Christ calls believers to work for God's kingdom in this world, which is the kingdom of justice. The real mission of the church is not to save souls for an invisible, eternal kingdom but to establish the kingdom of God on earth. Its priority should be to work for justice, freedom, and a better society.

The Roman Catholic Church

Liberal ideas also challenged the Roman Catholic Church. In response, Pope Pius IX issued the Syllabus of

251

The Nineteenth Century

Errors in 1864. It defended tradition and it rejected "modern liberalism," namely, rationalism and historical criticism of the Bible. It also denounced the separation of church and state, freedom for other religions, public school education, and other principles that threatened the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church in Catholic lands. It specifically identified the following as errors:

It is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship. . . . It has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.7

Despite official opposition, many Catholic scholars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries became modernists, adopting liberal theology and higher criticism of the Bible. Their reinterpretations of the Bible were not as devastating as those of the Protestants, because as Catholics they affirmed the authority of church tradition

and the continuing work of the Holy Spirit to lead the church into new doctrinal understandings. Thus, even if they concluded that the Bible does not support a certain doctrine, they could uphold it on the basis of postbiblical tradition and progressive revelation.

The nineteenth century marked the victory of the pope over centuries of conflict regarding his authority. Beginning in the seventeenth century, there had been widespread opposition to excessive ecclesiastical centralization, particularly the papacy. Strongest in France, this movement became known as Gallicanism. ("Gallic" is

252

A History of Christian Doctrine

from "Gaul," the old Roman name for France.) The Sorbonne, a prestigious college in the University of Paris, published six articles in 1663 that said the king is independent of the pope in temporal matters, the pope does not have authority to depose French bishops, he is not superior to a council, and he is not necessarily infallible. The French Revolution effectively ended Gallicanism by radically separating church and state and suppressing the church's political influence.

An important step in consolidating the pope's ecclesiastical power was the proclamation of the immaculate conception of Mary. For centuries the Catholic Church had elevated Mary, venerating her, praying to her, looking to her as an intercessor, speaking of her as sinless, teaching her perpetual virginity, and so on. From early medieval times, many theologians, particularly the Franciscans (a monastic order), taught that by the special grace of God Mary was born without original sin and without a sinful nature. At conception, God sanctified her and gave her an innocent nature like that of Adam and Eve in the beginning. The Dominicans, including Thomas Aquinas, generally opposed this view, however.

In 1854, Pope Pius IX proclaimed the immaculate conception of Mary as official doctrine. This move was quite popular, for the doctrine had already won the hearts of most Catholics. The significance of this pronouncement went beyond the doctrine of Mary, however. For the first time, a pope defined a major new doctrine on his own authority, without calling a council or seeking approval from the rest of the hierarchy. Before this time, the immaculate conception was technically a matter of private belief or speculation, but as of 1854 it became the

253

official position of the Roman Catholic Church solely on the pope's authority. The immediate effect was to establish this doctrine, but the long-range effect was to enhance papal power.

The doctrine of papal supremacy reached its apex at the First Vatican Council (Vatican I) in 1870. This council, held in the papal city, proclaimed the infallibility of the pope. Again, what was once private belief or speculation became the official doctrine of the church.

Technically, infallibility does not mean the pope is incapable of making a mistake or expressing a wrong opinion. It applies only when he speaks ex cathedra ("from the chair"), or in his official capacity as pastor and teacher of the universal church, and then only when he speaks on matters of faith and morals. In these limited circumstances, God preserves him from error so that his words are the words of Christ on the issue at hand.

Some Catholics rejected this doctrine and split from the Roman Church, becoming known as Old Catholics. Even in the twentieth century several prominent Catholic theologians, including Hans Küng, have challenged it. Interestingly, this decision applies retroactively: according to official Catholic theology, papal infallibility has always been true even though popes of previous centuries did not make this claim. For Catholics, it is difficult to reconcile this doctrine with theological positions of some ancient bishops of Rome that run counter to Catholic orthodoxy today. For example, Zephyrinus and Callixtus held modalistic views, Liberius signed an Arian creed to regain his position, Gelasius I denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and Honorius I denied that Christ had two wills—all views later deemed

254

A History of Christian Doctrine

gross heresy.8

Vatican I also declared that the pope has the final authority in church discipline and administration. As an example, the celibacy of the priesthood is a rule enforced by the authority of the pope, going back to the time of Gregory VII.

In essence, Vatican I ceded to the pope the historical authority of the councils, effectively ending the conciliar movement. The pope reigned supreme over every aspect of the church. Not until Vatican II (1962-65) did another council meet and play a significant role in directing the

church.

Despite the confirmation and consolidation of his ecclesiastical power, the pope lost most of his temporal authority. In 1870, Italy annexed the Papal States, territory in central Italy that the popes had ruled from the Donation of Pepin in 754. The pope was left only with Vatican City, which remains an independent country under his reign.

Roman Catholicism received a boost from a Protestant source during this century. The high-church, Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church of England reacted against both liberalism and evangelicalism. Beginning at Oxford in 1833, the leaders of the Oxford (or Tractarian) movement championed church tradition and ritual through sermons and tracts. They believed the evangelical wing rejected too much tradition, and they reintroduced Catholic elements such as elaborate rituals, confession to a priest, monasticism, and frequent communion. Later many of them converted to Roman Catholicism, including the chief spokesman, John Henry Newman, who became a cardinal.

255

The Nineteenth Century

Eastern Orthodoxy

Space does not allow a thorough treatment of Eastern Orthodoxy, but there was much less doctrinal development in the East than in the West. The fall of Constantinople (the seat of Orthodoxy) to the Ottoman Turks in 1453 stunted the progress of Orthodox theology. As a result of the Turkish conquest, Islam ruled over much of the historic territory of Orthodoxy.

The Protestant Reformation affected the East very little. Eventually, however, Eastern Orthodoxy found it necessary to oppose Protestant doctrines. As new ideas in science, philosophy, and religion came from the West there was much opposition but gradually some acceptance.

In the Greek church, Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638) became, in effect, a moderate Calvinist. Patriarch of Alexandria and then of Constantinople (the highest position of leadership in Orthodoxy), he taught justification by faith, the supreme authority of Scripture, a spiritual Eucharist, and predestination. After his death, however, the Greek Orthodox Church condemned Calvinism.

After the fall of Constantinople, the Russian Orthodox Church considered itself to be the purest representative of Christianity. It said the center of Orthodoxy shifted

411

from Rome to Constantinople to Moscow, and it considered Scripture, the church fathers, and oral tradition to be equal in authority.

The Russian church went through an anti-Catholic period and then an anti-Protestant period. The school of Kiev in the 1600s tended toward Catholicism, but it rejected papal supremacy and the procession of the Spirit from the Son. Meanwhile, Theophanes Prokopovic and his followers tended toward Protestantism, advocating

A History of Christian Doctrine

Scripture as the primary authority.

Nikon (1605-81), patriarch of Moscow, reformed the ancient liturgy. Those who rejected the changes and split away became known as Old Believers.

In the 1800s the Slavophile movement held that Russian Orthodoxy is the correct halfway point between Catholicism and Protestantism, avoiding the errors of both. The Slavophiles also criticized the stifling control of the hierarchy.

Overall, from the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries Eastern Orthodoxy was traditional, conservative, and hierarchical. Where it was the majority faith, it closely aligned itself with the state and, in the case of Russia, was quite subservient to the state.

New American Religions

In nineteenth-century America, several new religions arose out of traditional Christianity. We can only briefly discuss some of the more important ones.

The Seventh-day Adventists grew out of the preaching of a Baptist named William Miller (1782-1849). He predicted the second coming of Christ in 1843 and again in 1844, attracting numerous followers. When his prophecies failed, he renounced his methods and apologized, but some of his followers rallied under the leadership of Ellen G. White in 1846. She explained that Christ had entered a heavenly temple on the predicted date to begin the "investigative judgment." She taught that Christians must keep Saturday as the Sabbath, or else they run the risk of being lost. Today's Seventh-day Adventists regard Ellen White as a prophet whose writings are authoritative, but they seek to be recognized as fully

The Nineteenth Century

Christian by accepting the supreme authority of Scripture and justification by faith.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, better known as the Mormons, began in 1830 with Joseph Smith (1805-44), who claimed he was restoring the true church. He said an angel revealed to him the location of a second volume of Scripture, called the Book of Mormon, written by ancient inhabitants of America who received a visit from Christ. In the 1830s, before their most serious doctrinal deviations, a few Mormon leaders claimed to speak in tongues, but this practice did not continue. After much persecution in which Smith was killed, Brigham Young (1801-77) led the majority of the Mormons to Utah in 1847, where they settled and became the dominant religion. Under Young's influence, Mormons came to believe that God was once a man and through obedience and good works we can become gods ourselves.

The founder of Jehovah's Witnesses, who also use the name of Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, was Charles Taze Russell (1852-1916). He and subsequent leaders made a number of failed predictions relative to the Second Coming and finally concluded that Jesus had already come invisibly. Jehovah's Witnesses deny the trinity and hold an Arian view of Jesus, believing that He is not the supreme God but a subordinate spirit being.

Mary Baker Eddy (1821-1910) founded the Church of Christ, Scientist, or Christian Science. Blending biblical terminology with Eastern religious philosophy, she taught that God is an abstract principle rather than a personal being. She denied the reality of disease and claimed that when a sick person fully embraces this truth he will be healed.

The Era of Protestant Missions

The nineteenth century is known as the great era of Protestant missions. As discussed in chapter 11, until the Pietists in the eighteenth century Protestants traditionally did not concern themselves greatly about missions in pagan lands but left that task to the Catholics. In the nineteenth century, however, many Protestants developed a missionary burden and vision.

Most of the early mission societies were formed in Great Britain by Baptists, but they were not initially associated with denominational structures. Methodists and others soon started to participate in them as well. Early missions societies also began in the United States and the Netherlands. Individuals from various churches and

denominations joined together, pooled their money, and sent missionaries. This process encouraged lay leadership, for the initial impetus came more from the laity than the ministry. Much later, denominations began to catch the vision and organized their own missions departments.

One of the earliest efforts slightly predated the century. William Carey (1761-1834), a Baptist shoemaker and pastor, was instrumental in organizing the Baptist Missionary Society in 1792, and the next year he journeyed to India as a missionary. Other noted missionaries were Robert Morrison, the first Protestant missionary to China (1807); J. Hudson Taylor (1832-1905), founder of the China Inland Mission, which had the largest number of missionaries; David Livingstone (1813-73), the most famous missionary to Africa and a noted explorer; and Adoniram Judson (1788-1850), an American Baptist missionary to Burma.

As a result of these labors, in the nineteenth century

259

The Nineteenth Century

Protestantism truly became a worldwide movement. Before this time, the stronghold of Christianity was Europe, and by immigration, conquest, and colonization Christianity had expanded to North America (mostly Protestant), South America (mostly Catholic), and Australia (mostly Protestant). The continents of Asia and Africa had been largely untouched by any kind of Christianity, except for ancient churches in the Middle East, North Africa, and Ethiopia. To the extent they were touched, it was primarily by Roman Catholicism, but in the nineteenth century Protestants established strong missions on these continents.

The Second Awakening

In America, the nineteenth century ushered in a new wave of revival. The fervor of the Great Awakening had subsided years before, but in the 1790s and early 1800s, a renewed thrust of revival and evangelism, sometimes called the Second Awakening, began. It was characterized by great frontier revivals, circuit-riding preachers, and camp meetings, which originated during this time.

The new revival mostly involved Methodists and Baptists, but some Presbyterians took part, particularly in the beginning. Leading evangelists of the revival were James McGready, a Presbyterian, and Peter Cartwright, a Methodist circuit rider.

A wave of revival began in Logan County, Kentucky,

with the preaching of McGready in 1799. The first camp meeting was held in July 1800 in the same area near the Gasper River, and it was noted for weeping and shouts of ecstasy.9

The most outstanding camp meeting took place near-

A History of Christian Doctrine

by, at Cane Ridge in August 1801. It was organized by Presbyterians and Methodists, and twenty to thirty thousand people attended. Participants engaged in extended prayer; enthusiastic, emotional worship; and physical demonstrations as the Spirit of God moved upon them.10 These demonstrations included sobbing, shrieking, falling (over three thousand fell under the power of God), exuberant singing, shouting, laughing ("holy laughter"), dancing, shaking ("jerking"), jumping, leaping, rolling, and running. People testified that they fell into trances, saw visions, and exercised various gifts of the Holy Ghost. There were also accounts of "barking," but Barton Stone explained that this report originated because some people grunted or gasped when they jerked under God's power.

Similar demonstrations occurred at other revival meetings throughout the century. Sometimes an entire congregation would begin breathing in distress, weeping, and repenting, with hundreds of people falling on the ground under conviction of sin. In the wake of these revivals were profound moral reforms.11

There were also numerous reports of speaking in tongues. As one example, a great revival swept the University of Georgia in 1800-1, and the students "shouted and talked in unknown tongues."12 In many cases speaking in tongues probably went unreported because observers did not recognize it or its significance and did not distinguish it from other physical phenomena. One historian summarized: "Throughout the nineteenth century speaking in unknown tongues occurred occasionally in the revivals and camp meetings that dotted the countryside. Perhaps the phenomenon was considered just

The Nineteenth Century

another of the many evidences that one had been saved or sanctified."13

Leading revivalists in the nineteenth century were Charles Finney and Dwight Moody. Their efforts helped promote the Holiness movement, which became the heir

of the Methodist revivals, the Great Awakening, and the Second Awakening. We will discuss Finney, Moody, and the Holiness movement in chapter 13.

The Christian Church and Churches of Christ

A leading participant in the Cane Ridge revival was Barton W. Stone (1772-1844), a Presbyterian minister who repudiated predestination and who emancipated his slaves. Stone described the revival as a genuine move of God in which God poured out His Spirit.

At first, Stone and his followers formed an independent Presbyterian group, but soon they dissolved it and determined simply to call themselves Christians and to advocate no creed but the Bible. Their chief goal was the restoration of primitive Christianity and of unity among Christians.

While a Presbyterian, Stone had difficulties with the doctrine of the trinity. One of his theology instructors introduced him to Isaac Watts's Glory of Christ, which advocated modalistic concepts. The instructor, Stone, and others embraced these views, although Stone merely said Watts taught that Christ had a preexistent human soul (instead of preexisting the Incarnation as the "eternal Son").14

Stone also revealed, however, his sympathy for a modalistic understanding of the Godhead:

Sometimes my mind inclined to consider the three

A History of Christian Doctrine

persons as three distinctions, appellations, or relations, in the one God. This opinion rather preponderated in my mind, yet I was unsettled. At the same time I so far doubted the propriety of the phrase Eternal Son of God, that I could not receive it as an article of faith.15

Stone did not make an issue of these ideas, but apparently he continued to hold them, for some trinitarians opposed him in later years because of them. He always upheld the deity of Jesus Christ.16

Stone's study of the Scriptures also led him to water baptism of believers by immersion in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. He wrote, "The subject of baptism now engaged the attention of the people very generally, and some, with myself, began to conclude that it ought to be administered in the name of Jesus to all believing penitents." He then quoted Acts 2:38.17

Similarly, Elias Smith (1769-1846), editor of the first religious newspaper in America, the Herald of Gospel

Liberty, was part of an early group that called themselves simply Christians. He baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ and rejected the doctrine of the trinity.18

Before long, Barton Stone met Alexander Campbell (1788-1866), who with his father, Thomas Campbell, led another group with views similar to Stone's. Stone had not consistently proclaimed his earlier insight that baptism was for the remission of sins, but Alexander Campbell emphasized this point, and Stone renewed his commitment to it. Like Stone, Campbell refused to use trinitarian terminology because it was not scriptural, but unlike Stone he seemed to have no problem with the

263

The Nineteenth Century

concept, and he always used the trinitarian baptismal formula.19

In 1832 the two groups merged, resolving to use the Bible alone as their creed and to call themselves only Christians or Churches of Christ. They wanted to bring all churches under their banner and restore the original apostolic church.

Since there was no defining creed or articles of faith, over time this movement separated into two distinct camps. The more liberal wing became the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), which is now a mainline Protestant denomination.

The conservatives became known as the Churches of Christ, and these churches remained strictly congregational and independent. They closely followed the original ideas of Alexander Campbell. They stress the essentiality of water baptism, are staunch trinitarians, forbid the use of musical instruments in church, and oppose any tangible feeling, anointing, demonstration, or gift of the Spirit for today.

The Oneness of God and Deity of Jesus Christ

As illustrated by Barton Stone, many people in the nineteenth century questioned traditional trinitarian orthodoxy and redefined or rejected it in favor of modalistic concepts. They affirmed the absolute oneness of God and the deity of Jesus Christ but drew away from or abandoned the idea of three distinct persons.

Horace Bushnell (1802-76), a Congregationalist, accepted "trinity," "three persons," and trinitarian baptism but denounced the idea that in God there are "three distinct consciousnesses, wills and understandings." He

264

A History of Christian Doctrine

described the "threefold denomination" of "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost [as] incidental to, and produced by the central fact, or mystery of the incarnation, as an impersonation of God developed in time." When asked whether he believed in a "modal trinity" and "three modal persons," he replied, "I must answer obscurely" and preferred rather to speak of the "Instrumental Trinity" and "Instrumental Persons." He concluded, "Through these living persons, or impersonations, I find the Infinite One brought down even to my own level of humanity, without any loss of His greatness."[20]

Henry Ward Beecher (1813-87), a famous Congregational pastor in New York City, identified "Christ as the Divine Spirit manifested in a human body and under the limitations of a human life." Against Unitarianism he strongly affirmed Christ's deity:

Could Theodore Parker worship my God?—Christ Jesus is His name. All that there is of God to me is bound up in that name. A dim and shadowy effluence rises from Christ, and that I am taught to call the Father. A yet more tenuous and invisible film of thought arises, and that is the Holy Spirit. But neither are to me tangible, restful, accessible. They are to be revealed to my knowledge hereafter, but now only to my faith. But Christ stands my manifest God. All that I know is of Him and in Him.[21]

Other American Congregationalists, such as Lyman Abbott, Joseph Cook, and A. H. Bradford expressed modalism even more strongly.[22]

John Miller, an American Presbyterian, wrote an

The Nineteenth Century

intriguing book in 1876 called Is God a Trinity? in which he explicitly rejected trinitarianism as unbiblical. Except for a few differences in terminology, he explained the oneness of God and the deity of Jesus Christ in the same way as Oneness Pentecostals do today. He also explained that Matthew 28:19 refers to baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. The book evidently gained a following, for it went through at least three editions, with the third one published in 1922.[23]

Modern Oneness Pentecostals have discovered similar works in England, including the following:

• A book written in 1828 by John Clowes, pastor of St. John's Church in Manchester. It teaches that Jesus is

the "only God" and that the Father is not "separate" from Jesus but is Him.24
• A Few Words of Obvious Truth (third edition, 1836) by an anonymous author who described himself as "a Unitarian Believer in the Divinity of the Son of God" and an "Apostolical Christian." He denied the trinity, upheld the oneness of God and deity of Jesus Christ, and advocated baptism only in Jesus' name.25
• The Testimony of Jesus (1884) by David Bailey. Founder of a school in Bilston, England, he taught that Jesus is Jehovah and the trinity is in Jesus. "God is One," he wrote, "in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ."26

The foregoing list is merely illustrative not exhaustive. Additional research will likely uncover others who expressed Oneness views, and many who held such beliefs probably left no written record.

Summary

In chapter 13, we will discuss the Holiness movement

A History of Christian Doctrine

of the 1800s, cite evidence for speaking in tongues throughout the nineteenth century, and draw conclusions about the century as a whole.

The Nineteenth Century

The Methodist movement, the Great Awakening, and the Second Awakening prepared the ground in the United States and Great Britain for further revival and evangelistic efforts. These, in turn, ultimately led to the Holiness movement in the latter half of the nineteenth century and then to the Pentecostal movement at the beginning of the twentieth.

The Evangelists

In the nineteenth century there arose two conservative Protestant evangelists in the United States who became nationally known. They preached revival meetings and crusades across the country and later in Great Britain, pioneering modern techniques of mass evangelism. They

The Holiness
Movement

13

emphasized the need for personal repentance and a personal decision for Christ, and they were responsible for thousands of conversions.

Charles G. Finney (1792-1875) became prominent around the middle of the century. Originally a Presbyterian, he left that denomination because he rejected the doctrine of predestination. He believed that anyone could respond to the gospel message and be saved. In 1835 he published his views in Lectures on Revival.

After leaving the Presbyterian church, Finney became a Congregational pastor. He also served as a teacher of theology at Oberlin College in Ohio for many years, and for fifteen years he was its president. Oberlin was an innovative, evangelical Christian college that accepted both male and female students and both blacks and whites.

Dwight L. Moody (1837-99) was converted in a Congregational church in 1855 and became a successful businessman in Chicago. Although he was never ordained, he soon gave up business, founded a nondenominational church, and served as president of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chicago. Throughout the latter part of the century, Moody toured the United States and Great Britain, holding evangelistic meetings.

Ira Sankey (1840-1908), a singer and musician, traveled with Moody most of the time. His fervent singing of "gospel hymns" was a vital part of the evangelistic ministry, and he popularized a style of music that became characteristic of conservative Protestantism.

In 1886 the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions was founded under Moody's leadership. It swept through colleges, universities, and seminaries across

A History of Christian Doctrine

America, calling students to a dedicated Christian life. Many of them later became missionaries in foreign lands.

Although he was primarily a pastor, we should also mention Charles Spurgeon (1834-92), the most prominent Baptist preacher of the century in Great Britain. Spurgeon's powerful preaching attracted great crowds to his church in London. Calvinistic in theology, he was quite evangelistic in his ministry.

Holiness Groups

As chapter 11 has discussed, John Wesley and the early Methodists promoted the life of sanctification with the goal of Christian perfection. By the mid 1800s, however, it was evident that the Methodist Church had departed from the original emphasis on holiness. A number of people within or associated with Methodism were quite

concerned to preserve this message. Phoebe Palmer
(1807-74) initiated a revival of holiness teaching in
Methodism, particularly with her book The Way of Holiness
(1845).

We can date the formal beginning of the modern Holiness
movement to a camp meeting in Vineland, New Jersey,
in 1867. The organizers issued a call to holiness,
dedicating the camp meeting to preaching and teaching
on this subject. From this camp, the National Holiness
Association was born. Its purpose was to renew and promote
the message of holiness within the Methodist Episcopal
Church and throughout Protestant ranks.

Toward the end of the century, the Methodist Church
as a whole rejected this renewed emphasis, and Methodist
publications condemned the movement. Consequently,
many holiness-minded people felt they had no choice but

The Holiness Movement

to form their own denominations. A number of conservative
Wesleyan or Holiness churches were established,
including the Wesleyan Methodist Church (1843), an antislavery
split that embraced the later Holiness movement;
the Pilgrim Holiness Church (1897), which merged with
the preceding group in 1968 to form the Wesleyan
Church; the Free Methodist Church (1860), which also
joined the Holiness movement; the Church of God
(Anderson, Indiana) (1880); the Church of God (Cleveland,
Tennessee) (1896); the Church of the Nazarene
(1895), which became the largest Holiness denomination;
the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church (1895), which in
1911 merged with the Pentecostal Holiness Church
(1900) under the latter name; and the Church of God in
Christ (1897), a black organization. From 1895 to 1905,
over twenty small Holiness denominations were started.
Two other groups that taught sanctification and practical
holiness were the Christian and Missionary Alliance
(1887) and the Salvation Army (1878). The former was
an evangelistic organization founded by A. B. Simpson,
who proclaimed a fourfold gospel of Jesus as Savior,
sanctifier, healer, and coming Lord. The latter originated
with the ministry of William and Catherine Booth in the
slums of London. Highly disciplined and with militarystyle
organization, this group endeavored to meet both
the physical and spiritual needs of people.

Holiness Theology

The distinctive doctrine of the Holiness movement

was entire sanctification, or Christian perfection. While
the Holiness groups sought to perpetuate the original
Wesleyan doctrine and lifestyle, their emphasis was some-

what different from Wesley's in that they focused on sanctification
as a crisis experience, an instantaneous second
work of grace. Although Wesley had spoken of sanctification
as instantaneous, he stressed the process of sanctification
over a person's life both before and after the
attainment of Christian perfection.

In short, the Holiness groups taught that everyone
should seek two distinct experiences with God, or works
of grace. First, a person needs to be saved. When he
repents of sin, believes on the Lord, and confesses Jesus
as his personal Savior, he is justified, forgiven of sins, and
born again, and has Christ living within.

At this point he needs a second work of grace, called
Christian perfection or entire sanctification. In this
experience, God "eradicates" the indwelling nature of
sin, thereby enabling the Christian to live a victorious,
holy life.

Holiness people sought this experience with prayer,
weeping, and soul searching, much as they did the initial
experience of conversion. Many began to look for evidence
of this second experience, such as a strong assurance,
emotional feelings, or physical sensations.

As they studied the Scriptures, particularly the Book
of Acts, they noticed that the disciples were "baptized
with the Holy Ghost," and they began to equate entire
sanctification with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. They
did not necessarily associate this experience with speaking
in tongues, although there were some instances of
speaking in tongues in the Holiness movement.

In using this terminology, they deviated from Wesley,
who thought that receiving the Holy Spirit occurred at
conversion. They followed, however, the language of his

designated successor, John Fletcher, who described sanctification
as receiving, or being baptized with, the Holy
Ghost. Nineteenth-century leaders who employed this terminology
included Phoebe Palmer; Asa Mahan, former
president of Oberlin College who wrote The Baptism of
the Holy Ghost; Dwight Moody; and R. A. Torrey.

For the most part, Oberlin College and Charles Finney

taught the Holiness doctrine of sanctification as a second work of grace. Their view is sometimes called Oberlin perfectionism.

A number of holiness-minded people began to proclaim an alternate view of holiness, however. The practical effect was much the same, but the approach was somewhat different. They denied that the inward nature of sin is eradicated in this life, but they proclaimed that by His Spirit God gives Christians power to overcome and suppress the influence of the sinful nature.

They exhorted all Christians to seek a distinct encounter with God's Spirit in which they would receive power for Christian service and power to bear spiritual fruit. It could happen at conversion or afterward. Subsequently, they should live in the "fullness of the Spirit" and participate in the "higher Christian life." These teachers also began to use the scriptural terminology of being "baptized with the Holy Ghost" for this crisis experience.

This view is sometimes called Keswick holiness, or Keswick higher life, from the village of Keswick (pronounced "Kessick"), England, which was the location of the first and most influential meetings to promote this view. Prominent advocates included William E. Boardman, F. B. Meyer, Andrew Murray, G. Campbell Morgan, A. B. Simpson, and A. J. Gordon. Dwight Moody, R. A.

274

A History of Christian Doctrine

Torrey (Moody's successor), and Moody Bible Institute were also close to this position, although they spoke primarily of power for service rather than power for holiness.

In sum, both Wesleyan and Oberlin perfectionism and Keswick holiness advocated the life of holiness, but the former stressed the eradication of the sinful nature while the latter stressed the endowment of power to subdue the sinful nature. Both movements used much the same terminology, encouraging people who had repented to seek for a subsequent baptism of the Holy Ghost to give them victory over sin and enable them to do the will of God.

There was a strong call to go back to the doctrines and practices of the apostles in the New Testament church. In describing this desire, the adjective "Pentecostal" became common, and a rallying cry was, "Back to Pentecost." Some leaders began to press for the restoration of spiritual gifts, including prophecy, healing, and miracles.

The Holiness movement particularly sought to restore

the New Testament truth of divine healing. Healing became an important part of the message of Holiness preachers, and many miraculous healings took place. Some began to teach that Christ provided physical healing in the Atonement. Prominent advocates and evangelists for divine healing were Ethan O. Allen, Charles Cullis, William Boardman, A. J. Gordon, A. B. Simpson, and John Alexander Dowie. Charles Spurgeon also practiced prayer for divine healing.

The people of the Holiness movement, as well as other conservative Protestants, dedicated themselves to strict morality and a separated, holy lifestyle. They

275

The Holiness Movement

preached that Christians should be godly in their conduct, dress, and speech. As part of Christian holiness, they preached against tobacco, alcohol, gambling, swearing, immodest dress, jewelry, theaters, dancing, and worldly amusements.1 When the twentieth century ushered in new styles and inventions, the Holiness denominations extended the application of these principles to prohibit attendance at movies, women cutting their hair, women wearing pants, and the use of makeup.

Many Holiness preachers, particularly itinerant evangelists, determined to live and conduct their ministries "by faith," depending on God to supply their daily needs as they worked for him. Some established faith homes or Bible schools, where Christian workers and students pooled their resources and trusted God to provide what they lacked.

Preparation for the Pentecostal Movement

In many ways the Holiness movement prepared the way for the Pentecostal movement, particularly by its emphasis on repentance, seeking a distinct experience after repentance called the baptism of the Holy Ghost, demonstrative worship, the move of the Holy Spirit, divine healing, faith, and practical holiness standards for everyday conduct and dress. Although in theology the Holiness movement was trinitarian, in practice the hymns, prayers, worship, and faith of its adherents centered on Jesus Christ, which set the stage for the message of Oneness Pentecostalism.

Donald Dayton, a non-Pentecostal professor who has specialized in the links between the Holiness and Pentecostal movements, concluded:

276

One might argue that the whole network of popular "higher Christian life" institutions and movements constituted at the turn of the century a sort of pre-Pentecostal tinderbox awaiting the spark that would set it off. . . . Indeed, when Pentecostalism emerged in the next few years, leaders of the Holiness movement recognized that it was only the gift of tongues that set it apart from their own teachings.2

The modern Pentecostal movement arose out of the Holiness movement. It began in the early hours of the new century, on January 1, 1901, in a small Bible school in Topeka, Kansas, operated by faith. The founder and director was Charles Parham, an independent preacher associated with the Holiness movement.

The Bible school began in the fall of 1900. Parham studied the Scriptures to find evidence for the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and he urged his students to do likewise. Under his guidance, they concluded that the initial biblical evidence is speaking in tongues, and they began to seek this experience.

In a prayer meeting on January 1, Agnes Ozman, a student at the school, asked Charles Parham to lay hands on her that she might receive the Holy Ghost with the evidence of speaking in tongues. When he did, she began to speak in tongues. Several other students soon received the same experience, and on January 3 Parham himself along with many others also received the Holy Ghost with the sign of speaking in tongues.

These new Pentecostals concluded that this experience was something more than what the Holiness movement had taught. At first, they thought of it as a third

277

The Holiness Movement

work of grace, leading to the common testimony of early Pentecostals: "Thank God, I am saved, sanctified, and filled with the Holy Ghost."

Many Holiness groups soon embraced the Pentecostal message en masse, including the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), the Church of God in Christ, and the Pentecostal Holiness Church. These organizations advocated three works of grace, while later other Pentecostals reduced the number to two or one. For instance, the Assemblies of God believes in two works of grace: conversion and the baptism of the Holy Spirit (a postconversional endowment of power), while the United

Pentecostal Church International holds that repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit are all part of the one experience of regeneration.

As we have already seen, January 1901 in Topeka was by no means the first time since Bible days that someone had received the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. But it was the first recorded time in modern church history when people sought for and received the Holy Spirit with the expectation of speaking in tongues. The biblical knowledge and expectation of the evidentiary role of tongues is what set this movement apart from earlier outpourings of the Spirit and led directly to Pentecostalism as a distinct movement. The Pentecostals also differed from earlier believers by proclaiming this experience as the norm and urging everyone to receive it. Further discussion of this movement must await a volume on the twentieth century.

Speaking in Tongues in the Nineteenth Century

Before the Pentecostal movement, there were numer-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ous instances of speaking in tongues in the nineteenth century. Chapter 12 has already cited evidence that it occurred in revival and camp meetings in America throughout the 1800s. In addition, there were notable occurrences in other parts of the world.

In the late 1820s a prominent Church of Scotland (Presbyterian) pastor named Edward Irving began to preach that believers should seek the restoration of all the miracles and gifts of the Spirit that characterized the New Testament church. In 1830 the Holy Spirit fell among his followers, beginning with Mary Campbell and James and Margaret MacDonald. Although there is no record that Irving himself ever spoke in tongues, he approved of and promoted this experience both in Scotland and in his church in London.

Expelled by his denomination, Irving founded the Catholic Apostolic Church, which emphasized the gifts of the Spirit. The Irvingite revival also gave birth to the Christian Catholic Church and the New Apostolic Church, and there were Irvingites in the mainline denominations. These groups tried to institutionalize the revival by creating a hierarchical church government led by apostles and prophets. Unfortunately, they gradually lost the gifts of the Spirit, degenerated into ritualism, suffered a rapid decline, and are almost nonexistent today. Nevertheless,

observers reported speaking in tongues in Irvingite churches in the latter quarter of the 1800s both in New York and London.3

Other outpourings of the Holy Spirit with tongues took place among the Readers (Läsare) in Sweden from 1841 to 1843 and in Irish revivals of 1859.4 Speaking in tongues also occurred among the Lutheran followers of

The Holiness Movement

Gustav von Below in the early 1800s in Germany and among Congregationalists and "gift people" ("gift adventists") in New England from 1824 on.5

Some of the Plymouth Brethren also received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues.6 Founded by John Nelson Darby (1800-82), an Anglican, this group promoted the literal interpretation of Scripture, sought spiritual renewal, strongly taught holiness and separation from the world, and gave great attention to the study of Bible prophecy. Darby was primarily responsible for the doctrine of dispensationalism, which spread rapidly across Fundamentalism in the early twentieth century, and for the popularization of the associated doctrine of the secret, pretribulation rapture of the church. Interestingly, some of the Plymouth Brethren, as well as other English groups at this time, practiced baptism in the name of Jesus Christ in obedience to the Book of Acts.7

As the century drew to a close, reports of speaking in tongues escalated, and in the great Welsh revival of 1904, which predated the arrival of the Pentecostal movement there, some people spoke in tongues.8 F. B. Meyer found Baptists in Estonia who spoke in tongues.9

Finally, speaking in tongues occurred in the Holiness movement in the latter part of the century well before the definite beginning of the Pentecostal movement. For instance, Holiness people in Tennessee and North Carolina spoke in tongues.10 In 1896, about 130 believers in the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) received the Holy Spirit with tongues at the Shearer Schoolhouse in Cherokee County, North Carolina.11

After the Pentecostal movement began and started stressing tongues, many people recalled their previous

A History of Christian Doctrine

experience of speaking in tongues as Methodists, Holiness adherents, or members of other conservative Christian groups, and they realized its significance. In other

cases they recalled hearing family members or acquaintances speak in tongues prior to the arrival of the Pentecostal message. Testimonies of this nature were common among the early Pentecostals.

Donald Dayton noted the increasing occurrence of speaking in tongues in the late 1800s:

This phenomenon of speaking in tongues was not unknown at the time. Assiduous searches for antecedents to contemporary Pentecostal practice have compiled lists of reports of such outbreaks that occurred at an increasing rate of frequency from 1870. . . . These incidents were widespread and apparently unrelated. There seems to have been a tendency for the practice to arise spontaneously in many contexts.[12]

Summary and Evaluation

Christianity in the nineteenth century underwent rapid changes and innovations and became increasingly diverse. In the Roman Catholic Church, the pope attained greater ecclesiastical power than ever before but lost most of his secular power. In Protestantism, liberal theology came into its own under the impact of the Enlightenment, particularly in Germany, yet conservative revivals swept America and prepared the way for the Pentecostal outpouring of the early twentieth century.

As we survey the history of Christian doctrine beginning with the Protestant Reformation, we find an amazing

The Holiness Movement

process of the restoration of biblical understanding and practice. It did not take place overnight, although in every age God provided a witness to the fullness of truth. In most cases, the leading theologians of the day took only a few steps at a time instead of making the full leap of restoration to the apostolic pattern.

Martin Luther restored to widespread understanding and acceptance the doctrine of justification by faith, although his explanation of it was flawed by his concept of predestination. Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin presented a more scriptural view of the Eucharist as a memorial and a spiritual communion. The Anabaptists restored the baptism of believers as well as proper emphasis on repentance and holiness of life. In the English-speaking world, the Baptists did much the same, while John Wesley brought much-needed attention and prominence to the doctrine of sanctification. Finally, by its restorationism

and its focus on the work of the Holy Spirit, the Holiness movement set the stage for the great revival of New Testament truth in the Pentecostal movement.

We must not suppose that the vital New Testament doctrines of the oneness of God, absolute deity of Jesus Christ, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of tongues, and holiness of life were entirely absent until the twentieth century. In each of the four major Protestant traditions—Lutheran, Reformed, Anabaptist, Anglican—we see God's hand at work to reveal these truths.

At the outset of the Reformation, Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon had difficulty with the doctrine of the trinity, and both became acquainted with the modalistic views of Michael Servetus. Luther recognized that the

A History of Christian Doctrine

apostles baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. In the 1500s, some of Luther's early followers or acquaintances baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and some received powerful experiences in the Holy Spirit accompanied by ecstatic utterances. It is likely that some were baptized in Jesus' name and received the Holy Spirit. Later there were other outpourings of the Spirit among Lutherans, particularly among the Moravians (1700s), who were Pietists in the Lutheran tradition.

In the Reformed movement, Ulrich Zwingli also recognized that the New Testament teaches baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Many of his associates and followers pursued scriptural truth further in the Anabaptist movement. The greatest Reformed theologian, John Calvin, initially had some difficulties with the trinitarian dogma, and in the person of Michael Servetus he and many other Reformed believers directly encountered a clear exposition of the oneness of God and the deity of Jesus Christ. Later on, some people from the Reformed tradition were baptized with the Holy Spirit, including the Camisards in France (1600s and 1700s) and the Irvingites in Great Britain (1800s). Moreover, the early Calvinists were quite strict in their advocacy of practical holiness.

Among the early Anabaptists of the 1500s, some questioned the traditional doctrine of the trinity and offered nontrinitarian alternatives, which included modalism. Some baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, some received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and

some probably embraced both experiences. The movement as a whole emphasized holiness of life in conduct

and dress.

The doctrines we have discussed also arose in groups who emerged from the Church of England. Some early Baptists (1600s) expressed Oneness views, and many baptized in the name of Jesus Christ; it also appears that some received the Holy Spirit. The early Quakers (1600s) espoused Oneness views, and many were filled with the Spirit. Many of the Methodists (1700s) also received the Holy Spirit. In the 1800s, both Oneness views and the outpouring of the Spirit reappeared frequently in Great Britain and America. Both baptism in Jesus' name and speaking in tongues occurred among the Plymouth Brethren, for example. Finally, many groups, including the Puritans, Quakers, Methodists, Plymouth Brethren, and Holiness people, advocated strict holiness of life. God also worked among the Catholics. Many of the Jansenists, for example, received the Holy Spirit in the 1600s and 1700s.

Undoubtedly many other people not recorded by history were baptized in Jesus' name and received the Holy Spirit. It should not surprise us that evidence for them is relatively sparse. The following comments of Kenneth Scott Latourette, church historian and professor at Yale University Divinity School, help explain why:

Those events, movements, and institutions which usually attract the attention of men and therefore find a place in the records of the past which survive are not nearly as significant as some which are scarcely noticed and of which either little or no trace remains or which, if it is there, is normally passed over by the historian. . . . Then, too, many individuals and institu-

tions which have borne the Christian name have compromised their Christian principles by mingling with the sub-Christian or anti-Christian world about them to such an extent that the latter has paid them the doubtful compliment of so noticing them that accounts of them have been kept.13

By faith—but a reasonable faith based on tangible evidence—we can affirm that in every age God has had people who received the full experience of New Testament

conversion, which the apostle Peter proclaimed in Acts 2:38. Only eternity will reveal the true history of God's church.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, people's hearts and minds were finally becoming receptive to a greater restoration and experience of apostolic truth. The people of the Holiness movement earnestly sought for an outpouring of the Holy Spirit, even though they did not fully understand everything it would entail, and God graciously responded. The result is that, while liberal theology captured mainline Protestantism, the papacy consolidated its position in Catholicism, and sub- or non-Christian groups proliferated worldwide, the twentieth century has seen history's greatest revival of the name of Jesus and the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

285

The Holiness Movement

Appendixes

Appendix A
Dates in the History of Christianity
1500-1900

A single date for a group or movement identifies the approximate time it began or first became a significant force. For people identified by an official title, such as king, inclusive dates refer to their term of office. For others, inclusive dates identify their birth and death. Some dates are uncertain, and in some cases sources differ on dates.

Secular History Church History
1300s-1500s Italian
Renaissance
1453 Fall of Constantinople,
End of Byzantine Empire
1456 Gutenberg Bible 1466-1536 Desiderius Erasmus
1492 Columbus discovers 1483-1546 Martin Luther
America 1484-1531 Ulrich Zwingli
1486-1543 John Eck
1487-1541 Caspar Schwenckfeld
1489-1656 Guillame Farel
1491-1551 Martin Bucer
1491-1556 Ignatius of Loyola
1494-1536 William Tyndale

289

Secular History Church History

1494-1566 John Agricola
1496-1561 Menno Simons
1497-1560 Philip Melanchthon
1498-1526 Conrad Grebel
?-1528 Balthasar Hubmaier
1498-1552 Francis Xavier
1499-1542 Sebastian Franck
1509-47 Henry VIII, 1509-64 John Calvin
King of England 1511-53 Michael Servetus
1513-72 John Knox
1515-82 Teresa of Avila
1516 Greek NT of Erasmus
1517 Luther's 95 theses;
the Reformation begins
1520 Leo X excommunicates
Luther
1521 Diet of Worms
1523 Zwingli begins Reformed
movement
1525 Anabaptist movement begins
1529 Colloquy of Marburg
1530 Augsburg Confession
1533-35 Münster kingdom
1534 Church of England
established
1536 Calvin's Institutes
(first edition)
1536-1600 Luis de Molina
1539-1604 Faustus Socinus
1540 Society of Jesus founded
1542-1605 John of the Cross

A History of Christian Doctrine
Secular History Church History
1545-63 Council of Trent
1548-1617 Francisco Suárez
1549 Book of Common Prayer
1553-58 Queen Mary, England 1550-1633 Robert Browne
1555 Peace of Augsburg 1559 Calvin's Institutes
(final edition)
1558-1603 Elizabeth I, 1560 Scotland becomes Protestant
Queen of England 1560s Puritans
1561-1626 Francis Bacon 1560-1609 Jacob Arminius
1564-1642 Galileo Galilei 1572-1638 Cyril Lucaris
1564-1616 William Shakespeare 1580 Book of Concord
1588 Spanish Armada defeated 1580 Congregationalists

1596-1650 René Descartes 1585-1638 Cornelius Jansenius
1598 Edict of Nantes 1609 Baptists
1611 King James Version
1618-48 Thirty Years' War 1618-19 Synod of Dort
1632-77 Baruch Spinoza 1624-91 George Fox
1632-1704 John Locke 1635-1705 Philip Jacob Spener
1633 Trial of Galileo 1646 Westminster Confession
1648 Peace of Westphalia 1652 Society of Friends (Quakers)
1649 Charles I beheaded 1675 Pietists (Pia Desideria)
1678 John Bunyan's Pilgrim's
Progress
1700-60 Count Nicholas von
Zinzendorf
1722 Moravians
1703-91 John Wesley
1711-76 David Hume 1703-58 Jonathan Edwards
1707 Isaac Watts's Hymns
1714-70 George Whitefield
1724-1804 Immanuel Kant 1734-35 Great Awakening begins

Appendix A
Secular History Church History
1739 Methodists
1775 American Revolution 1761-1834 William Carey
1789 French Revolution; 1768-1834 Friedrich
U.S. Bill of Rights Schleiermacher
1772-1844 Barton W. Stone
1770-1831 Georg Hegel 1780 Robert Raikes begins
Sunday school
1807 Abolition of British 1792-1875 Charles Finney
slave trade 1800 Second Awakening
1809-82 Charles Darwin 1813-55 Søren Kierkegaard
1813-73 David Livingstone
1816 African Methodist Episcopal
Church
1818-83 Karl Marx 1822-89 Albrecht Ritschl
1830 Mormons
1832 Disciples of Christ;
Churches of Christ
1832-1905 Hudson Taylor
1833 Oxford movement
1837-99 Dwight Moody
1845 Phoebe Palmer's Way of
Holiness
1846 Seventh-day Adventists
1854 Immaculate conception of

Mary proclaimed by Pius IX
1861-65 U.S. Civil War 1864 Syllabus of Errors (Pius IX)
1867 Holiness movement
1869-70 First Vatican Council
1870 Papal infallibility declared
1878 Salvation Army
1880 Holiness organizations
292
A History of Christian Doctrine
Secular History Church History
1886 Student Volunteer
Movement
1901 Pentecostal movement
Note: Sources for the foregoing dates include Christian
History 9, no. 4 (issue 28: "The 100 Most Important
Events in Church History"); William L. Langer, ed., An
Encyclopedia of World History; New Grolier Multimedia
Encyclopedia; Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History
of Christianity; Justo Gonzalez, A History of Christian
Thought; and Philip Schaff, History of the Christian
Church.
293
Appendix A

Appendix B
Oneness Believers in History
This list consists of people for whom we have documented
evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups
the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily
know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people
included (after the apostles). It appears that the
people on this list affirmed the absolute oneness of God
and the full deity of Jesus Christ and that they were nontrinitarian
(by orthodox trinitarian standards). For documentation,
see The Oneness of God and Oneness and
Trinity: A.D. 100-300 by David Bernard as well as A History
of Christian Doctrine, volumes 1 and 2.
Century Group or Individual
1 Apostolic church
2 Post-apostolic leaders, including Clement of Rome,
Ignatius, Polycarp; some Montanists; modalists
3 Modalists, including Noetus, Praxeas, Epigonus,
Cleomenes, Sabellius; probably the Roman bishops
Victor, Callistus, and Zephyrinus; Commodian,
probably a bishop in North Africa; "the majority of
believers" in Tertullian's day

4 Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and followers; believers
in Antioch, probably including Eustathius, the
bishop there; Priscillian and followers; Sabellians
295
Century Group or Individual
5-15 Sabellians, Priscillianists; possibly other heretics
such as Euchites and Bogomils; some theologians
such as Peter Abelard, William of Conches, and
Gilbert de la Porrée
16 Michael Servetus, some antitrinitarians, some
Anabaptists
17 Some English Baptists; George Fox, William Penn,
and other early Quakers
18 Emmanuel Swedenborg, Isaac Watts
19 Barton Stone (Christian), some New England Congregationalists,
John Miller (Presbyterian), John
Clowes (Anglican), David Bailey, anonymous English
author
20 Oneness (Apostolic) Pentecostals, some Charismatics,
some Sabbatarians, some Baptists including
Frank Stagg, some Neo-Orthodox theologians
296
A History of Christian Doctrine
Appendix C
Baptism in Jesus' Name in History
This list includes only people for whom we have documented
evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups
the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily
know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people
included (after the apostles). For documentation, see
The New Birth by David K. Bernard as well as A History
of Christian Doctrine, volumes 1 and 2.
Century Group or Individual
1 Apostolic church
2 Early post-apostolic church, Marcionites, some
Montanists, modalists
3 Many in the institutional church; "heretics"; opponents
of Cyprian; Sabellians; endorsement by
Stephen, bishop of Rome
4 Sabellians, Theophranes, Eutychus, endorsement
by Ambrose and Hilary
5-6 Sabellians, other "heretics"
7 Endorsement by Bede
8 Endorsement by Council of Fréjus
9 Endorsement by Pope Nicholas I
12 Support by Peter Lombard and Hugo Victor

13 Mention by Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, and
297
Century Group or Individual
Albertus Magnus; endorsement by Synod of
Nemours
16 Some antitrinitarians, some Anabaptists, people
known to Martin Luther
17 Some English "heretics"; some Baptists, including
Francis Cornwell
18 Some American Baptists, including Daniel Hibbard
19 Some Christians, including Elias Smith and perhaps
Barton Stone; some Plymouth Brethren; John
Miller (Presbyterian); an anonymous English
author
20 Some trinitarian Pentecostals, Oneness Pentecostals,
some Sabbatarians, some Charismatics
298
A History of Christian Doctrine

Appendix D
Speaking in Tongues in History

This list includes only people for whom we have documented
evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups
the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily
know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people
included (after the apostles). For documentation, see
The New Birth by David K. Bernard as well as A History
of Christian Doctrine, volumes 1 and 2.

Century Group or Individual
1 Apostolic church
2 Early post-apostolic church, Justin, Irenaeus, Montanists
3 Tertullian, Novatian, Sabellians
4 Endorsement by Hilary and Ambrose
12 Some Waldenses, some Albigenses, some Franciscans,
some among other mendicant religious
orders
16 Some Anabaptists, prophecy movement in England
17 Camisards; some Quakers; some Jansenists; some
Pietists, including some Moravians
18 Some Methodists, some from the 17th-century
groups mentioned above
299
Century Group or Individual
19 Some in American revivals and camps, Irvingites,
some Plymouth Brethren, some Congregationalists
and the "gift people" in New England, Readers in
Sweden, some German Lutherans, Irish revivals,

some Estonian Baptists, some in the Holiness
movement, other Christians
20 Welsh revival, Pentecostals, Charismatics from
every denomination

A History of Christian Doctrine
Appendix E
Holiness Teaching in History
1. Groups That Emphasized Practical Holiness.
This list includes only people for whom we have documented
evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups
the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily
know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people
included (after the apostles). For documentation, see
Practical Holiness: A Second Look by David K. Bernard
as well as A History of Christian Doctrine, volumes 1
and 2.
Century Group or Individual
1 Apostolic church
2 Post-apostolic church, Montanists, Greek Apologists
3 Ante-Nicene writers, including Tertullian and
Clement of Alexandria
4 Some post-Nicene writers, such as John Chrysostom
12 Waldenses, Humiliati, Albigenses
14 Hussites
15 Bernardino of Siena and followers, Savonarola and
followers
16 Anabaptists, including Mennonites, Hutterites,

Century Group or Individual
16 Amish; Calvinists
17 Puritans, Quakers, Baptists
18 Methodists; Pietists, including Moravians and
Brethren
19 Holiness movement, Plymouth Brethren, other
conservative Christians
20 Early trinitarian Pentecostals, early Fundamentalists
and Evangelicals; Oneness Pentecostals
2. Teachings. Here are examples of various teachers
or groups who have taken a position against the following
worldly practices. These lists are representative and do
not necessarily include everyone who has taken such a
stand. Some of the groups originally held the position but
no longer do, and in other groups only some of the members
held or hold the position. For documentation, see
Practical Holiness: A Second Look by David K. Bernard.

Worldly theater: Tatian, Theophilus, Clement of
Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Apostolic
Constitutions, John Chrysostom, Calvinists, Puritans,
Spener and Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness
movement, Pentecostals.

Movies: H. A. Ironside; R. A. Torrey; Moody Church;
Roman Catholic Archbishop George Mudelein; Holiness
movement; Pentecostals, including Apostolic Faith,
Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), Assemblies of
God, United Pentecostal Church International; Baptists,
including Baptist Bible Fellowship, John R. Rice, Liberty
Baptist College.

Television: Holiness movement; Anabaptists, includ-

302

A History of Christian Doctrine

ing Amish, Hutterites; some Evangelicals, including Malcolm
Muggeridge and Joe Bayly; some independent Baptists,
including Bill Gothard; some trinitarian
Pentecostals, including David Wilkerson; United Pentecostals.

Personal ornaments: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian,
Tatian, Commodian, Cyprian, Apostolic Constitutions,
John Chrysostom, Waldenses, Humiliati, Hussites,
Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvinists, Puritans,
Quakers, Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness
movement, Pentecostals.

Makeup: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Commodian,
Cyprian, Apostolic Constitutions, Savonarola,
Holiness movement, Pentecostals.

Immodest dress: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian,
Cyprian, Waldenses, Humiliati, Hussites, Bernardino,
Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvinists, Puritans, Baptists,
Quakers, Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement,
some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Wearing clothes of the opposite sex: Clement of
Alexandria, Cyprian, Councils of Gangra and Chalcedon,
Holiness movement, some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Short hair on women and long hair on men:
Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Apostolic Constitutions,
John Chrysostom, Councils of Gangra and Chalcedon,
Savonarola, Anabaptists, Holiness movement,
some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Alcohol: Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian,
Apostolic Constitutions, Anabaptists, Puritans, Wesley
and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists,
Pentecostals.

303

Appendix E

Tobacco: Anabaptists, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Abortion: Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, Apostolic Constitutions, Roman Catholic Church, Holiness movement, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Warfare: Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Lactantius, Waldenses, Anabaptists, Quakers, early Pentecostals.

Astrology: Didache, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Lactantius, Apostolic Constitutions, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Worldly sports and amusements: Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Apostolic Constitutions, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, Tatian, Chrysostom, Bernardino, Savonarola, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Gambling: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Apostolic Constitutions, Bernardino, Savonarola, Hussites, Calvin, Puritans, Pietists, Quakers, Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Dancing: Clement of Alexandria, Commodian, Apostolic Constitutions, Waldenses, Hussites, Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvin, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

304

A History of Christian Doctrine

Notes

1. The Protestant Reformation

1James Fallows, "Vatican City," National Geographic, December 1985, 735.

2David Bernard, A History of Christian Doctrine (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1995) 1:293-302, 267, 271.

3Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church (1910; Repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 7:123.

4Ibid. 7:247.

2. Martin Luther and Early Lutheran Theology

1Schaff, History 7:35.

2See, for example, Acts 2:38; 5:32; 6:7; Romans 1:5; 6:16-17; 16:26; 11:19-22; Hebrews 5:9; 10:23-39; Revelation 3:20; 22:17. For full discussion, see David Bernard, The New Birth (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1984), 31-64.

3Schaff, History 7:24, n. 1.

4Roland Bainton, Hunted Heretic: The Life and Death of Michael Servetus, 1511-1553 (Boston: Beacon Press, 1953), 60.

5Robert Willis, Servetus and Calvin: A Study of an

439

Important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation
(London: Henry S. King & Co., 1877), 44.

6Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (1931; Repr.
Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983) 3:85.

7Ibid. 3:7, 13.

8Schaff, History 7:218.

9Martin Luther, The Babylonian Captivity of the Church,
in Word and Sacrament II, vol. 36 of Luther's Works, ed.
Abdel Wentz (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), 63.

10Roland Bainton, Here I Stand (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978),
216-17.

11Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of Christianity
(New York: Harper and Row, 1953, 1975) 2:728.

3. Ulrich Zwingli and Early Reformed Theology

1Schaff, History 8:6; Sherwood Wirt, "You Can Buck the
System and Win," Christianity Today, 3 February 1984, 21.

2Ibid., 20; Schaff, History 8:188.

3Ulrich Zwingli, Selected Works, ed. Samuel Macauley
Jackson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1901,
1972), 238.

4Schaff, History 8:49.

5William Lock, "Zwingli Was the Reformation's Most Gifted
Musician," Christianity Today, 3 February 1984, 22.

6Ulrich Zwingli, Of Baptism, in Zwingli and Bullinger,
trans. G. W. Bromiley, vol. 24 of The Library of Christian
Classics (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), 145. For
reiteration of this point, see ibid., 144, 168, 171.

7Ibid., 137-38.

4. The Anabaptists

1Schaff, History 8:77.

2Will and Ariel Durant, The Story of Civilization (New
York: Simon and Schuster, 1935-75) 6:401.

3Ibid.

4George Huntston Williams, The Radical Reformation,
3rd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962, 1992), 228,

A History of Christian Doctrine

667; Donald Bloesch, Essentials of Evangelical Theology
(San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978) 2:115-16.

5Menno Simons, Christian Baptism, in The Complete
Writings of Menno Simons, c. 1496-1561 (Scottdale, PA: Herald
Press, 1956), 277.

6Balthasar Hubmaier, A Form for Christ's Supper, in
Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism, trans. and
ed. H. Wayne Pipkin and John H. Yoder (Scottdale, PA: Herald

Press, 1989), 394.

7Simons, The True Christian Faith, in Complete Writings, 377.

8Crane Brinton et al., A History of Civilization, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967) 1:480.

9Hubmaier, On the Christian Baptism of Believers and On Infant Baptism against Oecolampad, in Pipkin and Yoder, 123, 293-94.

10John Christian Wenger, The Doctrines of the Mennonites (Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1952), 108.

11Schaff, History 8:738.

12Williams, Radical Reformation, 1962 ed., 193, quoting the hymn from Frederick Weis, The Life and Teachings of Ludwig Hetzer, 214ff.

13Edgar Gibson, The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England (London: Methuen & Co., 1896), 91.

14Hubmaier, Summa of the Entire Christian Life, in Pipkin and Yoder, 86; but see Hubmaier, A Form for Water Baptism, in Pipkin and Yoder, 389, for his trinitarian formula.

15Williams, Radical Reformation, 668, 738.

16George Huntston Williams, ed. and trans., The Polish Brethren (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1980) 2:455. Brackets are in original. The quote is from Irenaeus, Against Heresies 3:18.

307

Notes

17Williams, Radical Reformation, 704. See also Albert Henry Newman, A History of Anti-Pedobaptism (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1897), 336.

18Wenger, 42-43.

5. The Radical Reformation

1Williams, Radical Reformation, 46.

2Ibid., 49.

3Ibid., 56.

4Roland Bainton, Hunted Heretic, 212; Schaff, History 8:785.

5Bainton, Hunted Heretic, 214.

6Michael Servetus, On the Errors of the Trinity, in The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trinity, ed. James H. Ropes and Kirsopp Lake, trans. Earl Morse Wilbur (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932), 168.

7Ibid., 173-74.

8Servetus, Two Dialogues on the Trinity, in Two Treatises, 196-97.

9Bainton, 131-33. George Huntston Williams concurs that Servetus was not a pantheist. See Radical Reformation, 323.

10Servetus, Dialogues, in Two Treatises, 238-63.
11Servetus, Errors, in Two Treatises, 44-45.
12Willis, 178-79.
13Servetus, Dialogues, in Two Treatises, 235.
14Willis, 347; but see Bainton, Hunted Heretic, 187.
15Ibid., 359; see Bainton, Hunted Heretic, 147.
16Bainton, Hunted Heretic, 60, quoting Sebastian Franck,
Letter to John Campanus.
17Willis, 371.
18Ropes and Lake, eds., xvi-xvii.
19Bainton, Hunted Heretic, 205.
308
A History of Christian Doctrine
20Willis, 302-3.
21Williams, Radical Reformation, 617, 622, 647-50, 808.
22Schaff, History 8:789-90.
23Williams, Radical Reformation, 199.
24Ibid., 822.
6. John Calvin and His Reformed Theology
1Schaff, History 8:559.
2John Calvin, Acts of the Council of Trent with the Antidote
(1547), in Tracts and Treatises in Defense of the
Reformed Faith, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,
1958) 3:180.
3John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans.
Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 514, 521.
4Ibid., 513, 520.
5Ibid., 523.
6Ibid.
7John Calvin, The True Method of Giving Peace to Christendom
and Reforming the Church, in Tracts and Treatises
3:287.
8Calvin, Institutes, 1981 edition, 2:33-34. The reference to
"true ornaments" comes from the literal translation in footnote
1.
9Schaff, History 8:489-90.
10Durant 6:469, 474.
11Schaff, History 8:644-45.
12Ibid. 8:492-93.
7. The Reformation in Great Britain
1Durant 8:194-95.
2Tony Lane, Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith
(San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984), 148.
309
Notes
3"Tongues, Gift of," Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. H.

B. Hackett (1870; Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971) 4:3310-11.

4John Smyth, A Short Confession of Faith in XX Articles (1609), in William Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith (Chicago: Judson Press, 1959), 101.

5George Fox, The Great Mystery of the Great Whore Unfolded (London, 1659), repr. as vol. 3 of The Works of George Fox (New York: AMS Press, 1975), 507.

6Propositions and Conclusions concerning True Christian Religion (1612-14), in Lumpkin, 127.

7Ibid., in Lumpkin, 125.

8A Confession of the Faith of Several Congregations of Christ in the County of Somerset, and of Some Churches in the Counties Near Adjacent (London, 1656), in Lumpkin, 204, 206, 209. Description of the confession is from Lumpkin, 202.

9A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith (London: G. D. for F. Smith, 1660), in Lumpkin 225, 227. The discussion is from Lumpkin, 339.

10Ibid., in Lumpkin, 226, 228; emphasis in original.

11Robert Robinson, The History of Baptism, ed. David Benedict (Boston: Lincoln & Edmands, 1817), 60.

12Thomas Weisser, Early Baptists Preaching Acts 2:38 (By the author, 1987), 4-7, 11, 12, 15.

13Thomas Weisser, Jesus Name Baptism through the Centuries (By the author, 1989), 37-38.

14Weisser, Early Baptists, 24-25, 30-31, quoting the following: Francis Cornwell, Two Queries Worthy of Serious Consideration, concerning the Gospel Faith of the LORD JESUS the Christ Once Given unto the Saints (1645), 4; Robert Whittle, An Answer to Mr. Francis Cornwell's Posi-

310

A History of Christian Doctrine

tions and Inferences (London: W. H., 1646), 20; Francis Cornwell, A Description of the Spiritual Temple (London: John Dawson, 1646), 44-45, 53, 60.

15Propositions and Conclusions, in Lumpkin, 134.

16The True Gospel-Faith Declared according to the Scriptures (London, 1654), in Lumpkin, 193.

17A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith, in Lumpkin, 229; emphasis in original.

18Donald Bloesch, Essentials of Evangelical Theology (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978) 2:115-16; Schaff, History 1:237.

19William Penn, The Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers (Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore, 1849), 25-

28, 39.

20William Penn, No Cross, No Crown, ed. Ronald Sedleck
(Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1981), cover.

21George Fox, The Great Mystery, in Works 3:180.

22Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, The Quakers, no. 3
of Denominations in America (New York: Greenwood Press,
1988).

23William Penn, A Key Opening the Way to Every Capacity
How to Distinguish the Religion Professed by the People
Called Quakers from the Perversions and Misrepresentations
of Their Adversaries, published with Rise and Progress
((Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore, 1849), 15-17.

24Thomas Weisser, Anti-trinitarianism of Early Quakers
(By the author, 1985).

8. The Catholic Reformation

1See David K. Bernard, A History of Christian Doctrine
(Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1995) 1:245-47, 255-60.

2Latourette 2:847.

311

Notes

3Ignatius of Loyola, Spiritual Exercises, quoted in Lane,
159.

4Michael Hamilton, ed., The Charismatic Movement
(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 76; "Charismata," Encyclopedia
of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings (New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951) 3:370.

5These additional writings are Tobit, Judith, I and II Maccabees,
Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus (Sirach), Baruch
with Epistle of Jeremiah, Additions to Esther, Song of the Three
Holy Children or Prayer of Azariah (added to Daniel 3), History
of Susanna (added as Daniel 13), and Bel and the Dragon
(added as Daniel 14). For further discussion, see David K.
Bernard, God's Infallible Word (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame
Press, 1992), 84-86.

6The Canons and Dogmatic Decrees of the Council of
Trent (1563), in Schaff, Creeds 2:112-13.

7Ibid. 2:115, 117-18.

8Ibid. 2:123.

9"For the Roman Catholic Church, the basis of ecumenical
dialogue with Pentecostals, properly speaking, is found in the
Catholic recognition of the baptism performed by Pentecostals
in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. . . . Our agreement
on the trinitarian basis of baptism draws and impels us to
unity." "Perspectives on Koinonia: Final Report of the International
Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue (1985-89)," par.
54, in Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal

Studies 12, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 128.

9. Lutheran Orthodoxy

1Philip Melanchthon, Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555, trans. and ed. Clyde Manschreck (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 206.

312

A History of Christian Doctrine

2Ibid., 215.

3Lane, 121.

4Willis, 45-47.

5Melanchthon, 11.

6Ibid., 16.

7Hamilton, ed., 85-86.

8Schaff, History 1:237.

10. Reformed Orthodoxy

1Jacob (James) Arminius, The Works of James Arminius, London ed., trans. James Nichols and William Nichols (Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986) 2:722.

2Ibid. 2:721; emphasis in original.

3Ibid. 2:723; emphasis in original.

4Ibid. 2:725.

5See Daniel Fuller, Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum? (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 16-17; C. I. Scofield, ed., The Scofield Reference Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1917), 999-1000, 1115, 1002; M. R. DeHaan, 508 Answers to Bible Questions (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1952), 219.

6Hamilton, ed., 75; Schaff, History 1:237; "Camisards," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings 1:175-76.

7"Tongues, Gift of," Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. H. B. Hackett (1870; Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971) 4:3310-11.

11. The Pietists and the Methodists

1Philip Jacob Spener, Pia Desideria [Pious Desires], trans. and ed. Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 63.

313

Notes

2Latourette 2:895.

3Dale Brown, Understanding Pietism (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 122-23.

4Frank Mead, Handbook of Denominations in the United States, 7th ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1980), 62.

5John Greenfield, When the Spirit Came: The Story of the Moravian Revival of 1727 (1928; Repr. Minneapolis: Bethany

Fellowship, 1967), 9-17.

6Ibid., 23-24.

7Ibid., 57.

8Hamilton, ed., 77, 95.

9Greenfield, 34-35.

10Donald Dayton, Theological Roots of Pentecostalism (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987), 38.

11Durant 9:131, 135.

12Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church 1952, ed. Nolan Harmon (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1952), 34-35.

13John Wesley, To Mr. S., at Armagh, in The Works of John Wesley, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950) 12:248.

14John Wesley, Advice to the People Called Methodist with Regard to Dress, in Works 11:466-69.

15John Wesley, Thoughts on Dress, in Works 11:477-78.

16Elmer Clark, The Small Sects in America (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1937), 111-12.

17"Tongues, Gift of," A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898) 4:796.

18Stanley Frodsham, With Signs Following (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1926), 232.

19Howard Snyder, The Radical Wesley (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 96.

314

A History of Christian Doctrine

20John Wesley, A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Conyers Middleton, in Works 10:54-56.

21Isaac Watts, The Glory of Christ, quoted by Arthur Davis, Isaac Watts: His Life and Works (London: Independent Press, 1943), 120.

22Emmanuel Swedenborg, The True Christian Religion (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1933), xv-xix, 268; emphasis in original.

12. The Nineteenth Century

1See David Bernard, God's Infallible Word, 42-46.

2Friedrich Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928), 399.

3Ibid., 747.

4Ibid., 743, 747, 395.

5Ibid., 738, 741.

6Ibid., 391, 397, 750-51.

7Schaff, Creeds 2:232.

8See David Bernard, A History of Christian Doctrine 1:119, 129-30, 156, 212.

9Robert Davidson, History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky (New York: Robert Carter, 1847; Repr. Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1974), 131-62.

10Ibid.; Barton W. Stone and John Rogers, The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself with Additions and Reflections (Cincinnati: J. A. & U. P. James, 1847), 34-42, in Hoke Dickinson, ed., The Cane Ridge Reader (N.p., n.d.).

11William Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 133, 227-31.

12Vinson Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), 25, quoting E. Merton Coulter, College Life in the

315

Notes

Old South (New York, 1928), 194-95.

13Synan, 25, n. 29.

14Stone and Rogers, 13, 275. See also Barton Stone, History of the Christian Church in the West, 28, in Hoke Dickenson, ed., The Cane Ridge Reader.

15Stone and Rogers, Biography, 277.

16Ibid., 329-31, 346.

17Ibid., 61.

18Weisser, Jesus Name Baptism through the Centuries (By the author, 1989), 38-40.

19Stone and Rogers, Biography, 325-27, 340.

20Horace Bushnell, God in Christ (Hartford: Brown and Parsons, 1849), 127, 168-69, 175, 177.

21Lyman Abbott, ed., Henry Ward Beecher: A Sketch of His Career (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), 110, 113, quoting from Henry Ward Beecher, Views and Experiences of Religious Subjects, 197; emphasis in original.

22Thomas Weisser, After the Way Called Heresy (By the author, 1981), 98, citing Levi Paine, A Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1900), 141-42.

23John Miller, Is God a Trinity? 3rd ed. (Princeton, NJ: Privately printed, 1922; Repr. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975).

24David Campbell, All the Fulness (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975), 167-73.

25A Few Words of Obvious Truth, 3rd ed. (London: R. Hunter, 1836); repr. as Thomas Weisser, ed., Baptism in Jesus' Name Early 1800's (By the editor, 1986).

26The building in which Bailey founded his school is now the home of a United Pentecostal Church pastored by Frederick Turley. David Turley, his son, discovered the book.

316
A History of Christian Doctrine

13. The Holiness Movement
1J. Gordon Melton, The Encyclopedia of American Religions (Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing Co.) 1:200.
2Dayton, 174-75.
3Schaff, History 1:237
4Ibid.
5Hamilton, ed., 85-86, 89; Stanley Frodsham, With Signs Following (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1926), 232.
6Bloesch 1:115-16.
7W. Robertson Nicoll, ed., The Expositor's Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956) 5:330.
8Hamilton, ed., 95-96.
9Fordsham, 234.
10"Pentecostal Churches," Encyclopedia Britannica (Chicago: William Benton, 1976) 14:31.
11C. W. Conn, "Church of God (Cleveland, Tenn.)," in Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, ed. Stanley Burgess, et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 198.
12Dayton, 177-78.
13Latourette 2:xviii.

317
Notes

Select Bibliography
Primary Sources
Arminius, Jacob (James). The Works of James Arminius. London edition. Translated by James Nichols and William Nichols. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1986.
Baille, John, et al., editors. The Library of Christian Classics. 26 volumes. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1950s.
Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1989.
—. Letters of John Calvin. Compiled by Jules Bonnet. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1858.
—. Tracts and Treatises in Defense of the Reformed Faith. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1958.
Fox, George. The Works of George Fox. New York: AMS Press. 1975.
Hubmaier, Balthasar. Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism. Translated and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin and John H. Yoder. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press. 1989.

Lumpkin, William. Baptist Confessions of Faith. Chicago: Judson Press. 1959.

Luther, Martin. Luther's Works. Edited by Abdel Wentz. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press. 1959.

Melanchthon, Philip. Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine:

319

Loci Communes 1555. Translated and edited by Clyde Manschreck. New York: Oxford University Press. 1965.

Penn, William. The Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers and A Key Opening the Way to . . . the People Called Quakers. Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore. 1849.

Schaff, Philip, ed. The Creeds of Christendom. Sixth edition. 3 volumes. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1931.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. The Christian Faith. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1928.

Servetus, Michael. The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trinity. Translated by Earl Morse Wilbur. Harvard Theological Studies 16. Edited by James H. Ropes and Kirsopp Lake. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1932.

Simons, Menno. The Complete Writings of Menno Simons, c. 1496-1561. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press. 1956.

Spener, Philip Jacob. Pia Desideria [Pious Desires]. Translated and edited by Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1964.

Stone, Barton W., and John Rogers. The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself with Additions and Reflections. Cincinnati: J. A. & U. P. James. 1847. In Hoke Dickinson, ed. The Cane Ridge Reader. N.p. N.d.

Swedenborg, Emmanuel. The True Christian Religion. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1933.

Walker, Williston. The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism. Philadelphia and Boston: Pilgrim Press. 1960.

Wesley, John. The Works of John Wesley. Third edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1950.

Williams, George Huntston, editor and translator. The Polish Brethren. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 1980.

Zwingli, Ulrich. Selected Works. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1901, 1972.

320

A History of Christian Doctrine

Secondary Sources

Bainton, Roland. Here I Stand. Nashville: Abingdon. 1978.

—. Hunted Heretic: The Life and Death of Michael Servetus, 1511-1553. Boston: Beacon Press. 1953.

Barbour, Hugh, and J. William Frost. The Quakers. Number 3

of Denominations in America. New York: Greenwood
Press. 1988.

Berkhof, Louis. The History of Christian Doctrines. Grand
Rapids: Baker Book House. 1937.

Bernard, David. The New Birth. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame
Press. 1984.

—. Practical Holiness: A Second Look. Hazelwood, MO: Word
Aflame Press. 1985.

Bloesch, Donald. Essentials of Evangelical Theology. San
Francisco: Harper and Row. 1978.

Boettner, Loraine. Roman Catholicism. Philadelphia: Presbyterian
and Reformed Publishing Company. 1962.

Brinton, Crane, et al. A History of Civilization. Third edition.
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1967.

Brown, Dale. Understanding Pietism. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
1978.

Brown, Harold O. J. Heresies: The Image of Christ in the Mirror
of Heresy and Orthodoxy from the Apostles to the
Present. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday. 1984.

Christian History. Volume 9, number 4. Issue 28: "The 100
Most Important Events in Church History."

Dayton, Donald. Theological Roots of Pentecostalism.
Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers. 1987.

Dowley, Tim, et al., editors. Eerdmans' Handbook to the History
of the Church. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1977.

Durant, Will and Ariel. The Story of Civilization. 11 volumes.
321
Select Bibliography
New York: Simon and Schuster. 1935-75.

Gibson, Edgar. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of
England. London: Methuen and Company. 1896.

Gonzalez, Justo. A History of Christian Thought. Nashville:
Abingdon. 1975.

Greenfield, John. When the Spirit Came: The Story of the
Moravian Revival of 1727. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship.
1967. Originally published as Power from on High.
1928.

Hamilton, Michael, editor. The Charismatic Movement. Grand
Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1977.

Harvey, Van. A Handbook of Theological Terms. New York:
Macmillan. 1964.

Hastings, James, editor. Encyclopedia of Religion and
Ethics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1951.

Heick, Otto. A History of Christian Thought. Philadelphia:
Fortress Press. 1965.

Hodge, Charles. Systematic Theology. Reprint. Grand Rapids:

Eerdmans. 1986.

Johnson, Paul. A History of Christianity. New York: Atheneum. 1976.

Klotsche, E. H. The History of Christian Doctrine. Revised edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1945, 1979.

Kolenda, Konstantin. Philosophy's Journey: A Historical Introduction. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. 1974.

Lane, Tony. Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1984.

Langer, William L., editor. An Encyclopedia of World History. Fourth edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1968.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. A History of Christianity. Revised edition. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1953, 1975.

322

A History of Christian Doctrine

Mead, Frank. Handbook of Denominations in the United States. Seventh edition. Nashville: Abingdon. 1980.

Nigg, Walter. The Heretics. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1962.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. 5 volumes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1971-89.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. Third revised edition. 8 volumes. 1910. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Snyder, Howard. The Radical Wesley. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press. 1980.

Strong, Augustus. Systematic Theology. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell. 1907.

Sweet, William. The Story of Religion in America. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1950.

Synan, Vinson. The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1971.

Wenger, John Christian. The Doctrines of the Mennonites. Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House. 1952.

Wilbur, Earl Morse. A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and Its Antecedents. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1946.

Williams, George Huntston. The Radical Reformation. Third edition. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1992.

Willis, Robert. Servetus and Calvin: A Study of an Important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation. London: Henry S. King and Company. 1877.

323

Select Bibliography

Augsburg, Diet of (1530), 97, 184

Augsburg, Peace of (1555), 22-23, 188

Augsburg Confession, 39, 104, 184, 196

Augsburg Interim, 188, 192

Augustine, 16, 32, 169, 202

Australia, 260

Austria, 22, 25, 93

Bacon, Francis, 242-43

Bailey, David, 266

Bainton, Roland, 100

Báñez, Domingo, 165, 169

Baptism, water: formula, 26, 40, 44, 60-61, 82-84, 88, 94, 101-2, 128, 150-54, 178-79, 280; mode, 40, 44, 82, 88, 101, 109, 128, 149, 221, 225; of believers, 65-66, 72-73, 88, 101-2, 148-49, 282; of infants, 24, 39-40, 43-44, 60, 66, 72-73, 90, 92, 97-98, 128; significance, 38, 43-44, 59-60, 62, 76, 81-83, 88, 96, 101, 109-10, 126-28, 149, 156, 185-86, 220, 225, 263-64

Baptist Missionary Society, 259

Baptists, 87, 148-54, 158-59, 197, 234-35, 257, 259, 260, 271, 280, 282, 284

Basel, 51, 67, 97, 105

Baur, F. C., 247

Bavaria, 23, 25

Baxter, Richard, 146

Beecher, Henry Ward, 265

Belarus, 25

Belgic Confession, 211

Belgium, 25

Bellarmine, 166

Below, Gustav von, 200, 280

Bern, 51, 67

Bernard, 16

326

327
Index

328
A History of Christian Doctrine

God, doctrine of, 37-38, 99-101,
115-16, 150-52, 235-36,
248-49, 262-66, 282-84. See
also Jesus Christ; Trinity

Gordon, A. J., 274, 275

Gospel, 31-32, 55-57, 63, 120-
21

Grace, 28, 33-34, 50, 101, 169,
176-78, 205, 208, 245

Great Awakening, 233-35

Great Britain. See England

Grebel, Conrad, 66, 67

Greece, 25, 71, 256

Greek Orthodox Church, 256

Gregory I, 180

Gregory VII, 180, 255

Gribaldi, Matthew, 105

Grotius, Hugo, 207-8

Gutenberg, Johann, 13

Haller, Berthold, 51

Hans Küng, 254

Hätzer, Ludwig, 66, 82

Healing, 158, 275

Hegel, Georg, 245

Heidelberg Catechism, 202

Helwys, Thomas, 148-49

Henry VII, 138

Henry VIII, 24, 138-41

Hermeneutics, 30-31, 77, 90, 92,
163-64, 175, 242, 280

Herrnhut, 221-22, 224

Hibbard, Daniel, 153

Hierarchical church government,
74, 125, 144-45,

Historical (higher) criticism, 246,
252

Hofmann, Melchior, 66, 91

Holiness, 45-47, 76-80, 84-86,
88, 90, 121, 124, 130-33,
146, 154, 155-56, 220-1,
273-76, 280, 282-84. See
also Sanctification

Holiness movement, 33, 87, 238,
262, 269-78, 280-81, 284-85

Holland. See Netherlands

329

330

A History of Christian Doctrine

331
Index

333

Index

335

A History of Christian Doctrine

A History of Christian Doctrine
Volume Three
The Twentieth Century
A.D. 1900 – 2000
by David K. Bernard

Contents

Preface
This book surveys the history of Christian doctrine
from A.D. 1900 to 2000. It generally follows chronological
order and identifies the most significant events in
church history, but the emphasis is on tracing doctrinal
developments and controversies. To further this purpose,
it discusses some events thematically rather than in strict
chronological sequence.
We will use the words church and Christian in the
most general sense, recognizing that the visible church
structure is not necessarily the New Testament church as
defined by message and experience. We will discuss the
major groups of people who have identified themselves as
Christian, providing an overview of Christendom in the
twentieth century and discussing various doctrines and
movements.
We devote special attention to the Pentecostal movement
for three reasons: (1) Numerically and theologically,
it is the single most important development within twentieth-
century Christianity. (2) It contains the most authentic
expressions of apostolic Christianity today. (3)
Volumes 1 and 2 of this series have examined the basic
doctrines of other major groups.
Occasionally material in this book may seem complex
and foreign, but some treatment of details is necessary to
provide background and to impart a feel for significant
issues and problems. The main objective is to introduce the
leading historical figures and movements and to convey a
7

basic understanding of their doctrines.

This information will provide various perspectives on
biblical issues and will aid in dialogue with people of different
backgrounds. The reader will see how God has
worked to restore and revive fundamental truths that
were largely forgotten.

This book arose out of teaching church history for
five years at Jackson College of Ministries in Jackson,
Mississippi, and lecturing for the extension program of
Kent Christian College in Dover, Delaware. Special thanks
goes to Claire Borne for transcribing the taped material,
which served as an outline and a partial rough draft.

It is important to remember that only the Bible is our
authority for doctrine. We cannot establish spiritual truth
by history, tradition, majority opinion, great leaders, or
personal experiences, but only by the Word of God.

8

A History of Christian Doctrine

The first day of the twentieth century marked the
beginning of a new movement in Christianity that would
sweep the world in the next hundred years. By century's
end, more people would identify with this Pentecostal
movement than any other label in Christendom, except
for the Roman Catholic Church.

Although the modern Pentecostal movement was a new
historical development, spiritually it was not new at all, but
it sought to restore the doctrine and experience of the
apostles and the first-century church. While in many ways
it succeeded, in many ways the majority of adherents have
not fulfilled its original promise. But the end is not yet.

The story begins with Charles F. Parham, an independent
Holiness preacher and founder of a small Bible school.

The Pentecostal
Movement

9

1

He and his students began to study the baptism of the
Holy Ghost in the New Testament. To understand their
motivation, we must first understand the Holiness movement.

Chapter 13 of A History of Christian Doctrine,
Volume 2 discusses the Holiness people and how they set
the stage for the Pentecostals; we briefly summarize this
information below.

Roots in the Holiness Movement

The Holiness movement arose within conservative
Protestantism in America in the latter half of the nineteenth

century. It was a revival of the founding principles of Methodism, which developed from the ministry of John Wesley, an eighteenth-century preacher in the Church of England.

The distinctive doctrine of the Holiness movement was Wesley's teaching of entire sanctification, which the Methodists had largely abandoned by this time. According to this doctrine, when a sinner first believes on Jesus, he is converted and justified and receives forgiveness of all sins. He still is dominated by his sinful nature, however, until he receives entire sanctification or Christian perfection. This divine work purifies his motives, desires, and thoughts. He still has the ability to sin, but his inward nature (the sinful nature inherited from Adam) is no longer a source of temptation. Wesley emphasized an ongoing process of sanctification with the goal of Christian perfection, but the later Holiness movement emphasized sanctification as a crisis experience. In essence, the Holiness groups taught that everyone should seek two distinct experiences with God, or works of grace: conversion and sanctification.

10

A History of Christian Doctrine

As people in the Holiness movement studied the Scriptures, particularly the Book of Acts, they noticed that the disciples were "baptized with the Holy Ghost," and they began to equate entire sanctification with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. They did not necessarily associate this experience with speaking in tongues, although there were some instances of speaking in tongues among them, as among the Methodists earlier.

A number of holiness-minded people in the late nineteenth century began to proclaim an alternate view of holiness. The practical effect was much the same, but the approach was somewhat different. They denied that the inward nature of sin is eradicated in this life, but they proclaimed that by His Spirit God gives Christians power to overcome and suppress the influence of the sinful nature. This view is sometimes called Keswick holiness, after a parish in English where meetings were held to promote the teaching.

Adherents of this position exhorted all Christians to seek a distinct encounter with God's Spirit in which they would receive power for Christian service and power to bear spiritual fruit. It could happen at conversion or afterward. Subsequently, they should live in the "fullness of the

Spirit" and participate in the "higher Christian life." These teachers also began to use the scriptural terminology of being "baptized with the Holy Ghost" for this crisis experience. An American group that was aligned with Keswick thinking was the Christian and Missionary Alliance, an evangelistic organization founded in 1887 by Presbyterian minister A. B. Simpson. He proclaimed a fourfold gospel of Jesus as Savior, sanctifier, healer, and coming

Lord. Many ministers in his organization would enter the Pentecostal movement.

In sum, adherents of both Wesleyan perfectionism and Keswick holiness advocated the life of holiness, but the former stressed the eradication of the sinful nature while the latter stressed the endowment of power to subdue the sinful nature. Both groups used much the same terminology, encouraging people who had repented to seek for a subsequent baptism of the Holy Spirit to give them victory over sin and enable them to do the will of God.

There was a strong call to go back to the doctrines and practices of the apostles in the New Testament church. In describing this desire, the adjective "Pentecostal" became common, and a rallying cry was, "Back to Pentecost." Some leaders began to press for the restoration of spiritual gifts, including prophecy, healing, and miracles. A minority of Holiness people, including the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, began to seek for the "baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire" as a third crisis experience, but again not associating it with tongues.

Charles Parham and the Topeka Outpouring

In this atmosphere, Charles Fox Parham (1873-1929) opened Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas, on October 15, 1900, at age twenty-seven. At the end of the first term, Parham asked his students to find the biblical evidence for the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Together they concluded that the initial evidence is speaking in tongues (foreign languages unknown to the speakers) as the Spirit gives utterance. (See Acts 2:4; 10:45-46; 19:6.)

Parham conducted prayer meetings with his students as the twentieth century dawned. On the evening of

January 1, 1901, Agnes Ozman (1870-1937), a "city missionary" in Topeka and a student at the Bible school, asked Parham to lay hands on her that she might receive the Holy

Spirit. When he did, she began to speak in tongues. On January 3, Parham, his wife, and twelve ministerial students also received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues. The new Pentecostals concluded that the experience they had received was something more than what the Holiness movement had taught. Parham thought of it as a third crisis experience, as expressed in the common testimony of early Pentecostals: "Thank God, I am saved, sanctified, and filled with the Holy Ghost." He believed it was an endowment of power for service, and at first he thought that speaking in tongues would assist in foreign missions efforts.

Parham called his new group the Apostolic Faith movement, and he published a periodical called The Apostolic Faith. The group conducted meetings in Kansas and Missouri but did not grow rapidly at first. A significant breakthrough came in the fall of 1903 in Galena, Kansas. A woman from the town was almost completely blind from an eye disease. After she was instantly healed in one of Parham's services in Eldorado Springs, Missouri, she invited him to conduct meetings in Galena. There, more than eight hundred people were baptized in water, many hundreds received the Holy Ghost, and at least one thousand people testified that they were healed.

A convert in this revival was Howard Goss (1883-1964), who would become one of the founders of the Assemblies of God and later the first general superintendent of the United Pentecostal Church. He was an "infidel" (atheist) when he visited Parham's meeting. He

13

The Pentecostal Movement

testified, "This was my first contact . . . with Christianity of any sort. . . . I feel that I owe my conversion to Christianity to hearing people speak in other tongues."1

In the aftermath of this revival, Parham started several churches in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. He established headquarters for his movement in Baxter Springs, Kansas, a small town near Galena.

In 1905 Parham received an invitation to hold services in Orchard, Texas, about forty miles west of Houston. Many people were converted. Revival spread throughout the countryside and to Houston, where Parham conducted services in a downtown auditorium. The movement enjoyed great success there after a wellknown woman was healed and raised from a wheelchair.

Due to the tremendous response, Parham soon opened a

short-term Bible school in Houston.

Goss came to Houston as a student worker, although he had not yet received the Holy Ghost. In April 1906, he and sixteen others received the Holy Ghost as they rode a train from Orchard to Alvin, Texas. Goss spoke in tongues for one week; it was two weeks before he could preach in English. Revival continued to spread throughout the Houston area and elsewhere in the state. Parham soon appointed Goss as field supervisor of the work in Texas.

In 1907 a controversy arose among some of the newer workers in Texas as to whether speaking in tongues was invariably the initial evidence of the Spirit baptism or simply one of the nine gifts of the Spirit. After a debate in Waco, the group was convinced that tongues was the initial evidence. Some of them, however, decided to seek confirmation at a revival in San Antonio.

14

A History of Christian Doctrine

Pentecost had not yet come to that city; no one there had preached on tongues as the initial evidence. The group conducted their revival by preaching the baptism of the Holy Ghost but never mentioning tongues or any other "evidence." Goss reported the outcome: "No seeker was expecting any unusual manifestation. But, it made no difference. They all likewise spoke in tongues as the Spirit gave utterance when they received the Holy Ghost. This satisfied even the most skeptical among us."2

In 1906 Parham brought the Pentecostal message to Zion City, Illinois. This town was a religious community near Chicago founded by John Alexander Dowie, a prominent healing evangelist and the organizer of a Holiness group he called the Christian Catholic Church. Dowie had recently been discredited because of gross financial mismanagement, authoritarianism, and increasingly eccentric behavior, and he had lost control of his movement. Parham converted many of his followers to the Pentecostal message, including many ministers. The new leaders, however, resisted him vigorously.

From Parham's revivals in Kansas and Texas, the Apostolic Faith movement grew to about 13,000 people in 1906.3 By 1908, there were about 25,000 adherents under Parham's leadership.4

Parham's Doctrine

Charles Parham upheld most of the doctrines of conservative Protestantism, including the inspiration and

infallibility of Scripture, the trinity, the existence of angels
and demons, the creation and fall of humanity, the
Incarnation and Atonement, salvation by grace through
faith in Jesus Christ, and the Second Coming. He took the

Wesleyan, Arminian view of grace, rejecting unconditional
election and unconditional eternal security.

Like the Holiness movement, he proclaimed sanctification
as a second work of grace and emphasized the
need for a holy life. As part of his teaching on holiness, he
advocated pacifism, holding that it was wrong to kill
another human being, even in war.

Like the Fundamentalists, Parham believed strongly
in the soon return of Jesus Christ to earth before the
Millennium. In his understanding, the end-time events
would occur in the following order: the Tribulation, the
Rapture, the Second Coming, the Millennium, and the
White Throne Judgment. He practiced a literal interpretation
of Scripture.

In addition to the baptism of the Holy Ghost with the
initial sign of tongues, Parham also believed in the supernatural
gifts of the Spirit. As a young preacher, he had
received a dramatic healing, and he believed so strongly
in divine healing that he did not use medicine. Even on
his deathbed, he refused a nurse's offer to give him pain
medication.

In a few areas, Parham embraced doctrines that were
not generally accepted in Protestantism or in the
Pentecostal movement. He taught British-Israelism: the
British and their descendants were the lost tribes of
Israel and would literally inherit God's promises to
Israel. He also taught annihilation: the lost would not
exist eternally in the lake of fire but would be completely
destroyed. When accused of not believing in hell, he
replied that he believed in hell more than his critics; he
believed in a hell so hot it would completely burn up
those who went there. He also thought that some pagans

could inherit life on the new earth rather than destruction
in the lake of fire if they lived a good life according
to the knowledge they had.

Parham attached tremendous significance to the baptism
of the Holy Spirit. He held it to be the fulfillment of
Joel's prophecy of the latter rain, a sign of the soon coming

of the Lord, the baptism that gives people full
entrance into the church, a vital endowment of power that
will enable the church to evangelize the world before the
Lord's return, and the seal of protection during the
Tribulation. It is the "full gospel" and "full salvation."5
Twenty-one days after the Holy Ghost outpouring,
Parham preached a message in Kansas City, Missouri, that
explained his views:6
When the power of Pentecost came, we found the
real, and everyone who has received the Baptism of
the Holy Spirit has again spoken in tongues. . . .
Thousands of Christians profess . . . the Baptism
of the Holy Ghost, yet the Bible evidence is lacking in
their lives. . . .
If you desire a personal Baptism of the Holy
Ghost, the sealing power, escaping plagues, and
putting you in the position to become a part of the
Body, the Bride or the Man-Child, seek the Holy
Ghost.
It is the Baptism of the Holy Spirit of promise,
that seals the Bride and the same Baptism that puts us
in one Body, (the Church). . . .
Speaking in other tongues is an inseparable part of
the Baptism of the Holy Spirit distinguishing it from
all previous works; and . . . no one has received
17
The Pentecostal Movement
Baptism of the Holy Spirit who has not a Bible evidence
to show for it. . . .
Speaking with new tongues . . . [is] the only Bible
sign given as the evidence of the Baptism of the Holy
Ghost.
Parham equated "the sealing of the Holy Spirit of
promise (which is evidenced by the speaking tongues)"
with being "baptized by the Holy Ghost into one Body, the
gloriously redeemed Church."7 People who believe on
Jesus can be saved in a lesser sense without this experience,
but they will endure the rigors of the Tribulation. If
they receive "the seal of the Holy Ghost," they will
"escape the power of the Anti-Christ as well as the
plagues and wraths." But "should you fail in the reception
of a personal Pentecost you will be compelled to either
accept the mark of the Beast or suffer martyrdom."8
Moreover, in eternity believers who do not receive the
Spirit will inhabit the new earth rather than the new heavens.
"Jesus [will] take out a people for His name, through

sanctification, being born of the water and the Spirit, they
see the Kingdom of God; Christ having given Himself for
the Church." The church will receive "eternal spiritual life
and immortality" in the "new heavens." By contrast,
Christians who are "unsanctified" as well as "many heathens"
will merely receive "everlasting human life" on "the
new earth."9

In 1902, Parham published the foregoing message
and teachings in a book entitled A Voice Crying in the
Wilderness. In the same book, Parham also wrote that
years earlier God had impressed upon him the importance
of water baptism. Under the influence of Quaker

18

A History of Christian Doctrine

teaching he had not practiced baptism, but one day God
spoke to him about obeying all His commands. Parham
specifically thought of the command to be baptized in
Acts 2:38, and he was baptized the next day. Sometime
later, however, he was persuaded that "triune immersion"—
triple immersion with the trinitarian formula—was
correct.

After opening his Bible school but apparently before
the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Parham realized that
triune immersion was not scriptural. Thus, he began baptizing
converts by single immersion in the name of Jesus
Christ, and he associated this practice with confessing the
deity of Christ, in contrast to liberal theology. Here is
Parham's account:10

For years after entering the ministry, we taught no
special baptism of water, believing the Baptism of the
Holy Spirit the only essential one; having been marvelously
anointed from time to time and received the
anointing that abideth, we put the question of water
baptism aside.

One day, meditating alone in the woods, the Spirit
said:—Have you obeyed every command you believe
to be in the Word of God?

We answered, yes; the question repeated, the
same answer given. The third time the question was
asked, we answered, no,—for like a flood the convincing
evidence of the necessity of obedience rushed
in upon us, how Peter said, Repent, and be baptized
every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ [Acts
2:38]. Was not this one baptism?

Then came the second; and ye shall receive the

19

gift of the Holy Ghost. Again Peter proceeded at once
to baptize Cornelius and all his house, who had
received the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, with the Bible
evidence of speaking in tongues. Thrusting aside all
arguments, he said:
Can any man forbid water, that these should be
baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well
as we. (Acts 10:47.)
Paul did not recognize the baptism of John to
repentance as sufficient, but baptized them in the
name of the Lord Jesus Christ before he would lay
hands upon them that they might receive the baptism
of the Holy Spirit.
These and other Scriptures were so convincing that
the next day we were baptized by single immersion.
Years afterward, through reading many arguments
and discussions on triune immersion, [we] were intellectually
persuaded that it was right, and persuaded
many of God's children to be baptized by this mode,
although we were never baptized by triune immersion.
About two years ago [1900], however, we found
that for which we had searched . . . the cleansing of
all unscriptural teachings. . . . We can well remember
when we sought God in this cleansing, how some of
the teachings we had believed to be so Scriptural and
some we had loved so dearly and been the most preserving
in propagating, were wiped from our minds.
Among them was triune immersion; though we had
been able to discuss this question for an hour, we
could not afterward find a single argument in its favor.
Indeed, for months nothing, pro or con came upon the
subject; until one day at the Bible School, we were
20
waiting upon God that we might know the Scriptural
teaching of water baptism. Finally the Spirit of God
said: "We are buried by baptism into His death." We
had known that for years; again the Spirit said: "God
the Father, and God the Holy Ghost never died."
Then how quickly we recognized the fact that we
could not be buried by baptism in the name of the
Father, and in the name of the Holy Ghost, because it
stood for nothing as they never died or were resurrected.
. . .
So if you desire to witness a public confession of

a clean conscience toward God and man, faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ, you will be baptized by single immersion, signifying the death, burial and resurrection; being baptized in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; they are one when in Christ you become one with all.

Howard Goss testified that Parham baptized him in the name of Jesus Christ in 1903.11 Parham published the foregoing account again in 1910, indicating that perhaps he was still baptizing in Jesus' name at that time. As many ministers entered the growing movement, however, for the sake of unity Parham reverted to the traditional trinitarian formula. When the Jesus Name controversy erupted, Parham affirmed trinitarian theology and denounced the Oneness movement.

William Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival

One of Parham's students in Houston was William Joseph Seymour (1870-1922), a black Holiness minister

21

The Pentecostal Movement

who was blind in one eye. Born in Louisiana, he now lived in Houston. In early 1906, Seymour traveled to Los Angeles in response to an invitation from a small Holiness church there.

Seymour preached the Pentecostal message in Los Angeles, even though he had not yet received the Holy Ghost. The leader of the church rejected this doctrine and locked Seymour out of the building. (She later joined the movement, however.) He continued services in the homes of two sympathetic families: first in the home of Edward Lee, where he stayed, and then in the Asberry home on Bonnie Brae Street.

On April 9, Lee received the Holy Spirit at his home while praying with Seymour and Lucy Farrow. Farrow was a black Holiness pastor in Houston who had entered the Pentecostal movement through Parham, and she had introduced Seymour to Parham. She was very effective in laying hands on people and praying for them to receive the Holy Ghost, and she had come to Los Angeles to help Seymour achieve a breakthrough.

That night, at the service on Bonnie Brae, when Seymour related what had just happened to Lee, the Holy Ghost fell. Jennie Moore, who later married Seymour, and several others received the Holy Ghost. Three days later, Seymour and others also received the Spirit.

The small group rented an old, two-story building on Azusa Street in downtown Los Angeles and began services on April 14. The Azusa Street Mission held services daily for three years, from 1906 to 1909. Many miracles, healings, and baptisms of the Holy Spirit occurred. There were documented accounts of the dead being raised.[12] The meetings were characterized by spontaneous,

22

A History of Christian Doctrine

demonstrative worship and strong moves of the Spirit. They were racially integrated, an amazing development in that segregated, prejudiced time. Frank Bartleman (1871-1936), a Holiness evangelist and the foremost chronicler of the revival, wrote, "The 'color line' was washed away in the blood."[13] Blacks and whites, men and women, served in public leadership and ministry roles.

While Parham and his students initiated the twentiethcentury Pentecostal movement, it was the Azusa Street revival that spread the Pentecostal message throughout the world. In September 1906, Seymour began publishing the news of the revival in a paper called The Apostolic Faith, which was widely disseminated in the Holiness movement and elsewhere. Missionaries, ministers, and lay members from across the United States and around the world flocked to Los Angeles, received the Holy Spirit, and carried the message everywhere. Many who could not attend nevertheless read the news of the revival and sought and received the same experience for themselves.

On April 18, 1906, The Los Angeles Times published its first report of the revival.[14] The article was entitled "Weird Babel of Tongues," with these subtitles: "New Sect of Fanatics Is Breaking Loose. Wild Scene Last Night on Azusa Street. Gurgle of Wordless Talk by a Sister." The first paragraph stated:

Breathing strange utterances and mouthing a creed which it would seem no sane mortal could understand, the newest religious sect has started in Los Angeles. Meetings are held in a tumble-down shack on Azusa street, near San Pedro street, and the devotees of the weird doctrine practice the most fanatical rites, preach

23

The Pentecostal Movement

the wildest theories and work themselves into a state of mad excitement in their peculiar zeal.

Later in the day, a special edition of the newspaper featured the great San Francisco earthquake, in which it

reported that 452 lives were lost. It included the following article on the front page:

Much strange phenomena was witnessed by this reporter at the Azusa Street Mission yesterday, as I was there for the Sunday morning worship service. The sight that greeted my eyes as I entered into the small building seemed to be commonplace enough. The old wood-slatted pews seated about twenty people, mostly from the lower scale of the social ladder. There were a couple of the parishioners that seemed to be of the wealthier class, however. All of these faced the black man standing behind the slender wooden pulpit.

The "worship" began with prayer; prayer that was conducted in a manner totally strange to me. All hands were uplifted and the parishioners began to audibly speak the requests, interspersing them, with much cries of "Amen," "hallelujah," and "praise the Lord."

The singing was also different, as loud, boisterous numbers were sung in place of the conventional hymns. I was shocked to my Sunday School roots as the people left their seats and began jumping up and down, and running around the church building.

At one point during the sermon, a hush fell over the congregation and an elderly man began to utter

24

A History of Christian Doctrine

strange guttural sounds. This, of course, was the much discussed "glossolalia," the supposed speaking in tongues as evidence of the Holy Spirit.

Surprisingly enough, after the sermon, the people seemed normal enough, socializing and speaking of everyday life. I found the pastor, Brother Seymour, to be a very affable fellow.

What is my conclusion?

Well, the worship was shockingly different, unlike anything I had ever seen before. It would be easy to say that it is conceived of by Satan himself. However, since the reports of happenings at the Azusa Street Mission are spreading like wildfire all over southern California, we shall let time be the judge.

Frank Bartleman, who had also attended meetings in the Lee home and in the Asberry home on Bonnie Brae Street, wrote vivid accounts of the Azusa Street Mission. He later described the worship as follows:15

The Spirit dropped the "heavenly chorus" into my soul. I found myself suddenly joining the rest who had received this supernatural "gift." It was a spontaneous manifestation and rapture no earthly tongue can describe. . . . It was indeed a "new song," in the Spirit. . . . It was sometimes without words, other times in "tongues." The effect was wonderful on the people. It brought a heavenly atmosphere. . . . In the beginning in "Azusa" we had no musical instruments. In fact we felt no need of them. . . . All was spontaneous. . . . All the old well-known hymns were sung from memory, quickened by the Spirit of

25

The Pentecostal Movement

God. "The Comforter Has Come" was possibly the one most sung. We sang it from fresh, powerful heart experience. Oh, how the power of God filled and thrilled us. Then the "blood" songs were very popular. . . . The "new song" was altogether different, not of human composition.

Brother Seymour generally sat behind two empty shoe boxes, one on top of the other. He usually kept his head inside the top one during the meeting, in prayer. There was no pride there. The services ran almost continuously. Seeking souls could be found under the power almost any hour, night and day. The place was never closed nor empty. The people came to meet God. . . . No subjects or sermons were announced ahead of time, and no special speakers for such an hour. No one knew what might be coming, what God would do. All was spontaneous, ordered of the Spirit. . . . When we first reached the meeting we avoided as much as possible human contact and greeting. We wanted to meet God first. We got our head under some bench in the corner in prayer, and met men only in the Spirit, knowing them "after the flesh" no more. The meetings started themselves, spontaneously, in testimony, praise and worship. . . . Someone might be speaking. Suddenly the Spirit would fall upon the congregation. God himself would give the altar call. Men would fall all over the house, like the slain in battle, or rush for the altar en masse, to seek God.

The Apostolic Faith contained the following description in the November 1906 issue:16

26

A History of Christian Doctrine

Here you find a mighty pentecostal revival going on from ten o'clock in the morning till about twelve at night. . . .

There is such power in the preaching of the Word in the Spirit that people are shaken on the benches. Coming to the altar, many fall prostrate under the power of God, and often come out speaking in tongues. Sometimes the power falls on people and they are wrought upon by the Spirit during testimony or preaching and receive Bible experiences. . . .

The demonstrations are not the shouting, clapping or jumping so often seen in camp meetings. There is a shaking such as the early Quakers had and which the old Methodists called the "jerks." It is while under the power of the Spirit you see the hands raised and hear speaking in tongues. While one sings a song learned from heaven with a shining face, the tears will be trickling down other faces. Many receive the Spirit through the laying on of hands. . . .

Little children from eight years to twelve stand upon the altar bench and testify to the baptism with the Holy Ghost and speak in tongues. In the children's meetings little tots get down and seek the Lord.

It is noticeable how free all nationalities feel. . . . No instrument that God can use is rejected on account of color or dress or lack of education. . . . The singing is characterized by freedom. . . . Often one will rise and sing a familiar song in a new tongue.

Doctrine of the Azusa Street Mission

The October 1907 to January 1908 issue of The

27

The Pentecostal Movement

Apostolic Faith identified the following seven teachings as "the principles of the doctrine of Christ":17

1. Repentance.
2. Faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.
3. Water baptism.
4. Sanctification.
5. The baptism with the Holy Spirit.
6. Second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.
7. Final white throne judgment.

The original statement of faith published by the mission listed and discussed six topics: repentance, faith, justification, sanctification, the baptism with the Holy Ghost,

and healing. Three of them were distinct crisis experiences with God and part of full salvation:18

First Work.—Justification is that act of God's free grace by which we receive remission of sins. Acts 10:42, 43. Rom. 3:25.

Second Work.—Sanctification is the second work of grace and the last work of grace. Sanctification is that act of God's free grace by which He makes us holy. . . . Sanctification is cleansing to make holy. . . .

The Baptism with the Holy Ghost is a gift of power upon the sanctified life; so when we get it we have the same evidence as the Disciples received on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:3, 4), in speaking in new tongues.

While the Azusa Street participants considered that a person was "saved" by the "first work" of grace, before

sanctification and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, they spoke of all three experiences as part of "Bible salvation." The headline and subheading at the top of the first issue of The Apostolic Faith reads: "Pentecost Has Come: Los Angeles Being Visited by a Revival of Bible Salvation and Pentecost as Recorded in the Book of Acts."19 The November 1906 edition of The Apostolic Faith describes the baptism of the Holy Ghost as "the real Bible salvation," "the mark of the prize of the high calling in Christ Jesus," and "heaven in our souls."20 In 1908, William Seymour wrote, "If you are sanctified and baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire, you are married to Him already. God has a people to measure up to the Bible standard in this great salvation. Bless His holy name. Amen!"21 Following Parham, Seymour frequently cited the parable of the ten virgins to emphasize the importance of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. In his application, the oil of the five wise virgins is the Holy Ghost. Thus, only people who have been baptized with the Holy Ghost will go up in the Rapture and enjoy the marriage supper of the Lamb. Christians who have not received the Holy Ghost will have to endure the Tribulation and be martyred. He explained:22

Those that will be permitted to enter in [the marriage supper of the Lamb] are those who are justified, sanctified, and baptized with the Holy Ghost—sealed unto the day of redemption. . . . Above all, we want to get the oil, the Holy Ghost. Every Christian must be baptized with the Holy Ghost for himself. . . . Now is

the time to buy the oil; that is, by tarrying at the feet
of the Lord Jesus and receiving the baptism with the
Holy Spirit. . . .

The Pentecostal Movement

Those that get left in the rapture and still prove
faithful to God and do not receive the mark of the
beast, though they will have to suffer martyrdom, will
be raised to reign with Christ. . . . By proving faithful
to death, they will be raised during the millennium
and reign with Christ. But we that are caught up to
the marriage supper of the Lamb will escape the
plagues that are coming on the earth. . . .
Dearly beloved, the only people that will meet our
Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and go with Him into the
marriage supper of the Lamb, are the wise virgins—
not only saved and sanctified, with pure and clean
hearts, but having the baptism with the Holy Ghost.
Articles in The Apostolic Faith affirmed that people
who continued to walk with God would receive the message
and experience of the Holy Ghost and warned that
those who rejected this message and experience could be
lost:23

• Friends, if you profess to know the Spirit of God
and do not recognize Him when He comes, there is
cause for you to be anxious about your own spiritual
condition.
• Men and women that are walking in the light can
quickly see that this is of God.
• Many church members are paying their way to hell.
They are paying preachers to preach against the
baptism with the Holy Ghost. They are getting poisoned
against the truth and it is damning their
souls. People need the baptism with the Holy Ghost
that they may know God.

A History of Christian Doctrine

• After the white throne judgment, we are going to
see men and women who have scorned this holiness
and baptism, and they will be cast down into the
burning hell. . . . O, accept this salvation.
• How will you miss hell if you stumble over this precious
Gospel, if you ignore this Gospel which God
has granted signs and wonders to follow?
Azusa Street participants spoke of the baptism of the
Holy Ghost as the decisive turning point in their lives.

Although they identified previous experiences of conversion and sanctification, their testimonies typically described the baptism of the Holy Ghost as the time they experienced the full saving power of Jesus Christ:24

• Adolph Rosa (Portugese Methodist minister from Cape Verde Islands): "All pride, and self, and conceit disappeared, and I was really dead to the world, for I had Christ within in His fullness."

• William Durham (prominent pastor in Chicago): "Then I had such power on me and in me as I never had before. And last but not least, I had a depth of love and sweetness in my soul that I had never even dreamed of before, and a holy calm possessed me, and a holy joy and peace, that is deep and sweet beyond anything I ever experienced before, even in the sanctified life. And O! such victory as He gives me all the time."

• Maggie Geddis: "O the love, joy, and peace that flooded my being as I arose from the floor. I was indeed a new creature."

• C. H. Mason (founder of the Church of God in

31

The Pentecostal Movement

Christ): "This was wedlock to Christ. . . . He had complete charge of me. . . . It was a complete death to me. . . . The glory of God filled the temple."

When Mason attended Azusa Street, he went to the altar in response to a call for sinners to be justified, even though he was a leader in his Holiness denomination. He explained his thought at the time: "It may be that I am not converted, and if not, God knows and can convert me."25

The Azusa Street Mission affirmed that the "Bible evidence" of baptism with the Holy Ghost is speaking in tongues. Seymour wrote in 1907, "Beloved, when we receive the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire, we surely will speak in tongues as the Spirit gives utterance. We are not seeking for tongues, but we are seeking the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire."26 There were many reports of people from other countries coming to Azusa Street and hearing their native languages spoken by people who received the Holy Ghost. There were also reports of people seeing flames of fire and clouds of glory.

The Azusa Street Mission did not believe in baptismal regeneration, but it emphasized the necessity of practicing water baptism as a commandment of the Lord, and it considered water baptism to be part of the "full Gospel":27

Baptism is not a saving ordinance, but it is essential
because it is a command of our Lord. Mark 16:16,
and Acts 2:38. . . . It is obedience to the command of
Jesus, following saving faith. We believe every true
believer will practice it. . . .
It should be administered by a disciple who is baptized
with the Holy Ghost and fire, in the name of the

32

A History of Christian Doctrine

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Matt. 28:19-20. . . .
We believe that we should teach God's people to
observe all things whatsoever He has commanded us
[Matthew 28:20], practicing every command and living
by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth
of God. This is a full Gospel.
The foregoing statement reflects the use of the trinitarian
baptismal formula. However, at least some converts
from Azusa Street were baptized in the name of
Jesus. By March 1907 a minister named Joshua Sykes
founded a Pentecostal church in Los Angeles that
required baptism in the name of Christ rather than the
trinitarian formula.28 The official history of the Apostolic
Assembly of the Faith in Christ Jesus, a Mexican-
American Oneness Pentecostal organization, states that a
man named Luis Lopez received the Holy Spirit at Azusa
Street and was baptized in the name of Jesus in 1909.29
When controversy later arose over the baptismal formula,
however, Seymour affirmed trinitarianism and the trinitarian
baptismal formula, but he continued to have some
fellowship with Jesus Name believers.30
True to their Holiness heritage, the new Pentecostals
emphasized a life of holiness both inwardly and outwardly.
One article said, "[Jesus] saves you from telling stories,
from gambling, playing cards, going to horse races, drinking
whiskey or beer, cheating, and everything that is sinful
or devilish. The Lord Jesus Christ will cleanse you and
make you every whit whole."31 Another article testified of
two women who discarded their jewelry after being convicted
by the Spirit, and it concluded, "So the Spirit has
been working in harmony with the Word, teaching His

33

The Pentecostal Movement

people how to dress according to the Bible. Gold watches,
rings, etc. have disappeared, and gone into sending the
Gospel."32 Seymour admonished, "O beloved, after you
have received the light, it is holiness or hell. God is calling

for men and women in these days that will live a holy life free from sin."33

The Decline of Parham and Seymour

After ministering in Zion City, Parham visited the Azusa Street Mission in late 1906 at the invitation of Seymour, who initially acknowledged him as originator of the movement.34 Parham felt that the worship manifestations were excessive, however, and overly influenced by blacks. While he acknowledged that many people were genuinely receiving the Holy Spirit at Azusa, he denounced the mission for "extremes, wild-fire, fanaticism," and false manifestations.35 Apparently, he was affected by racial prejudice and also resented that the revival was not under his direction. At this point, Seymour rejected Parham's leadership completely.

The next year, in July 1907, Parham was arrested in San Antonio, Texas, on a moral charge.36 Although the charge was soon dropped, his enemies publicized the incident, particularly the leadership in Zion. Parham soon lost most of his following and influence. He continued his evangelistic ministry from his home base in Baxter Springs, Kansas. To his death in 1929, Parham was sidelined from the leadership of the movement he had initiated. A small group remained faithful to him and exists today as the Apostolic Faith, centered around a Bible college in Baxter Springs.

Perhaps in an effort to distance themselves from

A History of Christian Doctrine

Parham, other leaders began to describe themselves as Pentecostal more than Apostolic. Eventually, the term "Apostolic" came to be used primarily for Oneness Pentecostals. In particular, it is the preferred term among Oneness groups that are predominately black or Hispanic.

Florence Crawford (1872-1936), an Azusa Street member in 1906, started the Apostolic Faith Mission in Portland, Oregon, in 1908 as a rival organization to Seymour's. She disapproved of Seymour's marriage to Jennie Moore and felt that Seymour was not emphasizing the doctrine of sanctification as he should. She took Seymour's mailing list, thereby shutting down his paper, and she started her own paper, also called The Apostolic Faith. Her group exists today as a small organization. Following her teaching, it has been known over the years for advocating strict holiness of conduct and dress and

separation from those who do not.

Seymour's struggles with Parham, Crawford, and William Durham (discussed in chapter 2) eroded his leadership role. The revival at Azusa Street dwindled in 1909, picked up again in 1911 with the preaching of Durham, and then diminished again in 1912. Most of the whites left the mission, and in 1915 Seymour changed the constitution of the church to specify that a "person of color" must always be the leader. He also moved away from the doctrine of tongues as the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit, holding that tongues did not always come immediately, although it was still expected as a sign that would follow Holy Spirit baptism. After Seymour's death in 1922, his wife carried on as pastor until her health failed. The building was demolished in 1931.

35

The Pentecostal Movement

Opposition and Persecution

The early Pentecostals encountered all kinds of opposition and persecution. The existing denominations—especially Holiness groups and Fundamentalists—typically forced them out, denounced them, ridiculed them as "Holy Rollers," and said they were of the devil. Prominent Holiness leaders said the Pentecostal movement was "the last vomit of Satan," "emphatically not of God," "wicked and adulterous," "anti-Christian," "sensual and devilish."[37] Others called the movement "heresy" and a "cult."[38] Pentecostal workers were threatened, beaten, shot at, tarred and feathered. They were pelted with rocks and with rotten fruit, vegetables, and eggs. Tents ropes were slashed; tents and buildings were set afire. Howard Goss explained:[39]

We could never be sure we were not going to be injured. Some workers were attacked, some were beaten, some had bones broken, some were jailed, some were made to leave town, some were rotten egged, and some were shot at. We were stoned, but at least we were never "sawn asunder."

Church services were disturbed by roughnecks for many years. Tents, buildings, and sometimes residences were burned; drinking water was poisoned, and windows were broken. We were sometimes threatened by angry mobs or by raging individuals when some member of their family had been converted. Often, we had no protection; there were times when the police chose to close their eyes because we were the strangers, while the city paid them a salary.

Many of the early Pentecostal preachers sacrificed

greatly to spread the gospel. They lived by faith and started churches in tents, brush arbors, storefronts, and rented halls. Non-Pentecostal historian Robert Mapes Anderson described their hardships:40

These lived often in extreme poverty, going out with little or no money, seldom knowing where they would spend the night, or how they would get their next meal, sleeping in barns, tents and parks, or on the wooden benches of mission halls, and sometimes in jail. Bands of workers would pool their funds, buy a tent or rent a hall, and live communally in the meeting place, subsisting at times on flour and water, or rice, or sardines and sausages. . . . The Pentecostals found their chief asset in the spirit of sacrifice and the enormous drive of their leaders.

Conclusions

The ministry and teaching of Charles Parham was the immediate cause of the Pentecostal movement. The distinctive message that he and his students introduced was the baptism of the Holy Ghost with the initial evidence of speaking in tongues.

As volumes 1 and 2 of this series document, this occasion was by no means the first time since Bible days that someone had received the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. But it was the first recorded time in modern church history when people sought for and received the Holy Spirit with the expectation of speaking in tongues. The biblical knowledge and expectation of the evidentiary role of tongues is what set this movement apart from earlier outpourings of the Spirit and led directly to

Pentecostalism as a distinct movement. The Pentecostals also differed from recipients in earlier times by proclaiming this experience as the norm and urging everyone to receive it. Without this doctrine of tongues as the initial evidence of receiving the Holy Ghost, the modern Pentecostal movement would not have begun.

William Seymour is equally significant for the history of the movement. The Azusa Street revival that he led became the impetus for the worldwide spread of Pentecostalism. Although Seymour's influence rapidly diminished after 1911, almost every Pentecostal organization

in the world owes its existence, directly or indirectly, to Seymour's Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles. The Pentecostal movement was a logical, scriptural extension of the ideas of the Protestant Reformation of the 1500s, the Methodist revival of the 1700s, and the Holiness movement of the 1800s. It was the next step in the restoration of apostolic doctrine and experience to professing Christendom.

Modern Pentecostalism did not originate solely with one person, and it quickly grew beyond any one person's leadership. Parham and then Seymour played vital roles in the formative years, but the restoration of biblical doctrine and experience occurred in a group setting.

Interestingly, neither Parham nor Seymour was the first in his own group to receive the Holy Spirit. Many leaders quickly emerged, the movement proliferated by a spiritual spontaneous combustion, and no central human authority was able to shape, direct, or control it. It was not the creation of an individual, but it was the sovereign move of God in response to the spiritual hunger and quest of thousands of sincere believers.

38

A History of Christian Doctrine

The first doctrinal division in the Pentecostal movement came over sanctification. Both Parham and Seymour embraced the Wesleyan-Holiness position that sanctification was a second work of grace, and they added the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a third experience. They taught that a person first had to be converted, or justified. Then he needed to be sanctified, at which time he was instantly purified from inward sin. Then and only then, he could be baptized with the Holy Spirit.

Before we discuss the doctrinal division, let us trace the formation of several other important Pentecostal groups that advocated this teaching.

39

The Finished
Work Controversy

2

G. B. Cashwell, Revival in the South, and the Pentecostal Holiness Church

One of the most notable examples of the spread of Pentecostalism from the Azusa Street revival is the story of Gaston Barnabas Cashwell (1862-1916), a prominent minister of the Holiness Church of North Carolina, which later became known as the Pentecostal Holiness Church.

After receiving the Holy Spirit at Azusa Street in late 1906, Cashwell returned to North Carolina and began to preach the Pentecostal message in Dunn, his hometown. A great revival took place, attended by many ministers, and it lasted for the month of January 1907. Many ministers, denominational leaders, and lay members received the Holy Ghost. As a result, four small Holiness organizations in the South became Pentecostal: the Pentecostal Holiness Church, the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, the Tabernacle Pentecostal Church, and the Free Will Baptist Church. The first three soon merged, and the resulting organization is now called the International Pentecostal Holiness Church. The fourth group became known as the Pentecostal Free Will Baptist Church.

One of the men who received the Holy Spirit under Cashwell was Joseph H. King (1869-1946), general overseer of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church (beginning in 1900) and later bishop of the Pentecostal Holiness Church until his death. Previously, the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, founded by Benjamin Irwin in 1895, had taught a "third blessing" beyond justification and sanctification called the "baptism of fire." Now it identified the baptism of the Holy Ghost with tongues as the third blessing.

Future founders of the Assemblies of God, M. M.

A History of Christian Doctrine

Pinson and H. G. Rodgers, also received the Holy Ghost under Cashwell's ministry. Because of his widespread impact, Cashwell became known as the apostle of Pentecost to the South. He later left the Pentecostal Holiness Church due to political conflict, however, and continued his ministry in his previous organization, the Methodist Church.

A. J. Tomlinson and the Church of God

In January 1908, Ambrose Jessup Tomlinson (1865-1943), the general overseer of the Church of God, invited Cashwell to speak to the leaders of the organization in Cleveland, Tennessee. While Cashwell was preaching, Tomlinson received the Holy Spirit, falling to the floor and speaking in tongues. Thereafter, this group also became Pentecostal.

The Church of God had been founded in 1886 by R. G. Spurling as a Holiness organization originally called the Christian Union and later the Holiness Church. In 1896, a great revival took place in the Shearer Schoolhouse in

Cherokee County, North Carolina. About 130 persons received the Holy Spirit with tongues, and many healings took place. However, this experience did not become a doctrine, nor did the group as a whole seek it. When the Pentecostal movement became widely known in 1906, many people in the Church of God began to seek the baptism of the Holy Spirit with tongues and to preach it.

In 1907 the organization became officially known as the Church of God, a name already in use by another Holiness organization that never adopted the Pentecostal message. To avoid confusion, the two groups are identified by their headquarters. The Pentecostal group is the

41

The Finished Work Controversy

Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), while the non-Pentecostal group is the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana).

In 1914 Tomlinson was elected general overseer for life, but due to dissatisfaction with his authoritarian leadership, he was replaced in 1923. He refused to accept his removal and led a split, which he regarded as the true church. Ultimately, it became known as the Church of God of Prophecy, which also has headquarters in Cleveland, Tennessee.

C. H. Mason and the Church of God in Christ

Charles Harrison Mason (1866-1961) founded the Church of God in Christ in 1897 as a Holiness organization, along with his friend, C. P. Jones. Both were black Baptist pastors who embraced the doctrine of entire sanctification. In 1907 Mason visited Azusa Street and received the Holy Spirit. While Mason was away from his home church in Memphis, Glenn Cook, the business manager of the Azusa Street Mission, preached at Mason's church and won many people in his organization to the Pentecostal message.

Jones and a majority of leaders rejected the Pentecostal doctrine, however, and expelled Mason and his followers. The non-Pentecostals reorganized as the Churches of Christ (Holiness), which remains today as a small group. The Pentecostals reorganized in 1907 as the Church of God in Christ with Mason as general overseer and chief apostle, an office he held until his death in 1961. The Church of God in Christ is the largest Pentecostal body—and one of the largest black Protestant bodies—in North America.

42

A History of Christian Doctrine

Due to the Holiness roots of most black trinitarian Pentecostal groups, they are commonly known in the black community as "sanctified" churches.

William Durham and the Finished Work Doctrine

Shortly after the great Azusa Street revival, a prominent minister named William H. Durham (1873-1912) began to question whether sanctification was actually a separate experience. Durham was a Baptist who had a conversion experience in 1898. Under the influence of Holiness teaching, for three years he sought for a definite experience of sanctification. Finally, in 1901, he had an experience that he identified as sanctification, and he began to teach sanctification as a second work of grace.

Durham soon started a ministry in Chicago called the North Avenue Mission. Influenced by Charles Parham, who was preaching in nearby Zion, Illinois, many of the members of Durham's mission received the Holy Ghost. Durham became convinced that this experience was genuine. In early 1907 he visited the Azusa Street revival in Los Angeles and received the Holy Ghost on March 2.

By his own testimony, Durham came to three important conclusions during this time.41 First, the baptism of the Holy Ghost was different from the experiences that he had identified as conversion and sanctification. "I saw clearly, for the first time, the difference between having the influence and presence of the Spirit with us, and having Him dwell within us in person."

Second, he realized that he could not simply "claim" the baptism of the Holy Ghost as did the Holiness people who equated it with entire sanctification. "I could not kneel at the altar, and claim the Holy Ghost and go away.

43

The Finished Work Controversy

This was a real experience. I must wait until He came." Third, speaking in tongues was invariably the initial evidence of this experience. "Dear reader, the Spirit may not deal with you just as He did with me; but when He comes within you, to take up His abode, He will speak in tongues and magnify God."

Durham's baptism in the Holy Spirit was glorious. He fell prostrate on the floor for three hours, his whole body shook one section at a time, and finally he spoke in tongues for a long time. This experience completely overshadowed his 1901 blessing. He concluded that sanctification was not a separate work of grace subsequent to

conversion but that the baptism of the Holy Ghost with the sign of tongues was the true experience that a converted person should seek. He reinterpreted his 1901 experience as a renewal of his conversion in 1898. From the time he received the Holy Ghost, Durham could never again preach on sanctification as a separate work of grace. Instead, "the Spirit began to reveal in my heart the finished work of Christ on the Cross of Calvary. . . . The Spirit kept revealing in my heart the precious Gospel as preached by the Apostles: identification with Jesus Christ in His death, burial and resurrection."42

In 1910, Durham began to preach what he called "the finished work of Calvary." He taught that there was no second work known as sanctification. Instead, sanctification is an integral part of conversion and an ongoing process. To be holy, we do not need to seek a second work of grace, but we simply need to appropriate the benefits of the finished work of Calvary. We can begin living the sanctified life immediately by realizing that with His blood Jesus purchased everything we need. He explained,

44

A History of Christian Doctrine

"The living faith that justifies a man, brings him into Christ, the Sanctifier, in Whom he is complete, not with regard to sanctification only, but everything else that pertains to his salvation."43

Durham objected that the "second work of grace theory has done more to blind the eyes of people to the simple truth of the Gospel than any other one theory," because it had led many "truly saved people" to believe they were not saved until they received the second work. "They are told that when God pardoned them He left them full of sin and corruption, and that it requires a second work of grace to save them from hell." In reality, when a person repents and believes, he "is saved from sin, death, and hell, is a real child of God, possesses eternal life, does not need another work of grace, but needs to abide in Christ, receive and walk in the Spirit, hold fast the faith, grow in grace and in the knowledge of God and of Christ."44

At conversion, the believer not only receives justification (forgiveness of sins) but also sanctification (purity of heart). "God in conversion brings a man into Christ and makes him holy by washing away all his sins, inward and outward, and giving him a new, clean heart, thus making a new creature out of him."45

To Durham, the doctrine of a second work of grace

detracted from the gospel and the Atonement by implying that Christ's atoning sacrifice was not powerful enough to deal completely with a person's sin when he repented and believed. Thus he insisted, "The Finished Work is by far the most important teaching in the Bible."46

The Controversy Erupts

Durham first proclaimed the Finished Work message

at a Pentecostal convention in Chicago in 1910. Also in 1910, he conducted a camp meeting in Malvern, Arkansas, where Howard Goss was pastor at the time. He convinced Goss and many of Parham's former followers of the truth of his message. Controversy erupted immediately.

In 1911, Durham went back to Los Angeles. The focus of revival there had shifted from the Azusa Street Mission to Elmer Fisher's Upper Room Mission. Durham sought to preach there, but because of the controversy, Fisher refused to let him. Durham then went to the Azusa Street Mission. Seymour was away on an extended trip, and Durham was allowed to preach.

A great revival broke out, reminding the participants of Azusa Street in its heyday in 1906-09. Many called it the second Azusa outpouring. Frank Bartleman wrote that it was the second shower of the latter rain. In less than three months, over 150 received the Spirit, many backsliders were renewed, and notable healings took place. Durham attributed the success to his emphasis on tongues as the initial evidence of the Holy Ghost (which Seymour was no longer stressing) and on the Finished Work message.47

When Seymour returned, however, he objected to Durham's doctrine and, taking a cue from his own experience, padlocked the door of the mission so that Durham could not continue services there. Durham responded just as Seymour had five years earlier. He started his own services at Seventh and Los Angeles Streets, and the revival continued. His assistants at this time were Harry Van Loon and Frank J. Ewart. After a few months, Durham returned to Chicago, leaving his new Los Angeles mission in their hands.

The Finished Work message spread rapidly through revival services and also through a periodical that Durham published called the Pentecostal Testimony.

Durham's preaching was powerful, and his message inspired great faith. Four hundred people received the Holy Spirit under his personal ministry in 1911 and two hundred in the first three months of 1912.48

The major leaders of the Pentecostal movement at the time all opposed Durham, however, including Parham, Seymour, Cashwell, Mason, and Tomlinson. They held that the Spirit could not come upon an unsanctified life, meaning that a person first had to receive sanctification as a definite, instantaneous, second work of grace. It was commonly stated that the Holy Ghost would not fill an unclean vessel (which many have erroneously thought to be a biblical quotation), referring not to repentance but to entire sanctification.

Florence Crawford labeled Durham's teaching as "a devilish theory from the pit of hell." Parham accused Durham of "counting the blood of the covenant an unholy thing" and having "committed the sin unto death." He prophesied Durham's destruction within six months, saying that whichever one of them taught false doctrine, God would kill him.49

Durham vigorously defended his message, preaching everywhere, taking little rest, and damaging his health in the process. At age thirty-nine, he contracted pneumonia and died in Los Angeles on July 7, 1912, within the six months proclaimed by Parham. When he heard that Durham had died, Parham commented, "How signally God has answered."

Opponents typically accused Durham of abandoning

47

The Finished Work Controversy

the message of holiness, but E. N. Bell, later the first chairman of the Assemblies of God, wrote in his defense shortly after his death, "He was much misunderstood. No one among us believed more firmly than he in Bible holiness, nor insisted more strongly that without holiness no man could see the Lord, holding it as God's only standard for all believers."50

Durham himself asserted that "God's one standard is entire sanctification." He affirmed the importance of "growth after conversion" and living "a holy, separate life." He taught that God expects Spirit-filled believers "to live a clean, holy, separate life, to crucify the flesh, and walk in the Spirit."51

Durham's Doctrine of Full Salvation

The Finished Work doctrine had implications for the

baptism of the Holy Spirit as well as for sanctification. If sanctification was not a second work of grace but began at conversion as the believer appropriated the benefits of the Cross, then what about the baptism of the Holy Spirit? Was it a second work of grace, or was it too associated with conversion?

Durham continued to regard the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a second crisis experience following conversion. Since sanctification had no initial objective sign, it was easy for him to collapse it back into his previous encounter with God at repentance. But the baptism of the Spirit was an overwhelming emotional and spiritual experience, and it came with the initial sign of speaking in tongues. Durham knew it was more than what he had received previously, which he had already identified as conversion, so he did not equate the two.

48

A History of Christian Doctrine

Nevertheless, Durham did begin to speak of the baptism of the Holy Ghost as an integral part of God's plan of salvation that should immediately follow repentance and faith. Since all that believers needed to do was to appropriate the finished work of Calvary, they could receive the Spirit without delay.

Durham's personal testimony revealed that he considered people to be saved from hell at the initial moment of faith, yet God's plan was for them to complete their salvation experience with water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit:52

Faith instantly sprang up in my heart to accept Him as my full Savior, and the moment I did so, I felt the quickening power of the Spirit, was made a new creature in Christ, and unutterable joy filled my soul. . . .

I had no one to tell me that the next step was to be buried with Him, in Whom I had died and had been made alive. Had I been taught the truth, as the Apostles taught it, had I been baptized and had hands laid on me, I would have at once received the Holy Ghost. . . .

My greatest difficulty was in harmonizing my experience with that in the Acts of the Apostles. My difficulty was, that I mistook soul rest and peace, and the sweet holy joy of salvation, and the witness, and influence of the Spirit, for the gift of the Spirit. . . .

For Durham, "God's glorious message of full salvation,"

the "Full Gospel," and God's "plan of salvation" included the baptism of the Holy Ghost.53 Indeed, Durham

49

The Finished Work Controversy

insisted quite strongly that to belong to the New Testament church, a person had to be baptized with the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues:54

The baptism in the Holy Spirit is the seal of a finished salvation in Jesus Christ. . . .

God's standard of the baptism in the Holy Spirit is found in Acts 2:4, and He has only one standard.

The Church of Jesus Christ is composed of Pentecostal people. . . .

We have an abnormal Christianity in the world today (that is, those we must recognize as Christians, but who are not filled with the Holy Spirit) for which it is impossible to find any Scriptural provision. In other words, only Spirit-filled people are recognized as being in a place that they are pleasing to God. Wherever we find converts in the New Testament who are not filled with the Holy Spirit, we find the Apostles dealing with them to lead them into the experience.

We conclude, therefore, that a Church, from a Scriptural standpoint, is a company of people who are called out of the world, made new creatures in Christ Jesus, buried with Him by baptism into death, and filled with the Holy Spirit. . . .

The denominational churches of today are of purely human origin. Not one of them has any Scriptural authority for its existence. . . . As said above, people become members of Christ's true, holy, spiritual Church when they are born of the Spirit and filled with the Spirit, as this is the only normal Scriptural experience.

50

A History of Christian Doctrine

Durham saw Acts 2:38 as the paradigm for New Testament salvation. He quoted this verse on the masthead of his Pentecostal Testimony. In a widely distributed tract entitled Salvation in Christ for All, he wrote:

If the Bible teaches anything it is that salvation is by grace through faith. . . .

The question then is: How may a man receive this great blessing of full deliverance through Christ? Acts 2:38-39 tells us: [quotation]. . . . This is a wonderful

truth! Men do not have to join any particular church,
nor subscribe to any creed of man, but can be saved
eternally by simply repenting and believing on the
Lord Jesus Christ; and then they can receive the gift
of the Holy Ghost with signs following, as in the days
of the Apostles.

He said the three steps of Acts 2:38—repentance,
water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost—were
God's standard of salvation. By these steps a person identified
with the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus
Christ:55

When we appeal the case to the Scriptures, we see
that They teach to repent and be baptized and receive
the gift of the Holy Spirit. Acts 2:38-39. All through
the Acts and the Epistles of Paul, we see this order of
teaching. Not one single Scripture ever mentions any
second work of grace. But the rule laid down by Peter
on the day of Pentecost is continually followed, both
in teaching and practice. . . .

The Epistles were written for the instruction of

51

The Finished Work Controversy

those who had received the Holy Spirit according to
the standard of God lifted up in Acts 2:4. . . .
Peter's answer [in Acts 2:38] forever settles the
question as to what the standard of God is. . . .
We are identified with Him by faith in His death on
the Cross, and in His burial, by our immersion in
water; and in His glorious resurrection life by the
blessed Holy Spirit, Who is supposed to come upon us
when we come up out of the water. And, thank God,
we have lived to see the blessed day that He has
restored the Scriptural order of things, and the Spirit
is falling on thousands and they are speaking in
tongues as at the beginning.

A prominent Fundamentalist preacher, A. C. Dixon,
once met with Durham and asked what his distinctive
doctrine was. Durham told him it was speaking in tongues
as the initial evidence of the Holy Ghost. Dixon exclaimed
that by this doctrine he indicted all Christendom, whereupon
Durham solemnly replied, "Sir, they deserve to be
indicted."56

Durham died before the Oneness movement began,
but Ewart believed he would have received the Jesus
Name message had he lived. He was a trinitarian, but
according to one report he performed at least one baptism

in Jesus' name.57 He placed great emphasis on the name, person, and work of Jesus Christ:58

• Christ is all and in all. As we yield to the Holy Ghost, we will see more in Him and less in everything else. If there is no other name under Heaven, whereby men can be saved, we ought to constantly proclaim

52

A History of Christian Doctrine

that blessed name in all the earth.

• Not in even one place in the New Testament is it ever taught that there is any other way of salvation except through Jesus Christ. Over and over again it is declared that there is no other way, no name except His great name that has salvation in it.

The Outcome of the Controversy

The Finished Work doctrine split the emerging Pentecostal movement in half. In general, the organizations that had already formed by 1910 rejected Durham's message, while the organizations that formed after 1910 embraced his message.

The groups who rejected the Finished Work message and continued to teach three crisis experiences included the Apostolic Faith groups of Charles Parham, William Seymour, and Florence Crawford; the Pentecostal Holiness Church; the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) and its later offshoot, the Church of God of Prophecy; and the Church of God in Christ.

The Pentecostal groups that accepted the Finished Work view included the Assemblies of God and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. The Oneness groups, including the United Pentecostal Church International and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, also accepted the Finished Work. Indeed, as we shall see in chapter 4, their doctrine of the new birth appears to be a logical development from the premises that Durham championed.

A few small Oneness groups, offshoots of the Holiness movement or of the Church of God in Christ, teach sanctification as a second work of grace. The largest

53

The Finished Work Controversy

Oneness organization to do so is the Apostolic Overcoming Holy Church of God, which was founded in 1917 by William T. Phillips (1893-1974), a black Holiness minister in Alabama.

Among trinitarians, a significant practical difference

emerged around mid-century between the Second Work and Finished Work churches. Originally, all Pentecostals emphasized holiness of life, including standards of conduct and dress. In the 1940s through 1960s, however, the Assemblies of God began to relax its stand in these areas, but the Second Work groups were much slower to abandon them. It was not until 1988, for example, that the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) officially deleted its rules against makeup, jewelry, movies, and women cutting their hair.

In the United States, about half of Pentecostals today belong to Finished Work groups. In the rest of the world, the vast majority of Pentecostals hold to the Finished Work doctrine. Even among the Second Work groups, the doctrine of sanctification as a second work of grace is rarely emphasized today, being mostly overshadowed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost.59 To a great extent, then, Durham's views have prevailed everywhere.

Why did the Finished Work message gain such widespread acceptance? Why did it become the wave of the future? We can identify three major reasons.

First, as the Pentecostal revival exploded, many converts came directly from a life of sin without claiming a prior experience of sanctification. While people such as Parham and Seymour had sought and received definite experiences with God years before the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, many new believers had not. At Azusa Street,

for example, sinners often repented and then immediately received the Holy Ghost. Some were filled with the Spirit immediately after having demons cast out of them. The Apostolic Faith published accounts of people who were saved, sanctified, and filled with the Holy Ghost all in one service. For more and more people, the theory of three crisis experiences did not fit the reality of what happened to them.

Second, many of the men who became leaders in the Pentecostal movement after 1910 did not come from a Wesleyan-Holiness background. For instance, Durham, Ewart, and Bell were former Baptists. They had been taught the standard Protestant view of sanctification as a progressive, ongoing work throughout a Christian's life.

Third, the Finished Work position has the stronger biblical support. Holiness people had equated entire sanctification with the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but

when early Pentecostals differentiated the two, there were
no clear examples in the New Testament of people receiving
sanctification as a distinct, instantaneous work.
Moreover, the Epistles present sanctification as beginning
at conversion (the new birth) and continuing throughout
the Christian's life.
For instance, Paul wrote that at our conversion we
were washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the
Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of God (I Corinthians 6:11).
Everyone in the church is already "sanctified in Christ
Jesus," yet we are all "called to be saints," that is, sanctified
ones (I Corinthians 1:2). The implication is that sanctification
is our lifelong identity, calling, and pursuit as
Christians.
Sanctification is instantaneous at the new birth in that
55
The Finished Work Controversy
we are immediately cleansed and set apart from sin and
given a holy nature. The old nature still resides within us,
however. Therefore, sanctification must also be progressive.
We must continue to pursue holiness (sanctification)
unto the coming of the Lord (Hebrews 12:14). As
we walk in the Spirit, we become more and more like
Christ and less and less like the world. "But we all, with
unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the
Lord, are being transformed into the same image from
glory to glory, just as by the Spirit of the Lord" (II Corinthians
3:18, NKJV). The ultimate goal of this process of
sanctification is perfection at the coming of the Lord:
"Now may the God of peace Himself sanctify you completely;
and may your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved
blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ"
(I Thessalonians 5:23, NKJV).
Conclusions
Despite his short Pentecostal ministry of five years,
William Durham was a powerful, unusually anointed
preacher who exerted tremendous and lasting influence
within the developing Pentecostal movement. The
Finished Work doctrine was not unique to him, of course.
In a general sense it was characteristic of mainline
Protestant theology. A century before, most Methodists
had abandoned the idea of sanctification as a second
work of grace, and some non-Pentecostal contemporaries
of Durham in the Holiness movement had formulated
essentially the same doctrine in their own context.
Nevertheless, Durham almost single-handedly introduced

this message to Pentecostals, redirected the course of the
movement, and broadened its theological appeal. As a
result, the majority of Pentecostals adopted basically the
Keswick position of two experiences—conversion and
baptism of the Holy Spirit as an endowment of power—
yet with the important distinction of tongues as the initial
evidence of the Spirit.

Of equal importance is the contribution that Durham
made toward the development of the Jesus Name movement.
Although he died a little over one year before its
emergence, he set the stage for Oneness Pentecostal theology
in several important ways:

1. He taught that we can receive all the benefits of the
Atonement by repentance and faith, without waiting for a
subsequent experience. While he retained the idea of two
experiences (conversion and Spirit baptism), he acknowledged
that when there is full scriptural understanding and
faith we can expect the baptism of the Spirit to come
immediately.

2. While some Pentecostals during and after his day
sought to modify the distinctive doctrine of the Holy
Ghost baptism, Durham staunchly affirmed the original
teaching of Parham and Seymour that receiving the Holy
Ghost is necessary to enter into the New Testament
church and that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence.

3. He established Acts 2:38 as the paradigm for New
Testament salvation, and he equated the three steps of
repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy
Ghost with the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus
Christ.

4. He stressed the importance of water baptism, and
he exalted the name of Jesus.

5. He had a major influence on future leaders of the
Oneness movement. Many of his ministerial colleagues
were soon baptized in Jesus' name, including Harry Van
Loon, R. E. McAlister, and A. H. Argue. As chapter 3 discusses,
the most prominent early proponent of the
Oneness message was Durham's associate and successor,
Frank J. Ewart.
The second doctrinal division in the Pentecostal

movement came over water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and the oneness of God. The Oneness doctrine affirms that God is one personal being, not a trinity of persons, and that Jesus Christ is the manifestation of the fullness of God, not just one of three persons. (See Deuteronomy 6:4; Colossians 2:9; I Timothy 3:16.) Trinitarians called this belief "the New Issue" and "Jesus Only," the latter because proponents baptized in the name of Jesus only instead of using the traditional trinitarian formula. Some trinitarians, however, began to use this label to accuse Oneness believers of denying the Father and the Holy Spirit. For this reason, most Oneness believers eventually rejected the designation "Jesus Only,"

59

The Jesus Name
Controversy

3

and today they generally regard it as an unfair mischaracterization. Instead, they call themselves Apostolic, Jesus Name, or Oneness Pentecostals.

Historical Roots

The Oneness doctrine did not arise in a vacuum. As volumes 1 and 2 of A History of Christian Doctrine discuss, throughout history many Christians have baptized in the name of Jesus, and many have promoted a concept of God that is essentially the same as the Oneness view. There is no historical link between these earlier groups and Oneness Pentecostals, however.

We do find roots of Oneness thinking in American revivalism of the eighteenth century and in the Holiness movement of the nineteenth century. These movements were characterized by a strong devotion to Jesus Christ and frequent use of the name of Jesus in prayer, praise, testimony, and song. In a way, as Episcopalian priest David Reed has argued, the Oneness doctrine was a theological expression of the practical piety of American revivalism, Holiness groups, and the earliest Pentecostals.

60

In these movements, there was also a strong impulse toward restorationism, that is, restoring the message and experience of the apostles and the first-century church. Indeed the entire Pentecostal movement was based on restorationist thinking. Given this focus, it was only a matter of time until people began to realize that the apostles always baptized in Jesus' name and never spoke of God in the terms of fourth-century trinitarian orthodoxy,

and further to see these points as doctrinally significant. In this regard, Edith Blumhofer, an Assemblies of God

60

A History of Christian Doctrine

scholar, wrote in an official history of her church:[61] The doctrinal departure aside, if one admits the strong restorationist component at the heart of the definition of Pentecostalism, Oneness proponents were more zealously restorationist, more doggedly congregational, and more Christocentrically spiritual— in short, in some important ways more essentially Pentecostal than the mainstream.

Walter Hollenweger, secretary of evangelism for the World Council of Churches, similarly commented that the Oneness doctrine "is more in accordance with religious feeling and practice of Pentecostalism than a doctrine of the Trinity taken over without understanding from the traditional churches."[62]

Another important factor was the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When the early Pentecostals were baptized with the Holy Ghost, they no longer had a theoretical concept of God but a direct, personal experience. They did not receive three divine spirits, but one Spirit. They did not encounter various divine persons or have multiple relationships with the Godhead, but they had an intensely personal relationship with one God.

Moreover, the Holy Spirit came upon them as they exalted Jesus Christ and the Atonement. For example, in the Azusa Street revival, some of the most popular hymns were "There Is Power in the Blood" and "Under the Blood." Participants were challenged not merely to preach "the baptism with the Holy Spirit" but "Christ in the power of the baptism."[63] The baptism of the Holy Spirit actually intensified their focus on Jesus Christ.

61

The Jesus Name Controversy

Finally, they received illumination from the Holy Spirit. Jesus promised, "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. . . . When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth . . . He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you" (John 14:26; 16:13-14). The indwelling Spirit played a vital role in helping them to understand and rediscover biblical truth, including truth

about the oneness of God and the full deity of Jesus Christ.

Thus, it is no surprise that Charles Parham, the catalyst for the entire Pentecostal movement, began to baptize in Jesus' name after the pattern of the Book of Acts. We have also seen that some people in Los Angeles were baptized in Jesus' name during the Azusa Street revival, and perhaps some people under Durham's ministry in Chicago were also. Gary McGee, an Assemblies of God scholar, discovered that a missionary in Latin America baptized in Jesus' name in 1904.64

Another early example was Andrew D. Urshan (1884-1967), an immigrant from Persia (Iran) who received the Holy Ghost in Chicago in 1908. He established a Persian mission there and was ordained by William Durham in 1910. That same year, he came to a new understanding of truth as he pondered the question: Why did the apostles always baptize in the name of Jesus in the Book of Acts when Jesus Himself had instructed them to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in Matthew 28:19? As he meditated on this matter, Acts 4:12 came to his attention, and he concluded that the Lord Jesus Christ

A History of Christian Doctrine

was "the one name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost":

The blessed Lord showed me then and there, that "The Lord Jesus Christ" is the ONE PROPER NAME of God for this gospel dispensation; because in Him, Jesus Christ, Our Lord, all the fullness of the Godhead dwelt; and to Him, all power in heaven and earth, was given; that repentance and remission of sins should be preached everywhere in Jesus' Name ONLY. [See Colossians 2:9; Matthew 28:18; Luke 24:47.]

He called this new understanding "a wonderful revelation of the Triunity in Christ" and "a blessed revelation of Christ's absolute deity." He did not mean an extrabiblical revelation, however, but as he explained when he first received the Holy Ghost, "The scriptures were illuminated to my soul as never before, by the Blessed Holy Spirit, who faithfully brought to my remembrance, with new meaning, that which I had read years ago and made it fresh as the morning dew." As a result of his study, in 1910 Urshan printed Acts 2:38 on the side of his baptismal tank and began to baptize all new converts "into the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."65

The Worldwide Camp Meeting,
Arroyo Seco, 1913

These early examples of baptism in Jesus' name did
not lead to the formation of the Oneness movement, however.
The events that ultimately resulted in controversy
and division began with the Worldwide Apostolic Faith
Camp Meeting organized by R. J. Scott and George Studd

63

The Jesus Name Controversy

and held at Arroyo Seco near Los Angeles, on a campground
used by the Azusa Street Mission. The month-long
meeting began on April 15, 1913, and perhaps two thousand
people attended.

The main speaker was Maria Woodworth-Etter (1844-
1924), a well-known Holiness evangelist who had
embraced the Pentecostal message. Expectations were
high, and they were fulfilled, for 364 people received the
Holy Spirit. Many miracles of healing took place as
Woodworth-Etter prayed "in the name of Jesus."

Of particular significance to the future of Oneness
Pentecostalism was the message of Robert E. McAlister
(1880-1953), a Canadian preacher who had received the
Holy Spirit at Azusa Street in 1906. Speaking at a baptismal
service, he explained that single immersion was
the proper mode for baptism, not triple immersion as
some people practiced. As proof he cited the baptismal
accounts in the Book of Acts. The apostles baptized in the
name of the Lord Jesus Christ; they never baptized using
the words "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," as triple immersion
requires.

At this, "an inaudible shudder" swept over the congregation,
and McAlister fell momentarily silent.66 A missionary
to China named Frank Denny leaped to the
platform, pulled McAlister aside and asked him not to
teach this doctrine, because it would associate him with a
certain minister named Sykes who was currently baptizing
in that manner. (See chapter 1.) McAlister then
explained that it was not wrong to baptize using the
words of Matthew 28:19.

McAlister's observation that the apostles always baptized
in Jesus' name planted a seed in the minds of sev-

64

A History of Christian Doctrine

eral people that day. A man named John Schaepe (1870-
1939) was so inspired by this thought that he spent the
night in prayer. Early the next morning he began running

through the camp shouting that he had received a revelation of the power of the name of Jesus. Quite a few of the campers were greatly stirred as Schaepe fervently explained his newfound understanding.

Detractors sometimes say that Schaepe founded the Oneness movement and that he did so by an extrabiblical revelation. Actually, little is known of Schaepe (pronounced "Sheppy" and sometimes misspelled "Scheppe").

In 1919 he was listed as a minister with the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, a Oneness organization, but he did not play a significant role in the movement after 1913.

As the quotations in this chapter from Andrew Urshan, Frank Ewart, and Frank Small show, early Pentecostals used the term "revelation" to refer to the illumination of Scripture by the Holy Spirit. David Reed has accurately noted, "'Revelation' was primarily a term used by Oneness exponents to describe the subjective confirmation of the objectively stated truth in the Bible."67 From the beginning, Oneness believers appealed to Scripture as the authority for their doctrine and rejected the idea of extrabiblical revelation. They believed that the Holy Spirit had helped them rediscover and understand biblical truths that had long been neglected.

Frank Ewart and the Oneness of God

Another man who was deeply impressed by McAlister's message was Frank J. Ewart (pronounced "You-ert") (1876-1947). A Baptist bush missionary in

65

The Jesus Name Controversy

Australia, he immigrated to Canada in 1903 and became a pastor there. The Baptists dismissed him when he received the Holy Spirit in 1908 under Florence Crawford in Portland, Oregon. In 1911 he became the assistant pastor to William Durham's mission in Los Angeles, and when Durham died in 1912, Ewart became the pastor.

Ewart had been studying the name and oneness of God for some time, so McAlister's comments were especially intriguing to him. Ewart invited him to his home, and they began to discuss the implications of using the name of Jesus in water baptism. McAlister suggested that the words "Lord" (meaning master), "Jesus," and "Christ" (meaning "Anointed One") represented "Father, Son, Holy Ghost" respectively. Therefore, when the apostles baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, they fulfilled Matthew 28:19.

After the camp meeting, Ewart left the pastorate of
his church and began a new work in Los Angeles with
McAlister and Glenn Cook (1867-1948). Cook had been
the full-time business manager of the Azusa Street
Mission under Seymour. By this time, he was a noted
evangelist, having brought the Pentecostal message to
Indianapolis and to the Church of God in Christ in
Memphis. He had also conducted successful campaigns in
Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas.

Ewart and McAlister continued their study of the
name of Jesus and the doctrine of God, and they included
Cook in their discussions. After several months McAlister
returned to Canada and shared his thinking with ministers
there, particularly Franklin Small (1873-1961). Small
was one of the first people in Winnipeg, Manitoba,
Canada, to receive the Holy Spirit in 1907. He became an

assistant pastor in Winnipeg to A. H. Argue, who had
received the Holy Spirit under Durham.

In Los Angeles, Ewart merged his work with that of
Elmer Fisher and continued working with Fisher and his
associate, A. G. Garr. (Garr was the first white pastor to
receive the Holy Ghost at Azusa Street and the first
Pentecostal missionary to India and Hong Kong.) Ewart
occasionally preached on the power of the name of Jesus
and was astonished by the tremendous results in healings
and Spirit baptisms. Fisher and Garr urged Ewart to continue
preaching on the name of Jesus, but they were
opposed to baptizing in Jesus' name.

In November 1913, at the eighth annual Pentecostal
convention in Winnipeg, McAlister preached the first sermon
on the exclusive use of the name of Jesus in water
baptism. Frank Small was asked to take charge of the
baptismal service, and he baptized thirty new converts in
the name of Jesus Christ. These were the first Jesus Name
baptisms to result from the Arroyo Seco camp meeting.

Ewart eventually decided that he needed to take a
clear stand for water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ.
He concluded that the essential name to use in baptism
was Jesus and that the titles of Lord and Christ could be
added.68 Moreover, he concluded that this practice had
great significance regarding the doctrine of God. The
apostles baptized in Jesus' name because the Father, Son,
and Holy Ghost are not three distinct persons but three
manifestations of one God, and Jesus is the revelation of

the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The reason why there is such power when believers preach, pray, and baptize in Jesus' name, is that the fullness of the Godhead dwells in Jesus.

The Jesus Name Controversy

Because of his new convictions, Ewart parted company with Fisher and Garr. He pitched a tent (which Fisher helped him obtain) and began meetings in Belvedere, California, just outside Los Angeles. Glenn Cook agreed with Ewart's message, and they decided to work together. On April 15, 1914—exactly one year after the Arroyo Seco camp meeting began—Ewart preached his first sermon on Acts 2:38. He proclaimed that the full message of salvation consists of repentance, water baptism in Jesus' name, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and he associated baptism in Jesus' name with the oneness of God in Christ. Then Ewart baptized Cook in the name of Jesus Christ, and Cook baptized Ewart. This action—the first rebaptisms in the name of Jesus Christ— was the decisive step in starting Oneness Pentecostalism as a distinct movement.

Frank Small, quoted with approval by Ewart, later explained the doctrinal significance of rebaptism in Jesus' name:69

Through the illumination of Scripture, the new message had resolved itself into the fullness of God in Christ (II Corinthians 5:19; I Thessalonians 5:18; I Timothy 3:16). This teaching developed in Los Angeles. It might be stated that until this time, the message of water baptism in the Name of Jesus had been based on record only. We knew beyond a shadow of a doubt that the apostles had baptized in the Name of Jesus, but we still did not fully understand why. But, in due time when complete scriptural revelation came, the absolute fullness of God in Christ was proven. Out of the development of this truth came the act of re-baptizing converts

A History of Christian Doctrine

who had previously been baptized using the titles Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The Spread of the Jesus Name Message

A great revival broke out under Ewart and Cook in the Los Angeles area. Ewart reported:70

All kinds of incurable diseases were healed in the Name of Jesus, and people were filled with the Holy

Ghost, speaking in other tongues.

One of the greatest, most startling characteristics of that great revival was that the vast majority of the new converts were filled with the Holy Ghost after coming up out of the water. They would leave the tank speaking in other tongues. Many were healed when they were baptized.

Many missionaries and preachers came to the meetings and were rebaptized in Jesus' name. Even more significantly, Ewart's periodical, Meat in Due Season, carried the Jesus Name message and reports of the revival far and wide. Many more people were touched and converted by the paper than by the revival itself. Missionaries to China, Japan, and India were soon baptized in Jesus' name.

During this revival, Ewart endured much opposition from local church people as well as from a gang of hoodlums. The latter threatened him and his wife on numerous occasions, planted "stink bombs" in the services, and even burned down the tent. The town constable did nothing to protect them, but the persecution ended when the gang leader was converted. Ewart had to

69

The Jesus Name Controversy

go to court several times on charges of disturbing the peace, as the Baptists complained against his meetings. In 1919, when Ewart established a permanent church in the Los Angeles area, he would sometimes baptize as many as fifty people in one service. He recorded two thousand names on the baptismal roll before he stopped counting for fear that God would not be pleased.71

Cook embarked upon an evangelistic campaign in 1914 to bring the Jesus Name message to the Midwest, where he had earlier brought the Pentecostal message. In St. Louis, he baptized "Mother" Mary Moise, who administrated a home for the downtrodden; her associate, "Mother" Barnes; and Ben Pemberton, a young minister under her. In Indianapolis, Cook baptized two influential pastors, L. V. Roberts and Garfield T. Haywood, and they baptized their congregations. A total of 465 people were baptized in Jesus' name in Indianapolis, in the first such event east of the Mississippi River.

The baptism of Haywood (1880-1931) was particularly significant. He was the black pastor of a large interracial congregation, an extremely influential teacher, and the publisher of a widely read periodical, Voice in the

Wilderness. He was undoubtedly the most prominent black leader of the Finished Work camp, but his gifts as teacher, preacher, author, and songwriter were recognized by blacks and whites alike.

In 1911 Haywood had obtained ministerial credentials with a small, obscure organization called the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World that began in 1906 or 1907 in Los Angeles. At this time its general superintendent was J. J. Frazee of Portland, Oregon, who had come out of Florence Crawford's ministry there. By 1913 Haywood had influ-

A History of Christian Doctrine

enced Ewart, Cook, and McAlister to associate with this group.72 However, at the time of his rebaptism, he was in close fellowship with the Assemblies of God.

The Assemblies of God

The Assemblies of God was organized at a convention on April 2-14, 1914, in Hot Springs, Arkansas. (The conference ended one day before Ewart and Cook rebaptized each other.) The prime movers were Howard Goss and Eudorus N. Bell. The need for this organization arose from two major factors: the demise of Parham's organization, particularly in the South, and the lack of an organization that embraced the Finished Work doctrine.

It appears that the primary catalyst for the formation of the new organization was Howard Goss, pastor in Hot Springs at that time. He had previously been Parham's field director for Texas, but he and most workers in Texas and Arkansas had broken with Parham over the allegations of Parham's misconduct, and they had accepted Durham's Finished Work teaching.

In 1910, Goss had received permission from C. H. Mason to use the name of his organization—Church of God in Christ—to issue credentials to white ministers and to obtain clergy railroad discounts. Mason exercised no authority over them, and they did not adhere to his doctrine of sanctification as a second work of grace. Moreover, they apparently conducted little or no business among themselves.

Another loose ministerial association had formed in 1909 in Dothan, Alabama, under H. G. Rodgers. They chose the name Church of God, not realizing that a preexisting Pentecostal organization was using the same

The Jesus Name Controversy

name. They joined Goss's group in 1913. The combined

list of ministers numbered 352, but the group did not function as a true organization.

Goss began to see the need for an active organization that would examine ministerial qualifications, protect churches from charlatans and troublemakers, and promote missionary efforts. He approached E. N. Bell (1866-1923) with his thoughts. Bell was an older minister who had been to seminary and who had pastored Baptist churches for seventeen years before coming into the Pentecostal movement under Durham. He was a pastor in Malvern, Arkansas, and editor of an influential monthly paper, the Word and Witness. Most of the workers in the South who had left Parham were still quite young—Goss himself was only about thirty—and had accepted Durham's doctrine, so they naturally looked to Bell for leadership.

Bell likewise saw the need for organization, and he used his paper to announce a "general council" to promote five stated purposes: unity, stabilization, missions outreach, legal identity, and schools and publications. Bell and Goss signed the initial call for organization. Soon they were joined by Daniel C. O. Opperman (1872-1926), Mack M. Pinson, and Arch P. Collins. Opperman had been the superintendent of the high school system at Zion. After receiving the Holy Ghost in Parham's work, he became a leading Pentecostal educator, conducting short-term Bible schools for workers. All five of the men who issued the call for a new organization were associated with the autonomous white wing of the Church of God in Christ. Over 300 people attended this first meeting, with 128 registering as ministers and missionaries. They voted to

72

A History of Christian Doctrine

form an organization and chose as their official name The General Council of the Assemblies of God. Bell was elected as general chairman, a title later renamed general superintendent. J. Roswell Flower (1888-1970) became the first secretary-treasurer. Born in Canada, he was a convert from the Christian and Missionary Alliance who pastored a small church in Indianapolis and published a weekly, The Christian Evangel. The two papers of Bell and Flower became the official organs, with Bell as the editor. The first executive presbyters—some elected and some later appointed by those elected—were Bell, Collins, R. L. Erickson, Flower, Cyrus B. Fockler, Goss, Daniel W. Kerr, Thomas K. Leonard, Opperman, Pinson,

John C. Sinclair, and John W. Welch. The assembled ministers agreed not to have any creed but the Bible, but their purpose was to create an organization for Finished Work Pentecostals.

In the fall of 1914, the new organization conducted its first regular meeting, which was its second general council. Collins replaced Bell as chairman, Opperman became the first assistant chairman, and Bennett F. Lawrence (1890-?) became the first assistant secretary.

Rebaptism of Leaders

Almost immediately, the new organization faced the issue of water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Many prominent ministers were being baptized in Jesus' name. At first, the leaders of the Assemblies of God opposed this teaching, notably Bell, Goss, and Flower.

In July 1915, a dramatic event occurred at the third interstate encampment of the Assemblies of God in Jackson, Tennessee. The host pastor was H. G. Rodgers,

73

The Jesus Name Controversy

and Bell conducted the camp. They chose L. V. Roberts of Indianapolis as the main speaker. After he preached his first sermon, which was on Acts 2:38, both Rodgers and Bell were baptized in Jesus' name.

In August 1915, L. C. Hall (1867-?) preached a camp meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas. A convert from Dowie's Zion City, Hall had recently been baptized in Jesus' name, and he preached this message. Bell performed the baptisms and baptized Goss. Although Parham had baptized Goss in Jesus' name twelve years earlier, neither man had attached doctrinal significance to the formula, and Goss wanted to identify clearly with the Jesus Name doctrine. Hall also brought Jesus Name baptism to eastern Texas, baptizing Harvey Shearer and others.

About this time, two other Assemblies of God officials, Lawrence and Opperman, were baptized in Jesus' name. Opperman began advocating the message in his periodical, The Blessed Truth.

Hall then conducted a campaign in Ontario, Canada, in November 1915 with George Chambers that resulted in hundreds being rebaptized in Jesus' name. About the same time, G. T. Haywood preached for R. E. McAlister in Ottawa and rebaptized him along with many others. Almost all the Canadian Pentecostal leaders accepted the Jesus Name message, including A. H. Argue, George Chambers, R. E. McAlister, and Frank Small.

At a thirty-day Bible conference in Elton, Louisiana,
beginning December 15, 1915, Harvey Shearer (the conference
chairman) and Howard Goss proclaimed the
Oneness teaching in that state. All but one minister in
attendance accepted Jesus Name baptism, including
Robert LaFleur and Oliver Fauss. According to notes that

74

A History of Christian Doctrine

Fauss took, the conference leaders taught "the oneness of
God in Christ" instead of "three persons in the Godhead"
and taught that "Acts 2:38 is God's plan" of salvation.73 All
twelve ministers of the Assemblies of God in Louisiana
embraced the Jesus Name message.

In short, within two years after Ewart and Cook
rebaptized each other, many early Pentecostal leaders
were baptized in Jesus' name. Some simply acted in obedience
to the apostolic pattern but did not fully embrace
the Oneness doctrine, or else did so for only a short time.
Many, however, accepted both Jesus Name baptism and
the associated Oneness doctrine. In addition to Argue,
Mother Barnes, Bell, Chambers, Cook, Ewart, Goss, Hall,
Haywood, Lawrence, McAlister, Mother Moise,
Opperman, Roberts, Rodgers, Shearer, and Small, early
Pentecostal leaders who accepted Jesus Name baptism
include Frank Bartleman, William Booth-Clibborn (grandson
of the founder of the Salvation Army), Frank and
Elizabeth Gray (missionaries to Japan), Elmer K. Fisher,
Thoro Harris (songwriter), S. C. McClain, Aimee Semple
McPherson, C. H. Mason (but not until 1930), Harry
Morse, F. S. Ramsay (missionary to China), R. J. Scott,
George B. Studd, Harry Van Loon, and Maria Woodworth-
Etter.74 (See Appendix B for a description of most of these
leaders.) As trinitarian historians point out, the Jesus
Name message came very close to sweeping the
Assemblies of God.

The Controversy in the Assemblies of God

In the meantime, the third general council of the
Assemblies of God convened in October 1915 in St.
Louis. With the approval of some executive presbyters,

75

The Jesus Name Controversy

J. R. Flower, the secretary-treasurer, convened the meeting
specifically to suppress the so-called New Issue.
Collins, the chairman, and Opperman, the assistant chairman,
did not want to do so, and they arrived late. In their
absence, Flower took charge and asked J. W. Welch

(1858-1939) to chair the meeting.

About one hundred ministers were in attendance, and a debate was organized. E. N. Bell and G. T. Haywood presented the case for baptism in Jesus' name. Speaking for the traditional trinitarian formula were Collins and Jacob Miller. William Schell was originally scheduled instead of Miller, but he was prepared to speak on church history. When he learned that the debate was to be confined to Scripture, he withdrew.75 The next day, however, he was allowed to speak for two hours on "the baptismal formula as given by the [Post-]Apostolic Fathers."76

The conference decided that either baptismal formula was acceptable but that more time was needed to pray and study the issue. It then recommended a compromise formula: "The substitution of the name of 'Jesus Christ' for the word 'Son' (Matt. 28:19) would better harmonize Matt. 28:19 with the book of Acts (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5) and, as a formula, would be preferable to the use of any one passage to the exclusion of the other."77

Despite the professed desire for further discussion and deliberation, the conference elected staunch trinitarians to every position and removed everyone who had accepted baptism in Jesus' name or who had a conciliatory attitude toward it. Bell, Collins, Goss, Lawrence, and Opperman all lost their positions. Welch replaced Collins as chairman.

During 1916, the leadership of the Assemblies of God

fought strongly against the Oneness message. Flower's opposition was the most decisive of all. From a study of church history, he concluded that the Oneness teaching was essentially a revival of modalistic monarchianism or Sabellianism, which the mainstream church of the third and fourth centuries had deemed heresy. He argued that if the Assemblies of God adopted this position, it would break fellowship with historic and contemporary Christianity. Although both sides appealed to Scripture, for many people the ultimate test was the verdict of tradition.

One of Flower's most significant accomplishments was influencing Bell to switch sides and endorse trinitarian baptism again. Bell never denied Jesus Name baptism as such, but he suppressed his practice of baptizing in Jesus' name for the sake of unity and continued fellowship with the Assemblies of God. Eventually he denounced the Oneness doctrine.

Welch announced that the general council in 1916 would decide the issue. The fourth general council of the Assemblies of God convened October 1-7, 1916, in St. Louis. The leadership appointed a committee to write a doctrinal statement, even though the organizing conference two years earlier had voted not to adopt such a statement. The committee was composed of D. W. Kerr, T. K. Leonard, S. A. Jameson, Stanley H. Frodsham, and E. N. Bell. Bell was the only one who had been baptized in Jesus' name; the others were staunch trinitarians. Bell was apparently placed on the committee because of his great influence and also to reestablish him firmly in the trinitarian camp.

Kerr (1856-1927), a former minister with the

Christian and Missionary Alliance, was the most prepared and had the most influence on the committee. He had studied the issue thoroughly and already had rebuttals for the Oneness position. He was the primary author of the document that the committee formulated, the "Statement of Fundamental Truths," which consisted of seventeen points. The statement strongly advocated trinitarianism—some would say almost tritheism—and expressly denounced the Oneness doctrine on a number of points. (See chapter 5.)

Vigorous debate ensued. In a personal interview, Carl M. O'Guin, the last surviving participant, gave the following description of the meeting. O'Guin was twenty years old at the time. He was living with Welch, and he supported the trinitarian position. He later became a district superintendent in the Assemblies of God.78

According to O'Guin, the most influential leaders in the Assemblies of God at the time were Bell, Goss, Kerr, Opperman, and Welch. Bell was by far the most respected. On the Jesus Name issue, his opinion was especially important, for the other four leaders mentioned were evenly split between strong trinitarians (Kerr, Welch) and strong Oneness believers (Goss, Opperman).

In the debate, the main advocates of trinitarianism were Kerr, Leonard, Pinson, and Welch, while the main advocates of Oneness were Ewart, Goss, and Haywood. Ewart and Haywood were not officially members of the Assemblies of God but were given the privilege to speak because of their close fellowship and significant influence. J. R. Flower's input was mostly behind the scene; he

was only twenty-eight at the time.

O'Guin estimated that about eighty ministers were in

attendance, about fifteen or twenty of whom had been rebaptized in Jesus' name.79 With the exception of a few leaders, most of these men were quite young. Many of the preachers had not yet made up their minds on the issue, and the position of the leaders was the deciding factor for some. Most of them did not consider the Jesus Name message to be heresy.

In O'Guin's opinion, Kerr was "stern, strict, and intolerant," and Leonard was the most effective debater.

Leonard (1861-1946) had been the man to suggest the name Assemblies of God in the beginning, and he was the primary author of the first constitution, which he considered to have been inspired of God. O'Guin said he was "a witty Irishman, a law unto himself," and no one could control him. He staked out a harsh position, not wanting to compromise on anything but issuing an ultimatum to the Jesus Name people to accept trinitarianism completely or leave. As O'Guin recalled, most of the ministers did not really agree with such a hard-line stance, but they did not have the courage to oppose Leonard. O'Guin concluded that the decision was too hasty. He said, "If we would have taken a humble attitude and waited on the Lord, I believe God would have solved the problem without division."

O'Guin remembered that Leonard especially did not like Haywood and was glad for the chance to "belittle" him. It is well documented that during the debate Leonard spoke of the Oneness people as "hay, wood, and stubble," obviously alluding to G. T. Haywood as well as I Corinthians 3:12. He also said they were in the wilderness and had "a voice in the wilderness," referring to Haywood's paper, Voice in the Wilderness.80

In the end, the conference adopted the trinitarian

statement. It also voted to require that the words of Matthew 28:19 be incorporated in the baptismal formula. The Oneness ministers had no alternative but to leave the organization. As they left the conference floor to discuss their options, they heard the assembly sing, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, blessed trinity."

As a result of this conference, 156 out of 585 ministers dropped out of the Assemblies of God—about onefourth

of the total. Presumably, almost all of them were
Oneness, although a few left because they objected to the
adoption of a statement of faith and felt that the handling
of the controversy was too harsh.

Robert Mapes Anderson, a non-Pentecostal historian,
concluded that doctrine was not the only factor in the dramatic
shakeup of the young Assemblies of God in 1915-
16, but a power struggle was also involved.81 He noted
that the six most influential men in the formation of the
Assemblies of God in 1914 were Bell, Goss, Opperman,
Collins, Pinson, and Rodgers. They were all from the
South, and they had all been associated with the white
wing of the Church of God in Christ. All of them lost their
positions. The men who gained power during this time—
Flower, Welch, Kerr, and Leonard—were from the upper
Midwest and Northeast. Flower, Welch, and Kerr had formerly
belonged to the Christian and Missionary Alliance
(Welch and Kerr were former Alliance officials), and
Leonard had belonged to the Christian Church.

Anderson also raised the question of whether racism
played a role, particularly in light of Leonard's animosity
toward Haywood. Practically all the blacks in the Finished
Work camp looked to Haywood for leadership, so by the
decision of 1916, the Assemblies of God became "an all

80

A History of Christian Doctrine

but 'lily white' denomination," and Oneness Pentecostals
became the most biracial wing of the entire Pentecostal
movement.82

Those Who Stayed

A few of the ministers who were baptized in the name
of Jesus simply acted in obedience to the apostolic pattern
but never fully adopted the Oneness position. As
indicated by Frank Small's remarks and by Oliver Fauss's
notes from the Elton Bible Conference, however, most
people did associate their rebaptism with a new understanding
of the full deity of Jesus Christ and the oneness
of God in contrast to traditional trinitarianism. Some of
these people drew back from their new belief and practice
when opposition came. Ministers who never completely
left trinitarianism, or who ultimately endorsed it again,
included A. H. Argue, E. N. Bell, George Chambers,
Elmer Fisher, R. E. McAlister, Aimee Semple McPherson,
L. V. Roberts, and Maria Woodworth-Etter.

Later such people tended to minimize the extent to
which they had embraced the Oneness doctrine. Many of

their testimonies at the time, however, reveal a profound spiritual and theological awakening when they were baptized in Jesus' name.

For example, R. E. McAlister later became a strong opponent of the Oneness message in Canada. When he was baptized, however, he wrote, "I have had a revelation to my soul of the one God in threefold manifestation. How my heart melted in His presence! I could only cry and weep."[83] The most significant defection from Jesus Name baptism back to trinitarian baptism was E. N. Bell. Trinitarian historians have commonly stated that Bell never accepted

the Oneness message but merely was baptized to follow the Book of Acts. Some have attributed his baptism in Jesus' name to psychological pressures, such as being tired, overworked, and afraid of failure. A careful study of his testimony, however, reveals that he emphasized classic Oneness themes, although he did retain some trinitarian terminology. Had he remained faithful to his new understanding, he would have undoubtedly attained a consistent Oneness perspective.

In 1915 Bell gave three reasons why he was baptized in Jesus' name.[84] First, he had entertained doubts about his previous water baptism ever since he had received the Holy Spirit, and he believed it would "please God for me now to be buried with Him in baptism." It was a matter of conscience, a matter about which God had been dealing with him for a long time.

Second, before the meeting in which he was baptized, God dealt specifically with him. He could not preach on any other topic: "God took away every other message until I would obey."

Third, he realized that the apostles taught and practiced baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. It was the apostolic pattern; thus he needed to follow it.

In his first article after being baptized in Jesus' name, published in August 1915, Bell described his new spiritual experience and theological understanding. The article, entitled "Who Is Jesus Christ?," begins as follows:[85]

The lost Christ being re-discovered as the Jehovah of the Old Testament and the True God of the New. A realization of Christ as the Mighty God being received.

I want to thank God today for the discussion of water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, because it has proven the means of discovering to me a mightier Christ than I ever realized before. The water baptism issue in the name of Christ, taken alone, would be comparatively a small and tame matter. Just so, it first seemed to me and to many others, and seems to some still, because they have not seen what is involved in it and do not have the full apostolic vision of Jesus Christ as Lord or Jehovah. The baptismal issue is only one cog in the wheel that will roll out and up to your bewildered and joyful vision the most glorious Christ you ever beheld, if you will let it, by beginning to walk in the light by obeying Him. I can say today, before God and all men, that His joy is rolling in my soul now as never before. As I write, His glory convulses my whole physical frame, and I have to stop now and then and say, "Glory," or "Oh, glory," to let some of it escape. Night before last, as I lay on my bed, I heard in the Spirit the sweetest, most soul-thrilling song on the wonderful name of Jesus I ever heard since I was born. If people knew what God is putting in my soul, by a brand new vision of Jesus and the wonders hid in His mighty and glorious name, they would cease pitying me for being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and begin to shout and help me praise the Lamb that was slain, who is now beginning to receive some honor and praise, but who will eventually make the whole universe— sea, earth and sky, reverberate with universal praise and honor to His great name. Hallelujah to His name forever!

83

The Jesus Name Controversy

The section titles of the remainder of the article are as follows: "Jesus is Jehovah. He is Eternal God and Creator. He is the Mighty God. Jesus is the True God. He is Emmanuel—God With Us. He is Lord of Lords. He is One With the Father. Trinity or Godhead, all in Christ. Father's Name Given Jesus. The Real Vision of Jesus Lost."

In the article, Bell quoted and discussed Colossians 2:9, then dealt with the trinity, and concluded as follows:

Now, it is a wonder how He [Jesus] could be God, or God could dwell in Him. It is more a wonder that the whole "Godhead" dwells in him. It is still a greater wonder that the fulness of the Godhead dwells in him;

and a wonder on wonders how all the fulness of the Godhead is in Jesus. But all this is declared of our glorious Christ.

Don't be afraid the Father and the Holy Ghost will be left out. We all believe in God the Father and in the blessed Holy Ghost. We can expect to continue to speak of both, just as the Apostles do in the New Testament, whenever occasion demands it and when that is our subject; but just now our subject is the wonders in Christ.

It is unreasonable, when magnifying Jesus as Lord, to expect us to stop and mystify our readers with the Greek mysteries about the Trinity. Anyway, few even after years of study on the Trinity, know much more about it than when they began. . . . So don't let anyone make you go into hysterics over the mysteries of the Trinity being neglected while we are exalting Jesus Christ. I never knew of any one being saved by a study of the Trinity, but exalting Jesus the

84

A History of Christian Doctrine

Christ as the mighty Lord, able to save unto the uttermost, will bring this great salvation to thousands on thousands. . . .

The whole Godhead, in all its fulness, is in Jesus. Hence, baptism in the name of Jesus was the apostolic custom everywhere. . . .

All may baptize with the phrase in Matthew 28:19 who feel so led, and I will love and fellowship them just the same; but personally, with my present light, I could not conscientiously do so any more. I prefer to use the real name common to both Father and Son, as the Lord commanded me to baptize in "The Name," not in a relationship phrase which is no proper name at all. Lord, help the dear brethren to see that Father and Son are, by no means, proper names. Recognizing that the whole Godhead was always present in Jesus, the Apostles baptized either in a part or all of His name; sometimes Jesus Christ; at other times, Lord, or Lord Jesus. (See Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:44; 19:5.) But there was never a hint, from their first sermon at Pentecost to the death of the last Apostle, that they understood Jesus to mean to use the phrase as in Matthew 28:19, rather than the name. But when the church lost the secret of this name, it began to fall into liberalism and formalism,

without understanding the true meaning and intent of the forms they were using. Now God is restoring the spiritual vision of the mighty Jehovah-Christ, the wonders in His name, and Christ is becoming daily larger and more glorious to our vision.

Oh, thank God forever for it. Well, we must stop,

but we have only just started into this great subject of who Jesus Christ is.

It is amazing that someone with this insight would suppress such a glorious message and experience for the sake of fellowship. Yet that is what Bell did. In 1920 he was elected a second time as general chairman of the Assemblies of God, a position he held until his death in 1923.

We should also note that some ministers eventually left Oneness circles in order to return to a broader base of fellowship and ministry. They maintained or renewed fellowship with trinitarians and conducted their later ministry primarily among them, but they never renounced their Oneness views. Examples were William Booth-Clibborn, L. C. Hall, and H. G. Rodgers.

Conclusions

The Oneness message was not an aberration but a logical, scriptural development among the earliest Pentecostals, given their restorationist impulse, emphasis on Scripture, and willingness to reevaluate and abandon doctrinal tradition. From the very start of the Pentecostal movement, some people were baptizing in Jesus' name, including Charles Parham himself. Very soon some, such as Andrew Urshan and Frank Ewart, were rethinking their understanding of the doctrine of God. The ministries of Parham, William Seymour, and especially William Durham prepared the way for the Jesus Name message, and this point will be even more apparent as we discuss the doctrine of salvation in chapter 4. As we shall see, in formulating and expounding their doctrine, the Oneness

people employed key concepts, phrases, and passages of Scripture that were already in use. For example, early preachers such as Parham and Durham had already drawn attention to Acts 2:38, and the Oneness movement extended that emphasis.

As with the Pentecostal movement generally, it would be a mistake to identify one person as the founder of the Oneness movement. More than any other individual, Frank Ewart was responsible for the theological formulation of the Oneness view of the Godhead. We should not neglect, however, the significant roles that others played at the very outset. R. E. McAlister contributed the crucial insight that the apostles always baptized in Jesus' name, and he and Ewart discussed the related doctrinal issues for months. John Schaepe was a catalyst with his insight regarding the power of the name of Jesus. Frank Small was the first to act upon the new thinking by baptizing converts in Jesus' name. Glenn Cook was instrumental in discussing the doctrine with Ewart, in jointly taking the decisive step of rebaptism, and in bringing the message to other leaders. Several other key thinkers began contributing significant insights almost immediately, notably G. T. Haywood and in a few years Andrew Urshan. Advocates of the Oneness message came from the front ranks of Pentecostal leaders, including one of Parham's earliest converts and closest associates (Howard Goss), one of Seymour's full-time coworkers at Azusa Street (Cook), and Durham's assistant pastor and successor (Ewart). Many of the founders of the Assemblies of God and the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada accepted the Oneness message in whole or in part. Indeed, the first general superintendents (or equivalent) of four major

87

The Jesus Name Controversy

trinitarian Pentecostal organizations were baptized in Jesus' name: the Assemblies of God (E. N. Bell), the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (George Chambers), the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel (Aimee Semple McPherson), and the Church of God in Christ (C. H. Mason). Clearly, Oneness Pentecostals were classical Pentecostals and not later offshoots.

As a result of the controversies over sanctification and the oneness of God, by the end of 1916 the Pentecostal movement was split three ways. In chapters 4 and 5, we will trace further expansion and organizational developments, examine doctrinal positions, and draw conclusions, giving particular attention to the Oneness Pentecostal movement in chapter 4.

88

A History of Christian Doctrine

When the Assemblies of God adopted its trinitarian

statement of faith in October 1916, the Oneness ministers were left without an organizational home. The other major Pentecostal organizations in existence were Second Work Pentecostals who had retained the doctrine of the trinity as part of their theological system. The Oneness message had arisen within the Finished Work wing of the Pentecostal movement, of which the Assemblies of God was the chief representative.

Most Oneness Pentecostal ministers had been forced to leave two organizations: first, when they received the Holy Spirit, and second, when they were baptized in Jesus' name. Many Pentecostals had long questioned the need and value of organization; indeed, Parham himself

89

Oneness Pentecostal
Organizations

4

opposed organization by this time. Many Oneness Pentecostals understandably felt that organizations too often promoted the traditions of men and stifled the move of the Spirit. As a result, there are many independent Oneness Pentecostals even to this day.

The Pentecostal Assemblies of the World

Nevertheless, the majority saw the need to form a Oneness Pentecostal organization. To further this purpose, a large group of Oneness ministers met in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, in late December 1916 and organized in early January 1917. They elected D. C. O. Opperman as chairman, Lee Floyd as secretary, and Howard Goss as treasurer. Opperman, Goss, and H. G. Rodgers were appointed as a credential committee. The group named themselves the General Assembly of the Apostolic Assemblies (GAAA). Among the ministers who joined were Booth-Clibborn, Ewart, Fauss, Hall, LaFleur, Pemberton, and Schaepe.

This organization lasted only one year because of two factors. First, America entered World War I in April 1917, and since the organization was so new, its ministers could not obtain exemption from military service. Second, they could not obtain clergy discounts on the railroad, which was almost essential at a time when few ministers owned automobiles.

In the meantime, a small organization known as the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (PAW), founded in 1906 or 1907 in Los Angeles, had become a Oneness organization under the influence of G. T. Haywood, a

member since 1911. It was able to obtain noncombatant status for its ministers, so in late 1917 or early 1918,

the GAAA merged with the PAW.

This organization was interracial. E. W. Doak (white) was elected as general chairman, G. T. Haywood (black) as general secretary, and Opperman (white) as general elder. Most Oneness groups today have originated, directly or indirectly, from the PAW.

The earliest list of PAW ministers we have is for 1919-20.86 On it were the following men whom we have already mentioned in this book: Booth-Clibborn, Chambers, Denny, Doak, Ewart, Fauss, Floyd, Goss, Gray, Hall, Haywood, LaFleur, Morse, Opperman, Pemberton, Ramsey, Schaepe, Shearer, Small, and Studd. Others on the list who would become key leaders in the future were S. N. Hancock, B. H. Hite, W. E. Kidson, R. C. Lawson, S. C. McClain, L. R. Ooton, G. B. Rowe, A. R. Schooler, Wesley Steelburg (son-in-law of Elmer Fisher and future general superintendent of the Assemblies of God), J. M. Turpin, S. L. Wise, and W. T. Witherspoon.

The total number of ministers was 704 (excluding two apparent duplicates). Of the total, 203 (29 percent) were women, many of whom were wives of ministers, such as Goss, Hall, and Lawson. The ministers lived in 36 of the 48 states, the District of Columbia, four provinces of Canada (17 ministers), and four other countries (at least 30 foreign missionaries or national workers in China, Japan, Persia, South Africa, and unspecified locations).87 Over 80 percent of the ministers resided in three areas—the West Coast, the Midwest, and the South—with the top three states being California (15 percent), Indiana (14 percent), and Texas (8 percent). Many were based in three cities: Indianapolis, Los Angeles, and Oakland. Approximately 25 to 30 percent were black,88 and three

Hispanic surnames appear on the list.

Organizational Efforts in Canada

In Canada, most of the early Pentecostal leaders had accepted the Jesus Name message. Some leaders—including R. E. McAlister, George A. Chambers, R. E. Sternall, Frank Small, and Howard Goss—began meeting in 1917 to plan a Canadian organization. (Goss was pastor in Picton, Ontario, at the time.) Their intention was to

work closely with the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, so they named their organization the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (PAOC).89 Indeed, Chambers and Goss were listed as PAW ministers for 1919-20. The two most influential organizers were Chambers, the first general chairman (superintendent), and McAlister, the first secretary-treasurer. The group did not formally obtain a federal charter until 1919.

Much like the Assemblies of God in 1914, in the first meeting of the board of trustees the PAOC voted not to adopt a doctrinal statement as a basis of fellowship. Between 1917 and 1920, however, a shift took place away from the Oneness position, with both Chambers and McAlister repudiating the doctrine.

The first general assembly, held in November 1919 and attended by 31 ministers and lay delegates, issued the following statement: "We recognize a three-fold relationship of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost being clearly taught in the New Testament. . . . As to baptism, we feel like leaving the matter of formula with the individual."90 In late 1919 some independent Pentecostal churches in western Canada joined the Assemblies of God. In 1920, the PAOC itself affiliated with the Assemblies of God. Although this

92

A History of Christian Doctrine

formal association was short-lived (until 1925), it marked the transition to a definitely trinitarian organization.

Frank Small, one of the founders of the PAOC, felt betrayed by this change of doctrine and affiliation. In 1921, he led ten Oneness ministers out of the PAOC and founded the Apostolic Church of Pentecost of Canada (ACPC) as a Oneness organization. It is unique among historic Oneness organizations in that it teaches unconditional eternal security, which Small strongly advocated. In 1953, the ACPC was joined by the Evangelical Churches of Pentecost, a group that included many who taught "the triunity of the Godhead" (in distinction to the trinity). Consequently, there is considerable latitude on the doctrine of God, but the key points of identity are the Pentecostal experience, baptism in Jesus' name, and eternal security. In 1998, the reported constituency in Canada was 14,000 and worldwide was 42,000.

Almost all the Pentecostals in the Maritime Provinces embraced the Oneness message. Most of them joined the ACPC and then later went to the United Pentecostal Church, which is now the largest Oneness group in

Canada. A number of Oneness ministers, particularly in
Ontario, stayed in the PAOC until the leadership forced
them out in 1940. Most of them also eventually joined the
United Pentecostal Church.

Racial Division

Back in the United States, the segregation laws of the
South put tremendous pressure on the PAW. Most of the
black ministers resided in the North, and all conferences
had to be held in the North due to segregated accommodations
in the South. Most Southern ministers, however,

93

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

could not afford the cost of travel to the North and so
could not attend. In order to work effectively, they felt
that they needed to participate in their organization and
to have conferences in various parts of the country,
including the South.

In 1922 a group of Southern ministers organized a fellowship
conference in Little Rock, Arkansas, that was well
attended. There was a great outpouring of the Spirit, with
a communion service for ministers lasting until 3:00 A.M.
This Southern Bible Conference impressed upon the
white ministers how much they needed such meetings in
their area, but it aroused concerns among black ministers
that they were deliberately being excluded.

The result of these pressures was a division along
racial lines in 1924. Most of the white ministers withdrew
from the PAW, while a few stayed. Even though the PAW
was now almost totally black for the first time, whites
were still given some leadership positions in an effort to
preserve the ideal of integration.

While some racial prejudice was undoubtedly
involved in the split, it appears that most of the white
ministers did not withdraw because of personal prejudice
but because of the legal and social hindrances to organizational
function and growth. S. C. McClain, a white minister
from the South, explained how the church rejected
prejudice yet struggled with societal obstacles:91

I, being Southern born, thought it a miracle that I
could sit in a service by a black saint of God and worship,
or eat at a great camp table, and forget I was eating
beside a black saint, but in spirit and truth God
was worshipped in love and harmony. . . .

94

A History of Christian Doctrine

While all Spirit-filled ministers agreed that with

God there is not a color line and in the hearts of the
people of God there should be none, yet ministers
laboring in the South had to conform to laws and customs.
James Tyson, a contemporary black historian with the
PAW, offered the following analysis:92

Racial prejudice was a factor in the development
of early Pentecostalism. . . . Barely two generations
had passed since the eradication of slavery, and there
still remained a mindset of white/black, superior/inferior
attitudes. These deeply entrenched philosophies
unfortunately carried over into many Pentecostal
organizations, as is demonstrated by the fact that up
until 1918 most groups were either all white or all
black.

This attitude was not just relegated to the white
brethren, for many blacks distrusted whites. . . . Much
suspicion and reverse discrimination was expostulated
by blacks against their white brethren. When
doors were opened for blacks to join ranks with
whites of like spiritual persuasion, many refused the
invitation with the general feeling they would be cast
in secondary roles. . . .

The merging of the General Assemblies of the
Apostolic Assemblies and the Pentecostal Assemblies
of the World was a bold and courageous move. The
new group would be one of the first Pentecostal organizations
to truly attempt to promote racial harmony,
and initially this move was more than symbolic. Even

95

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

though in 1918 seventy to seventy-five percent of the
constituency was white, there seemed to be a determined
effort to promote brotherly love and to exalt
Christ as the Creator of all people.

Nevertheless it would not be long before this
chivalrous effort would fail. Racial considerations
would again surface in a few years. . . .

Perhaps if the P.A.W. had been conceived in the
1970s or 1980s, the forces of pride, tradition, and
upbringing would not have been the same, and the
history of the organization would have been drastically
different. Undoubtedly, great outside pressure
was put on the brethren, both whites and blacks, by
the prevailing thinking of the country at that time.

In 1925, the white ministers who withdrew from the
PAW formed three organizations primarily along regional

lines: (1) the Pentecostal Ministerial Alliance, later renamed the Pentecostal Church Incorporated (PCI), in Jackson, Tennessee; (2) the Apostolic Churches of Jesus Christ, in St. Louis; and (3) Emmanuel's Church in Christ Jesus, in Houston. The latter two soon merged to become the Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ. The PAW, meanwhile, adopted a modified form of episcopal church government and elected G. T. Haywood as its first presiding bishop.

The desire for interracial unity was so strong, however, that in 1931 the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World and the Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ merged to form an integrated organization again, known as the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ (PAJC). Although the ministerial membership was eighty percent white, it

96

A History of Christian Doctrine

mandated that the board of presbyters be fifty percent black.93 Some blacks did not believe this merger would be successful, so a leading black minister, Samuel Grimes, renewed the charter of the PAW before it expired. He and other ministers kept it alive as a separate organization with a small constituency.

Unfortunately, the same pressures as before continued to work against the integrated body. In 1936, the conference voted that the racial composition of the board of presbyters should be the same as that of the ministerial constituency and that conferences could be held anywhere in the U.S. At this point the PAW had 87 churches (black), as opposed to 126 ten years earlier (black and white). The PAJC had 245 churches (black and white), and the PCI had 168 (white).94

In 1937, the PAJC leadership finally acceded to the wishes of the Southern ministers for a conference closer to home by holding one in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Since Tulsa was segregated, the blacks did not attend. As a result, no significant business was conducted, and the conference voted to meet in the North the next year. But it was too late. By 1938, almost all the remaining black ministers had withdrawn from the PAJC and returned to the PAW. As of 1998, the PAW reported 1,760 churches and 450,000 constituents in the U.S. with a total of 4,141 churches and 1,000,000 constituents worldwide.

Over the years, the resulting organizations grew further apart in structure and function, but many ministers maintained a degree of fellowship. Consequently, there

has always been greater interracial interaction in Oneness ranks than in other branches of Pentecostalism and Protestantism.

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

In summary, the Oneness Pentecostals as a group denounced racial prejudice and tried harder and longer than any other group to overcome the social pressures of racism. The reasons for the whites leaving in 1924 and the blacks leaving in 1938 were not trivial and should not simply be dismissed as prejudice. Nevertheless, it is unfortunate that a better solution could not have been found—one that would have confronted the culture with the radical claims of the gospel. The PAW and later the PAJC were perhaps the most integrated bodies in America at the time, and perhaps American history itself could have been affected had the ministers been able to elevate their vision beyond the difficulties of the time to see the plan of God for racial reconciliation.

The United Pentecostal Church International

In short, by 1938 there were two sizeable white Oneness organizations that were almost identical in structure, doctrine, and practice: the Pentecostal Church Incorporated (PCI) and the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ (PAJC). After some unsuccessful attempts, in 1945 they merged to form the United Pentecostal Church, which immediately became the largest Oneness Pentecostal organization in the world. The general superintendent of the PCI, Howard Goss, became the first general superintendent of the new organization. The general superintendent of the PAJC, W. T. Witherspoon, became the assistant general superintendent. At the time of the merger, there were approximately 400 churches. (The first directory, in 1947, listed 617 churches, and the annual increase in the 1940s was around 100 churches per year.95)

A History of Christian Doctrine

In 1946, the Full Gospel Pentecostal Church joined the new organization. It was composed of Oneness ministers in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island who had withdrawn from the Apostolic Church of Pentecost of Canada because they did not believe in unconditional eternal security.

In 1972 the organization officially became known as the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI). In

addition to Church Administration, the work of the organization is conducted by the following divisions: Editorial, Education, Foreign Missions, Harvestime (radio), Home Missions, Women's, Sunday School, and Youth.

The UPCI also operates the Pentecostal Publishing House. It publishes books and tracts under the name of Word Aflame Press, with about 150 books currently in print. Under the name of Word Aflame Publications, it also produces a multi-year curriculum for Sunday school (nursery through adult), including various undated adult electives, and a curriculum for children's church. The UPCI is the only Oneness organization to have its own publishing house and Sunday school curriculum; thus it plays an important role in supplying literature to the rest of the Oneness movement. Indeed, about one-half of its customers are outside the UPCI.

As of June 30, 1998, the UPCI reported 3,861 churches and 8,219 ministers in the United States and Canada, organized into 53 districts. Elsewhere in the world, it reported 21,407 churches and preaching points, 15,882 ministers, and almost 2,000,000 constituents in 136 nations.[96] Thus the total number of churches worldwide was 25,268.

As of February 1999 there were about 4,000 churches

99

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

in the U.S. and Canada, not counting daughter works.[97] The reported 1998 Easter Sunday attendance in the U.S. and Canada was 416,807 (almost 110 per church), but if we include estimates for nonreporting churches, the total is about 500,000 (about 130 per church).[98]

To compare these numbers with other denominations, we need to use an inclusive number for constituents, for mainline denominations report many more adherents than regular attendees. They typically count all those who have been baptized or all who claim identification. Even the Assemblies of God (AG) reports significantly more constituents than those in actual average attendance. For instance, in 1997 it reported an average Sunday morning worship attendance of 132 per church, but average number of constituents per church was 208, almost 60 percent more.[99] Using this type of estimate, the total UPCI constituency in the U.S. and Canada would be almost 800,000, and in the rest of the world it would be 3,200,000, for a total of 4,000,000.[100]

The best comparison is probably the number of

churches. For example, in 1997 the UPCI reported 3,821 churches in the U.S. and Canada, while the AG reported 11,884 churches in the U.S. and Puerto Rico. This ratio is about one to three, roughly the same as the ratio in 1916 of ministers who left the AG (156) compared to those who stayed (429). Thus the growth of the UPCI has paralleled that of the AG. Indeed, a comparison of growth in number of churches from 1958 to 1992 showed that the UPCI grew by 123 percent, the AG grew by 40 percent, and the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) grew by 54 percent.[101] From 1988 to 1998, the UPCI in the U.S. and Canada grew 9 percent in the number of churches and 27

A History of Christian Doctrine

percent in reported Easter attendance.[102]
Elsewhere in the world, the UPCI has grown quite rapidly. From 1988 to 1998, it grew at a rate of 154 percent in total constituency, or about 10 percent per year. The increase in churches was 118 percent.[103]
The largest UPCI national church or mission field is the Apostolic Church of Ethiopia, started by UPCI missionaries. Despite having faced severe persecution from the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and repression from a communist regime, the church has grown rapidly and now reports over 1,000,000 constituents. An annual outdoor crusade in Wara regularly attracts hundreds of thousands of attendees. In the first such crusade, in 1992, an estimated 130,000 people attended, 20,000 claimed their healing, and 25,000 received the Holy Spirit.[104] In 1999 an estimated 700,000 attended and 50,000 received the Holy Spirit.[105] The leadership of the Ethiopian church holds the unusual view that Mary was not the biological mother of Jesus but that His humanity was a direct creation of God out of the substance of His Word.
In other mission fields—including the Philippines, El Salvador, and Papua New Guinea—thousands have received the Holy Spirit in one service or in one week of services. For example, in April 1999 in one service, 4,700 received the Holy Spirit in the Philippines.[106]
The UPCI is the only Oneness organization to have a large missions program in all areas of the world. For a listing of UPCI national churches and mission fields with over 10,000 constituents, see Appendix G.
Because of the historical events we have examined, the UPCI is typically classified as a white organization, but this

designation is no longer true. If we consider the international
constituency, the UPCI is about 75 percent nonwhite.
If we consider only the U.S. and Canada, the UPCI is
approximately 20 percent nonwhite. In these two countries,
the UPCI conducts services in 42 languages. It has
approximately 300 Spanish-language churches, 200 additional
Spanish-language daughter works, and a total
Hispanic constituency (including those in English-speaking
churches) of approximately 70,000. Total black constituency,
in both majority black and majority white
congregations, is estimated at 75,000.107
Blacks now hold district offices—district board member,
departmental director, or departmental secretary—
in eight districts (15 percent), including representation
on five district boards. Hispanics hold district offices in
seven districts (13 percent), including representation on
three district boards. One district has Asian/Pacific
Islander officials. A total of thirteen districts (25 percent)
have at least one person from these minority
groups holding a district office. These districts are in the
West (five), the South (three), the North (two), and
Canada (three).
Six general divisions have a national board composed
of members from each district, and some of them also
have regional directors. All six divisions have one or more
minority representatives as board members or regional
directors. At present, the General Board does not have
minority representation, although it has in the recent
past. Much progress has been made in this area, but
clearly much more is needed.
The highest concentrations of United Pentecostal
believers are as follows:108

Country, State, Province	UPCI Constituency	General Population	UPCI %
Mizoram, India	65,000	730,000	8.9%
Ethiopia	1,000,000	55,000,000	1.8%
Louisiana, U.S.A.	68,000	4,500,000	1.5%
New Brunswick, Canada	8,000	725,000	1.1%

Other Oneness Organizations in America
A number of other Oneness organizations have originated
in the United States. In this section we discuss
those that have attained a worldwide constituency of

20,000 or more as reported by Talmadge French in 1998. (Reported worldwide constituency is given in parentheses following the name.)

In 1919, R. C. Lawson, a convert of Haywood's and an early black leader in the interracial PAW, founded Refuge Temple, a large and powerful church, in New York City. From this base, he formed his own organization, the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith (COOLJC) (140,000). He disagreed with the PAW on two major issues: he opposed allowing women to be pastors, and he opposed remarriage after divorce for any reason. An all-black group, COOLJC has retained a relatively conservative stance on matters of lifestyle and dress, and it has had strong leadership. At century's end it was led by William Bonner, one of Lawson's sons in the gospel.

In 1930, Sherrod C. Johnson split from COOLJC and formed the Church of The Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith (24,700). The main issues were personal leadership, Johnson's stricter views on modesty of dress, and his unusual belief that the Sonship ceased at the death of Jesus.

103

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

In 1933, Henry Brooks left COOLJC to form The Way of the Cross Church of Christ International (31,000 constituents). He founded a large church in Washington, D.C.

In 1957 another split from COOLJC took place, led by Smallwood Williams. Again, the main disagreement was over authoritarian leadership. The new group has also relaxed some of the standards of dress. It is known as the Bible Way Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ Worldwide (101,000). Williams founded a large, influential church in Washington, D.C. He became quite active in the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, serving as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Council in the city. He worked closely with Martin Luther King and met various federal officials, including President Lyndon Johnson.

Also in 1957, S. N. Hancock split from the PAW, forming the Pentecostal Churches of the Apostolic Faith Association (25,000). Hancock was a convert of Haywood's who became a leading PAW bishop and who married Haywood's widow. The division was caused primarily by a leadership struggle. However, Hancock also began to deviate from the Oneness position, proclaiming

an adoptionist Christology that seemed to make the Son
less than the Father, less than the true God. The organization
has since rejected this doctrine, however.

Another group with roots in the PAW is the United
Church of Jesus Christ (Apostolic)(32,300).

There are many Hispanic Apostolics in America. The
largest group is the Apostolic Assembly of the Faith in
Christ Jesus (116,700); it is the largest Hispanic Pentecostal
church of any kind in the U.S. Many Hispanic min-

isters were part of the early PAW, but when the split along
racial lines occurred in 1924, most of the Hispanics left.
In 1925 they formed their own association to focus on
ministry in Spanish. In 1926 they chose their name and
elected Antonio Nava as president. These Apostolics
require women to wear head coverings in church and do
not allow women to preach.

After the UPCI, the best-known predominately white
group in the U.S. is the Assemblies of the Lord Jesus
Christ (48,500). It was formed in 1952 as a merger of
three small Oneness groups, which in turn had originated
with the departure of whites from the PAW in
1924.

Another predominantly white group is the Church of
Jesus Christ (37,000), a conservative, loose-knit fellowship
of formerly independent ministers.

The International Ministerial Association (63,600)
adopted the Latter Rain teaching of the 1950s and left the
UPCI. (See chapter 9.) W. E. Kidson, a prominent United
Pentecostal minister, led this split in 1954.

Over the years, there have been several other breakaways
from the UPCI and its predecessor organizations.
Some have sought to be more strict in the doctrine of salvation
and holiness of dress than the main group, and
some have sought to relax standards in these areas. None
of them have attained the size of the groups identified
here, however.

As we have seen, almost all Oneness groups are
aligned with the Finished Work camp. Several in the black
community, however, originated in the Holiness movement
and teach sanctification as a second work of grace.
The largest is the Apostolic Overcoming Holy Church of

God (35,000), whose founder, William Phillips, also

taught that blacks are descendants of the Jews.

The Church of God (Apostolic) (31,000) also teaches the second blessing. It began as a Holiness church in 1897 and adopted Oneness Pentecostal views around 1915. Several other small Oneness bodies, mostly offshoots of the Church of God in Christ, also teach sanctification as a second work. The largest group that apparently has such roots is the Original Glorious Churches of God in Christ Apostolic Faith (30,000).

In addition to the larger Oneness organizations, there are hundreds of small groups and independent works. There are Oneness sabbatarians groups and sacred name (Yahweh) adherents.

Many of the smaller groups and independent ministers are part of the Apostolic World Christian Fellowship (AWCF), an umbrella association that offers recognition to everyone who identifies with the plan of salvation according to Acts 2:38. It does not screen candidates or discipline members, but its purpose is to provide identification and fellowship. Its founder, Worthy Rowe, is the son of a Oneness pioneer, G. B. Rowe, who left the UPCI over the "Adam doctrine." He held that as to His humanity, Jesus was the reincarnation of Adam. For this reason, the UPCI has not associated with the AWCF, but it has sought one-on-one fellowship with other major Oneness organizations.

Other Oneness Organizations around the World

The Pentecostal movement came to Mexico from American Hispanic Pentecostals. The earliest known

Mexicans to receive the Holy Spirit did so in 1914, and they were baptized in Jesus' name. From the U.S. contacts, an indigenous Mexican church came into being, known today as the Apostolic Church of the Faith in Christ Jesus (302,200 constituents worldwide), one of the largest churches in the country outside the Roman Catholic Church.

From this church have come two personality-based groups, the Christian Gospel Spiritual Church (20,000) and the Light of the World (600,000). The latter group is also known as the Aaronistas, because its founder, Eusebio Joaquin, assumed the name of Aaron and announced that he was a special prophet. It is quite exclusive and authoritarian in its theology. The Lord's

Supper is celebrated only at the headquarters church in Guadalajara (the largest Protestant building in Mexico), and the faithful take a pilgrimage there once a year for that purpose. This group is now the largest Jesus Name Pentecostal body in Mexico and Central America.

From the work of Canadian, British, and American missionaries of the UPCI came the United Pentecostal Church of Colombia (1,000,000). Begun in 1936, it endured much persecution, including martyrdom, from Roman Catholics. It became completely indigenous in 1967. Today, it is the largest Protestant church in Colombia, and it has been the subject of two published church growth studies.109

In Chile, the Voice in the Desert Apostolic Church (70,000) originated from missionary efforts of the Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is affiliated with that American group.

One of the earliest Pentecostal missionaries in China,

107

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

F. S. Ramsey, accepted baptism in Jesus' name by 1915 under the influence of Ewart's Meat in Due Season. Great revival erupted from Ramsey's base in Ta Fung Fu, Shansi Province, northern China. By 1917, Paul Wei, a Chinese Pentecostal, had embraced the Oneness message, and he established the True Jesus Church in

Tianjin and Beijing (his hometown). By 1918 he was joined by Chang Ling Sheng and Barnabas Chang. Sheng had been baptized in Jesus' name by Ramsey, and he assumed leadership of the True Jesus Church when Wei died in 1919. The True Jesus Church is now the largest church in China and one of the largest in Taiwan. It reports 12,000 churches and 3,300,000 constituents worldwide, with 3,000,000 in mainland China and 100,000 in Taiwan.110

As its name indicates, the True Jesus Church is a strong Oneness organization. It teaches baptism in Jesus' name and the baptism of the Holy Spirit as the new birth. It also advocates holiness in lifestyle and dress. It holds two doctrines unusual for Pentecostals, however: it strongly advocates worship on the Sabbath, and it allows infant baptism.111 Moreover, "baptism must be full immersion in natural, living [flowing] water . . . with the candidate's head facing downward."112

The True Jesus Church is the second largest Oneness Pentecostal body in the world. When we consider the total

543

number of churches and ministers, as well as our estimates of inclusive constituency, the UPCI is clearly the largest.

In the early years of the movement, there were more Oneness missionaries in China than any other country. All missionaries were expelled when the communists seized

A History of Christian Doctrine

power in 1949. From these efforts over the years, as well as more recent works, Talmadge French estimated that there are perhaps 1,000,000 independent Jesus Name believers in China.113

In Japan, missionaries B. S. Moore and Frank and Elizabeth Gray accepted the Jesus Name message in 1915. Leonard Coote, a British businessman, received the Holy Spirit under the Grays and took over their work. Through contact with Coote and others, a Pentecostal pastor named Jun Murai accepted the Jesus Name message in the 1930s. He established the Spirit of Jesus Church, which is the largest Christian denomination in Japan today, with a reported 256 churches, 520 house churches, and 420,000 constituents. It is a remarkable success story in a land that has been very difficult for Christian missions.114

Perhaps under the influence of the True Jesus Church, the Spirit of Jesus Christ is also sabbatarian. Its most unusual doctrine is proxy baptism for the dead.

In Indonesia, there is a large "triunity" group that baptizes in Jesus' name, the Pentecostal Church of Indonesia (1,000,000). This church is an amalgamation with diverse views on the Godhead. It originated from missions efforts by Bethel Temple in Seattle, founded by W. H. Offiler. Glenn Cook baptized Offiler in Jesus' name in 1915. Offiler did not embrace the full Oneness position, however, but taught a modified "triunity" view.

In recent years, the Philippines has been a productive field for Oneness Pentecostal missions. A number of organizations have formed there, some breaking away from the UPCI. The group reporting the largest number other than the UPCI is the Jesus Church, which claims

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

five churches and 40,000 constituents.

John G. Lake, a convert from Zion City, took the Pentecostal message to South Africa. One of Lake's converts, C. J. Beetge, accepted the Oneness position in 1944.

He established the Assemblies of Christ, now known as the
Reformed Christian Church of South Africa. This group
has 200 churches; it claims 200,000 constituents, which
seems high for the number of churches.

Shiloh United Church of Christ Apostolic (Worldwide),
based in the United Kingdom, has 130 churches
and claims a questionably high figure of 101,000 constituents,
almost all in Africa.

Pentecostal missions came to Russia and the countries
of the former Soviet Union in 1915-16 under the
ministry of Andrew Urshan. He baptized converts in
Jesus' name, and he himself was rebaptized in Jesus'
name by one of them. Urshan established a strong
Oneness church, led by N. P. Smorodin, which became
known as the Evangelical Christians in the Spirit of
the Apostles. These believers were persecuted severely,
with Smorodin dying in prison in 1953. Today, most of
these churches are independent. Some have formed an
organization based in St. Petersburg, some are part of an
organization in Kazakhstan, and some have joined the
UPCI. The total constituency of all the known churches
outside the UPCI is about 28,000.

For a listing of major Jesus Name Pentecostal organizations
worldwide, with total churches and constituency,
see Appendix F.

Summary of Oneness Pentecostal Beliefs

In our survey of major Oneness organizations world-

A History of Christian Doctrine

wide, we have noted a diversity of beliefs and practices.
All of them share key beliefs with conservative
Protestantism, including the existence of one true God;
the creation of the universe by God; the inspiration and
authority of Scripture; the existence of angels, the devil,
and demons; the fall and sinfulness of humanity; the
Incarnation (Jesus Christ is God manifested in the flesh
and the Son of God); the Atonement (the death, burial,
and resurrection of Jesus Christ); salvation by grace
through faith in Jesus Christ; water baptism; the New
Testament church as the people of God; the priesthood of
believers; the rapture of the church; the second coming of
Jesus Christ to earth; the Millennium; the last judgment;
eternal punishment for the unrighteous; and eternal life
for the righteous. With the exception of a small American
"spiritual communion" group called the Associated
Brotherhood of Christians, they observe the Lord's

Supper, and most practice foot washing as an ordinance. Like other Pentecostal groups, they all teach the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of tongues, spiritual gifts for today, and divine healing.

In addition, these groups share three major Oneness Pentecostal distinctives: (1) the Oneness view of the Godhead, (2) the plan of salvation according to Acts 2:38, and (3) holiness of lifestyle and dress (at least in some measure). We have already examined the doctrine of God in chapter 3, and we will examine the doctrine of salvation next. The teachings on holiness are not unique to Oneness Pentecostals, but they characterized the Holiness and Pentecostal movements generally, including Trinitarian Pentecostals until the latter half of the twentieth century. Thus we will discuss this point in chapter 5,

111

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

even though Oneness Pentecostals are the main proponents of these teachings today.

The section titles of the Articles of Faith of the UPCI are as follows:

Preamble [authority of the Bible], The One True God, The Son of God, The Name [Jesus], Creation of Man and His Fall, Repentance, Water Baptism, The Baptism of the Holy Spirit, Fundamental Doctrine [the plan of salvation according to Acts 2:38], Divine Healing [in the Atonement], Sacrament or Communion, Foot Washing, Holiness, The Grace of God [against unconditional eternal security], The Restitution of All Things [against universalism], Conscientious Scruples [pacifism and noncombatant military service], Secret Societies, Etc. [opposition], Translation of Saints [the Rapture], Marriage and Divorce [remarriage allowed for "innocent party" in cases of "fornication"], Tithing, Second Coming of Jesus, Millennium, Final Judgment, Public School Activities [opposition to secular mandates that contradict holiness principles], Religious Holiday [designation to assist people in attending the general conference].

The Doctrine of Salvation

One of the distinctive positions of Oneness Pentecostals is that God's standard of full salvation for the New Testament church is repentance, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of speaking in tongues. The major Oneness groups hold that this experience is "the new

birth," although there is some debate on this issue. While

there are differences between groups and even within groups on the proper theological characterization of these three steps of faith, there is agreement that God commands everyone to obey them. There is also agreement that these steps do not constitute salvation by works. Rather, they are applications of the grace of God, purchased by the blood of Jesus Christ, and they are expressions of faith in God.

This understanding of salvation did not suddenly spring into being with Oneness Pentecostals. Rather, the groundwork was laid in the teaching and terminology of John Wesley and other early Methodists and then by the earliest Pentecostals, including Charles Parham, William Seymour, and especially William Durham.

The concept of "full salvation" appears in the writings of John Wesley and other Wesleyan and Holiness authors.115 As we saw in chapter 1, Wesley believed in two distinct works of grace: justification and entire sanctification (Christian perfection). Both John Wesley and his designated successor, John Fletcher, spoke of sanctification as being "baptized with the Holy Spirit."116

In an unpublished manuscript, Fletcher invoked Wesley's authority for equating the phrases "to be born again of water and of the Spirit" and "being baptized with water and with the Holy Ghost." He specifically linked John 3:3, 5 with Acts 2:38, citing them in the same paragraph. Fletcher further said of Wesley, "He explicitly rests the doctrine of full Christian regeneration on the full or Pentecostal dispensation of the Spirit." Fletcher allowed for the existence of "two sorts of children of God": "imperfect believers in Christ" and "those who are perfected by the full baptism of the Holy Ghost." He argued, however, that the Christian church began on the Day of

Pentecost, that "the peculiar glory of the Christian Church consists in the Pentecostal fullness of the Spirit," and that "we must be baptized with [the Holy Ghost] baptism and refining fire, before we can be styled true (I would say complete or truly spiritual) 'members of Christ's mystical body.'"117

Early Pentecostals, including Parham, Seymour, and Durham, applied the terms "full salvation" and "full gospel" to the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial

evidence of tongues. (See chapters 1 and 2.) Parham taught that one must be baptized with the Holy Spirit to be truly part of the church, to escape the wrath of the Tribulation, and to inherit the new heavens. In one place he even used the phrase "being born of the water and the Spirit" to refer to the complete experience of entering the church, as opposed to an initial confession of faith.

Seymour likewise spoke of the baptism of the Spirit as necessary to be part of the church and to escape Tribulation wrath. His Apostolic Faith paper emphasized the need of "walking in the light" and accepting this "Bible salvation." Those who rejected it were in danger of going to hell.

Durham explicitly identified repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Spirit as God's "plan of salvation," citing Acts 2:38. Being baptized with the Holy Spirit was necessary to be part of the church; people who did not receive this experience had at best an "abnormal Christianity."

Thus, when the early Oneness pioneers began proclaiming water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, it was only a small advance for them to say that all three elements of Acts 2:38 were necessary for entrance into the

114

A History of Christian Doctrine

New Testament church. For the earliest and most significant Oneness leaders, belief in Acts 2:38 as the "new birth" and "full salvation" came almost simultaneously with belief in the Oneness doctrine of God.

From the start, Frank Ewart equated being "born again" with baptism in Jesus' name and the baptism of the Holy Ghost.118 He reported the following testimony, apparently from 1914 or 1915: "Brother E. D. Yeoman . . . declared that he never was saved until he surrendered to Christ, was baptized in Jesus' name, and received the gift of the Holy Ghost."119

George Farrow, who attended Ewart's church in Los Angeles and composed "All in Him," wrote in January 1915:120

Many of the saints here are seeing it and walking in the light. This truth is water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. . . . It may seem to be very nonessential at first thought. . . . But God has surely been blessing this truth and talking very definitely to many about its importance. . . . I also am coming to see that under the present light that we have, nothing short of the baptism

in the Holy Ghost is really salvation in the highest sense of the word.

G. T. Haywood taught that the new birth is water baptism in the name of Jesus and the baptism of the Holy Spirit with tongues.121 In 1913, even before his baptism in Jesus' name, he drew up a tract showing that water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Ghost were necessary to enter into the kingdom of God.122 In 1914 he penned the hymn "Baptized into the Body":123

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

Verse 1: Have you been baptized into the Body? Baptized with the Holy Ghost; There is but one way to enter in it, Just as they did on Pentecost.

Chorus: Are you in the Church triumphant? Are you in the Savior's Bride? Come and be baptized into the Body, And forevermore abide.

Verse 2: There is but one Church, Bride or Body, And into it we're all baptized; By the one, true, promised Holy Spirit; Tho' by the world we're all despised.

Verse 3: Every creed has claimed to be the Body, But the "plumb-line" proved untrue, All their dreams; for God has so determined, To bring His Son's true Bride to view.

Verse 4: Many thought that they were in the Body, 'Til the Holy Ghost had come; When the Word of God was opened to them, They entered in, and yet there's room.

Verse 5: Those who died before the Holy Spirit/ Came upon us from on high/ May, by faith with Saints of old departed, Arise to meet Him in the sky.

Verse 6: When the Bridegroom comes, will you be ready; And your vessel all filled and bright? You will be among the foolish virgins, If you do not walk in the light.

Oliver Fauss took the following notes at the 1915 Elton Bible Conference:124

God is bringing us back to Acts 2:38, His plan. . . . God's pattern is Acts 2:38, this is plain. . . . We have no record of God being in these people until the Day of Pentecost (Colossians 1:27; John 3:3). Cornelius was a

A History of Christian Doctrine

just man, but not saved (Acts 10:22; 11:14-18; Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38).

Howard Goss contrasted "the Spirit-filled Christian

and the nominal church attendant." He said, "These last are all alike without a Saviour, and thus have no scriptural promise of ever seeing heaven, because they have not actually been adopted into God's family, nor have they legally become His child, and thereby have no rightful claim on Him."125

During the struggles over Jesus Name baptism, the Assemblies of God, in its 1915 and 1916 general councils, censured the view that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is the new birth.126 In 1917, E. N. Bell denounced the view that water baptism is part of salvation.127 Clearly, they dealt with ministers who taught that the birth of water and Spirit was baptism of water and Spirit.

Andrew Urshan similarly taught that obeying Acts 2:38 constitutes being "born of water and of the Spirit." He proclaimed, "You must be born again or be lost!"128 The Articles of Faith of the GAAA (1917) stated that there was but one entrance into the true church, the body of Christ, namely, "a baptism of water and Spirit." Moreover, "God's standard of salvation" includes "a holy, Spirit-filled life with signs following."129

The PAW's original doctrinal statement as a Oneness body repeated the foregoing statements from the GAAA and also said, probably still quoting from the GAAA, "In order to escape the judgment of God and to have the hope of enjoying the glory of life eternal, one must be thoroughly saved from their sins, wholly sanctified unto God and filled with the Holy Ghost." The PAW's 1919 conference

117

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

affirmed by majority vote, "The new birth (being 'born again') includes a genuine repentance, water baptism in Jesus' name, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, evidenced by speaking in other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance."130

Let us turn to the two organizations that merged to form the UPCI: the PCI and the PAJC. The first doctrinal statement of the PMA, later renamed PCI, said, "The Bible way of salvation is repentance toward God, faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, obedience to the Word of God by baptism in water (in Jesus' name), and receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost, as in Acts 2:4, 38."131 In the September 1929 issue of the Apostolic Herald, the voice of the PMA, Goss stated that to be in the Christian church "one must be baptized in the Holy Spirit," but he felt that sins were remitted before water baptism.132 In the August 1930 issue of the Apostolic Herald, Farrow wrote that Acts

2:38 is the new birth.133

In 1936, when discussing a possible merger with the PCI, the PAJC convention insisted that the basis of union be the following: "that baptism in water in Jesus' name, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, with the initial evidence of speaking in other tongues, be recognized as constituting the new birth, and be accepted as one of our fundamental doctrines." A committee of PCI leaders responded, however, that "the matter of the new birth be left open to personal conviction."134

At the merger of these two groups in 1945, there were still some differences of opinion on the new birth, but a strong majority believed that the complete Acts 2:38 experience was necessary for salvation. S. W. Chambers, who was elected general secretary at the merger, said most ministers believed in the necessity of both water

118

A History of Christian Doctrine

baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He regarded the differences as primarily of terminology, not so much of basic belief.135 E. J. McClintock, PCI pastor in Idaho at the time of the merger and later director of the UPCI General Sunday School Division, gave the same explanation, independently using almost the same words. He said the ministers agreed on the necessity of the three steps of Acts 2:38 but did not all agree on terminology.136

Nathaniel Urshan, son of Andrew Urshan and general superintendent of the UPCI for many years, agreed with the assessment of Chambers and McClintock and stated that the majority believed Acts 2:38 to be the new birth.137 Indeed, an analysis reveals that about eighty-five to ninety percent of the merged body held that the full Acts 2:38 experience was essential to salvation.138

The two major histories of the UPCI, by Arthur Clanton and Fred Foster, state that the most significant difference of opinion was on the essentiality of water baptism. 139 Clanton explained that the PCI allowed greater latitude on the new-birth message than the PAJC. David Gray of the PCI, who became the first youth president of the UPC, confirmed this statement.140 In short, not everyone agreed that Acts 2:38 was "the new birth," and in particular, a significant minority did not believe that "remission of sins" necessarily occurred at water baptism.

What Chambers, McClintock, Urshan, and Gray have pointed out, however, is that despite the different interpretations, there was agreement that the Acts 2:38 experience

is God's plan for New Testament salvation, whatever the precise theological terminology that one should attach to each step or to the experience as a whole. J. L. Hall, editor in chief of the UPCI, chairman of the

119

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

UPCI's Historical Committee, and a leading Pentecostal historian, offered the following explanation of the Fundamental Doctrine:141

There does not appear to have been a doctrinal difference between the two groups, for most ministers in the PAJC and PCI held to the necessity of the Acts 2:38 experience. However, a few ministers in each group—more in the PCI than in the PAJC—held that a person may be saved at repentance. The merging agreement included the "Fundamental Doctrine" statement affirming that salvation includes water baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost—something the overwhelming majority of both the PAJC and PCI believed. However, to show patience toward ministers who practiced Acts 2:38 but who held to the view that salvation—at least in part—occurred at faith and repentance, the "Fundamental Doctrine" also includes the second paragraph calling for unity in Spirit until all came to the same view. There was no tolerance on the salvation message of Acts 2:38, for this is clearly stated. It was only tolerance toward those who needed time to accept the view of salvation as stated in the first paragraph.

The Fundamental Doctrine of the UPCI states:142

The basic and fundamental doctrine of this organization shall be the Bible standard of full salvation, which is repentance, baptism in water by immersion in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost with the

120

A History of Christian Doctrine

initial sign of speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance.

We shall endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit until we all come into the unity of the faith, at the same time admonishing all brethren that they shall not contend for their different views to the disunity of the body.

The first paragraph relies on Acts 2:38. We have already discussed antecedents for the term "full salvation" and for the use of Acts 2:38 as a paradigm.

The second paragraph is based on Ephesians 4:3, 13.
Many early Pentecostals made a similar appeal to maintain
"the unity of the Spirit until we all come into the unity
of the faith." In 1913 this phrase appeared in the writings
of Frank Ewart, D. W. Kerr, and Andrew Urshan, and on
the masthead of The Christian Evangel (J. R. Flower's
paper that would later become an official organ of the
Assemblies of God).143 In 1914, the statement appeared in
the original constitution of the Assemblies of God, and in
1919 it appeared in the original constitution of the
Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada.144

In recent years, a number of trinitarian theologians
have identified Acts 2:38 as the paradigm for New
Testament salvation, including Frederick Bruner
(Evangelical), James Dunn (Evangelical), Leighton Ford
(Evangelical), David Pawson (Charismatic), and Kilian
McDonnell and George Montague (Catholic Charismatics).
145 Gordon Fee, an Assemblies of God theologian,
has similarly argued that Spirit baptism is not a distinct
experience subsequent to the new birth.146 Typically, however,
they do not teach that tongues is the initial evidence
of the Spirit baptism, or else they offer some exceptions.
121

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

At this point, it is important to note that the Oneness
pioneers we have cited did not proclaim dogmatically that
all who had not experienced Acts 2:38 would go to the
lake of fire. Like Parham, Seymour, and Durham, most felt
that there still could be a type of salvation outside the
New Testament church, similar to that of Old Testament
saints, particularly for people who walked in all the "light"
they had received. We have already seen examples of this
thinking in the quotation from Farrow and in the song
"Baptized in the Body" by Haywood.

Thus Ewart could say, "Pastor Durham passed on to
glory at a comparatively early age," even though he died
without being baptized in Jesus' name. Ewart even called
A. G. Garr "a great man of God" while also remarking that
he "flatly rejected" the Oneness message.147

G. T. Haywood made a distinction between being
begotten and being born, similar to one Parham had made
earlier. Christians who had faith but who were not born
again according to Acts 2:38 could still be considered as
"'begotten' by the Word" even though they had not yet
been "born of the Spirit." In language reminiscent of the
Apostolic Faith (Azusa Street), he discussed the question

of whether all such people were lost:148
The one question that is so often asked is, "Are all
those people who thought they were born of the
Spirit, and were not, lost?" No, not by any means.
They shall be given eternal life in the resurrection if
they walked in all the light that was given them while
they lived.

Andrew Urshan likewise made a distinction between

122

A History of Christian Doctrine

being begotten and born. He described his status at
repentance as "a happy, blood-washed, newly conceived
child of the King!" He spoke of people being "saved"
before they were born again and wrote of some who died
in the faith before baptism in Jesus' name. Nevertheless,
he taught that baptism in Jesus' name is for the remission
of sins. It is necessary to go in the Rapture and escape the
Tribulation. He also believed strongly that the baptism of
the Holy Spirit is necessary.149 People who believed in God
and lived righteous lives "without ever coming to the light
of being born again according to Acts 2:38" will rise in
the second resurrection, presumably to live on the new
earth.150

Conclusions

In chapter 5, we will discuss doctrines of Trinitarian
Pentecostals, make comparisons, and draw conclusions
about the theology of Pentecostals overall.

123

Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

In this chapter we will survey the two remaining
branches of the Pentecostal movement—the Second Work
Trinitarians and the Finished Work Trinitarians—and
draw general conclusions about Pentecostal doctrine. We
will briefly identify the major groups, placing the reported
worldwide constituency in parentheses after each
name.151

Second Work Trinitarian Pentecostals

The Second Work Trinitarian Pentecostals teach three
distinct crisis experiences associated with God's plan of
salvation: (1) conversion (also the time of justification
and regeneration), (2) sanctification, and (3) the baptism
of the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of speaking in other

125

Trinitarian Pentecostal
Organizations

5

tongues. This wing of the movement retained the earlier Holiness movement's doctrine of sanctification as a second work of grace.

In recent years, however, the emphasis on sanctification as a second work of grace has diminished significantly. So concluded James Bowers, a Church of God minister in Scottsboro, Alabama, from a study of sermons, articles, textbooks, and other publications:152

Sanctification is conspicuously absent from the preaching and teaching of Church of God pastors. . . . Whatever teaching Church of God members receive on sanctification and holiness is likely to come from some source other than their local church. . . . Sanctification has been largely neglected in denominationally sponsored training opportunity for laity and ministers. . . . Nor did Church of God members receive definitive instruction on sanctification from their prominent authors [in recent years]. With few exceptions, sanctification was left unaddressed or presented in ambiguous language. . . . Many Church of God authors were either non-Wesleyan, ambiguous, or altogether silent where sanctification was concerned.

Most Second Work Trinitarian Pentecostals were part of existing Holiness denominations that joined the Pentecostal movement. (See chapter 2.) The predominantly white groups have grown steadily, although not as fast as the AG and UPCI, the major representatives of the other two wings of Pentecostalism. The major black group has grown rapidly.

The Church of God in Christ (COGIC) (6,500,000)

126

A History of Christian Doctrine

is by far the largest Holiness Pentecostal denomination in the United States. Indeed it is the largest Pentecostal denomination in the country, one of the largest black denominations, and one of the most rapidly growing denominations. In the U.S. it grew from a reported 733 churches and 30,263 adherents in 1926 to 15,300 churches and 5,499,875 adherents in 1991. We should note, however, that church growth researcher C. Peter Wagner and others believe that its currently reported constituency is considerably overstated—it is over 350 per church—and should be reduced by about one-half for comparison with other denominations.153

The church officially emphasizes seven major doctrines:

the Bible, the trinity, the Rapture, salvation, healing,
the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and sanctification.
The statement on salvation stresses the importance of
repentance, faith, water baptism, and the Holy Ghost:
"We believe that the only means of being cleansed from
sin is through repentance, faith in the precious Blood of
Jesus Christ and being baptized in water. We believe that
regeneration by the Holy Ghost is absolutely essential for
personal salvation." The church emphasizes sanctification,
but its official statement does not clearly define it as
a second work: "The doctrine of sanctification or holiness
is emphasized, as being essential to the salvation of
mankind. . . . We believe in the sanctifying power of the
Holy Spirit, by whose indwelling, the Christian is enabled
to live a Holy and separated life in this present world."154
Originally COGIC "held to strict standards of dress
and personal conduct," but after the death of the founder,
C. H. Mason, in 1961, there was a "blurring of doctrinal
and disciplinary distinctives."155 Unlike other black

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

denominations, COGIC has been quite willing to have fellowship
with the Charismatic movement.
The Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) (CG)
(4,000,000), is the largest predominantly white organization
among Second Work Pentecostals. Its foreign missions
efforts have benefited greatly from mergers with
several large indigenous Pentecostal churches. In the U.S.
it grew from 202 churches and 7,784 adherents in 1916
to 6,060 churches and 753,230 adherents in 1996.
The CG has a number of black members. In 1936, 42
of 1081 churches were identified as black. From 1920 to
1966, black and white congregations were segregated in
the official structure. Today, however, there are no such
barriers, and the Council of Eighteen (international governing
body) must always have black membership.
R. G. Spurling, the founder of the Christian Union in
1886 (which became the CG), was opposed to creeds of
any kind. By 1910, however, the church found it necessary
to publish its basic beliefs. A committee report,
which became the official teachings, stated, "The Church
of God stands for the whole Bible rightly divided. The
New Testament as the only rule for government and discipline."
It then listed twenty-five prominent teachings, as
follows (excluding Scripture references):156
(1) Repentance. (2) Justification. (3) Regeneration.

(4) New Birth. (5) Sanctification subsequent to
Justification. (6) Holiness. (7) Water Baptism by
immersion. (8) Baptism with the Holy Ghost subsequent
to cleansing: The enduement of power for service.
(9) The speaking in tongues as the evidence of
the baptism with the Holy Ghost. (10) The full
128
A History of Christian Doctrine
restoration of the gifts to the church. (11) Signs following
believers. (12) Fruits of the Spirit. (13) Divine
healing provided for all in the Atonement. (14) The
Lord's supper. (15) Washing the saints' feet. (16)
Tithing and giving. (17) Restitution where possible.
(18) Premillennial second coming of Jesus: First, to
resurrect the dead saints, and to catch away the living
saints to meet Him in the air. Second, to reign on the
earth a thousand years. (19) Resurrections. (20)
Eternal life for the righteous. (21) Eternal punishment
of the wicked. No liberation, no annihilation.
(22) Total abstinence from all liquor or strong drinks.
(23) Against the use of tobacco in any form, opium,
morphine, etc. (24) Meats and drinks [citing passages
of Scripture granting liberty]. (25) The Sabbath [citing
passages of Scripture granting liberty].
In the 1940s a controversy erupted over sanctification
as a second work of grace. In response, the church
adopted it first official Declaration of Faith, which has
remained unchanged. It consists of fourteen points
affirming the verbal inspiration of the Bible; the trinity;
the deity, humanity, death, burial, resurrection, ascension,
and exaltation of Jesus Christ; the sinfulness of humanity
and necessity of repentance; justification, regeneration,
and new birth by faith in the blood of Jesus; "sanctification
subsequent to the new birth, through faith in the
blood of Christ; through the Word, and by the Holy
Ghost"; holiness as "God's standard of living for His people";
"the baptism of the Holy Ghost subsequent to a
clean heart"; speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of
the Spirit baptism; water baptism by immersion in the
129
Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations
trinitarian formula; divine healing in the Atonement; the
Lord's supper and foot washing; the premillennial second
coming of Jesus; and the bodily resurrection, with eternal
life for the righteous and eternal punishment for the
wicked.157 The statement on sanctification was a compromise

that did not clearly define it as a second work of grace but averted a schism.

As noted in chapter 2, when the CG removed A. J. Tomlinson as its leader for life, he broke away and formed a new church in 1923, which he considered the true church. Due to litigation, this church was forced to adopt a distinct legal name. For years it was known as the Tomlinson Church of God, but since 1952 has been called the Church of God of Prophecy (CGP) (286,848) in its "secular affairs." In the U.S. it grew from 441 churches and 18,351 adherents in 1936 to 1,961 churches and 72,859 adherents in 1996.

The CGP has a distinctive ecclesiology. It believes that the true church as an organization disappeared in A.D. 325, when the Roman emperor Constantine essentially united church and state. The true church was restored with A. J. Tomlinson in 1903. While members of other churches may be saved, eventually the saved people will recognize that the CGP is the true church.

To commemorate the spot where Tomlinson received his revelation from God to restore the church, the CGP established the Fields of the Wood, a meeting ground named because of a belief that it fulfills Psalm 132:6. The church has erected various religious monuments on the site, which are maintained by the Church of Prophecy Marker Association.

The International Pentecostal Holiness Church

130

A History of Christian Doctrine

(IPHC) (378,538) resulted from a merger of three holiness denominations that embraced the Pentecostal experience: the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church (founded 1895), the Holiness Church of North Carolina (founded 1898), and the Tabernacle Pentecostal Church (founded 1898). The Fire-Baptized Holiness Church taught an especially strict standard of holiness, even prohibiting the eating of pork and the wearing of neckties.

The five "cardinal doctrines" of the church are justification by faith, sanctification as a second work of grace, the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues, divine healing in the Atonement, and the imminent, premillennial return of Jesus Christ.158 In accordance with its Methodist roots, the IPHC allows baptism by sprinkling.

The IPHC revised its statement on sanctification in 1997 to acknowledge the progressive nature of sanctification

instead of merely presenting "entire sanctification" at one point in time, yet the statement still confesses sanctification as a "definite, instantaneous work of grace." Its Articles of Faith now explain sanctification as follows:159

Jesus Christ shed His blood for the complete cleansing of the justified believer from all indwelling sin and from its pollution, subsequent to justification. . . .

While sanctification is initiated in regeneration and consummated in glorification, we believe that it includes a definite, instantaneous work of grace achieved by faith subsequent to regeneration.

In the U.S. the IPHC grew from 192 churches and

131

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

5,353 adherents in 1916 to 1,653 churches and 157,163 adherents in 1996. In addition to the reported worldwide constituency, it has two large indigenous churches as its affiliates—the Pentecostal Methodist Church of Chile and the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Brazil.

Over the years, the IPHC has moderated its Holiness and Pentecostal distinctives and identified closely with the Evangelical movement. Many members have transferred to non-Pentecostal denominations while not renouncing their Pentecostal identity. The most notable example is Oral Roberts, who became a Methodist minister. In many cases, upward social mobility or a job transfer was the catalyst for the change. As of 1988, researcher David Barrett estimated that there were 150,000 IPHC adherents in the U.S. but another 450,000 former adherents in other denominations.160

A small black Holiness organization founded in 1886, the United Holy Church of America (50,000), also accepted the Pentecostal experience. It teaches that speaking in tongues is one of the spiritual gifts but not necessarily the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit baptism. There are a number of smaller groups in this branch of Pentecostalism, mostly offshoots of the groups we have already discussed. Also in this category are the Apostolic Faith (Baxter Springs, KS) (4,000), founded by Charles Parham, and the Apostolic Faith Mission (Portland, OR) (4,100), founded by Frances Crawford.

Finished Work Trinitarian Pentecostals

The second branch of Pentecostalism accepted William Durham's doctrine that sanctification was not a second work of grace but a process that began at conver-

sion. The Oneness movement arose within this branch, but the groups we will discuss rejected that doctrine and remained trinitarian.

The largest Pentecostal denomination in the world is the Assemblies of God (AG) (30,000,000). It was founded in 1914 as the first Finished Work group. (See chapter 3.) The AG did not explicitly exclude those who believed in sanctification as a second work, however.

The Assemblies of God is the first or second largest Protestant church in about thirty countries of the world. Its total constituency includes 16,000,000 in Brazil. The church there is actually an indigenous church founded in 1911 that later affiliated with the AG but retained its own government.

In the U.S. the AG had 118 churches and 6,703 adherents in 1916. For 1996 the AG reported 11,823 churches, 32,314 ministers, 1,573,108 in Sunday morning attendance, 1,407,941 members, and an estimated 2,467,588 constituents ("persons of all ages who identify with an A/G church"). Of the total churches, 14.7 percent identified themselves as Hispanic and 1.4 percent as black. Average annual water baptisms per reporting church were 15.2, and average annual Spirit baptisms were 12.2.161

In 1916, in response to the Oneness controversy, the AG adopted a Statement of Fundamental Truths. The preamble explained:162

This Statement of Fundamental Truths is not intended as a creed for the Church, nor as a basis of fellowship among Christians, but only as a basis of unity for the ministry alone. . . . The human phraseology employed

in such statement is not inspired nor contended for, but the truth set forth in such phraseology is held to be essential to a full Gospel ministry. No claim is made that it contains all truth in the Bible, only that it covers our present needs as to these fundamental matters.

The statement consisted of seventeen points, with the following headings:

(1) The Scriptures Inspired. (2) The One True God. (3) Man, His Fall and Redemption. (4) The Salvation of Man. (5) The Promise of the Father. (6) The Full

Consummation of the Baptism in the Holy Ghost. (7)
Entire Sanctification, the Goal for All Believers. (8)
The Church a Living Organism. (9) The Ministry and
Evangelism. (10) The Lord's Supper. (11) Baptism in
Water. (12) Divine Healing. (13) The Essentials as to
the Godhead. (14) The Blessed Hope. (15) The
Imminent Coming and Millennial Reign of Jesus. (16)
The Lake of Fire. (17) The New Heavens and New
Earth.

Section 2 stated that God has "revealed Himself as
embodying the principles of relationship and association,
i.e., as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Section 13, which
was about the same length as all the other sections combined,
expressly taught the doctrine of the trinity and
refuted the doctrine of Oneness. It said that God is "a
Trinity" or "one Being of three Persons." The distinction
of persons "is an eternal fact, but as to its mode it is
inscrutable and incomprehensible, because unexplained.

134

A History of Christian Doctrine

(That is, it is not explained as to how there can be three
persons in the Godhead.)"

This section denounced the Oneness doctrine in
strong terms:

It is a transgression of the Doctrine of Christ to
say that Jesus Christ derived the title, Son of God,
either from the fact of the incarnation, or because of
His relation to the economy of redemption. . . . To
deny that the Father is a real and eternal Father, and
that the Son is a real and eternal Son, is . . . a denial
of the Father and the Son; and a displacement of the
truth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.

Some of the scriptural references cited as support
were I John 2:22-23 and II John 9, which speak about the
spirit of antichrist, false prophets, and not having God.

Sections 5 and 6 explained that the baptism in the
Holy Ghost is "the normal experience of all in the early
Christian Church," and "the full consummation . . . is indicated
by the initial sign of speaking in tongues, as the
Spirit of God gives utterance." However, "this wonderful
experience is distinct from and subsequent to the experience
of the new birth."

Section 7 proclaimed the importance of "a life of holiness
without which no man shall see the Lord" and "entire
sanctification [as] the will of God for all believers."

"Entire sanctification" is Wesleyan language; thus, in

principle, a believer in the second work could subscribe to the statement.

Section 12 taught that divine healing is in the Atonement. While the document affirmed the Lord's supper and

135

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

water baptism, there was no mention of foot washing and no mention of a required baptismal formula.

The Statement of Fundamental Truths was revised in 1983. It now consists of sixteen points. Most of the language remains essentially the same as in 1916, with a significant exception: the entire section entitled "The Essentials as to the Godhead" has been deleted. Instead there is a brief statement that Jesus is "the eternal Son of God." Some other significant clarifications are as follows: (1) The current statement eliminates the term "entire sanctification." (2) It further describes speaking in tongues as "the initial physical evidence of the baptism in the Holy Ghost" and "the initial physical sign." (3) It says the Rapture is "the imminent and blessed hope of the church," indicating a pretribulation Rapture.163

In position papers adopted in the 1970s through 1990s, the AG defined its position on a number of controversial issues.164 The papers affirm the inerrancy of Scripture, tongues as the initial evidence of the Holy Ghost and as real languages spoken as the Spirit gives utterance, pastoral authority, ministry in the body, women in ministry, the pretribulation Rapture, and divorce and remarriage in the case of marital unfaithfulness only. One paper prohibits the licensing of ministers who have divorced and remarried (regardless of the reason). Other papers refute the doctrines of unconditional eternal security, annihilation or liberation of the wicked in eternity, divine healing as automatic upon faith or as incompatible with medical assistance, and various doctrines that are prominent in the Charismatic movement. (See chapter 10.) Finally, with some position papers the AG opposes abortion, alcoholic beverages, gambling, homosexuality, and transcendental meditation.

136

A History of Christian Doctrine

Shortly after the Oneness controversy, the AG faced a challenge to the doctrine of tongues as the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit baptism. F. F. Bosworth, one of the original delegates in 1914 and later an executive presbyter, began to teach that tongues was only one of many possible signs of the Spirit baptism. The AG reaffirmed its

position that tongues is the only initial sign. Consequently, Bosworth withdrew from the AG in 1918.

He joined the Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA), which had lost numerous ministers and members to the Pentecostal movement, many of whom entered into the AG. The CMA allowed speaking in tongues and other supernatural gifts but did not promote them. In later years, however, it has distanced itself from Pentecostal manifestations. Bosworth held many healing campaigns and was an important influence on the post–World War II healing revival. He joined William Branham in several of his campaigns.

Over the years, many other influential ministers were part of the AG but left for other organizations or ministries. Examples are Aimee Semple McPherson, Finis Dake (author of Dake's Annotated Reference Bible), Kenneth Hagin, A. A. Allen, Jim Bakker, Jimmy Swaggart, and Paul Crouch.

The International Church of the Foursquare Gospel (ICFG) (2,500,000) was founded by Aimee Semple McPherson (1890-1944). Born in Ontario, Canada, she married a Pentecostal evangelist named Robert Semple. They were ordained by William Durham in Chicago and worked with him for a time. They went to China as missionaries, but Robert soon contracted malaria and died. Aimee returned to the U.S. in 1910. A year

137

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

later she married Harold McPherson, but this marriage ended in divorce in 1921.

"Sister," as she became known, joined the Assemblies of God in 1919. She started a church in Los Angeles, known as Angelus Temple, that grew rapidly. When she began erecting a church building, the largest auditorium in America at the time, the AG asked for an assurance that the property would not be placed in her name. She declined to give it, voluntarily left the AG in 1922, and started her own organization in 1923.

She chose the name for her organization from a fourfold emphasis on Jesus as Savior, baptizer in the Holy Spirit, healer, and coming king. This message was similar to the earlier teaching of A. B. Simpson, founder of the CMA, except where he spoke of Jesus as sanctifier she spoke of Him as baptizer with the Holy Ghost.

Aimee McPherson was a flamboyant preacher who used theatrical techniques. For example, she once rode

into church on a motorcycle dressed as a policeman and exclaimed, "Stop, you're going to hell!" She became one of the best-known preachers in America, "the first Pentecostal well-known to the public at large."165 During the Depression, the ICFG provided 1,500,000 people with food, clothing, and other assistance.

McPherson was also quite controversial. In 1926, she suddenly disappeared, apparently drowning while swimming at the beach. A month later she was discovered in Mexico, and she explained that she had been kidnapped. Her detractors alleged an affair with a former employee, but she steadfastly denied it. In 1930 she suffered a nervous breakdown, and in 1931 she married David Hutton. (The marriage ended in divorce.) In 1944

she died of an apparently accidental overdose of a medical prescription.

Aimee McPherson was the "lifetime president" of the ICFG. After she died, her son, Rolf McPherson, served as leader until his retirement.

Today the IFCG has grown beyond its controversial past. It has a large overseas constituency due to mergers with indigenous groups. In the U.S. it grew to 1,742 churches and 227,307 constituents in 1996.

Compared to other Pentecostal organizations, historically the ICFG has had a high percentage of women ministers, has been less concerned with outward holiness, and has been the most receptive to the Charismatic movement. While the church officially proclaims that tongues is the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit, this doctrine is not universally held. One of the best-known ICFG pastors in recent years is Jack Hayford.

The Pentecostal Church of God (PCG) (301,786) was founded in 1919 by some trinitarian ministers in the AG who did not want a statement of faith such as the AG adopted in 1916. Its first leader was John C. Sinclair (1863-1936), one of the AG's executive presbyters in 1914. He later withdrew from the PCG, however, and became independent.

In 1933 the PCG adopted a statement of faith similar to that of the AG. Over the years it has been considered more liberal than the AG in matters such as holiness and divorce and remarriage. In the U.S., the PCG has grown from 81 churches and 4,296 constituents in 1936 to 1,224 churches and 119,200 constituents in 1996.

The Open Bible Standard Churches (46,000)
resulted from a merger of two groups in 1935. The first

group withdrew from Florence Crawford's Apostolic
Faith Mission in 1919 on the ground that she was too
strict in matters of holiness, fellowship, and church
government. The second withdrew from the Foursquare
Gospel in 1932 after Aimee McPherson's remarriage as
a divorcee.

A small group that is quite similar to the AG is the
Christian Church of North America (13,500), which
was originally composed of Italian-Americans. The first
congregation was started in 1907 by Luigi Francescon,
an immigrant who received the Holy Spirit under William
Durham in Chicago, and his friend Pietro Ottolini.

The Full Gospel Fellowship of Churches and
Ministers International (195,000) is a loosely structured
organization that provides credentials for independent
ministers and churches. It began in 1962 with the
(unrealized) hope of providing leadership to the
Charismatic movement. The primary organizers were
Gordon Lindsay (1906-73) and W. A. Raiford. Lindsay
was a convert of Charles Parham, the manager for
William Branham's healing campaigns for a time, the
publisher of Voice of Healing (later Christ for the
Nations), and the founder of Christ for the Nations
Institute in Dallas.

Over the years, the Trinitarian Pentecostal organizations
of the U.S. and Canada maintained some fellowship
with one another, forming the Pentecostal
Fellowship of North America (PFNA). No black organizations
were included, however. In 1994, the "Memphis
Miracle," a significant step toward racial reconciliation,
took place. Pentecostal leaders meeting in Memphis dissolved
the PFNA and formed the Pentecostal/Charis-

matic Churches of North America, which included black
organizations. No Oneness organizations were invited to
participate.

Trinitarian Pentecostals around the World

From the Azusa Street Mission in Los Angeles, the
Pentecostal movement spread rapidly around the world.
The February-March 1907 issue of The Apostolic Faith,
published by the mission, reported outpourings of the

Holy Spirit in London, Stockholm, Oslo, and Calcutta. Later issues gave reports from Africa, Australia, Canada, China, Denmark, Jerusalem, and elsewhere.

The earliest missionaries from Azusa Street were A. G. Garr and his wife, who went to India and Hong Kong. American missionaries in various parts of the world received their Pentecostal experience either by attending Azusa Street or reading the news about it, and the Holy Spirit began to fall in their missions. Notable revivals occurred in India, China, and Japan as a result.

A key figure in the spread of Pentecostalism to Europe was Thomas Ball Barratt (1862-1940) of Norway, a Methodist pastor. While in the United States in 1906, he heard of the Azusa Street revival, corresponded with the mission, and received the Holy Spirit in New York City. He returned to Oslo, where he conducted the first modern Pentecostal meeting in Europe and founded the Filadelfia Church.

Pastors from across Europe came to visit Barratt's services in Oslo and were filled with the Spirit. Notable converts, who in turn established Pentecostal movements in their own countries, were Alexander Boddy, an Anglican pastor in Sunderland, England; Jonathan Paul, a

141

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

Holiness leader in Germany; and Lewi Pethrus, a Baptist pastor in Stockholm, Sweden. Pethrus's Filadelfia Church in Stockholm became the largest Pentecostal church in the world.

In Canada, the Pentecostal movement began in Toronto, Ontario, when an independent Holiness evangelist from England, Ellen Hebden, received the Holy Ghost. Soon afterwards, her husband, James, also a preacher, received the Spirit as well. They apparently had no prior contact with Pentecostals. Ellen Hebden testified that she received the Spirit while seeking God in prayer but without any expectation of what would happen. She began speaking in tongues, and then she sang in tongues for three hours. The Hebdens soon learned of the Azusa Street Mission and sent a report that was published in The Apostolic Faith. While the influence of the Hebdens was great initially, they did not believe in organization, so other workers ultimately had a greater impact.

After the peak of the Azusa Street revival (1906-09), the center for worldwide revival shifted to William Durham's work in Chicago. A. H. Argue received the Holy

Spirit there in 1907 and spread the Pentecostal message in western Canada.

The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (218,782) was founded in 1919. (See chapter 4.) It briefly affiliated with the Assemblies of God (1920-25) but soon chose to become a separate organization. It suffered major losses in 1947-48 due to the Latter Rain movement, which began in its ranks. (See chapter 9.)

The Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland (30,992) developed as a separate organization, for until 1949 Newfoundland was a separate dominion from

142

A History of Christian Doctrine

Canada in the British Commonwealth. The founder was Alice Belle Garrigus (1858-1949), a Pentecostal evangelist from Boston, Massachusetts, who started a mission in St. John's in 1911 and served as the first leader.

Two Italian immigrants, Luigi Francescon and Giacomo Lombardi, received the Holy Spirit under William Durham. In 1908, Lombardi held the first Pentecostal service in Italy. On periodic trips back to Italy, he and Francescon established a strong Pentecostal following there; today it is by far the largest Protestant grouping in that country. About 200,000 people are in the AG, and 200,000 are with other Pentecostal organizations. Francescon also established large Italian Pentecostal churches in Argentina (1909) and Brazil (1910).

Two Swedish immigrants to America, Daniel Berg (1884-1963) and Gunnar Vingren received the Holy Spirit in South Bend, Indiana, near Chicago. Commissioned as missionaries by William Durham, they went to Brazil and began a national church there in 1911, which they called the Assemblies of God. It began before the American organization of that name, as a distinct entity, but it later affiliated with the American AG while remaining independent in government. It is the largest Protestant church in Brazil and the largest AG church in any country. It reports 16,000,000 constituents, but some researchers say 8,000,000 is more accurate.166

In Chile, a Methodist missionary named Willis C. Hoover (1856-1936) received the Holy Ghost in 1909 after reading about a Pentecostal revival at a mission in India. He organized the Pentecostal Methodist Church of Chile and later the Evangelical Pentecostal Church of Chile, the

143

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations
two largest Protestant denominations in the country. Their
combined adult membership in 1975 was 350,000.[167]
These churches do not teach that speaking in tongues is
the sole initial evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.
John G. Lake (1870-1935), a convert from Zion City
and a noted healing evangelist, went to South Africa in
1908 and established two large Pentecostal churches
there: the Apostolic Faith Mission (white) (440,000) and
the Zion Christian Church (black) (5,250,000). The latter
is the country's largest Christian denomination.

Holiness and Christian Living
All Pentecostals have historically had a great concern
for holiness of life, both inwardly and outwardly. Steven
Land, a theologian in the Church of God, has explained
this concept well:[168]

With regard to salvation and the daily walk of holiness,
faith and works, "talk and walk," love and obedience,
gospel and law are fused. Love obeys. . . .
Faith alone justifies through grace. But the faith
which justifies is never alone; it is always, in the
Spirit, the faith which works through love. To be in
the faith is to be faithful. To be unfaithful is to be an
adulterer who has fallen out of love with God.
Pentecostals believe that Christians can and have
defected or "backslid.". . . They call upon those crucified
with Christ to crucify the "affections and lusts.". . .
They do not see this as works-righteousness. . . .
As a result of this emphasis Pentecostals often
practiced a very strict discipline which recognized
very few indifferent matters. . . . Holiness prohibitions

144
A History of Christian Doctrine
against dancing, attendance at movie theatres
(worldly amusement), wearing jewelry (worldly luxury
and adornment, or vainglorious displays) and so on
became tests of fellowship. . . . When the apocalyptic
fervor was high, of course, most people were glad to
submit to these lists of rules or holiness practices.
However, as the fervor subsided and incomes rose,
more became affordable; and, as a result, many thirdand
fourth-generations believers went to other more
lenient churches. For most of the early believers however,
these practices . . . were seen as being consistent
with a full commitment to the God who was looking
for a people who were holy and blameless before him

in love. These practices also served to give a social identity and sense of distinction between the church and the world. . . . The plain, simple life of sacrifice, consecration and witness was consistent with the vision of the kingdom that must shine brightly from within to a watching world.

The fruit of the Spirit and the gifts of the Spirit were fused as were the salvation experiences of regeneration, sanctification and Spirit baptism. . . . The fullness of salvation [was] regeneration, sanctification, and Spirit baptism. . . .

To be of the world was to be motivated by the lust of the eye, lust of the flesh and pride of life. Worldliness and godliness were mutually exclusive. To become a Christian is to receive the Spirit of God and to reject the spirit of the world. Men and women were called upon to come out of the world, to be delivered from all binding vices, to leave worldly luxuries, intoxicating beverages, harmful habits (such as smoking) and to cease

145

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

frequenting worldly amusements where there were lewd displays contrary to the Spirit of holiness. . . . Their differences in conversation, dress, worship, witness, and so on were . . . important to their sense of identity and belonging. Their intense sense of the otherness of God and his coming kingdom seemed to drive them to find ways in which to bear witness to that in their daily life. . . .

Dramatic conversions and deliverances were the rule. It was eventful because of the sharp distinction and the costs that had to be counted. But if there were tears and travail as one was born into the new "world" on the way to consummation, there was also great joy. . . . Witnessing drew the line between the church and the world and invited the world to cross the line.

In his early Pentecostal ministry, Charles Parham purposed to live by faith, not to incur debts, not to solicit money, to share all things with coworkers and people in need, and to love those who opposed him. He taught the paying of tithes. He opposed worldly practices such as theater attendance, dancing, and warfare.169 He did not specifically discuss matters of adornment and dress in his writings, however. Apparently he was not opposed to the wearing of some jewelry,170 although pictures of his early followers reveal a conservative, modest appearance.

Holiness was an important theme at Azusa Street. Seymour was moderate on specific issues, not wanting to divert the preaching of the gospel into excessive emphasis on rules. The Apostolic Faith, however, did report about converts who gave up their jewelry, and it warned against various worldly amusements such as

A History of Christian Doctrine

gambling, playing cards, and going to horse races. (See chapter 1.)

Florence Crawford, a leader at Azusa Street and later founder of her own organization, took a strict stand on a number of matters:171

Ministers could neither solicit funds nor receive regular offerings. An offering box near the church entrance sufficed. Her members not only relinquished dancing, card playing, theater attendance, smoking, and drinking, they also distanced themselves from those who practiced such activities. Proscribing all makeup and short hair for women, Crawford enjoined modest apparel and insisted that slacks, shorts, and short sleeves were inappropriate for women.

The Second Work Trinitarians historically took a strict stand on holiness of conduct and dress. In recent years, most of them have moderated or abandoned these positions, although a minority of members still adhere to them. As an example, the Church of God formerly opposed all jewelry. In the 1950s a controversy arose over wedding bands, and the church decided to allow them. There was a steady relaxing of the "practical commitments," until in 1988 the church officially eliminated its rules against going to movies, wearing makeup, wearing jewelry, and women cutting their hair.172

The Church of God of Prophecy maintained a more conservative position on these issues than its parent body. In the 1950s it took a stand against members owning televisions. In its "Advice to Members" (1968), it specifically prohibited shorts in public, rings, lipstick,

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

going to movies, and public swimming. Women did not cut their hair or wear pants. No one was accepted for membership if he or she wore any jewelry, including a wedding band.173

The Finished Work Trinitarians were not as strict as the Second Work Trinitarians, but even so the Assemblies

of God was quite conservative on matters of lifestyle, dress, and amusements in comparison to the rest of society. Over the years, it has abandoned most of its outward expressions of holiness, however, as AG historian Edith Blumhofer has explained:174

In 1914, Pentecostals generally agreed with other fundamentalist evangelicals about what separation meant: modesty in dress and appearance, as well as abstinence from alcohol, smoking, gambling, dancing, theater attendance, and other such amusements. . . . While some matters were left to individual conscience, there was a general agreement about acceptable and unacceptable behavior.

As time passed, however, and cultural standards changed, a new generation in the Assemblies of God questioned what they saw as "legalism" in the older generation. Although a range of "acceptable" behavior (depending to some degree on geographical location) still exists, Assemblies of God people are less outwardly conspicuous in society than they once were.

Carl O'Guin, an AG minister in 1915, said the ministers preached for people to dress modestly, but the people "wanted to do it anyway; it was their frame of mind." Women wore long dresses and long sleeves and did not

A History of Christian Doctrine

wear makeup or jewelry. No woman would wear pants or cut her hair. Preachers were "death" on the theater. The AG was not as strict as some groups, for it allowed engagement and wedding bands.175

Pictures on display in the historical center at AG headquarters show that the gradual abandonment of holiness standards of outward appearance (hair, ornaments, makeup, dress) took place in the 1950s and especially the 1960s. During this time, many ministers tried to stem the tide. For example, Call to Holiness, a tabloid published in Lorain, Ohio, by AG members contained articles against television, movies, tobacco, alcohol, makeup, and excessive jewelry (such as beads, bracelets, and earrings). In 1961 it reprinted an article from the Pentecostal Evangel (the official AG organ)—"There Is Beauty in Holiness" by Carl Brumback—that taught inward and outward holiness and opposed makeup and jewelry.

In 1963, Ralph Riggs, general superintendent from 1953 to 1959, wrote A Call to Holiness, a tract that was

also printed as an article in Call to Holiness. In it he urged Christians not to attend movies, use tobacco or alcohol, wear makeup, or dress immodestly. He also spoke of a "twilight zone of public ball games, newsreels in a downtown theater, and public roller-skating rinks where a person mixes with a crowd of sinners" and recommended abstaining from such activities also.

In 1961 the Rocky Mountain District of the AG amended its bylaws to read, "We unitedly declare ourselves against all forms of worldliness, such as wearing of slacks and shorts, lipstick, paint, earrings, and excessive jewelry. We further declare ourselves against mixed

149

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

bathing, use of tobacco and alcoholic beverages." In 1963, the Ohio District reaffirmed, with only one dissenting vote, its standard of holiness as stated in its constitution and bylaws: "We oppose all appearance of evil . . . such as immodesty in dress, bobbing or undue dressing of the hair; . . . attendance at picture shows, dances, roller rinks, places where mixed bathing is permitted, use of tobacco, and the use of cosmetics which change the natural appearance." Also in 1963, the Southern Missouri District (home of Springfield, the headquarters) added a statement against makeup in its list of qualifications for church membership: "Applicant must disapprove of, and refrain from participation in worldly amusements, theaters, movies, cards, dancing and use of make-up, etc."176

Oneness Pentecostals have remained the most conservative on issues of practical holiness, although there is some variation in beliefs and in the local implementation of standards. In its Articles of Faith, the UPCI opposes "theaters [movies], dances, mixed bathing or swimming, women cutting their hair, make-up, any apparel that immodestly exposes the body, all worldly sports and amusements, and unwholesome radio programs and music" and ownership of television. A position paper on holiness further explains the meaning of modest apparel: people are not to wear ornamental jewelry or clothing associated with the opposite sex. Other position papers take a stand against abortion, gambling, homosexuality, transcendental meditation, and ungodly, worldly use of computers, the Internet, video equipment, and other technology.177

Most of the other major Oneness groups have had similar teachings. For instance, in 1963 the PAW opposed

A History of Christian Doctrine

"all unnecessary jewelry, such as rings (not including
wedding rings), bracelets, earrings, stick-pins, and flashy
breast pins . . . showy colors in dress, attractive hosiery,
short dresses, low necks, short sleeves (that is, above the
elbow), and bright ties."[178] In recent years, however, there
has been greater variation among many of these groups.
The PAW, for example, has many members who wear jewelry
and makeup and many others who do not. To some
extent, this trend has extended to doctrine, with a few
PAW ministers espousing unconditional eternal security
and even elements of trinitarianism.

Many early Pentecostals, especially those who came
from the Holiness movement, opposed all remarriage
after divorce. The wife of J. H. King, IPHC leader from
1900 to 1946, left him shortly after their marriage in
1890. Because of his conviction against divorce and
remarriage, he remained celibate until she died, remarrying
only in 1920. While the AG allows divorce and remarriage
in the case of marital unfaithfulness, it will not
license anyone who has divorced and remarried and has
a previous companion still living. The UPCI allows remarriage
for the "innocent party" and will grant ministerial
license in such a case, although it recommends that ministers
do not remarry after divorce.

Most of the early Pentecostals were pacifists. For
example, the AG, PAW, and UPCI adopted official statements
supporting the government but opposing the taking
of human life in warfare.[179] The AG eventually
abandoned this position, however. The UPCI retains this
view in its Articles of Faith but treats the matter as a "conscientious
scruple," and today many ministers and members
are not pacifists.

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

All major Pentecostal groups teach that tithes and
offerings are God's plan for the church.

Summary of Pentecostal Beliefs

In summary, all three branches of classical
Pentecostalism affirm most of the basic doctrines of conservative
Protestantism, including the existence of one
true God; the creation of the universe by God; the inspiration
and authority of Scripture; the existence of angels,
the devil, and demons; the fall and sinfulness of humanity;
the Incarnation; the Atonement; salvation by grace

through faith in Jesus Christ; water baptism; the Lord's
Supper; the New Testament church as the people of God;
the priesthood of believers; the rapture of the church; the
second coming of Jesus Christ to earth; the Millennium;
the last judgment; eternal punishment for the unrighteous;
and eternal life for the righteous.

We have already discussed the most significant differences
among Pentecostals, namely, on sanctification,
water baptism, the Godhead, and the experience of the
new birth.

The unique doctrine that Pentecostals hold in common
is the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial
sign of speaking in tongues (speaking miraculously in
languages unknown to the speaker, as the Spirit gives
utterance). They also teach that miracles and gifts of the
Spirit, including healing for the body, are for the church
today.

From the beginning, one of the major tenets of
Pentecostals has been the soon return of Jesus Christ to
earth. In accordance with Joel 2 and Acts 2, they associate
the great outpouring of the Holy Spirit with the latter

152

A History of Christian Doctrine

days. They teach that the Lord has restored apostolic doctrine,
experience, and power in order to produce a worldwide
revival that will prepare people for His coming.

Pentecostals affirm that the Second Coming is drawing
near and that it will occur before the Millennium. Most
expect the Rapture to take place before the Tribulation,
but some believe it will occur during or at the end of the
Tribulation.

If we must single out the most distinctive tenets of
Pentecostalism as a whole, historically it would be these
two: the baptism of the Holy Spirit with tongues and the
soon coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. While other conservative
Christians have proclaimed the second point as
well, for Pentecostals it is so intertwined with the first as
to be an essential part of their identity.

All three branches of Pentecostals affirm that divine
healing is part of the Atonement. In other words, Christ's
redeeming work has made physical healing available to
the church. As a result, some early Pentecostals shunned
all medical care, but the general practice has been to trust
God for healing while also recognizing that God can use
doctors and medicine.

A few people taught that if a person had enough faith

he would always receive healing. Some even taught that by faith it was possible to have perfect health and never die. This doctrine tended to be self-defeating, as all proponents eventually died. In general, Pentecostals stress the importance of believing God for healing, but they do not say that healing is automatic or that if someone does not receive healing then he does not have faith. They acknowledge that God is sovereign and that they will not receive some benefits of the Atonement until the resurrection.

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

A few Pentecostals interpreted Mark 16:17-18 to mean that Christians should deliberately handle snakes as a test of faith, and a few even extended the test to the drinking of poison. The latter was rare because it was usually fatal. For a time, A. J. Tomlinson and the early Church of God were the main proponents of snake handling. Today, the practice exists primarily among a few independent churches in Appalachia. To most Pentecostals, the passage in Mark simply speaks of divine protection and deliverance in times of unsolicited danger or satanic attack.

Pentecostals celebrate the Lord's Supper, typically once or a few times a year. They teach it to be symbolic, but they expect the Lord to meet with them in a special way. As they partake, they exercise faith for the forgiveness of sins, healing, and deliverance. In practice, then, their view of communion approximates Calvin's teaching of the spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament.

The Second Work Trinitarians and the Oneness believers traditionally have conducted foot washing in conjunction with the Lord's Supper at least once a year. Most of the Finished Work Trinitarians, notably the Assemblies of God, do not follow this practice, however.

Demonstrative, spontaneous worship has always characterized Pentecostals. Important elements of public worship are preaching, singing, testifying, and praying. Evangelistic services typically end with an altar call, extended prayer by the congregation, and laying on of hands.

Common expressions of worship include exuberant singing, vocal expressions of praise, praying aloud, raising of hands, clapping of hands, dancing ("shouting"), shaking, crying, and speaking in tongues. Sometimes there is leaping, running, falling ("being slain in the Spirit" by the power of

A History of Christian Doctrine

God), "holy laughter," and singing in tongues. Early

Pentecostals found this type of worship in the Scriptures, and to a great extent they inherited it from English and American revivalism and African-American churches.

Almost all Pentecostals accept the ministry of women. In most cases, however, women do not fill positions of top leadership. The COGIC and the CG do not allow women to be ordained or to become pastors, but the AG and UPCI allow both. Compared to the early days, there are fewer women pastors, as significantly more men entered the movement and as many women now exercise their ministry in conjunction with their husbands.180

Pentecostals are diverse in church government. The Second Work groups generally have an episcopal form like their Methodist forebears, and so do most black and Hispanic groups. The other major groups, notably the AG and UPCI, are mostly congregational with some presbyterian elements. The local church controls its own affairs, with strong pastoral leadership; a district organization handles the licensing and discipline of ministers; and the general organization supervises and promotes world missions efforts.

A few small groups are neither Oneness nor trinitarian but espouse a two-person view in which the Son is subordinate to the Father. Sometimes called "duality," it is essentially a form of Arianism.181 The three major branches of Pentecostalism strongly reject this view, however.

In characterizing the Pentecostal movement as a whole from a historical perspective, Steven Land has concluded, "The streams of Pietism, Puritanism, Wesleyanism, African-American Christianity and nineteenthcentury Holiness-Revivalism form a confluence which has

155

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

today become a sea of Pentecostal believers. . . . Perhaps the two most important spiritualities which formed the originators of Pentecostalism [were] Wesleyan and African-American."182

Significant Changes

In recent decades, the Pentecostal movement has undergone significant changes away from its roots, particularly among the Second Work Trinitarians and Finished Work Trinitarians. The most important change concerns the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

First, the initial evidence doctrine is increasingly under attack. Some indigenous churches in Europe and Latin America have departed from this teaching, and the

Charismatic movement does not generally adhere to it. (See chapter 10.) Even in the classical Pentecostal denominations that affirm this doctrine, many theologians and ministers now question or deny it.

In a related development, the number of members who receive the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues has steadily declined. Overall, it is estimated that only 35 percent of the members of classical Pentecostal denominations have received this experience,183 and in the Charismatic movement the percentage is far less. In the Assemblies of God, the number is estimated at 30 percent (by some scholars) to 50 percent (by denominational officials). The AG has established a commission to investigate this problem and propose remedies.

As we have noted, there has also been a significant departure from practical expressions of holiness in lifestyle, dress, and amusements. Many countercultural beliefs and practices, such as pacifism and foot washing,

156

A History of Christian Doctrine

have been abandoned by some groups and are gradually declining in groups that still affirm them. Worship is generally more subdued and sedate than in times past.

Why are these changes occurring? We can identify at least three major factors.

First, there is the generational effect.184 In any revival movement, the first generation experiences a dramatic encounter with God that results in radical changes of belief and lifestyle. This generation has a high commitment to the distinctive tenets of the group, because they discovered these truths for themselves, defended them in the face of great opposition and at great cost, and experienced first-hand the spiritual benefits of their newfound commitments.

Typically, most of the second generation adheres to the same tenets because they were molded by the dedication, spirituality, sacrifice, and sincerity of the first generation. They observed or at least heard direct testimonies of the transformation of their elders, and they observed first-hand the spiritual blessings that resulted. In many cases, however, they are not as effective in transmitting the core values to the next generation.

Consequently, the third generation often inherits a tradition without the full inward experience that molded the tradition. They neither observe nor experience the transition from the old life to the new. Living realities of

the first generation become monuments in the second generation and relics in the third. Godly disciplines become legalisms and then archaic practices. Of course, this trend can be countered by personal revival and renewal and by a continual influx of converts who embrace the original spiritual realities.

Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

The second influence that has prompted changes in the Pentecostal movement is upward social mobility with a corresponding increase in the desire for social acceptance. Like most revival movements and like Christianity in the beginning, Pentecostalism appealed first and foremost to the common people, especially to the socially disadvantaged, the dispossessed, and the oppressed.185 Such people had the least to lose and the most to gain by taking the step of faith.

As Pentecostals experienced the blessings of God upon their lives, however, they began to move upward in society and had the means to enjoy greater participation in society. As their churches grew, they drew the attention of the establishment and were able to influence the establishment to some extent. At this point, they acquired a greater stake in society and thus a greater concern for how society viewed them. As part of the price of participating in and influencing the larger religious and secular communities, however, they encountered greater pressure to conform to the expectations of those communities.

In connection with this process, the Trinitarian Pentecostals particularly sought to identify with conservative Protestantism—Fundamentalism and later Evangelicalism—and this association in turn became a third catalyst for change. When the Assemblies of God rejected the Oneness movement in 1916, they chose ecclesiastical tradition over apostolic precedent. In essence, they drew back from the full application of the restorationist idea that had produced Pentecostalism in the first place. Had all Pentecostals devoted several years to Bible study, discussion, and prayer over the matter, perhaps the outcome would have been significantly dif-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ferent, but in 1916 the die was cast that would mold future generations.

Trinitarian Pentecostals thus consciously sought to identify more with Fundamentalists who did not receive

the Spirit—and indeed who denounced the move of the
Spirit—than fellow Pentecostals with whom they had
been closely associated. In fact, early leaders such as AG
editor Stanley Frodsham spoke of themselves as
Pentecostal Fundamentalists—Fundamentalists whose
only important difference from the others was that they
spoke in tongues.186 J. R. Flower—AG orchestrator of the
anti-Oneness wing and a key denominational leader from
the beginning in 1914 until his retirement in 1959—said,
"We are fundamentalists, but we are more than that."
When the AG was invited to help form the National
Association of Evangelicals in 1943, he led the AG in
doing so, noting that some Pentecostals kept their "fingers
crossed" lest they lose this "good fortune."187 From
the 1940s onward, the influence of Evangelicals became
stronger. As we shall see in chapters 9 and 10, the Latter
Rain movement in the 1950s and the Charismatic movement
in the 1960s and beyond also had a significant
impact in diluting Pentecostal uniqueness.
As a result, Trinitarian Pentecostals gradually adopted
many Evangelical positions and methodologies. For
example, one of the arguments that arose against certain
holiness practices was that other Christians—including
prominent ministers to whom the Pentecostals looked for
instruction and leadership—did not see the need for
them. When the Pentecostal Fellowship of North America
was formed in 1947, it simply adopted the statement of
faith of the National Association of Evangelicals and
159
Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations
added a Pentecostal paragraph.188
In recent years, both Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal
scholars have urged Pentecostals to resist the "evangelicalization"
of their movement and instead draw inspiration
and guidance from their own unique identity,
experience, and theology. In arguing for a "distinctive
Pentecostal self-understanding" in theology and spirituality,
Steven Land has asserted, "Pentecostalism cannot and
should not be simply identified with a rationalist or
scholastic type of evangelicalism. Further, it cannot, without
fundamental alteration and accommodation, be
assimilated into any and every Christian denomination
without eventually bringing fundamental changes."189
The Oneness movement has not been immune to the
motivators for change that we have discussed, although
its theological isolation has served to minimize the third

factor. Consequently, Oneness Pentecostals have preserved more of the doctrinal approach, experience, worship, and lifestyle of the early Pentecostals than Trinitarian Pentecostals have.

First of all, regarding doctrine, it is true that the Oneness views of the Godhead and the new birth were a development in the second decade of the Pentecostal movement. They were a logical progression of the earliest Pentecostal thought, however, and in many cases the practical emphasis and effect have been remarkably similar. For example, Trinitarian Pentecostals today assume that their doctrine of salvation is the same as that of the early Pentecostals, but in practice many of them emphasize a Baptist-style sinner's prayer more than the baptism of the Holy Ghost. While Parham, Seymour, and Durham spoke of a person as being justified before receiving the

160

A History of Christian Doctrine

Holy Ghost, they stressed the necessity of receiving the Holy Ghost. Early Trinitarian Pentecostals typically said that believers were born again before receiving the Holy Spirit but needed to receive the Spirit in order to have full salvation, to enter the New Testament church, and to go in the Rapture. Early Oneness Pentecostals typically said that believers needed to receive the Holy Spirit to be born again, to enter the New Testament church, and to go in the Rapture, but those who did not could still receive a degree of salvation (such as life on the new earth) if they walked in all the light they knew. While the doctrines were different, the effect upon preaching, witnessing, and praying was much the same, and both stand in contrast to the Trinitarian Pentecostal approach today.

In particular, it is the norm for Oneness Pentecostals to receive the Holy Spirit with tongues, and it is generally a requirement for church membership. By one estimate, 90 percent of people ages ten or over who regularly attend a United Pentecostal Church have spoken in tongues.190 Thus, a UPCI church of 100 adult members has about the same number of Spirit-filled people as an AG church of 300 adult members. In the U.S., the reported AG constituency is at least 300 percent more than that of the UPCI, but the number of active Spirit-filled believers is probably only about 55 percent greater.191

It seems clear that doctrinal emphasis is an important factor in the disparity. The UPCI places a much greater emphasis on the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is a focal

point of every evangelistic service, and it is taught as an integral part of salvation and God's plan for all believers. In the Apostolic Church of the Faith in Christ Jesus, a Oneness church in Mexico that has a greater diversity of

views on the essentiality of the Holy Spirit, only 72 percent of members have spoken in tongues—still higher than trinitarian churches but very low for a Oneness group. In the Pentecostal Methodist Church of Chile, a trinitarian group that does not teach tongues as the sole initial evidence, only 50 percent of the ministers have spoken in tongues.192

On secondary doctrinal issues, Trinitarian Pentecostal denominations have gradually solidified their position in a way that corresponds to Fundamentalism, while Oneness Pentecostals allow greater diversity, as was characteristic of early Pentecostals. For example, the AG officially teaches the pretribulation Rapture, while the UPCI has no official position. The AG officially opposes the doctrine of annihilation, while the UPCI has generally treated it as a part of eschatology and therefore open to different interpretations. In the 1980s, however, the UPCI passed a rule against licensing new ministers who teach the doctrine, while still allowing ministers to hold the view.

Longtime participants in Trinitarian Pentecostalism have told UPCI audiences and ministers that UPCI camp meetings and conferences are quite similar to early Pentecostal services in the fervency of worship, racial integration of audiences, and physical demonstrations.193 Some of them state that they no longer experience the intensity of the move of the Spirit in their groups that they did in early times.194 Some of them even urge Oneness Pentecostals to maintain their original zeal, consecration, worship, and emphasis on the Holy Ghost, and not follow the example of groups such as the AG and CG, who have in many ways become more Evangelical than

Pentecostal.195 Oneness Pentecostals who visit Trinitarian Pentecostal churches often remark that the prayer, worship, and move of the Spirit there is less fervent, demonstrative, and intense than what they typically experience in their own churches.

In sum, Second Work Trinitarian Pentecostals and

Finished Work Trinitarian Pentecostals adhere to the basic doctrines of early Pentecostalism, but their teaching, preaching, worship, and lifestyle have gradually become less distinctive, less zealous, more Evangelical, and more middle-class American. Oneness Pentecostals retain much of the earlier characteristics of the Pentecostal movement as a whole, but their distinguishing doctrines have caused them to remain relatively isolated from other Pentecostals and Evangelicals to this day.

163
Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

In chapters 1-5 we have traced the most significant development within Christianity in the twentieth century, as measured both by theological innovation (or restoration) and by numerical growth. In the early part of the century, however, the Pentecostals were a very small segment of Protestantism that had sprouted from Holiness groups that in turn had separated from Methodism. In this chapter and the next, we will look at the developments within mainline Protestantism. Due to space limitations, we can only present a brief overview of various theologies and cite some representative examples.

The most important development within mainline Protestantism was Liberalism, also known as Modernism, and the reactions to it. Liberalism was a continuation of a

165
Liberalism and
Neo-Orthodoxy
6

trend that began in earlier centuries and became quite strong in the nineteenth century, but to a great extent it captured the mainline Protestant denominations in the twentieth century.

In essence, Liberalism questioned the truthfulness of the Bible and undermined its authority. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had seen the emergence of a post-Christian mindset as the Western world emphasized scientific methods, rationalism, and experiential knowledge. (See volume 2, chapter 12.) Many theologians and philosophers began to apply these methods to traditional religion, eliminating the supernatural elements and retaining what they deemed to be rational and humanly comprehensible.

In a way, we can regard both Liberalism and Holiness-Pentecostalism as reactions to formal Protestant orthodoxy, albeit at opposite ends of the spectrum. By the

seventeenth century, Protestantism had settled into rival theological camps, each with its own well-defined confession of faith and each of whom labeled the others as heretics. They seemed to focus on doctrinal identity more than on personal faith and spiritual experience. By the eighteenth century, the Pietists in continental Europe and the Methodists in England were seeking to refocus attention on a personal relationship with God and a lifestyle of holiness. The Holiness movement of the nineteenth century (which arose from Methodism) and the Pentecostal movement of the twentieth century (which arose from the Holiness movement) perpetuated that emphasis.

Liberalism

Whereas the Pietists, Methodists, Holiness movement, and Pentecostals all sought a more fervent personal

166

A History of Christian Doctrine

relationship with God on the basis of scriptural teachings, Liberalism sought a more personal theology by questioning scriptural teachings. Liberal theologians in the nineteenth century began to view the Bible as a human book that contained divine principles. To them, it was inspired much like other great writings of philosophy, poetry, and literature. In other words, the human element predominated in the writing of Scripture.

Instead of seeing Scripture as infallible, they saw it as full of errors. Instead of being the direct revelation of God to humanity, it was a reflection of human thinking about God. It was not the authoritative Word of God; it simply described human efforts to understand ultimate reality. Liberal theologians began to deny, one by one, the supernatural elements of Scripture, including the miracles, the deity of Jesus, the virgin birth (conception) of Jesus, the atoning work of Jesus, the resurrection of Jesus, and the second coming of Jesus. They regarded these beliefs as mythical or prescientific elaborations that arose from the superstitious nature of the people who wrote the Bible. Now that the human race had developed a rational understanding of the universe, miracles were no longer an acceptable explanation of reality.

These theologians thus sought to remove the miraculous from Christianity and yet perpetuate what they considered to be its spiritual, moral essence. As volume 2 has discussed, theologians who attempted this task in the nineteenth century included Friedrich Schleiermacher, a Reformed pastor in Germany and the starting point for

Liberalism; Søren Kierkegaard, a Danish existential philosopher (existentialism relates to individual existence and discovery of truth); and Albrecht Ritschl, a German

professor and son of a Lutheran bishop. By the early twentieth century, Liberalism was in the process of taking over seminaries, universities, and mainline denominations. In general, Liberalism denied that humans have a sinful nature, instead holding that they are basically good. Therefore, it denied the need for salvation in the traditional Christian sense of atonement, redemption, justification, and regeneration. Instead of proclaiming personal deliverance from the penalty of sin, it reinterpreted salvation in terms of improving individuals and bettering society. Heaven and hell became states of being or states of mind rather than literal places.

To understand Liberalism, let us briefly examine three prominent theologians at the beginning of the twentieth century. Adolf von Harnack (1851-1930) of Germany was the foremost church historian in his day and a theological professor in Berlin. In 1901 he published an influential book, What Is Christianity? He proposed that one could express the essence of Christianity by three essential points: the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the infinite value of the human soul. He discarded the other elements, particularly the miraculous. In effect, he reduced Christianity to a philosophical religion, something that could appeal to everyone and not be offensive to anyone.

In the U.S., Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918), a German Baptist pastor, was the most prominent proponent of the social gospel, which stressed the importance of social action. Of course, conservative Christian groups, including the Methodists and Holiness people, had long engaged in practical works such as establishing

orphanages, feeding the poor, rehabilitating alcoholics, and so on. The primary motivation for the antislavery and temperance movements of the nineteenth century was religious conviction.

The social gospel went beyond these kinds of actions, however, and offered a redefinition of Christianity. It said that the goal of Christianity is not the spiritual salvation of individual souls from sin and hell, but the transformation

of society on earth. Christians are not to look for the physical return of Christ to earth, the literal reign of Christ for a thousand years, or eternal life in a place called heaven. Rather, the gospel calls them to establish the kingdom of God in this world—the kingdom of justice— through social and political means. The church's priority should be to work for justice, freedom, and a better society.

Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965), a German theologian and philosopher, became famous as a missionary doctor in Africa. He published The Quest of the Historical Jesus (1906). In it, he tried to strip away the myths about Jesus and discover who He really was as a man. He concluded that Jesus mistakenly believed the end of the world was near in His day, and thus He proclaimed that the kingdom of God was at hand. In order to fulfill His predictions, Jesus unsuccessfully tried to provoke the end of the world. He believed He would precipitate the end of all things, and His death would be the climactic moment. In Schweitzer's view, Jesus miscalculated and was killed too soon to implement His plans. In essence, He failed in His mission. Early Christianity was thus an attempt to reinterpret the failure of Jesus and turn it into a spiritual success.

169

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

Associated with Liberalism was higher criticism of the Bible, in which scholars studied the Bible as they did uninspired literature.196 They analyzed the total historical situation of the biblical books, including dating, verification and writing of history (historical criticism). They also studied the structure and style of the books (literary criticism) and the literary sources and composition of the books (source criticism). Some of them investigated the presumed process by which oral tradition moved from stage to stage, became modified, and was finally incorporated in Scripture (tradition criticism).

While some study of this sort is necessary for a full understanding of the biblical text, and while these methods did yield some positive, productive results, many scholars employed them in a way that undermined the Bible's message. They typically denied the miracles of the Bible, questioned the accuracy of biblical accounts, and disagreed with what the Bible said about itself. This type of destructive criticism of Scripture developed in the nineteenth century in Germany with F. C. Baur, David

Strauss, Julius Wellhausen, and the Tübingen school, but it came to full fruition in the twentieth century.

In the view of conservative Christians then and now, Liberalism actually cut the heart out of Christianity. It undermined or destroyed essential biblical doctrines such as the deity of Jesus Christ, the Atonement, justification by faith in Jesus Christ, and the new birth. Nevertheless, to a greater or lesser extent, its ideas became predominant in mainstream European and American Protestantism.

Liberalism provoked a sharp counterattack from people who accepted the Bible as the infallible, inerrant

A History of Christian Doctrine

Word of God, including its miracles. This response became known as Fundamentalism, which we will discuss in chapter 7. There was also a more moderate reaction in the scholarly world, called Neo-Orthodoxy, which we discuss next.

Karl Barth and Neo-Orthodoxy

Neo-Orthodoxy developed in the 1920s through 1940s as a response to Liberalism. It defended historic Christian doctrines against Liberalism, yet it did not return completely to earlier beliefs such as the infallibility of Scripture in all things. Thus, it adopted an intermediate stance between Liberalism and traditional Protestant orthodoxy, with various theologians being closer to one side or the other. In the eyes of more conservative Christians, this movement did not completely return to the "orthodox" Protestant theology of the sixteenth-century Reformers, yet they welcomed its critique of Liberal theology and its defense of many biblical concepts.

Neo-Orthodox theologians realized that the Liberal agenda was bankrupt, yet they still tried to take into account the rationalism of modern society. They sought to blend biblical supernaturalism and modern rationalism so as to affirm the essential doctrines of Scripture in a modern context. Ancient doctrines were rephrased and reinterpreted.

We can mark the beginning of the Neo-Orthodox movement with the publication of Karl Barth's Commentary on Romans in 1919. Barth (1886-1968) was a Reformed pastor in Switzerland and the foremost theologian in the first half of the twentieth century. His major

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

publication was Church Dogmatics (1932-64). It was the most comprehensive theological work of the century, with

twenty-one volumes in English.

Barth emphasized the "otherness" of God and the "strange new world" of the Bible. In other words, God is so different from us that we could never learn about Him simply by human reason. Rationalism is insufficient to establish religion. Rather, we must learn about God by revelation, and God's Word is His revelation to us. Thus, the basis of Christianity is revelation, not reason.

Clearly, Barth rejected the central tenet of Liberalism—the idea that we can approach God and construct religion through rationalism. He fell short of going back completely to earlier Protestant orthodoxy, however, because he did not fully uphold the infallibility of the Bible and he employed the methods of higher criticism, with its denial of the Bible's literal accuracy.

He avoided the apparent conflict between his emphasis on biblical revelation and his failure to uphold biblical infallibility by stressing that God uses the Bible to speak to us individually when we encounter Him personally. Instead of viewing the Bible as the absolute Word of God, he said it "becomes" the Word of God when humans encounter God. The objective statements of Scripture, then, are not as important as what the Bible means to us subjectively. Here he built upon the existential philosophy of Kierkegaard even while rejecting Liberalism itself.

Barth proclaimed the sovereignty of God. God is in control of the world. We cannot remake God in our image, for God is who He is.

In contrast to Liberalism, Barth emphasized the sinfulness of humanity. Because of their sinfulness, humans

172

A History of Christian Doctrine

must have God's illumination to understand truth, and they must have the grace of God at work in their lives.

Barth drew considerably from Luther and Calvin, especially the latter. He stated many of the same doctrines as earlier Protestants but not with the same commitment to the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible that they had presupposed. He presented his teachings in a fresh, original way, and he was willing to challenge traditional formulations. Yet, in the final analysis, he did not wish to breach ecumenical tradition.

On the doctrine of God, Barth did not like the traditional terminology of "three persons," because it made too great of a distinction in the Godhead. He was willing to speak of three eternal "modes of being," "the triune

God," and "the Trinity," however. His doctrine of God bears similarities to Oneness thought—so much so that some critics have called him a modalist.197 "For Barth there is only one revelation of God—in Jesus Christ."198 Jesus Christ is the unique revelation of God Himself in flesh, and His atoning sacrifice is the work of God Himself:199

God is the One whose name and cause are borne by Jesus Christ. . . .

Who and what is the God who is to be known at the point upon which Holy Scripture concentrates our attention and thoughts? . . . From first to last the Bible directs us to the name of Jesus Christ. . . . Under this name God Himself became man. . . . There is no greater depth in God's being and work than that revealed in these happenings and under this name. For in these happenings and under this name He has

revealed Himself. . . . When the bearer of this name becomes the object of our attention and thoughts, when they are directed to Jesus Christ, then we see God, and our thoughts are fixed on Him. . . .

God has not withheld Himself from men as true being, but . . . He has given no less than Himself to men as the overcoming of their need, and light in their darkness—Himself as the Father in His own Son by the Holy Spirit. . . .

God Himself, in His deep mercy and its great power, has taken it upon Himself to exist also in human being and essence in His Son. . . . We have to do with God Himself as we have to do with this man. . . . God Himself has assumed and made His own our human nature and kind in His Son, just because God Himself came into this world in His Son. . . .

The Holy Spirit is the coming of the man Jesus, who is the Son of God, to other men who are not this but with whom He still associates. . . .

It is the eternal God Himself who has given Himself in His Son to be man, and as man to take upon Himself this human passion. . . . He gives Himself to be the humanly acting and suffering person in this occurrence [on the cross]. He Himself is the Subject who in His own freedom becomes in this event the object acting or acted upon in it.

If we truly know God, said Barth, then we will obey

God. "Knowledge of God is obedience to God. . . . Knowledge of God as knowledge of faith is in itself and of essential necessity obedience. . . . This is obedience, the obedience of faith."200

Barth attributed great significance to water baptism. He said that it relates us to "the one divine act of salvation and revelation." Believers are baptized into the following expectations: 201

(1) The coming to pass of the kingdom and rule of God in their lives, (2) their baptism and endowment with the Holy Spirit, (3) the execution of God's judgment on them too, (4) the receiving of remission of sins, (5) their membership of the new people of God of the last time, and (6) their existence in the unity of Jews and Gentiles in common judgment and blessing.

Despite his Reformed heritage, Barth opposed the baptism of infants since they could not have the personal encounter with God that baptism represents.

He identified the inward work of salvation as the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is related to, but distinct from, water baptism.

Based on passages in Acts and the Epistles, Barth taught that baptism is an identification with the saving work of Jesus. He was not willing to say that any specific baptismal formula was uniform in the early church. He acknowledged that, theologically, a simple baptismal formula that invoked the name of Jesus would be the most appropriate, but since the trinitarian formula is used everywhere we should not abandon it, even though we cannot otherwise justify its necessity:202

The name "Jesus" as the basis and goal of the apostolic message and apostolic baptism shows that the divine act had taken place and the Mightier [than

John] had come. . . . Proclamation of the name of Jesus in which all salvation is enclosed, and baptism in His name, are thus the distinguishing mark of the apostolic preaching and baptism which began on the Day of Pentecost. . . .

What may not be presupposed, however, is that from the very first a specific formula was used . . . and even less still that it was always and everywhere the same. If a formula of this kind was required, it is hard

to see why the simple "into Jesus Christ" of Gal. 3:27
and Rom. 6:3 did not contain all that was needed, or
why it would not have been enough to include the
term onoma [name] as in most of the relevant verses,
e.g., "into the name of Jesus Christ" or "of the Lord
Jesus Christ." In the most solemn passage of all, however,
though with no change of meaning, this short
statement took the familiar Trinitarian form (Mt.
28:19) and this form . . . established itself in all parts
of Christendom as the ecclesiastically normal and
obligatory formula . . . It may be noted that what we
have here is a custom that should be observed for the
sake of ecumenical peace even though its exegetical,
dogmatic and theological necessity cannot be demonstrated.
. . . The only thing which is unconditionally
necessary from a theological standpoint is that baptism
should be a washing with water . . . and that
whatever is said . . . should characterise it unequivocally
as a movement into Jesus Christ, into the washing
of man accomplished in Him. . . .
The name of Jesus Christ, the place of salvation
and the origin of all the related action, is here the
object and goal of Christian action, which is referred
176
A History of Christian Doctrine
and orientated to the name of Jesus Christ as this
goal. In faith, love and baptism the Christian moves
towards the name of Jesus Christ, towards Jesus
Christ Himself. . . .
When the community baptises, and when its candidates
are baptised, they are on the way into that
strong tower [Proverbs 18:10], on the way to the One
who enters Jerusalem, the Lord, their Creator,
Reconciler and Redeemer. One might also think here
of the virgins who go to meet the Bridegroom with
their lamps. . . . Baptism is a going forth to Jesus
Christ.
Barth explained that the wording of Matthew 28:19
actually points to Jesus Christ and His saving work. For
him, the three titles do not refer to three names but to the
one name of God. They signify God's redemptive work in
Jesus Christ in light of the past (salvation history, the plan
of God through the ages), the present (Christ's act of
atonement as applied to the believer), and the future (the
ongoing work of God in the individual and in the
world):203

Mt. 28:19 . . . is an extension of the christological formulae of Acts and Paul. . . .
The apostles are to baptise them, not into three names, but into one name expounded in three different ways. . . .
If the mention of Father, Son and Holy Ghost is to be regarded as an enumeration, it is the enumeration of the dimensions of the one name of God, i.e., of His one work and word, of His one act of salvation and

revelation, with a view to which, if there is to be faith, love, obedience and service, so the nations are to be made disciples, summoned to conversion, and led to enter and pursue the way of Jesus Christ. The words Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in their inseparability and distinction, together indicate the expansion of the one name, work and word of God. . . .
The Father is the basis of the history of Jesus Christ, of the history of Israel and of all world history. . . . [Jesus] is invested with the glory of His name, work and word, with His exousia [authority] in heaven and on earth. . . .
"And of the Son": . . . The one work and word of God which forms the goal of baptism is decisively the work and word of this Servant of God, of Jesus Christ. . . .
"And of the Holy Ghost"—this is, from the centre, the forward extension: God's one act of salvation and revelation in the dimension which points to future time. . . . The name, work and word of the Holy Spirit is again the one name, work and word—now in its future and eschatological aspect—which is the goal of baptism.

Rudolf Bultmann and Form Criticism

Toward midcentury, the influence of Barth was eclipsed by Rudolph Bultmann (1884-1976), a German, who perhaps had the greatest impact on theology of anyone in the twentieth century. He stood in the Neo-Orthodox tradition, but he pushed it toward Liberalism. He criticized Liberalism, yet his theological system is clearly unacceptable to conservatives.
An important critical tool that Bultmann employed

and popularized is form criticism. This approach assumes that much of the biblical material was originally

in various oral forms, and it seeks to understand the text by investigating these forms. Bultmann particularly applied this method to the Gospels. The idea is that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John did not simply sit down and write their Gospels, but they collected various bits and pieces of information, stories, parables, sayings, teachings, sermons, and legends that were preserved orally. While some of the material originally came from the life of Jesus Himself, many of the words and deeds that the Gospels attribute to Jesus actually came from other sources and are not historically accurate.

To understand Christianity, then, we cannot simply read the Gospels at face value, but we must ascertain where the various pieces of the story came from and then evaluate their relative significance and their purpose. Some passages, for example, are Jewish fables or legends that perhaps predated Christ, but the Gospel writer appropriated them for his purpose of glorifying Christ. We should not regard them as history, but they provide insight as to what the early church believed.

Bultmann concluded that the Gospels are not very reliable historically and that we can know almost nothing about the historical Jesus. In essence, the Gospels reflect early theology, not actual history. They reveal what the early Christians taught about Christ, not what really happened in Christ's life. Thus, it is not necessary for us to believe in the miracle accounts; we can simply extract the truth they teach. We should focus on the Christ of faith.

For Bultmann, then, what is important is what the

179

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

Bible means for our present experience with God. In Bible days, people believed in angels, demons, and miracles, so of course they wrote in those terms. But today, we realize that these things are fanciful, so we need to translate the stories into modern terms. We need to strip away the mythological elements and focus on the true message of Christianity. Bultmann called this process "demythologizing" the Bible.

This method creates a huge problem, however: where does one stop demythologizing? Who is to say what is true and what is false, what is historical and what is not, what is the true message and what is just the disposable wrapping that surrounds the message? Who decides what is the essential core? The bottom line is that no objective

determination is possible. The reader is the one who decides subjectively.

At this point, it appears that we are almost back to old-time Liberalism and its fallacies. If the Bible is God's revelation to humans, how can humans sit in judgment on it? Once again, it appears that in trying to accommodate to twentieth-century rationalism, theologians fatally compromised the Word of God. Indeed, Bultmann discarded the historical reality of the Incarnation, substitutionary Atonement, Resurrection, and Second Coming. In essence, he retained only "justification by (personal existential) faith alone and not by history (the saving events recorded in the Gospels)."204

We cannot simply dismiss Bultmann as a Liberal, however, because he did emphasize personal faith in Jesus Christ. He taught the importance of a definite, personal experience with God. He did not completely eliminate the Cross or the uniqueness of Christ, but he

180

A History of Christian Doctrine

presented what he considered to be the challenge and offense of the Cross to sinful humans. Clearly, however, he erred in deleting the miraculous from the Bible, discarding essential doctrines, and emphasizing experience and ethics over doctrine.

Bultmann stands between Liberalism and Evangelicalism. Many conservative theologians employ some of his methods while rejecting his extreme conclusions. People from both sides of the spectrum thus draw from his work, perpetuating his influence.

Other Neo-Orthodox Theologians

Closely associated with Karl Barth was Emil Brunner (1889-1965), also from Switzerland. Like Bultmann, he represented the more liberal side of Neo-Orthodoxy. For example, he taught universalism, the doctrine that everyone will be saved in the end. He also criticized the doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus.

In the United States, a prominent Neo-Orthodox theologian was Reinhold Niebuhr (1893-1971). Like Barth, he reacted against Liberalism, but he considered that Barth had gone too far the other way in that he failed to deal adequately with ethics. While Niebuhr did not accept the social gospel, he sought to work out a proper Christian ethical system. For example, he taught that Christians must actively oppose the exploitation of minority groups and that Christians have a duty to take part in

politics. He adapted positive elements in the teaching of Liberal theologians and sought to implement them in a more conservative theological system.

Reinhold's brother, H. Richard Niebuhr (1894-1962), was also a significant figure. His description of

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

Liberalism has become a classic critique: "A God without wrath brought men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministration of a Christ without a cross."205 By this statement he highlighted that Liberalism does not believe in eternal punishment, the last judgment, the sinfulness of humanity, or the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and thus robs Christianity of its most meaningful and distinctive tenets.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-45), a German pastor and theologian, wrote The Cost of Discipleship (1937), in which he proclaimed the importance of acting upon our faith and living a committed life. While salvation is free, he said, discipleship will cost us everything. He deplored what he called "cheap grace"—the false notion that people can receive God's grace and then continue in a disobedient, self-willed, sinful lifestyle:206

Cheap grace . . . amounts to the justification of sin without the justification of the repentant sinner who departs from sin and from whom sin departs. . . . Cheap grace is the grace we bestow on ourselves. Cheap grace is the preaching of forgiveness without requiring repentance. . . . Cheap grace is grace without discipleship, grace without the cross, grace without Jesus Christ.

In what serves as a critique of both Liberalism and much of Evangelicalism, Bonhoeffer explained that obedience is essential:207

The response of the disciples is an act of obedience, not a confession of faith. . . .

A History of Christian Doctrine

Only he who believes is obedient, and only he who is obedient believes. . . . It is faith which justifies, and not the act of obedience. . . . From the point of view of justification it is necessary thus to separate them, but we must never lose sight of their essential unity. For faith is only real when there is obedience, never without it, and faith only becomes faith in the act of obedience.

We should completely misunderstand the nature
of grace if we were to suppose that there was no need
to take the first step, because faith was already there.
Against that we must boldly assert that the step of
obedience must be taken before faith can be possible.
Unless he obeys, a man cannot believe.

Bonhoeffer practiced what he preached. During the
Nazi regime in Germany, most Christians, including pastors
and theologians, supported Adolf Hitler out of
national pride and fear of the consequences of opposing
him. Bonhoeffer felt that he needed to oppose Hitler by
whatever means he could. Thus, he joined a conspiracy to
assassinate Hitler, but the plot was discovered and he was
arrested. He was executed by the special order of
Himmler just a few days before his concentration camp
was liberated by the Allies.

Bonhoeffer taught that we must learn to live for others,
not just for ourselves. We must learn to live without
constantly relying on God for comfort and help, instead
taking responsibility for our own lives. Rather than merely
focusing on a personal experience with God and having a
self-contained religion, we must develop our character,
our personality, and our relationships with others. He

183

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

described this concept as "religionless Christianity."

Paul Tillich (1886-1965), a German Lutheran immigrant
to America, tried to provide theological answers to
secular questions. The basis of his theology was what he
called "the ultimate"—the ultimate reality, the ultimate
truth. He said it is located in God, who is the "ground of
being" and can only be encountered by experience.
Humans reject God only because they have never really
encountered Him; if they ever encountered God, then
they would respond accordingly.

Tillich's theology was existential, that is, focusing on
personal experience and subjective beliefs. His approach
undermined the authority of Scripture, and it even called
into question the personality of God by its focus on the
search for "the ultimate."

Neo-Orthodox theologians began to make use of
another tool of higher criticism called redaction criticism
("redaction" means "editing"), an outgrowth of form
criticism. Under this view, each biblical writer had his
own reasons for writing and selected and shaped his
material accordingly. The Gospel writers, for instance, did

not simply record history but selected material in accordance with their own theology or agenda. Redaction criticism tries to investigate the mind of the writer to determine why he included certain elements and omitted others.

It is true that the Gospel writers emphasized certain important themes, but conservative theologians say that God inspired them to do so. Redaction criticism, however, underscores the human element in the process. The result is that it typically finds different—even competing and conflicting—theologies in the New Testament itself.

184

A History of Christian Doctrine

Evaluation of Neo-Orthodoxy

In summary, Neo-Orthodoxy was not an organized movement but a grouping of theologies that reacted against Liberalism yet used many of the critical tools of Liberalism. The key beliefs were the sovereignty of God, the grace of God, the sinfulness of humanity, the necessity of divine revelation for people to know God, the revelation of God in Christ, the Scriptures as containing (but not being identical to) the Word of God, and the need for a personal encounter with God.

The Neo-Orthodox theologians clearly identified the errors of Liberalism. In this they were aided by the First and Second World Wars, which for many people shattered the humanistic notions that people are basically good, can perfect themselves, and can establish the kingdom of God on earth.

On the other hand, the Neo-Orthodox theologians were willing to question traditional beliefs and terminology. They were more interested in basing their views on Scripture rather than historic creeds. The doctrine of the trinity is a case in point. Some were critical of traditional trinitarian terms. Others continued to use them but reinterpreted them. They were often more frank and insightful than Evangelicals in acknowledging the historical development of the doctrine of the trinity, because they did not feel bound to defend every traditional formulation.208

In the final analysis, however, the Neo-Orthodox theologians did not return completely to biblical truth, because they did not fully accept the authority of the Bible as the Word of God. While they refuted the central tenets of Liberalism and discarded some aspects of nonbiblical tradition, they failed to acknowledge in full the

185

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

supernatural message of the Bible. They emphasized a personal encounter with God, but they failed to discover the biblical experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Other Philosophical and Theological Developments

A man who had a tremendous impact upon twentiethcentury religious views was Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), an Austrian Jew. He founded the modern study of psychology and the practice of psychotherapy. Many of Freud's ideas are quite controversial even today, notably his tracing of most psychological problems to childhood experiences and his attribution of almost every motivation to sexuality (often unconscious or repressed). Freud was an atheist, and he labeled religion as a neurosis. In his view, only an unhealthy mind would believe in God or depend upon religion for assistance.

Christian thought was a significant force in the Civil Rights movement in the United States in the 1960s, which secured political and social rights for blacks. The moral leader of this movement was Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929-68), a Baptist minister who was committed to nonviolent protest in order to achieve equality and integration. He worked through the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to achieve his goals. King organized the massive March on Washington in 1963 and was assassinated in 1968.

A philosophical development that affected modern theology is positivism. This philosophy stresses the analysis of language, and it tries to determine which logical propositions have factual meaning. It says that all valid knowledge comes through the scientific method.

186

A History of Christian Doctrine

Since metaphysical language cannot be verified by the scientific method, it is meaningless.

In the 1960s, some theologians drew from the ideas of positivism and the implications of Bultmann, Tillich, and others to formulate secular theology. They sought to apply theology to the secular world and to answer the questions of secular philosophy. Carried to its extreme, this movement said that language about God is meaningless. It is impossible to talk intelligently about God, and it is even impossible to think of God as a personal being. This movement became characterized by the phrase "God is dead." What was left was to apply theology to society—

a reduction of theology to philosophy.

In this line of thought, Joseph Fletcher became the foremost exponent of situation ethics. Under this view, there are no moral absolutes. What is true and right depends upon the situation. What is moral in one situation may not be moral in another. Fletcher went so far as to say that, in certain cases, such things as prostitution or fornication may not be wrong. To make a moral decision on these matters, we have to look at the background of people, the influences on them, their motivation, their purpose, and the alternatives available to them.

Liberation theology arose in Latin America among Roman Catholics who were influenced by Marxism. It looks at salvation largely in terms of political and economic liberation, sounding much like the social gospel in a revolutionary setting. According to liberation theologians, the church's goal should be to create a just society, and therefore it should be active in promoting political, economic, and social changes. They typically define social justice to include the redistribution of wealth and

187

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

means of production, and some of them, like the communists, attack the notion of private property. Pope John Paul II has spoken against liberation theology, but it is quite influential in both Catholic and Protestant circles.

Another recent development is process theology. Drawing from modern scientific theory, it says that all reality, including God, is in a state of flux, a state of becoming, or a state of evolution. Even God is changing, progressing, and "becoming" something that He is not. He does not know the future because it does not yet exist and has not yet been determined.

Wolfhart Pannenberg (born 1928) of Germany is characterized by a theology of history. He reacted against Barth and Bultmann in stating that God's revelation comes within human history rather than outside it. It is necessary to study Jesus historically instead of simply accepting the Christ of faith. In particular, we should acknowledge the resurrection of Jesus as a historical event.

Jürgen Moltmann (born 1926) of Germany is characterized by a theology of hope. In contrast to Neo-Orthodoxy and secular theology, Moltmann embraced eschatology (the doctrine of the last things) and anticipated that the future will bring theological answers. He

emphasized that faith must be socially relevant, applying faith to the problems of modern society. He also taught a social doctrine of the trinity, stressing the supposed threeness of God and making this concept the foundation of human relationships.

In Africa, some have formulated a distinctively African theology, blending elements of traditional African religion with Christianity. There are many indige-

nous Christian or quasi-Christian organizations. They run the gamut in religious beliefs from conservative Christian to almost totally African. Some of these groups are Pentecostal in character, encouraging moves of the Spirit, spiritual gifts, and demonstrative worship. At the same time, many include practices and concepts from tribal religions, such as ancestor worship, animism, sacrifices, and polygamy.

Feminist theology has developed as a means of proclaiming the equality of men and women. In its mildest form, it seeks to make the language of worship inclusive rather than masculine. Many feminist theologians seek to eliminate all references to God as masculine, or at least balance them with references to God as feminine. For example, prayers may be addressed to "our heavenly Parent" or "our heavenly Father and Mother." Jesus may be called "the Child of God." Some seek to make these changes in the Bible and in official liturgy. For instance, in 1999 the Methodists in England included the first prayer to "God the Mother" in their new worship book.209

Radical feminists worship the "Goddess" or "Sophia" (Greek for "wisdom"). They draw inspiration from the pagan worship of female deities. They celebrate female sexuality and endorse lesbianism.

As an example, a feminist church in San Francisco called Weave of Faith, "a Christian feminist worshipping community," described its worship as follows:210

While our rituals may borrow from women's spirituality and non-christian religions, the divinity which we worship is grounded in the judeo-christian tradition, more often than not with feminine names and

attributes which are biblically based. Our liturgies try to provide a model for using inclusive language. Also, we are committed to providing a safe environment for

theological exploration and open spiritual experience: there are no "heresies" in our worshipping community. We are all exploring greater understanding of the divine and our relationship to the world, each other, ourselves, and that which is greater than ourselves (who can be called She, He, It or Them): whatever provides a meaningful connection.

The twentieth century also saw the rise of the ecumenical movement, the attempt to unite various branches of Christendom in fellowship and ultimately in organization. The worldwide movement began with the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910. The foremost example of ecumenism today is the World Council of Churches (1948), which we discuss in the next section. The sister organization in the United States is the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (NCCC). The NCCC is the successor to the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, founded in 1908.

In addition, there are other significant examples of ecumenism that we will discuss in subsequent chapters, including the National Association of Evangelicals, Catholic-Protestant dialogue, the Pentecostal/Charismatic Churches of North America, and the Charismatic movement itself.

The World Council of Churches

The World Council of Churches (WCC) is a "fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as

190

A History of Christian Doctrine

God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit."211 Most Protestant and Orthodox churches have joined it, but the Roman Catholic Church, most Evangelical churches, and most Pentecostal churches have not. From the beginning, the leadership and the agenda have been dominated by liberal theology of one sort or another. It was too liberal for Karl Barth, who addressed the opening conference and sharply criticized it for departing from essentials of the Christian faith.

Christianity Today, the leading Evangelical Christian magazine, offered the following critique of the WCC in 1984:212

The gospel soon became lost in all sorts of political and social causes with which the World Council identified. . . . From 1960 through 1980, this seemed

to be the permanent direction of the council. Most troubling to biblically oriented evangelicals were the following: (1) The deity of Christ was left undefined, though the council's constitution gave it lip service. Vastly differing views on the person and work of Christ flourished equally within the leadership of the council. (2) The New Testament gospel became lost—the gospel that Jesus Christ, the divine Savior and Lord, became incarnate, died on the cross and rose again bodily from the dead to redeem mankind from sin through personal faith in himself. (3) The Bible was an honored book from which proof texts were selected when they supported views considered relevant on other grounds, but no attempt

191

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

was made to deal seriously with scriptural teaching. (4) Universalism—the view that all will be saved regardless of faith, religion, or moral condition, became standard doctrine. (5) World history was interpreted in Marxist terms, superficially glossed with traditional Christian vocabulary. (6) Left-wing offenses against human rights and human freedom were seldom noted, and rarely rebuked. By contrast, right-wing oppression was made a cause célèbre; and the council actively opposed efforts to further human rights and political democracy in the Marxist countries.

In 1984, at its sixth assembly at Vancouver, the WCC attempted to woo Evangelicals. Christianity Today reassessed the council at that time and concluded that its theology still fell far short of biblical truth in five major areas:213

1. Its equivocal stand on the deity of Christ. . . .

2. Its failure to diagnose the predicament of mankind [human sinfulness]. . . .

3. Its wrong diagnosis surely leads to a wrong remedy. . . . In the WCC study volume prepared for the Vancouver assembly, John Paulton lists as one unlikely option, that "only those calling upon Jesus as their personal savior, can be saved.". . .

4. Its almost exclusive concern for the horizontal dimension of salvation . . . communal salvation, one that leads to a new humanity and a restoration of society rather than to personal faith in Jesus Christ, a right relationship to God, and the new birth. . . .

5. Its religious pluralism. . . . Its official preassembly study guide [said], "In the end the great communities of faith will not have disappeared. None will have 'won' over the other. Jews will still be Jews; Muslims still Muslims; and those of the great Eastern faiths, still Buddhists or Hindus or Taoists. Africa will still witness to its traditional life view; China to its inheritance. People will still come from the east and the west, the north and the south, and sit down in the Kingdom of God without having first become 'Christians' like us.". . . [A] stern warning [was] presented by World Council official D. C. Mulder against evangelizing because it imposed an obstacle to dialogue with other religions.

Moreover, the World Council study guide on the Bible stated:214

There are diverse literary traditions in the biblical writings. . . . Some of these traditions may be contradictory. The church is in dialogue with Scripture, but has been fed from many sources, in the light of which, biblical statements may have to be declared inadequate, or erroneous. . . . We are not to regard the Bible primarily as a standard to which we must conform in all the questions arising in our life.

In 1998, the WCC held its eighth assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe. It faced considerable dissent from Orthodox bodies, which make up about 30 percent of the membership and are concerned about the increasingly liberal drift of the organization. Christianity Today reported, "Both Orthodox and

mainline evangelicals generally are unhappy with the liberal Protestant ethos they say dominates WCC debate on issues such as feminism, inclusive language in Bible translation, same-sex unions, ordination of homosexuals, abortion, environmentalism, and population control."215

Interestingly, the WCC has discussed water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Its study of water baptism advocated the traditional trinitarian formula. In response, two member organizations—both in areas where the United Pentecostal Church International has large national churches—asked that the WCC recognize the validity of the Jesus Name formula. The Church of

North India stated:216

In view of the fact that there is strong biblical evidence for baptism performed/received in the name of Jesus/Jesus Christ as well as the fact that certain Christian denominations still baptize in the name of Jesus (which is more personal and evocative of discipleship than the metaphysical Trinitarian formula) the churches should be urged to recognize as valid baptisms in the name of Jesus.

The National Council of Churches in the Philippines made a similar proposal:217

There are churches which are using the Trinitarian formula as found in Matthew 28:19. . . . Most of the member churches of NCCP are using this formula. There are those who use 'in the name of Jesus' only. Both practices have scriptural support. Among the NCCP member churches the issue of baptismal

194

A History of Christian Doctrine

validity is not very intense at this very point. Other sectarian groups would consider this point very vital to the question of baptism's validity.

As of 1999, the WCC consisted of 339 Protestant and Orthodox organizations, with a total constituency of about 500 million, or 25 percent of the almost 2 billion professing Christians worldwide. The remainder are mostly Roman Catholics and Pentecostals.218 The NCCC had 35 denominations with 52 million constituents.219

Liberal Trends

By century's end, liberal ideas about the infallibility of the Bible and other essential doctrines dominated most mainline Protestant denominations, including the Presbyterians and Reformed, Lutherans, Methodists, United Church of Christ, Episcopalians, Anglicans, United Church of Canada, and some Baptists. In the United States, the two major exceptions are the Southern Baptist Convention and the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. There are some conservative organizations in the denominational groupings we have mentioned, and even in the liberal organizations there are significant conservative minorities.

A survey of 10,000 Protestant ministers by sociologist Jeffrey Hadden indicated the extent of liberal thinking among mainline Protestant clergy in 1982. He obtained the following results from 7,441 who responded:220

Jesus born of a virgin?

60% of Methodists said no
49% of Presbyterians said no
195
Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy
44% of Episcopalians said no
19% of American Lutherans said no
Bible—inspired Word of God? [infallibility of
Scripture]
82% of Methodists said no
81% of Presbyterians said no
89% of Episcopalians said no
57% of American Lutherans said no
Existence of Satan [as a personal being]?
62% of Methodists said no
47% of Presbyterians said no
37% of Episcopalians said no
33% of Baptists said no
14% of American Lutherans said no
Physical resurrection of Jesus?
51% of Methodists said no
35% of Presbyterians said no
30% of Episcopalians said no
33% of Baptists said no
13% of American Lutherans said no
A notable example of liberal thinking in the mainline
denominations is the increasing acceptance of extramarital
sex and homosexual activity as compatible with
Christianity, even though the Bible clearly teaches otherwise.
(See Leviticus 18:22; Romans 1:26-27; I Corinthians
6:9-11.)
In 1988, the Newark (New Jersey) Episcopal Diocese
voted to receive a fifteen-page report entitled "Changing
196
A History of Christian Doctrine
Patterns of Sexuality in Family Life." The report stated: "It
is our conclusion that by suppressing our sexuality and by
condemning all sex which occurs outside of traditional
marriage, the church has thereby obstructed a vitally
important means for persons to know and celebrate their
relatedness to God." The presiding bishop of the
Episcopal Church, Edmund Lee Browning, praised the
Newark Diocese for being "at the cutting edge" of church
issues, although he did not officially endorse the report.221
In 1989, John Spong, bishop of the Newark Episcopal
Diocese, ordained J. Robert Williams, a confessed practicing
homosexual, as a priest. At the time, Williams had

lived with a male companion for four years. Spong said, "We need to be honest. We have gay priests in every diocese." 222 Six weeks after his ordination, Williams stated publicly, "Monogamy is as unnatural as celibacy. It is crazy to hold up this ideal." He also advised the famous Roman Catholic nun Mother Teresa to get a lover and thereby improve herself.223

In 1988, the United Church of Canada, that country's largest Protestant denomination, agreed to allow the ordination of practicing homosexuals. It affirmed the right of church membership "regardless of sexual orientation" and the right of all church members to "be considered eligible" for ordination.224

In 1989, in a poll of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 50 percent of the pastors and 56 percent of the specialized clergy said the Bible teaches that it is possible to be a Christian and engage in homosexual activities.225

In 1998 and 1999, controversy erupted in the United Methodist Church, as some ministers performed "marriage" and "blessing" ceremonies for homosexuals. On

197

Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

January 16, 1999, 95 United Methodists "blessed" a lesbian couple before 1,500 people in Sacramento, California. The two lesbians were lay leaders who had lived together for fifteen years.226

Summary

Two significant trends characterized mainline Protestantism in the twentieth century. First, it became predominantly and increasingly liberal in theology and ethics. That is, the majority of denominational leaders, clergy, and laity no longer accepted some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, such as the infallibility of the Bible, the miracles of the Bible, the virgin birth of Jesus, the true deity of Jesus, the substitutionary atoning work of Jesus for our salvation, the physical resurrection of Jesus, and the second coming of Jesus to earth.

Second, church membership in these denominations declined significantly over the century. For instance, from 1965 to 1989, the United Church of Christ decreased by 20 percent, the Presbyterian Church by 25 percent, the Episcopal Church by 28 percent, the United Methodist Church by 18 percent, and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) by 43 percent.227 Increasing numbers of people with Protestant backgrounds no longer attended church or identified with Christianity but

became secularists. In addition, the loss in the mainline denominations translated into moderate gains for Evangelical churches and significant gains for new religious movements (such as Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses), the Pentecostal movement, and the Charismatic movement.

A History of Christian Doctrine

In the early twentieth century, conservative Protestants began to rally against Liberalism (Modernism) and its higher criticism of the Bible. They defended a traditional understanding of the Bible and affirmed fundamental doctrines that Christians of all branches had held over the centuries. They also stood against Darwinian evolution and Marxist socialism.

The Fundamentalists

From 1910 to 1915 prominent conservative Protestant scholars wrote a series of twelve pamphlets called The Fundamentals, which defended key doctrines that were under attack. The result was a new movement called Fundamentalism. Of course, the basic doctrines

were not new, but the movement itself was.

The editors of The Fundamentals were A. C. Dixon and R. A. Torrey. The authors included Benjamin B. Warfield, H. G. Moule, James Orr, Charles Erdman, and others. They came from the United States and the United Kingdom and from many denominations.

For a number of years, the Fundamentalists and the Modernists struggled for control of the major Protestant denominations and seminaries. Eventually Liberal and Neo-Orthodox views won the day. As a result, many Fundamentalists left their denominations and institutions and formed their own. For example, John Gresham Machen, a Presbyterian professor, left Princeton Theological Seminary and founded Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. He was also instrumental in founding what became known as the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (1936). Other Fundamentalist organizations that came into existence were the Independent Fundamental Churches of America (1930), the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (1932), the Bible Presbyterian Church (1938), and the Conservative

Baptist Association of America (1947).

These denominations have remained small. In addition to them, there are many independent Fundamentalist churches, including the independent Bible churches and Baptist churches. The largest defender of Fundamentalist doctrine became the Southern Baptist Convention, one of the few major groups to maintain its conservative theological identity.

The first attempt at forming an association of Fundamentalists was the World's Christian Fundamentals Association (1919). In 1941, Carl McIntire, a fiery radio

200

A History of Christian Doctrine

preacher, organized the American Council of Christian Churches (ACCC). In 1948, the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC) came into being as a counterweight to the World Council of Churches. Today, the ACCC supports another international organization instead of the ICCC—the World Council of Biblical Churches.

The ACCC is the largest association of historic Fundamentalism today, but it is relatively small. In 1987, its member organizations claimed a total constituency of only 1.5 million, compared to 40 million for the National Council of the Churches of Christ and 5 million for the National Association of Evangelicals.228

In 1925, the Fundamentalists received national notoriety as a result of the so-called Scopes Monkey Trial. Tennessee had recently passed a law forbidding the teaching of evolution in the public schools. John Scopes, a high school biology teacher in Dayton, was put on trial for violating this law. Scopes was convicted by a jury, but the real significance of the trial was in the debate between two of the most prominent lawyers in America and the resulting press coverage.

William Jennings Bryan, a three-time Democratic presidential candidate, aided the prosecution and upheld the biblical account of creation. Clarence Darrow, a famous criminal defense attorney, represented Scopes. In an unusual maneuver, Darrow was allowed to call Bryan as a witness for the defense and subjected him to harsh attacks and ridicule. By asking questions on science and biblical interpretation that required expert knowledge, he was able to make Bryan look somewhat foolish, and he called the proponents of creationism "bigots and ignoramuses." The national press painted a distorted picture of

201

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism
Bryan and his allies as fools, calling them "peasants, yokels, morons, hillbillies." Of course, Darrow and his allies were depicted as educated and enlightened.229 The Scopes Trial gave Fundamentalists an undeserved national reputation for being ignorant, anti-intellectual, anti-science, and anti-education. This negative impression exists to this day, and the media still show heavy bias in this regard.

Unfortunately, too many Fundamentalists reacted to this type of ridicule by becoming defensive and antagonistic. As a result, they helped perpetuate the stereotype. In addition to the organizations we have mentioned, prominent institutions that used the Fundamentalist label over the years include Bob Jones University, Moody Bible Institute, and Dallas Theological Seminary. A popular Fundamentalist evangelist was Billy Sunday (1863-1935), a former professional baseball player and a Presbyterian minister. Leading Fundamentalist writers and media personalities today include Jerry Falwell, Tim La Haye, and Hal Lindsey.

Key Doctrines of Fundamentalism

In opposition to Liberalism, Fundamentalism emphasized five major doctrines:

1. The verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. As we have seen, Liberalism was really an attack on the authority of Scripture. In response, the Fundamentalists affirmed the divine inspiration and infallibility of the Bible. This doctrine became the basis for all the others, for they are derived from a straightforward interpretation of Scripture.

"Verbal" means pertaining to words. By "verbal inspi-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ration," the Fundamentalists did not mean that Scripture was verbally dictated, but that every word of the Bible was inspired of God and therefore true. Not only are the thoughts and themes of Scripture inspired, but so is the choice of words.

Verbal inspiration means that the Bible is infallible (incapable of error or mistake) and inerrant (without error). Every word is true. While a scribe, translator, or printer could make an error in transmitting a particular text, the original writings were given by inspiration of God and thus were completely true. Consequently, the Fundamentalists rejected any higher criticism that would

attribute errors to the original text of Scripture.230 (A few Fundamentalists, such as James Orr, were willing to concede that there could be factual errors on matters such as geography, but no theological errors.)

Perhaps the strongest, clearest exponent of the verbal inspiration of Scripture at this time was Benjamin Warfield (1851-1921). He was a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, which in the nineteenth century and early twentieth was a bastion of conservative Reformed theology. The Princeton theologians of that era, including Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, Warfield, and Machen, were noted for their exposition and defense of the inerrancy of the Bible.

2. The deity and virgin birth of Jesus. Jesus is not merely a man, but He is truly God manifested in the flesh. Moreover, as a human He was conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary by a miracle of God's Spirit. (Some Fundamentalists listed the deity of Christ as the essential element, some listed the virgin birth, and some listed both. All affirmed both teachings.)

203

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

3. The substitutionary atonement. Jesus Christ died for the sins of the human race, paying the penalty for our sins so that we might be saved through Him. Thus the only means of salvation is by grace through faith based on the atoning sacrifice of Jesus.

4. The physical resurrection of Jesus. Jesus arose from the grave with a glorified human body, and He lives forever.

5. The bodily return of Jesus to earth. Jesus is physically coming back to earth again in fulfillment of biblical prophecy. (Some Fundamentalists identified the fifth essential as the historicity of biblical miracles, which all Fundamentalists agreed upon as a consequence of the inerrancy of Scripture.)

Of course, these five doctrines were not the only ones that the Fundamentalists espoused, nor were they the only doctrines addressed in The Fundamentals. These five, however, were the essential doctrines that characterized the movement as a whole. These were the major points of controversy with Liberalism, which denied each of them. Most Fundamentalists also espoused premillennialism, meaning the Second Coming will take place before the Millennium. Christ will return to earth and then establish a kingdom on earth for a thousand years, after which

will come the last judgment. (See Revelation 20.) The
alternative proposed by more liberal-minded theologians
was either postmillennialism or amillennialism. Postmillennialism
says the church will establish the Millennium
first, and after a thousand years of peace Christ will
return. Amillennialism says there will be no literal kingdom
for a thousand years; the prophecy of Revelation 20
simply refers to the rule of God in our hearts.

204

A History of Christian Doctrine

As time went on, most Fundamentalists also accepted
the doctrine of dispensationalism. This system of interpreting
the Bible makes a strong distinction between
Israel and the church. Consequently, the nation of Israel
will yet receive the fulfillment of promises that God made
to them in the Old Testament which have not yet been fulfilled;
the promises are not simply fulfilled in the church.
Dispensationalists identify different ages, called dispensations,
in which God worked with people in distinct
ways. Most dispensational schemes identify seven such
ages. An important part of dispensationalism is the doctrine
of the secret, pretribulation Rapture.

John Nelson Darby (1800-1882), leader of the
Plymouth Brethren (a Separatist group in England), systematized
dispensationalism and became its most prominent
advocate. He was the first to teach clearly that Christ's
second coming will occur in two phases: (1) Before the
Tribulation, He will come in the air to catch away the
saints. (2) After the Tribulation, He will come to the earth
with His saints to rescue Israel at the close of the Battle of
Armageddon and to establish His millennial kingdom.

Dispensationalism was made popular among
Fundamentalists in America by Cyrus I. Scofield (1843-
1921). He taught the doctrine in the notes to the Scofield
Reference Bible, which he published in 1909.

On matters of lifestyle, the early Fundamentalists
were quite conservative. They advocated strict morality,
modesty of dress, and abstention from smoking, drinking,
dancing, gambling, attending movies, and worldly
amusements. Unlike the Holiness movement, however,
most of them did not take an absolute stand against the
wearing of jewelry or (when it became popular) makeup.

205

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

When it became common in society for women to cut
their hair and wear pants, many Fundamentalist were initially

opposed to these practices, but most eventually
accepted them. Some of them, notably independent
Baptists, maintained their opposition, however.
Prominent examples were independent Baptists John R.
Rice and Jack Hyles.

We clearly see Fundamentalism's major doctrinal
themes and separatist stance in the ACCC's official characterization
of itself:231

Among the fundamental doctrines of the Faith are:
the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture; the deity of
Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, substitutionary blood
atonement, His literal bodily resurrection and His
Second Coming "in power and great glory." We as
Fundamentalists also affirm that the Bible teaches
separation from unbelievers and erring brethren. . . .
We need to stand together to expose Liberalism,
New Evangelicalism, the Charismatic movement, and
compromise in all areas of life and ministry. . . .
No church or individual can be a part of the ACCC
and at the same time be connected in any way with
the National Council of Churches (NCC) with its liberal
theology, ecumenical apostasy, and leftist sociopolitical
agenda. Neither can one be a part of the
ACCC and be associated with the National Association
of Evangelicals (NAE), which is noted for its compromise,
confusion and inclusion of Charismatics.

The ACCC has adopted the following doctrinal statement:
232

206

A History of Christian Doctrine

Among other equally biblical truths, we believe and
maintain the following:

a. The plenary [full] divine inspiration of the
Scriptures in the original languages, their consequent
inerrancy and infallibility, and, as the Word
of God, the supreme and final authority in faith and
life;

b. The Triune God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit;

c. The essential, absolute, eternal deity, and the real
and proper, but sinless, humanity of our Lord Jesus
Christ;

d. His birth of the Virgin Mary;

e. His substitutionary, expiatory death, in that He
gave His life "a ransom for many";

f. His resurrection from among the dead in the same
body in which He was crucified, and the second

coming of this same Jesus in power and great glory;
g. The total depravity of man through the fall;
h. Salvation the effect of regeneration by the Spirit and
the Word not by works but by grace through faith;
i. The everlasting bliss of the saved, and the everlasting
suffering of the lost;
j. The real spiritual unity in Christ of all redeemed by
His precious blood;
k. The necessity of maintaining, according to the
Word of God, the purity of the Church in doctrine
and life.

Fundamentalists and Pentecostals

As we saw in chapter 5, early leaders in the
Assemblies of God described themselves as Fundamentalists
who spoke in tongues. Actually, however, the

207

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

Pentecostal movement and the Fundamentalist movement
are quite distinct. Historically, the former began in 1901,
while the latter began in 1910, among two entirely different
groups of people. The Pentecostals arose primarily
from the edges of the Holiness movement, and they developed
their own organizations in the first two decades of
the century. The Fundamentalists arose primarily among
Presbyterians, Baptists, and other large Protestant bodies.
They fought for control of their denominations for
years and did not form their own organizations until the
1930s.

More importantly, as a matter of theology, the early
Fundamentalists flatly rejected the Pentecostal movement.
They typically said that speaking in tongues is of
the devil, or at best a psychologically induced phenomenon.
The reaction of the two editors of The Fundamentals
is a good example. A. C. Dixon discussed the baptism of
the Holy Ghost with William Durham but rejected the
doctrine as an indictment against Christianity. He said the
Pentecostal movement was "wicked and adulterous."233
In his 1895 book The Baptism with the Holy Ghost,
R. A. Torrey had promoted the Keswick concept of the
baptism of the Holy Ghost as an endowment of power. He
had even speculated that tongues could be the initial sign
but ultimately rejected this idea:234
In my early study of the Baptism with the Holy
Spirit, I noticed that in many instances those who
were so baptized "spoke with tongues," and the question
came often into my mind: if one is baptized with

the Holy Spirit will he not speak with tongues? But I

saw no one so speaking, and I often wondered, is
there anyone today who actually is baptized with the
Holy Spirit. This 12th chapter of 1st Corinthians
cleared me up on that, especially when I found Paul
asking of those who had been baptized with the Holy
Spirit: "Do all speak with tongues?"

When the Pentecostal movement came, Torrey rejected
it out of hand. He asserted, "God withdrew the gift of
tongues from the church back in the beginning of the
Church Age, and there is no good reason to say that He
ever restored it." He also said that the Pentecostal movement
"was emphatically not of God and founded by a
sodomite."235

Fundamentalists typically held that miracles ceased
with the completion of the New Testament. Warfield
argued against tongues on that basis. They also used
dispensationalism
to maintain that God no longer deals with
His people through visible miracles, signs, and wonders.

In 1928, the World's Christian Fundamentalist
Association officially rejected speaking in tongues and
miraculous healing ministries. When it was formed in
1941, the American Council of Christian Churches specifically
excluded Pentecostals and those who had fellowship
with Pentecostals. In the 1980s, Jerry Falwell suggested
that speaking in tongues results from eating too much
pizza the night before and getting indigestion.

Thus it is a misnomer to speak of Pentecostals as
Fundamentalists. Of course, Pentecostals have historically
affirmed the five essential points of Fundamentalism
that we have presented—the verbal inspiration and
inerrancy of Scripture, the deity and virgin birth of Jesus,

the substitutionary atonement, the physical resurrection
of Jesus, and the bodily return of Jesus to earth. The overall
approach to theology and spiritual experience is considerably
different, however, as the Fundamentalists have
been quick to point out.

Clearly, then, Pentecostals should not uncritically
adopt the Fundamentalist approach to theology, although
they have sometimes done so. For example, the second
generation of Pentecostal teachers often embraced dispensationalism

uncritically. But while this system does
offer helpful insights, it has to be modified significantly to
be compatible with Pentecostal belief and practice.236
Even professed Pentecostal dispensationalists have often
contradicted the theological system—for instance, speaking
of the church as "spiritual Israel"—or otherwise modified
it.237
Pentecostals are not simply Fundamentalists who
speak in tongues. Their respect for the inspiration, infallibility,
and authority of the Bible is just as great, and so
is their commitment to the fundamental doctrines relating
to the identity and work of Jesus Christ in human history.
They are quite different, however, in their personal experience
with God, understanding of the work of the Holy
Spirit, concept of holiness, and interpretation of the New
Testament.
While Fundamentalists affirm miracles in the Bible,
they reject miracles today. They deny that the church in
the Book of Acts is the role model for us to follow. They
say that instructions in the Epistles relative to divine healing,
spiritual gifts, and spiritual ministry are no longer
applicable. Morever, dispensationalists minimize the ethical
teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, considering
210
A History of Christian Doctrine
them to be legalistic instructions for the Jews in preparation
for their earthly kingdom. Although Fundamentalism's
reason for existence is to champion the
inspiration and authority of the Bible, in effect it renders
large portions of the Bible irrelevant to the church today.
Historically, the Fundamentalists were quite conservative
politically, while many early Pentecostals warned
both of the dangers of socialism and unbridled capitalism.
Fundamentalists typically supported military action by
the government, while most early Pentecostals were pacifists.
The Fundamentalist movement mainly attracted
whites, while the Pentecostals were racially diverse. Of
course, both groups have always been conservative
morally.
The difference between Fundamentalists and Oneness
Pentecostals is particularly great. Fundamentalists reject
any modification of the doctrine of the trinity or any idea
that the experience of salvation could involve more than
a verbal confession of faith. Most of them also advocate
unconditional eternal security.
The Evangelicals

By the 1940s some conservatives were dissatisfied with the label "Fundamentalist" because of the negative connotations in society and the adversarial position of many Fundamentalists toward other churches. They wanted to affirm the basic doctrines of Fundamentalism and historic Protestantism, but they wanted a more positive identity, a less strident tone, a more conciliatory approach toward others, and a greater appreciation for culture, education, scholarship, and science. That desire led to the Evangelical movement. In essence, the

211

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

Evangelicals are the moderate heirs of the Fundamentalists. The word evangelical comes from the Greek word for "gospel," and historically it has been synonymous with Protestantism. Even today, in continental Europe and in Latin America the term generally refers to all Protestants. In the twentieth century it came to be associated with a definite, identifiable conversion experience—accepting Jesus as one's personal Savior or making a decision for Christ—coupled with efforts to spread the gospel to others. In our context, it denotes "the movement in modern Christianity, transcending denominational and confessional boundaries, that emphasizes conformity to the basic tenets of the faith and a missionary outreach of compassion and urgency."238

The modern Evangelical movement became a recognizable force in 1942 in the U.S. with the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). The three major leaders who spearheaded the development of the NAE were J. Elwin Wright, Harold Ockenga, and Carl F. H. Henry. A subsidiary, the National Religious Broadcasters (NRB), was formed in 1944.

The NAE was an alternative to the ACCC that was less sectarian and more inclusive. Notably, the ACCC excluded all Pentecostals, while Trinitarian Pentecostals participated in the formation of the NAE.

In 1987, the NAE had a membership in its constituent churches of 5 million, 60 percent of whom were Pentecostals. In 1999, the NAE consisted of 49 denominations, individual congregations from 27 other denominations, several hundred independent churches, and 250 parachurch ministries and educational institutions. These

212

A History of Christian Doctrine

groups ministered "directly or indirectly" to 27 million

people.239 Actual constituency of NAE denominations was about 6 million. The total number of churches was about 43,000.240

The ten largest denominations in the NAE are, in order, the Assemblies of God, the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), the Church of the Nazarene, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, the Presbyterian Church in America, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, the Baptist General Conference, the International Pentecostal Holiness Church, the Wesleyan Church, and the Conservative Congregational Christian Churches. Four of these groups are Pentecostal (AG, CG, ICFG, IPHC), three are Holiness churches (Nazarenes, CMA, Wesleyans), and three emerged from the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy in mainline Protestantism (Presbyterians, Baptists, and Congregationalists). The Southern Baptist Convention is not a member of the NAE, although it is the largest Evangelical denomination. (Indeed, it is larger than all NAE denominations combined.) There are also no black or Hispanic groups in the NAE. Oneness Pentecostals are excluded by the NAE's doctrinal statement, although a Oneness organization— the Bible Way Church—was able to join the NRB.

The Evangelical movement began to grow rapidly after World War II, first in America and then in other parts of the world. The person who did more than any other in this regard, and who is most associated with the term "Evangelical," was Billy Graham (born 1918), a Southern Baptist evangelist. Graham's ministry drew national attention beginning with a crusade in Los Angeles in

213

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

1949. Since then, he has conducted numerous evangelistic crusades around the world, and they have resulted in more than two million decisions for Christ. In the early 1970s, one million people attended a Sunday crusade service in Seoul, Korea. Graham has been a friend of a number of U.S. presidents.

In 1956, Graham founded Christianity Today magazine. Now independent of him, it has become the leading Evangelical periodical. Graham was also instrumental in calling the World Congress on Evangelism (Berlin, 1966), the International Congress on World Evangelization (Lausanne, 1974), and two International Conferences of Itinerant Evangelists (1983 and 1986).

Graham epitomized the new Evangelicalism in contrast

to the old Fundamentalism. He was one of the first speakers to insist on racial integration of his crusades. Moreover, in planning a crusade in a city, he enlisted help from people of all denominations in the area, including Roman Catholics. As a result, he came under fire from Fundamentalists for compromise.

Well-known Evangelical educational institutions include Wheaton College, Fuller Theological Seminary, and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. Evangelical institutions in the Pentecostal/Charismatic tradition are Evangel University (Assemblies of God), Lee University (Church of God), Regent University, and Oral Roberts University.

There are many other Evangelical institutions and parachurch organizations. One of those at the cutting edge of evangelizing unreached peoples is Wycliffe Bible Translators (1934).

Well-known scholars and authors of the Evangelical

214

A History of Christian Doctrine

movement include F. F. Bruce, Carl F. H. Henry, George Eldon Ladd, Harold Lindsell, James I. Packer, Bernard Ramm, and John R. W. Stott.

In a class by himself is C. S. Lewis (1898-1963). Although he was not strictly an Evangelical—he did not uphold the infallibility of Scripture, for example—he is one of the most widely read and beloved authors among Evangelicals. A classics scholar and Christian apologist, Lewis was born in Northern Ireland. He converted to Christianity in 1931 while a professor at Oxford, and he later taught at Cambridge. Lewis wrote lucid, logical defenses of classic Christian positions for a lay audience. His seven-volume Chronicles of Narnia is an outstanding work of children's literature that incorporates important theological concepts.

In the latter part of the twentieth century, some Evangelical churches grew rapidly by structuring their services in a contemporary, nontraditional format specifically for the unchurched. This "seeker sensitive" approach was pioneered by Pastor Bill Hybels and Willow Creek Community Church in suburban Chicago, where the weekly attendance grew to 14,000.

Exemplifying the growth of Evangelicalism, in 1970 the Southern Baptist Convention surpassed the United Methodist Church to become the largest Protestant denomination in the United States. It now reports over

40,000 churches in the U.S. with a constituency of 15 million.
In 1976, a Southern Baptist was elected as president—
Jimmy Carter—and he popularized the term "born
again." In 1992 and 1996 Southern Baptists were elected
as president and vice president—Bill Clinton and Al
Gore—although their political, social, and moral views

were more liberal than those of most Southern Baptists.
There are also many Evangelicals within the mainline
denominations, especially in the southern U.S. Moreover,
in Third World countries, Protestants tend to be more conservative
than in the West.

Key Doctrines of Evangelicalism

Evangelicals affirm the basic theology of historic
Protestantism. In opposition to Liberalism, they affirm
the same doctrines as the Fundamentalists, although they
usually express them more moderately. As an example,
Fundamentalists officially state that the Bible is
"inerrant," while Evangelicals typically state that it is
"infallible." The dictionary meaning of both words is
essentially the same, and most Evangelicals would also
affirm that the Bible is "inerrant." The term "infallible" is
a little less absolute, however. It allows for the view of
some Evangelicals that the Bible could have minor errors
of history and geography while still being absolutely
trustworthy and authoritative in matters of doctrine and
Christian living.

Evangelicals are also much more open to the miraculous
work of the Holy Spirit, whereas the Fundamentalists
are not. Among Evangelicals who are not part of the
Pentecostal/Charismatic movement, there is often an
acknowledgment that miracles, including speaking in
tongues and divine healing, can still take place today,
even if they are not regarded as the norm or the paradigm.
The Southern Baptists and the Holiness groups (such
as Nazarenes and Wesleyans) are still overwhelmingly
opposed to speaking in tongues. Consequently, the

Charismatic movement among them is still small in comparison
to that in mainline denominations. Ironically,
then, Trinitarian Pentecostals are closely aligned with
some groups that discourage speaking in tongues but in
theological opposition to other groups that are open to
speaking in tongues.

The NAE Statement of Faith is as follows:241
1. We believe the Bible to be the inspired, the
only infallible, authoritative Word of God.
2. We believe that there is one God, eternally
existent in three persons: Father, Son and Holy
Spirit.
3. We believe in the deity of our Lord Jesus
Christ, in His virgin birth, in His sinless life, in
His miracles, in His vicarious and atoning
death through His shed blood, in His bodily
resurrection, in His ascension to the right hand
of the Father, and in His personal return in
power and glory.
4. We believe that for the salvation of lost and sinful
people, regeneration by the Holy Spirit is
absolutely essential.
5. We believe in the present ministry of the Holy
Spirit by whose indwelling the Christian is
enabled to live a godly life.
6. We believe in the resurrection of both the
saved and the lost; they that are saved unto the
resurrection of life and they that are lost unto
the resurrection of damnation.
7. We believe in the spiritual unity of believers in
our Lord Jesus Christ.
217
Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism
Interestingly, the statement does not explicitly affirm
salvation by grace through faith. Nor does it issue an
explicit call to evangelism. Apparently, the framers were
still primarily concerned to establish conservative doctrine
against Liberalism.
While Evangelicals are confessional trinitarians, a
number of scholars who are considered authorities by the
Evangelical world have offered interpretations of the trinity
that are remarkably similar to the Oneness view. Frank
Stagg, a prominent Southern Baptist seminary professor,
essentially embraced the same view of the Godhead as
Oneness Pentecostals.242 Renowned Christological scholars
Oscar Cullmann and James D. G. Dunn have
described the Incarnation in the same way that Oneness
theologians do when distinguishing their belief from traditional
trinitarianism.243 Often, there seems to be little
difference from the Oneness view when Baptist ministers
preach, teach, pray, lead in worship, and explain the doctrine
of God in practical terms, as when former Southern

Baptist president W. A. Criswell stated that the only God
we will see in heaven is Jesus.244

Lordship Salvation

There is a dispute within Evangelicalism over the
meaning of faith and repentance. One side says that genuine
conversion includes more that a verbal confession
of faith; it also involves confession of sin, godly sorrow
for sin, and a decision to forsake sin. One must accept
Christ both as Savior and Lord in order to be truly converted.
This position gives full weight to the biblical definition
of repentance. Exponents of this view are A. W.
Tozer, John Stott, and John MacArthur. Christianity

A History of Christian Doctrine

Today described MacArthur's views as follows:245
MacArthur argued that most contemporary evangelical
teaching on salvation is rife with "easybelievism,"
which he says, is a doctrine that gives bare
intellectual assent to the redemptive work of Christ
while failing to call Christians to true repentance and
a life of obedience and goods works. . . . MacArthur
holds that the only correct biblical model of the salvation
experience is a doctrine known traditionally as
"lordship salvation." In essence, it holds that to be
saved a person "must trust Jesus Christ as Lord of his
life, submitting to His sovereign authority."
"Easy-believism" [has resulted in] a community of
professing believers populated by people who have
bought into a system that encourages shallow and
ineffectual faith. . . . [Many] sincerely believe they are
saved but are utterly barren of any verifying fruit in
their lives . . . [and in the judgment may be] stunned
to learn that they are not included in the kingdom.

In opposition to this view, many Evangelicals argue
that the only requirement for salvation is a simple decision
to accept Christ as Savior, even without any intention
of serving Him. One should also accept Him as Lord and
obey His Word, but this attitude is not a necessary part of
saving faith. Either repentance is synonymous with a profession
of faith, or else it is not required. Defenders of
this view include Charles Ryrie and Zane Hodges.
This view is influenced by a dispensationalist view of
repentance. Some argue that under the law (including the
ministry of John the Baptist), repentance did require a

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

decision to forsake sin, but under grace, repentance is stripped of this "works" requirement.

Charles Ryrie, a former professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, explained:246

Is repentance a condition for receiving eternal life? Yes, if it is . . . changing one's mind about Jesus Christ. No, if it means to be sorry for sin or even to resolve to turn from sin, for these things will not save. . . . Repentance may prepare the way for faith, but it is faith that saves, not repentance (unless repentance is understood as a synonym for faith or changing one's mind about Christ). . . . [A person is saved if he accepts Jesus as Savior] in spite of [an] area of initial unwillingness when he came to Christ and continued disobedience while he lived the Christian life.

Similarly, Zane Hodges, a professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, wrote:247

Faith alone (not repentance and faith) is the sole condition for justification and eternal life. . . . It is an extremely serious matter when the biblical distinction between faith and repentance is collapsed and when repentance is thus made a condition for eternal life. For under this perception of things the New Testament doctrine of faith is radically rewritten and held hostage to the demand for repentance. . . . Though genuine repentance may precede salvation . . . it need not do so. . . . There is no such thing as believing the saving message without possessing eternal life at the same time.

220
A History of Christian Doctrine

This doctrine flies in the face of Jesus, who said in Luke 13:3, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." (See also Acts 2:38; 3:17; 11:18; 17:30; 26:20.) Again, we see the contrast between the heirs of Fundamentalism and the Pentecostals, particularly the Oneness Pentecostals. Many of the former have reduced the concept of saving faith to intellectual acceptance, excluding an active appropriation of or obedience to the gospel. They discount the necessity of genuine repentance, of water baptism for the remission of sins, and of an actual experience of being baptized (immersed) with the Holy Spirit. Oneness Pentecostals, of course, emphasize all three as part of saving faith and full salvation.

Evangelicals Today

By 1920, it appeared that Liberalism was victorious

within Protestantism, and the Fundamentalists were fighting to stay alive. In the latter half of the twentieth century, however, the Evangelicals—the moderate heirs of the Fundamentalists—made a remarkable comeback. They grew significantly while the mainline Protestant denominations declined. They established their own colleges, universities, seminaries, publishing houses, magazines, social agencies, evangelistic associations, and other parachurch organizations. They produced biblical scholars and theologians who published first-rate works in defense of the faith. In short, the Evangelical movement has revitalized conservative Protestantism, has grown significantly, and now possesses everything it needs to perpetuate itself.

Liberal trends are developing within Evangelicalism, however. For example, some Evangelicals teach that ultimately God will save everyone, or at least that He will

221

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

save many people who never confess Christ but have sincere faith according to their traditional religion. Some Evangelical scholars have questioned the infallibility of Scripture and are using the tools of higher criticism in a way that is incompatible with a high view of inspiration. Some advocate the acceptance of homosexual behavior. These trends also affect Pentecostal scholars and institutions that identify with Evangelicalism.

A number of Evangelical leaders are concerned about a disturbing trend of accommodation to secular social mores. For example, in 1988, the Josh McDowell Ministry commissioned the Barna Research Group to survey sexual activity among youth who attend church regularly. The survey covered 1,500 young people aged twelve to eighteen in eight Evangelical denominations, including one Trinitarian Pentecostal denomination. Here are some of the findings:248

• 65% of churched youth have had some type of sexual contact by age 18.
• 43% have had sexual intercourse by age 18.
• 20% have participated in some sexual experimentation by age 13.
• 57% said they received at least some of their information about sex from the movies.

These figures are about 10 to 15 percentage points behind the results from secular youth surveys. Nevertheless, they are still disturbingly high. The influence of the movies is noteworthy since Evangelicals formerly

opposed movie attendance.

In 1989, the Christian Broadcasting Network com-

A History of Christian Doctrine

missioned the Gallup organization to survey college students. The survey included students from 100 U.S. colleges, and almost 99 percent of them were unmarried. Here are the results (in Christianity Today, 14 July 1989):

Percent . . . All Evangelicals
• who believe premarital sex is
wrong 24% 52%
• who have sex regularly or
occasionally 50% 28%
• who have had more than one
sex partner 50% 30%
• who believe abortion is wrong 37% 71%
• of women who have had
abortions 9% 4%
• of men with partners who have
had abortions 15% 6%

Again the negative results for Evangelicals are significantly lower than for the general population, but in absolute terms they are still quite high. Clearly, the secular society is having a significant impact upon Evangelical youth.

In 1990, the Barna Research Group conducted a survey of the general U.S. population to see how many people considered themselves to be "born again" (a simple indication of Evangelicalism) and how many had an Evangelical view of salvation. Here are the results:249

• 34% of American adults considered themselves
born again.
• 62% of the respondents said they had made a personal commitment to Jesus Christ, but about half

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

this number said they would reach heaven because of their good works or because everyone goes to heaven.
• 48% of church attendees considered themselves
born again.
• 58% of those holding church leadership positions
considered themselves born again.
• 15% of those holding church leadership positions
said they had never made a personal commitment
to Christ.

Evangelicals and Oneness Pentecostals

Trinitarian Pentecostals consider themselves to be Evangelicals even though the Pentecostals arose primarily from the Holiness movement while the Evangelical movement was a development from Fundamentalism, which rejected the Pentecostal movement. As we discussed in chapter 5, this self-identification has been a significant influence in changing Pentecostals. For better or worse, it appears that the "evangelicalization" of Trinitarian Pentecostals will continue.

What about Oneness Pentecostals? Are they Evangelicals? If we examine the distinctive doctrines that Evangelicals proclaim in contrast to Roman Catholicism and Protestant Liberalism, then Oneness Pentecostals would indeed appear to be Evangelicals. Some Evangelical cult-hunting organizations have argued that they are not, however, because of their distinctive doctrines of the Godhead and salvation, and therefore label them as a cult. Ironically, in making this claim, the cult hunters appeal to "historic orthodoxy" and the creeds, sounding more like Catholics than Protestants. J. L. Hall, editor in

224

A History of Christian Doctrine

chief of the UPCI, has examined their criteria in light of Scripture and has shown that on this basis the Oneness Pentecostals are more truly Evangelical than the mainstream Evangelicals.250

Oneness Pentecostals should resist the efforts of those who label them a cult. (See appendixes C and D.) First, it is a prejudicial label designed to thwart a sincere examination of Scripture. Second, as the Evangelical Dictionary of Theology notes, it plays into the hands of secularists who would curtail religious freedom for everyone. 251

At the same time, Oneness Pentecostals should be cognizant of their unique theological identity. They should resist "evangelicalization" but should affirm that in the light of Scripture they are indeed the most evangelical believers in the truest sense of the word. As the motto of the UPCI proclaims, they believe in proclaiming "the whole gospel to the whole world."

225

Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

The Roman Catholic Church entered the twentieth century with the basic views proclaimed by the Council of Trent (1545-63). It had faced liberal ideas in the nineteenth

century and resisted them firmly. In 1864 Pope
Pius IX had issued the Syllabus of Errors. In it he
defended tradition; rejected "modern liberalism" (rationalism
and historical criticism of the Bible); and
denounced the separation of church and state, freedom
for other religions, and public school education.
The nineteenth century also saw the official promulgation
of two important doctrines: the immaculate conception
of Mary, proclaimed by Pope Pius IX in 1854, and
the infallibility of the pope, proclaimed by the First
Vatican Council in 1870.
227
Roman Catholicism
and Eastern Orthodoxy
8
Despite the consolidation of papal power and the papal
rejection of liberal theology, rationalism and liberalism
began to affect the Roman Catholic Church. As with
Protestantism in the early twentieth century, it became
common for Catholic scholars to use modern critical methods
of studying the Bible. Their reinterpretations of the
Bible were not as devastating as those of the Protestants,
however, because as Catholics they affirmed the authority
of church tradition and the continuing work of the Holy
Spirit to lead the church into new doctrinal understandings.
Thus, even if they concluded that the Bible did not support
a certain doctrine, they could uphold it on the basis of postbiblical
tradition and progressive revelation.
For example, many Catholic theologians have
acknowledged that the Scriptures do not explicitly teach
the doctrine of the trinity. Nevertheless, they maintain
that the Holy Spirit progressively revealed it over the centuries
through church fathers, councils, and creeds. Some
have urged Protestants to accept other doctrines that
have developed over the centuries, such as the veneration
of Mary, on the same basis that they accept the trinity.
The Doctrine of Mary
The latest development of official Roman Catholic
doctrine came in 1950, when Pope Pius XII proclaimed
the bodily assumption of Mary. He taught that at the end
of her life Mary was taken up into heaven, body and
soul. While many Catholics had long believed this doctrine,
it did not become official church teaching until
1950. To date, this pronouncement is the only time that
a pope has officially invoked the doctrine of papal infallibility
since it was defined in 1870.

A History of Christian Doctrine

The pope did not specify whether Mary actually died before she was taken up into heaven, but most Catholic theologians believe that she did. There is a Roman Catholic church in Jerusalem that commemorates the place where she was supposedly laid to rest.

Pius XII's official pronouncement, Munifidentissimus Deus, states:252

The majestic mother of God . . . finally achieved,
as the supreme crown of her privileges, that she
should be preserved immune from the corruption of
the tomb and, like her Son before her, having conquered
death should be carried up, in body and soul,
to the celestial glory of heaven, there to reign as
Queen at the right hand of her Son, the immortal king
of the ages.

This doctrine is the latest in a series of steps that have elevated Mary almost to the status of a goddess. From the Middles Ages onward, Catholics have often called her Queen of Heaven and Mediatrix. In 1891, Pope Leo XIII stated that "nothing is bestowed on us except through Mary, as God himself wills. Therefore as no one can draw near to the supreme Father except through the Son, so also one can scarcely draw near to the Son except through his mother."253

The Second Vatican Council (1962-65) resisted efforts to further define and exalt Mary's position, but as the end of the century drew near, a movement arose to take yet another step in glorifying Mary. By 1997 the pope received petitions from 157 nations on every inhabited continent with over four million signatures asking him to

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

exercise papal infallibility to declare a new official doctrine, namely that Mary is "Co-Redemptrix, Mediatrix of All Graces and Advocate for the People of God." Supporters were Mother Teresa of Calcutta (an Albanian nun known internationally for her humanitarian work in India), 500 bishops, and 42 cardinals. Among the cardinals were John O'Connor of New York, Joseph Glemp of Poland, and six at the Vatican itself. This doctrine would mean "that Mary participates in the redemption achieved by her son, that all graces that flow from the suffering and death of Jesus Christ are granted only through Mary's intercession with her son, and that all prayers and petitions

from the faithful on earth must likewise flow through
Mary, who then brings them to the attention of Jesus."254
Supporters hoped that Pope John Paul II would be
sympathetic, for he adopted the papal motto of "Totus
tuus" ("All yours"), referring to Mary. Many Catholic theologians,
however, opposed the proposed doctrine, and
Protestants were highly critical. Nevertheless, this discussion
reveals the level of devotion that many Catholics
have for Mary.
Many of them claim to have seen apparitions of her,
and the sites of these alleged visits have become shrines
where pilgrims congregate. The most famous occurrences
were in Lourdes, France (1858); Fatima, Portugal
(1917); and Medjugorje, Bosnia and Herzegovina (1981
to present). Ten to twenty million pilgrims have visited
Medjugorje.

Vatican II

The most important development in Roman Catholicism
in the twentieth century was the Second Vatican

230

A History of Christian Doctrine

Council, which met from 1962 to 1965. Convened by
Pope John XXIII and concluded by Pope Paul VI, this
council made the most significant changes since the
Council of Trent. It set a new tone for the church.
We can identify five major characteristics of the council's
work:

1. Pastoral, rather than dogmatic, discussion. The
council affirmed traditional Catholic theology. Unlike the
Council of Trent's dogmatic presentation, however, it
offered a more nuanced approach, with the goal of relating
to modern needs and concerns.

2. Conciliatory, rather than confrontational,
approach. Whereas Trent pronounced anathemas on key
Protestant positions, Vatican II adopted a conciliatory
tone toward Eastern Orthodox and Protestants, speaking
of them as "separated brethren." It acknowledged the
work of God in their midst and offered the hope of peaceful
reunion:255

The Church recognizes that in many ways she is
linked with those who, being baptized, are honored
with the name of Christian, though they do not profess
the faith in its entirety or do not preserve unity of
communion with the successor of Peter. . . . They are
consecrated by baptism, in which they are united with
Christ. . . . Likewise we can say that in some real way

they are joined with us in the Holy Spirit, for to them
too He gives His gifts and graces whereby He is operative
among them with His sanctifying power. . . . In
all of Christ's disciples the Spirit arouses the desire to
be peacefully united, in the manner determined by
Christ, as one flock under one shepherd, and He

prompts them to pursue this end. Mother Church
never ceases to pray, hope and work that this may
come about.

Before this time, it was considered a sin for Catholics
to visit a Protestant church, but now the church offered
dialogue and even fellowship. Moreover, it said that people
of other religions could also be saved, specifically
mentioning Jews, Muslims, and others:256

Whosoever, . . . knowing that the Catholic Church
was made necessary by Christ, would refuse to enter
or to remain in it, could not be saved.

Those also can attain to salvation who through no
fault of their own do not know the Gospel of Christ or
His Church, yet sincerely seek God and moved by
grace strive by their deeds to do His will as it is known
to them through the dictates of conscience. Nor does
Divine Providence deny the helps necessary for salvation
to those who, without blame on their part, have
not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God and
with His grace strive to live a good life.

3. Enhancement of the bishops' role. Ever since
Vatican I proclaimed papal infallibility in 1870, the pope
was practically the only source of doctrinal teaching, but
to a limited extent Vatican II revived the influence of the
bishops. The pope remained the undisputed ruler, but
with the pope's consent, the council made important decisions
for the future of the church.

4. New emphasis on the Bible. Vatican II continued
to maintain that Scripture and church tradition are equal

in authority and that the church hierarchy is the only correct
interpreter of Scripture. Thus it proclaimed:257

It is clear, therefore, that sacred tradition, Sacred
Scripture and the teaching authority of the Church, in
accord with God's most wise design, are so linked and
joined together that one cannot stand without the others,
and that all together and each in its own way

under the action of the one Holy Spirit contribute effectively to the salvation of souls.

Nevertheless, the council decided to incorporate more Scripture readings and quotations in the liturgy, placing them in the language of the people. It also encouraged laymen to read and study the Bible.

This attitude contrasted sharply with the traditional Roman Catholic position. Under the old view, laymen were not capable of understanding the Bible properly; it could be confusing and even dangerous for them. Thus they were to leave the study of Scripture to the priests and theologians. The church would interpret the Bible authoritatively for them and tell them what they needed to know. Indeed, in 1229 the laity were forbidden to read the Bible.

5. Modernization and reform of liturgy and canon law. Vatican II changed many practices that had been standard for four hundred years. The primary purpose was pastoral, that is, to become more relevant to modern people and to meet their needs more effectively. For instance, the council decided that priests should recite the mass in the vernacular—the common language of the people—instead of Latin. Now the people could under-

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

stand what was being said when they went to church, and they could benefit from the Scripture readings in the liturgy.

Another change was the eating of meat on Fridays. By longstanding tradition, Catholics had abstained from eating meat on Fridays in commemoration of the day of Christ's crucifixion. They were allowed to eat fish, since most of the apostles were fishermen. Even the public schools in America typically served fish on Fridays to accommodate their Catholic students.

The list of saints and the church calendar were revised to reduce the number of saints that were venerated. Those who appeared to be mythical—evidence for their historical existence was lacking—were removed from the list. For example, St. Christopher, the patron saint of travel, was deleted.

In summary, Vatican II did not make major doctrinal changes, but it did change many traditions, and it opened the door for further debate. People began to think about the potential for additional changes. If the church could suddenly modify or overturn traditions that were hundreds of years old, then more changes were also possible.

For example, the celibacy of the priesthood had become an official rule in the early Middle Ages. In principle, it could be overturned. Before Vatican II, such a change was unthinkable, but after Vatican II many people began to think it was possible.

Vatican II shook the faith of some traditionalists. Many devout people had difficulty adjusting to the changes. People who had abstained from eating meat on Fridays now learned that it was no longer a sin. People who had prayed for years to St. Christopher, who were

234

A History of Christian Doctrine

named after him (traditionally a Catholic's first or middle name was that of a saint), and who had medals or statues of him for their protection, now learned that he was not a saint after all. Some people became disillusioned and cynical. Some Catholics insisted on celebrating the old Latin mass of the Council of Trent, called the Tridentine mass. A few bishops even broke away from the church in order to perpetuate more conservative views and practices.

Catholic Theologians

Probably the most influential Catholic theologian of the century was Karl Rahner (born 1904), a Jesuit and a German. He defended orthodox Catholic dogma, such as the trinity and papal infallibility, but he did so in the spirit of Vatican II. Indeed, he was one of the leading thinkers behind that council.

One of Rahner's best-known concepts was that of the "anonymous Christian"—a person who can be saved even without an explicit religious commitment. Rahner taught that God's grace can bring salvation through non-Christian religions, and a person can be saved if he allows this grace to work in him even though he does not understand what it is. Rahner went so far as to say, "Even an atheist . . . is not excluded from attaining salvation, provided that he has not acted against his moral conscience."

258

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955), another Jesuit, was a paleontologist from France. He developed a mystical theology whereby he sought to integrate Christian thought with evolution. He described creation as the process of evolution and sin as the imperfections

235

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

that arise within evolution. He emphasized faith in the "cosmic Christ," describing the mystical body of Christ

as evolving in the context of human evolution and identifying this process as the true meaning of redemption.
He believed that humanity is evolving toward the "omega point" of perfection, of unification under the commitment of love, and he identified this destiny as Jesus Christ.

Hans Küng (born 1928) of Switzerland became a professor at Tübingen. In his doctoral thesis, he analyzed Karl Barth's doctrine of justification by faith and concluded that it was compatible with the teaching of the Council of Trent. He further stated, "Today there is a fundamental agreement between Catholic and Protestant theology, precisely in the theology of justification—the point at which Reformation theology took its departure." 259 Most Catholic theologians accepted his conclusion and no longer see the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone as a heresy.

In 1970, Küng attacked the doctrine of papal infallibility. Instead, he proposed a doctrine of the "indefectibility" of the church. That is, God keeps the church in the truth, preserving the gospel, despite errors in the church. Similarly, he argued that the Bible is not infallible but indefectible. Küng acknowledged the pope as the leader of the church, but as the chief servant rather than the sovereign.

As a result of these ideas, under the direction of Pope John Paul II, the church stated that Küng was no longer a Catholic theologian. He was not excommunicated or removed from the priesthood, but he was banned from holding a post as professor of Catholic theology. Despite this restriction, he continued to teach at Tübingen and to

236

A History of Christian Doctrine

exert enormous influence.

Current Issues in Catholicism

Today there is probably as much theological diversity within the Roman Catholic Church as there is within mainstream Protestantism. There are liberal Catholic theologians who question the basic doctrines of Scripture and Catholic tradition and who question historic moral and social stands. There are also conservatives who uphold the inerrancy or at least the infallibility of Scripture and who advocate strict morality. Just as in Protestantism, there are many proponents of modern approaches such as historical criticism, situation ethics, liberation theology, and feminist theology.

Under the leadership of Pope John Paul II, the Roman

Catholic Church has remained officially conservative on moral issues, standing firm against artificial birth control, abortion, divorce, extramarital sex, and homosexuality. It opposes women in the priesthood, and it insists on celibacy of the priesthood. Catholic laity, however, have abandoned many of these moral stands, particularly in the West. For example, almost all Catholics in the West practice some form of birth control, and the rates of divorce, premarital sex, and abortion are about the same for Catholics as for the general population. Moreover, many bishops in Europe and the U.S. are working toward changes in some of these areas, although they remain in submission to the pope.

In particular, there is pressure to rethink the rules regarding the priesthood, due to a severe shortage of priests in the U.S. and Europe. In some cases, parishes have been consolidated, and in others, lay persons have had to take over many functions that were traditionally

237

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

reserved for the priests. Many observers believe that a major reason for the shortage is the requirement of celibacy.

In addition, there is quite a bit of evidence that the celibacy rule is not effective but is a factor in the high incidence of moral failure in the priesthood. Of course, this problem goes back to the early Middle Ages.

A. W. Richard Sipe, a former Benedictine monk who became a psychotherapist, studied the problem of sexual misconduct in the priesthood and published his findings in A Secret World: Sexuality and the Search for Celibacy. He conducted a study for twenty-five years (1960 to 1985) with over one thousand priests and with five hundred other men and women, many of whom had been involved as sexual partners of priests. He estimated "that half the 53,000 Roman Catholic priests in the U.S. are breaking their vow of celibacy." According to him, about twenty-eight percent of all priests are engaged in relationships with women, many of them long-term; an additional ten to thirteen percent have relationships with men; and about six percent pursue adolescents or children, usually boys.260

The Roman Catholic Church says that these figures are far too high. For one thing, half the priests that Sipe interviewed were already in therapy, so presumably they had problems and were not representative of all priests.

Even if we reduce Sipe's numbers by one-half, however, there is still a significant problem. In recent years, the church has been sued many times and has paid many millions of dollars in claims to victims of sexual misconduct and child molestation by its clergy.261

In Latin America, the Roman Catholic Church faces

both conservative and liberal challenges. On the left are the liberation theologians, who redefine the gospel in terms of social justice and revolutionary action. Pope John Paul II denounced these views, but they are still quite influential.

On the right are the Evangelicals, of whom eighty percent or more are Pentecostals. The Evangelicals are growing rapidly in Latin America at the expense of the Catholics. Even though the Catholic Church has become quite ecumenical, in Latin America it has taken a strong stand against non-Catholic denominations, calling them cults or sects. At times there has been strong persecution, even resulting in violence and murder. In the 1950s, the United Pentecostal Church suffered severe persecution of this nature in Colombia. In recent years, Evangelicals in remote areas of Mexico have also endured such persecution. Of course, the Catholic Church does not officially endorse violence, but bishops and priests in various locations have incited followers to harass, hinder, or expel non-Catholics.

A dramatic development in the Roman Catholic Church is the Charismatic movement, which entered the church in 1967. (See chapter 10.) Officially, the Catholic Church has been open to this movement. The prevailing philosophy is that as long as the Charismatics stay within the Catholic Church, continuing to acknowledge its authority and doctrines, then they can conduct and attend private Charismatic prayer meetings. In this way, the church has been able to retain most of these people.

Conflict occurred, however, when Archbishop Emmanuel Milingo of Lusaka, Zambia, embraced the Charismatic movement. He "experienced a trancelike vision after meeting Italian priests in the Catholic charis-

matic movement" in Rome. "Back in Africa, Milingo began praying for cures of ailing supplicants, and soon hundreds were reporting miracles."262 Critics accused him of promoting tribal magic instead of modern medicine,

and the Vatican ordered him to Rome for a year of rest and psychiatric evaluation. Milingo denied that he used charms, spells, or witch doctor's techniques or that he opposed modern medicine. Instead, he said that the healings took place by the power of God. Nevertheless, in 1983 he resigned his position.263

Despite the dramatic changes that the twentieth century brought to Roman Catholicism, Pope John Paul II sought to maintain a conservative stance on its distinctive doctrines. For example, in a 1984 document entitled Reconciliation and Penance, he attacked the idea that Catholics can receive forgiveness "directly from God" without going through the church. He emphasized the importance of the sacrament of penance, which he said Jesus instituted, and the importance of confession to a priest in order to obtain forgiveness.264 In 1985, the Vatican announced that Catholics can receive a plenary indulgence by hearing their bishop's Christmas or Easter blessing on radio or television if they are unable to hear it in person.265 According to Catholic theology, a plenary indulgence remits the temporal penalty for all confessed sin and is paid for by the "treasury of merits" built up by Christ, Mary, and saints.

Ecumenical Dialogue

The twentieth century saw a considerable convergence of thinking and practice among mainline Protestants and mainline Catholics. Key doctrinal differ-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ences that had long separated these two movements in the past grew relatively unimportant.

Vatican II's characterization of Protestants as "separated brethren" opened the door for ecumenical dialogue with various denominations. As we have seen, Catholic theologians now generally agree that the doctrine of justification by faith, which caused the Protestant Reformation in the 1500s, is no longer a problem.

The Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England have made much progress in ecumenical dialogue. The Church of England has always been diverse theologically, with a strong Anglo-Catholic element. The biggest issue separating the two churches is papal supremacy. (King Henry VIII broke away from Rome and formed the Church of England in 1534 for this very reason.) In 1982, however, the Anglicans made a major concession, agreeing that the pope should be the supreme

bishop in any future united church. "Both sides agree that there is no doctrinal barrier to reunification, and that even the most difficult problem—the office of the Pope—need not stand in the way." One of the Anglican negotiators, Cambridge professor Henry Chadwick, stated, "We have agreed that the papacy should be the focus of Eucharistic communion of all the churches."266

In 1987 the Second Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission said it had reached agreement "on the essential aspects of the doctrine of salvation and on the church's role within it." According to Kortright Davis, a member of the Anglican delegation, the agreement makes clear that "salvation is from beginning to end God's activity. . . . The notion of [human] merit has been transformed so that it is no longer merit that is at issue,

241

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

but the response of faith." The goal of the dialogue is eventually to bring both churches to fully accept each other's sacraments and ministries.267

A significant new problem, however, is that in recent years the Anglicans have begun to ordain women to the priesthood, which Rome refuses to do. Papal infallibility and the doctrine of Mary also remain obstacles.

The Catholics have also conducted a significant dialogue with Lutherans. Some theologians on both sides have signed a statement saying that the central issue of justification by faith, which caused the Lutherans to leave the Catholic Church in the 1500s, is no longer an issue—that both Lutherans and Catholics believe justification is by faith and is shown by works. In 1983, the Lutheran–Roman Catholic Dialogue Group in the United States announced that it had reached a "fundamental consensus" on the doctrine of justification by faith. It stated, "Our entire hope of justification and salvation rests on Christ Jesus and on the gospel whereby the good news of God's merciful action in Christ is made known." While differences remain, some of the Catholic scholars stated that Luther was essentially right and that Vatican II essentially vindicated him.268

In the 1990s, Roman Catholics and Evangelicals conducted a similar dialogue. Some prominent theologians and leaders on both sides have signed a joint statement of agreement in key doctrinal areas, including justification. There is considerable debate within the Evangelical community, however, as to whether the dialogue and the joint

statement are appropriate.

Interestingly, the Roman Catholics started dialogue with Pentecostals beginning in 1972. Pentecostal partici-

pants included leading scholars and ministers of the Assemblies of God, the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), the Church of God of Prophecy, the Church of God in Christ, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, the International Pentecostal Holiness Church, and the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada. One Oneness Pentecostal church was represented: the Apostolic Church of the Faith in Christ Jesus (Mexico). Also participating were Charismatics from the American Baptist, Anglican, Catholic, Episcopal, Lutheran, Orthodox, and Presbyterian churches.

In the final report of the dialogue that took place from 1985 to 1989, the participants explained the basis of their desire for unity:269

For the Roman Catholic Church, the basis of ecumenical dialogue with Pentecostals, properly speaking, is found in the Catholic recognition of the baptism performed by Pentecostals in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This implies a common faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This recognition by Roman Catholics of Pentecostal baptism means, in consequence, that Roman Catholics believe that they share with Pentecostals a certain, though imperfect koinonia [fellowship, communion]. . . . The unity of baptism constitutes and requires the unity of the baptized. . . . Our agreement on the trinitarian basis of baptism draws and impels us to unity.

Pentecostals do not see the unity between Christians as being based in a common water baptism. . . . Instead, the foundation of unity is a common faith and experience of Jesus Christ as Lord and

Savior through the Holy Spirit. This implies that to the extent that Pentecostals recognize that Roman Catholics have this common faith in and experience of Jesus as Lord, they share a real though imperfect koinonia with them.

In this statement and in the Vatican II documents, we find that Roman Catholics seek institutional unity based on a common trinitarian faith and baptism. At this point

it is not clear how far Pentecostals and other Protestants will be willing to go to fulfill this vision of unity. That Pentecostals have participated in sustained ecumenical dialogue is itself quite significant, since early Pentecostals of all kinds generally viewed the Roman Catholic Church as an apostate church or at least a church of false doctrine whose members needed to be saved.

Eastern Orthodoxy

The Eastern Orthodox Church officially broke from the Roman Catholic Church in 1054. While it has a similar theology of the sacraments, it does not recognize the sovereignty of the pope, and it considers itself to be the original, pure church. Culturally, theologically, and liturgically, it has a Greek, rather than Latin, heritage. A contemporary Greek Orthodox writer has explained the differences as follows:270

Some of the major differences between the Orthodox and the Roman include the following: The primacy and the infallibility of the Roman Pope; the filioque clause [procession of Holy Spirit from both Father and Son instead of the Father only]; the teach-

A History of Christian Doctrine

ings on purgatory; the immaculate conception and the bodily ascension of the Theotokos ["mother of God"]; all these are rejected by the Orthodox. In addition there are other doctrinal, ecclesiastical, and administrative differences. The Greek Church recognizes only a primacy of honor to the Bishop of Rome, to the Bishop of Constantinople and then to other church leaders for historical reasons. . . . In the matter of the ecumenical dialogue the Orthodox Church would have no hesitation to accept the bishop of Rome as the primus inter pares, the first among equals. But she would yield no other ground on this important subject.

Eastern Orthodoxy is not monolithic but consists of autocephalous (self-governing) national churches that have mutual fellowship under the patriarch of Constantinople. It is the dominant religion of Greece, Romania, Georgia, Russia, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). It is strong in other Slavic countries, and it has ancient churches in the Middle East. In the West, its adherents are primarily people whose ethnic origins are in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

In addition, several ancient churches are generally

classified with Eastern Orthodoxy even though they operate independently. On one side are the Monophysites, notably the Coptic Church in Egypt, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (also called Coptic), and the Armenian Apostolic Church. They reject the Council of Chaldecon (451), believing that Christ has only one nature (primarily divine) instead of two complete natures (human and divine) in one person. On the other side are the

245

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

Nestorians, notably the Assyrian Church in the Middle East. The Council of Chalcedon denounced Nestorianism for emphasizing too greatly the distinction between the divine and human in Christ and for refusing to call Mary the mother of God.

Apart from these deviations, the theology and liturgy of these churches are similar to the other Eastern churches. The Egyptian Copts and the Assyrian Church are minority faiths, since their lands are dominated by Muslims.

Overall, Eastern Orthodoxy is traditional, conservative, and hierarchical. Where it is the majority faith, it closely aligns itself with the state and the culture. In these countries, the church benefits from special legal status and promotion, and for people to deny the faith is to deny their culture.

Under communism, the Russian Orthodox Church and the Orthodox churches in other communist countries cooperated closely with the state. Their leaders were appointed with the approval of the Communist Party. Orthodoxy lost much credibility in these countries because of its accommodation and collaboration. Since the fall of communism, Orthodoxy has sought to reestablish political power and exclude or limit other religious faiths and denominations, especially Evangelicals and Pentecostals.

The Greek Orthodox Church takes a similar position. In Greece, it is against the law to proselyte (seek to convert) someone from Greek Orthodoxy. Occasionally Evangelical ministers and members are persecuted and charged with illegal activity because of their evangelistic efforts.

246

A History of Christian Doctrine

Theologically, Eastern Orthodoxy has remained relatively static, in part because the Muslims conquered its

ancient strongholds in the Middle East. When the
Byzantine Empire fell in 1453, the Turks took control of
Constantinople (now Istanbul), the imperial capital and
the traditional seat of Orthodoxy.

The Orthodox churches are members of the World
Council of Churches, and they exert a conservative influence
on both doctrine and social ethics. In many ways,
their stance is similar to that of the Roman Catholic
Church. Moreover, there were Orthodox observers at
Vatican II, and in recent years Catholic and Orthodox
leaders have engaged in dialogue as "separated brethren."

In the 1980s and 1990s, a number of Evangelicals
converted to Eastern Orthodoxy. Notable examples are
Franky Schaeffer, son of a well-known Evangelical author
and teacher, Francis Schaeffer; and Michael Harper,
Anglican Charismatic pioneer. Converts explained that
they were attracted by several features: (1) ancient heritage
and tradition, (2) liturgical worship, (3) conservative
morality, and (4) authoritative voice yet without the difficult
Roman Catholic position of papal supremacy and
infallibility. It appears that these Evangelicals were looking
for a more meaningful, mystical, awe-inspiring worship
experience in contrast to simple, unemotional, rational
Evangelical forms, and a more certain doctrinal sound in
the face of Evangelical fragmentation and liberal trends.

Conclusions

Roman Catholicism, with almost 1.1 billion adherents,
and Eastern Orthodoxy, with about 200 million adherents,
are major forces in world Christendom, encompassing

247

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

over twenty percent of the world's population. Although
separated by the papacy, to a great extent they are theological
and ideological twins. While both advocate traditional
doctrines and moral positions, most of their
members have adopted the values and lifestyle of modern,
secular society.

The Catholics and the Orthodox are in ecumenical
dialogue with each other, with the Protestants, and even
with non-Christian religions. It is possible that in the
future Roman Catholicism could be the basis of a worldwide
communion of Christians of many denominations,
and ultimately it could become the foundation for one
worldwide church.

248

A History of Christian Doctrine

After World War II, events in the classical
Pentecostal movement resulted in two related developments:
the Latter Rain movement and the Charismatic
movement. Setting the stage for these movements was a
post-war healing revival, the peak of which occurred from
about 1946 to 1958.

Background of the Healing Revival

Throughout the history of Christianity, there have
been various revivals of divine healing. The New
Testament clearly teaches that healing is one of the spiritual
gifts that God has given to the church (I Corinthians
12:8-10).271 It instructs the church to pray for the
healing of those who are sick (James 5:14-16). The

The Healing Revival
and the Latter Rain
Movement
9

Gospels contain many accounts of people who were
healed in the earthly ministry of Jesus, and the Book of
Acts contains many account of people who were healed
through the prayers of the apostles and the early church.
In history, whenever people have proclaimed and believed
the healing message of the Scriptures, God has performed
miracles of healing.

Even before the great outpouring of the Holy Spirit in
the twentieth century, there were significant healing
revivals in the nineteenth century, both in Europe and in
America. In the late 1800s, many preachers and teachers
in the Holiness movement proclaimed the message of
divine healing. They taught that Christians could receive
healing by praying to the Lord in faith.

Most of these leaders also began to teach that healing
is part of the Atonement. That is, just as Christ purchased
our justification and sanctification by His death, burial,
and resurrection, so He purchased our healing. He came
to reverse all the consequences of our sins, including
sickness and disease. They appealed to the scriptural
statement that "with his stripes we are healed" (Isaiah
53:5). (See also I Peter 2:24.) They noted that Matthew
8:16-17 clearly applies the Atonement passage in Isaiah
53 to physical healing.

A number of Holiness evangelists, both men and
women, became noted for their message of healing. While
most taught a balanced view of healing that respected the
sovereignty of God and acknowledged that healing did

not always come instantly or as people desire, a few went to extremes in their teaching. Some insisted that healing would always come instantaneously if a person had sufficient faith, just as they believed sanctification to be an

instantaneous experience. Others held that if someone had enough faith to be saved then he had enough faith to be healed. The corollary was that if a person did not receive healing then his salvation was also questionable. Some rejected all use of medicine and doctors, saying it was contrary to faith.

One of the most famous healing preachers was John Alexander Dowie, whose ministry reached its apex from 1894 to 1905. From Australia, he immigrated to the United States and attracted a national following. As we noted in chapter 1, he founded his own denomination (the Christian Catholic Church) and his own town (Zion, Illinois).

Many early Pentecostal leaders received inspiration from Dowie. Before the Pentecostal movement began in 1901, Charles Parham visited Dowie's operation and learned from his methods. In 1906, Parham brought the Pentecostal message to Zion and converted many of Dowie's followers to the new movement. A number of them became Pentecostal leaders, including L. C. Hall, D. C. O. Opperman, John Lake, and F. F. Bosworth. Lake and Bosworth were noted for their healing ministry as Pentecostals. The parents of Gordon Lindsay, who was to figure prominently in the post-war healing revival, were also followers of Dowie.

Parham preached healing before the outpouring of the Holy Ghost came. Afterwards, he continued to emphasize healing, and some of his early breakthroughs came as a result of dramatic healings. Some well-known Holiness healing preachers entered the Pentecostal movement, including Carrie Judd Montgomery and Maria Woodworth-Etter. Other well-known healing campaigners

in the early Pentecostal movement were Smith Wigglesworth (England), Aimee Semple McPherson, and Charles Price, who received the Holy Spirit under McPherson.

In short, healing was a prominent theme among the later Holiness preachers and among the early

Pentecostals. Moreover, the decade immediately after World War II saw the emergence of several nationally prominent ministries that focused on divine healing.

William Branham

The father and pacesetter of the post-war healing revival was William Marrion Branham (1909-1965). As a young person, Branham received a personal healing and became an independent Baptist preacher. Later he received the Holy Spirit and became a Pentecostal. He also accepted water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and adopted a nontrinitarian, Oneness view of the Godhead.272 He preached for both trinitarian and Oneness churches, but he remained independent.

Branham stated that he had received visitations from God at ages three and seven. Then, in 1946, he testified that an angel visited him and announced that God would give him a gift of divine healing. He said this angel guided him from that time forward. As evidence, Branham's followers displayed a 1950 photograph of Branham preaching in Houston. Above his head is something that appears to be a halo or flash of light.

Branham began his healing campaigns in 1946, and the results were amazing. In his heyday, he filled the world's largest auditoriums and stadiums. Perhaps the most outstanding and widely attested miracle occurred in

252

A History of Christian Doctrine

1951. William Upshaw, a U.S. congressman from California who had been crippled for many years, was healed in one of Branham's campaigns. This notable event catapulted Branham to international fame.

Branham had an unusual ability to discern people's illnesses. He would call them out of the audience, reveal details about them, inspire their faith, and pray for their healing. Many people were healed. Walter Hollenweger, who later became the secretary of evangelism for the World Council of Churches, gave the following description and analysis:273

The angel gave him signs to help him in his task. The most important was Branham's ability to name with astonishing accuracy the sickness, and often also the hidden sins, of people whom he had never seen. The author, who knew Branham personally and interpreted for him in Zurich, is not aware of any case in which he was mistaken in the often detailed statements he made. It was characteristic of Branham's

kind-heartedness that he gave certain personal revelations to those who were seeking healing in a whisper, so that they were not picked up by the microphone and revealed to the spectators. . . . Much that was written about him in Pentecostal journals seems to be exaggerated, but there are a number of well-attested cases of miraculous healings. . . . However generously he is judged, it must be admitted that his sermons were not merely simple, but often naïve as well, and that by contrast to what he claimed, only a small percentage of those who sought healing were in fact healed. The Pentecostal

253

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

pastor Leonhard Steiner had a poor opinion of Branham's campaign in Zurich. He wrote that the call to make a decision for Christ was "disturbingly vague. No real call to repentance could be distinguished."

Branham assembled a management team of three men: Jack Moore, Gordon Lindsay, and W. J. E. "Ern" Baxter. Moore was a United Pentecostal pastor in Shreveport, Louisiana, who was so impressed with Branham that he devoted himself to managing Branham's campaigns.

Moore contacted his friend Gordon Lindsay, who was a minister of the Assemblies of God and a convert of Charles Parham. Lindsay resigned his position to become Branham's full-time manager. He wrote a book about him entitled A Man Sent from God, and he started a magazine called Voice of Healing to promote Branham's ministry. Lindsay soon expanded coverage to other healing ministries that were quickly springing up, however, which caused Branham to part company with him. Ultimately Lindsay adopted the name of Christ for the Nations for his ministry, his magazine, and the Bible institute he founded in Dallas, Texas.

Ern Baxter was an independent Pentecostal who traveled with Branham for a time. He was greatly influenced by the Latter Rain movement a few years later, although he eventually became concerned about errors in it. He ultimately joined the Charismatic movement and became one of the foremost leaders of the Shepherding movement. (See chapter 10.)

F. F. Bosworth, who had left the Assemblies of God because he rejected the initial evidence doctrine, joined

254

643

A History of Christian Doctrine

Branham's campaigns in 1948-50.

The Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International, founded in 1951, became a major promoter of William Branham in the 1950s and early 1960s. Branham was a personal friend of the founder, Demos Shakarian, an Armenian Pentecostal and lay church leader in California. Branham's central message was healing and prosperity. During the time of his greatest popularity he did not place great emphasis on doctrine. For instance, he believed that everyone needed to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, including those already baptized with the trinitarian formula, but he did not stress this belief to his mass audiences. Instead, during this time he conducted most of his ministry among trinitarians.

For Branham's first three meetings, Nathaniel Urshan, a UPCI evangelist and later general superintendent, preached the opening message, after which Branham conducted his healing ministry. When Urshan proclaimed baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, Branham asked him not to do so, and Urshan ended his association with the campaign.274

Branham's ministry began to decline in the mid 1950s. He encountered severe financial difficulties, and when the Charismatic movement began, he had difficulty adapting to it. He was from a rural background with a limited education, while most Charismatics were urban middle-class people from mainline denominations, and Branham was not very successful in attracting them.

In his later ministry, he began to emphasize doctrine, including several unusual, aberrational beliefs. His following narrowed to those who embraced these views. In

255

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

particular, he taught what is known as the serpent seed doctrine. This doctrine asserts that the original sin of the human race was sexual. In the Garden of Eden, Eve committed sin and became spiritually polluted by having a sexual relationship with the devil. By having sexual relations with her after this time, Adam likewise became polluted. In this way, the whole human race came under sin and perpetuates sin to future generations.

Branham further maintained that Eve conceived a child by the devil, namely Cain. Cain and his descendants were therefore predestined to damnation. This satanic

bloodline survived the Flood because one of Noah's daughters-in-law was supposedly a descendant of Cain. Thus even today some people are literally children of the devil and cannot be saved. They will be annihilated in the end of time.

Of course, nothing in Scripture teaches or implies anything like the serpent seed doctrine. However, Sun Myung Moon and the Unification Church ("the Moonies") promote essentially the same view today.

Branham understood the seven churches of Asia Minor in Revelation 2-3 to be representative of ages in church history. He interpreted each church's "angel" (which literally means "messenger" in Greek) to be God's special prophet to the respective age. For example, he identified Martin Luther as the messenger or prophet for the age of the Reformation. He concluded that his day was the last church age, the age of Laodicea, and he was the prophet for that age. Indeed, on his grave is a pyramid that lists the seven ages and seven prophets, and it identifies Branham as the end-time prophet.

Those who accepted Branham's message would con-

A History of Christian Doctrine

stitute the bride of Christ in the end time and would go up in the Rapture. Organized religion was a mark of the beast. Although people in various denominations could be saved, they would suffer through the Tribulation.

Branham predicted that the Millennium would begin by 1977.

Branham identified himself as the coming of Elijah before the great and dreadful day of the Lord. (See Malachi 4:5.) He also understood himself to be the angel of Revelation 10 and one of the two witnesses in Revelation 11.

Branham maintained that the zodiac and the pyramids contained hidden messages of prophetic significance. He referred to the Western zodiac, apparently not knowing about the completely different Eastern zodiac system. He believed that the dimensions of the pyramids were significant because God had inspired their building.

Based on his prophetic role, Branham advocated what he called the spoken word ministry. According to this view, when he preached under the anointing of God, God actually inspired him to speak authoritative words. Thus, even today, his followers study his books and tapes, believing that they are the special message of God for this

age. One of their major methods of evangelism is to distribute his messages in transcribed and taped form.

Branham died on December 24, 1965, as a result of injuries sustained in an automobile accident some days earlier. His followers expected that he would soon rise from the dead, like the two witnesses in Revelation 11, so they embalmed and refrigerated his body and delayed his funeral for one month. Some even believed him to be born of a virgin or to be God incarnate. Even after the

memorial service on January 26, 1966, Branham's followers delayed his burial until after Easter in hopes that he would rise on that day like Jesus. Finally, their hopes dashed, they buried him on April 11, 1966.

At the memorial service on January 26 in Phoenix, Arizona, the main speaker was T. L. Osborne, a prominent evangelist in his own right. Some of his remarks demonstrate the unusually high regard that Branham's followers had for him:275

God . . . clothed Himself in flesh, came, and showed us the new creation—how it would be when everything was taken care of. The price was paid. All claims were satisfied. He walked here in a human body, a Godman—Whom we call Jesus. . . .

The man we know as William Branham was sent to demonstrate God AGAIN in the flesh.

Some are going to think I am sacreligious or off doctrinally (and it doesn't really matter), but God came again in human flesh and said, "Apparently I must show them again. I must remind them again. They must see one more time. Once again they must know what God is like. And He stepped down and sent a little man, a prophet, but more than a prophet this time, a Jesus-man this time!

Here comes Brother Branham along in the twentieth century and does exactly the same way. GOD IN THE FLESH, again crossing our paths; and many did not know. THEY WOULD NOT HAVE KNOWN HIM IF THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN HERE-: WHEN GOD CROSSED THEIR PATH IN THE BODY THEY CALLED JESUS CHRIST! . . .

This is a matter to give glory to our God, Who has come in the flesh again in our generation. He has

come in the flesh in all of us, but in a particular way in this man who was His prophet for this generation. Although Branham's end-time prophecies were not fulfilled and although he did not rise from the dead, his teachings are still influential to this day. His followers, generally called Branhamites, teach repentance, baptism in Jesus' name, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and holiness of life. In a few locations they are the largest group that advocates Jesus Name baptism. Unfortunately, they also zealously promote the serpent seed doctrine, the spoken word doctrine, and the necessity of accepting William Branham as the prophet of the end time.

The Branhamites exist in thirteen loosely organized fellowships and in many independent churches. In the U.S. there are about 300 churches with 86,000 constituents and another 400 house churches with 10,000 constituents. Worldwide, there are an estimated 1,150 churches with 191,000 constituents, and 1,380 house churches with 109,000 constituents.276

Many Pentecostal observers have concluded that Branham was a man whom God used greatly to inspire faith in people to receive divine miracles, particularly in the early half of his ministry. He was not pretentious, he lived simply, and he exhibited a real concern for people and their needs. Unfortunately, over time he developed an exaggerated opinion of his role. This exalted view of self, theological naiveté, and an independent spirit led him into false and destructive doctrines that seriously damaged his effectiveness and legacy. Even so, his emphasis

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

on healing and prosperity, his methods of operation, and his emphasis on the prophetic spoken word greatly influenced later healing evangelists, the Latter Rain movement, and the Charismatic movement.

Oral Roberts

The second major figure in the post–World War II healing revival was Granville Oral Roberts (born 1918). Roberts was originally a member of the Pentecostal Holiness Church. At age seventeen he was healed of tuberculosis and stuttering. In 1947, one year after Branham, he began a healing ministry. Roberts met Branham on a number of occasions, ministered with him, and was influenced by him to some degree. Oral Roberts soon became the foremost healing evangelist in America. The main emphasis of Roberts's ministry has been

health, prosperity, and hope. In 1955, when television was first becoming widespread in America, he began a national weekly television program; thus he was one of the earliest religious figures to use television.

In 1968, Roberts joined the United Methodist Church. By this time, he had a great following outside the confines of traditional Pentecostalism, and the Charismatic movement was growing rapidly within Protestantism. It seemed to his advantage to identify himself with mainline Protestantism and thus maximize his appeal to the broadest spectrum of Christianity. Since the Methodists were theologically diverse, he could take this step without abandoning his Pentecostal beliefs. Since the Pentecostal Holiness Church had its roots in Methodism, there were many similarities of overall philosophy and structure. Nevertheless, many classical Pentecostals at the time saw

260

A History of Christian Doctrine

this as a compromising, backward step, for the United Methodists did not teach the baptism of the Holy Spirit and were dominated by Liberalism.

Oral Roberts was one of the catalysts of the Charismatic movement, for he attracted many people from mainline churches and introduced them to Pentecostal concepts. He was a key influence in the formation of the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship in 1951. At century's end, he was still one of the leading figures in the Charismatic movement.

Between 1947 and 1968, Roberts conducted over 300 crusades and personally prayed for millions of people. In the 1950s, his radio program was on more than 500 stations, his Sunday morning television program was the number-one syndicated religious program in America for three years, his monthly magazine reached a circulation of one million, and 674 newspapers carried his monthly column. In the 1970s, his prime-time television show reached an estimated 64 million viewers. A survey in 1980 concluded that he was the best-known Pentecostal in the world. An amazing 84 percent of Americans who were surveyed recognized his name. By the 1980s, he had written 83 books, with over fifteen million copies printed, and his mail averaged about five million letters per year.277

In 1965, Roberts founded Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Oklahoma. By 1988, it was worth 250 million dollars and had an enrollment of 4,600 students.

In 1981, Roberts opened another 250-million-dollar

project in Tulsa, called the City of Faith Medical and Research Center. It was a hospital, medical center, and research facility, in which he planned to combine medical expertise with healing ministry. The medical community

in the city opposed the project, saying there were already excess hospital beds there, but Roberts persevered. His ministry suffered financially because of the stupendous investment, and he had to make dramatic appeals for money to keep the project afloat. On one occasion, he announced that he had seen a 900-foot vision of Jesus telling him to complete the work. He even stated that God would "take him home" if he did not raise the remaining eight million dollars that he needed.278 Critics responded that this claim in effect made God a hostage taker. At the last moment, the owner of a race track in Florida gave Roberts a sizable donation from gambling income that enabled him to meet his goal.

Ultimately, however, Roberts had to close the City of Faith because it could not sustain itself financially. Tulsa did not need another hospital after all, and there were not sufficient patients coming from around the country as Roberts had expected. Roberts leased the facilities to tenants and concluded that God intended all along for this to take place as a means of supporting Roberts's ministry financially.

Other Healing Evangelists

A number of other healing evangelists also established significant ministries after World War II. Kathryn Kuhlman (1907-76) became the world's most widely known female evangelist. She never openly identified with the Pentecostal movement, and she did not allow public speaking in tongues in her services. In this regard, no one knows exactly where she stood in her theology or experience. Early on, she established a large church in Denver,

but she had to leave it when she married a man who divorced his wife for her. They evangelized together, but after about six years she left him and launched out on her own again.

Kuhlman's healing ministry began in 1946. She focused primarily on people from mainline churches. Pentecostals were somewhat reluctant to follow her because they did not know where she stood doctrinally. In

the 1960s, she became popular among Charismatics, and she attracted many mainline Protestants into the Charismatic movement.

In her services, Kuhlman would often announce that a certain type of illness or condition would be healed in a certain part of the auditorium. Someone with the relevant problem would soon identify himself. In addition to healings, her services were noted for people being "slain in the Spirit."

Kuhlman was dramatic in ministry and flamboyant in lifestyle. Her biographer and personal friend Jamie Buckingham noted, "She loved her expensive clothes, precious jewels, luxury hotels, and first class travel."279

Another well-known healing evangelist was Jack Coe (1918-56). He got his start in the Assemblies of God (AG). He became successful about 1950, but the AG expelled him in that year because of questionable methods and teachings. He died suddenly of polio at age thirtyeight.

A. A. Allen was another healing revivalist who started with the AG. He also began achieving success about 1950, although he too found himself at odds with the AG over questionable and exaggerated claims. He left the AG in 1955 after he was arrested for drunken driving.

263

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

Allen was one of the first evangelists to emphasize financial blessings for those who donated money to his ministry. He was also one of the first to introduce gospel rock music into his services. In addition to healing, he also specialized in casting out demons.

He divorced his wife in 1967, which caused him to lose much credibility. He died of sclerosis of the liver in 1970.

Tommy Lee Osborne (born 1923) was inspired by William Branham to begin a healing ministry. He also focused on evangelism and missions, conducting mass evangelism crusades overseas and raising funds to support indigenous churches around the world. He taught the concept of "seed faith" in giving—God would grant a financial harvest to those who planted a "seed" by contributing to his ministry.

In the 1960s, T. L. Osborne sought to appeal to youth by growing a beard and wearing youth-oriented clothing. He began stressing that his wife, Daisy, was an equal partner in pulpit ministry and organizational leadership. She became known as Daisy Washburn-Osborne and became

president of the Osborne Foundation.

The Latter Rain Movement

Almost simultaneously with the surge of healing campaigns arose another movement from within Pentecostalism, called the New Order of the Latter Rain. Its peak was from 1948 to 1956.

The Latter Rain movement began among classical Pentecostals who desired revival and a greater exercise of spiritual gifts. There was a perception among Pentecostals in some areas that in the 1930s and 1940s their

A History of Christian Doctrine

movement had lost momentum, had gotten somewhat dry, and perhaps even had stagnated. Many people longed for a fresh move of the Spirit. William Branham tapped into this desire with his healing ministry in 1946, sparking renewed faith and spiritual hunger among many people. Another man who inspired great expectations was Franklin Hall, a teacher who particularly emphasized fasting and healing. He went to extremes in both areas, proclaiming, in essence, that a person could receive whatever he wanted from God if he would invest enough time in fasting. Moreover, a truly spiritual person could be delivered from the potential for sickness, tiredness, and even body odor.

In this atmosphere of desire for a new move of God, some people appealed to the prophecy of Joel 2:23, which speaks of the former rain and the latter rain. Most early Pentecostals had interpreted the former rain to be the first-century outpouring of the Holy Spirit (as Peter indicated in Acts 2:16) and the latter rain to be the endtime outpouring from 1901 onward. Now, some people considered that the latter rain was yet to come. They also appealed to Isaiah 43:19, where God promised to do a new thing, and applied these words to their day.

Another biblical source for the new movement was the Old Testament typology of the three major feasts—Passover, Pentecost (Weeks), and Tabernacles. Some said that Passover was fulfilled by the Atonement, and Pentecost by the outpouring of the Spirit, but the Feast of Tabernacles had not yet been fulfilled. There would soon come a new work of God in addition to the Pentecostal revival that would fulfill the Feast of Tabernacles.

As a distinct movement, the New Order of the Latter

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

Rain began in February 1948 at Sharon Orphanage and Schools in North Battleford, Saskatchewan, Canada. Three men were key figures in this initial stage: George Hawton, P. G. Hunt, and Herrick Holt. Hawton and Hunt had recently been involved in a dispute with the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada and had resigned from that organization. They began working in North Battleford with Holt, an independent minister who had been associated with the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel.

During this time, these men and their students began seeking God for a fresh outpouring of the Holy Spirit. They began intense fasting and prayer, and soon they reported a great anointing of the Spirit, many healings, and many personal prophecies—something that would become a characteristic of the Latter Rain movement. People began to lay hands on one another and give detailed prophecies and instructions concerning each other's lives.

The Latter Rain movement swept through classical Pentecostalism, drawing people out of their existing churches. It drew both trinitarians and Oneness believers, but its impact was much greater among the former. It was especially strong in Canada and in the northwestern United States. The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada suffered a split.

Some prominent Trinitarian Pentecostals who became associated with or endorsed the Latter Rain movement were as follows:

Myrtle Beall (1896-1979), an AG pastor who founded Bethesda Missionary Temple in Detroit. The church became a headquarters for Latter Rain teaching.

266

A History of Christian Doctrine

Her son, James E. Beall (born 1925), later became pastor. He wrote Rise to Newness of Life, a book that teaches the necessity of water baptism and advocates baptism in Jesus' name while retaining a trinitarian view of God.

Ivan Q. Spencer (1888-1970), founder of Elim Bible Institute (1924) in upstate New York and Elim Fellowship (1933), an alliance of people who were trained at the institute. Before 1924, Spencer had been a member of the AG. He was introduced to the Latter Rain by Myrtle Beall, and Elim Fellowship became one of the foremost propagators of the movement.

Stanley Frodsham (1882-1969), an AG pioneer and

editor of AG publications, who identified with the Latter Rain movement for a while. He considered it to be a renewal of the early Pentecostal movement. In 1949 he resigned as the AG editor and an AG minister in order to participate in the Latter Rain. He taught at Elim Bible Institute for a time, but ultimately he became disenchanted with the excesses of the movement and disassociated himself.

Lewi Pethrus (1884-1974), founder of Filadelfia Church in Stockholm, Sweden, and a leading European Pentecostal pioneer. His church was the largest Pentecostal church in the world until about 1975, and his organization was the largest free (nonestablished) church in Sweden.

Some Oneness Pentecostals who joined the Latter Rain movement were as follows:

David ("Little David") Walker (born 1934), a child evangelist who began preaching at age nine and held great evangelistic, healing campaigns. Eventually, however, he joined the AG.

267

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

Raymond Hoekstra, well-known United Pentecostal (UPCI) pastor at Calvary Tabernacle in Indianapolis, Indiana. He resigned his church to be the manager for Little David. Subsequently, he established a successful radio and prison ministry under the name of Chaplain Ray.

W. E. Kidson, a UPCI pastor in Houston and longtime general secretary of the Pentecostal Church, Incorporated (PCI). Accused of financial misdealing, he began to work with William Branham and to have fellowship with the Latter Rain people.280 He left the UPCI to found the International Ministerial Association.

Leonard W. Coote, missionary to Japan and founder of International Bible College in San Antonio, Texas, a UPCI institution for a short time.

Harry F. B. Morse, a Oneness Pentecostal pioneer, the founder of an influential missionary training institute in Oakland, California, a foreign missions director for the PCI, and a UPCI minister. He believed in keeping Saturday as the Sabbath. Many influential pastors and missionaries, such as David Gray and Ellis Scism, were trained under him.

A. O. Moore, a UPCI minister who had been foreign missions director for the PCI at the time of the merger.

Ted Fitch, an independent minister and author of a

book that spoke of the man Christ as preexisting in
angelic form.

The main organizational representatives of the Latter
Rain movement today are Elim Fellowship (90 churches),
the International Ministerial Association (a Oneness
group with 635 churches worldwide), and the
Independent Assemblies of God International (1,800 ministers).
The Gospel Assembly (about 10,000 con-

268

A History of Christian Doctrine

stituents), also known as the School of the Prophets, is a
similar and related organization. These groups have a relatively
small number of churches and constituents.

Most of the Latter Rain churches left their parent
organizations and became independent. Some ceased to
exist. For the most part, the New Order of the Latter Rain
has become part of the Charismatic movement.

Doctrines of the Latter Rain Movement

As we have seen, the New Order of the Latter Rain
was a Pentecostal revival movement. Although it was not
primarily doctrinal in nature, it developed some distinctive
approaches and practices. The classical Pentecostal
denominations—including the Assemblies of God, the
United Pentecostal Church International, the International
Pentecostal Holiness Church, and the Pentecostal
Assemblies of Canada—rejected the movement because
of these characteristics, which they regarded as extreme
and excessive. They also opposed it for drawing people
away from existing congregations, splitting many
churches, and advocating that churches should become
independent. The movement was theologically diverse,
and not everyone embraced all the beliefs and practices
we will discuss. In general, however, the Latter Rain
emphases were as follows:

1. Spiritual gifts, including the bestowal of gifts
upon others. Pentecostals have always advocated the
gifts of the Spirit, but Latter Rain people urged individuals
to seek various gifts, sometimes even naming the gifts
they would receive or attempting to transfer gifts to one
other.

2. Laying on of hands, including its use to bestow

269

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

spiritual gifts. Pentecostals likewise have always advocated
the laying on of hands, but this practice assumed
great significance with the Latter Rain people. In many

cases, they sought to obtain spiritual gifts through prophecy and laying on of hands. They advocated human initiative, citing I Timothy 4:14 and II Timothy 1:6. Classical Pentecostals asserted that the spiritual gifts were bestowed at God's initiative and according to His will. (See I Corinthians 12:11.)

3. Prophecy, particularly personal prophecy. Once again, Pentecostals believe in prophecy, but the Latter Rain adherents placed more emphasis on this gift and commonly employed it to give instructions to the church, the pastor, or individuals. Many people made important decisions on the basis of personal prophecies. Some promoted new teachings on the basis of direct revelations.

4. Identification of modern-day apostles and prophets. Latter Rain people pointed to scriptural evidence for modern-day apostles and prophets. (See I Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 2:20; 4:11.) That concept in itself was not objectionable, but problems came when they attempted to identify who was and who was not an apostle or a prophet. Further problems developed when selfdesignated apostles and prophets sought to assert spiritual authority over others and to give authoritative pronouncements.

5. Fellowship with all professing Christians. The Latter Rain people minimized doctrinal teachings and standards of holiness, which were quite important to the entire Pentecostal movement at that time. In essence, they sought active fellowship with anyone who confessed Christianity. Issues such as the Oneness-trinitarian con-

270

A History of Christian Doctrine

troversy, the initial evidence doctrine, and many lifestyle choices were not important to them.

6. The complete autonomy of the local church. As a corollary to the preceding point, they felt that local churches should not submit to organizational decisions regarding doctrine, lifestyle, and fellowship. Essentially, each church should operate independently in theology and government.

7. The "manifest sons of God" or "kingdom" theology. According to this view, Latter Rain believers would achieve such a place of spirituality that they would become visibly identified as sons of God by various miracles and victories in spiritual warfare. In this way, the kingdom of God would be visibly established on the earth, characterized by a supernatural life in this world.

This last theme was vital to Latter Rain theology. As an example, J. Preston Eby, a former Pentecostal Holiness minister, said that the coming outpouring of the Spirit would bring "the fullness," which he described as follows:281

The FULLNESS [will be] a company of overcoming Sons of God who have come to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ to actually dethrone Satan, casting him out of the heavenlies, and finally binding him in the earthlies, bringing the hope of deliverance and life to all the families of the earth. This . . . great work of the Spirit shall usher a people into full redemption—free from the curse, sin, sickness, death and carnality.

Typically, Evangelicals and Pentecostals have identified this scenario with the millennial reign of Jesus

271

The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain

Christ upon earth after His second coming, but in Latter Rain theology it would occur among mature believers before His coming and would actually help bring about His coming. Latter Rain believers typically expected great visible signs of power shortly before the Second Coming, such as instantaneous healings of all who were sick. Some thought the manifested sons of God would never die. Others expected them to acquire various supernatural powers, perhaps being able to appear, disappear, and transport themselves like the resurrected Christ.

In the view of classical Pentecostals, the Latter Rain movement stressed certain Pentecostal themes to the point of imbalance. Widespread excesses and abuses took place, particularly with the use of personal prophecies, and some people lost faith in God altogether. Questionable and fanciful claims were made. For example, some said that God placed dental fillings in tooth cavities as an answer to prayer. Classical Pentecostals questioned these accounts, wondering why God would not simply make the teeth whole instead.

The excesses and the disruption of local churches ultimately caused the Pentecostal denominations to turn away from the Latter Rain movement. For instance, at its general conference in 1950, the UPCI condemned the following ten teachings as its response to the New Order of the Latter Rain:282

1. The promiscuous laying on of hands for the bestowing of spiritual gifts.

2. The teaching that the church is based upon present-day apostles and prophets.

3. The teaching that Christians must sever themselves from all church organization.

4. The compromising of the truths of Oneness and water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ.

5. The teaching that one can receive the Holy Ghost without speaking in tongues.

6. The teaching that candidates for the Holy Ghost baptism should not praise the Lord while tarrying for this gift.

7. The sowing of discord among the assemblies and ministers.

8. The prophesying of prophets who speak out of their human spirits.

9. The fellowshipping of those whose lives are ungodly.

10. The teaching that the true church is composed of all who call themselves Christians regardless of doctrinal belief.

Not all Latter Rain people embraced all of these points, but they were significant issues among them. It is important to note that the UPCI and other classical Pentecostal groups did not reject the nine spiritual gifts of I Corinthians 12, the fivefold ministry of Ephesians 4, signs, wonders, or miracles. These beliefs had always been characteristic of Pentecostal teaching, but the feeling was that the Latter Rain movement promoted and practiced these beliefs in an unscriptural, unbalanced way while neglecting important doctrinal truths. Some classical Pentecostals did become excessively cautious in these areas, however, in reaction to the damage caused by the Latter Rain. (For further doctrinal discussion, see

Spiritual Gifts by David K. Bernard.)

Conclusions

The post-war healing evangelists brought Pentecostal concepts, such as the supernatural gifts of the Spirit, to the average American. In doing so, they prepared the way for the Charismatic movement and later helped attract many people to it. Their message and methods, often suspect by classical Pentecostal standards, became typical among Charismatics. Today, most of these evangelists or

their successors identify primarily with the Charismatic movement rather than classical Pentecostalism.

The Latter Rain movement was another significant catalyst for the Charismatic movement of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Indeed, most of the characteristic innovations, beliefs, and practices of the Latter Rain have found their way into the Charismatic movement. Put another way, most of the distinctive Charismatic tenets have their roots in Latter Rain theology.

Classical Pentecostals were correct to withdraw from the New Order of the Latter Rain. While in many ways it was a sincere manifestation of spiritual hunger, and while in some cases it brought revival, most often it resulted in confusion, division, doctrinal compromise, neglect of holiness lifestyle, mysticism, and unscriptural excesses. Today, however, many classical Pentecostals, particularly trinitarians, have in essence endorsed some of the same beliefs and practices by an unreserved endorsement of the Charismatic movement.

A History of Christian Doctrine

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, an increasing number of people in mainline Protestant denominations began to receive the Holy Spirit while remaining in their traditional churches. At first called Neo-Pentecostals, they eventually became known as Charismatics, from the Greek charismata—the word that I Corinthians 12 uses for spiritual gifts.

The roots of the Charismatic movement go back to classical Pentecostalism itself. Most of the early Charismatic leaders received the Holy Spirit as a result of contact with classical Pentecostals. As the movement grew, many of the teachers who became prominent had previously been affiliated with classical Pentecostal churches such as the Assemblies of God (AG). In theology, methodology and

The Charismatic
Movement

10

lifestyle, however, the early Charismatics were greatly influenced by the healing revivals and the Latter Rain movement of the 1940s and 1950s.

Important Pentecostal Influences

Pentecostals have always witnessed to Christians of other denominations and converted many of them to the Pentecostal message and experience. Three factors made

the early Charismatics different from most of the past converts: (1) They were members of mainline Protestant denominations instead of more conservative groups. (2) They stayed in their denominations instead of joining Pentecostal churches, and later some formed their own independent churches. (3) Generally they did not want to adopt the theology, lifestyle, or religious culture of the Pentecostals, but they sought to renew their churches from within.

The Pentecostal message came to mainline Protestants from several important sources in addition to the individual witness of many believers. As we discussed in chapter 9, Demos Shakarian (born 1913), a Pentecostal, founded the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International (FGBMFI) in 1951 as a nondenominational group that could bring the Pentecostal message to businessmen outside the movement. Many Protestant and Catholic businessmen first heard about and experienced the baptism of the Holy Spirit through FGBMFI and its magazine, Voice.

Another important witness was David du Plessis (1905-87), a South African Pentecostal preacher who immigrated to America and joined the Assemblies of God. In the 1950s, when there was little contact or dialogue

A History of Christian Doctrine

between Pentecostals and the mainline denominations, he felt that God was leading him to witness to mainline Protestants, the World Council of Churches (WCC), and even the Roman Catholic Church. Over the years, he developed close ties to leaders in these organizations. He was received by three popes, he attended all the WCC international conferences, and he spoke at a number of mainline Protestant churches. He became known in those circles as "Mr. Pentecost."

In most cases, du Plessis gave denominational leaders their first close encounter with an authentic Pentecostal. He combined an intelligent theological presentation with Pentecostal spirituality, contradicting the stereotype of Pentecostals as poor, lower class, ignorant, and fanatic. In 1962, du Plessis was forced to withdraw from the AG, because in effect he advocated ecumenical relations with the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church, which the AG opposed. He sometimes made controversial statements in his pursuit of ecumenism—for instance, commenting favorably on the papacy and on the supposed

apparitions of Mary—and he urged Charismatics to stay in their denominational churches. The AG was concerned about compromise of Pentecostal theology and lifestyle, especially by recognizing groups that denied essentials of biblical faith by Evangelical standards. Moreover, the general superintendent of the AG, Thomas Zimmerman, was the head of the National Association of Evangelicals, which was the conservative rival to the National Council of Churches and the WCC. Eventually, however, the AG came to accept the Charismatic movement, and du Plessis was reinstated in 1980.

Another classical Pentecostal influence was David

277

The Charismatic Movement

Wilkerson (born 1931), an AG minister who began an effective ministry among the street gangs of New York City. He ultimately founded Teen Challenge as a nationwide deliverance ministry. His book, The Cross and the Switchblade (1963), recounted how God had led him into this work and how many youth were miraculously delivered from drugs, alcohol, gang violence, and promiscuity. It spoke of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a key factor in the process. A film by the same name was also produced. Many Protestants and Catholics first learned of the baptism of the Spirit from the book or film and developed a hunger to receive this experience for themselves.

Early Charismatic Experiences

After World War II, a few Protestant ministers began receiving the Holy Spirit yet remained in their denominations. Probably the first significant case was Harald Bredesen (born 1918), a Lutheran minister who received the Holy Spirit at a Pentecostal camp in 1946. He offered to resign as a minister, but Lutheran authorities refused to accept the resignation. In 1957, Bredesen became a pastor— at Mount Vernon Dutch Reformed Church in New York City—and he soon began a charismatic prayer meeting there. Later, when the Charismatic movement blossomed, he became a prominent leader and media figure. For example, he appeared on Walter Cronkite's television program in 1963.

Another early forerunner of the Charismatic movement was Tommy Tyson (born 1922), a United Methodist pastor. He received the Holy Spirit in 1952 and became an evangelist.

A number of mainline Protestants received the Holy

278

A History of Christian Doctrine

Spirit at the Camps Farthest Out. As an example, Don Basham (born 1926) of the Disciples of Christ received the Holy Spirit in 1952. Although these camps were not explicitly Pentecostal, some of the speakers had received the Holy Spirit.

Robert Walker (born 1912), the editor of an Evangelical magazine called Christian Life, received the Holy Spirit in 1952. He did not publicly witness to this experience, but he began to write about the need for renewal. He did witness to Billy Graham, who acknowledged that his brother-in-law and sister had spoken in tongues and that he had received an experience with the Holy Spirit but without tongues.283 Christian Life helped create a hunger within Protestant churches for a new move of God. In 1987 the magazine merged with Charisma.

Agnes Sanford (1897-1982), the wife of an Episcopalian priest, became interested in healing after she was healed of depression. She received the Holy Spirit in 1953-54 after contact with Pentecostals and became one of the foremost promoters of healing and charismatic renewal within mainline Protestant churches.

A prolific writer and teacher, she developed views beyond those of classical Pentecostalism. She emphasized positive thinking as a natural law of healing that anyone could operate. Blending psychology with religion, she also advocated the healing of memories, which she equated with forgiveness of sin. In essence, she stated that many problems are the result of past events and wrongs. When a person is healed of these negative memories, then he or she will overcome the problems.

One of the first Mennonite ministers to be baptized

279

The Charismatic Movement

with the Holy Spirit was Gerald Derstine (born 1928). He was asked to leave his church in Ogema, Minnesota, when he received this experience in 1955.

An early catalyst for charismatic experiences was the Order of St. Luke, an Episcopalian organization that promoted healing. While it did not explicitly advocate the baptism of the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues, many people who sought divine healing also received the Holy Spirit. Richard Winkler (born 1916) was one of the early participants to receive the Holy Ghost (1956). As rector (parish pastor) of Trinity Episcopal Church in Wheaton,

Illinois, he began a charismatic prayer group there in the 1950s.

A Presbyterian pastor, James H. Brown (1912-87), received the Holy Ghost in 1956 after contact with Pentecostals. He followed the advice of David du Plessis, who urged him to stay within his denomination to renew it. Brown soon instituted a charismatic service on Saturday evening at his pastorate, Upper Octorara United Presbyterian Church in Parkesburg, Pennsylvania, just outside Philadelphia. The main church services remained traditional, however.

In 1958, John Osteen (1921-99), a Southern Baptist pastor in Houston, Texas, received the Holy Spirit after being influenced by Pentecostal literature. About that time, his daughter, who was born with cerebral palsy, was healed. He was tried for heresy by the Southern Baptists in Texas and left his pastorate to form the independent Lakewood Church.

The Beginning of the Movement

The Charismatic movement became a distinct movement in the eyes of the public in 1960. As we have just

A History of Christian Doctrine

seen, a number of Protestants who would become leaders in the Charismatic movement had received the Holy Spirit before this time. Most historians, however, identify the defining event with Dennis Bennett (born 1917), rector at St. Mark's Episcopal Church in Van Nuys, California. Bennett and some of his parishioners had received the Holy Spirit with tongues in November 1959, but it was not until April 1960 that he announced this news to his congregation.

The announcement proved to be quite controversial, and Bennett was soon forced to resign his pastorate. Jean Stone (born 1924), a church member who had received the Holy Spirit along with Bennett, alerted the news media to the controversy, including Newsweek and Time. Both of these national news magazines carried the story of mainline Protestants who had embraced Pentecostal experiences. It was also widely reported in the religious press and on television.

As a result of the publicity, many people began to inquire about the Pentecostal experience and to seek it. Many who had already received the Holy Spirit in mainline churches began to openly acknowledge the fact and to make contact with one another. A network of Spiritfilled Protestants grew, and the Charismatics became a

distinct, identifiable movement.

Protestant Charismatics

By the early 1960s, all the major Protestant denominations had a Charismatic movement within them.

Eternity magazine labeled it Neo-Pentecostal, but Harald Bredesen and Jean Stone proposed the name that the participants preferred: the Charismatic Renewal.

The Charismatic Movement

The term "Charismatic" identified the movement with the diversity of spiritual gifts of I Corinthians, rather than stressing the uniqueness of tongues in Acts 2 as the label "Pentecostal" would. Most of the early Charismatics spoke in tongues, but unlike the classical Pentecostals most of them did not accept tongues as the necessary, initial evidence of Spirit baptism.

The Charismatic movement was particularly strong among Episcopalians. Early Episcopalian leaders were Sanford, Winkler, Bennett, and Stone. After resigning his church in Van Nuys, Bennett became pastor of St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Seattle, Washington, which was at the point of closing down. He revived the church and transformed it into a powerful Charismatic center. Both Bennett and his wife, Rita (born 1934), became prominent Charismatic teachers. To promote the movement, Jean Stone (later Williams) founded the Blessed Trinity Society and Trinity magazine, published from 1961 to 1966.

Among Lutherans, the foremost Charismatic leader and theologian was Laurence "Larry" Christenson (born 1928). An American Lutheran pastor in San Pedro, California, he received the Holy Spirit at a Foursquare Gospel church in 1961. His church became a strong center for Lutheran Charismatics.

Among Presbyterians, key leaders were James Brown, Robert Whittaker, George "Brick" Bradford, and J. Rodman Williams (born 1918). The United Presbyterian Church sought to expel Whittaker for his Pentecostal beliefs, but after two appeals in which his case went to the highest church court, he won the right to remain in the denomination. Williams received the Holy Spirit in

A History of Christian Doctrine

1965 while a professor of systematic theology at Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Austin, Texas. He became a noted theologian in the Charismatic movement.

John Sherrill (born 1923), an Episcopalian and a
senior editor for Guideposts, and his wife, Elizabeth
(born 1928), decided to investigate the Charismatic
movement. In the process, they received the Holy Spirit
themselves. The result was a book called They Speak
with Other Tongues (1964). One of the first books to
tell about the Charismatic movement, it had a great
impact upon people of many denominations. The
Sherrills also collaborated in the writing of a number of
other influential books, including The Cross and the
Switchblade (1963) with David Wilkerson, God's
Smuggler (1967) with Brother Andrew (a Dutch missionary
who smuggled Bibles into communist countries),
and The Hiding Place (1975) with Corrie ten Boom (a
Dutch Charismatic who had helped hide Jews from the
Nazis in World War II).

In 1972, the Mennonite Church officially recognized
the validity of the Charismatic movement in its ranks. By
one estimate, perhaps as many as twenty percent of the
Mennonites have received the Holy Spirit, and in some
countries a majority have done so.

Initially, the Charismatics met much rejection. Some
churches expelled pastors who had received the Holy
Spirit, and some churches split. As time went on, however,
most of the major denominations accommodated to the
movement. Most merely tolerated it: as long as pastors
continued to affirm traditional theology, continued to conduct
traditional services on Sunday, and did not promote
their views in a dogmatic or controversial manner, then

283

The Charismatic Movement

they could conduct Charismatic prayer meetings or praise
services also. Some denominations eventually welcomed
the Charismatic movement as an antidote to the decline in
membership of liberal Protestants, for it attracted new
people and renewed the devotion of many who had been
drifting away. Some churches even began to conduct most
or all of their services in Charismatic fashion.

By century's end, the Charismatic movement no
longer encountered opposition from the large Protestant
denominations, with the notable exception of two conservative
groups who were Evangelical in theology: the
Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod and the Southern
Baptist Convention. While these groups did not take an
official stand nationally, on the local and district levels
most Charismatics in these groups were pressured to

leave. A significant number still remained, however, particularly among the Baptists. Usually, they had to hide or minimize their distinctive beliefs. Most used the term "fulness" instead of "Charismatic" to describe their experience. James Robison (born 1945), a prominent Southern Baptist evangelist, experienced healing and deliverance in 1981. Thereafter he focused his ministry on gifts of the Spirit, but he did not explicitly accept or reject the label "Charismatic."

In sum, the more liberal Protestant denominations freely allowed the Charismatic movement within their ranks. The most vigorous opponents were Fundamentalists, Holiness churches, and some Evangelicals. For instance, the conservative Wesleyan and Holiness churches, such as the Church of the Nazarene, denied the validity of speaking in tongues.

284

A History of Christian Doctrine

The Catholic Charismatic Renewal

In 1967 the Charismatic Renewal swept into the Roman Catholic Church, beginning at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Some students there heard about the Holy Spirit through The Cross and the Switchblade, They Speak with Other Tongues, and testimonies of Pentecostals. They began praying for the Holy Spirit and received the experience in February 1967.

From there, the movement spread to Notre Dame University in South Bend, Indiana. Leaders who received the Pentecostal experience at Notre Dame were Kevin Ranaghan (born 1940), his wife, Dorothy (born 1942), and Edward O'Connor, a priest.

The movement went on to Michigan State University in Ann Arbor, Michigan. These three universities became great centers of the Catholic Charismatic movement, and through them it spread throughout Roman Catholicism. For a time, Catholic Charismatics held annual national meetings at Notre Dame, but later they began to hold regional meetings. In 1976, 30,000 Catholic Charismatics gathered at Notre Dame. The next year, a regional meeting in Atlantic City, New Jersey, had an attendance of 37,000.284

Some Charismatics formed spiritual communities in the Catholic tradition. In some of them, all the members lived in the same community; in others, members lived in separate residences but made a covenant to meet together

and submit to one another. These communities became powerful vehicles for teaching and evangelism, helping to spread the Charismatic movement throughout Catholicism. The most prominent of them were the Word of God

285

The Charismatic Movement

community in Ann Arbor, Michigan, which established a network of communities under its leadership called the Sword of the Spirit; People of Praise community in South Bend, Indiana; and Mother of God community in Gaithersburg, Maryland. While they were not restricted to Catholics, most of their members were Catholic Charismatics.

For the most part, the Catholic Charismatic movement took the form of prayer groups within parishes, instead of taking over entire parishes or splitting away to form independent churches. Most Catholic Charismatics continued to attend traditional mass and participate in parish life, but they also attended Charismatic prayer groups where they could speak in tongues and worship spontaneously. In1986, there were an estimated six thousand Catholic Charismatic prayer groups in the United States.

The Roman Catholic Church's response was to accept the Catholic Charismatic Renewal as long the participants remained in the church and continued to acknowledge church authority and doctrine. Indeed, on this basis both Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II endorsed the movement. In 1975, Pope Paul VI appointed Léon-Joseph Cardinal Suenens (born 1904), an archbishop in Belgium, to a special position as overseer of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal. Cardinal Suenens had been one of the leaders of the Second Vatican Council, and he began to participate openly in the Charismatic movement in 1973. As a result of this recognition, Catholic Charismatics have had a significant influence in the church. One of them, Raniero Cantalamessa, was appointed as special preacher to the Vatican.

286

A History of Christian Doctrine

The Catholic Church recommended that each diocese establish a liaison with the Charismatic movement in its jurisdiction. To some extent, then, depending on the diocese, the Charismatic Renewal was incorporated into the structure of the Catholic Church.

Influential Catholic Charismatics were Kilian

McDonnell (born 1921), Benedictine monk, theologian, and ecumenical leader; Francis MacNutt (born 1925), Dominican priest and healing preacher who later withdrew from the priesthood and married; Peter Hocken
(born 1932), Anglican convert to Catholicism, historian, theologian, and ecumenist; and John Bertolucci (born 1937), priest and evangelist.

In the 1980s and 1990s, the Catholic Charismatic movement declined somewhat. Many people participated in prayer groups for a few years but then dropped out. There was a decline both in the number of prayer groups and in the number of participants.

In contrast to Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy took a strong stand against the Charismatic movement. Despite this opposition, there are small Charismatic groups within the Orthodox churches.

Further Developments

As we have just seen, from 1960 to 1967 the Charismatic movement spread to all major branches of Christendom. This dramatic growth led to the development of a number of distinctly Charismatic institutions, including the following:

• Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN), founded by M. G. "Pat" Robertson (born 1930). The son of a U.S. senator, Robertson was a Southern Baptist minister who

287

The Charismatic Movement

received the Holy Spirit. He began his worldwide network with the purchase of a defunct television station in 1959. The flagship program was "The 700 Club." In 1988, Robertson ran for the Republican nomination for U.S. president, but he never became a serious contender.

• Youth with a Mission (YWAM), a nondenominational, youth-oriented missionary movement. It was founded by Loren Cunningham, an AG minister, in 1960-61, but he left the AG in 1964 after he and AG officials could not agree on policy for YWAM.

• Oral Roberts University (1965). (See chapter 9.)

• Logos International Fellowship (1966), the first Charismatic publishing house, founded by Dan Malachuk. It became quite well known, distributing millions of books on Charismatic themes, including the prosperity message. It suffered financial difficulties, however, and finally went bankrupt. Part of its operation was taken over by Bridge Publishing. Other Charismatic publishers have since arisen, including Harvest House, Bethany House,

and Creation House.
• Women's Aglow Fellowship (1967), a nondenominational women's fellowship similar to the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International.
• Trinity Broadcasting Network (TBN) (1973), founded by Paul Crouch (born 1934) and his wife, Jan. Crouch was a minister with the AG.
• Charisma magazine (1975), probably the most influential publication in the Charismatic movement today. It was founded by Stephen Strang (born 1951), who had his origin in the AG. Strang later acquired Christian Life magazine (which he merged with Charisma) and Creation House. He also launched other

288

A History of Christian Doctrine

publications including Ministries Today.
• Regent University (1977), founded by Pat Robertson (originally as CBN University).

Several influential ministries arose but then fell. Examples were the media empires of Jim Bakker (based in Charlotte, North Carolina), Jimmy Swaggart (based in Baton Rouge, Louisiana), and Robert Tilton (based in Dallas, Texas). Bakker and Swaggart were prominent television evangelists in the AG who developed a nationwide following outside classical Pentecostalism. In the 1980s, both acquired lavish incomes, fell into sexual immorality, and lost their credentials with the AG. Bakker's ministry, PTL, folded, and he served time in prison for fraud. Swaggart continued his ministry but lost most of his following. Tilton's ministry likewise crashed in the 1990s after two divorces and accusations of dishonesty and financial wrongdoing.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, many hippies and other youth who embraced street culture were converted to Christianity, especially on the U.S. West Coast. Some adopted Baptist beliefs, while others received the Pentecostal experience. They turned from drugs, promiscuity, and other sins, but many retained their countercultural hairstyles, dress, music, and informality. Charles "Chuck" Smith (born 1927), a Foursquare Gospel pastor, was able to incorporate many of these Jesus People into his church—Calvary Chapel in Costa Mesa, California— giving rise to a network of such churches.

This time period also saw the rise of Messianic Jewish congregations and organizations, including Jews for Jesus. These Jewish believers in Jesus embraced conservative

Christian theology but retained Jewish culture and
forms of worship. Most of the Messianic Jews were
Charismatic.

The coming of age of the Charismatic movement—
and perhaps its high-water mark—was signified by the
first national conference in 1977 in Kansas City. It drew
over 50,000 participants from many denominations—
classical Pentecostals, mainline Protestants, and Roman
Catholics (18,000). Officials of some classical Pentecostal
denominations took part, indicating approval of
the Charismatic movement and its ecumenical thrust.
Demonstrative worship occurred to a degree that was
quite unusual for Charismatics: "One firmly entrenched
memory from Kansas City was the 'Holy Ghost breakdown'
which occurred while Bob Mumford was speaking.
For 10 unrestrained minutes the crowd worshipped
wildly."285

In 1987, another conference was held in New Orleans.
About 35,000 to 40,000 participated—much less than the
anticipated 70,000 to 80,000.286 In 1990, an international
Charismatic conference in Indianapolis drew 23,000 people.
In both conferences about one-half of the participants
were Roman Catholic.

In 1994, a great revival began at the Toronto Airport
Vineyard Fellowship in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, under
Pastor John Arnott. People from across the world came to
receive the "Toronto Blessing" and bring it back to their
churches. The emphasis of this revival was on strengthening
and renewing existing believers. One of the
churches most affected was Holy Trinity Brompton, an
Anglican church in London, England, which in turn
became a revival center. In the first two years, an estimated
200,000 people visited the Toronto church, and
about 4,000 churches were touched as a result.
The revival was somewhat controversial, however,
because of emphasis on unusual physical manifestations
such as laughter, roaring, and animal noises. Consequently,
the Vineyard association severed ties with the
Toronto church, which became known as the Toronto
Airport Christian Fellowship. The church responded to
criticism by explaining that it did not try to promote or
insist on these unusual manifestations. In 1999, the

church made a controversial claim, reminiscent of the Latter Rain, that God was transforming people's dental fillings into gold, although no such cases were officially documented. To promote this type of miracle, it produced a video entitled Go for the Gold, and it cited Psalm 81:10 as scriptural support.287

In 1995, a great revival broke out at Brownsville Assembly of God in Pensacola, Florida, with Evangelist Steven Hill and Pastor John Kilpatrick. Although this church was part of a Pentecostal denomination, the revival attracted people of many denominations. The emphasis was on repentance, deliverance, and inward holiness. By early 1999, over 2,300,000 people had visited the revival, and over 130,000 people had made decisions to become Christians. Some Oneness Pentecostal observers concluded that there was a genuine work of the Spirit to draw people, similar to what typically occurs in revivals and camp meetings of the UPCI.

Four Major Streams

Over time, some Charismatics left their traditional denominations and formed new congregations, networks, and organizations. They were joined by many people who

291

The Charismatic Movement

had left classical Pentecostal denominations, including participants in the post-war healing revivals and the Latter Rain movement. By the 1970s, it was possible to identify four distinct streams within the Charismatic movement.

1. Charismatic Renewal. As we have discussed, this term refers to the Charismatic movement within the mainline denominations, Protestant and Catholic. It is particularly strong within the Episcopal Church and the Roman Catholic Church. The participants attend Charismatic prayer meetings, exhibit renewed zeal for spiritual matters, and enjoy relatively free and spontaneous worship in contrast to traditional liturgy. They believe in deliverance, healing, miracles, and gifts of the Spirit.

2. Faith, Word, or Word of Faith Churches. These churches developed outside preexisting denominations and emphasize positive confession, healing, health, and prosperity.

The acknowledged founder of this stream is Kenneth Hagin (born 1917), a former AG minister who developed his own unique theological system. He established Rhema

Bible Training Center in 1974 in Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, near Tulsa. Since that time his influence and ministry have mushroomed. By 1988 he had written eighty-five books, and 180 stations carried his radio program. Each year, about three million of his books and a half million of his cassette tapes are distributed.[288] Hagin's theology owes much to the influence of E. W. Kenyon (1867-1948), an independent Baptist evangelist and teacher.[289] For instance, Hagin's writings contain many quotations or paraphrases of the earlier writings of

A History of Christian Doctrine

Kenyon (but without attribution). Other prominent teachers in this camp are Kenneth Copeland, Frederick Price, Jerry Savelle, Charles Capps, Norvell Hayes, Robert Tilton, and David (formerly Paul) Yonggi Cho.

The Word of Faith teachers emphasize healing and prosperity. They typically proclaim that if a person truly has faith and makes the right confession, then he will be healthy and rich. His only limitations in these areas would be deficient faith and negative confessions. For instance, if he says, "I think I am getting sick," then he will get sick. On the other hand, if he says, "I am not sick; I am healed," then he will be healed. He should rebuke and deny any symptoms of sickness and confess his healing. His level of faith will determine whether he is sick or well, and his words will actually create the condition.

3. Nondenominational Churches and Fellowships.

This stream consists of nondenominational, Spirit-filled churches and fellowships that sprang up in the last quarter of the twentieth century. It has become the fastestgrowing segment of the Charismatic movement.

Many of the leaders were formerly in the classical Pentecostal movement but sought to operate independently of their one-time Pentecostal doctrinal formulas, ecclesiastical organization, and ministerial disciplines. Others were associated with the Charismatic Renewal in mainline churches but decided that they could be more effective by leaving their denominations and operating full-fledged Charismatic churches.

Many megachurches (churches with two thousand or more in weekly attendance), a relatively recent phenomenon, fall into this category. In addition, a number of church networks emerged that fell short of being full

The Charismatic Movement

denominations yet fostered cooperation on many endeavors. Some have dissolved, others have remained as fellowships of independent churches, and some have evolved into the equivalent of denominations. Examples of such networks, with founders and leaders, are as follows: National Leadership Conference (Ken Sumrall and Gerald Derstine); People of Destiny International (Larry Tomczak and C. J. Mahaney); Maranatha Christian Churches (Bob Weiner); Fellowship of Covenant Ministers and Conferences (Charles Simpson); Network of Christian Ministries (Charles Green); International Convention of Faith Ministries (Happy Caldwell); Charismatic Bible Ministries (Oral Roberts); Victory Ministry Fellowship (Billy Joe Dougherty); Church on the Rock (Larry Lea); International Communion of Charismatic Churches (John Meares and Earl Paulk); and Global Christian Network (ex-UPCI ministers).

4. Third Wave, or Signs and Wonders Movement.

C. Peter Wagner (born 1930), a church growth specialist, coined the name "Third Wave" to refer to Evangelicals who do not want to be identified as Pentecostal (the first wave) or Charismatic (the second wave) but who seek miracles, healings, and other "power" encounters with God. Most of them do not speak in tongues. Those who do, generally do not publicize or emphasize this experience. The Third Wave adherents seek to retain Evangelical theology. Thus they do not speak of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a distinct experience but consider that they have had it all along as part of their conversion. They simply learned to "release" or "manifest" miraculous gifts of

A History of Christian Doctrine

the Spirit. This theology prompted Dennis Bennett to reaffirm the reality of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a distinct experience subsequent to Evangelical conversion. He asked, "Does this mean that what has happened to me and to the people at St. Luke's—and to all those other Christians over the last three decades—has been just a happy illusion?" He warned, "Don't let any wave wash away the blessing of Pentecost."290

The Third Wave has successfully introduced Pentecostal-Charismatic beliefs and experiences into many conservative Protestant churches, including many that were resistant both to the early Pentecostal revival and to the Charismatic Renewal. Increasingly, Evangelicals

have begun to acknowledge the validity of speaking
in tongues, healing, miracles, and casting out of demons,
even though they are somewhat doubtful about experiencing
these things personally.

Peter Wagner, a Congregationalist minister, became a
proponent of the Third Wave. As an Evangelical missionary
in Bolivia, he had actively opposed Pentecostalism. In
1971, however, he joined the faculty of Fuller Theological
Seminary as a church growth specialist. His research documented
a close association of signs and wonders with
church growth. He began to advocate the pursuit of
supernatural gifts for the purpose of facilitating church
growth.

John Wimber (born 1934) was a Friends (Quaker)
pastor who became a church growth researcher along
with Wagner. Eventually he decided to implement his
Third Wave views by founding a church in Anaheim,
California, which he called the Vineyard Christian
Fellowship. This led to the Association of Vineyard

295

The Charismatic Movement

Churches, which in 1999 consisted of about 500 churches
in the U.S. and 850 worldwide. Since Wimber's death
it has been led by Todd Hunter. It is the most significant
Third Wave organization, and it emphasizes teaching,
signs and wonders, contemporary worship, and small
groups.

As of 1988, David Barrett reported that there were
123 million Charismatics worldwide, excluding the Third
Wave, and 28 million in the Third Wave.291 Of the 123 million,
however, he identified 80 million as post-
Charismatics. They were once active in Charismatic
meetings, but later stopped attending or attended rarely.
It is doubtful if most of this number ever received the
Holy Spirit. Thus, the net number of active Charismatics
was about 43 million. As a more conservative estimate, J.
I. Packer stated in Christianity Today that in 1989 total
Charismatics numbered about 25 million.292

In an update of Barrett's figures, by the end of 1998
there were an estimated 92 million Catholic Charismatics
and 71 million Protestant Charismatics, for a total of 163
million.293 When we consider the percentage of post-Charismatics
reported by Barrett, however, probably only about
60 million of these could be counted as active Charismatics.
There were reportedly 110 million Third Wavers.

Doctrines and Practices

Peter Hocken, a Catholic Charismatic priest and a
well-known scholar in the Charismatic movement, presented
nine characteristics of the Charismatic movement
that it shares with Pentecostalism:[294]

1. "Focus on Jesus"—renewed devotion, worship,
praise, and proclamation of Jesus.

2. "Praise."

3. "Love of the Bible"—renewed emphasis on reading
and studying the Scriptures.

4. "God Speaks Today"—God reveals Himself and
gives direction to His people, corporately and individually.
In short, people can have a personal, supernatural
relationship with God.

5. "Evangelism"—telling others about one's experience
and converting them to it.

6. "Awareness of Evil"—believing in the reality of
sin, Satan, and demons.

7. "Spiritual Gifts."

8. "Eschatological Expectation"—looking for the
second coming of Jesus.

9. "Spiritual Power."

Hocken also discussed seven points of contrast with
classical Pentecostals:[295]

1. The Charismatic movement began in the white
middle class and has not had a significant impact
among racial minorities. By contrast, the Pentecostal
movement began primarily among the lower classes and
the poor, and from the beginning it was strong among
blacks, Hispanics, immigrants, and other minorities.

2. Charismatics are not as missionary oriented as
Pentecostals. Pentecostals established vigorous missionary
efforts from the outset, while Charismatics have only
recently begun to give significant attention to missions.

3. Charismatics exhibit less concern for holiness
of life. The Pentecostal movement historically emphasized
holiness of life, including standards of conduct and
dress. Examples are abstention from alcohol and
tobacco, avoiding worldly pleasures and amusements,

and dressing modestly. The Charismatic movement has
exhibited little concern for these external issues. It is
common for Charismatics to smoke, drink, attend movies,
and wear makeup, jewelry, and relatively scanty clothing.

In recent years, however, some voices in the Charismatic
movement have called for moderation and caution in
these areas, while most Trinitarian Pentecostals have
relaxed their stand.

4. Charismatics have greater fellowship across
doctrinal boundaries. Pentecostals have tended to have
fellowship along major doctrinal lines, while Charismatics
have generally said that love and unity should predominate
over doctrine. For this reason, it is common for
Charismatics of various denominations, including both
Protestants and Catholics, to have close fellowship.
Historically, Pentecostals have wondered, How can we
unite with Roman Catholics, when we emphasize justification
by faith in Jesus Christ and the sole authority of
Scripture while Roman Catholics believe in papal infallibility,
venerate the virgin Mary, worship the bread and
wine at mass as the actual body and blood of Jesus, confess
their sins to a priest, and perform acts of penance to
pay the temporal penalty for sin? How can we unite with
Protestants whose churches do not proclaim the fundamentals
of the Christian faith? How can we have close fellowship
with people who do not adopt the beliefs,
worship, and lifestyle that we believe the Bible commands?
In recent years, however, Trinitarian Pentecostals
have broadened their fellowship under the influence of
the Charismatics.

5. Most Charismatics are not dispensationalist
premillennialists, whereas Pentecostals are premillenni-

298

A History of Christian Doctrine

alists, and historically most of them have been dispensationalists.
Premillennialism presupposes a literal interpretation
of end-time prophecy, under which the next
great event is the coming of the Lord Jesus followed by
His reign of a thousand years on earth (the Millennium).
Many Charismatics, however, follow the traditional view
of mainline denominations—amillennialism or postmillennialism.

6. Charismatics emphasize inner healing—psychological
healing or healing of memories. While both
Pentecostals and Charismatics teach healing for the
whole person—body, soul, and spirit—there is some difference
of emphasis. Pentecostals speak more of physical
healing. They approach spiritual problems with a greater
stress on repentance, prayer, deliverance from sinful
habits, and developing godly disciplines, whereas
Charismatics speak more of the need to overcome personal

hurts.

7. Charismatics have a different theology concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues. First, most Charismatics do not believe that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence of receiving the Holy Spirit. Instead, they consider it to be merely one of the spiritual gifts that may be manifested in the life of a Spirit-filled believer. Thus, many of them call it a "prayer language"—simply an aid or accompaniment to spiritual prayer. Some regard it as an evidence, but one that can come some time after a person has received the Holy Spirit.

Some deny that one should expect any initial evidence. Instead, they say that the baptism of the Holy Spirit comes simply by asking, confessing, or claiming it—with or without a miraculous manifestation. Harald

299

The Charismatic Movement

Bredesen suggested the following prayer for receiving the Spirit:296

Heavenly Father, I thank You for the promise of Your Spirit. Jesus, You are my Savior. I trust You now by grace through faith. You are the One who baptizes with the Holy Spirit. I'm not waiting for any sign or feeling to believe that You have baptized me with the Holy Spirit. I receive Your gift. Thank You that I am now a Spirit-filled child of God. Amen.

Nevertheless, many Charismatics do expect that the typical Spirit-filled person will speak in tongues. For them, speaking in tongues is still the most common manifestation if not the uniform evidence. Thus Kilian McDonnell was willing to speak of tongues and prophecy as having a "privileged place," present in the vast majority of cases.297 David Pawson considered the sign to be "spontaneous spiritual speech"—tongues, prophecy, or ecstatic praise.298 John Wimber said that tongues and prophecy are the "initiatory" gifts that should normally accompany the baptism of the Holy Spirit.299

Many Charismatics believe that they already received the Spirit when they first confessed faith or were baptized in water, and they do not consider the baptism of the Holy Spirit to be a distinct experience theologically. Instead, they speak of the "release" of the Spirit with miraculous power in their lives. Others speak of multiple comings of the Spirit in a person's life. Kilian McDonnell explained, "If the effects of the Spirit are not fully manifest [at initiation or water baptism] . . . subsequent prayer for the

outpouring of the Spirit . . . is wholly appropriate."300
300
A History of Christian Doctrine
In short, when Charismatics say they have received,
been filled with, or been baptized with the Holy Spirit,
they may not mean that they have spoken in tongues.
Instead, they may mean simply that they had some sort
of spiritual encounter with God, but one that
Pentecostals may not consider to be the baptism of the
Holy Spirit.
Moreover, many Charismatics believe that it is possible
to teach someone how to speak in tongues, or that the
gift of tongues can come by imitation, practice, and
human efforts. In essence, they regard it as a psychological
phenomenon, while Pentecostals insist that true
speaking in tongues can only come as the Spirit gives
utterance (Acts 2:4). For Charismatics, tongues may simply
be language-like sounds; for Pentecostals they are
genuine languages.
As an example, Charles Hunter, a well-known Charismatic
evangelist, gave the following instructions on how
to receive the Holy Ghost:301
In just a moment when I tell you to, begin loving
and praising God by speaking forth a lot of different
syllable sounds, but not in a language you know, and
don't try to think of the sounds. At first, make the
sounds rapidly so you won't try to think as you do
speaking in your natural language.
Continue making the sounds with long flowing
sentences; don't just make a few sounds and stop and
start. . . .
I am going to speak in tongues talking to God in
my spirit language so you can hear what my language
sounds like.
301
The Charismatic Movement
With these instructions, he said that hundreds instantly
receive the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals would say that many
of these people may repeat, copy, or manufacture certain
sounds, but they do not truly receive the baptism of the
Holy Spirit, with the Spirit of God giving the prompting
and the utterance.
On the doctrine of salvation, Charismatics typically
affirm the standard theology of their parent denominations.
Some Charismatic theologians teach that both
water baptism and Spirit baptism are integral to

Christian initiation, or the new birth. Larry Christenson (Lutheran) taught that repentance, baptism in water, and baptism of the Holy Ghost are all links in the conversion process.302 David Pawson (former Baptist) held that repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit are all necessary for salvation, justification, and new birth.303 Kilian McDonnell (Roman Catholic) affirmed that both water baptism and Spirit baptism are part of Christian initiation.304 In principle, the position of such teachers is quite similar to that of the Oneness Pentecostal doctrine of the new birth, although in practice most of them do not baptize specifically in the name of Jesus Christ or expect tongues to be the initial sign in every case of Spirit baptism.

A number of Charismatics practice baptism in Jesus' name after the pattern of the Book of Acts. Examples are David Pawson in England, Bob Weiner in the U.S., and the churches that formerly were associated as Maranatha Christian Fellowship. Recently, a prominent Charismatic leader in the Philippines was baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and by one report as many as 500,000 of his followers have been so baptized.305

302

A History of Christian Doctrine

Some leading Charismatic and Pentecostal ministers invoke both the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and the Lord Jesus Christ at baptism. For instance, Peter Kuzmic, a Pentecostal Croatian and the most prominent theologian in the Balkans, usually baptizes with both formulas.306 Larry Lea has reportedly done the same. Some say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ."

There is no accurate measurement of how many Charismatics have been baptized in Jesus' name, but estimates range from ten to twenty-five percent. Most of them do not regard water baptism as essential to salvation, however, or insist that invoking the name of Jesus is the only correct way. Nor do they explicitly reject trinitarianism in favor of the Oneness doctrine. Even some classical Trinitarian Pentecostals, such as ministers in the AG, baptize in the name of Jesus Christ on this basis, although they do not rebaptize those who have already been baptized with the trinitarian formula.

The worship of Charismatics is free in comparison to that of their parent denominations. It is generally not as spontaneous or intense as that of classical Pentecostals,

however. Charismatics tend to be more subdued. There is
less emphasis on altar calls and extended prayer, and
more emphasis on praise celebration and entertainment.
For example, the independent churches commonly
employ rock music and choreography in their worship. As
Charisma noted, "Ecstatic 'dancing in the Spirit' has
largely given way to spontaneous and choreographed
'dancing before the Lord.'"307 The services of the
megachurches often take the form of Christian shows and
concerts, including dance teams and body building

303

The Charismatic Movement

shows. Huge crowds are often attracted as a result, but
much of the Pentecostal spontaneity, fervor, and spirituality
seem to be lost.

Charismatics are also prone to follow new spiritual
trends, doctrines, and fads. Some such practices have
little or no biblical support. Others have precedents in the
Bible and in classical Pentecostalism, but Charismatics
have transformed them into norms or rituals. Examples
are being "slain in the Spirit" and "holy laughter." While
these expressions of worship have always existed in
Pentecostal ranks, they have generally been left to individual
action under the unction of the Spirit. In some
Charismatic circles, however, they have become norms,
with leaders pressing for everyone to exhibit these manifestations.
The result is often a stylized, mechanical, or
psychologically induced phenomenon instead of a genuine
move of the Holy Spirit.

For example, the meetings of evangelist Benny Hinn
(originally from Israel) are noted for people falling down
when he blows on them or waves at them. Typically, however,
the people do not enter into deep prayer or a
trancelike state as Pentecostals do, but they gently
descend to the floor, lie there for a short while, look
around to see what is happening, and then get up.
Evangelist Rodney Howard-Browne (originally from
South Africa) promotes mass laughter in his meetings.
He often initiates this response by making funny statements
and sounds, laughing infectiously, urging others to
imitate him, and commanding the crowd to laugh.

There is a wide variety in church government and
leadership style in the Charismatic movement. Many of
the independent churches have strong, authoritarian

304

A History of Christian Doctrine

679

leadership, and many are heavily oriented toward the leader's personality. Many institutions and ministries are named after an individual. As a result, huge churches and ministries can mushroom almost overnight but then quickly deflate when the founder is discredited or dies, or when a more exciting leader comes along.

In addition to the doctrines and practices that generally characterize the entire Charismatic movement, there have also been some doctrinal innovations and some recycling of Latter Rain doctrines. While we cannot attribute them to all Charismatics, they have become prominent, especially among the independent Charismatics, and they have also affected classical Pentecostal churches.

Positive Confession

As we have already mentioned, the Positive Confession doctrine is quite prominent among Charismatics. Its teachers proclaim, "What you say is what you get," and, "What you confess, you possess." (Detractors often call this message, "Name it, claim it.") Under this view, since humans are created in the image of God, they are actually little gods. As such, they have great creative power in their own right. Just as God created the world by speaking it into existence and allegedly by having faith in His words, so humans can speak things into existence in their own lives. Instead of merely having "faith in God," they are to have "the faith of God."

This view goes beyond the typical Pentecostal understanding of prayer. Classical Pentecostals believe in the power of prayer and expect miraculous results from prayer, but they focus their faith on God, stress the sovereignty of

305

The Charismatic Movement

God, and expect God to answer according to His will and timing, which may not always correspond to their desire or expectation. The Positive Confession doctrine, however, is essentially an abstract principle that purportedly operates by a natural power within humans. When people decide what they want and speak that desire in complete faith, then their desire will surely come to pass.

Positive Confession teachers use the Greek word rhema for the "word of faith." For them, logos is God's eternal Word, while rhema is an individual's spoken confession that secures a particular desire. (Actually, however, the Greek New Testament often uses these words interchangeably.) This word spoken in faith becomes

anointed, powerful, and creative.

The practical effect of this teaching is to shift the focus of faith: the object of faith and the effective cause of miracles is no longer God Himself but the mental state and utterance of the individual. Instead of stressing the sovereignty of God, this teaching stresses techniques and formulas for receiving answers to prayer. Some of the writers speak of faith formulas, formulas for healing, and formulas for prosperity. Some explicitly say that faith, not God, causes the results and that even people who reject the gospel can achieve these results when they use these principles.

When the Positive Confession doctrine is taken to its ultimate conclusion, faith becomes a natural law that operates apart from the sovereignty of God, much as Christian Scientists teach. Here are some book titles that illustrate the problem: How to Have Faith in Your Faith, The Tongue: A Creative Force, God's Will Is Prosperity, The Laws of Prosperity, Having Faith in Your

306

A History of Christian Doctrine

Faith, How to Write Your Own Ticket with God, and You Can Have What You Say. This teaching minimizes or ignores basic Christian principles such as seeking the will of God, humility, moderation, self-denial, putting the kingdom of God above personal desires, and trusting in God's plan and power instead of our own.

Presentations of the Positive Confession doctrine abound with theologically aberrant concepts such as the divinity of man, the inherent power of the tongue, and the formulaic nature of faith declarations. Here are some quotations that illustrate the problems:308

• Kenneth Copeland: "You don't have a god in you. You are one."

• Casey Treat: "I'm an exact duplicate of God. . . . When God looks in the mirror, He sees me! When I look in the mirror, I see God! . . . You know, sometimes people say to me . . .'You just think you're a little god!' Thank you! Hallelujah! You got that right! 'Who d'you think you are, Jesus?' Yep!"

• Kenneth Hagin: "Every born again man is an incarnation. . . . The believer is as much an incarnation as Jesus of Nazareth. . . . That's who we are; we're Christ!"

• Earl Paulk: "Just as dogs have puppies and cats have kittens, so God has little gods. . . . Until we

comprehend that we are little gods and we begin to
act like little gods, we cannot manifest the kingdom
of God."
• Robert Tilton: "He's given us power to create
wealth."
• Kenneth Hagin: "Having faith in your word is
307
The Charismatic Movement
having faith in your faith. . . . That's what you've
got to learn to do to get things from God: Have
faith in your faith. . . . I've not prayed one prayer
in 45 years . . . without getting an answer. I always
got an answer—and the answer was always yes."
• Kenneth Copeland: "The force of faith is released by
words. . . . The success formulas in the Word of God
produce results when used as directed. . . . You can
have what you say."
• Larry Lea: "God exercised faith in His own word to
create. And He has given us the ability to create
change in our lives by the same means He used to
create the world: the spoken word."
Abuses abound when the Positive Confession doctrine
is taken to extremes. In one case, a board member of a
Charismatic church in Texas was diagnosed with terminal
cancer. Initially, the church prayed fervently for him and
repeatedly confessed his healing. He did the same, but he
steadily declined in health. Eventually, the leaders concluded
that the problem was the sick man's lack of faith,
for they knew they had faith. They condemned him for his
unbelief and pressured him out of the church.
Fortunately, after this point God healed him.
New Revelations
Some Charismatics believe in new revelations—
receiving new doctrines by direct revelation from God
apart from a study of Scripture. An advertisement in
Charisma magazine for a study Bible promised, "This is
the only complete publication of all the spiritual warfare
strategies that have been given Morris Cerullo, by God,
308
A History of Christian Doctrine
through divine revelation."309 One leader stated:310
The Bible is God's Word, but through prophets the
Holy Spirit also brings revelation to this generation
that is equally God's Word. The prophet is not a
method that God uses; but in fact is the only method
He uses to speak to this generation. . . . The message

of a true prophet of God is not to be judged.
Some of the Positive Confession teachers speak of
rhema as a direct, personal revelation that God can give
to people. This concept has some validity when speaking
of direction that God gives individuals in daily life, which
always harmonizes with the Bible, but it become dangerous
when used as the basis for establishing authority,
teaching doctrine, or directing the lives of others.
Personal Prophecy
In a similar vein, some Charismatics try to exercise
the gift of prophecy at will, teach others how to prophesy,
and use personal prophecies to direct the lives of others.
These practices were introduced from the Latter Rain
movement. Here are examples from the report of a
prophecy conference:311
The night was . . . highlighted by tremendous warfare
in the Spirit led by . . . Chief Musician, Prophet
Robert Gray. During the warfare, many prophecies
were given about the breaking of the enemies' spiritual
strongholds and God's restoring Atlanta for His
Glory. . . .
As a special treat this year Bishop [Bill] Hamon

The Charismatic Movement

offered to minister prophetically to each graduate. . . .
Dr. Hamon felt God prompting him to lay hands on the
graduates and prophesy the mind of the Lord. He took
time to pray and prophesy over the 7 graduates in
attendance. God truly blessed each one of us with His
word. . . .
The February Prophets Conference will focus on
God's prophetic ministry today. . . . We will . . . have
times of instruction and activation. Each attendee will
be taught about how to hear and discern God's voice,
how to relate what you are hearing to others, and how
to receive and relate to personal prophecy from others.
. . . In the afternoons, prophetic presbytery
teams, groups of seasoned prophets, will be ministering
to each registered attendee.
Shepherding
The Shepherding movement was an attempt to place
everyone in a relationship of submission to a personal
shepherd. It originated with the teaching of five men:
Derek Prince, Don Basham, Charles Simpson, Bob
Mumford, and Ern Baxter (of the Latter Rain). In an
effort to bring greater accountability and discipleship to

the Charismatic movement, these men proclaimed that every Christian should enter into a covenant relationship with a mentor.

Unfortunately, many such shepherds became quite authoritative, controlling the major decisions of their disciples. Many excesses and abuses occurred, which resulted in the discrediting of the concept. The movement disbanded, and the leaders acknowledged their errors. Some renounced the doctrine altogether, while others

said the principle was right but the implementation was wrong.

Spiritual Warfare Techniques

Another area of doctrinal innovation is the teaching of certain spiritual warfare techniques. Of course, the Bible clearly teaches that the church is at war with Satan, but in a search for special keys for winning this warfare, many Charismatics embrace beliefs that the Scriptures do not support.

For instance, some teach that Spirit-filled believers can have demons inhabiting them. The key to victory over various attitudes and habits of sin is to cast out the demons responsible for them. Don Basham popularized this view with his book Pigs in the Parlor. After accepting this teaching, one assistant pastor starting trying to cast demons out of various church members. When the pastor admonished him to stop this practice, he accused the pastor of having a demon of unbelief. Scripture, however, does not support such a view. While demons can attack Christians, they cannot enter the body or spirit of someone who is filled with the Spirit. (See Luke 10:18-20; I Corinthians 6:17, 19-20; I John 4:4, 13, 18; 5:18.)

Some Charismatics teach the theory of generational curses and generational spirits. A person can inherit a spiritual curse or an evil spirit because of the sins of an ancestor. Again, in order for the person to have spiritual victory, the particular ancestral curse or spirit must be identified and overcome. A scriptural response, however, is to recognize that a person's sins and wrong choices can indeed affect his descendants, but God treats everyone

individually, based on his own response to God. (See Ezekiel 18.)

Some Charismatics teach that Christians can command angels to do their bidding. For example, Gloria Copeland asserted, "When you become the voice of God in the earth by putting His Words in your mouth, you put your angels to work."312 Scripturally, however, Christians are simply to pray to God, seeking His help. He then can dispatch angels or provide answers in other ways, according to His will. While angels do protect us and minister to us, they do so at God's bidding, not ours. An attempt by Christians to order angels seems to be presumptuous and a usurpation of God's authority. (See Psalm 8:5; 91:11; 103:20.)

Here are two additional examples of unbiblical techniques of spiritual warfare, taken from advertisements in Charisma:313

Subliminal Deliverance. Bible-based subliminal messages hit controlling spirits where they live and command them to leave in Jesus' name. Then the void is filled with the Word of God! . . . Renew's 35 continuous play tapes offer freedom from: Doubt, Fear, Failure, Fear of Death, Guilt, Grief, Depression, Temper, Pride, Lust, Temptation, Pornography, Procrastination, Unforgiveness, Rejection, Drugs, Alcohol, Smoking, Anger, Rebellion, Anxiety and Panic, Judging, Homosexuality, Scars of Child Abuse & Molestation. Renew tapes speak into being: Prosperity, Weight Loss, Peace, Healing, Self-Esteem, Salvation, Marital Harmony, Surrender to God, Acceptance of God's Love, A Closer Walk with God.

312

A History of Christian Doctrine

On April 7, 1990, 150 prayer warriors and intercessors will be departing in Eagle Seven, Eagle International's Boeing 707 jet airliner, for Israel and the Soviet Union for a vitally significant flight. The purpose of the Exodus II Airborne Intercessor's Flight is to trigger the prophetic return of Jews to Israel as we intercede in prayer on the ground and in the heavenlies over Israel and the Soviet Union. . . . The battle is spiritual, not carnal, and it is fought in "high places" or in the heavenlies as the Bible says.

Finally, there is the practice of binding territorial spirits. Many Charismatics seek to identify which demons rule over certain locations and then engage in vigorous prayer against them, theorizing that there can be no revival until these controlling demons are specifically

bound. It is true that the devil's kingdom is well organized, and there is some indication in Daniel that specific demons are assigned to geographic or political areas. (See Ephesians 6:12; Daniel 10:13, 20.) But the Christian should recognize that Jesus Christ has already won the victory over the devil by the Cross. (See Colossians 2:14-15; Hebrews 2:14-15.)

Prayer, fasting, and spiritual warfare are vital so that we can discipline the flesh, exercise faith in God, rebuke the devil, and personally appropriate the benefits of the Cross, but the Bible does not teach that any special techniques are necessary to bind the devil in a certain location. Daniel won the victory simply through prayer to God without even knowing about the demonic opposition until afterwards. Likewise, the early church successfully evangelized their world through faith, prayer, preaching

313

The Charismatic Movement

of the Word, and the power of the Holy Spirit. They trusted in God for protection and deliverance, cast out demons when they encountered them, and enjoyed the assistance of angels, but the Book of Acts does not reveal any use of the elaborate spiritual warfare strategies that some teachers propound.

Kingdom Now

Another belief of some Charismatics is the Kingdom Now doctrine, also known as dominion theology, which is essentially the same as the "manifest sons of God" teaching of the Latter Rain. Proponents include Earl Paulk, Bob Mumford, and Bill Hamon. They proclaim that, instead of looking for a rapture, the church needs to possess the earth now, before the Lord comes, and establish His visible kingdom for Him. The church must gain control over society, including the government and the economic system, in order for the Lord to return.

This view is closely associated with Christian Reconstructionism, a movement within conservative Calvinism. It is based on a postmillennial eschatology which states that the church should take over the institutions of society and operate them according to the laws of the Old Testament. In this way the church will Christianize the world and usher in the Millennium.314

The Bible teaches, however, that the hope of the church is the coming of Lord and that He will personally establish His kingdom on earth. (See Luke 21:27-31; Titus 2:13; Revelation 19-20.) We are to exert a positive,

godly influence upon this world, but it is not our home.
Our Lord's kingdom is not of this world; we are but
strangers and pilgrims here (John 18:36; I Peter 2:11).

Conclusions

The Charismatic movement began with a genuine outpouring
of the Holy Spirit upon hungry hearts in the
denominational world. It transformed their lives and
emboldened them to bear witness of this event despite
ridicule and rejection. Like the Pentecostals, the early
Charismatics sought and received a distinct experience
known as the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and in most
cases they spoke in tongues.

Today, however, most people in the Charismatic
movement do not receive the Holy Spirit with the evidence
of speaking in tongues. Many do not even claim to
speak in tongues, some have merely been taught to say
nonsense syllables as a substitute for genuine tongues,
and most do not believe that tongues is the necessary evidence
of the Holy Spirit.

While God has used the Charismatics to bring the
witness of the Holy Spirit to every denomination and to
make speaking in tongues and other supernatural manifestations
broadly acceptable, it appears that the movement
as a whole has fallen short of its promise. The
emphasis on entertainment, personalities, and spiritual
fads, coupled with a de-emphasis on fundamental doctrine,
repentance, and holiness, has often resulted in shallowness
of worship, commitment, and lifestyle.

In many cases, Charismatic ministers seem more
intent on building personal kingdoms than in truly
advancing the cause of Christ. Many of them amass
wealth, power, fame, and prestige while preaching convenient
doctrines and indulging in personal pleasures. (See
II Timothy 3:1-7; 4:3-4.) By their own definition of salvation,
many of their churches grow primarily by attracting

saved people from other churches rather than by converting
the lost from a lifestyle of sin to holiness. When
their megachurches mushroom, there often seems to be
little concern for ministerial ethics, qualifications for spiritual
leadership, and discipleship of every member.

How do the Charismatics relate to Pentecostals?
Initially, Trinitarian Pentecostals had great reservations

about the Charismatic movement, but today there is widespread acceptance, interaction, fellowship, mutual influence, and mutual transfer of ministers, churches, and members. In 1994, major Trinitarian Pentecostal and Charismatic organizations joined together in the Pentecostal/Charismatic Churches of North America (PCCNA), which replaced the Pentecostal Fellowship of North America (PFNA).

While we have discussed various practices and emphases that are typical of Charismatics, we must also note that many classical Pentecostals, especially trinitarians, have adopted many of them. Although Pentecostalism gave rise to the Charismatic movement, the latter is now exerting greater influence on the former. The Charismatics have generally prevailed on matters of holiness and fellowship, and they are significantly affecting forms of worship, views of end-time prophecy, and the initial evidence doctrine.

Classical Pentecostal organizations have taken clear stands against the doctrinal innovations of Charismatics, however. For example, the Assemblies of God has adopted official position papers against the Positive Confession doctrine, the Kingdom Now doctrine, the excesses of the Shepherding movement, the belief that Christians can have demons, absolutist views on divine healing, and

316

A History of Christian Doctrine

attempts to teach or imitate speaking in tongues.315 Oneness Pentecostals generally oppose the distinctive doctrines and practices of Charismatics, although some have followed Charismatic trends. In return, Charismatics usually do not see the Oneness doctrine as a problem, but they object to the doctrine of salvation and holiness lifestyle of Oneness Pentecostals.

In 1997, Charisma published the first significant analysis of Oneness Pentecostals by Charismatics. It noted their many achievements but exhibited an agenda of trying to move them toward the Charismatic position. It based its analysis primarily upon views and reports of ex-members rather than interaction with Oneness theologians. The article accused Oneness Pentecostals of "legalism," "elitism," being "mean-spirited," "judgmentalism," "hypocrisy" and embracing "a flawed theology of salvation by works"—with no awareness of the irony of judging them so harshly based on a few disgruntled sources.316 From a Oneness Pentecostal perspective, there are

many honest-hearted, Spirit-filled people in the
Charismatic movement. Indeed, many have received the
full Acts 2:38 experience of salvation. The movement has
led millions of people to a more biblically based faith and
a greater spiritual experience with God. Nevertheless, it
has fallen short in restoring them to the full apostolic
doctrine and lifestyle. It still needs a revival of the message
of the almighty God in Jesus Christ and the message
of scriptural holiness, both inwardly and outwardly.
In many cases, the movement has actually created significant
barriers to further spiritual progress. Multitudes
outside the movement have been turned away by foolish,
unbiblical doctrines and practices and by the poor examples
317
The Charismatic Movement
of prominent leaders. Multitudes inside the movement
have been led astray by the introduction of various false
doctrines, by attacks on the apostolic doctrine and
lifestyle, and by the belief that since they experience
some work of the Spirit then they do not need anything
further. But the Bible itself warns against this attitude.
(See Matthew 7:21-23; Luke 13:23-27.)
Still, the Charismatic movement has helped spread
the message of the Holy Spirit throughout the world,
reaching into denominations and social classes that had
been practically untouched. By fostering a desire for
deeper spirituality while not completely fulfilling that
desire, it has helped set the stage for genuine, end-time,
apostolic revival.
318
A History of Christian Doctrine
Since the Protestant Reformation, it has been common
to identify three major branches of world
Christianity—Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy,
and Protestantism. The Pentecostal movement of the
twentieth century became so significant, however, that
many church historians have added it as a fourth branch.
A better classification, proposed by theologian Henry
Van Dusen, is to recognize three branches as follows:
Catholicism/Orthodoxy, Protestantism, and Pentecostalism.
Of course, Pentecostalism arose within Protestantism
and affirms the distinctive points of Protestantism in
its opposition to Catholicism. Nevertheless, Pentecostalism
is distinctive enough and large enough to be classified
as a branch in its own right.
319

Christianity Today

11

Statistics

Of approximately 6 billion people on earth in 1999,
about 2 billion—one-third—identified themselves as
Christians. As of 1999 here are two attempts at classification.
(The numbers are rough estimates, and not every
group is included.)317

Branch Adherents
Roman Catholic 1,030,000,000
Eastern Orthodox and Other Eastern Christian 230,000,000
African Indigenous (Protestant, Pentecostal,
or marginal Christian) 110,000,000
Pentecostal 85,000,000
Baptist 80,000,000
Lutheran 75,000,000
Reformed/Presbyterian 70,000,000
Anglican 67,000,000
Methodist 50,000,000

Branch Adherents
Roman Catholic 1,030,000,000
Eastern Orthodox and Other Eastern Christian 230,000,000
Conservative Protestant 200,000,000
Liberal Protestant 170,000,000
African Indigenous (Protestant, Pentecostal,
or marginal Christian) 110,000,000
Pentecostal 85,000,000
Anglican (Protestant) 67,000,000

According to Pentecostal scholar Vinson Synan, total
Pentecostals and Charismatics numbered about 540 million
in 1999, categorized as follows:318

320

A History of Christian Doctrine

Denominational Pentecostals 215,000,000
Chinese Pentecostals 52,000,000
Protestant Charismatics 71,000,000
Catholic Charismatics 92,000,000
Third Wavers (Protestant) 110,000,000
Total 540,000,000

As we will discuss, the two numbers for Pentecostals
include various groups that have some Pentecostal characteristics,
such as demonstrative worship and belief in
healing, even though they may not be fully Pentecostal.
The two numbers for Charismatics also include many
Protestants and Catholics who once participated in the
Charismatic movement but who are no longer active. The

number for the Third Wave consists primarily of people in
Protestant denominations who believe in miracles but do
not fully embrace Pentecostal theology or identity.
Even by the most conservative measurement,
Pentecostals are now larger than any other Protestant
group. By the more inclusive statistics, Pentecostals are
the second-largest group of Christians after the Roman
Catholic Church. Taking Pentecostals and Charismatics
together, in one hundred years they attained numerical
equivalency to the traditional Protestant branch, which
has existed for five hundred years. They now account for
about 27 percent of total Christian population and about
9 percent of world population. They are increasing by 19
million per year.319
Based on the above statistics, we can identify the
three major branches of Christianity as follows: Roman
Catholics and Eastern Orthodox at about 1.3 billion,
Protestants at about 450 million, and Pentecostals
321
Christianity Today
(excluding Charismatics) at about 250 million.
Let us look more closely at the total of 540 million for
Pentecostals and Charismatics. It does not mean that 540
million people have received the Holy Spirit with the initial
sign of speaking in tongues. First of all, only about 35
to 50 percent of the members of Pentecostal churches
have received the Holy Ghost, and the percentage for
Charismatics is even less.
Second, 540 million represents inclusive constituency,
not active membership. This figure is based on the
research of David Barrett, who counts children of members
and people who identify themselves with the movement
even though they do not attend regularly. His
numbers reflect an average of about 275 constituents per
church, whereas average Sunday attendance per church
is less than half of that.
Third, the numbers include marginal groups who are
not fully Pentecostal. For instance, Barrett estimated that
there were 406 million Pentecostals and Charismatics in
1990.320 From his notes we find that the 1990 number
includes 5 million pre-Pentecostals (mostly Holiness
groups), 50 million quasi-Pentecostals (not explicitly
Pentecostal), 18 million in revival groups (not explicitly
Pentecostal), 3 million post-Pentecostals, 25 million or
more Chinese believers who are not definitely
Pentecostal, 4 million radio Pentecostals (who have no

connection other than listening to the radio), 2 million in the Catholic Apostolic Church (Irvingite group in which tongues has largely died out), 92 million post-Charismatics, 5 million radio Charismatics, 7 million crypto–Third Wavers (who do not confess to being in the Third Wave), and 33 million unaffiliated with any group.

The total of these groups that are not explicitly Pentecostal or Charismatic is 244 million. This leaves 162 million who are active in Pentecostal or Charismatic groups, counting children and irregular attendees. If we assume that 35 percent of the latter number has received the Holy Spirit with tongues (which is Barrett's estimate) and that 5 percent of the former number has done so, the total would be about 69 million. This number of active, Spirit-filled believers is about 17 percent of the grand total.

This figure corresponds closely to a 1979 Gallup poll, in which 29 million adult Americans (19 percent at the time) called themselves "Pentecostal or Charismatic Christians" but only 5 million (3 percent) claimed to have spoken in tongues.321 Thus, only 17 percent of those who identified with the label said they spoke in tongues. Another Gallup poll in 1984 found that 5.8 million American adults said they spoke in tongues. A 1992 Bliss survey reported 8.7 percent claimed to have done so, and a 1993 Barna survey reported 11 to 12 percent.322

In short, the estimated number of active, Spirit-filled believers in early 1999 would be about 17 percent of the total of 540 million Pentecostals and Charismatics, or about 90 million.

This analysis does not mean that it is false to say there are 540 million Pentecostals and Charismatics. This number is helpful for comparison with the other religious movements, for they too count children, constituents who do not attend regularly, and constituents who do not practice the tenets of their faith. Whether we look at total Spirit-filled believers or total constituents, the numbers are still amazing.

Of further interest, Barrett estimated that by 1990, 90 percent of the world's countries had Pentecostal/Charismatic churches, and these countries contained 99 percent of the world's population. Barrett also estimated

that there were 1,474,000 churches and house groups in his inclusive Pentecostal/Charismatic categories; 11,000 Pentecostal denominations (large and small); and 3,000 Charismatic denominations. In addition, Charismatics existed in all 150 of the non-Pentecostal denominational families.323

In the most thorough study of Oneness Pentecostal statistics, Talmadge French documented an inclusive constituency of 13.7 million Oneness Pentecostals in 1998. After making allowances for groups he could not document, he estimated a total of 15 to 20 million Oneness Pentecostals worldwide.324 For comparison with Barrett's figures, the highest number is the most suitable, since Barrett includes pre-, quasi-, and post-Pentecostals. Thus, about 10 percent of all denominational Pentecostals worldwide are Oneness. Moreover, since Oneness Pentecostals report a much higher percentage of people receiving the Holy Ghost, it is probable that 15 percent of all those who have been baptized with the Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues, are Oneness Pentecostal.325

Among Charismatics, the Oneness message is not nearly as strong as it is among Pentecostals. If we could count Charismatics who have been baptized in Jesus' name, however, we would probably find that Jesus Name Charismatics total 10 percent or more of Charismatics worldwide.

Turning to the United States, there are approximately 1,200 denominations, including non-Christian groups.326 There are approximately 350,000 churches.327 Thus, the

324

A History of Christian Doctrine

UPCI has a little over one percent of the total. About 20 to 25 percent of American Pentecostals are Oneness believers.328

According to Gallup polls, about 36 percent of Americans claim to be born again.329 There are about 400 megachurches with 2,000 or more people in attendance each week.330 Of churches that average 400 or more in weekly attendance, from 60 to 95 percent of the numerical growth comes from transfer of members.331

The statistics of C. Peter Wagner, the leading church growth researcher in America, are more conservative than those of David Barrett.332 He estimated that in 1985 the total number of active, faithful Pentecostals and Charismatics in the U.S. was 9 to 10 million. That number probably doubled by 1999.

For U.S. churches, Wagner estimated an average attendance

per church of 76. As of 1988, eight of the ten largest
churches in the world were Pentecostal or Charismatic, and
so were the largest churches in 40 American states.
Wagner provided the following information on
decadal growth rates in the U.S. in the early 1980s:
Charismatics (smaller base contributed to higher rate) 457%
Pentecostals and Charismatics 173%
Classical Pentecostals 52%
Oneness Pentecostals 48%
Christian and Missionary Alliance 49%
Seventh-day Adventists 33%
Southern Baptists 14%
According to Wagner, 100 percent is a good growth
rate, 50 is fair, and 25 is marginal. He further noted that

325
Christianity Today

Pentecostals and Charismatics are the fastest-growing
group in about 80 percent of all nations.
Church Growth Factors
Peter Wagner identified seven reasons why the
Pentecostal movement has grown so rapidly:333
1. "Biblical Triumphalism"—preaching power, victory,
and overcoming based on the Bible; proclaiming a
message of hope, salvation, deliverance, and healing.
2. "Targeting the Poor and Oppressed."
3. "Multiple Tracks to Ordination." Instead of
requiring seven years of college and seminary for ordination,
Pentecostals base ordination on the call of God, spiritual
qualifications, and mastery of basic Bible doctrines.
As preparation, they consider self-study, experience, and
on-the-job training.
4. "High Local-Church Autonomy." Instead of
denominations controlling the local church and its
finances, the local church makes its own decisions. The
strength of the movement rests in the local churches and
not at the top.
5. "The Apostolic Model of Church Planting"—using
recognized leaders to plant churches in new areas, and
using large churches to start daughter works.
6. "Schism." Over time, two churches in an area usually
reach more people than just one church would.
Pentecostals have proliferated from divisions over the
years. The point is not that the church should encourage
church splits, but if a split occurs, it is wise not to castigate
those who have left. Instead, if the wounds can be
healed and the wrongs can be righted, then both sides can

achieve great growth. Moreover, this principle can work

326

A History of Christian Doctrine

in a positive way through the deliberate planting of daughter churches.

7. "Local Institutional Factors." Here Wagner listed eight additional factors: "conservative evangelical theology," "strong pastoral leadership," "prayer," "openness to the person and work of the Holy Spirit," "abundant financial support," "worship [as] a central feature of church life," "participation in lay ministry . . . expected of all church members," and "extensive Bible-teaching ministry . . . focused on the felt need of church members." Wagner also warned about three factors that could stunt the growth of Pentecostals:334

1. "The Dark Side of Respectability." When churches receive wide social acceptance, they tend to minimize or abandon some of the factors that caused them to grow. Social status and cultural approval become more important to them, so they moderate their distinctive elements, which are their primary reasons for existence and growth.

2. "St. John's Syndrome . . . losing their first love." The initial zeal and commitment are not always passed down to subsequent generations. As children grow up in middle-class society and comfortable churches, they can become social Pentecostals, no longer fully committed to strong doctrinal preaching and teaching, godly disciplines, fervent worship, or zealous evangelism. The constant influx of new converts helps to counteract this trend, however.

3. "Ministerial elitism"—making the technical or academic standards for the ministry too strict. Instead, the primary goal should be to find ministers who are called of God and anointed by the Spirit. The system should foster

327

Christianity Today

the selection of ministers who come from the people themselves and who minister among the people.

Conclusion

The most significant story in twentieth-century Christianity is the rise of the Pentecostals. A movement that did not formally exist at the beginning of the century became one of the three major branches of Christendom by century's end.

The outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the twentieth

century is amazing. The movement advanced far beyond the imagination of its founders and other early adherents. In the first half of the century, the Pentecostals were ignored, ridiculed, and persecuted. The religious leaders of the day rejected the baptism of the Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues, and Pentecostal-style worship. Today, however, Pentecostals are generally respected. Their doctrines and practices are widely accepted, imitated, and followed. They have penetrated every denomination with their message and made a significant impact on society.

Oneness Pentecostals and Revival

To this point, the Jesus Name, Oneness message has not enjoyed the same level of acceptance. Moreover, many Pentecostals have compromised the message and practice of holiness. Nevertheless, Oneness Pentecostals are the most biblical, apostolic movement in the world today. They face unprecedented opportunity. If they will continue to affirm their distinctive doctrines, they will experience increasing revival and growth. In 1900 the great twentieth-century outpouring of the Holy Spirit was

328

A History of Christian Doctrine

inconceivable, yet it took place. Similarly, a great revival of Jesus Name and holiness seems quite possible. Indeed, such a revival has begun.

It is God's will to send a mighty revival of the full apostolic message. To a great extent it is the responsibility of Oneness Pentecostals, as they enter a new century and a new millennium, to see this revival come to pass. It will not come automatically, but if they will pray, be fervent in Spirit, remain committed doctrinally, be zealous in evangelism, and live a holy life, they can realize this goal. God desires to give a revival of the Name to match the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. He also desires to lead everyone into a lifestyle of true holiness, inwardly and outwardly. By faith, diligence, sacrifice, and the power of the Holy Spirit, Oneness Pentecostals can participate in the greatest move of God in human history, as they await the soon coming of our Lord.

329

Christianity Today

Appendixes

Appendix A

Dates in the History of Christianity
1900-2000

Secular History	Church History
1861-65 U.S. Civil War	1862-1916 G. B. Cashwell
	1865-1943 A. J. Tomlinson
	1866-1923 E. N. Bell
	1866-1961 C. H. Mason
	1867-1948 Glenn Cook
	1870-1922 William Seymour
	1873-1929 Charles Parham
	1873-1912 William Durham
	1876-1947 Frank Ewart
	1880-1931 G. T. Haywood
	1883-1964 Howard Goss
	1884-1976 Rudolf Bultmann
	1886-1968 Karl Barth
	1890-1944 Aimee Semple McPherson
	1892-1971 Reinhold Niebuhr
	1898-1963 C. S. Lewis
1901 New century begins	1901 Pentecostal movement begins, Topeka, KS
	1906-9 Azusa Street revival, Los Angeles
	1906-7 Pentecostal Assemblies of the World
	1910 Durham proclaims Finished Work doctrine
	1910 Edinburgh Missionary Conference
	1910-15 The Fundamentals

333

Secular History	Church History
	1913 Arroyo Seco camp meeting
1914 World War I begins	1914 Oneness movement begins
	1914 Assemblies of God
1917 U.S. enters World War I	1916 AG rejects Oneness doctrine
1918 World War I ends	1919 Karl Barth's Commentary on Romans
	1931 Conversion of C. S. Lewis
	1934 Wycliffe Bible Translators
1939 World War II begins	1941 Rudolf Bultmann's demythologizing
1941 U.S. enters World War II	1942 National Association of Evangelicals
	1945 Dietrich Bonhoeffer's prison

writings
1945 World War II ends 1945 United Pentecostal Church
1946 Post-war healing revivals
1948 Israel becomes a nation 1948 Latter Rain movement begins
1948 World Council of Churches
1949 Billy Graham's Los Angeles
crusade
1950 Assumption of Mary
proclaimed by Pius XII
1960 Charismatic movement begins
1963 Martin Luther King 1962-65 Second Vatican Council
marches on Washington
1967 Six Day War; Israel
regains Old Jerusalem
1972 Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue
begins
1994 Pentecostal/Charismatic
Churches of North America
334
A History of Christian Doctrine
Appendix B
Early Pentecostal Leaders
Baptized in Jesus' Name
The following is a list of some prominent figures in the
early Pentecostal movement who were baptized in Jesus'
name. They were well-known leaders at the time of their
baptism, or would be shortly thereafter. For documentation,
see endnote 74. Charles Parham is not included here, for
there is no direct evidence that he himself was baptized in
Jesus' name, although his testimony implies that he was.
• Andrew H. Argue (1868-1959), a convert of William
Durham, a pastor in Winnipeg, and an influential leader in
western Canada. He did not enter the Oneness movement but
was an early leader in the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada.
A grandson, Don Argue, served as president of the National
Association of Evangelicals.
• Leanore "Mother Mary" Barnes (1854-1939), an early
evangelist in the Midwest, associate of "Mother" Mary Moise
in rescue mission work in St. Louis, and a charter member of
the Assemblies of God.
• Frank Bartleman (1871-1936), historian of the Azusa
Street revival and an international evangelist. Bartleman
never joined a Pentecostal organization but maintained fellowship
with both Oneness and trinitarian believers, although
he remained committed to Oneness beliefs.
• Eudorus N. Bell (1866-1923), the first general chairman of

the Assemblies of God (1914). He later repudiated his baptism in Jesus' name and served as chairman a second time (1920-23).

• William Booth-Clibborn, a grandson of William Booth (founder of the Salvation Army) and an evangelist. He was

335

active in early Oneness organizations but later returned to fellowship with trinitarians, although he never renounced his Oneness views. He penned the words of "Down from His Glory."

• George A. Chambers (1879-1957), an early Canadian leader. He was a minister in the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World in 1919. He soon repudiated the Oneness position, however, and became the first general chairman (superintendent) of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada.

• Glenn A. Cook (1867-1948), business manager of the Azusa Street Mission, evangelist who brought the Pentecostal message to Indianapolis and to the Church of God in Christ, and assistant to Frank Ewart in Los Angeles. He brought the Oneness message to St. Louis and Indianapolis, baptizing Mother Barnes, Mother Moise, and Ben Pemberton in St. Louis and L. V. Roberts and G. T. Haywood in Indianapolis.

• Frank J. Ewart (1876-1947), assistant pastor and successor to William Durham in Los Angeles. He was the chief proponent of the Oneness doctrine in 1914, in conjunction with Glenn Cook. At his death he was a minister in the United Pentecostal Church.

• Elmer K. Fisher (1866-1919), associate of William Seymour and then pastor of the Upper Room Mission in Los Angeles. He did not enter into the Oneness movement. His son-in-law, Wesley Steelburg, was a minister in the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, but he later became general superintendent of the Assemblies of God. A grandson, Stanley Horton, became a well-known Assemblies of God theologian.

• Howard A. Goss (1883-1964), a convert of Charles Parham in 1903 and onetime field director of Parham's work in Texas. He and E. N. Bell were the chief organizers of the Assemblies of God in 1914, and he served as one of its first executive presbyters. He later became the general superintendent of the Pentecostal Church Incorporated and the first general superintendent of the United Pentecostal Church.

336

A History of Christian Doctrine

• Lemuel C. Hall (1867-?), a convert from Zion City and an evangelist. He later became the first chairman of the Pentecostal Ministerial Alliance (a Oneness organization).

Eventually, he accepted the pastorate of a trinitarian church, but he never abandoned his Oneness beliefs.

• Thoro Harris (1874-1955), black gospel songwriter. His songs include "Jesus Loves the Little Children," "All That Thrills My Soul Is Jesus," and "He's Coming Soon."

• Garfield T. Haywood (1880-1931), black pastor of a large interracial church in Indianapolis, outstanding Bible teacher, author, songwriter, and one of the most influential leaders in the Finished Work camp. He later became the presiding bishop of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World and served until his death. His songs include "I See a Crimson Stream of Blood," "Thank God for the Blood," "Jesus the Son of God," and "Baptized into the Body."

• Bennett F. Lawrence (1890-?), author of the first history of the Pentecostal movement, The Apostolic Faith Restored (1916), and first assistant secretary of the Assemblies of God in 1914.

• Robert E. McAlister (1880-1953), Canadian evangelist and pastor in Ottawa, Ontario. He helped found the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada and became its first secretary-treasurer. He stayed with his organization when it embraced trinitarianism and denounced the Oneness belief.

• Aimee Semple McPherson (1890-1944), missionary and evangelist. In 1923 she founded the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. She did not enter the Oneness movement.

• Charles H. Mason (1866-1961), co-founder of the Church of God in Christ and general overseer when the group was reorganized as a Pentecostal body. According to numerous sources in the black Apostolic movement, he was baptized privately in Jesus' name in Chicago in 1930. When the leaders under him did not accept the message, he did not proclaim it

337

Appendix B

but stayed with his organization. He continued to have some fellowship with black Apostolics.

• "Mother" Mary Moise (1850-1930), a pioneer in Pentecostal social work and operator of a rescue mission in St. Louis for social outcasts. She received a first prize at the World's Fair in St. Louis in 1904 for her work with homeless girls.

• Daniel C. O. Opperman (1872-1926), a founder of the Assemblies of God, one of its first executive presbyters, and its first assistant chairman. He had formerly been superintendent of the high school system in Zion City, Illinois, under Alexander Dowie. He was an early leader in Pentecostal education, conducting short-term Bible training programs. He soon became the chairman of the General Assembly of the

Apostolic Assemblies, the first group to be founded as a Oneness organization.

• L. V. Roberts, pastor in Indianapolis and evangelist who baptized E. N. Bell in the name of Jesus. He later returned to trinitarianism.

• H. G. Rodgers, an early leader in the South who received the Holy Ghost under G. B. Cashwell. He briefly led a loose association of ministers called the Church of God (Dothan, Alabama) but soon merged that group with Howard Goss's white wing of the Church of God in Christ. One of the founding members of the Assemblies of God, he never withdrew. He maintained fellowship with Oneness ministers and continued to baptize in Jesus' name, however. His daughters became part of the United Pentecostal Church.

• Franklin M. Small (1873-1961), Canadian evangelist and one of the founders of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada. After it adopted trinitarian theology, he withdrew and founded the Apostolic Church of Pentecost of Canada.

• George B. Studd (1859-1945), younger brother of missionary C. T. Studd, an associate of Dwight Moody, and an organizer of the Worldwide Camp Meeting at Arroyo Seco in 1913. He served as Frank Ewart's assistant pastor in the Los

338

A History of Christian Doctrine

Angeles area for many years. He was a noted supporter of missions who gave away his inherited fortune.

• Andrew D. Urshan (1884-1967), immigrant from Persia and international evangelist. He brought the Oneness message to Russia and was rebaptized there in 1916. He served as foreign missions secretary of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World and of Emmanuel's Church in Christ Jesus. At his death he was a minister in the United Pentecostal Church. His son, Nathaniel A. Urshan, became general superintendent of the United Pentecostal Church International.

• Harry Van Loon, associate of William Durham and Frank Ewart in Los Angeles.

• Maria Woodworth-Etter (1844-1924), well-known Holiness evangelist who accepted the Pentecostal message and who preached at the Worldwide Camp Meeting in Arroyo Seco, California, in 1913. She never became part of the Oneness movement.

339

Appendix B

Appendix C

Answering the Charge of Cultism

In recent years a small but vocal group of opponents of the

Jesus Name message has sought to label the United Pentecostal Church (UPCI) as a cult. How should we respond to this charge?

1. This charge stems from a small segment of the Evangelical community inspired by "ministries" who garner their financial support by making charges of this nature and who take their cue from the late Walter Martin, founder of Christian Research Institute and self-styled "Bible Answer Man." In many cases the charge is repeated by people who have had no personal knowledge of, or contact with, the UPCI and who have an inaccurate concept of the UPCI's beliefs. It does not come from any mainline Christian organization, nor is it the official position of any Evangelical denomination. Trinitarian Pentecostal groups, who have had the most contact with us, consider our views on the Godhead to be erroneous but still regard us as saved.

The National Religious Broadcasters, an arm of the National Association of Evangelicals, has accepted Oneness individuals and groups as members. The Society for Pentecostal Studies, an interdenominational organization of Pentecostal and Charismatic scholars, also accepts Oneness believers as members, and one recently served as its president. Major Evangelical and Charismatic publishers publish and market books and music by United Pentecostals. Evangelical radio stations worldwide routinely carry programs by United Pentecostals, including Harvestime, the UPCI's official radio broadcast.

2. This labeling is an unfair tactic. It is designed to prej-
340
udice people against us, not to open dialogue regarding scriptural truth. To the general public, the word cult means a group that is sociologically aberrant and even dangerous, typically characterized by authoritarian leadership, exotic beliefs, manipulative methods, financial exploitation, mind control, and rebellion against government. Our critics do not use the word in this sense, however, for sociologically and organizationally we are quite similar to most other Evangelical and Pentecostal churches. They actually mean that they differ with us theologically. To be honest and fair, they should explain their differences of biblical interpretation with us, and let people examine the issues for themselves.

An editorial by Terry Muck in the February 5, 1990, issue of Christianity Today, the leading Evangelical periodical, gave three reasons why Christians should not use the pejorative label of cult: (1) "The spirit of fair play suggests it is best to refer to groups of people as they refer to themselves." (2) "There is also a theological reason for avoiding" the label, for it

wrongly implies that certain sinners "are the worst kind." (3) "It simply does not work well to use disparaging terms to describe the people whom we hope will come to faith in Christ. . . . In fact, we are commanded to love them as ourselves."

An editorial in the August 1993 issue of Charisma magazine specifically rebuked Hank Hanegraaff, Walter Martin's successor as president of Christian Research Institute and "Bible Answer Man." Editor and publisher Stephen Strang said, "The heresy hunters are still with us. Only now, instead of stakes, they use their books and radio programs to destroy those they consider heretics. . . . I'm concerned that heresy hunting may be turning into leukemia because some cult-watchers seem more intent on destroying parts of the body than healing the body. . . . Hanegraaff goes way too far [in attacking independent Charismatics]. . . . It's time he shows as much respect to fellow Christians with whom he disagrees as he does to those outside the faith."

341

Appendix C

3. The critics rely on the authority of "historic Christianity" or "orthodoxy" instead of the Bible, even though they claim that the Bible is their only authority and denounce the use of extrabiblical authority as cultic. For instance, they say we are a cult because we do not accept the doctrine of the trinity as defined by creeds developed from the fourth to eighth centuries. If by "orthodoxy" they mean anything more than the doctrines of the Bible, then they have an extrabiblical authority. If they do not mean anything else, however, why do they not simply appeal to Scripture?

Moreover, they are inconsistent and selective in their appeal to "historic orthodoxy." For example, they denounce our teaching that baptism is part of the salvation experience, even though this has always been the majority view in professing Christianity. Not only have Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and the theologians of the first five centuries consistently held this view, but the founder of Protestantism, Martin Luther, did so as well. Yet these critics, who are Protestant, do not label Luther as a cultist. The Nicene Creed, to which they often appeal for its doctrine of the trinity, also proclaims that there is "one baptism for the remission of sins," yet they reject its teaching on this subject.

When trying to prove that their doctrine of the trinity is the only orthodox view in history, the critics appeal to early writers such as Justin, Tertullian, and Origen, yet these men's definition of the trinity is considered heretical by orthodox trinitarians today because they subordinated the second and third persons of the trinity to the first. Ironically, Walter Martin was heretical

according to the ancient creeds, because he denied the eternal generation of the Son. In short, our critics determine what is "orthodox" not by the Bible or even by the historic creeds, but by their personal theologies.

4. Many Christians in major denominations hold similar or the same views. Southern Baptist seminary professor Frank Stagg taught a doctrine of God that he acknowl-

edged to be essentially the same as Oneness. W. A. Criswell, past president of the Southern Baptist Convention, stated in his commentary on Revelation that the only God we will see is Jesus, and described Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the same terms that Oneness believers do.

Calvin Beisner, an ally of Walter Martin, conceded in his book God in Three Persons, "Monarchianism is represented today by the United ('Jesus Only') Pentecostals. . . . As the differences between modalism and pure trinitarianism are rather minute, it is not surprising that a great number of Christians in mainline denominations, including Roman Catholicism, hold a modalistic conception of the Trinity, at least unconsciously" (p. 18). Noted Roman Catholic theologian Karl Rahner similarly stated in The Trinity, "Despite their orthodox confession of the Trinity, Christians are, in their practical life, almost mere 'monotheists'" (p. 10). Many ministers and lay persons of various trinitarian denominations have similarly stated to United Pentecostals that they accept the Oneness view of the Godhead.

A number of Charismatic scholars, including Larry Christenson, Kilian McDonnell, and David Pawson, teach that water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Spirit are part of Christian initiation and not subsequent to it. Evangelical writers such as Leighton Ford and James Dunn have argued essentially the same thing, but without associating the baptism of the Holy Spirit with tongues. Many Trinitarian Pentecostals and Charismatics agree that water baptism should be performed in the name of Jesus. Many theologians and scholars, including Martin Luther and F. F. Bruce, have acknowledged that this was the formula of the apostles.

Our critics do not attack these teachers, because they belong to major denominations or use traditional theological terminology. It is not fair, however, to single us out for views that many other professing Christians also hold, just because we have formed our own group or refuse to use the nonbiblical terminology treasured by so many.

Appendix C

5. The attack on us is inconsistent with the critics'
doctrine of salvation. They commonly say they believe in salvation
"by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone."
How does this doctrine negate the salvation experience of the
typical United Pentecostal convert? Most United Pentecostals
do not decide to join the UPCI after an intellectual study of the
Oneness doctrine. Many come to God as children. Many come
from no church background, or a nominal church background.
Typically they hear a simple evangelistic message about the
death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, believe that
Jesus is their Savior, decide to accept the offer of salvation, and
come to the altar of repentance.
For example, I repented of my sins, believed on the Lord
Jesus Christ, and received the Holy Spirit at age seven. At that
point I could not debate Oneness versus trinitarianism, but I
knew that Jesus was God manifested in the flesh to be my
Savior, that He loved me, that I was trusting in Him for salvation,
and that I was devoting my life to Him as my Lord.
If someone were to make the identical response in a Baptist
church, our critics would not hesitate to pronounce him saved,
and many would argue that he could not lose this salvation under
any circumstances. How, then, could his subsequent baptism in
the name of Jesus, reception of the Holy Spirit, and acceptance
of the Oneness doctrine annul this genuine experience with God?
If someone professes to believe in salvation by grace
through faith but denies that our converts are saved, then actually
he must believe in salvation by faith plus a creed, a denomination,
or intellectualism. Such a position is more exclusive
than that of the UPCI, for we readily acknowledge that people
of various denominations can have genuine faith in God and a
genuine relationship with God, even before receiving the full
Acts 2:38 experience.
On the other hand, if our critics concede that we are saved,
what justification do they have for attacking us so vehemently
and uncharitably?

344

A History of Christian Doctrine

Several years ago, Robert Bowman, one of Walter Martin's
chief researchers, acknowledged to me in a telephone conversation
that most UPCI converts truly have faith in Christ and
receive salvation, but he maintained that when they progress in
doctrinal study and consciously embrace the Oneness view then
they lose salvation. It is an unusual cult indeed that leads people
to salvation but then gradually takes it away from them!
Would he say the same of any other group he considers cultic,
such as Mormons or Jehovah's Witnesses?

Martin not only believed that some UPCI members are saved but also that once a person is saved he can never lose his salvation. This means he attacked those whom he considered to be fellow Christians and sought to destroy their churches. It would seem more appropriate to let the Lord of these people decide how to judge these churches and deal with them as He wills, rather than appointing oneself to that role. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand" (Romans 14:4).

6. The critics do not recognize that we are involved in ministry. While our critics raise money by attacking us and feel that their "ministry" is to label us, our ministers and churches are busy leading people to a saving and transforming relationship with Jesus Christ. We are restoring broken marriages and homes, strengthening families, freeing people from sinful habits and addictions, training people in morality, and helping them to become productive citizens and saints. We do not fulfill our ministry by name calling, denunciations, and anathemas, but we seek to share with the world God's great gift of salvation that He has made available in Jesus Christ.

We invite everyone to open their hearts and their Bibles, for we believe that truth is its own best defense. The Bereans exemplified the "more noble" course of action, "in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures

345

Appendix C

daily, whether those things were so" (Acts 17:11).

With the apostle Paul, we say, "After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets" (Acts 24:14). We remember that Jesus said, "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake" (Matthew 10:22). Nevertheless, like the apostles, we can go our way "rejoicing [to be] counted worthy to suffer shame for his name" (Acts 5:41). Despite unjust opposition and unfair accusations, we "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory" (I Peter 1:8).

346

A History of Christian Doctrine

Appendix D

Response to a Cult Hunter

Book Review of E. Calvin Beisner, "Jesus Only" Churches (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998), 87 pages. Reviewed in 1998, citing sources available prior to publication of the book.

It is important for trinitarians and Oneness believers to communicate with each other and to develop a greater understanding

of one another's beliefs. The back cover of Beisner's
booklet promises to provide "essential and reliable information
and insights" on Oneness Pentecostalism. Unfortunately,
the booklet fails in this purpose and actually creates significant
obstacles for understanding and communication. The
prejudicial tone does not foster dialogue, much of the information
is simply wrong, the presentation of Oneness
Pentecostal doctrinal views is seriously flawed, and the presentation
of "historic, orthodox understanding" is surprisingly
narrow and controversial.

Strident Polemics

The title itself provides an indication of problems to come,
for it uses a derogatory and misleading label to characterize the
movement it seeks to understand. This branch of Pentecostalism
uses the designations of Apostolic, Jesus Name, and
Oneness to identify itself. The label "Jesus Only" arose as a
description of its baptismal formula, but soon opponents began
using it against Oneness adherents, erroneously claiming that
they denied the Father and the Holy Spirit. As a result Oneness
Pentecostals today do not designate themselves by the term
"Jesus Only" and generally consider it misleading and offensive.
Similarly, the booklet's use of three theatrical masks to symbolize
the Oneness doctrine is inaccurate and inappropriate.

347

It is evident that the author and publisher wish to portray
Oneness Pentecostals as cultists and false religionists. The booklet
is one of the newest in a series by various authors entitled
Zondervan Guide to Cults and Religious Movements. On the
cover, the most prominent word in this series title is Cults. The
introductory booklet to the series is Unmasking the Cults. The
last booklet in the series summarizes all the movements studied,
and its title is Truth and Error: Comparative Charts of Cults
and Christianity. The other twelve titles in the series are
Jehovah's Witnesses; Masonic Lodge; Mormonism; New Age
Movement; Satanism; Unification Church; Mind Sciences;
Astrology and Psychic Phenomena; Buddhism, Taoism and
Other Far Eastern Religions; Goddess Worship, Witchcraft
and Neo-Paganism; Hinduism, TM and Hare Krishna; and
Unitarian Universalism.

Classifying Oneness Pentecostals with these groups implies
a spiritual similarity and a common satanic origin. At the least,
it seems that the author and publisher discredit all Oneness
Pentecostal experiences with God. But how can they venture to
make such a judgment with no indication that they have ever
attended Oneness Pentecostal worship services or interacted
significantly with Oneness Pentecostals on a personal level?

How can they seemingly denigrate all faith, repentance, reception of the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts, and spiritual fruit among Oneness Pentecostals while apparently accepting the same manifestations among Trinitarian Pentecostals? Have they no concern that they could be ascribing works of the Holy Spirit to Satan, something Jesus warned strongly against in Matthew 12:22-32? In this connection, it is noteworthy that many Oneness Pentecostals first believed on the Lord, repented, or received the Holy Spirit in trinitarian churches and then continued serving the Lord in Oneness churches.

The author's willingness to excoriate Oneness Pentecostals for their doctrine of God is particularly surprising in light of views expressed in his book God in Three Persons:335

348

A History of Christian Doctrine

Monarchianism is represented today by the United ("Jesus Only") Pentecostals. . . . As the differences between modalism and pure trinitarianism are rather minute, it is not surprising that a great number of Christians in mainline denominations, including Roman Catholicism, hold a modalistic conception of the Trinity, at least unconsciously.

According to this passage, the Oneness doctrine is a relatively insignificant deviation from "pure trinitarianism" and amounts to nothing more than "a modalistic conception of the Trinity." Why then it is sufficient to make someone a cultist? Is the author now willing to extend this blanket condemnation to the "great number of Christians in mainline denominations" who hold essentially the same view?

Serious Factual Errors

The booklet begins with historical background and statistics. Here we find many egregious errors, such as these examples from pages 8 and 9:

• Claim: There have been two "recent schisms" in the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI). First, in 1986 a "3,000-member" church left.

Response: The church in question had about one-fifth this number at the time, and there was no schism.

• Claim: In 1993 "over 200 pastors" left the UPCI rather than "pledge conformity with the UPCI's 'Holiness Standard.'" The booklet repeats a 1993 prediction that "800 ministers would leave the denomination soon" and comments, "It is not yet disclosed how many defected."

Response: In the spring of 1993, the UPCI reported that 50 pastors withdrew by missing the final deadline to sign an annual reaffirmation of two sections of the UPCI's Articles of Faith entitled "Fundamental Doctrine" and

"Holiness." A total of 120 ministers did not sign the affirmation, representing 1.6 percent of the total of

7,668 in the United States and Canada in 1992.336

• Claim: "Oneness Pentecostalism worldwide comprises about 90 denominations in 57 countries."

Response: The UPCI by itself exists in 137 countries.337

• Claim: "Estimated affiliated [Oneness Pentecostal] church members worldwide in 1990 totaled about 1.4 million." The cited source is David Barrett (1988).

Response: The author misread his source, because Barrett listed two categories of Oneness Pentecostals totaling 4,704,960.338 Moreover, this estimate is over ten years old and incomplete. In June 1997, Charisma magazine reported 17 million Oneness believers.339 The most thorough study of this subject, presented as a master's thesis for Wheaton College in 1998, documents 13.7 million Oneness Pentecostals and estimates a total of 15 to 20 million.340

• Claim: "About 75 percent (1.03 million) were affiliated with the UPCI."

Response: In 1997, the UPCI published the following statistics as of midyear: In the U.S. and Canada, there were 8,091 ministers; 3,821 churches (not including daughter works); and a reported Easter attendance of 428,513. In the rest of the world, there were 14,588 ministers; 20,348 churches and preaching points; and 1,908,943 constituents.341 If we estimate total constituency to be approximately 60 percent more than average attendance, as does the Assemblies of God, then as of 1998 the total worldwide constituency was almost 4 million.

• Claim: "The schism of 1993 throws membership figures in doubt from that year forward. Before the schism [1992], worldwide membership was about 1.1 million. About two years later [1994], it decreased to about 1.02 million."

Response: The booklet provides no source for these

erroneous statistics or the mythical decrease. In 1992 reported Easter attendance in the U.S. and Canada was 384,610, and total foreign constituency was 1,050,973.342 In 1994 Easter attendance was 400,991, and foreign constituency was 1,623,030.343 The respective

growth rates for this two-year period are 4.3 percent
and 54.4 percent.

Numerous other errors exist in the booklet, but these will
suffice to demonstrate the extent of the problem. The research
is careless, to say the least. The booklet consistently uses outdated
and false information that puts Oneness Pentecostals in
an unfavorable light when accurate, current information is
readily available, thereby revealing that prejudice has significantly
compromised the scholarship. The seriousness of the
errors calls into question the integrity and trustworthiness of
the entire enterprise.

Faulty Presentation of Oneness Doctrine

The bulk of the booklet is devoted to three theological topics:
the doctrines of Christ, trinity, and salvation. It contains numerous
quotations from various Oneness authors, but never when it gives
the "basic statement of the Oneness position" on each topic
(pages 11, 25, and 51). In each case, it significantly distorts the
Oneness position and thus argues against a straw man.

On the doctrine of Christ, it reduces the Oneness teaching
concerning the relation of Jesus to the Father and Holy
Spirit as follows: "Jesus is the Father and the Holy Spirit." On
the doctrine of God, the booklet represents Oneness believers
as saying "Jesus = the Father = the Holy Spirit." As they stand,
these statements are simplistic, incomplete, out of context, and
therefore distortions. Here are more accurate statements, the
first one from the UPCI Articles of Faith:

Before the incarnation, this one true God manifested
Himself in divers ways. In the incarnation, He manifests

351

Appendix D

Himself in the Son, who walked among men. As He works in
the lives of believers, He manifests Himself as the Holy
Spirit. . . . This one true God was manifest in the flesh, that
is, in His Son Jesus Christ.344

The doctrine known as Oneness can be stated in two
affirmations: (1) There is one God with no distinction of
persons; (2) Jesus Christ is all the fullness of the Godhead
incarnate. . . . Jesus is the one God incarnate. . . . Jesus is
the Father incarnate. . . . The Holy Spirit is literally the
Spirit that was in Jesus Christ. . . . The UPCI teaches that
the one God existed as Father and Holy Spirit before His
incarnation as Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and that while
Jesus walked on earth as God Himself incarnate, the Spirit
of God continued to be omnipresent.345

We do not believe that the Father is the Son, [but] we
do believe that the Father is in the Son (John 14:10). Since

Jesus is the name of the Son of God, both as to His deity as
Father and as to His humanity as Son, it is the name of both
the Father and the Son.346

On the doctrine of salvation, the booklet represents
Oneness Pentecostals as believing that "water baptism is the
indispensable means of regeneration." This statement is false.
While Oneness Pentecostals generally agree that water baptism
is for the remission of sins, part of the new birth, and part of
the experience of New Testament salvation, they believe that
regeneration is supremely the work of the Holy Spirit and purchased
by the blood of Jesus.

The booklet says the true view is that "God, the agent of
regeneration and remission, may elect to use it [baptism] or
not. . . . Christ's blood, not water, washes away sins" (pages 57-
58). Oneness Pentecostals accept this view. They would argue,
however, that while God is sovereign in establishing a plan of

352

A History of Christian Doctrine

salvation and then in judging an individual's fulfillment of that
plan, from the human perspective water baptism is not an
option but a divine command to obey and a necessary act of
faith. The following statements summarize their true views:347

Water baptism is not a magical act; it is without spiritual
value unless accompanied by conscious faith and
repentance. Baptism is important only because God has
ordained it to be so. God could have chosen to remit sin
without baptism, but in the New Testament church He has
chosen to do so at the moment of baptism. Our actions at
baptism do not provide salvation or earn it from God; God
alone remits sins based on Christ's atoning death. When we
submit to water baptism according to God's plan, God honors
our obedient faith and remits our sin.

The Bible describes water and Spirit baptism as two
distinct events. . . . The New Testament particularly associates
the Holy Spirit with God's work of regeneration and
His dwelling in man. . . .

God could have chosen to remit sins without water
baptism, but we exceed our authority if we assert that He
will or list circumstances under which He will. . . . We
should obey the full gospel to the utmost of our understanding
and capacity, encourage everyone else to do the
same, and leave eternal judgment to God.

For a detailed discussion of the various doctrinal and historical
points that the booklet raises, see the following books by
David K. Bernard, published by Word Aflame Press: The
Oneness of God, The Oneness View of Jesus Christ, The New

Birth, and Oneness and Trinity: A.D. 100-300.
Narrow Presentation of "Historic Orthodoxy"
The booklet's presentation of the "historic, orthodox understanding" of Christ, the trinity, and salvation is surprising

Appendix D

in places. Its position on a number of issues is quite controversial, and its appeal to historical authority is inconsistent. Here are some examples:

• It relies heavily on postbiblical tradition to support the doctrine of the trinity and trinitarian baptism, when Scripture alone should be our doctrinal authority, in practice as well as in theory. For the "basic statement of the doctrine of the Trinity" it quotes the Athanasian Creed instead of Scripture (pages 42-43). It asserts, "The proper formula for water baptism is triune," and as proof it cites the following authorities: Matthew 28:19, the Didache, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and the church historians Sozomen and Socrates (pages 71-72).

• Ironically, on other subjects the booklet ignores prominent and even majority teachings in church history, thereby falsely portraying its views as the only "historic, orthodox" ones. For instance, most of the writers it cites as authorities for the baptismal formula taught that baptism effects the remission of sins and is part of the new birth. So taught Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and many more.348 It vehemently denounces as cultic the teaching that baptism is part of the experience of salvation, yet it conveniently omits that throughout history and even today most professing Christians have affirmed this very doctrine, including Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Lutherans (the first Protestants). The Nicene Creed affirms "one baptism for the remission of sins," and the framers clearly meant that in the ceremony of water baptism God washes away sins.

If the creeds and the ancient writers known as the church fathers represent so-called historic orthodoxy on the doctrine of God, why do they not equally represent historic orthodoxy on the doctrine of water baptism? The truth is that the author is highly selective in what he deems orthodoxy. To support the doctrine of the trinity he invokes the creeds and fathers and denounces anyone who would deviate from their supposed

A History of Christian Doctrine

authority, yet he renounces their authority when it comes to water baptism.

Similarly, the booklet says that the holiness teachings of the

UPCI "are strange and legalistic and lack biblical ground" (page 74), yet it ignores the strong teachings of ancient writers such as Tertullian and Cyprian on this very subject. While embracing John Calvin's doctrine of predestination, the booklet says nothing about Calvin's teachings on practical holiness and the laws he promulgated on this subject in Geneva, which were stricter than the voluntary disciplines that the UPCI has adopted in obedience to the Scriptures.

• The presentation of the doctrine of the trinity suffers from the classic weaknesses of the doctrine, namely tendencies toward tritheism and subordinationism. Many trinitarians will have problems affirming his views in this area.

For instance, the booklet argues strongly that the Godhead is a substance that subsists in three centers of consciousness. "The term person can properly denote self-conscious things other than human beings, such as angels, demons, imaginary self-conscious beings, and each of the three persons of God" (page 47). Interestingly, A Handbook of Theological Terms asserts, "No important Christian theologian has argued that there are three self-conscious beings in the godhead,"349 but this booklet certainly comes close to doing so.

One passage of Scripture seems to give the author particular trouble: "Now the Lord is that Spirit" (II Corinthians 3:17). To avoid saying that "the Spirit" here is the Holy Spirit, he argues that there are at least two divine Spirits, "the Holy Spirit" and "the spirit that is God's substance": "There are many spirits other than the Holy Spirit, both literal (e.g., angels, demons, the spirits of men, and the spirit that is God's substance [John 4:24]) and metaphorical" (page 34).

To avoid saying that "the Lord" in II Corinthians 3:17 is Jesus, he indicates that Jesus and Jehovah are not the same being and that there is more than one divine Lord: "The word

355

Appendix D

Lord in 1 Corinthians 8:6 denotes Jesus, while in 2 Corinthians 3:17 it may instead denote Jehovah. . . . 1 Cor. 8:6 teaches only that one Lord is in special relationship to believers, not that there is only one lord at all" (page 35, text and note 91).

The author admits a certain subordination in the Godhead, using terms that one could apply to children or to subjects of an absolute monarch: "Although it affirms their equality of nature, trinitarianism acknowledges a subordination of will by the Son to the Father and of the Spirit to the Father and the Son" (p. 39).

• When presenting the "historic, orthodox" view of salvation, the booklet advocates a strict, five-point Calvinism,

including unconditional election and unconditional eternal
security. The implication is that all who do not adhere to
this view—and the vast majority of professing Christians do
not—are heretical. Here are some surprising statements based
on this view:

"New birth is a gift of God's sovereign grace, independent
of the sinner's actions" (page 64).

"Faith and repentance follow new birth" (page 65).

"Acts 2:1-4 does not report the disciples' receiving the
Spirit" (page 62).

Conclusion

In summary, it appears that the purpose of the booklet is not
to engage in serious, respectful dialogue with the goal of ascertaining
biblical truth, but to prejudice readers against Oneness
Pentecostals by labeling them a cult, presenting a superficial
caricature of their teachings, and leaving a false impression that
many are abandoning this message while only a few are embracing
it. These seem to be desperate tactics motivated by a fear
that if people indeed give careful consideration to the message
of Oneness Pentecostals, then many will embrace it.

When sinners on the Day of Pentecost cried out to the apos-

356

A History of Christian Doctrine

tles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" the apostle Peter
responded, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the
name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall
receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:37-38).

By contrast, the author of this booklet would have
responded, in effect, "You can do nothing but hope that God
has already chosen you for salvation. If He has, you will be born
again before you believe on Jesus Christ and before you repent
of your sins. Assuming you are regenerated, then you will
automatically
believe and repent, and afterwards if you wish you
may be baptized, although it is not necessary for the remission
of sins. If you do get baptized, you do not need to use the name
of Jesus, but you should invoke three divine persons—the
Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—in accordance with the
doctrine of the trinity that will be developed over the next three
centuries. Finally, the Spirit will have filled you, although not
according to the experience that we have just received and you
have just witnessed, for after all, we already had the Spirit anyway.
One day you too will realize that you already received the
Spirit, and then you may wish to seek for an optional baptism
of the Spirit."

The contrast is stark. Let us embrace the message and

experience of the apostles.

Appendix D

Appendix E

Major U.S. Pentecostal Organizations350

Name U.S. U.S. World

Churches Constituents351 Constituents352

Assemblies of God 11,920 2,494,574 30,000,000

Church of God
(Cleveland, TN) 6,060 753,230 4,000,000

Church of God in Christ 15,300 5,499,875 6,500,000

Church of God of
Prophecy 1,908 76,531 286,848

Full Gospel Fellowship of
Churches & Ministers Int'l 650 195,000 195,000

International Church of the
Foursquare Gospel 1,832 231,522 2,500,000

International Pentecostal
Holiness Church 1,681 170,382 378,538

Pentecostal Assemblies
of the World 1,760 450,000 1,000,000

Pentecostal Church of God 1,230 111,900 301,786

United Pentecostal Church
International353

Attendance 3,861 500,000 2,500,000

Inclusive constituency 800,000 4,000,000

Appendix F

Major Jesus Name Pentecostal
Organizations354

Name U.S. U.S. World World

Churches Constituents Churches Constituents355

Apostolic Assembly of
the Faith in Christ
Jesus 455 100,000 622 116,700

Apostolic Church of
Pentecost of Canada 413 42,000

Apostolic Church of the
Faith in Christ Jesus
(Mexico) 1,723 302,200

Assemblies of the Lord
Jesus Christ 339 40,000 426 48,500

Bible Way Church of Our
Lord Jesus Christ
Worldwide 320 80,000 470 101,000

Church of Our Lord Jesus

Name	U.S. Churches	U.S. Constituents	World Churches	World Constituents
Christ of the Apostolic Faith	430	120,000	550	140,000
International Ministerial Association	339	34,000	635	63,600
Light of the World (Mexico)			2,900	600,000
Pentecostal Assemblies of the World	1,760	450,000	4,141	1,000,000

Name	U.S. Churches	U.S. Constituents	World Churches	World Constituents[355]
Pentecostal Church of Indonesia			2,500	1,000,000
Spirit of Jesus Church (Japan)	11	2,000	776	420,000
True Jesus Church (China)	40	5,000	12,000	3,300,000
United Pentecostal Church Int'l (attendance)	3,861	500,000	25,268	2,500,000
(inclusive constituency)		800,000		4,000,000
United Pentecostal Church of Colombia	30	3,000	3,543	1,000,000
Voice in the Desert Apostolic Church (Chile)			300	70,000

A History of Christian Doctrine

Appendix G
Major United Pentecostal National Organizations[356]

Country	Churches[357]	Constituents[358]
Brazil	795	47,500
Colombia	769	16,410
Ecuador	526	14,541
El Salvador	967	76,000
Ethiopia	6,847	1,000,638
Guatemala	252	12,000
Haiti	288	24,698
India, Northeast	676	66,885
India, South	441	42,000
Indonesia	420	35,805
Jamaica	218	31,000
Kenya	334	25,164
Liberia	400	20,794
Madagascar	400	40,000
Malawi	245	10,500

Mexico 260 24,024
Myanmar (Burma) 164 13,602
Nicaragua 283 13,000
Pakistan 409 26,949
Papua New Guinea 129 52,000
Peru 317 12,063
Philippines 3,355 164,400
Venezuela 603 60,000

361

Notes

Chapter 1. The Pentecostal Movement

1Ethel E. Goss, The Winds of God, rev. ed. (Hazelwood,
MO: Word Aflame Press, 1977), 35, 37.
2Ibid., 104.
3William Seymour, ed., The Apostolic Faith (Los Angeles)
[hereafter AF] 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1, reprinted in The
Azusa Street Papers [hereafter Papers] (Foley, AL: Together
in the Harvest Publications, 1997), 10.
4J. L. Hall, "United Pentecostal Church International," Stanley
Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic
Movements (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 860.
5Sarah E. Parham, The Life of Charles F. Parham (Baxter
Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1930), 107.
6Charles F. Parham, A Voice Crying in the Wilderness,
rev. ed. (Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College,
1910), 25-38.
7Ibid., 64, 75.
8Ibid., 123.
9Ibid., 137-38. There is some ambiguity here as to whether
those who are sanctified but not baptized with the Holy Ghost
will be part of the church and inherit the new heavens. See also
Charles Parham, The Everlasting Gospel (Baxter Springs, KS:
Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1911), 50, 54-55, 62, 82, 98-99,
102, 104.
10Charles Parham, Voice, 21-24.
11Fred Foster, Their Story: 20th Century Pentecostals
(Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975), 98, 121.
12Frank J. Ewart, The Phenomenon of Pentecost, rev. ed.
(Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975), 92.
13Frank Bartleman, Azusa Street (Plainfield, NJ: Logos
International, 1980) (reprint of How "Pentecost" Came to Los
Angeles, 1925), 54.

362

14For a reproduction, see James L. Tyson, The Early
Pentecostal Revival: History of Twentieth-Century Pentecostals
and The Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, 1901-

30 (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1992), 90.

15Bartleman, 55-60.

16AF 1, no. 3 (November 1906): 2, in Papers, 18.

17AF 1, no. 11 (October 1907 to January 1908): 4, in Papers, 57.

18AF 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 2, in Papers, 11. (Paragraphs 2-3 are almost identical to the wording of Charles Parham in Everlasting Gospel, 13-15.)

19Ibid., 1, in Papers, 10.

20AF 1, no. 3 (November 1906): 4, in Papers, 21.

21AF 2, no. 13 (May 1908): 4, in Papers, 65.

22AF 1, no. 5 (January 1907): 2, in Papers, 27. See Charles Parham, Voice, 123-24, for the same teaching.

23Papers, 15, 19, 21, 26.

24Ibid., 14, 33, 36.

25"Church of God in Christ History," www.cogic.org/history. htm (Memphis: COGIC, 1999).

26AF 1, no. 6 (February-March 1907): 7, in Papers, 36.

27AF 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 2, in Papers, 51. The text actually says "Acts 2.28" but quotes Acts 2:38.

28Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., "Making Sense of Pentecostalism in a Global Context" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Evangel University, Springfield, MO, 1999), 10-11, citing "Apostolic Church Stirred by Vision," Los Angeles Express, 24 March 1907, 4.

29See Daniel Ramirez, "Flor y Canto Apostólico: Preliminary Inquiries into Latino Pentecostal Hymnody" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Oakland, CA, 1997), 7; Manuel Gaxiola, "The Spanish-Speaking Oneness Churches in Latin America" (paper presented at the First Occasional Symposium on Aspects of the Oneness Pentecostal Movement, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge,

363

Notes

MA, 1984), in Jeffrey Gill compilation, 125. See also Manuel Gaxiola, La Serpiente y la Paloma: Historia, Teología Análisis de la Iglesia Apostólica de la Fe en Cristo Jesús (1914-1994), 2nd ed. (Mexico: Libros Pyros, 1994), 117.

30James Tinney, "The Significance of Race in the Rise and Development of the Apostolic Pentecostal Movement" (paper presented at the First Occasional Symposium on Aspects of the Oneness Pentecostal Movement, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, MA, 1984), in Jeffrey Gill compilation, 60.

31AF 1, no. 12 (January 1908): 4, in Papers, 61.

32AF 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 2, in Papers, 51.

33AF 2, no. 13 (May 1908): 2, in Papers, 63.

34AF 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1, in Papers, 10.
35Charles Parham, "A Note of Warning," The Apostolic Faith (Zion City, IL), January 1907, in Sarah Parham, Life, 166-170.
36The San Antonio Light reported on July 24, 1907, that Parham and J. J. Jourdan were arrested for "the commission of an unnatural offense," or sodomy, but that Parham would fight the charge and that he attributed the numerous stories of his alleged immoral conduct to the anti-Pentecostal followers of Dowie in Zion City. For a reproduction of the article, see Tyson, 41.
Sarah Parham wrote, "One day I received word that he had been arrested while preaching but some of his true friends had immediately came [sic] to his release and he continued the meeting. The city attorney told him that he would not have to appear, because he (the attorney) would not even call the case for trial for he 'was satisfied it was all spite work.' I was with him in Texas, at the date set in the indictment, but the case was never called, the prosecuting attorney declaring that there was absolutely no evidence which merited any legal recognition." Sarah Parham, Life, 198.
Howard Goss stated about the events in 1907: "The greatest test of our whole lives came, as Satan struck our movement a terrible blow from within. One of our leading ministers fell into an awful sin, which turned out to be only a temporary
364
A History of Christian Doctrine
affair. He repented, confessed, was forgiven, and afterward lived an exemplary life so far as I ever heard." Ethel Goss, 134.
W. C. Parkey, a United Pentecostal minister, stated that Goss told him the sin was an act of homosexuality with no evidence that Parham ever became involved with it again. Personal interview, Hazelwood, MO, 8 September 1986.
37Ewart, Phenomenon, 180. G. Campbell Morgan used the first phrase.
38Robert Mapes Anderson, Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 141.
39Ethel Goss, 148.
40Anderson, 77-78.
Chapter 2. The Finished Work Controversy
41William Durham, Pentecostal Testimony [hereafter PT] 2, no. 3 (August 1912): 3-4.
42Ibid., 14.
43Ibid. 2, no. 1 (January 1912): 6.
44Ibid. 2, no. 3 (August 1912): 6.
45Ibid., 10.
46Ibid., 5.

47Ibid., 12.

48Ibid., no. 1 (January 1912): 9; no. 3 (August 1912): 6.

49Edith Blumhofer, The Assemblies of God: A Popular History (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1985), 43.

50E. N. Bell, Word and Witness, August 1912, quoted in Edith Blumhofer, "Finished Work of Calvary," Assemblies of God Heritage, Fall 1983, 11.

51Durham, PT 2, no. 3 (August 1912): 10.

52Ibid., 3.

53Ibid., no. 1 (January 1912): 14; no. 3 (August 1912): 10.

54Ibid., no. 1 (January 1912): 1, 13-14.

55Ibid., 3, 5.

56Ewart, Phenomenon, 98.

365

Notes

57Gordon Mallory (a United Pentecostal minister), personal interview, Austin, Texas, 14 February 1999. His mother told him that her father, R. E. Sternall, one of the founders of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, was baptized in Jesus' name by William Durham in Chicago.

58Durham, PT 2, no. 1 (January 1912): 13; PT 2, no. 3 (August 1912): 6.

59See, for example, James Bowers, "The Neglect and Loss of Sanctification Teaching and Experience in the Church of God" (paper presented at an overseas training conference, 1995).

Chapter 3. The Jesus Name Controversy

60David Reed, Origins and Development of the Theology of Oneness Pentecostalism in the United States (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1978), 27-45.

61Edith Blumhofer, The Assemblies of God: A Chapter in the Story of American Pentecostalism (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1989) 1:238.

62Walter J. Hollenweger, The Pentecostals (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1972), 311-12.

63Blumhofer, History, 30-31.

64Gary B. McGee, personal interview, Dallas, TX, 9 November 1990.

65Andrew Urshan, The Life of Andrew Bar David Urshan (Portland, OR: Apostolic Book Publishers, 1967), 91, 99-102.

66Ewart, Phenomenon, 106.

67Reed, Origins, 159.

68Ibid., 118.

69Franklin Small, Living Waters, quoted in Ewart, Phenomenon, 141-42.

70Ewart, Phenomenon, 112-13.

71Ibid., 127.

72See Anderson, 177; Talmadge L. French, "Oneness Pentecostalism in Global Perspective: The Worldwide Growth and Organizational Expansion of the Oneness Pentecostal

366

A History of Christian Doctrine

Movement in Historical and Theological Context" (M.A. thesis, Wheaton College Graduate School, Wheaton, IL, 1998), 39.
73Oliver F. Fauss, What God Hath Wrought: The Complete Works of O. F. Fauss (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1985), 181-82.
74See Ewart, Phenomenon, 117, 142-43, 195; Hollenweger, Pentecostals, 32, 43 n. 21; and various articles in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary. The evidence for the rebaptism of C. H. Mason is anecdotal; it is widely stated in black Apostolic circles, including the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World and the Pentecostal Churches of the Apostolic Faith. See Tinney, in Gill, 61, 66. According to Robert Spellman, historian for the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, Mason was baptized in 1930 or 1931 in Chicago. When the leaders under him did not accept the message, he did not proclaim it but stayed with his organization. Robert Spellman, telephone interview, 22 January 1999.
75Carl O'Guin, personal interview with J. L. Hall and David Bernard, Granite City, Illinois, 18 December 1987.
76Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God (1915), 7.
77Ibid. Interestingly, Justin Martyr advocated the same formula in the second century A.D. It appears that he endorsed a compromise that led the church away from its original baptism solely in the name of Jesus to baptism in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.
78O'Guin interview, 1987. He eventually joined the Pentecostal Church of God and served as pastor of Trinity Tabernacle in Madison, Illinois. He authored Special Occasion Helps (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965).
79The 1916 minutes contain the roster roll for the meeting. It consists of 67 people who held credentials and 13 who did not hold credentials but were granted "privileges of the floor." A few Oneness ministers appear on this roster roll, but most do not, including Ewart, Goss, Haywood, and Opperman.

367

Notes

Apparently, those known to have withdrawn were not included. Combined Minutes of AG (1916), 15-16.
80Foster, 115.
81Anderson, 183-84.

82Ibid., 189-91.

83Ewart, Phenomenon, 192.

84Reed, Origins, 122-23, citing articles in Weekly Evangel and Word and Witness, both official Assemblies of God publications at the time.

85Published in Oliver F. Fauss, Buy the Truth and Sell It Not (1965), reprinted in Fauss, What God Hath Wrought, 165-74.

Chapter 4. Oneness Pentecostal Organizations

86Minute Book and Ministerial Record of the General Assembly of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (1919), reprinted in Tyson, 293-314.

87States not represented were Arizona, Delaware, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming. Provinces of Canada represented were British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec.

88Tyson, 195.

89R. A. N. Kydd, "Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 695.

90Thomas W. Miller, Canadian Pentecostals: A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (Mississauga, Ontario, Canada: Full Gospel Publishing House, 1994), 16-17.

91Foster, 125-26, quoting S. C. McClain.

92Tyson, 192-93, 195, 247.

93Arthur Clanton and Charles Clanton, United We Stand, jubilee ed. (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1995), 97.

94Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies: 1936 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941) 2:1323, 1330, 1343; idem, Religious Bodies: 1926 (1929) 2:1086.

368

A History of Christian Doctrine

95See Irvin J. Cunningham and J. L. Hall, comps., "The United Pentecostal Church North America: Growth Trends and Other Insightful Statistics" (Hazelwood, MO: General Home Missions Division, UPCI, 1996), 1. The figures most commonly quoted—900 churches and 1,838 ministers—apparently come from the first official report, in 1949.

96Financial Reports, United Pentecostal Church International, Year Ending June 30, 1998 (Hazelwood, MO: United Pentecostal Church International, 1998), vi, 71.

97Jerry Jones (general secretary-treasurer, UPCI), personal interview, Hazelwood, MO, 16 February 1999.

98Gary Erickson (secretary, General Sunday School Division, UPCI), telephone interview, 18 February 1999. Reported Easter attendance for 1997 was 429,066. For 1998

there was not an actual decrease in attendance but only a decrease in reporting. For 1997 and 1998 figures broken down by district, see Christian Educator, Fall 1998, 12.

99The Assemblies of God Current Facts (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1997).

100Add 60 percent to estimated Easter attendance of 500,000 and foreign constituency of 2,000,000. The number reported by the Foreign Missions Division for foreign constituency "represents our regular attendance in our churches." Financial Reports, UPCI (1986), 77.

101French, 100.

102There were 3,543 churches in 1988 and 3,861 in 1998. Sources: Financial Reports, UPCI for number of churches and Sunday School Division reports for attendance.

103Outside the U.S. and Canada, there were 9,803 churches and 787,677 constituents in 1988, and 21,407 churches and 2,000,000 constituents in 1998. Source: Financial Reports, UPCI (1988, 1998).

104Harry Scism, "Together Winning the Lost," Pentecostal Herald, June 1992, 6.

105T. F. Tenney, "Ethiopia," Superintendent's Communique,

369
Notes

April 1999, 2-3. Tenney is the superintendent of the Louisiana District UPCI and had recently returned from attending the crusade.

106Gordon Mallory, public statement, Texas Men's Conference, Lufkin, TX, 15 May 1999. Mallory is a UPCI minister and former missionary to the Philippines.

107Donald Hanscom, Sr. (coordinator of multicultural ministries, General Home Missions Division, UPCI), personal interview, Hazelwood, MO, 16 February 1999.

108Constituency in Ethiopia and Mizoram is based on reports from the Foreign Missions Division. (Source: see Appendix G.) Constituency in New Brunwick and Louisiana is based on 1998 Easter attendance reports of over 5,000 for New Brunswick and 42,438 for Louisiana. (Source: see note 98.) I assumed reporting by 100 percent of churches but added 60 percent to obtain inclusive constituency.

109Cornelia Butler Flora, Pentecostalism in Colombia: Baptism by Fire and Spirit (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1974); Donald Palmer, Explosion of People Evangelism (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974).

110French, 133-37. My parents and I met leaders of the True Jesus Church in Korea in the 1970s. The church estimated actual membership in 1995 to be 1,079,000. See "True Jesus

Church, Our Church," www.tjc.org/church/index.shtml (Los Angeles: TJC, 1999).

111See John Yang, The Essential Doctrines in the Holy Bible, trans. M. H. Tsai (Taichung City, Taiwan, Republic of China: The General Assembly of the True Jesus Church in Taiwan, 1970).

112"True Jesus Church, Our Basic Beliefs," www.tjc.org/beliefs/index.shtml (Los Angeles: TJC, 1999).

113French, 231. My parents and I are in contact with a group in Manchuria (northern China) founded by an independent Korean minister who was baptized by the UPC of Korea. This Chinese group has translated some of my writings to use for

370

A History of Christian Doctrine

evangelism and discipleship, and my parents and I have provided ministerial training. As of 1999, the group numbered about 1,500 baptized believers.

114French, 138-40. My parents and I met members of the Spirit of Jesus Church in Korea in the 1970s.

115David Reed, "The 'New Issue' of 1914: New Revelation or Historical Development?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Wheaton, IL, November 1994), 19-20.

116Laurence W. Wood, "The Rediscovery of Pentecost in Early Methodism" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Church of God Theological Seminary, Cleveland, TN, March 1998), 2.

117John Fletcher, "An Essay on the Doctrine of the New Birth," Asbury Theological Journal, Spring 1998, 35-56.

118Frank J. Ewart, The Name and the Book (1936; repr. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1987), 65.

119Ewart, Phenomenon, 114. David Gray, who was trained under Ewart, confirmed that Ewart taught Acts 2:38 as the new birth. David F. Gray, telephone interview, 29 March 1993.

120George Farrow, "Letter to Miss Lulu Brumwell," 11 January 1915, in UPCI Historical Center, Hazelwood, MO.

121G. T. Haywood, The Birth of the Spirit in the Days of the Apostles, 15, 24, 28-29, in The Life and Writings of Elder G. T. Haywood, Paul Dugas, comp., (Portland, OR: Apostolic Book Publishers, 1968).

122See Tyson, 180.

123Sing unto the Lord (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1978), 208. For the date, see Morris Golder, The Life and Works of Bishop Garfield Thomas Haywood (1880-1931) (Indianapolis, IN: By the author, 1977), 24.

124Fauss, What God Hath Wrought, 182.

125Ethel Goss, 111-12.

126Combined Minutes of AG (1915), 9; Combined Minutes of AG (1916), 11.

127Reed, Origins, 170.

128A. D. Urshan, Apostolic Faith Doctrine of the New Birth (Portland, OR: Apostolic Book Publishers, n.d.), 13.

129Clanton, 28.

130Minute Book and Ministerial Record of PAW (1919), 2, 5, 9-10, reprinted in Tyson, 295, 299-300.

131Clanton, 52.

132Ibid., 52, 114.

133Ibid., 52-53.

134Ibid., 135-36.

135Stanley W. Chambers, telephone interview, 27 February 1993.

136E. J. McClintock, personal interview, Hazelwood, MO, 8 April 1993.

137Nathaniel Urshan, personal interview, Austin, TX, 24 April 1999.

138David Gray, youth president of the Western District of the PCI at the time of the merger and first youth president of the UPC, estimated that two-thirds of the PCI and practically all the PAJC held this view. (Telephone interview, 29 March 1993.) This number would represent about five-sixths, or eighty-three percent, of the merged body. J. L. Hall suggested that ninety percent may be more accurate. E. J. McClintock said he could not give statistics but agreed that Gray's estimate is reasonable, and he pointed out that most PCI members who did not hold a firm view of the new birth were concentrated in a few districts. Ellis Scism, who served as superintendent of the Northwestern District of the PCI at the time of the merger and who was elected to the same position for the UPC immediately after the merger, stated, "A minority in the PCI did not believe that water baptism or a tongues experience was essential to salvation." Ellis Scism with Stanley Scism, Northwest Passage: The Early Years of Ellis Scism (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1994), 227. Scism would not have called this group a "minority" unless it was clearly less than one-half of the PCI, and thus probably no more than one-third or one-fourth. His district

was a major area of concentration for this minority.

139See Clanton, 143-44; Foster, 143-44.

140David F. Gray, telephone interview, 29 March 1993.

141J. L. Hall, personal interview, Hazelwood, MO, 28

October 1993.

142Manual (Hazelwood, MO: United Pentecostal Church International, 1999), 22. These two paragraphs compose a section of the UPCI's Articles of Faith entitled "Fundamental Doctrine." It appears every month in the Pentecostal Herald, the official organ of the UPCI.

143David Reed, "The 'New Issue' of 1914" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, 1994), 8. For The Christian Evangel, see Tyson, 165.

144Combined Minutes of AG (1914), 4-5; Miller, 116.

145Frederick Bruner, A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 166; James D. G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today (London: SCM, 1970), 91; Leighton Ford, "The 'Finger of God' in Evangelism," in J. I. Packer and Paul Fromer, eds., The Best in Theology, Vol. 1 (Carol Stream, IL: Christianity Today, 1987), 292-93; J. David Pawson, The Normal Christian Birth (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1989), 13, 143-46; Kilian McDonnell and George Montague, eds., Fanning the Flame (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 14.

146Gordon D. Fee, God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 863-64.

147Ewart, Phenomenon, 200-2.

148G. T. Haywood, Birth of the Spirit, in Life and Writings, 10, 12, 21. Parham said that at conversion people were conceived but at sanctification they were born again and entered the church. Everlasting Gospel, 10-11, 102.

373

Notes

149Urshan, Life, 9, 88, 116, 151-52, 175-77.

150Reed, Origins, 354.

Chapter 5. Trinitarian Pentecostal Organizations

151Worldwide statistics are from Preston D. Hunter, "Adherents.com," www.adherents.com (Dallas, 1999). U.S. statistics are from Kenneth Bedell, ed., Yearbook of American & Canadian Churches 1998 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), reporting for 1996; Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Religious Bodies: 1916 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919); idem, Religious Bodies: 1926 (1929); idem, Religious Bodies: 1936 (1941). A few figures are from Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary.

152James P. Bowers, "The Neglect and Loss of Sanctification

Teaching and Experience in the Church of God" (paper presented at an overseas training conference, 1995), 21-23.

153C. Peter Wagner, "Church Growth," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 191.

154"Church of God in Christ Beliefs," www.cogic/believe.htm and "Church of God in Christ History" www.cogic/history.htm (Memphis: COGIC, 1999).

155C. P. Jones, "Church of God in Christ," Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 205.

156Church of God History and Heritage, Summer 1998, 5.

157Ibid., 6; Hollenweger, Pentecostals, 517.

158H. Vinson Synan, "International Pentecostal Holiness Church," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 467.

159"International Pentecostal Holiness Church Articles of Faith," www.iphc.org/docs/artfaith.html (Oklahoma City: IPHC, 1999).

160David Barrett, "Statistics, Global," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 824.

161The Assemblies of God Current Facts (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1997).

162Combined Minutes of AG (1916), 10-13.

374

A History of Christian Doctrine

163"Assemblies of God Statement of Fundamental Truths," www.ag.org/info/16truths (Springfield, MO: AG, 1999).

164"Assemblies of God Position Papers," www.ag.org/info/position (Springfield, MO: AG, 1999).

165Vinson Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 203.

166Hunter, citing Patrick Johnstone, The Church Is Bigger Than You Think (Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire, U.K.: World Evangelism Crusade).

167C. E. Jones, "Hoover, Willis Collins," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 445.

168Steven J. Land, Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom (Sheffield, U.K.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 101-4.

169Charles Parham, Voice, 42, 53-60.

170Ethel Goss indicated that jewelry was not a concern for the early followers of Parham until Holiness preachers joined the movement. Ethel Goss, 69. Of course, Holiness preachers and members were an integral part from the beginning.

171Edith Blumhofer, "Apostolic Faith Mission (Portland, Ore.)," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 18.

172"Church of God Relaxes Rules, OKs Makeup, Jewelry,"

Houston Chronicle, August 1988.

173See Harold D. Hunter, "Church of God of Prophecy, The," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 209.

174Blumhofer, History, 133-35.

175Carl O'Guin, personal interview, Granite City, IL, 18 December 1987.

176Call to Holiness 1, no. 1 (November 1961): 4; no. 4 (October 1963): 1.

177Manual (Hazelwood, MO: United Pentecostal Church International, 1999), 23-24, 132-50.

178Hollenweger, Pentecostals, 402.

179Combined Minutes of AG (1915), 11-12; Department of

375

Notes

Commerce, Statistics: 1926 2:1090; Manual (UPCI, 1999), 24-25.

180Early Pentecostal organizations reported almost twice as many women members as men. In 1936, for instance, the PAJC reported 5,777 males and 10,030 females; the PCI reported 3,566 males and 6,093 females; and the PAW had 1,901 males and 3,537 females. Department of Commerce, Statistics: 1936 2:1323, 1330, 1343.

181See Bartley J. Linder, The "Godhead," How Many? (Illumination Press: Kerrville, TX, 1997).

182Land, 47.

183David Barrett, "Statistics, Global," Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 820. AG officials say the number for their group is 50 percent. Charisma, October 1993.

184See Daniel Butler, The Last Generation of Truth (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1989).

185See Anderson.

186Ibid., 149.

187Walter J. Hollenweger, Pentecostalism: Origins and Development Worldwide (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), 192-93.

188Wayne E. Warner, "Pentecostal Fellowship of North America," Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 704.

189Land, 29.

190No general survey has been taken. This statistic was valid for New Life United Pentecostal Church of Austin, Texas, in January 1999, when it had about 250 people ages ten or older in regular attendance. The ten percent (or less) who had not spoken in tongues were mostly newcomers or people who did not seek the Spirit. Conversations with other pastors around the country indicated that this statistic corresponded closely to their situation also.

191AG membership (not constituency) is about 1,400,000, and if 35 percent have received the Holy Ghost, then the Spiritfilled number is about 490,000. UPCI attendance is about

500,000. Assuming 70 percent are ages 10 or older (for New Life United Pentecostal Church of Austin, Texas, the percentage is 75), and assuming 90 percent of these have spoken in tongues, then the Spirit-filled number would be about 315,000.

192Both statistics are from Manuel J. Gaxiola, public statement at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Springfield, MO, 13 March 1999.

193Vinson Synan, personal conversation, Cleveland, TN, March 1998. Synan is dean of the School of Divinity at Regent University and a former assistant general superintendent of the International Pentecostal Holiness Church. He also made similar comments at the Louisiana District UPCI camp meeting, Tioga, LA, July 1997.

194Raymond Cox, personal conversation, Springfield, MO, 12 March 1999. Cox is a Foursquare Gospel minister who was converted under Aimee Semple McPherson in 1936 and attended Angelus Temple for many years.

195Paul Elbert, personal conversation, Springfield, MO, 11 March 1999. Elbert is a professor at Lee University, a Church of God liberal arts university in Cleveland, Tennessee.

Chapter 6. Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy

196See David K. Bernard, God's Infallible Word (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1992), 42-46.

197James Buswell, Jr., A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) 1:123.

198Tony Lane, Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 188.

199Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969) 3:4:479-80; 2:2:52-53; 2:1:261; 4:2:50-51, 128.

200Ibid. 2:1:26

201Ibid. 4:4:85-86.

202Ibid., 75, 91-94.

203Ibid., 96-99.

204Lane, 200.

205Tim Dowley et al., eds., Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of the Church (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 598.

206Dietrich Bonhoeffer, The Cost of Discipleship, rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 47.

207Ibid., 61, 69, 72, emphasis in original.

208See, for example, Emil Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of God (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949).

209Victoria Combe, "Methodists to Worship 'God the Mother,'" London Daily Telegraph, 18 February 1999.

210Sandy Gess, "Worship and Rituals in a Feminist Key," www.hooked.net/~sgess/rituals.html (San Francisco: Weave of Faith, 1999).

211"World Council of Churches, Who Are We?," wcccoe. org/wcc/who/cuv-e.html#self-understanding (Geneva, Switzerland: WCC, 1999).

212Kenneth S. Kantzer and V. Gilbert Beers, "Winds of Change in the World Council?" Christianity Today, 20 April 1984, 10.

213Ibid., 11-12, emphasis in original.

214Ibid., 15.

215Tom Finger, "Orthodox, Evangelicals Push for WCC Reforms," Christianity Today, 11 January 1999, 22.

216Max Thurian, ed., Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry" Text, vol 2., Faith and Order Paper 132 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1986).

217Ibid., Faith and Order Paper 143 (1988).

218Finger, Christianity Today, 11 January 1999, 22.

219"National Council of Churches, NCC Member Communions," ncccusa.org/members/index.html (New York: NCCC, 1999).

220Leonard Ravenhill, Revival God's Way (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1983), 145-46, citing Christ for the Nations, May 1982.

378

A History of Christian Doctrine

221Christianity Today, 1988.

222St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 17 December 1989.

223Time, 12 February 1990.

224Christianity Today, 7 October 1988.

225Christianity Today, 19 February 1990.

226Bill Lindelof, "Lesbian 'Blessing' Rekindles Tensions," Christianity Today, 1 March 1999, 17.

227Richard Ostling, "Those Mainline Blues," Time, 22 May 1989, 94.

Chapter 7. Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism

228C. M. Robeck, Jr. "National Association of Evangelicals," Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 634.

229Mark A. Noll, "Scopes Trial," in Walter A. Elwell, ed., Evangelical Dictionary of Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker,

1984), 989.

230For a thorough discussion of inspiration, inerrancy, transmission, and text of Scripture, see David K. Bernard, God's Infallible Word (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1992).

231"American Council of Christian Churches, Introduction," www.amcouncilcc.org/introduc.htm (Bethlehem, PA: ACCC, 1999).

232"American Council of Christian Churches, Constitution" www.amcouncilcc.org/constitu.htm (Bethlehem, PA: ACCC, 1999).

233Ewart, Phenomenon, 98, 180.

234Reuben A. Torrey, The Baptism with the Holy Spirit (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1895), 18.

235Ewart, Phenomenon, 180, 182.

236See David K. Bernard, "Dispensationalism and Oneness Pentecostal Theology," in Symposium on Oneness Pentecostalism 1988 and 1990 (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1990).

237See, for example, Frank Boyd, Ages and Dispensations

379
Notes

(Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1955). Boyd, an Assemblies of God teacher, used Scofield's definition of "dispensation" and his seven ages but rejected his definition of the kingdom of heaven and the postponed-kingdom theory.

238R. V. Pierard, "Evangelicalism," in Elwell, ed., Evangelical Dictionary, 379.

239"The National Association of Evangelicals, About NAE," www.nae.net/about.htm (Carol Stream, IL: NAE, 1999).

240Christine Gardner, "Hungry for God," Christianity Today, 5 April 1999, 33.

241"The National Association of Evangelicals, Ministry, Statement of Faith," www.nae.net/ministry-statement.html (Carol Stream, IL: NAE, 1999).

242Frank Stagg, The Holy Spirit Today (Nashville: Broadman, 1973), 11-18. In a telephone conversation with J. L. Hall, Stagg explained that as a New Testament professor, he derived his views on the Godhead from the New Testament instead of the creeds. He further acknowledged that his views were the same as those of T. F. Tenney, United Pentecostal district superintendent of Louisiana. Interestingly, Stagg had baptized Tenney as a boy in the Baptist church, before he converted to the United Pentecostal Church.

243See James D. G. Dunn, Christology, vol. 1 of The Christ and The Spirit (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 367, 371;

Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament (London: SCM Press, 1963), 265-66.

244W. A. Criswell, Expository Sermons on Revelation (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961-66) 1:145-46.

245Christianity Today, 17 March 1989.

246Charles C. Ryrie, So Great Salvation: What It Means to Believe in Jesus Christ (1989), emphasis in original.

247Zane Hodges, Absolutely Free! (1989).

248Christianity Today, 18 March 1988.

249Christianity Today, 5 March 1990.

250See J. L. Hall, The United Pentecostal Church and the

380

A History of Christian Doctrine

Evangelical Movement (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1990).

251Irving Hexham, "Cults," in Elwell, ed., 289.

Chapter 8. Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy

252Lane, 213.

253Ibid., 213-14.

254Kenneth Woodward, "Hail, Mary," Newsweek, 25 August 1997, 49.

255Pope Paul VI, promulgator, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium), 21 November 1964, 2:15, in "The Holy See, Archive, Documents of the Vatican II Council, Constitutions" [hereafter "Holy See"], www.vatican.va/archive/par_en.htm (Vatican City: Roman Catholic Church, 1999).

256Ibid., 2:14, 16.

257Idem, Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation (Dei Verbum), 18 November 1965, 2:10, in "Holy See."

258Lane, 218.

259Ibid., 219.

260Anastasia Toufexis, "What to Do When Priests Stray," Time, 24 September 1990, 79.

261See, for example, Church Law & Tax Report, 13, no. 2 (March-April 1999): 18-29. In this issue, of nine reported cases of sexual misconduct by clergy, eight involved Roman Catholic priests.

262"Healer's Trials," Time, 25 October 1982.

263Jackson Daily News, 7 August 1983.

264"Pope attacks pardon 'directly from God,'" Jackson Daily News, 11 December 1984.

265"Christmas Gift," Time, 30 December 1985, 71.

266Richard Ostling, "Blueprint for Union," Time, 22 March 1982, 60.

267Religious News Service, "Joint Commission Agrees on Meaning of Salvation," Christianity Today, 20 March 1987, 61.

268"Lutherans and Catholics Reach Some Surprising
Agreements," Christianity Today, 16 December 1983, 11.
269"Perspectives on Koinonia: Final Report of the International
Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue (1985-1989),"
Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies
12, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 128.
270Demetrios J. Constantelos, An Old Faith for Modern Man,
2nd ed. (New York: Greek Orthodox Diocese, 1964), 17-20.
Chapter 9. The Healing Revival and the Latter Rain
Movement
271See David K. Bernard, Spiritual Gifts (Hazelwood, MO:
Word Aflame Press, 1997), chapters 9-11.
272He rejected the idea of three persons in the Godhead
and the idea of an eternal Son. He held that Jesus is the fullness
of the Godhead incarnate. However, he believed that
the humanity of Jesus was a special divine creation, with
Mary serving as the "incubator" only and not the biological
mother.
273Hollenweger, Pentecostals, 354-55.
274Nathaniel Urshan, personal interview, Austin, TX, 24
April 1999.
275"The William Branham Memorial Service," www.biblebelievers.
org/wbmtos.htm (Mt. Pearl, Newfoundland, Canada:
Bible Believers Association, 1999), emphasis in original.
276French, 222.
277P. G. Chappell, "Roberts, Granville Oral," in Burgess et
al., eds., Dictionary, 760.
278Steven Lawson, "Charismatics Rally Behind Roberts,"
Charisma, September 1987, 64.
279D. J. Wilson, "Kuhlman, Kathryn," in Burgess et al., eds.,
Dictionary, 530, citing Jamie Buckingham, Daughter of
Destiny: Kathryn Kuhlman . . . Her Story (1976), 247.
280Nathaniel Urshan (UPCI general superintendent), personal
interview, Austin, TX, 24 April 1999. At the merger of the
PCI and PAJC to form the UPC, PCI ministers believed that the
organization owned a publishing house and that it would now
belong to the UPC. They soon discovered, however, that the
publishing house was held in the name of Kidson, who was PCI
secretary, and he did not allow the UPC to take possession.
281Quoted in R. M. Riss, "Latter Rain Movement," in Burgess
et al., eds., Dictionary, 534, emphasis in original.
282Clanton, 189.

10. The Charismatic Movement

283Steven Lawson, "Robert Walker Reflects upon 50 Years of Christian Life" (interview), Charisma, July 1989.

284F. A. Sullivan, "Catholic Charismatic Renewal," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 112.

285Steven Lawson, "The Big Charismatic Get-Together," Charisma, September 1987, 56.

286Julia Duin, "The Holy Spirit and World Evangelization," Christianity Today, 4 September 1987, 44.

287James Beverley, "Dental Miracle Reports Draw Criticism," Christianity Today, 24 May 1999, 17.

288R. M. Riss, "Hagin, Kenneth E.," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 345.

289See D. R. McConnell, A Different Gospel: A Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 3-14.

290Dennis Bennett, "A Second Look at the Third Wave," Ministries Today, July/August 1989, 8.

291David Barrett, "Statistics, Global," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 816.

292J. I. Packer, "Piety on Fire," Christianity Today, 12 May 1989, 18.

293Stephen Strang, "Pentecostals at a Crossroads," Charisma, November 1998, 130.

294Peter Hocken, "Charismatic Movement," in Burgess et al, eds., Dictionary, 155-56.

295Ibid., 156-58.

383

Notes

296Harald Bredesen, Charisma, August 1994.

297Kilian McDonnell and George Montague, Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 40.

298J. David Pawson, The Normal Christian Birth (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1989), 73-76.

299John Wimber, "John Wimber Calls It Power Evangelism," Charisma, September 1985, 35.

300McDonnell and Montague, Christian Initiation, 41.

301Charles Hunter, "Receiving the Baptism with the Holy Spirit," Charisma, July 1989, 54.

302Larry Christenson, The Charismatic Renewal among Lutherans (Minneapolis: International Lutheran Renewal Center, 1976).

303Pawson, 4-5, 187-88, 294-98.

304McDonnell and Montague, Christian Initiation, 30, 35.

305The leader is Mike Velarde of the El Shaddai movement,

a Charismatic group that began in the Roman Catholic Church. Gordon Mallory, public statement, Lufkin, TX, 15 May 1999. Mallory is a United Pentecostal minister and former missionary to the Philippines.

306Peter Kuzmic, personal interview, Dallas, TX, 8 November 1990.

307Paul Thigpen, "Praise Him with the Dance," Charisma, March 1989, 52.

308See Dave Hunt and T. A. McMahon, The Seduction of Christianity: Spiritual Discernment in the Last Days (Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 1985); McConnell, A Different Gospel. Sources of specific quotes are as follows: Copeland 1—Hunt, 84; Treat—Hunt, 83; Hagin 1— McConnell, 122; Paulk—Hunt, 219; Tilton—Hunt, 220; Hagin 2—McConnell, 134, 142; Copeland 2—McConnell, 141, 171, 173; Lea—Larry Lea, Charisma, October 1989. Emphasis is original.

309Charisma, April 1990.

384

A History of Christian Doctrine

310Earl Paulk.

311Prophetic Ministries News 3, no. 3 (Fall 1989): 2, 6-7, 15.

312Hunt, 101.

313Charisma, February 1990.

314See H. Wayne House and Thomas D. Ice, Dominion Theology, Blessing or Curse? An Analysis of Christian Reconstructionism (Portland, OR: Multnomah, 1988).

315See "Assemblies of God Position Papers," www.ag.org/info/position (Springfield, MO: AG, 1999).

316Lee Grady, "The Other Pentecostals," Charisma, June 1997, 62-68.

Chapter 11. Christianity Today

317Preston D. Hunter, www.adherents.com (Dallas, 1999).

318"Pentecostals Celebrate the Future," Advance, November 1998, 10. See also Stephen Strang, "Pentecostals at a Crossroads," Charisma, November 1998, 130.

319"Pentecostals: World Growth at 19 Million a Year," Christianity Today, 16 November 1998.

320David Barrett, "Statistics, Global," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 810-30.

321Grant Wacker, "America's Pentecostals: Who They Are," Christianity Today, 16 October 1987, 16.

322C. Peter Wagner, "Church Growth," in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 193; Peter Hocken, "The Charismatic Movement in the United States," Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies 16, no. 2 (Fall 1994): 192-93.

323Barrett, in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 810-30.
324French, 79.
325If two-thirds of the inclusive constituency of 20 million
Oneness Pentecostals are Spirit-filled, then that total is over 13
million, or about 15 percent of the 90 million people whom we
estimated have received the Holy Ghost.
326J. Gordon Melton, The Encyclopedia of American
Religions (Wilmington, NC: McGrath, 1978).

327Barna Research Group. In 1994, a U.S. Congressional
committee estimated that there were 340,000 churches.
Church Law & Tax Report, September-October 1994.
328Dowley, 619, says it is 25 percent.
329Charisma, December 1993.
330Tim Ferguson with Josephine Lee, "Spiritual Reality,"
Forbes, 27 January 1997.
331Charisma, December 1993, citing Carl George.
332C. Peter Wagner, in Burgess et al., eds., Dictionary, 193.
333Ibid., 193-94.
334Ibid., 194-95.
Appendix D. Response to a Cult Hunter
335E. Calvin Beisner, God in Three Persons (Wheaton, IL:
Tyndale House Publishers, 1984), 18.
336"Ministers Who Have Not Signed Affirmation," unpublished
list compiled by UPCI Church Administration, 20 May
1993. See also Financial Reports, UPCI, June 30, 1992, vi.
337U.S., Canada, and 135 mission fields. See Financial
Reports, UPCI, June 30, 1997, 71.
338David Barrett, "Statistics, Global," in Burgess et al., eds.,
Dictionary, 813.
339J. Lee Grady, "The Other Pentecostals," Charisma, June
1997, 63.
340French, 79.
341Financial Reports, UPCI, June 30, 1997, vi, 71, 84.
342Financial Reports, UPCI, June 30, 1992, 75, 90.
343Financial Reports, UPCI, June 30, 1994, 77, 93.
344Manual (UPCI, 1999), 20.
345David K. Bernard, The Oneness View of Jesus Christ
(Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1994), 9, 12-13, 141.
346David K. Bernard, The Oneness of God (Hazelwood, MO:
Word Aflame Press, 1983), 127.
347David K. Bernard, The New Birth (Hazelwood, MO:
Word Aflame Press, 1984), 131, 152, 187, 307.

348For documentation, see Bernard, New Birth, 261-64.
349Van Harvey, A Handbook of Theological Terms (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 246.

Appendix E. Major U.S. Pentecostal Organizations

350This list consists of all groups that teach the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the sign of speaking in tongues and that report at least 500 churches and 50,000 constituents in the U.S., using the latest available statistics, mostly from 1997.

351Source: Eileen Lindner, ed., Yearbook of American & Canadian Churches 1999. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 337-51. Constituency is typically more inclusive than membership or regular attendance. It includes all who identify with the church. These numbers are the best for comparing with mainline denominations, who typically count all who have ever been baptized. They are estimates, however, and in some cases they may be unrealistically high. The most accurate gauge of an organization's strength is probably the number of churches. One can evaluate and compare the reliability of the number reported for constituents by calculating the number of constituents per church. For example, the numbers for the Church of God in Christ seem overstated, while the numbers for the Church of God of Prophecy seem understated.

352Source: Preston D. Hunter, www.adherents.com (Dallas, 1999).

353See pages 99-100.

Appendix F. Major Jesus Name Pentecostal Organizations

354This list consists of all groups that teach water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ and that report at least 300 churches and 40,000 constituents. We should note that the International Ministerial Association is a Latter Rain group; the Light of the World has an aberrant and exclusive doctrine of the church and a vague doctrine of God; and the Pentecostal Church of Indonesia is predominantly trinitarian in its doctrine of God.

387

Notes

Source for statistics: Talmadge French, "Oneness Pentecostalism in Global Perspective," M.A. thesis, Wheaton College Graduate School, Wheaton, IL, 1998. For the United Pentecostal Church International, see pages 99-100.

355Constituency is typically more inclusive than membership or regular attendance. It includes all who identify with the church. These numbers are the best for comparing with mainline denominations, who typically count all who have ever been baptized. They are estimates, however, and in some cases they may be unrealistically high. The most accurate gauge of an organization's strength is probably the number of churches.

One can evaluate and compare the reliability of the number reported for constituents by calculating the number of constituents per church.

Appendix G. Major United Pentecostal National Organizations

356This list consists of all national churches and mission fields reporting over 10,000 constituents. Source: "1998 Annual Field Report" (Hazelwood, MO: Foreign Missions Division, United Pentecostal Church International), 17 September 1998. For El Salvador and Mexico, see Pentecostal Herald, June 1999, 8.

357Number of churches and preaching points.

358In most cases, this number represents actual attendance. Add 60 percent to obtain estimated inclusive constituency. (See page 100.) In Ethiopia, however, it represents all who have been baptized. Teklemariam Gezahagne (superintendent), personal interview, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 1997.

388
A History of Christian Doctrine

Select Bibliography

1. Primary Sources: Pentecostal History and Theology

Azusa Street Papers, The. Foley, AL: Together in the Harvest Publications, 1997.

Bartleman, Frank. Azusa Street. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1980. Reprint of How "Pentecost" Came to Los Angeles, 1925.

Booth-Clibborn, William E., comp. A Call to the Dust and Ashes. St. Paul, MN: By the compiler, 1922.

Combined Minutes of the General Council of the Assemblies of God in the United States of America, Canada and Foreign Lands. Springfield, MO: Assemblies of God, 1914-1917.

Dayton, Donald, et al., eds. "The Higher Christian Life": Sources for the Study of the Holiness, Pentecostal and Keswick Movements. 50 vols. New York: Garland, 1984– .

Durham, William. Pentecostal Testimony. January and August 1912 issues.

Ewart, Frank J. The Name and the Book. 1936. Reprint, Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1986.

———. The Phenomenon of Pentecost. 1947. Rev. ed. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975.

Fauss, Oliver F. What God Hath Wrought: The Complete Works of O. F. Fauss. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1985.

Financial Reports, United Pentecostal Church International. Hazelwood, MO: United Pentecostal Church International, 1981-1998.

Goss, Ethel. The Winds of God. Rev. ed. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1977.

Hall, J. L., and David K. Bernard, eds. Doctrines of the Bible. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1993.

Haywood, G. T. The Life and Writings of Elder G. T. Haywood. Compiled by Paul Dugas. Portland, OR:

389

Apostolic Book Publishers, 1968.

Horton, Stanley M., ed. Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1994.

McDonnell, Kilian, and George Montague. Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

Menzies, William M., and Stanley M. Horton. Bible Doctrines: A Pentecostal Perspective. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1993.

Minute Book and Ministerial Record of the General Assembly of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World. Indianapolis: Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, 1919.

Parham, Charles F. A Voice Crying in the Wilderness. 1902. Rev. ed. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1910.

———. The Everlasting Gospel. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1911.

Parham, Sarah E. The Life of Charles F. Parham. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1930.

Urshan, Andrew D. Apostolic Faith Doctrine of the New Birth. Portland, OR: Apostolic Book Publishers, n.d.

———. The Life of Andrew Bar David Urshan. Portland, OR: Apostolic Book Publishers, 1967.

Yang, John. The Essential Doctrines in the Holy Bible. Translated by M. H. Tsai. Taichung City, Taiwan, Republic of China: The General Assembly of the True Jesus Church in Taiwan, 1970.

2. Primary Sources: General History and Theology

Barth, Karl. Church Dogmatics. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969. (See also edition of selected readings. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.)

Berkhof, Louis. Systematic Theology. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1941.

390

A History of Christian Doctrine

Bloesch, Donald. Essentials of Evangelical Theology. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. The Cost of Discipleship. Rev. ed.

Translated by R. H. Fuller. New York: Macmillan, 1959.

Documents of the Vatican II Council. "The Holy See, Archive, Constitutions," www.vatican.va/archive/par_en.htm. Vatican City: Roman Catholic Church, 1999.

Evans, William. The Great Doctrines of the Bible. 1912. Enlarged ed. with additions by S. Maxwell Coder. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.

Fletcher, John. "An Essay on the Doctrine of the New Birth." Asbury Theological Journal. Spring 1998.

Feinberg, Charles L., ed. The Fundamentals for Today. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1958.

Harnack, Adolf. What Is Christianity? Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. Introduction by Rudolf Bultmann. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Hodge, Charles. Systematic Theology. 3 vols. 1892. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Rahner, Karl. Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity. Translated by William Dych. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.

Strong, Augustus. Systematic Theology. Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1907.

Theissen, Henry C. Lectures in Systematic Theology. 1949. Revised by Vernon D. Doerksen. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

3. Secondary Sources: Pentecostal History and Theology

Anderson, Robert Mapes. Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Bernard, David. Understanding the Articles of Faith: An Examination of United Pentecostal Beliefs. Hazelwood,

391

Select Bibliography

MO: Word Aflame Press, 1998.

Blumhofer, Edith W. The Assemblies of God: A Chapter in the Story of American Pentecostalism. 2 vols. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1989.

———. The Assemblies of God: A Popular History. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1985.

Bonner, William L. My Father in the Gospel: Bishop R. C. Lawson. By the author, n.d.

Burgess, Stanley M., Gary B. McGee, and Patrick H. Alexander, eds. Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988.

Clanton, Arthur L., and Charles E. Clanton. United We Stand. Jubilee ed. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1995.

Cox, Harvey. Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century. New York: Addison-Wesley, 1995.

Crane, Richard. Pentecostal Handbook. Rev. ed. By the author, 1989.

Dayton, Donald. Theological Roots of Pentecostalism. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987.

Foster, Fred J. Their Story: 20th Century Pentecostals. Rev. ed. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1981.

French, Talmadge L. "Oneness Pentecostalism in Global Perspective: The Worldwide Growth and Organizational Expansion of the Oneness Pentecostal Movement in Historical and Theological Context." M.A. thesis, Wheaton College Graduate School, Wheaton, IL, 1998.

Gaxiola, Manuel J. La Serpiente y la Paloma: Historia, Teología Análisis de la Iglesia Apostólica de la Fe en Cristo Jesús (1914-1994) [The Serpent and the Dove: Historical, Theological Analysis of the Apostolic Church of the Faith in Christ Jesus (1914-1994)]. 2nd ed. Mexico: Libros Pyros, 1994.

Gill, Jeffrey, comp. Papers Presented to the First Occasional Symposium on Aspects of the Oneness Pentecostal Move-

392

A History of Christian Doctrine

ment. Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, MA, 1984.

Goff, James R., Jr. Fields White unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1988.

Golder, Morris E. History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World. Indianapolis, IN: By the author, 1973.

———. The Life and Works of Bishop Garfield Thomas Haywood (1880-1931). Indianapolis, IN: By the author, 1977.

Hall, J. L. "Contending for the Faith, Parts 1-9," Pentecostal Herald. November 1996 to September 1998. (To be published in book form. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press.)

Hamilton, Michael, ed. The Charismatic Movement. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Harrell, David, Jr. All Things Are Possible: The Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1975.

Hollenweger, Walter J. The Pentecostals. 3rd ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

———. Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.

Hunt, Dave, and T. A. McMahon, The Seduction of Christianity:

Spiritual Discernment in the Last Days. Eugene, OR:
Harvest House Publishers, 1985.

Jones, Charles Edwin. Black Holiness: A Guide to the Study
of Black Participation in Wesleyan Perfectionistic and
Glossolalic Pentecostal Movements. Metuchen, NJ:
Scarecrow Press, 1987.

———. A Guide to the Study of the Pentecostal Movement.
American Theological Librarians Association Bibliography
Series, no. 6. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1983.

Land, Steven J. Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the
Kingdom. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press,
1994.

McConnell, D. R. A Different Gospel: A Historical and

393

Select Bibliography

Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement.
Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

Menzies, William. Anointed to Serve: The Story of the
Assemblies of God. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing
House, 1971.

Miller, Thomas William. Canadian Pentecostals: A History of
the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada. Mississauga,
Ontario, Canada: Full Gospel Publishing House, 1994.

Quebedeaux, Richard. The Charismatics: The Origins,
Development and Significance of Neo-Pentecostalism.
New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Reed, David A. Origins and Development of the Theology of
Oneness Pentecostalism in the United States. Ann Arbor,
MI: University Microfilms International, 1978.

Sherrill, John L. They Speak with Other Tongues. New York:
McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Smith, Harold B., ed. Pentecostals from the Inside Out.
Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1990.

Society for Pentecostal Studies. Affirming Diversity. Papers
presented at the 24th meeting of the Society for Pentecostal
Studies, Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL, 1994.

———. The Fivefold Gospel. Papers presented at the 26th
meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Patten
College, Oakland, CA, 1997.

———. Purity and Power: Revisioning the Holiness and
Pentecostal/Charismatic Movements for the Twenty-
First Century. Papers presented at the 27th meeting of the
Society for Pentecostal Studies in special session with the
Wesleyan Theological Society, Church of God Theological
Seminary, Cleveland, TN, 1998.

———. Toward Healing Our Divisions: Reflecting on

Pentecostal Diversity and Common Witness. Papers presented at the 28th meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Evangel University, Springfield, MO, 1999.

Spellman, Robert C., ed. Pentecostal Apostolic Fellowship

394

A History of Christian Doctrine

Crusade Journal. June 1989.

Synan, Vinson. The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

———. In the Latter Days: The Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the Twentieth Century. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1984.

———. The Twentieth-Century Pentecostal Explosion: The Exciting Growth of Pentecostal Churches and Charismatic Renewal Movements. Altamonte Springs, FL: Creation House, 1987.

———, ed. Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1975.

Tyson, James L. Before I Sleep: A Narrative and Photographic Biography of Bishop Garfield Thomas Haywood. Indianapolis, IN: Pentecostal Publications, 1976.

———. The Early Pentecostal Revival: History of Twentieth-Century Pentecostals and the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, 1901-30. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1992.

4. Secondary Sources: General History and Theology

Barrett, David B. World Christian Encyclopedia. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Boettner, Loraine. Roman Catholicism. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1962.

Christian History. Volume 9, number 4. Issue 28: "The 100 Most Important Events in Church History."

Constantelos, Demetrios. An Old Faith for Modern Man: The Greek Orthodox Church, Its History and Teachings. 2nd ed. New York: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, 1964.

Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. Religious Bodies: 1916. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1919.

———. Religious Bodies: 1926. Washington, D.C.: U.S.

395

Select Bibliography

Government Printing Office, 1929.

———. Religious Bodies: 1936. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941.

Dowley, Tim, et al., eds. Eerdmans' Handbook to the History

of the Church. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Elwell, Walter, ed. Dictionary of Evangelical Theology.
Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

Gonzalez, Justo. A History of Christian Thought. 3 vols.
Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.

Harvey, Van. A Handbook of Theological Terms. New York:
Macmillan, 1964.

Heick, Otto. A History of Christian Thought. Philadelphia:
Fortress, 1965.

Hunter, Preston D. www.adherents.com. Dallas, 1999.

Klotsche, E. H. The History of Christian Doctrine. Rev. ed.
Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Lane, Tony. Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith. San
Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. A History of Christianity. 2 vols.
Rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1975.

Lindner, Eileen, ed., Yearbook of American & Canadian
Churches 1999. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.

Mead, Frank. Handbook of Denominations in the United States.
9th ed. Revised by Samuel Hill. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.

Melton, J. Gordon. The Encyclopedia of American Religions.
Wilmington, NC: McGrath, 1978.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Tradition: A History of the
Development of Doctrine. 5 vols. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press, 1971-89.

Piepkorn, Arthur. Profiles in Belief: The Religious Bodies of
the United States and Canada. 3 vols. San Francisco:
Harper and Row, 1979.

Sweet, William. The Story of Religion in America. Grand
Rapids: Baker, 1950.

396
A History of Christian Doctrine

401

Index

402

A History of Christian Doctrine

403

Index

405
Index

407
Index

A History of Christian Doctrine

Index

247-48, 276-78, 285-87, 290,
292, 298, 319-21
410
A History of Christian Doctrine
Rosa, Adolph, 31
Rowe, G. B., 91, 106
Rowe, Worthy, 106
Russia, 110, 246
Russian Orthodox Church, 246
Ryrie, Charles, 219-20
Sabbatarians, 106, 108, 109,
268
Sabellianism, 77
Sacred name groups, 106
Salvation Army, 75, 336
Salvation, 15, 28-32, 48-53, 68,
75, 105, 111-23, 127, 145,
152, 160-61, 192-93, 207,
217-18, 223-24, 232, 235,
241, 302, 343-44, 352-53,
356-57
San Antonio, TX, 14-15, 34, 268
Sanctification, 10-11, 16, 28, 35,
39, 43-48, 55-56, 113, 125-
31, 135-36. See also Holiness
Sanford, Agnes, 279, 282
Savelle, Jerry, 293
Schaeffer, Francis, 247
Schaeffer, Franky, 247
Schaepe, John, 65, 87, 90-91
Schell, William, 76
Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 167
School of the Prophets, 269
Schooler, A. R., 91
Schweitzer, Albert, 169
Scism, Ellis, 268, 372
Scofield, C. I., 205
Scopes Monkey Trial, 201-2
Scott, R. J., 63, 75
Scripture. See Bible
Seattle, WA, 109
Second Coming, 15-16, 111,
152-53, 180, 204, 217, 297
Second Work groups, 53-54,
105-6, 125-32, 147, 154-56
Secular theology, 187

Index

413

Index

Other Books by DAVID K. BERNARD
Pentecostal Theology Series:
Vol. 1: The Oneness of God
Vol. 2: The New Birth
Vol. 3: In Search of Holiness
Vol. 4: Practical Holiness: A Second Look
A Study Guide for the New Birth
A Study Guide for the Oneness of God
Booklets:
Essentials of Oneness Theology
Essentials of the New Birth
Essentials of Holiness
Essential Doctrines of the Bible
Understanding the Articles of Faith
Commentaries:
The Message of Colossians and Philemon
The Message of Romans
Other Books:
A Handbook of Basic Doctrines
A History of Christian Doctrine, Vol. 1, 2, & 3
God's Infallible Word
In the Name of Jesus
Oneness and Trinity, A.D. 100-300
The Oneness View of Jesus Christ
Spiritual Gifts
The Trinitarian Controversy
in the Fourth Century
Order from:
Pentecostal Publishing House

8855 Dunn Road
Hazelwood, MO 63042-2299