

**EVANGELICAL BIBLE COLLEGE OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA**



**COURSE NOTES – CHURCH HISTORY  
Paper 511**

**DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY.**

**BY**

**DR JOHN C McEWAN**

**[BOOK 6 OF 13]**

**Revised 27 November 2021**

## **WHO IS JESUS CHRIST?**

Professor Simon Greenleaf was one of the most eminent lawyers of all time. His "Laws of Evidence" for many years were accepted by all States in the United States as the standard methodology for evaluating cases. He was teaching law at a university in the United States when one of his students asked Professor Greenleaf if he would apply his "Laws of Evidence" to evaluate an historical figure. When Greenleaf agreed to the project he asked the student who was to be the subject of the review. The student replied that the person to be examined would be Jesus Christ. Professor Greenleaf agreed to undertake the examination of Jesus Christ and as a result, when he had finished the review, Simon Greenleaf personally accepted the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour.

Professor Greenleaf then sent an open letter to all jurists in the United States saying in part "I personally have investigated one called Jesus Christ. I have found the evidence concerning him to be historically accurate. I have also discovered that Jesus Christ is more than a human being, he is either God or nothing and having examined the evidence it is impossible to conclude other than he is God. Having concluded that he is God I have accepted him as my personal Saviour. I urge all members of the legal profession to use the "Laws of Evidence" to investigate the person of the Lord Jesus Christ and if you find that he is wrong expose him as a faker but if not consider him as your Saviour and Lord"

## **HOW CAN I BE SAVED?**

### **Salvation is available for all members of the human race.**

Salvation is the most important undertaking in all of God's universe. The salvation of sinners is never on the basis of God's merely passing over or closing His eyes to sin. God saves sinners on a completely righteous basis consistent with the divine holiness of His character. This is called grace. It relies on God so man cannot work for salvation, neither can he deserve it. We need to realise that the creation of this vast unmeasured universe was far less an undertaking than the working out of God's plan to save sinners.

However the acceptance of God's salvation by the sinner is the most simple thing in all of life. One need not be rich, nor wise, nor educated. Age is no barrier nor the colour of one's skin. The reception of the enormous benefits of God's redemption is based upon the simplest of terms so that there is no one in all this wide universe who need be turned away.

### **How do I become a Christian?**

There is but one simple step divided into three parts. First of all I have to recognise that I am a sinner (Romans 3:23; 6:23; Ezekiel 18:4; John 5:24).

Secondly, realising that if I want a relationship with Almighty God who is perfect, and recognising that I am not perfect, I need to look to the Lord Jesus Christ as the only Saviour (I Corinthians 15:3; 1 Peter 2:24; Isaiah 53:6; John 3:16).

Thirdly, by the exercise of my own free will I personally receive the Lord Jesus Christ as my Saviour, believing that He died personally for me and that He is what He claims to be in an individual, personal and living way (John 1:12; 3:36; Acts 16:31; 4:12).

### **The results of Salvation**

The results of this are unbelievably wonderful:

My sins are taken away (John 1:29),

I possess eternal life now (1 John 5:11,12),

I become a new creature in Christ (2 Corinthians 5:17),

The Holy Spirit takes up His residence in my life (1 Corinthians 6:19),

And I will never perish (John 10:28-30).

This truthfully is life's greatest transaction. This is the goal of all people; this is the ultimate of our existence. We invite and exhort any reader who has not become a Christian by trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ to follow these simple instructions and be born again eternally into God's family (Matthew 11:28; John 1:12; Acts 4:12; 16:31).

© Evangelical Bible College of Western Australia 2020

Many other Christian resources are available freely from our internet web site: [www.ebcwa.org.au](http://www.ebcwa.org.au) and [www.orakeibaptist.co.nz](http://www.orakeibaptist.co.nz) for weekly messages.

For further information contact Dr Peter Moses at [pjmoses@bigpond.com.au](mailto:pjmoses@bigpond.com.au) or email Brian Huggett [brianhuggett@bigpond.com.au](mailto:brianhuggett@bigpond.com.au) or Dr John McEwan at [john.mcewan@xtra.co.nz](mailto:john.mcewan@xtra.co.nz)

We encourage you to freely copy and distribute these materials to your Pastor and friends. You only, need written permission from EBCWA if you intend using the materials in publications for resale. We encourage wide distribution freely!

## CONTENTS

LECTURE	SUBJECT	PAGE
1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	THE EARLY JEWISH CHURCH	10
3	THE POWER OF LOVE	14
4	MARTYRDOM THE ULTIMATE WITNESS	17
5	THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS	20
6	THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE	25
7	THE GREAT EPISCOPY	30
8	THE APOLOGISTS AND THE INTELLECTUALS	35
9	CONSTANTINE AND THE CHURCH – THE MIXED MULTITUDE	38
10	THE TRINITY DEBATE	44
11	THE NATURE OF THE LORD	47
12	MONASTICISM	52
13	AUGUSTINE	56
14	THE PAPACY	59
15	ICONS	62
16	THE MISSIONS TO THE BARBARIANS	65
17	GREGORY THE GREAT – THE MASS	69
18	THE CHURCH AND STATE IN MEDIEVAL TIMES	73
19	CRUSADES AND CATHEDRALS	76
20	SCHOLASTICISM	80
21	POVERTY AND WEALTH	83
22	PRELUDE TO THE REFORMATION	86
23	LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION	91
24	EARLY CONGREGATIONALISM	95
25	JOHN CALVIN	99
26	THE ENGLISH SOLUTION	104
27	THE COUNTER REFORMATION	108
28	THE PURITANS	111
29	THE AGE OF REASON	114
30	PIETISM	118
31	METHODISM	121
32	THE GREAT AWAKENING OR REVIVAL IN THE USA. 1720-1760	125
33	PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE WORSHIP OF MARY	128
34	SOCIAL CONCERNS	131
35	WORLD MISSIONS	135
36	THE RISE OF AMERICA	138
37	EVOLUTION AND LIBERALISM	141
38	COMMUNISM AND THE SOCIAL GOSPEL	146
39	THE HARVEST OF LIBERALISM	150
40	THE BATTLE FOR THE BIBLE	154
41	CHURCH UNION	157
42	VATICAN 2, FATIMA, AND THE EMERGING CHURCH	159
	DOCTRINE INDEX	161

TEXT BOOK - Church History in Plain Language - B Shelley - 4<sup>th</sup> Edition

Those without access to this text should refer to the EBCWA website or CD, and open the file titled, "Church Age History and Study Books". You will find seven volumes of study notes to use to cover all periods of the Church Age, as well as additional specific topics; including; Antioch, Alexandria, Byzantium, Canterbury, Hymn Writers, Leaders, Emperors, Popes, and Missionaries. Instead of reference to a passage from Shelley, simply refer to the appropriate volume and draw your teaching notes from the entries therein.

## LECTURE 1 - INTRODUCTION

The key set text for the course is by Bruce Shelley – “Church History in Plain Language” [CHS]. It was written to teach the subject in an African context. Another good textbook is “Christianity through the Centuries” by Cairns. Erdmans or Lion Handbook, “History of Christianity”, is also good. Reference to text book page numbers throughout these lectures will be made to these books, but if you are unable to get them, simply look up the topic we are studying in the index at the back of whatever texts you are able to find and read about the subject at hand there, or read through the ample notes provided on the CD and website “Church History Notes” file. Audio Lectures are on the USB.

There are many theological liberals in Church History so you have to discern where the person writing textbooks is coming from. Many who become specialists in Church History are liberals. Bruce Shelley is a neo evangelical, so while he is good, he does not accept some historical points that I would. In history it is often more what these authors have left out rather than what they have included that is the important thing to see. This is a study in learning discernment!

History is the “survived and accepted record” of man’s past. What is called “history” is what has survived from the past and what is left after the historian has decided what he/she wants to say, and what they will “ignore” as it doesn’t suit their purpose. There is no such thing as unbiased history; you cannot pick up any book, other than the Bible, and say this is what really happened. What you can say of a history text is, this is what the historian believes is important from the facts that were known to them, or accepted by them. Your Bible is required on your desk all the time when you are working with Church history and we will be basing our discussion of each period firmly in the Scriptures.

Many of the issues that became large in Church History did so because the people in the past forgot the teaching of God’s Word relative to that issue. The flame of God’s truth working through time always burns throughout history and that is one of the things that I will refer to throughout our study. Sometimes, as you study a period and look at what we know of it, you will wonder if there are any real Christians there. Sometimes the liberal historian does not even mention the real Holy Spirit filled believers, and you are left wondering what was going on.

You must remember that God’s people are there all the way through. However in historical study we examine the evidence that has remained for us to study, and the real work of God may have been done by simple people who left no lasting trace of their work and words upon the earth. What survives for the historian to study is the books written by the rich and powerful, and, remember the teaching of the Word, they are often the apostates and the disobedient. God’s people may be the small people of a society, but their story is the one we are searching for.

In your own society think of what will remain after several hundred years, and what records will survive. Will the story of your church be told on the earth, or only the story of the rich hymn singing rotary club down the road? In heaven alone we will fully know what truly happened in church history. Many times in our study we will see people in church garb who are with Satan and not the Lord. The Doctrine of the Remnant is an important one to remember here. In many periods of church history there is only a small faithful remnant of true believers, but they are still there.

### FOUR POINTS OF INTRODUCTION

[1] Most people captured by the cults and isms do not know their Bibles, or Church history.

[2] Most of the heresies, or false teachings on specific subjects, are things that have occurred in the past. After the first few hundred years you will find no new heresies arise. In early church history we will meet the Christadelphians, Mormons, Seventh Day Adventists, and Jehovah’s Witnesses. They are all there, even if their title in the early church is something different. Satan has not had an original thought in 2,000 years, and deviations from the truth and straight lies abound early on. If you know church history you are prepared to face all the cults and all the false views of scripture, for they are simply recycled by the enemy.

[3] Christianity is an historical religion. If you can split Christianity from history you have destroyed it. The liberals try and split the Jesus of History from the Christ of faith. History however shows that Jesus Christ is historical and also The Man who was God amongst us, and HE is going to return.

[4] The facts of the Lord Jesus Christ’s ministry, person, His work on the Cross, resurrection, Ascension and Pentecost are all historical facts. If they are not then your faith is vain and you are lost. If it is not so the men who recorded the story of Christ were either fools and liars. Refer back to the notes on Pastoral Theology – Apologetics for a good discussion of this subject. Read slowly and refer to the facts outlined in, “Evidence that demands a Verdict”. Choose your company here, and do so very carefully.

### SOME POINTS TO NOTE

**2 Peter 1:16 - 18** - Peter faces the issue of the historicity of Christ. He is either telling the truth or lying. Either what we are studying is true or is false. If you can prove what you are studying about Jesus Christ in Church history is false, then you have disproved the Christian faith because without an historical Christ you have no basis for your gospel and for your faith. Shelley doesn’t believe enough to really make a saving theology – see how he fudges truth and avoids it!

**Luke 1: 1- 4** - Luke never saw the Lord Jesus Christ in person. He was a university trained doctor, and as a professional man he is the historian of the early days. There were many books that were written about the sayings of Jesus but only four of them were ACCEPTED BY THE CHURCH as canonical (refer to a later lecture). Luke is writing to Theophilus, who was a convert, and possibly Paul's lawyer for his trial in Rome. Luke records for us that he had written the facts down so that all that happened could be understood.

He is going from eyewitnesses from the beginning of the church. Luke was the first true reporter and historian, and he took time during Paul's imprisonment in Caesarea, to travel around Palestine to talk to the many eyewitnesses of the events he describes. Luke was the only one who took any time with Mary. That is why you have got more in Luke about Mary and Elizabeth than anywhere else. He says to his convert that he is being accurate and these are the facts that he sees are important.

**Joshua 4:20-24** - This passage states an important principle. Here we see the importance of having physical evidence of things that shows definitely that there is reason for belief. Faith is based on evidence, faith in things that can be seen, heard or touched. All Christians can look back to the Scriptural record with confidence.

Everything that can be seen from archaeology has reinforced rather than disproved the Bible. The only way unbelievers can try to disprove the Scriptures is to ignore the scholars who don't suit them. If you look at all the evidence you will be converted as was the great Scottish historian, Sir William Ramsey, and this has happened to many others.

When real historians have studied history they have seen that the evidence is incontrovertible. There are two good books, "Who Moved the Stone?", and "Evidence that Demands a Verdict", read them and have confidence in the Bible we hold. Do not be afraid that you will discover things that undermine your faith; keep studying. The thing that you should be afraid of is not studying enough. Beware of Wikipedia however, as it is very anti-Christian.

You need to get access a good book, or journals, on Bible archaeology. In these you will find many things that are still being discovered today that add extra light onto the world that we see described in the Bible.

For example; at an archaeological excavation at Ugarit and Ebla they found many tablets with cuneiform writing on them. It was found that these were copies of the transactions between merchants of Ebla and the cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, Zoar and other cities of the plain, listed in the same order as recorded by Moses in Genesis. Moses had the tablets in front of him and he wrote exactly as the Ebla scribes wrote the names of those cities – Genesis is real history not mythic history, and we need not excuse ourselves affirming the truth of God's Word.

There was also the discovery of an amphitheatre in Caesarea in Palestine. The amphitheatre dedication stone mentions the Pontius Pilate of the Bible. You do not need to fear scholarship as long as you are open and honest with it. The Scriptures cannot be disproved. If the historian is worth his salt he will prove them, or in the very least provide glimpses of life as it was in Bible times.

#### THE MESSAGE OF RESURRECTION

In **Acts 2:29-43** we have the message of the early church. It is a message of the resurrection. The disciples stated that Jesus was God, the expected Messiah. He was the one expected and he was the one who must be responded to. They were urgent and they were dogmatic. Their emphasis is different to many of today's preachers, and so as we study them we must be corrected.

The results of the message and the way they approached the task of giving the message is given clearly in the New Testament. Their preaching was of the resurrection first, and this remains the pattern right the way through the Acts of the Apostles. They would preach the resurrection primarily and then go back to what was behind the resurrection, the Cross. Their message was clear, "He is risen from the dead and he is Lord and Saviour". He showed by his resurrection, that what he did on the Cross was acceptable to the Father. He was raised from the dead proving by this, that everything He did was authenticated. Do we as evangelists and preachers talk enough about the resurrection? If we do not speak as they spoke perhaps we don't! Read through Acts, they always speak of the resurrection!!!!

The touchstone of history is the Scriptures, for example **Acts 4:12, 17-24, 17:1-4**, is prominent as far as the resurrection is concerned. The letters of Paul and other apostles have this subject as particularly important. We should look at the resurrection and the cross and tie them in together. Refer also to Acts 4:2, 33, 17:18, 31,32, 23 : 6, 24:15-21. Also Romans 1:4, 4:24,25, 6:4,5,9, 7:4, 8:11, 1 Corinthians 15:13-52, Philippians 3:10,11, Colossians 2:12, 1 Thessalonians 1:10, 2 Timothy 2:8, Hebrews 6:2, 1 Peter 1:3, 21, 3:21.

Christianity is centered in Easter. It is Resurrection faith, and this subject is the key to understanding the growth in the early church. It is hard to conceive that there would have been any Christianity without the firm belief held by the early disciples in the bodily resurrection of the Lord. They were convinced that their master had conquered death and had appeared to many in person. It is not as Shelley waffles on about his "message", it was his person and work, and words.

Only through the reality of the physical bodily resurrection does this motley demoralized group, which we see in the garden after his arrest, become the powerful and focused group that Jesus leaves on earth after His ascension into

heaven. Only a physical reality, with solid evidence, could have produced the enthusiasm to sweep all obstacles before them in a world wide bold mission. A few disheartened, disillusioned followers were transformed into the most dynamic movement in the history of mankind. Without this firm evidence based belief in the risen Christ the fledgling Christian faith would have faded into oblivion.

Even some liberals admit that it was the faith in the resurrection that did this even though they do not believe in it. This belief, in the power of the risen Lord and his presence with them every moment, gave the church power in the first few hundred years of the Christian era. If the church does not have this sort of power today it is because of the lack of the true resurrection faith. Even the liberals realise the significance of the empty tomb. The book, "Who moved the Stone", by Frank Morrison is a good book on this. It was in the power of belief in the resurrection that they changed the world. The early believers believed in the bodily resurrection, and if we are to stand with them, in the faith once delivered to the saints, we must also affirm this central doctrine.

In 2 Peter the Apostle Peter is facing death. As he does so he tells us that we have not followed cunningly devised fables. Peter was crucified. It normally took two to four days to die on the Cross. You suffocated on the Cross. It was designed to be torture. The Romans crucified people to warn others that you do not mess with Rome. If you did not die of suffocation you died of tetanus. Peter was facing that sort of death when he wrote 2 Peter. He said that he was not going to his death for a lie. Paul in 2 Timothy, said that he was persuaded, facing execution himself. The core of the Christian life is the historical person of the Lord Jesus Christ, the historical reality of the Cross, Ascension and Session. The primary thing was what the Lord did, and what it meant, which in turn proved who he was.

Then alongside this we have what the Lord taught. In many ways this teaching was commented upon and expanded by the teaching of the Apostles. This was what the Holy Spirit gave to them to be passed on to teach the church. The Lord had told them, **John 14:15-21, 23-31, 16:5-16**, that the important material for living in the church age, that they were not ready for then, would be given when the Holy Spirit comes. There was to be a change of dispensation/age, from the age of Israel, the Temple and it's sacrifices, to the church age, with the filling of the Holy Spirit and Communion. You need, as you study this period, to keep the whole picture of God's plan through the ages together, and remember to apply all the words of the Lord in the time frame that they are given.

#### THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM AND THE GOSPEL OF GRACE

The teaching of the Lord is given to the disciples in two phases, with the second phase starting in John 13. The first is the gospel of the kingdom, which was rejected by Israel, whilst the second is the gospel of grace, with the new covenant with the church, which will comprise both Israelites and Gentiles. It commences in John 13 and is completed in the letters of the New Testament. The message preached before the resurrection to the Jewish people in Palestine, was different to that preached in Acts. There is a gospel of the kingdom before the cross and the gospel of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ after the resurrection. There is a completely different pattern of preaching in the gospels compared with Acts. This is not a contradiction; it is simply a transition. **John 12:23-26, 14:16-20, 16:7-14**.

The "gospel of the kingdom" was the message that Messiah had come to Israel, in effect it said, "He is over here, come over and listen to him". "The King is come, accept him as the promised Messiah, and then let us see the kingdom set up". The ministry of Jesus as the Messiah/Christ was accompanied with signs and wonders. He healed the sick, he cast out demons, and he had power over the elements of nature. He demonstrated by messianic miracles, prophesied by the Old Testament prophets, that he was the true king and Messiah, but his message was rejected by the majority and accepted only by a "remnant" of Israel. "Continuity and Discontinuity"....

He however was rejected by the people he came to save, only a remnant believed, and these entered the new age as the start of, or foundation members of the new group, the church. All the saved remnant from the old age go into the new age and become the new covenant body - the church, to which are then added all people who will believe in the Lord, from all races.

In the early years of the church there was a time of transition as the early Judean and Syrian churches, all Jewish, remained very Jewish in their worship and emphasis until the time when they moved to become an independent (away from Judaism) Christian church. As they moved away from the Temple and synagogues to form their own assemblies there was a lot of fluidity in practice and worship, with believers going to and fro, from messianic meeting to Temple service. This is the reality reflected in Hebrews, where for the last time the believers around 64 AD are told to "come out" from the Temple system finally. This occurs only a few years before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD.

This is a time of both excitement and confusion, with the Jewish believers having to relearn and unlearn many things they had believed about God's plan while within Judaism. They were expecting the Lord to set up his kingdom soon after the resurrection and he didn't. After ten or fifteen years they recognized that they were here for longer than they had envisaged. Throughout Acts there is a growing realization of what the gospel message is now and how their understanding of it has changed from the time when the Lord was with them.

The epistles are the early instructions to the Church and act as commentaries on the Gospels, the Lord's teaching and the Old Testament itself. Two things characterized the early church. They had a message, a message of resurrection power and the message of the only Saviour who died, who rose again, and is coming again. Secondly they demonstrated that they had power, that they were transformed people. Their message went with their Holy Spirit empowered life. Look

for any references to the Holy Spirit in any texts you read – the absence of this shows you how the author is sliding around the truth. You cannot write about the Early Church without significant reference to the Holy Spirit.

What effect has miracles on this? Wonder workers today emphasize the kingdom and miracles today. They will take the greatest part of what they say from before the Cross, whereas the church should base itself after the resurrection and day of Pentecost. This is where we get so much emphasis on the kingdom in some circles. These people have failed to discern the change in emphasis from the kingdom message to Israel, to the new message of the apostles of the church. This is clear with Peter's sermon in Acts, which was different from anything that he had preached before.

Many people go back to the Gospels to see how they should live and what they should preach now, however the disciples, when they become apostles in Acts have changed, and we must go into the Gospels in light of what we see happening in Acts. The Resurrection and the Day of Pentecost changes everything and we have often not appreciated that in our preaching. The apostolic emphasis was the "good news" of deliverance from the power of sin and death, and the free offer of eternal salvation in Christ Jesus, won by the cross, proved by the empty tomb. There were different "kingdom" messages after the resurrection than what had been preached before the cross. Paul disputed often about what the "kingdom" now meant. Study the [www.ebcwa.com.au](http://www.ebcwa.com.au) website Bible book study of Acts and see just how Paul preached this. Also refer to the first volume of the Church History notes, which cover this period of history, and refer to the additional book on the church at Antioch. Shelley page 7-8 – waffles around this = not good theology at all – but sadly the dominant one now!

The signs and wonders that we see in the Gospels do demonstrate themselves in some places in Acts but not always. The people who saw Peter on the day of Pentecost saw a transformed man and that they could not answer. This was more powerful than the raising of the dead or the healing of the sick, although they also occurred. There are cases in the early church where a person is killed and remains dead. Paul heals the sick at one point and yet later he is unable to. Miracles are an extra in Acts, occurring when the Plan of God calls for them, not auto-pilot events. If they are there then all Praise the Lord for them, but signs and wonders "may not follow". Paul and the others were working through resurrection power, and that is the power that needs to be seen in the transformed lives of us all today, as it was in our spiritual ancestors in the first centuries.

Peter works miracles in **Acts 2:42, 46-47, 3:3 -5, 9 -12**, and people are challenged by them but it is always followed by the preaching of the gospel. It is always the miracle followed by the gospel which is in stark contrast with some of the so called modern healing evangelists. In fact this is the test of truth with modern healing movements, do they magnify the gospel message exactly as the apostles did? The resurrection power in the lives and message of the early church was central; the early church was known as "the people of the way", because they emphasized that a "faith-walk" with Jesus was the only way to finding relationship with God. **Acts 4:1-14, 5:12-39**.

#### SUMMARY OF EARLY APOSTOLIC PREACHING

They came out preaching the resurrection. If God has got this power over death, He has got the power for you to deal with sin, and all sinners are commanded to accept the Lord. That was the gospel message. Whilst Mark 16 says that there will be signs following, Luke 24 and Matthew 28 do not. There will always be one sign, the sign of a transformed life. Be ready to receive any miracles God gives, but don't stamp your foot like a child and demand them.

It should be noted that the disciples/apostles did the miracles and not the ordinary believers. This is in contrast with today where some groups who get upset if they have not seen a miracle every week in their life. If there is any miracle working out in your life, then praise God for it, but remember the greatest miracle is your acceptance by God through the precious blood of Christ shed for you. Let this truth transform you, as it transformed our forefathers. **Luke 16:19-31**.

There are no apostles today; there are only 12 apostles to the Lamb. Ephesians 2:19-20, Revelation 21:14. This is told us clearly in the book of Revelation by John. You may be sent out as a missionary, but you are not an apostle. God can work miracles through you if he wishes. The question nowadays is walking with the Lord and getting what applies right. Some believers want to have people come down the front and deal with demons rather than commanding them to deal with their habitual pattern of sin, and only facing the demonic issue if it really is a demon, and not just the Old Sin Nature. This hunger for the dramatic often masks the issue where there is a need to deal with sin. People look for easy options.

We should not criticize other believers if we have minor differences with them, but we do need to stand up when things are not Biblical. At Pentecost they recognized that the "gospel of the kingdom" as it had been preached before the Cross was no longer applicable. We have the command to love and to give the "gospel of salvation". It is ironic but some of the Pentecostals today have not discerned the meaning of Pentecost. We should be dynamic with doing things correctly. Most of the churches do not understand the real change at Pentecost and often talk about the kingdom in ways the apostles did not.

#### DOCTRINES

**APOSTLESHIP**

1. Apostleship is the highest spiritual gift in the Church. - Like all other spiritual gifts it was sovereignly bestowed by the Holy Spirit to certain individuals (1 Corinthians 12:11,28, Ephesians 4:11)
2. Apostleship was a temporary gift. It was designed to establish and direct the early church until the canon of scripture was completed.
3. The apostles to the church were appointed after the resurrection of Jesus Christ (Ephesians 4:8). Hence, they must be distinguished from the "Apostles to Israel" in (Matthew 10:2ff).
4. This spiritual gift exercised authority over all local churches. Once the canon of scripture was complete the gift was removed (1 Corinthians 13:10). Today all local churches are autonomous with authority vested in the canon of scripture and the local pastor
5. The qualification of apostles:- Apostles had to be eye witnesses to the resurrection of Christ. This qualified the eleven, Paul being qualified on the Damascus Road (Acts 1:22, 1 Corinthians 9:1, 15:8,9).
6. The authority of the apostles was established by the possession of certain temporary gifts that went with this gift. Apostles also had the gifts of miracles, healing and tongues (Acts 5:15, 16:16-18, 28:8-9).
7. There are twelve apostles (Revelation 21:14). We have the eleven (excluding Judas). Mathias was elected by men, but not appointed by God (Acts 1:26). The twelfth apostle was we believe probably Paul (1 Corinthians 15:7-10). Paul was appointed by God on the road to Damascus.
8. The word "apostle" means "one sent". Hence, some believers are called apostles in this sense. They include Barnabas (Acts 14:14, Galatians 2:9), James (half brother of Jesus) (1 Corinthians 15:7, Galatians 1:19), Apollos (1 Corinthians 4:6), Silas and Timothy (1 Thessalonians 1:1).

**MIRACLES: PURPOSE**

1. Miracles occurred mainly in three periods of history. Of all the miracles recorded in the Scriptures all but twelve fall into the following three periods.
  - a) The Law and Prophets Group:- prepares for the coming of the Lord
    - i) At the Exodus through to the giving of the Law, miracles were performed by Moses, Aaron and later by Joshua.
    - ii) At the period when the great prophets Elijah and Elisha were teaching many miracles were performed.
  - b) The Lord and Church Group:- bears witness to His first coming
    - i) The miracles of the Lord.
    - ii) The miracles performed by the apostles.
  - c) The Future Miracle Group:- attest to His second coming
    - i) Beginning with the activities of the two witnesses of the Great Tribulation, or earlier with the "Beginning of Sorrows", as from 1917 we see tongues and many "miracle signs" becoming more common.
    - ii) The universal outburst of miracle activity at the establishment of the Millennial Kingdom, when the Lord rules over a restored earth.
2. Their purpose includes the following:-
  - a) To glorify the nature of God (John 2:11, 11:40)
  - b) To accredit certain men as spokesmen for God (Hebrews 2:3-4, Luke 7:18-23)
  - c) To provide evidence for belief in Jesus as Messiah (John 6:2,14, 10:37-38, 20:30-31, 1 Corinthians 15:13-20)
  - d) To demonstrate the Lord's superiority over the forces of evil (Matthew 9:27-34; Mark 5:1-20; Luke 4:31-37)
  - e) To demonstrate the uniqueness of the Lord Jesus Christ, God with us (John 1:14).
3. Miracles demonstrate the attributes of God.
  - a) The Sovereignty of God was illustrated in:-
    - i) the Lord's creative work of turning water into wine at Cana. (John 2:1-11)
    - ii) His power when stilling the storm on Galilee. (Mark 4:35-41; Matthew 8:18)
    - iii) the feeding of the 5000 and the 4000. (Mark 6:33-44; 8:1-9)
    - iv) walking on the water at Galilee. (Mark 6:47-52)
    - v) His arrest in Gethsemane. (John 18:6)



- b) The Righteousness of God was illustrated in:-  
the Lord's transfiguration before the disciples on the mountain, when they saw the Holiness of God in the Lord displayed. (Matthew 17:1-8; Mark 9:2-8; Luke 9:28-36)
- c) The Justice of God was illustrated in:-  
the cursing of the fig tree during the last week before the cross as a sign of His coming judgment upon unresponsive Israel. (Matthew 21:18-22; Mark 11:12-14, 20-26)
- d) The Love of God was illustrated in:-  
all the healing ministries as the Lord's compassion flowed into action, even to the exhaustion of His humanity. While thirty-six specific miracles of the Lord are recorded, many thousands of healing miracles are passed over in a few isolated verses. (e.g. Matthew 9:35-36, 14:14, 15:30-31, 8:16-17 etc.)
- e) The Eternal Life of God was illustrated in:-  
the great miracle of the resurrection of Christ.
- f) The Omniscience of God was illustrated in:-
  - i) his knowledge of where unseen shoals of fish were. (Matthew 4:18-22, Mark 1:16-20, John 21:1-14)
  - ii) where the fish was with just enough money in its mouth to pay the required tax. (Matthew 17:24-27)
  - iii) the knowledge about Nathaniel and the woman at the well at Sychar also shows his omniscience (John 1:45-51, 4:5-43).
- g) The Omnipresence of God was illustrated in:-  
His ability to appear in various places many kilometres apart demonstrating the truth of His promise to be with believers always. (Matthew 28:20)
- h) The Omnipotence of God was illustrated in:-  
the raising of people such as Lazarus from the dead.
- i) The Immutability of God was illustrated in:-  
the repetition of the miracle of the draught of fishes both before and after the resurrection showing that His character and power were unchanged.
- j) The Veracity of God was illustrated in:-  
the healing of the Centurion's servant and the Nobleman's son. The Lord said they were healed, and at that moment, many kilometres away, they were. (Matthew 8:5-13, Luke 7:1-10, John 4:46-54)
- k) The Grace of God was illustrated in:-  
the healing of Malchus' ear in the garden on the night of the Lord's arrest (Luke 22:50). It was a testimony to His Grace that as he faced the horror of the cross, our Lord could still stoop and heal one of His captors. It is significant that the last recorded miracle performed by the Lord before the cross benefited an enemy, one who had come to arrest him.

**MIRACLES OF CHRIST**

**MIRACLES OF CHRIST: CATEGORIES**

**1. Healing Miracles of Command**

- a) Healing the sick from afar:-
  - i) Nobleman's son at Cana. (John 4:46-54)
  - ii) Centurion's servant. (Matthew 8:5-13)
- b) Healing the sick in person:-
  - i) Man with the withered arm. (Matthew 12:9-13)
  - ii) Man by the pool of Bethesda. (John 5:1-15)
  - iii) The ten lepers. (Luke 17:11-19)
  - iv) Two blind men between the two Jerichos. (Luke 18:35-43)

**2. Healing Miracles of Touch**

- a) Simple Touch:-
  - i) Peter's mother in law. (Matthew 8:14-15)
  - ii) A leper. (Matthew 8:2-4)
  - iii) Woman with a haemorrhage. (Matthew 9:20-22)
  - iv) Two blind men. (Matthew 20:30-34)

- v) Crippled woman. (Luke 13:10-13)
- vi) Dropsy case. (Luke 14:1-6)
- vii) Malchus' ear. (Luke 22:49-51)

- b) Other Activity in the Touching:-
  - i) Blind man at Bethsaida. (Mark 8:22-26)
  - ii) Man born blind. (John 9:1-41)
  - iii) Deaf and dumb man. (Matthew 15:29-31)

3. Resuscitation Miracles

- a) By Command:-
  - i) Lazarus. (John 11:1-46)
- b) Touch and Command:-
  - i) Widow of Nain's son. (Luke 7:11-17)
  - ii) Jairus' daughter. (Mark 5:21-43)

4. Miracles where Faith was an Issue

- a) Command:-
  - i) Nobleman's son at Cana. (John 4:46-54)
  - ii) Centurion's servant. (Luke 7:1-10)
  - iii) Ten lepers. (Luke 17:11-19)
  - iv) Paralysed man. (Mark 2:1-12)
  - v) Man at pool of Bethesda. (John 5:1-15)
  - vi) Withered arm. (Matthew 12:9-13)

- b) Touch:-
  - i) Two blind men. (Matthew 9:27-31)
  - ii) A leper. (Mark 1:40-45)
  - iii) Woman with a haemorrhage. (Luke 8:43-48)

5. Miracles where Sin was an Issue.

- i) Paralysed man. (Mark 2:1-12)
- ii) Man by pool of Bethesda. (John 5:1-15)

6. Miracles associated with Parables or Teaching.

- i) Withered arm and lost sheep. (Matthew 12:9-13)
- ii) Man born blind and the good shepherd. (John 9, John 10:1-16)
- iii) Casting out of the demon from the dumb man. (Luke 11:14)
- iv) Unclean spirit who returns. (Luke 11:14 cf. Luke 11:21-28)
- v) Cursing of the fig tree and the teaching on faith. (Mark 11:20-26)

7. Miracles associated with the Sabbath Controversy.

- i) Healing of the man at Bethesda. (John 5:1-15)
- ii) Healing of the man with a withered arm. (Mark 3:1-6)
- iii) Crippled woman healed. (Luke 13:10-21)
- iv) Case of dropsy healed. (Luke 14:1-6)

**HEALING AND MIRACLES**

1. The healing ministry of Jesus was not primarily to relieve suffering but to show Himself to the Jews as the Messiah; that God had indeed stepped into history uniquely and powerfully. He demonstrates HE is creator in all areas of life.

2. Jesus Christ's major thrust in his ministry was healing from sin rather than physical healing, as healing from sin has eternal results whilst physical healing has temporal results only.

3. Examples of healing by Jesus Christ:

- a) The Leper (Matthew 8:1 -4)

The Jew was suffering from an incurable disease - leprosy. It was totally hopeless to expect a cure under normal conditions at that time in history. The cured leper was told to go to the priests, the Levitical priest of those days who had been given by God two chapters in the Old Testament for such cases: Uncleanliness (Leviticus 13), Cleanliness (Leviticus 14). It was unknown to use (Leviticus 14), its use with the cure of the leper should have alerted the Levitical priests that the Messiah was on earth.

b) Centurion's Servant (Matthew 8:5-13)

The Centurion was a Gentile believer who had great faith, showing he was a mature believer. His servant was suffering from the palsy (paralysis or polio). The Centurion showed great faith by knowing that he did not need Jesus Christ to enter his house to heal his servant. Using the Centurion's faith, Jesus Christ challenges the Jewish onlookers to trust him also.

c) Paralytic Healed (Matthew 9:1-8)

A Jewish believer who lacked assurance of his sins forgiven. His friends, the stretcher bearers, who brought him to Jesus had great faith in the Lord. Jesus cured him to give the paralytic confidence in his sins being forgiven.

d) Peter's Mother-in-Law (Matthew 8:14-17)

Jesus cured her so that she could serve the Lord and help sustain Him, and also prove that the elderly are not ignored in the healing area, just as Lazarus would demonstrate this even more dramatically.

4. There are many examples and means used by God for healing:

- a) By direct contact. (Matthew 8:3,15; Mark 6:5)
- b) In response to the faith of friends. (Mark 2:5)
- c) In response to prayer. (James 5:15,16)
- d) Through doctors (Colossians 4:14), and medicines - Figs for boils (2 Kings 20:7), Wine for ulcers (1 Timothy 5:23)

5. God did not heal many great saints who had diseases or problems.

- a) Elisha (2 Kings 13:14)
- b) Paul (2 Corinthians 12:7-10)
- c) Epaphroditus (Philippians 2-26,27)
- d) Timothy (1 Timothy 5:23)
- e) Principle of the sick saint (2 Corinthians 12:9)

6. Sickness is permitted for a number of reasons:

- a) To bring us back to God's Word. (Psalm 119:6 7)
- b) To make God's Word manifest. (John 9:1-3)
- c) To glorify Jesus Christ. (John 11:4)
- d) So that we can comfort and assist others later. (2 Corinthians 1:4)
- e) To prepare us for future glory. (2 Corinthians 4:17)
- f) To return us to fellowship. (Hebrews 12:5-10)
- g) To make, us more fruitful. (John 15:2; Hebrews 12:1)

7. Miraculous healing does occur from time to time. God is able to heal anyone at any time but the Bible shows that it is not normally His purpose to do so. Satan can counterfeit divine healing through his own healers – beware – look for the fruit of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the lives of all involved.

## **LECTURE 2 - THE EARLY JEWISH CHURCH.**

### **NEO ORTHODOXY**

Every textbook that you choose has limits. You need to spot the liberalism of an author. With early church history authors cannot lie anywhere, because there is too much documentation and other evidence of what happened. There are two places in Shelley where his neo orthodoxy is seen, one is in chapter one where he skips over the resurrection and early days of the church to Stephen. The other is in the praise of the World Council of Churches that this author believes is a useless time and money wasting body. In chapter 1 he is at the tomb being sealed. Note that Chapter 2 starts with the stoning of Stephen.

Why is there a complete lack of the word resurrection in Chapter 1?, yet in chapter 2 he talks about the Cross and Resurrection. This is the viewpoint of what we call now neo-orthodoxy - this is the old liberalism put by people who have lost the certainty of their faith in this area. He is a believer who has lost the certainty of his faith in certain areas. They show this in two areas. They talk about the man Jesus, which is correct, but he is also God, he is the God-man; refer to BTB study of Christ: the Hypostatic Union. Beware the language in Shelley – it does help you to ID the liberal!

The neo - orthodox and the neo - evangelicals talk about the man Jesus and the Christ of faith. They muddy the water about the resurrection and cross of the Lord Jesus Christ. Shelley quotes from Albert Schweitzer who was a liberal and who wrote a very poor book on the Lord. He notes he was a "famous missionary to Africa" – false –he was a liberal doctor who did social work "up the river" in Africa. He also quotes from Rudolph Bultmann whose commentary on the book of John is a lot of nonsense (and I had to wade through every word of it as a part of my PhD study). Sadly he is true about him being "influential" – note the word and be warned – these are the devices that falsehood uses to build credibility for nonsense!!! It is therefore very important to find out where a person is coming from before you embrace all they say. It is all right to use a neo orthodox neo-evangelical like Shelley for Church History with discernment, but if you

go to them for theology you have a disaster on your hands. Be aware of what people do not speak about strongly, for that gives you a clue!

A good book to get is "Christianity through the Centuries", by Earl Cairns. It is good, as he was a strong biblical believer, with a very sound presentation. New edition now has "Resurrection faith" in the box on page 16.

#### THE EARLY YEARS

The early years of the church were Jewish. Most people in Christian Education today are totally ignorant about the Jewish Christian Church which existed, in a uniquely Jewish way, for about a century from Pentecost (32AD - 135AD). For the first few years the entire Christian church was almost entirely Jewish. It is only after about 15 years that the number of Gentile believers start to exceed the Jewish population in the church through the evangelistic work of the early leaders, Philip, Peter, and Paul in particular. Read Messianic Histories of the early Jewish Church by Arnold Fruchtenbaum and others. Alfred Edersheim in the nineteenth century wrote a lot of good material, and Arnold has updated it. Check the [www.ariel.com](http://www.ariel.com) website for details of his latest books.

It is important in all present evangelizing of Jewish people to understand what happened to the believing Jews in the first few years of the church. In Acts 6 and 7 we have the appointment of the first deacons including Stephen. The deacons were not only administrators of funds, but apologists, or systematic defenders of the faith and evangelists. Stephen defended the faith on the basis of Jewish history. He was very accurate in what he said and a little too pointed, and convicting for his hearers.

The early Christian church headquarters was situated in Jerusalem. There were a lot of people being converted in the early church and they were all Jews or proselytes to Judaism from paganism. They had received the Lord as their Saviour and as the Jewish Messiah. They met in two places in those early years; they had public services in the Temple and they had meetings in house churches, each led by one of the apostles or elders.

There was always a service (sacrifice) going on inside the Temple but large areas in the outer courtyard were places where visiting rabbis were allowed to teach. If you go to Jerusalem, go to see the area called Solomon's stables; this is where Solomon's porch was. The vast crowd was accommodated in the large area of the Temple courtyard. Here you could get up to 50,000 people standing in the courtyard without any problems. This was like the university of Judaism in the day. This is very similar in concept to the mosque today. Whilst the apostles had status like visiting rabbis they could teach, but by the 60s they were told not to teach in the name of Jesus Christ, and they were driven underground.

In the home cell groups on Sunday they would meet before dawn and would celebrate communion and have a worship/praise service in the home. In the day they would go to the Temple to teach and debate with the crowds. In the evenings they would meet again in homes for Bible study.

What the early apostles hoped would happen was that their nation would become Christian or "Messianic" (followers of the Messiah) and take over Judaism for Christ. It was Paul's desire that the people could be won for Christ. The apostles were hoping to change the temple worship so that it was centered around Christ. Paul remains hopeful until his arrest in the temple in the late 50s, recorded at the end of Acts.

The first person to see that was not possible was Stephen, and his message in Acts 7 to the Sanhedrin, showed that the new had come and the old had to go. Everything that he held dear to as a Jew had to go and had to be replaced by a relationship through Christ. Rabbi Saul from Tarsus and the ultra orthodox Jews had the absolute view that Christianity was new and it had to go. Therefore there was a clash between them. The first martyr was therefore a Jew, Stephen.

#### THE JEWS AND SCRIPTURE

What were the Jews expecting in the first century as a Messiah? What they say today is very different to what they expected in those days. The view was changed deliberately in the Middle Ages when the Roman Catholic Church started persecuting the Jews. The Jewish Rabbis got very tired of the Catholic Church quoting Scripture back to them so several of the Rabbis rewrote the commentaries of the Jews on the Scriptures denying that certain passages of Scriptures were Messianic. They reinterpreted the Scriptures in an anti Christian way over several hundred years. This viewpoint now dominates in Orthodox Judaism but was not current belief at the time of the Apostles.

In the Lord's day the Jew was brought up in the "study" of what later was called the "Talmud", which were a collection of Rabbinical teaching. Today the Jews have completed writings called "The Talmud", and it records the writings of Jesus day and the centuries following. It is in two sections, the Mishnah, which was a commentary on the law which was written in Aramaic. The second part was the "Midrash" which was a commentary on the rest of the Old Testament. This latter section was further divided into two parts; the Halachah, the commentary on the balance of the Old Testament and the Haggadah, which were a collection of sermons collected by Rabbi Akabah (who was killed by the Romans in 135 AD), Meir and Judah (who both died before 200 AD). The Talmud is formed in part by the Rabbis who had rejected Christ to solidify Judaism against the threat that the Messianic (Christian church) presented to them.

About a thousand years later the Jewish Rabbis of the Middle Ages reinterpreted it all again to try to eliminate any chance of the Jews becoming Christians. Praise God that there has been a total turn around in our own day with thousands of Jews becoming "Messianic" followers of Y'Shua (Jesus) again.

#### THE TWO MESSIAHS

In the first century there were two Messiahs expected. The Rabbis expected the Messiah Ben Joseph who was to suffer and die and Messiah Ben David who would raise him and rule. The rabbis of the Lord's day were looking for the two messiahs, which is reflected in the Palm Sunday crowds response of the triumphal entry of Christ into Jerusalem. They claimed him as Son of David but in fact he was Son of Joseph and had come to suffer. He returns as "Son of David".

In the Middle Ages however this was reinterpreted, so that where Messiah Ben Joseph had been seen, he was reinterpreted as standing for the nation Israel under persecution and suffering, such as in the pogroms and holocaust. We know of course that both pictures refer to the Lord Jesus Christ's first and second advents.

#### **ACTS 7:2 - 8:1.**

Stephen said to the Jews that they did not get Moses right, nor did they get the prophets correct. He also tells them that they have got it wrong with the Temple. He said that the Temple and everything associated with it is temporary, the permanent thing is what Christ has done and you should rely on that. The Jews looked on the Temple as a good luck charm, as they had in Jeremiah's day also; it was their security.

Stephen is well ahead of his compatriots in Jerusalem. He has been listening a lot more than John, James and Peter. It is going to be a further thirty years before the Jewish Christians leave the Temple completely. It is finally the murder of James in the Temple that causes them to leave the Temple. The Jewish Christians continued to call their places of worship synagogues right through to the second century AD when they were killed along with their fellow Jews during the second Jewish War against Rome.

The structure of elders and deacons come from the Jewish organisation in the synagogue. The Messianic synagogues continue right up until the collapse of the second Jewish rebellion against Rome in 138AD. The Romans killed some of them with the other Jews, although many messianic Jews rejected Bar Kokhba especially after Rabbi Akkiba recognized him as messiah. The Messianic Jews at this point rejected the rebellion as ungodly, and so in many cases the rebellious Jews killed the Messianic ones because they looked upon them as traitors. Jews who accept Jesus as Messiah today are still called, "Meshumit", or traitors/destroyers of Judaism; a term that goes back to this time.

On Page page 14 (revised edition) Shelley notes just how thoroughly things had changed after the speech of Stephen - Everything had to be changed in the light of Christ. If he was who he claimed to be, "Messiah", then the standard interpretation of the Old Testament at that time had to change for the Jewish people.

Stephen confronts the people with the stark choice - Jesus as the Christ (Messiah), **or** the on-going application of the Mosaic Law according to the Rabbis. He notes that all the Old Testament rituals were to be seen as temporary! They were only operative until Jesus/Messiah came, for he would fulfill them all! This was revolutionary.

It was going to take twenty years or so of the work of the Holy Spirit on the early church until they all saw it fully as well. It would only be the book of Hebrews that would end the debate (it goes in three phases; 1, Galatians, 2, Romans, 3, Hebrews).

On Page 16-18 Shelley observes the fact that Stephen had underlined, that the new had come and the old had to pass away, but such a notion was anathema to the orthodox Jews. Jesus had told the parable of the wineskins to illustrate this in **Matthew 9:14-17**. As within Judaism of the time there were many groups and factions so the early Christian Jews were in two groups; the Greek speaking Jews and the Aramaic Jews. There were disputes and friction between the two groups in the church. They did not get along too well. This was also why the deacons were formed to look after all the widows, the Greek and the Aramaic speakers, to try and look after them so that there was no further disputes about one group being favoured.

The deacons names are all Greek and this tells us how far the Aramaic group was prepared to go to ensure the Greek speakers didn't feel put out. Here we have the early Christian church under pressure at the start of the Church Age. Here we have a cultural difference held together by the Apostles and deacons. The early church had more conflict than many of our modern ones. The early church members did not want to give up their Jewishness as they saw the Lord as their Messiah, the fulfillment of the hope of Israel. They also wanted to continue their worship in the Temple. Everything that the priest was wearing spoke of Christ, the sacrifices all spoke of his work on the cross, the very buildings of the temple spoke of him. Yet Stephen had seen that all this had to go, it had pointed to him but after he had come it needed to be let go of. Understand just how hard this was for many!

From the first days Judaism infiltrated the gentile churches when the legalists came in and starting submerging the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus with the Law of Moses. Stephen had told them that they had to stop the rituals. However even Paul was so devoted to the saving of his fellow Jews and to the practices of his fathers that in Acts 21:20 he took a Nazarite vow a number of times.

This was something he was entitled to do as a Jew, but it was not a “spiritual” thing to do since the cross, and it didn’t work out well. This act of Paul’s ended up in a riot and Paul’s arrest. Acts 21-23. The sacrificial system was to finish with Christ; no more lambs were to be offered. [Read **Hebrews 6:1-6**].

Hebrews had to be written, after Paul’s release, as the last call to the Jews to get out of the Temple and City.

**SIX STAGES OF THE JEWISH CHURCH**

There are therefore six stages in the history of the Jewish church:-

[1] The time of persecution 32-40 AD with the first martyr Stephen and others that were killed by Saul and his group. This caused the gospel to move out into Samaria and Judea. The Lord allowed persecution of the Church to get them out of Jerusalem.

[2] 41-44 AD was the persecution headed by Herod Agrippa I where the gospel starts moving out into the Empire. Paul starts moving here but most of the twelve continue in Jerusalem.

[3] 44-63 AD the wider church becomes more and more Gentile in nature, with Jewish Christians still staying in Jerusalem. During this time there are less Jews responding and Jewish resistance to the gospel is increasing. In 57 AD Paul is arrested in Jerusalem while taking the Nazarite vow. He is sent to Rome, and released by 61AD.

[4] 63 AD The murder of James in the Temple on the orders of the High Priest. He is called James the Just as even the unbelievers recognized that the murder of this just man was a crime. This is a call to the Jewish believers in Palestine to come out of the Temple system and to stop being involved in this worship. The Temple building work was finally completed in 64 AD and the book of Hebrews arrives to challenge the Judean Churches about leaving the temple.

[5] 65 AD The Jewish revolt against the Romans begins. Some of the Christians seeing the eagles of the Roman standards flying recognize (**Luke 21 : 20 - 24**) that it is time to leave the city. The siege was lifted temporarily for a few months and in that time the early Christians escaped under the leadership of Simon the son of Cleopas and John. He led them to Pella where they stayed during the Jewish revolt. None of them perished. - Romans 8:1.

After the fall of Jerusalem in August 70 AD, 2+ million Jews were killed or sold into slavery but the Messianic Congregations escaped. Many of their orthodox brethren never forgave them. In 73 AD Masada fell with all except a handful of the occupants of this fortress committing suicide. After the pacification of the area many Jewish Christians returned and set up a number of Churches throughout Palestine until the time of the Second Jewish revolt under Bar Kochba.

[6] In 135 AD the Bar - Kochba revolt saw the Jews revolt again against the Romans. These rebels were originally supported by the Jewish Christians (Messianic believers) for patriotic reasons but some way into the revolt Bar – Kochba was recognised as the Messiah by Rabbi Akabah and his followers and this caused the Messianic Jewish synagogues and early church generally to oppose them.

The Jewish rebels then attacked the churches killing many and ending the independent Jewish church in Palestine. A few survived into the Middle Ages but from 135 AD onwards the messianic believers were mainly members of the church in general. Remember to refer to the Church history notes to gain additional information on this period.

**DOCTRINE**

**RELIGION**

1. Satan's religion is a humanly acceptable one: no sin, no judgment, no Saviour and no Hell. Satan appears as an angel of light (2 Corinthians 11:13-19,26).
2. Many pastors in the churches are servants of Satan's policy, knowingly or unknowingly (Isaiah 30:12, Jeremiah 2:8, 2 Peter 2:1-10).
3. Satan's strategy towards unbelievers is to keep them blinded to the gospel (2 Corinthians 4:3-4, Colossians 2:8, 2 Thessalonians 2:9-10).
4. Satan's strategy towards believers is:
  - a) to confuse by false teaching (Matthew 7:15, Romans 16:18)
  - b) to appeal to pride (2 Corinthians 10:12)
  - c) to promote idolatry (Habakkuk 2:18,19)
  - d) to promote legalism (1 Timothy 1:7-8).

5. Satan's policy calls for counterfeit faith:
- a) counterfeit gospel (2 Corinthians 11:3-4)
  - b) counterfeit pastors (2 Corinthians 11:13-15)
  - c) counterfeit communion (1 Corinthians 10:19-21)
  - d) counterfeit doctrine (2 Timothy 4:1)
  - e) counterfeit righteousness (Matthew 19:16-28)
  - f) counterfeit way of life (Matthew 23)
  - g) counterfeit power (2 Thessalonians 2:8-10)
  - h) counterfeit gods (2 Thessalonians 2:3-4).

### **LECTURE 3 - THE POWER OF LOVE**

#### **THE TRANSFORMED CHRISTIAN LIFE**

The early Christians gave evidence by their lives that they had been with Jesus. Miracles could be falsified or ignored and even when miracles were done in the power of the Holy Spirit not everybody became a follower of the Lord. The people of the Lord's day saw many more miracles than we are seeing today, and the majority were still unsaved.

It was the work of the Holy Spirit through the lives of the apostles that really did the work. It is the transformed lives within the Christian community that really impressed the unbelievers of the day, way more than miracles. God knows what is needed in each case to confront people with truth, but they are still "free will agents" and cannot be forced to salvation.

**John 15:9-11** shows that the power of the witness comes from the transformed Christian life. The Christians had respect for one another, they did things for others which helped rather than hindered. We should love one another practically and with agape/concern. Our love for them will be shown as we give them the gospel. The early believers took things very seriously. Their lives stood out as lights in the darkness. That remains our challenge. **Matthew 5:14-16.**

#### **THE GREAT COMMISSION**

**Matthew 28:18-20** is the gospel commission. What Jesus says is to observe those things that he has commanded, thus we must be doing what the Lord wants us to do before we can have any effect on others. The first century church was doing things which the pagans were not, even unto death.

The pagans say that they were killing these people for "atheism", that is the rejection of the pagan gods, because the impact of the gospel was emptying the worshippers from the pagan temples. The early believers were not known for their miracles but their obedience to "the way". The pagans killed them. They were however transformed people known for their message, and for loving one another.

In page 37 - Shelley (4<sup>th</sup> edition) notes, "first century Christianity was a spiritual explosion ignited by "the event", the presence of Jesus Christ, the church hurtled/extended in all directions". The church exploded through the world and caught the Roman Empire by surprise and powerfully influenced it within a few years. Within a hundred years of the resurrection and Day of Pentecost the Gospel message had reached India and China.

Their message was that the Creator, in the person of Jesus the Christ has come into history, He has died on the Cross and has been raised from the dead. The unique thing about Christianity is the sacrifice of the Lord and his resurrection. What impressed the pagans was the love for one another of the Christians as well as their message. We should be motivated by the resurrection power of the Lord Jesus Christ, which cleanses from sin and has given us newness of life and a reason for living. We need to trumpet the Cross and the Resurrection from the rooftops. The "EVENT" is true!

For the first thirty years of the church the majority of believers were Jewish. The Acts of the Apostles emphasizes the western movement of the gospel but the gospel went along the Roman roads and the silk route also towards Africa, China, India, Persia, as well as westwards. Acts records Paul's journey to the heart of the Roman Empire only.

The Lord had told them that they would be witnesses to him in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria and then worldwide. In the book of Acts we have exactly that with the first church in Jerusalem, then it moved into Judea, Philip took it into Samaria and thence throughout the world. Paul took the gospel to Rome itself, yet there were believers there, as a result of the Day of Pentecost the gospel message had spread throughout the Roman World.

The pattern was always the same, to the Jew first and then the Greek. **Romans 1:16-17, 2:5-11.** It is clear that it is to the Jew first and then the Gentile. In addition the Jew is judged first and then the Gentile. God judges man in relation to the light that they have received. The Lord holds you responsible for what you hear. If you receive "much" the Lord expects a great deal from you! Luke 12:48. The Lord will judge us and punish us if we are disobedient. We have the same responsibility they had. Matthew 13:11-12, Mark 4:11-25.

**Romans 2** is one thing that Paul would have said in the synagogue. He came preaching the righteousness and justice of God. The synagogues in the ancient world had three different groups, male Jews, female Jews and the proselytes. Most of the services in Asia were in the Greek language while the ones in Jerusalem were in Aramaic, Greek, or Hebrew. In services in the synagogues many of the spectators were pagan Greeks who wanted to get purity in religion, which the Jews in their worship were seen to have. These people are referred to as "the god fearers". This is why pagans today are sometimes miserable, because the Lord is convicting them of their need of a Saviour, their need for righteousness.

People knew in the synagogue the real God was being talked about. It was at these places that visiting rabbis were allowed to speak. For the first twenty years the synagogues were generally open to people like Paul, but after that period the Christians were not allowed in them, and they became centres of opposition to the gospel. In that early period the god fearing pagans at the back would become believers as well as some of the congregation.

#### FIVE STAGE APPROACH TO MISSIONARY WORK

In Acts 13-19 we see Paul's approach to missionary work. **Firstly** he would arrive in a city and find the local synagogue and try to attempt a rapport with someone in the assembly so that he would be able to be invited to preach. The modern Brethren Assembly is modeled on this system. Paul would take a passage from the Old Testament and talk about the Messiah and point out then that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Messiah.

As long as they would let him speak he would keep teaching and he would return Sabbath after Sabbath with the idea of turning the synagogue into a Christian synagogue. If and when he got ejected from the synagogue he would take the converts and establish an independent (Christian or Messianic) synagogue. It was not long before Jewish synagogues that had been treated in this way locked the doors and started to persecute believers.

About 7% of the population of the Roman Empire was Jewish and they had many synagogues scattered throughout the Empire. This is where the apostles went initially. Only when there were no synagogues open to him would Paul speak first to Gentiles.

If there were no synagogues the Jews would meet near running water (for baptisms and cleansing rituals) so Paul knew, on a Sabbath morning, where to look. This is what happened at Philippi. He would also speak in the market place as he did at Athens. This however was only after the local Jews had said no. Even when he said he was going to the Gentiles first in the book of Acts, in the next chapter he is seen going back to the Jews, he could never turn his back on his fellow countrymen.

The good news spread along the main roads. Most Christians met in homes or open spaces. It is in the second century that the second wave of evangelism takes the message from the towns on the main road system and spreads them out to the villages. This **Second Wave** however was patchy and in some areas such as North Africa, Asia Minor and Egypt it did not occur to any large extent. We therefore often find in the early centuries a pagan countryside and a Christian city, which became a problem three to four hundred years later with the influence of the Moslem Arabs. It is a lesson for us today, not to neglect any pockets of paganism. However – lets heed the Holy Spirit – not have our own plans....

Paul left the people in the cities to evangelize the countryside with varying success. It is the same nowadays with some churches more evangelical than others. Very few churches are "going out" now, with the gospel to the unsaved "pockets of paganism" in their areas. As a result of this sort of neglect North Africa was lost even though in the first two to three centuries it was Christian but when the Roman Empire fell apart the Christian church fell with it, and when the Arabs came along it disappeared altogether and became Moslem.

It should also be remembered that the Roman and Greek culture was dominant in the cities and the countryside was often left untouched. Their language was a barrier as well with the country people speaking a local dialect using Greek only when they went to town while the city folk spoke Latin and Greek.

The rural areas therefore, in many provinces, had an almost completely different cultural and racial basis from the cities on the main roads. If invaders wiped out the cities and their population they could also therefore wipe out the Christian church in that area. This is what the Moslems did. There were survivors, for example, there are still churches in Turkey and Egypt for instance, but they are often in fear of their lives.

In Shelley Chapter 3, we see how the Apostle Paul and Peter set the pattern for evangelism. Their success can be seen through the documents of history. For example Peter went to Bithynia on the northern part of modern Turkey on the border with the Black Sea where Paul was not allowed by the Holy Spirit to go.

**Stage Three.** The church was so powerful there some 50 years later, that the Roman governor Pliny in letters to the Emperor Trajan, that have survived wrote about the "Christian problem". He said that the pagan temples were being closed down because of the spread of Christianity. In 96 and again in 112 AD the church came under persecution. In his letter number 10 Pliny asked Caesar what to do with the Christians. In this he shows that Christianity permeates the province and included Roman citizens in their number. This is in contrast with North Africa, as here the gospel has gone into the countryside. These letters are all available today.



The Romans had ways of controlling their empire by getting local peoples to fight amongst themselves, and one of these tools would be used to attack the church. People who had problems with others tried to get the State to eliminate enemies by accusing them of crimes. It was a crime to be a Christian and so a person would drop this information to the government and the believer would be arrested. Pliny however would not act on unsigned accusations; he would let them go. But to be fully acquitted the Christians had to curse Christ and worship Caesar. This they could not and would not do and so they faced Roman judgment and died.

Pliny gives us a description of early Christian worship from those he tortured, especially deaconesses, he said that they would rise before dawn and read their Scriptures and bind themselves with an oath not to commit any crime and to be law abiding. They would then take food and have a community meal. Pliny could see it was a "harmless superstition" but they were banned so he killed them.... He was a good Roman and followed orders.

The Romans called the Christians an illegal society, which was not allowed to meet without permission. Pliny attacked the church with vigor to try to protect, as he saw it, the worship of the pagan gods that he served. After the persecution a number of the Christians went back to their original pagan ways and the temples were not deserted anymore, but for many there was no compromise and they served their Lord, even if it meant death.

#### THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH MOVES FROM JERUSALEM

The centre of Christianity was originally Jerusalem until 65 AD when they had to flee at the time of the revolt against Rome. The centre of the church then moved to Ephesus due to the location there of the apostle John, until about 96 AD, when the churches look to the leader of the church at Rome, where the leader of the church Clement, became acknowledged as the one others would look to for guidance after the last apostle had died.

Because Rome was the empire's capital it had status anyway and trends for the empire started there, and so it becomes the centre of the Christian church for administrative purposes in the 2nd to 3rd centuries. **Stage 4** of the shift in evangelism begins with the acceptance/tolerance of Christianity from 312, as its now free to evangelize. This shifts again by the 320s when Christianity becomes the preferred religion and "Christendom" is born, and public pretence of faith is almost demanded. In such a situation we enter a **Stage 5** of evangelism, and few openly give the gospel message and the Gospels themselves are lost to the majority! This remains the case until the Anabaptists challenged the Church-State union in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The other early centres of influence were Alexandria in Egypt and then Constantinople after 350 AD. The church leaders, or bishops, in these cities gained status due to the politics of the time, or to their own personal standing as men of scriptural wisdom, and courage under persecution.

In the Acts of the Apostles Christians would refer to Jerusalem as per Acts 15. However after October of 66 AD there is no Church in Jerusalem. After the death of Bishop John the Apostle of Ephesus, we have the Bishop of Rome Clement heading up the church in the West. He writes a number of letters to Corinth that have survived, and is clearly a godly and biblically sound man.

On page 31 Shelley deals with the North African situation. The church in North Africa and south of Egypt in Ethiopia grew quickly but remained city focused and there was not a great deal of evangelism into the country areas. The area was prosperous, with deserts now being grain fields then!

As with many wealthy churches they often go cold and do not do any real evangelism. Augustine of Hippo is the best known of the church leaders of this area but he is a scholar and not involved in outreach evangelism, and it is on him that Roman Catholic doctrine and Reformed theology is based.

Any problems that John Calvin had, can be traced back to Augustine of Hippo. The church in these areas is all but wiped out in the early 400s as the pagan tribe, the Vandals, destroyed the area, and brought their own "Christian" theology.....

As a defence against the early persecution, apologists, or defenders of the faith, came forward to defend the faith intellectually. By the end of the 2nd century people like Justin Martyr and Tertullian were writing defences, or Apologia, for Christianity. By the 4th and 5th centuries the philosophical schools have been closed down and taken over by Christians. Pagan philosophers are murdered (Eg, Hypatia) by "Christian mobs" in Alexandria!!! Not the biblical model!

#### DOCTRINES

##### SPIRITUALITY

1. All Christians have the Holy Spirit indwelling them. When we allow Him to control our lives, we are said to be "filled with the Spirit" or "walking in the Spirit".
2. The filling of the Holy Spirit can be lost by:
  - a) Grieving the Spirit - by sin
  - b) Quenching the Spirit - by not submitting to His leading

c) This is called being carnal, or controlled by the flesh, the old sin nature.

3. The filling of the Holy Spirit can be regained by:

- a) confessing sin (1 John 1:9)
- b) surrendering your life to God (Romans 12:1-2)
- c) This is called being spiritual, or controlled by the Holy Spirit.

4. Only the Holy Spirit in us can produce good works acceptable to God - anything in our own strength is unacceptable (Romans 8:8-9, 1 Corinthians 3:10-15).

5. The spiritual believer:

- a) Imitates God (Ephesians 5:1, 1 John 3:9)
- b) To glorify Christ (John 7:39, John 16:14)
- c) Fulfills the Law (Romans 8:2-4, Romans 13:8).

## LOVE

1. Love for God is total appreciation for all He is and has done.

2. Words for love in Greek language:

- a) eros (sexual love) not used in the New Testament
- b) storge (comradeship) not used in New Testament
- c) agape (concerned love for others, great esteem for the loved one, reverence, a love that springs from adoration and veneration, and is a love of the will that chooses the loved one and devotes self to them to the exclusion of lesser objects. It may mean a self denying and compassionate devotion to the loved one)
- d) phile (a love that embraces and kisses. This love is that of the affections and speaks of friendship and all one will do for a friend).

3. Our Lord makes it clear to Peter in John 21: 15-19 that he wants Peter to love him with agape love that flows from a deep occupation with the Lord. Agape, as a love of the will, must work out in service of the Lord, and this will express the believers love (agape) for other believers also.

4. Do not love of the things the world has to offer (1 John 2:15-17).

5. True love of God will always lead to love of the brethren (1 John 1:3 -11, 1 John 3:1-3, 10, 4:7 -12, 19).

6. Love is expressed in worship and in service (1 John 5:1-5).

7. Love for God will flow and grow from knowledge of His word (1 Corinthians 2:9).

8. This deep love will be expressed in witness for the Lord to others (2 Corinthians 5:14).

9. God loves every believer with perfect and unchanging love because we are united with His beloved Son.

## LECTURE 4 - MARTYRDOM THE ULTIMATE WITNESS

### PERSECUTION

The impressions on the pagans, by the way that the Christians conducted themselves, was great. The apostles prepared their congregations for the ever present possibility of martyrdom, and it came initially just around Rome in the year of the great fire, 64 AD. The fire began on the night of 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> July and burned until the 23<sup>rd</sup> July, destroying much of the city that was mainly crowded 2-3 storied, timber, wattle, and daub buildings. Nero seized the opportunity to begin to rebuild Rome in Marble, brick, concrete and stone, but the lingering suspicion of the people was that the the enthusiasm of the Emperor for the rebuild may point to him being the "fire-starter". He wasn't, but the Christians proved a useful scape goat for the calamity, and many paid the price with their lives. Shelley Chapter 4.

In 1 Peter you have the warning to people that they were likely to come under persecution, by 2 Peter he himself is in jail in Rome awaiting execution late in 64 AD. Within 32 years of the Cross Nero would persecute viciously, but 20 years later the regular and systematic persecutions began. For the next 230 years the Roman Empire was going to cause the Christians a lot of problems and lead to the deaths of many in the arenas Empire wide. When we are preaching the Word of God we must prepare our congregations for the reality of their deaths. The challenge the early church gives us is to

prepare for death, that true Christian growth/maturity involves being prepared to die for Christ in the Word. If we do not train our congregations to have strength enough to die for the Lord we have not gone far enough.

**1 Peter 1:3-12** In this passage, believers are told that the likely end of their faith was death. People had to be told that even though they would physically die the Lord would deliver them. They had a heavenly existence rather than an earthly one. Living in obedience to the Word of God was to be heavenly minded, not absorbed with the details of daily life.

The realities of time are to be subservient to those of eternity. We need to look at things in an eternal situation to strengthen us from temptation in time. The early church met for worship, in times of persecution, in the catacombs around Rome. The services were held in these tombs with the bodies of the saints slain earlier around them; it was a reminder that life is transitory and that eternity must be their focus. Death's presence in the mind makes time count!

#### NERO

The persecution of Nero (in the mid 60s) was somewhat localized to Rome itself. Whilst the persecution only took two years it was a very bloody time. This occurred after the burning of Rome where only 4 of the 14 districts that made up the city were not affected. It was well known that Nero wanted to rebuild Rome using marble rather than the wooden structures that comprised it when he came to the throne. As he saw Rome burning he sang the song of Homer about the destruction of Troy on his lyre. It was a lament, but also an opportunity for the heroic rebuild.....

His action while Rome burnt was not totally compatible with that of an arsonist joining the fire department, but the rumors were so strong that he was not able to scotch them. He therefore decided in order to divert attention to put the blame on the Christians.

Tacitus, the Roman historian, said that the originator of the group was a person called Christus who suffered the ultimate penalty under Tiberius when Pontius Pilate was procurator in Judea. "Accordingly an arrest was made of all who confessed that they are Christians and upon their information a huge number of people were convicted not so much of arson but of their hatred of the human race. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. They died in a variety of ways. Some were covered in skins and were torn apart by wild beasts, some were crucified, others were put to the flames whilst yet others were covered in pitch and acted as torches in Nero's garden while he rode past in a chariot."

This however created a certain level of public sympathy for the Christians who were being killed to satisfy Nero's requirements. Suetonius, a pagan historian said that the Christians were, "given to a new and wicked superstition". The reasons given for the removal of Christians were that of "hatred of the human race", "practicing abominations and practicing a new and wicked superstition", which to the Roman mind was "atheism".

The Romans considered them to be criminals, members of a new and secret society, who had withdrawn from their pagan neighbours, and so posed a threat to public unity. When a pagan became a Christian they separated themselves from their pagan neighbours as they radically changed their lifestyle. To the pagan that looked as if they hated them. Is this not similar to things faced by Christians today? We are different, or we are meant to be!

In addition they preached another Lord than Caesar. To look for another person to rule the world other than Caesar was revolutionary and "terrorist" to the Romans who had experienced so many years of civil war that they desired above all the Pax Romana for their own prosperity, and any group that threatened that – "to the lions". Clement of Rome a Christian Bishop of the city, writing in about 96 AD said that it was through envy and jealousy that prominent Christians were persecuted and martyred. He wrote looking back some 30 years, but as he wrote the next period of persecution began. This occurred under Domitian (who ruled from 81 AD and was murdered in 96AD). This was the persecution when John was sent to the island of Patmos. Father - Vespasian (70-79AD), then Titus (79-81).

Domitian ruled after the death of his brother Titus, probably from malaria. He was a passionate rebuild of Rome, and loved entertainments and used the newly built Coliseum to entertain the crowds with naval battles as well as gladiators. He built the new chariot racing arena and loved these sports. He was committed to re-igniting a passion for the old Roman religion, and dedicated new temples and was active in pagan worship, with associated sexual immorality. There are a number of reasons why he would hate the new "Christians", but the main one may have been his satanic paranoia, that led to the deaths of many senators and other prominent people. He feared conspiracy around every corner. He was not a murderer of the believers in the arena, but selected leaders to persecute by exile and some for death. Secular historians do not consider him a persecutor as such, simply because he was paranoid and killed anyone he feared!

The Pagan Romans did not like the Christians, they were jealous of their faith and their lifestyle and very suspicious of the activities they got up to. The WCC would not have been in trouble nor would make-believers, they would worship Caesar as well as Christ. It was the Bible believing Christians who had trouble and died. The Romans would have had no trouble with a church that was prepared to put Jesus alongside the other gods, it was the absolute claims of Christ that they couldn't handle. Domitian loved being called "dominus et deus" (Lord and god), and when this worship of Caesar developed into a State Cult early the next century all who would not call Caesar "Lord" were considered traitors.

The best emperors were often the worst persecutors. The emperor Trajan answering Pliny the Younger, his governor in Bithynia said that anyone who repents from Christianity, however suspicious their past should be set free, that Christians

were not be accused on the basis of unsigned letters. He however said that if the Christians did not repent they had to be punished, and by that he meant killed. Shelley page 45 – Pliny asks the Emperor for advice.

Trajan was followed by Hadrian who built the wall across the north of England. Hadrian replied to another man in Asia and confirmed the rules laid down by Trajan. If the Christians were accused by a libeler the perpetrator of the libel should be tried and if guilty killed instead of the one they accused. This makes it clear that false accusations were common, as old scores in the community were settled. By the reign of Decius (249-251) Emperor worship was compulsory and an annual certificate of compliance had to be carried and checked by officials against tax records. The last years until the Edict of Milan in 312 AD were the worst for martyrdom – satanic hatred was violent as he saw he was losing.

The evangelism started by Paul, John and other believers had become quite effective and there was a significant amount of Christianity in Asia at that time. Much of Roman Law was just, but some of the laws were not possible for the believers to obey.

#### PERSECUTION IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Shelley page 41 (4<sup>th</sup> Edition) and following gives six points relating to the persecution in the Roman Empire:-

1. The Christians had a distinctive lifestyle, they were living separate from their neighbours and would not get involved with what the pagans were doing.
2. Christians did not conform. Conformity was the key to a trouble free political-social life. It still is!
3. Christians would not worship or recognize the pagan gods. The Christian was a standing rebuke to everything that they were doing. Their accusation was that Christianity was not tolerant and so had to go!
4. One could not reject their gods without being a social misfit. The pagans would commence every meal with a prayer to the gods together with a libation offering of wine. Both Christians and pagans would drink wine in the ancient world but the Christians would not make a libation offering, which was pouring the first wine onto the ground.

What did you do as a Christian when you knew that all the meat had been dedicated at the abattoir which was housed in the pagan temple? This is similar to the problems some have today eating halal meat, or eating in a Chinese restaurant where the food has been dedicated to the gods in the owner's shrine.

Paul asked the Corinthians if they were going to become a vegetarian, to avoid the issue, or would they see the issue differently? These were issues then and still are today for some of us. **1 Corinthians 8 : 4 - 8, 10 : 19**. Refer to the web site or CD for studies on this section of Corinthians.

All these things caused a break in fellowship with the pagans, which made the pagans suspicious of the religion as a whole.

5. The Christians had a fear of idolatry. There was a god for every trade in a similar way to their being a saint for many things in the Roman Catholic tradition. Before they started work the people would pray to their work-place god for "health and safety" reasons, and many Christians could not stand that, so they gave up organized union work, and "sat around" causing the pagans to say what a lazy lot the Christians were.

They had to go back to work, even though their trade may have been dedicated to Zeus because Zeus is a nothing. Note Paul's point in the Corinthian passage above; he did not get "hung up" on the demons behind the gods, he referred to them all as "nothings", so should we!

With paganism when a child was born the husband would ask what sex the baby was and if it were a girl they would often "expose it"; place it outside a temple on the steps to die or be baby farmed for slavery/prostitution. Christians out of charity would pick these babies up and care for them before the brothel owners got to them. This caused the rumor to go round that they used them in their secret services and for cannibalism on the basis of the Lord's Table requiring the believer to eat the flesh and drink the blood.

The pagans came to this conclusion because they were doing bad things, and thought the Christians were doing worse, because they did it in secret. They knew that the Lord's Table was an agape or love feast with brothers and sisters thus the pagans thought that there was incest as well as cannibalism.

6. Finally the Christians refused to call Caesar Lord. The Roman Empire moved towards Emperor worship with Nero being the first to claim godhood during his lifetime, and by the end of the century Domitian was calling himself god. Both were assassinated, but the use of religion to control the multi-cultural/religious Empire was finally a major tool of the demonic State. (Remember Matthew 4:8-11). To indicate assent to this a pinch of incense would be offered on an altar stating that Caesar was a god. Because they said Jesus Christ was Lord the Christians were also considered traitors to the Empire.

The people went to the pagan Temples at least once a week. It had the best food, wine, and prostitutes in town and you could worship the pagan god there in all three ways, plus prayer, offerings and incense. Because those who were converted ceased to do these things, this convicted the pagans of sin, who resented the Christian's judging of them. As we live in an increasingly pagan world we can expect this sort of increasing hostility from the unbeliever. Many believers were betrayed because they rebuked their neighbours by their lifestyle. The very showing of love and concern to others will both draw people to the gospel message, and cause those convicted of sin or evil to hate the one convicting them. We as Bible believers will come under increasing pressure not only from unbelievers but also from the liberal churches as the days darken. They may well teach and target you with law changes that mean that you cannot preach the gospel openly, and must in civic ceremonies worship/acknowledge the pagan gods and other religions as true.

If persecution comes for that reason the Lord will be glorified through it, but individual believers must know church history and understand the issues, well before the pressure arrives. We may well come under such pressure within a few years, and we must be like the early believers, ready for the pressures that are a part of living in an increasingly pagan world. How relevant are the words of **Luke 17:24-37** for us, just as they were in 66AD?

## **DOCTRINE**

### **SUFFERING**

1. Ultimately, all suffering is a result of the sin of Adam.
2. God is sovereign and allows even undeserved suffering to come upon the world for a reason (Romans 8:28)
  - a) To bring people to a point of helplessness where they call out to Him
  - b) To test and develop faith, so bringing glory to Himself.
3. There will be no suffering for believers in eternity (Revelation 21:4).
4. Unbelievers will suffer forever in the Lake of Fire (Revelation 20:12-15).
5. Suffering can be caused by:
  - a) Discipline for your own sins
  - b) The effect of the sins of others on you - gossip, war, crime
  - c) Self-induced suffering as a result of your own actions – e.g. sickness from smoking, poverty from poor stewardship
  - d) The sovereign will of God - health, weather.
6. Premise of Suffering:
  - a) All suffering is designed for blessing in the Christian walk (1 Peter 1:7, 8, 4:14)
  - b) Even discipline is designed to restore fellowship (Hebrews 12:6)
  - c) Suffering follows the principle of grace (Romans 8:28, 1 Thessalonians 5:18).
7. Purpose of Christian Suffering:
  - a) To receive discipline for carnality or backsliding (Psalm 38)
  - b) To glorify God (Job 1:8-12, Luke 15:20, 21)
  - c) To illustrate doctrine (Book of Hosea)
  - d) To learn obedience (Philippians 2:8, Hebrews 5:8)
  - e) To keep down pride (2 Corinthians 12:7-10)
  - f) To develop faith (1 Peter 1:7, 8)
  - g) To witness for Christ (2 Corinthians 13:4)
  - h) To demonstrate the power of God (2 Corinthians 11:24-33, 2 Corinthians 12:7-10)
  - i) To manifest the fruit of the Spirit (2 Corinthians 4:8-11)
  - j) To help others who suffer (2 Corinthians 1:3-5)
  - k) From indirect action - because other believers get out of fellowship (Romans 14, 1Corinthians 12:12, 13, 26, 1Samuel 21, 1Chronicles 21).

## **LECTURE 5 - THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This is the big divide between liberal and conservative Christianity. Is Christianity just a way of life or is it essentially about an historic event, and personal belief in proven facts, as well as commitment to a person? Is it about ethics? Is it about philosophy? Or is it about the unique person of the universe who makes absolute claims upon us?

In Shelley's book, Chapter 5, page 49, starts with Mahatma Ghandi, who in his understanding, separated what Jesus said from who He was. Many people who call themselves Christians do that, including Albert Schweitzer. Remember

Jesus words, **Matthew 7:13-23**. This is the harvest of the German Liberalism that swept the theological colleges from the early 1800s through until the 1920s. They exalt Jesus ethical teachings and behaviour. The Liberal attitude is totally opposite to that of the earliest Christian writers, both New Testament and the Early Church fathers. In the Early Church they made what you believed about who Jesus was the central criteria as to whether you were Christians or not.

We at EBCWA believe that we should still do this, as it was the criteria that the apostles took as the standard for calling a person a Christian. **Jude 3**. Behaviour follows from belief, but belief must be on the firm foundation of who Jesus was, is and will be. Do we stress relationship or way of life, or do we stress these things in the historic context of who we are related to through the Incarnation, the teaching, the miracles, the Cross, Resurrection and the Day of Pentecost? Is the Cross and resurrection central or does the Sermon on the Mount take central stage in isolation from the completed work?

Liberalism emphasizes the ethical teaching and looks at the cross and resurrection as an illustration of spiritual principles that have no historical basis. To avoid the heresy charge they just avoid speaking of the “event” – and focus only on the teaching as if they emerge from the collective consciousness of mankind. The genuine apostolic Christian emphasizes the life and work of Christ, the resurrection, the day of Pentecost, the certainty of his Return, and through that interprets everything else. It is the individual’s relationship with God who has become man which is important, and through that you have the authoritative ethical teaching as a part of the total package. One writer challenged the liberals with a book, “Your god is Too Small!” We have a Bible, and we have certainties, the liberal has a pamphlet and hopes for the best.

#### PAUL AND AGRIPPA

A good example of this biblical emphasis as given by the apostles is in **Acts 26:1-29**, which is Paul's defence in front of Agrippa. Here he talks about the facts of his faith, the reality of the resurrection, the physical person Jesus of Nazareth in verse 9, after the resurrection, which is mentioned in verse 8. He continues with things that Paul did and taught in Jerusalem and beyond in the synagogues. In Asia verse 11, in Damascus verse 12, his conversion verses 14-15, and that he firmly believed that the evidence demanded the verdict that Jesus is God with us (Immanuel).

He explains the purpose of the incarnation was to open the eyes of mankind, and to turn the darkness into light from the power of Satan to the power of God. He stresses the forgiveness of sins and the sanctification of those who are saved. This gives us a clear idea of what the gospel truly was to the early preachers; it was the incarnation, which opened the door to salvation from sin and death, leading to having a relationship with Christ. It all rests upon historic certainties!

He said that he kept on preaching that Christ suffered and rose from the dead - **verse 23**. Paul says that he is walking and speaking words of truth and nobleness. All this was not done secretly, “in a corner”; it was done quite openly. These are physical, testable historical facts as far as Paul is concerned, and he invites Agrippa to prove him wrong by calling other witnesses and opening up Roman records. Roman spy networks and recording was such that this was possible.

To this Agrippa said that Paul almost persuaded him to become a Christian. Paul was stating firmly that Jesus Christ was God made man, the need for repentance; his message to Agrippa was, change your mind about Christ, believe in him! Paul's three points about Christ are; He is the unique person of the universe, the Creator has become a creature, and He rose from the dead, He is therefore clearly Messiah and Saviour, and so, everyone, everywhere is commanded to repent.

In his address you will find no reference to the Sermon on the Mount, nor will you find it referred to anywhere in the book of Acts, nor any others of the ethical teachings of Christ. The ethics of all the teaching of Jesus is taken as foundational but the key point always rests upon the unique person and work of Jesus; it is always the person and work of Christ on the cross and resurrection. The ethics are relevant to believers only as growth material. The gospel is the thing that is important from the viewpoint of the unbeliever.

When people have come to terms with the Lord's work on the Cross and accepted it they should then be instructed on the ethics of Jesus and the apostles, given that Jesus taught them. John Chapters 14-16. Then they have a relationship and truths to apply into the very fabric of their lives, in the power of the Holy Spirit. Until they have accepted the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour, King of all kings, and Lord of all lords, the Sermon on the Mount is a distraction.

As Mahatma Gandhi proved in his life in India, people can believe the Sermon on the Mount and still be on the route to hell while reading it. It is the Lord as Saviour from sin, the power of the risen Lord through the Holy Spirit that is the genuine message to a lost world. The phrase “the blood of Christ”, summing up the Lord’s work on the Cross, is not mentioned in many liberal churches, (it is too disgusting to them) and the Cross is not mentioned as a sacrifice for sin, neither is the bodily resurrection, ascension or session. What this watered down view of Christianity does is destroy it's power to save and sanctify men. It always kills the church over time, for there is no “good news”, just boring morality without the power to apply it to change lives.

The confused liberal, or philosopher like Gandhi, therefore goes out of this life saying, that if they go out in their own strength and do their best it will be all right. However it is only when you have a relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ that you are able to live and function as a Christian. That relationship is blood bought, and is, in resurrection power, provided, as is the power to live in the Holy Spirit's many ministries. All this is unknown to the liberal. See the “Angelic Conflict” here and the great divide between the liberal and the believer. Facts - Faith – Fellowship.

#### GOSPEL OF SALVATION

In **Jude 1 through 4** this is spelt out in a brief but powerful way. In verses 2-4 Jude is saying that there is only one faith that saves. This is the faith that was once and for all delivered to the apostles.

If you get away from it there is no salvation. If you see people come in and preach another gospel you need to deal with them. **Galatians 1:6-9**. Many have corrupted the gospel and perverted the churches down the centuries and they begin here with doubting the resurrection and the uniqueness of the person of Christ. They talk about Jesus all the time but do not know Him. Even if they do miracles, or great social work in His name it does not mean that they know Him! Remember Jesus words, "I never knew you", **Matthew 7:22-23**, to those who had even worked miracles in his name! History confronts us with two alternatives, and much of "church history" is written by the liberals, who do not represent believers at all, and will not be in heaven with you if you love the Lord, but will claim relationship now!

1. The Jesus of history, who we follow, was virgin born, He did miracles, He went to the cross, died for the sins of the world, rose bodily from the grave, ascended into heaven and is at the right hand of the Father until His enemies are made His footstool. Before he ascended he spoke to more than 500 people. He sent his Spirit to empower the church and said that he would come again, and we believe he will come again, and say this every Communion Service.

2. The Jesus of the false church of liberalism was born normally, did not perform miracles, and suffered the terrible tragedy of the Cross, as an example of sacrifice. By this example if we love God we must be prepared to die to self. According to the liberals we are all going to heaven if we are sincere about what we believe and desire to be good. This Jesus is not the Jesus you confront in the Bible! This Jesus never lived – the only Jesus of history is the God-Man.

We need to follow the historical person of Jesus Christ. The Cross was not a tragedy; it was the central part of the Plan of God. He is the author and finisher of our faith, or we have not got the right view of the Christian faith. There is no meeting point between the conservative (the one who conserves the truths of apostolic faith) and liberals. The liberals will be among the sorriest in hell, because they will realise what a big con job Satan did on them.

Agrippa had a liberal faith, and even Gamaliel had a liberal faith. Gamaliel believes that Rabbi Jesus taught some good things. He says that if it is of God let us be open. However he has not accepted Jesus as Saviour he just believes he is a great teacher. This is to be lost. He has to be Lord and Saviour as well as being a great teacher. **James 2:19-20**.

#### DUALISM - DOCETISM

In Shelley on - Page 54 - we see another important flow on topic. Check in other texts for this subject in the index at the back and read their passages on it. One of the essences of early attacks on the truth of the faith was a belief from the Greek world called "dualism" AND "docetism". Those with this view split man into two or three; soul and spirit and body. The body is seen as "not good" but the soul and spirit is pure. They said what you should do is to emphasize the soul and not worry about the body. The Ebionites made Jesus a great Law keeping man, removing his deity, and the "Docetists" eliminated the human, making Jesus a "god-like" being. The Apostolic Faith upholds the "Hypostatic Union" – that Jesus was God and Man, uniquely come to do what only God in Humanity could do for the race of Adam and Eve.

The Gnostics, the heretics of the early church brought these philosophies into Christianity. They moved the church away from the Hebrew emphasis of the unity of man, and were quickly addressed by the writings of John especially calling the believers to hold the original faith, which has the Jewish emphasis on unity between body and soul and spirit. As we will see throughout church history most attacks on the truth would have been solved quickly by firmness in holding the original Hebrew concepts that are at the centre of the Gospel message as delivered to the apostles.

Liberalism through the centuries tends to follow the Greeks dualistic world view, and talks about the Jesus of History in distinction from the Christ of faith. Greek philosophy did not want to worry about physical resurrection, but about the soul. The liberals talk about love, living in the now, or, entering into the world consciousness. This is the mixture of Greek philosophy and the old eastern religions. The twentieth and twenty-first century is closer to the first century than any intervening century because the eastern mysticism which surrounds us today is similar to the Greek philosophy and pagan religions which surrounded the apostles. Today we need to understand what happened in the first and second century more accurately than at any other time in church history.

To the later Greeks God as creator was in the nature of an ethereal spiritual "force", whereas to the Hebrew, He was in the nature of a person. The Greek philosophy was very close to the "Star Wars" philosophy of the movies of George Lucas and Stephen Spielberg. It was only the Jewish-Christian tradition that kept the personal being in view. Christianity teaches a personal God behind the universe who demands a personal response to his plan from each member of mankind in the unity of their whole person. God wants all of you to be sanctified; your soul, spirit and body.

Rasputin, in Russia, was the most dramatic example of the Gnosticism of Greek philosophy in the twentieth century. He talked about the purity of the soul but he was the greatest fornicator of his day. This is also one of the darker sides of even some otherwise bible teaching cultic groups, where in enthusiasm some err from the godliness taught in all the Scriptures. Like the false teachers of the past some of them thought they could do anything they wanted to and confess afterwards. "Be thou holy for I am holy", says God. Once you get away from the biblical (Jewish) emphasis on the whole person you get into all forms of falsehood. We must be biblical and historical in faith, not philosophical.

On the other hand there are those who enter into flagellation; punishing their bodies as if all physicality is evil. They think that if they punished their body enough their soul will be purified. This is equally as false as the extreme of Rasputin and the fornicators. This is not what is wanted, what is wanted is application of **Romans 12:1-2**. You equally should not be lascivious or a hermit, and we can see the satanic versions of "religion" in each option. God calls us to be Holy Spirit filled where ever we are, but the satanic wants anything else – whatever the extremes and opposites. The problem, as with all perversions of the truth, is the Old Sin Nature, which is the author of both sides of perversity. Shelley page 55-59.

When the Greek philosophy came into conflict with Christianity the apostles would quote Old Testament prophecies which had been fulfilled by the Lord, the stone that the builders rejected, the Son of David, the Son of Adam and many others. Study BTB topic studies, CHRIST – PROPHECIES, CHRIST – TYPES. The apostolic approach was to keep the Church firmly grounded in the "event" – the Incarnation that gives mankind the only "good news" there is – that this is the "visited planet" and that we have the Creator stepping into space and time and opening the door to eternity with Him for each of us.

The books of 1, 2 and 3 John, with the Gospel of John, were written to particularly answer the assaults of Greek philosophy, those who wanted to get away from the uniqueness and claims of the person and work of Christ. Paul's letter to the Colossians also addresses the importance of the person of Christ, countering an earlier form of this satanic alternative to the truth.

#### CREEDS

To handle these problems there were little creeds developed for use in the services and in daily life, so that the believers could recite them as they joined together to reinforce what they really believed.

Examples of these early creedal statements are:-

**1 Corinthians 15:3,4** - For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures:

**Ephesians 4:4-6** - There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

**2 Timothy 3:16** - All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

**Romans 10:9,10** - That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

**1 Timothy 2:3-6** - For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.

You know these, stick to them, and do not budge from these basic tenets of your historic faith.

Shelley notes in the section, "The dangers of Knowing"- Page 60, and quotes an Old Roman Creed, which was one used in the Second century. Here we see the Christians codifying exactly what they believed. They did this because there were people who were trying to dilute and pervert the Christian faith. They emphasize the basic doctrines clearly.

Nicholas of Antioch, (**Revelation 2 : 6, 15**) one of the original deacons was one of these detractors from the apostolic faith. He believed in pleasure, having adopted an Epicurean philosophy, in addition to his Christian faith, and was living in a way that was dishonoring to God. He is criticized for the error of not bringing his faith and life together in holiness, as both correct belief and correct life are required for correct witness!

This type of attitude necessitated the early church being very clear about how they defined a Christian. If you apply the early creeds to the Christian church today you would find that many in churches were not Christians, in the definition the early church used. Note (page 57-58) the way paganism/liberalism treated the false "gospels" – and this continues.

Shelley has a good diagram on Page 59 - The Gnostics were basically eastern mystics who believed that the world was evil but that God was spiritual and good. Between man and God they believed there were many mediators and that the purpose of man was to move from emptiness to fullness. Both the Hare Krishna's and Buddhists are preaching recycled Gnosticism today. They talk about Jesus as one of the mediators. The Colossian church took on an early form of Jewish Gnosticism and prayed to the saints, angels and the virgin Mary on the basis that the Lord Jesus Christ was going to listen to his martyred saints or to his mother, and sadly, by the fifth century you have the Church adopting this false and unscriptural viewpoint. As we go on you will see how the "official churches" often compromise with the enemy and get diluted in truth and then in power.



We are to hold to the faith, once delivered, say Paul, James and John. That is our challenge still.

On page 54 we have the two main satanic alternative views explained, some groups saying that Jesus was only a man whilst others said that he was only God, but John comes up and says that He is the God-man Jesus Christ. The cults therefore have a false view of Christ and a false view of the human being. The Bible says that you are body soul and spirit and that you are going to glorify God in your body, in your soul and in your spiritual relationship with Him. BTB topic of CHRIST – HYPOSTATIC UNION covers this subject.

Eastern mysticism is promoted in many new age books where the concept is tied up into nice stories. We all however have an Old Sin Nature. We love these things. Sadly, but truthfully, Gandhi was wrong. You do not need another lovely teacher, you need a Saviour. You need the power of the Holy Spirit in your life so that you may be able to glorify him in your body. Everything that is not that apostolic gospel of truth is a step away from falsehood and paganism.

## **DOCTRINES**

### **GOSPEL OF SALVATION**

1. Gospel means "good news" - there are four gospels found in the New Testament.
2. Gospel of the Kingdom.
  - a) Preached by John the Baptist (Matthew 3:1, 2), the Lord Jesus Christ (Matthew 4:23) and his disciples (Matthew 10:7) Thy Kingdom come (Matthew 6:10).
  - b) It consists of the setting up on earth of Christ's 1,000 year Kingdom thus fulfilling the Davidic Covenant (2 Samuel 7-16)
  - c) There will be another preaching of the gospel by the Jewish remnant in the days of the Great Tribulation before the 2nd Advent (Matthew 24:14, Revelation 7). After the 2nd Advent the 1,000 year reign commences (Revelation 20:1-6).
3. Gospel of Grace - the gospel of personal salvation by grace through faith. This gospel appears under many names and is the means of salvation throughout the history of mankind.
  - a) Gospel of God (Romans 1:1, 1 Thessalonians 2:2)
  - b) Gospel of Christ (Mark 1:1, Romans 1:16)
  - c) Gospel of the Grace of God (Acts 20:24)
  - d) Gospel of Peace (Ephesians 6:15)
  - e) Gospel of your salvation (Ephesians 1:13)
  - f) Glorious Gospel (2 Corinthians 4:4)
4. The Everlasting Gospel - (Revelation 14:6) - the good news is everlasting. This gospel will be preached on earth just before Christ's return in glory (Matthew 25:31, 32). This gospel is the means of salvation to countless thousands both Jews and Gentiles (Revelation 7:9-14).
5. Paul's "My Gospel" - (Romans 2:16) This is the same gospel of salvation by grace through faith but includes the mystery doctrines of the church age not previously revealed. The gospel in the Old Testament was revealed by the Tabernacle, Feasts, Levitical Offerings etc.
6. "Another Gospel" which is not another (Galatians 1:6, 7, 2 Corinthians 11:4) This is a perversion of the Gospel of Christ (Galatians 1:8, 9) The curse is proclaimed on any who preach it. There have been many perversions - legalism in Galatia, angel worship in Colossae (Colossians 2:18) among others.

### **VIRGIN BIRTH OF CHRIST**

1. Jesus Christ had to be born of a virgin to fulfill prophecy (Isaiah 7:1 4).
2. Jesus had to be born of a virgin to confirm the curse of Coniah (Jeremiah 22:28-30).
  - a) Coniah was a believer but an evil king at the time of the Babylonian captivity.
  - b) Coniah is also in the direct line of Christ in Joseph's lineage from David (Matthew 1:6, 1:11, 1:16) through Solomon. This is the Kingly line.
  - c) Mary was also in the direct line of Christ from David (Luke 3:23, Luke 3:31) through Nathan. In Luke 3:23 Joseph is the son-in-law of Heli, Mary's father.

d) Both lines, Solomon's and Nathan's meet in the person of Jesus Christ but by the virgin birth Coniah's line is cut off as Joseph is the legal but not natural father of Jesus Christ.

3. Jesus had to be born of a virgin to not have the sin nature of Adam. The sin nature of man comes down through the male. (1 Timothy 2:14)

- a) Adam, as the head, was responsible for his wife.
- b) Eve was deceived and sinned.
- c) Adam made deliberate choice.

4. In order to be the God-Man, Jesus had to be conceived of the Holy Spirit to Mary.

5. The virgin birth is therefore critical especially in the doctrine of Redemption, Imputation and Propitiation. NO virgin birth - NO salvation.

## **LECTURE 6 - THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE**

### **INTRODUCTION                    2 Peter 3:14-18**

The word "canon" means a standard or rule. The Bible was seen by the early churches as the "rule of life", the apostolic authoritative standard of the Christian life. It is final and absolute for the Church and vital for it. Without the Scriptures we would be unsure about the doctrines, we would not have the Holy Spirit as author, we would not have the words of the Lord, and therefore would not know how to live the Christian life in the apostolic manner. There are some churches however which function without an authoritative Bible, and this has been true since the beginning. Satan hates the Word, and all his strength is bent on perverting it, distracting the church from it, and providing alternatives to it.

Many believers over the centuries have died protecting the Word. They died because they tried to get it out to people and tried to teach it because they saw, with Holy Spirit fired passion that without the scriptures, the people would perish under persecution. In Shelley chapter 6, page 64, he notes how in the last great persecution, the Romans recognized the centrality of the Bible and the importance of it for the Christians. Their satanic malice was focused upon the destruction of the Bible. He tells of the event when in the fourth century a believer from Sicily was brought before the authorities and convicted on the capital offence of possessing the Gospels. This is still a criminal offence for which people still "disappear" in some countries.

In the early fourth century the persecution involved the burning of the Scriptures. In the first decade of that century many copies of the Scriptures were burnt but enough survived over the Roman world to enable the council at Carthage about a hundred years later to determine what were inspired Scriptures and which were not. It is this last great persecution that meant very few copies of the scriptures survive to our day from the years before 312AD.

### **THE BIBLE AS THE WORD OF GOD**

The Bible is called the Holy Bible or Hagios Biblos, the Holy or set apart book. It is a special set apart book for God's service. It is also a test of truth for Christians. Jesus said my words are truth. **John 14:6, 16:13, 17:17, Galatians 4:30** says that the Scriptures are true.

In the Bible we have an authoritative standard from which we are able to determine what the Christian position is on any subject. We have a canon or rule or standard, a standard for all questions of faith and practice.

The canon at the time of Christ was the Old Testament. The Gospel of John was not available until over 60 years after Pentecost 32 AD. The Gospel of Luke was written by around 62 AD. If he had written more in Acts we would have a later date, so it is clear Luke's work is done after the first imprisonment of Paul. Mark's Gospel was, it is believed by many, written first, with Matthew being dated about the same time as Luke, although Matthew's may be the first written as has been argued recently by some scholars. Certainly there were circulating manuscripts that Matthew may be the author of in the 40s, and he may have completed his Gospel in Aramaic and then Greek by 50 AD.

**Luke 1:1** shows that there were many collections of the sayings, parables and miracles of the Lord Jesus Christ in existence at the time of the writing of Luke. One of the source documents is called by Biblical scholars "Q" or quelle which means "the source", but there were clearly many stories and accounts of Jesus life around in the very early first century. John also refers to this wealth of material in the final verses of his gospel when he says that if everything were written down there would not be sufficient room in the world to contain it. **John 20:30-31, 21:24-25**.

When one looks at the synoptic gospels it is clear that they are drawing from a common source which the disciples wrote down originally in the first few years of the church age. "Q" like all the other early accounts, has been lost. The early church had many collections of sayings, miracles and acts of the Lord, which have now been lost.

### **THE OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA**

For the Old Testament the early church had the Septuagint (LXX), or common Greek version of the OT, which had the apocrypha also included. In addition they accumulated a series of letters from various sources (apostles and early bishops, many of which survive) together with other devotional type material. We are very fortunate nowadays because we can pick up one copy of the Bible and that is it. A bible may be expensive as far as a book is concerned but in the ancient world their Old Testament would cost the equivalent of many months wages, as it had to be copied by hand. The Old Testament would cost between \$20,000 and \$30,000 to officially copy. Given the costs, only the very wealthy would have a copy and others would come around and read it, or have it read and memorize passages.

On pages 65-69 Shelley notes - when Christians retained the Old Testament for their own use they did not agree with all that had found its way into the LXX. There were later arguments about the Apocrypha, that contained several very interesting but dubious works from the centuries between Malachi (around 400BC) and when the Gospel story begins.

The Jews in Palestine had a canon of Scripture, which did not have the Apocrypha, whilst those living outside the land using the Septuagint had the Apocrypha as part of the Old Testament. The Palestinian version corresponded to the 39 book version of the Protestant Old Testament, and remains the Aramaic version and Hebrew Bible of today.

The Lord Jesus Christ spoke only ever from the Palestine list, and pointed to that canon rather than the Septuagint list, and the Apostles quoted from the Apocrypha only in two places (Jude and 2 Peter) indicating that while those books are suspect, the things recorded in those verses are true. The apostles freely quoted the Greek of the LXX translation. In the eastern empire the Palestinian list was accepted whilst in the west after Augustine of Hippo (circa 400AD) the church agreed to have the apocrypha included. The first KJV [ King James or Authorized Version in 1611] had the Apocrypha in it because it was designed for the Anglican church and the High Anglicans wanted it, as it was close to the Roman Catholic Church in many areas of teaching.

The lay church, which eventually triumphed in the Civil War, did not want anything to do with the Apocrypha so later editions of the KJV left it out. If you went into the Roman Catholic church for a church service tomorrow you would be quite as likely to get a sermon from the apocrypha as from the Protestant Bible as we know it.

The Roman Catholics tend to have a higher view of the Gospels than the Old Testament or the Apocrypha, and so any problems with "Tobit" are sorted by Matthew. The early church also had another groups of books called the Pseudopigrapha which were books that pretended to be by famous early Christian or Jewish authors. The Testament of Abraham would be an example written in the first century AD and ascribed to Abraham some 2,000 years before. Many of these have survived and their "garbage" may be studied – it is nonsense and is seen clearly as such when compared to the simple "ring of truth" of the real Scriptures.

Today we have seen as many attacks on the Word of God as our forefathers did. We must be as sure as they were of what we believe. In the first few centuries there were also the cult papers, much as we have with the "Watchtower" and other magazines today.

Look up in a Bible Encyclopaedia, Internet search, the following topics - Apocalyptic, Apocrypha, Canon, Pseudapigrapha.

#### CANONICITY

When you had a young believer in the ancient world you did not give them a Bible, as you did not have \$25,000+ to spend on each of them. Young Christians were encouraged to copy and memorize their local church's copies of the recognized Holy Scriptures. Finally there was a realization that there had to be a decision as to what was and was not inspired, as in the ancient world by the third century there were many churches that were practicing many unusual and weird things.

The churches also wanted guidance so that they could tell the young believer what to spend their time copying, and what was worth dying for, and what could be given up for burning without any worries. The pagans were slow at recognizing what was and was not "Christian", so believers could "give up" a copy of a Pseudapigrapha book without concerns and possibly escape with their life from the persecution. The Lord used the fake to protect the real!

On page 68 - 69 Shelley gives correctly the three criteria that were used to determine canonicity

[a] They have power and self evidencing quality.

[b] The Scriptures were those which were normally read in public service whilst the other literature could be read at home. The main feature in the ancient world was the reading of the Scriptures and the evaluation of them with a small amount of singing at the end. This has now been reversed and we have mainly singing under the guise of worship followed by a shorter evaluation of the Scriptures. Rather than the way we do it by warming up with songs and then having a message they would give the message and give the congregation something to sing about it. This is a far better system.

[c] The final test was whether it was written by an apostle, or a close associate of an apostle. **2 Peter 3:15-18**. Peter at the time of writing considered Paul's writing as Scripture.

The early attack on the Word of God came from two angles, Shelley pages 69-72.

[a] The first group wanted the canon of Scripture closed early. They wanted to exclude a lot of things that were genuine. These were the Marcionites, who followed Cerdo and Marcion from the Black Sea area. Marcion said that the God of the Old Testament was different to that of the New Testament. They accepted only the writings of Paul. The Ultra Dispensationalists follow the Marcion error. They will not read the letter of James in Church. This group had an abridged New Testament. Certain portions of the Word of God were therefore excluded by this group. Some modern "Sabbath Keeper" groups will consider all the Letters of the New testament as "Midrash"; not Scripture, just interesting commentary of men, and so not doctrinally to be followed. Attacks on Scripture remain a satanic hallmark signature.

[b] The other group was an "open canon" group, which wanted to have no limits, so that new revelation could be included in an expanded canon. These were the "super spirituals" – following Montanus who were at their height in the middle to end of the Second Century. They took John 16 as their starting point, and said that the Holy Spirit will reveal all things, and that therefore they could never say that the Bible was complete.

Some extreme Pentecostal groups today may have a Montanist outlook. Tertullian was an ex Montanist and therefore you have to be careful of what he is saying and where he is coming from at times. The Montanists were ascetic, vegetarian, they rejected marriage but not necessarily sex, spoke in tongues and had visions. They had female ecstatic prophetesses and an experiential basis to their faith without any authoritative scriptures to correct them.

Both of these views are equally in error as noted by the apostle John who said that nothing should be added to, nor taken from the Word of God.

The early writers such as Polycarp, and Clement of Rome, quoted from the early authoritative books of the church, so we get a snapshot of what the early church valued by looking at their works. They would always quote from the Gospels or the Apostles Letters, and if you look at their letters you would have a very good idea of what would become Scriptures. The effect of these two heretical groups however was to bring the need for a canon into focus. The first record of this is the so called "Muratorian Canon" from around 190. During the second and third centuries prominent church fathers included more and more of the final canon into the church's practice, but it was not until the Council of Carthage in 400 AD that the final canon was agreed, some 360 years after the Cross. The main books that were eventually included but were disputed up to the end were, 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John, and the very Jewish Church letters, Hebrews, James and Jude.

It is important to remember that this process involved the church fathers trying to identify the books that were inspired, it was not them making the books inspired! Believers had used and recognized the canonical books all through the early years, this formal process was the official recognition of the reality that had existed since the beginning.

Bound volumes or Codexes were then published with some of the early ones dating from this time, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus were the three great Codexes that have come down to us, possibly bound editions copied for the Christian Emperors. After this time you have Jerome sitting down and writing the Vulgate; the Latin translation of the bible for the Western area of the old Empire where Latin remained the common language.

## **DOCTRINE**

### **BIBLE: CANONICITY**

DEFINITION - Canon - KANON (Greek) – a measuring rule or standard.

1. Why do we need a canon of Scripture?

- a) So that believers in every generation might have complete revelation from God.
- b) That man might have God's Word in writing (1 Corinthians 2:16).
- c) A need for the preservation and circulation of sacred writing in the time of oppression.
- d) That people might know what was scripture and what was not, and know how God thinks.

2. CRITERIA FOR OLD TESTAMENT CANONICITY

- a) The question of Inspiration (2 Peter 1:21) - every existing book of an acknowledged messenger of God was immediately accepted as the Word of God being commissioned by God to make known his will.
- b) The principle of Internal evidence (Deuteronomy 31:24-26, Joshua 1:8, Judges 3:4). Nehemiah 8:1-8 shows that people were taught the word of God. Daniel in captivity read (Jeremiah 25:11-12, Jeremiah 29:10) and discovered Israel had a future giving rise to (Daniel 9:2, 5, 6. Zechariah 7:12)

- c) Documentation by quotation - New Testament quotes by Jesus Christ and others declare them to be the Word of God, e.g. (Matthew 22:29, John 5:39, John 10:35)
- d) The Law of Public Official Action (Nehemiah 8:5)
- e) The Law of Cause and Effect. In this area canonicity is a recognition of what God has done in the field of communication. Passages such as (2 Kings 22:1 - 23:2 and Nehemiah 8) are not historical accounts of the ratification of the Canon but the result of the existence of the Canon.
- f) Principle of external evidence - Israel had gone down spiritually prior to the Babylonian captivity (2 Chronicles 36:11-21). During captivity the Jews realised the importance of Bible doctrine and there was a spiritual resurgence led by people like Ezra, Nehemiah, Malachi, Zerubbabel who extrabiblically attested to the canon of scripture. The Old Testament canon was closed in 425 BC-

### 3. DIVISION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT - Three sections:

- a) Torah or Law - The Pentateuch consisting of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.
- b) The Nabiim or Prophets. This was divided into 2. The Former and the Latter Prophets, the division being the Babylonian Captivity.
- c) The Kethubim or Writings which were further subdivided into 3 subsections:
  - i) Poetical Books - Psalms and Job.
  - ii) The Five Rolls or Megilloth books that were read at various feasts:
    - Song of Solomon - Passover
    - Ruth - Pentecost
    - Ecclesiastes - Tabernacles
    - Esther - Purim
    - Lamentations - Anniversary of the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BC-
  - iii) Historical Books - Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles.

### 4. NUMBER OF OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS

The number of books in the Hebrew Old Testament was 24 compared to 39 in the English: 1st and 2nd Kings etc. are combined and many of the prophets also combined into scrolls, e.g. Matthew in the New Testament when quoting Zechariah said "As Jeremiah said" (Matthew 27:9-10), Zechariah was in the Jeremiah scroll (Zechariah 11:12-13).

### 5. CLASSIFICATION OF OLD TESTAMENT CANON

- a) Homologoumena - these are writings that were accepted and had always been accepted as canonical.
- b) Antilegoumia - these were five books which were eventually accepted as canonical which were disputed in the 1st - 5th centuries AD:
  - i) ESTHER - because the name God was not mentioned.
  - ii) SONG OF SOLOMON - this dealt with a love affair which the early church fathers apparently were somewhat embarrassed about and thought it non-canonical.
  - iii) ECCLESIASTES - where Solomon was looking at life from a human viewpoint which was not reconcilable with Judaism or Bible Doctrine.
  - iv) EZEKIEL - because chapters 40-48 seemed to contradict the Mosaic Law. Ezekiel 40-48 deals with annual sacrifices in the Millennium not the Levitical usage.
  - v) PROVERBS - because one proverb seemed to contradict another.
- c) Pseudepigrapha - these were the false writings and were rejected. Such books as "The Penitence of Jannes and Jambres", "The Magic Book of Moses", are in this category.
- d) Apocrypha - these were books written after 425 BC and have been rejected as not being canonical. The Apocrypha includes 14 books which are found in the Septuagint and Vulgate but never in the Hebrew Canon. False doctrine found in the Apocrypha includes:

- i) Prayers and Offerings for the Dead - 2 Maccabees 12:42.
- ii) Suicide Justified - 2 Maccabees 14:41.
- iii) Atonement by Almsgiving - Ecclesiasticus 3:32, 4:1-11.
- iv) Salvation by Almsgiving - Tobit 4:11
- v) Cruelty to Slaves Justified - Ecclesiasticus 33:25-9.
- vi) Pre-existence of souls - Wisdom of Solomon 8:19,20.
- vii) Other fallacies include magical incantations, purgatory, assassination, angels having the power of intercession.

#### 6. REJECTION OF OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA

- a) These books are included in the apocrypha:  
1 & 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, additions to Esther, The wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, The letter of Jeremiah, The prayer of Azariah, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, The prayer of Manassah, 1 & 2 Maccabees.
- b) The apocrypha was never in the Hebrew Canon.
- c) Neither Jesus Christ nor any of the New Testament writers ever quoted once from the Apocrypha.
- d) Josephus expressly excluded them from his history of sacred scriptures.
- e) No mention of the Apocrypha was made in any catalogue of canonical books in the first 4 centuries AD.
- f) These apocryphal books were never asserted to be divinely inspired or to possess divine authority.
- g) No prophets were connected with these writings.
- h) These books contained many historical, geographical and chronological errors.
- i) The apocrypha teaches doctrines and upholds practices which are contrary to the canon of scripture.

#### 7. CRITERIA FOR NEW TESTAMENT CANONICITY

- a) Apostolicity - every book must either to have been written by an apostle or someone closely associated with an apostle (Mark with Peter, Luke with Paul). An early date of writing is essential - prior to 100 AD.
- b) Reception by the Churches - must be accepted by the churches as authentic when written.
- c) Constancy of Doctrine - with Old Testament scripture and Apostolic teaching.
- d) Inspiration - each book must have internal and external evidence of inspiration. This was evaluated using the spiritual gift of discernment during the formation of the canon (1 Corinthians 12:10).
- e) Recognition - each must be recognised by the Church Fathers as canonical. Four councils were held - Laodicea (336 AD), Damascus (382 AD), Carthage (397 AD), Hippo (419 AD).
- f) Internal - each must contain exhortation to public evaluation of the word (Colossians 4:16, 1 Thessalonians 5:27, 1 Timothy 4:13, Revelation 1:3).

#### 8. CLASSIFICATION OF NEW TESTAMENT CANON

- a) Homologoumena - the accepted books.
- b) Antilegomena - the disputed books which were eventually accepted - James, 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John, Hebrews.
- c) Pseudepigrapha - the false writings - Gospel of Peter, Gospel of Thomas, Acts of Andrew etc.
- d) Apocrypha - the rejected writings - Acts of Paul, Epistle of Barnabas, Shepherd of Hermes, The Revelation of the Twelve, The Revelation of Peter.

#### NOTES

## LECTURE 7 - THE GREAT EPISCOPY

### THE FIRST CENTURY

This is a study of the growth of the power of the Bishops. Episcopalian is the governing of the church by Bishops.

In Shelley chapter 7, page 75ff - The rejection of Montanism with its prophesying and moralising disclosed the church as an institution more clearly than any other movement of the time, and its coordinated responses came through respected and admired Holy Spirit filled and Bible saturated bishops. The church preached to the nations and revealed its universality and confronted heretics and articulated its orthodoxy, dealt with sin and developed its hierarchy. Sadly by the second century after years of seeing bishops burned or torn for faith, it conferred on its Bishops the "saintly" power to forgive sins. This completed the formation of what we now know as the "Roman, and Eastern Orthodox Catholic church".

The power of the bishops developed slowly. In the early church the elder, pastor and bishop were terms for the same person in the local house-group church of a city. This however gradually changed after the turn of the first century when Ignatius the pastor/bishop of the church at Antioch spoke, in a number of letters, of a single bishop over each city or area incorporating many house churches. This bishop would have a number of elders and deacons under his direct authority. God's power, Ignatius said, flows to the flock through this three level united ministry.

**Hebrews 13:7,17** tells us to remember those who have "the rule over us", which in the Greek is "hegemonon". This means to lead, but as servant/shepherd leaders, but not in an autocratic way. This is not a dictator telling people what they are to do. It is a person setting an example from the Word of God, from his own behaviour and his own faith. He is someone who says, "follow me", and the people willingly follow. By the days of Ignatius however the bishop had begun to rule in an autocratic way in response to the persecutions, directing action, and eliminating heresy by decree, all done for the safety of the flock.

Today in many churches there is a senior pastor in each church, a person who rules. The authority however is vested with the elders who formed the governing body. The early church leadership ruled through their teaching of God's Word, which they taught, and through the lives that they lived. Servant Leadership. **Matthew 6:32-34, 20:24-28, John 13:12-17.**

In **Titus 1:5-11, 1 Timothy 3:1-13**, we have the qualifications of an elder and/or a bishop. The qualifications are personal holiness as well as doctrinal correctness. He must be a teacher of God's Word and to be able to silence everyone by the example of his holy life, and by his theology; therefore he has to know the Scriptures thoroughly. Each house church would have had an elder plus perhaps a couple of deacons, if they were needed for poor relief duties. The senior elder, or bishop became, by the end of the first century, the one who would co-ordinate the house churches at a city or district wide level.

The monies coming in would come to the elders to assist them with the teaching ministry, or for distribution to the widows and orphans, and this became crucial for survival of many after fathers and husbands were killed in the arena. There was not a big administrative system in the ancient church during the first three hundred years. Basically it was the synagogue model, and most elders would have had a full time job, and been "elders" only after their daily work was done.

### DEVELOPMENT OF THE BISHOPS

On Pages 76-79 Shelley notes that there was quite a drastic change from the early synagogue model to the more structured Roman church. It took some time before Ignatius's three tiered hierarchy was adopted everywhere. In Alexandria for instance we know that there was not a single bishop before 180 AD. Each congregation was still independent until that stage with their own senior elder ruling the local area/suburban church.

However it was conflict with the Gnostic heretics that caused each town and city to have its own spokesman for the church, as all the little house churches, if not united by an authoritative leader, could be led astray. Persecution paid its part also, as bishops acted as rallying points for the local Christian community. Their holy lives and their martyrdoms often added to the status of their office.

The Churches gradually went one step further however, and said that the bishops were standing in the apostolic tradition and what he says goes, and then sadly finally they added, that if you do not agree with him you do not go to heaven. By the end of the second century this is what had happened. Succession lists of bishops going back to the apostles were by then drawn up for Corinth and Rome and a number of other cities.

Note what has happened! The churches are starting to say that something was either true or not true not just because the Bible said so, but because of the tradition of the apostles, as was given by their successors the bishops. In the case of Rome the apostle it was claimed was Peter, and because the city was the Empire capital the bishop became one other's looked to for guidance. The test of the truth is of course God's Word not the thoughts of man, nor historic tradition. While the growth of the power of the bishops is understandable it is not necessarily either acceptable or biblical.

Note the three basic positions that believers take towards the growth of power of the bishops by around 200 AD. What do you think? Was it, Liberty for a temporary situation, Necessity for that time, or a permanently binding tradition under the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the church until the end?

#### CHURCH STRUCTURE

Your view on the validity of this will determine the structure in the church which you adopt or accept. There are three possibilities as shown on Shelley pages 71 – 72.

[a] The structure that was functioning for the first 80 years, where you have several elders with deacons and deaconesses with one of the elders being a senior elder or pastor. The church would have equality between the three groups. There are leaders who are recognized as leaders in accordance with the criteria listed in the letter of Timothy and Titus, with orthodoxy in doctrine and correctness in life, with everyone in the church walking and working together under the recognized servant leadership of the pastor/elders.

[b] The next is the autocratic, where you have a person who makes all the rules and the others either accept or reject it. This could become a cult type system, but quickly became the one followed throughout the latter years of the Empire, and was the structure that kept the church pure in its doctrines and witness through the years of persecution, due to the incredible Christian character of many of the bishops involved.

[c] The other is a complete democracy, where you have an eldership which rotates through the congregation with no one making the policy. Everything will be decided by majority vote, with the Scriptures as the sole standard for truth. This is not a biblical model **at all**, but became the model for governing many of the Protestant churches from the sixteenth century onwards.

Those who have not got the "primitive", or Biblical church government, argue that they are just following church history. The question is where do you stop in history? The local church however lost a lot of its power as the bishop's power increased. There appears in later centuries however, to be a close relationship between the rise in Episcopacy and the decline of spirituality in the church, although as we advance in this study you will see that under great bishops the Holy Spirit moved mightily through them and the churches they led. Each of the systems above can be "biblical" if the women/men chosen to hold leadership are spiritually qualified in accordance with the "spiritual character/fruit lists", as recorded in Titus and Timothy, and are Holy Spirit filled.

#### SACRAMENTALISM

By the time we get to the middle years of the third century we have something that many would consider even more sinister with the decline of the moral power of the church. This was in the growth of the form of sacramentalism. Here we get away from the teaching of Scripture on baptism and communion to the point where it is believed that the elements themselves have spiritual power, and that power is controlled by the bishops and clergy.

Shelly says in pages 80-82 that in the first two centuries most Christians believed that baptism cancelled all sins committed up to that moment in the believer's life. Serious post baptismal lapses called for special treatment especially in the areas of murder, heresy and sexual sins. These sins were forgivable by God but never fully by the church. The penalty for these was exclusion from the church and deprivation of the Lord's Supper until a set period had passed. In some cases this meant that the person would have to sit at the back of the church at every service for up to seven years to show penitence before being re-admitted to fellowship. They had to pray they did not die during that time, or they were denied Christian burial, and they believed with that, a place in heaven.

Here the provision of the Lord's Supper was seen as a special channel of divine grace, but only open through the bishop. Withholding the elements from a person they believed to put their eternal life in jeopardy. Ignatius stated that communion was the medicine of immortality and the antidote for death. This is a good and great believer, but he is here talking absolute rubbish we believe. He is saying that communion can do something for you. The Lord does not say that and neither does Paul, yet Paul's words make it clear that Communion is indeed a very holy event. **1 Corinthians 11:23-34**. If it is "done wrong" = death may result!

By the second century communion was no longer a memorial feast, it now has become something that does something for you. Some of these early church "fathers" considered that if you ate enough bread and wine you got eternal life. Conversely if you do not eat the elements you will run out of eternal life, not unlike your car running out of fuel if you do not refuel at a service station on a regular basis.



The Lord had told them that the Holy Spirit would be with them forever, and this falsehood creeping in was getting people away from the teaching of the Lord. As the bishop is the person giving the communion out, he is the person with real and eternal power, as he can give it or withhold it. Is their salvation outside “mother church”? Answer to them – “no”.

If you have been bad or had not complied with the tenets of the church the elements were withheld from you. People came to the church to get their bread and wine that kept them going for the rest of the week. It is this concept which still holds in the orthodox and catholic churches until this day.

We do not believe that we should ever call the communion elements the “sacraments” as this implies that it does something for you. Communion is a holy memorial and should not do anything for you other than remember that Christ has done everything for you already. Can you see however that if you wanted to put pressure on people, and control them, then in the early church these bishops with this power could deny some believers communion and thereby control them and their money and lives. Cultic things develop early – because Satan loves cultic stuff!!!

The channel of grace however is salvation and that of power is through the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit’s and the Lord’s message of salvation by grace through faith, has been replaced by, join the church, obey, and take the sacraments.

By implication you are super spiritual if you come to every morning service to take the elements. Under this you went to the church for your theological fix. This can get believers away from walking in the filling of the Holy Spirit, to teach that the believers had to have the bread and wine to carry them through the week. When you start teaching sacraments your Bible teaching will tend to go out of the window. Instead of teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit they teach the power of the sacraments and the power of the bishop and that it is the bishop who has to be obeyed rather than what the Bible says.

Instead of Bibles being copied and carried, little lexionaries came into the church, with set readings for each day of the year. This prevents the bishop teaching the Bible verse by verse. This places complete power into the hands of the people who write the lectionaries, the senior bishops, whereas verse by verse teaching through the whole Bible ensures that all things the Holy Spirit wants said to the people are covered. The bishop reads these set readings to the people and they have the sacrament, the so called spiritual food, and they are not getting the true systematic teaching from the Word of God. They are getting bread and wine and a little homily. They had changed from a verse by verse analysis and spiritual growth and strength, to a few verses read out of context and the giving of “the sacrament”.

You as a Bible believer have to be very clear about the danger of the sacramental idea. We must stress real spiritual food and that it is the Bible which is paramount. One way of doing this is to have the communion service at the start of the service. Those who have communion every week are also in danger of making it appear a sacrament. Think how we can avoid this yet keep the regular weekly observance that the early church practiced.

In this regard read **Ephesians 3:1-7, 2 Peter 3:1-4, Jude 3, 4, 17-21, Matthew 7:13-23.**

In some churches you will have people who stay for the communion, but do not stay for the message as they think that if they have sufficient wine and bread it will ensure them of eternal life. Unfortunately rather than get them to heaven it will see people in hell with their delusions intact until they fall into eternity.

To further convince those who believe that there is eternal life in the bread and wine the leaders of later centuries started to wear special clothes, he is now in priestly robes, indicating his special power, not unlike the pagan, or old Israelite priests of old. You therefore have people who stand up and give out what people think is eternal life or withhold it. This has been one of Satan’s biggest pushes in church history. Anything to get people away from Holy Spirit filled living!

Many Christians had died under the systematic and thorough persecutions of the third century. Most of the bishops did not go back to the Scriptures but started to look at prominent martyrs as being important objects for prayer and veneration, and possibly also channels of grace/access to Christ. You had two birthdays, one when you were born and one when you were martyred. They came up with the concept that you could only be sure of your salvation if you died for the Lord; that martyrdom was a very special channel of grace, rather than a thing rewarded by an eternal crown.

There were people in the last great persecution who were throwing themselves at the animals to get eaten in the hope of eternal life. Some may even have been unbelievers who unknown to themselves were committing suicide and even going to hell by means of Satanic deception. Yet if they truly loved the Lord, all their foolishness and deception would be forgiven them. There were “fake” as well as “foolish” believers then as now.

As you read of the practices of this period remember that not all the church members and leaders you read about are “Christian” in the sense that the bible defines it. Look closely at their arguments, and then ask, is there a passage of scripture that clearly corrects their “logical error”? Also remember that the Lord deals with us all in grace and love, and that theological correctness is not as important as a heart and life that is sold out for Jesus. We can be foolish and forgiven, if we love the Lord, but not fake about our love.

#### DESTINY OF UNBELIEVERS

[a] God is holy and cannot compromise with evil or sins.

- [b] The problem of sin was solved at the Cross and is available to all those who would believe.
- [c] Those who reject Christ are without hope and without God in the world.
- [d] We are born spiritually dead and are only regenerated through the ministry of the Holy Spirit.
- [e] The unbeliever spurns the offer and therefore chooses darkness rather than light. John 3.
- [f] The first stop for the unbeliever after death is hell, Hades, Gehenna or Sheol, a place of torment not because of fire but of deep regret and torture of the soul. The horror of hell is that the unbeliever as soon as he dies realizes what he has rejected and knows there is no escape. They have turned their back on light and now suffer darkness.
- [g] The second stop is the Great White throne. They are taken out of hell and go before the one they have rejected and are condemned to the Lake of Fire. The assurance of eternal life for us is on the word of the Lord Jesus Christ which is also the basis of the certainty of the fate of the unbeliever. However some will respond but many will reject.

You have to ask the question often as we go through church history, as to whether these people are Christians or not. What are they doing, what do they believe? Is what they did a Christian position? This is the tremendous tragedy within church history; you will read of many deluded people suffering needlessly, yet behind all the stories of foolishness that are known to us there are many more of glory that we will hear of in heaven. Remember **Matthew 7:13-23**.

#### THE CHURCH FORGIVES SINS

Shelley notes that the church started to believe that once a person died there was power in the person involved, power in the saint, who has died in a dramatic way. Cyprian in Carthage in North Africa said that some believed that due to the merits which the martyrs had gained, they had the ability to cover the sins of those who were still alive, and therefore you had the rise of the worshipping of martyred saints, and the slide to "indulgences" being sold later.

In addition by this time many churches had vested the power of forgiveness of sins with the bishops. You did not confess your sins as per 1 John 1:9, you came to the bishop who would apportion penance. At the end of say six months you can again take communion if you have lived a holy life and done what the bishop commanded over that period. We can see the argument that raged at this time, with some seeking easy forgiveness for betraying the faith, while others had died in the arena. Those whose relatives had suffered and died didn't want to share a pew with those who had betrayed their "faith" at the slightest test of suffering. They wanted them to pay, and while this is normal and human, is it biblical? What is the biblical basis for forgiveness? Case study = **1 Corinthians 5:1-13, 2 Corinthians 2:5-11**.

If the person became sick and was dying during this penance period, this caused a problem so the church brought in another sacrament called "Absolution" (Last Rites). You had to make sure that you did not commit any sin until you died and at the last moment you would have the last communion to get to heaven. Every orthodox believer who knows this medieval church dogma is in fear that they will not be able to get the last communion in time.

The worst church for this sort of non-biblical nonsense was that of North Africa, with such people as Augustine of Hippo and Tertullian up to their necks in this concept. It is of interest that the Lord allowed the whole North African church to be removed because they had lost their evangelical witness. Early in its history Rome was not nearly as bad as North Africa. Is the sweeping away of the African Church a judgment of God upon its faith and practice? Fruit bad = gone! John 15!

The apostate church said you get penance and indulgences so that you can buy your way back into God's favour. All this comes in when the early church got away from the centrality of God's Holy Word as their standard for truth. It is only fidelity to the Bible that will keep you in accordance with God's plan. Liberals will magnify this period saying that Christians did this or that, but we have to ask if they are Christians or not. Most who appear to be theological "nut bars" are deluded religious unbelievers, not brethren! There were many times when real Christians had to get out of the church due to these practices. Our real brethren may not be the ones we read of in many places.

#### DOCTRINE

##### **CHURCH GOVERNMENT**

1. There is no evidence in the scriptures for denominations.
2. Where denominations have formed there has been a tendency for apostasy and degeneration.
3. God the Holy Spirit has given at least one spiritual gift to all believers in the church.
4. The correct use of these gifts will cause the efficient function of the body of Christ (church). People should not be fill roles if they do not have the appropriate gift, or if they fail to meet the qualifications listed in Scripture.
5. Each local church should be independent, with its own leadership (pastor/elders), administration (deacons) and all other members functioning in their spiritual gifts.

#### PASTORS/ELDERS

1. Acts 20:17,28 shows that the elder/pastor/bishop/overseer are the same. Each word simply emphasizes a different role.
2. Greek words used of the pastoral role and responsibility:
  - a) Presbuteros (elder) - the authority in the church (cf. the elders were the wise judges who sat at the gates of ancient cities) (Acts 20:17)
  - b) Poimenos didaskalos (pastor-teacher) - the shepherd, to feed the flock and protect them (Jeremiah 3:15)
  - c) Episkopos (bishop/overseer) - the leader/overseer of the church (Acts 20:28, 1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:7)
  - d) Diakonos (servant/minister) - the servant in humility.
3. It is therefore concluded that an elder is a pastor holding the office of bishop, overseer or shepherd in the Church. They deal with spiritual matters within the church, shepherding, feeding and protecting the flock.
4. An elder should have the spiritual gift of Pastor/Teacher or Evangelist.
5. Function:
  - a) To rule (1 Timothy 3:4,5; 1 Timothy 5:17) - the pastor/elders in a church are the authority in the church, under God.
  - b) To guard the body of revealed truth from error and perversion (Titus 1:9).
  - c) To oversee the Church as a shepherd of his flock (Acts 20:28; John 21:16; Hebrews 13:17; 1 Peter 5:1-3).
  - d) Elders are given to the church by the Holy Spirit (Acts 20:28).
  - e) Great stress is laid upon their due appointment (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5)
  - f) At first they were ordained by an apostle. (Acts 14:23)
  - g) Later Church guidance was required in such appointments. (Titus 1:5; 1 Timothy 3:1-7)
6. Qualifications: (1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1)
  - a) blameless - you will be blamed for many things - make sure they are not true. You must deal with sin in your life.
  - b) be the husband of one wife or a one-woman man (ie faithful, not lusting after other women) - v 11 He may have been legitimately divorced according to scripture.
  - c) be vigilant - clear headed or cool
  - d) be sober - has self control
  - e) be of good behaviour - orderly and well co-ordinated, respectable
  - f) be hospitable - always ready to invite people into your home
  - g) be keen to teach - keen to share the Word of God with them.
  - h) not given to wine - he should not be addicted to alcohol.
  - i) not be a striker - he must not be a hot head
  - j) must not be greedy of filthy lucre - he must not be greedy for money
  - k) must not be a contentious arguer
  - l) must not be covetous
  - m) if married, his wife and children must be dignified and under control
  - n) not a new convert. Train candidates for ministry as deacons, in Sunday Schools and youth groups before appointing them
  - o) he must have a good witness to the unbelieving world.
7. The appointment of pastors is described in (1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11).
8. The gift of pastor-teacher is given to men only - it is not the role of the woman to teach or exercise authority over men in the church (1 Timothy 2:12, 1 Corinthians 14:34-35).
9. Pastoral authority is not a cause for boasting, it is based on service with all humility (John 13:5 -17 2 Corinthians 10:8, Galatians 6:3-5). The pastor's authority is to teach the Word of God so that all will see the truth clearly.
10. Age is not a barrier (1 Timothy 4:9-12).
11. If the pastor does not fulfill his responsibilities:
  - a) He is to be warned, then rebuked by the elders if he continues (Titus 2:15, 2 Corinthians 13:10, 2 Timothy 4:2).
  - b) The Lord will discipline him (1 Timothy 6:3-5, James 5:19-20).
12. The reward of the pastor - Hebrews 6:10, 1 Peter 5:4.
13. Key verses for the pastoral role - 1 Peter 5:4, Ephesians 3:7-13, 1 Timothy 2:24-26, 3:1-9, Colossians 1:23-29, Titus 1:6-9, 1 Thessalonians 2:19, 20, Hebrews 13:7, 17, 6:10.

## DEACONS

1. The Greek word (DIAKONOS or DIAKONEO) means "servant". The function of the deacons is to serve in the church so that the elders are free to deal with spiritual matters Acts 6:1-7
2. Deacons are the administrators of the Church, including such functions as secretary, treasurer.
3. A deacon should have the gift of administration, helps or service.
4. Qualifications: (1 Timothy 3)
  - a) be honest regarding money
  - b) be morally pure as they are dealing with people who have lost their husbands
  - c) be spiritual and walking with the Lord
  - d) be wise - full of doctrine
  - e) be endorsed by the eldership (the apostles laid their hands on them to give them authority)
  - f) be grave - they must be serious, mature and dignified
  - g) not be double tongued or two faced - what they say must be what they mean
  - h) not be given to wine, not a drinker who sits over his drinks. He does not need to be a tee totaller
  - i) not be greedy for money because the deacon is the person who deals with money
  - j) hold doctrine in purity, thus being a conservative as far as doctrine is concerned
  - k) have a pure conscience or a tender conscience, a person who feels sin deeply
  - l) be proved. He should be proved in other areas before he becomes a deacon- v 10
  - m) be a faithful worker in the church if he is to be considered as a deacon
  - n) be the husband of one wife or a one-woman man (ie faithful, not lusting after other women) - v 11 He may have been legitimately divorced according to scripture
  - o) if married, have a wife who was dignified, not a gossip, since the deacon may share sensitive matters with his wife.

## LECTURE 8 - THE APOLOGISTS AND THE INTELLECTUALS

### GIVING THE GOSPEL

After the ministry of the Lord and Pentecost Christianity spread throughout the Roman Empire and many who had been pagan philosophers became converts. Some of these people started to put the gospel into philosophical terms.

There is a great question mark over how successful/spiritual this is. The danger is that you might obscure the gospel and instead of it being the gospel of the saving grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and casting yourself at the foot of the Cross, you can approach from another angle and give a person a faith which is no faith at all.

**1 Corinthians 9:19-27** examines the question as to how far should we go to meet people in their own background and cultural situation? This passage gives testimony of the Apostle Paul's attitude and technique. Refer to the study of 1 Corinthians on the CD or website.

Paul was willing to change his style, his approach; he would change anything but the message. He was absolutely committed to saving souls whether they were Jews or Gentiles. He said that he had many different ways of giving the gospel but his attitude was always the same. He compares himself to a runner and a boxer. He is out there to win a prize. He is going for souls in the same manner as athletes go for gold. He has his body under control and is living a Christ controlled life, but like all professional athletes he fights by the rules – and that means the facts of the historic Christian faith – biblical teaching, Holy Spirit led. **Romans 8:9-15**.

### PHILOSOPHICAL METHOD IN ATHENS

He uses a philosophical method to win souls in **Acts 14:15-18, 17:16-34**, where he was speaking to Greek philosophers in the Athenian market place. These would be Epicureans and Stoics. The philosophers said that he was an idiot, a babbler. He was talking about the Cross and the Resurrection. He was then taken to the open air court at the Areopagus.

Here the philosophers would evaluate a new teaching to see if it was blasphemous, and if not, it was then allowed to be publicly debated in this forum. At this location in modern day Athens you have Acts 17 carved in stone. Paul is walking a careful line in Athens, as he remembers the death of Socrates for "atheism" 400 years before, condemned by this very court. He must appeal to them using their own accepted practice and belief, and bring them to see that their acknowledged inadequacy is the pointer to the fact that God must "step into history at some point", and HE has!

The Greeks did not know who God was and therefore to hedge their bets they had an altar to all gods including one to the "unknown god", in case they had forgotten one. Paul starts where they are with this altar, suggesting to them that they have recognized their lack of understanding in this matter by the fact that they have got such an altar.

Paul said to them that this "unknown God" was the God who made the world. He does not dwell in temples built with hands. People were bringing offerings all the time to pay off their gods in this day. God cannot be bribed or impressed by our efforts, said Paul. He does not need anything from me or you, He gives us all life and breath. God is the Creator of all nations and peoples and is in control of history.

Paul now quotes from two pagan poets. "In God we live and move and have our being" and "we are his offspring". He knows the pagan poetry having likely studied at the University of Tarsus. Even you pagans know this concept he implies. In the time of our ignorance God overlooked this but not now. Now all men everywhere are commanded to repent, as there is coming the day when God is going to judge the world in righteousness. This is what God is like and even the philosophers with their poetry had recognized that.

The Athenians had made some excellent works of art in the form of statues and they worshipped them as gods. Paul said that God did not want people to do that but to repent from their sin, to put aside the false practices and cast themselves on the living God. Who is the living God? The One who has stepped into his space-time universe in the person of Jesus Christ. Christ is the living God, as He has been certified true because of the resurrection.

At that point the whole meeting blew up but some said that they wanted to hear more but others laughed. There were however sufficient people at that meeting who were saved to form the nucleus of an Athenian church. Here Paul has used a philosophical method but has not compromised the message. He still emphasizes the person of Christ, the resurrection and the need to repent. Here the resurrection is stressed all the way, as proving that what was done on the Cross was successful, and that Jesus is truly the one he claimed to be.

Paul has not compromised the gospel but he has put it in an interesting way because he knew his audience. As a university graduate from Tarsus he has an audience of graduates from Athens and he communicates to them in the best way to reach that crowd, but without compromise to the message. The church in Athens dates its existence to that very day.

He meets them where they are, talks about God and says that we need not speculate any further about God as he has come in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ and this is proved by the resurrection. He got that far before the Epicureans exploded. If you know your audience it is possible to get in the gospel before they explode. There are however dangers here. The gospel is an offence to the unsaved "natural" and self satisfied person, and it always will be. Holy Spirit alone!

#### PRESENTING THE GOSPEL TODAY

Many people fall into error today as they put the gospel in such a way that it is no longer the gospel. Some people erroneously say that you have to update or "contextualize" the gospel. They say that the so called "golden rule" is now the gospel. This is the liberal False "gospel", which is not the true gospel at all. We must communicate, but what we communicate is what the hearer actually "hears and understands" – and it must be the saving faith, not liberal lies.

The gospel is, that God has come, stepped into the space-time creation and paid the penalty of sin, and that in Christ there is hope and life, there is power, purpose and possession. What also must be accepted is that man is a sinner, he must turn from his sin and repent and accept the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour. The gospel is good news. The bad news for the unbeliever is that it hits at the pride of man, as most unbelievers do not want to admit that they need a Saviour.

There is a danger in any philosophical approach, that the gospel is so watered down that everybody can accept it and can come to the erroneous conclusion that Buddhists, atheists, Moslems and Hindus are Christian, as they say also, 'to do unto others as you would have them do unto you'. Some of us have very loyal unbelieving friends who are lovely people, may believe in God, and apply the "golden rule", but the golden rule is not the gospel. The gospel has been changed if this fallacy is accepted so that you sing and even pray, on the way to hell. **James 2:19-20.**

Shelley in chapter 8, speaks of the religious theologians from Alexandria, who tried to put the gospel into philosophical terms, and most of the times they destroyed the gospel. We should not write off Clement and Origen of Alexandria as there is evidence that they were regenerated, but they are ponderously boring and legalistic. Their lives and written works show however what dangers there are in putting the gospel in a philosophical form, unless you are a genius like the Apostle Paul. There is a danger that the message of saving faith is lost. They have given mental assent to a group of propositions but their life is not changed. They try to out-philosopher the philosophers – we don't have to do this!

Shelley starts on page 84 with a quote from Jerome who translated the Greek into what becomes known as the Vulgate. Jerome, while he was a novice had a nightmare while he was fasting. He heard a voice say that he was not a follower of Christ but of Cicero. He loved the classics but this put pressure on him to consider whether he was so occupied with the classics that he was interpreting the Bible through literature rather than the other way around. He kept fasting and he destroyed his body and died young needlessly. He was religious – but I wonder about his genuine spiritual walk.

Who comes first in my life, Christ or one of the great authors of the past? Is the Scripture important or have I allowed my love for the classics/music/art/literature...etc, to push the gospel out of my life? This is the type of question that people who get to a high cultural and academic level have to ask themselves. What is the answer for you?

#### DO NOT COMPROMISE

As a pastor of a church you should be aware of this fact of Church history. You have to come to grips with all manner of people groups, dealing with their cultural background without compromising God's Word. The gospel approach which will lead to the salvation of the drunk in the gutter, will not necessarily be effective when speaking to the intellectual; but to both you must be sure you have given them the truth of "the gospel once delivered to the apostles", and not changed it, even though the words used to each may differ!

We are challenged as to how far the Christian should compromise with culture. The church needs to separate from the world yet penetrate the world. How far do we go to engage? In the second century we had Tertullian who was very strong against any accommodation of philosophy. Heresies, he shouted, are prompted by philosophy. "Valentinus was a Platonist, Marcion a Stoic. What do Athens and Jerusalem have in common? Away with all attempts to produce a mottled Christianity of Stoic, Platonic and dialectic composition. We have no need of curiosity reaching beyond Christ Jesus. Search that you may believe, then stop". That was his view. He is on the safe ground, but to reach the educated lost do we have to risk the things the Alexandrians did? The murder of Hypatia illustrates this.

The use of philosophy is dangerous, and yet it can be effective. Francis Schaeffer used it in the 1960s through to the 1990s to evangelize many hippies who went to his Swiss house and who would never have heard the words he said had they come in traditional form. However he was a genius and called by God to do this work. God's call is critical!

Origen set up a school in the third century and his pupil Clement and others there attacked the Gnostics from a philosophical basis. They were very effective, as Shelley notes but their results were theologically powerless, and false (page 92).

Another pupil was Gregory a great missionary worker who had the nickname the wonder worker, so these men and their works were not without "signs following". Many a proud young man entered the school and left with a lot of knowledge but, did they leave without the real gospel? Clearly many found faith and worked as evangelists, so the issue is not simple here!

Sometimes however those who talk about things in philosophical terms get so excited about what they are talking about they cease to see themselves as sinners, and they can magnify their own mental abilities rather than be dependent upon the Holy Spirit. It is not necessarily a problem of knowledge but of will, it is not a problem of knowing, but what you are applying in your life.

It is not a matter of living a good life, it is a matter of not being able to live a good life without the power of the Holy Spirit in you, and you cannot have the Holy Spirit in you until you come to your Saviour as a sinner, bowing before your God and dealing with your sinful nature. You need to be a disciple of Christ not of Origen, Clement, or Plato.

You need to magnify the gospel itself in the form of resurrection, repentance and the person and work of Jesus on the Cross and within you today. It is relationship with the real Jesus Christ we need.

**1 Corinthians 1:22-2:8** - when Paul left Athens he thought about his philosophical approach and decided not to do it the same way again. He is talking about here what he was talking about in Corinth after he left Athens. If you wish to take something philosophically you take Acts 17 very carefully as your guide but it is far better to forget that method as it can cause people to get the wrong idea.

People are saved by the work of the Holy Spirit on their life convicting of sin righteousness and judgment. **John 16:8-11**. This is so they will be convicted of their sins, and be on their knees before him.

#### DOCTRINES

#### PAUL – PRESSURE

1. SCRIPTURE - Acts, Epistles.

#### 2. BIOGRAPHY

Paul, whose name means "little", was born Saul ("asked for") in Tarsus, Cilicia (Acts 9:1 1; 21:39; 22:3). His family probably was fairly wealthy and influential as this was a requirement for Roman citizenship of foreigners (Acts 16:37). Jewish law required a boy to start studying the scriptures at five years of age, with him taking on the full obligation of the law at 13. Paul had a married sister (Acts 23:16), with whom he may have stayed during his studies in Jerusalem under Gamaliel (Acts 22:3). He was one of the chief persecutors of the early church and was responsible for the martyrdom of Stephen and the movement of Philip to Samaria. Converted on the road to Damascus, Paul, who is the greatest sinner who ever lived (1 Timothy 1:15) spent many years preparing himself for his ministry. He was unmarried (1 Corinthians

7:8) and was the apostle to the Gentiles. He was the last apostle. Famous for his four missionary journeys and responsible for the writing of much of the New Testament, Saul the persecutor became Paul the great believer. Paul was not a striking person to look upon, being reported as "a man of small stature with a bald head and crooked legs with eyebrows meeting, and nose somewhat hooked but full of friendliness". Paul eventually was imprisoned for a final time in Rome where he was beheaded by Nero in AD 67.

### 3. EVALUATION

Testing and pressure is seen throughout Paul's ministry:

- a) Persecuted in Damascus, he escaped in a basket (Acts 9:20-25).
- b) Driven out of Jerusalem and sent to Tarsus (Acts 9:28-30).
- c) He was stoned at Lystra and thought to have died (Acts 14:19).
- d) Paul whipped and imprisoned at Philippi (Acts 16:16-24).
- e) Paul received five Jewish and three Roman scourging (2 Corinthians 1 1:16-33).
- f) Disputed with Peter (Galatians 2:14).
- g) He was subject to a great tumult by Demetrius the silversmith (Acts 19:23-29).
- h) Seized by the Jews and beaten (Acts 21:27-32).
- i) Paul bound with chains (Acts 21:33).
- j) He was persecuted for his mission to the Gentiles (Acts 22:21-23).
- k) The Jews conspired to kill him (Acts 23:12-14).
- l) The high priest conspired to kill Paul (Acts 25:1-3).
- m) Paul is shipwrecked but all hands are saved (Acts 27:41-44).
- n) Paul is bitten on the hand by a viper in Malta but survives (Acts 28:1-6).
- o) He becomes a martyr in Rome by beheading.

### 4. PRINCIPLES

- a) Pressure can come from your closest colleagues (such as Peter), your family or countrymen (the Jews), religious or political leaders (the high priest) (Matthew 10:35,36).
- b) Pressure can be applied by circumstances (Psalm 46:1-5).
- c) We are in Satan's world. If we are effective we will be opposed (Ephesians 6:12).
- d) Religion is antagonistic to Christianity (Romans 3:27,28).
- e) You will be attacked if you downgrade people's idols, be they physical or mental (Judges 6:30).
- f) The Lord can divinely protect believers (Psalm 124:1-5).
- g) The purpose of testing or pressure is to build up faith and to keep down pride (Romans 5:3,4).
- h) There is inner happiness for those who are persecuted for the Lord's sake (Luke 6:22,23).
- i) All things work together for good to the believer (Romans 8:28).

## **LECTURE 9 – CONSTANTINE AND THE CHURCH – “THE MIXED MULTITUDE”**

### CHRISTIANITY TO CHRISTENDOM

Shelley Chapter 9 (“Laying Her Scepter Down” – or, was it infiltrating the spiritual with the political?)

The title here is related back to the Exodus generation where not only the Jews but those of mixed nationality came out. It was found that those of mixed nationality were the ones who caused the major problems. In a similar way it is the make believers who make trouble in the church. These are people who think that they are Christians but do not know truly the one they call their Lord. It is important for those in Christ to know Him who died for you. We must know His Word and how it works in our life by daily application. **Matthew 7:13-23, James 1:19-27 and 2:12-26** - by the fruit of your life you are truly known!

After many years of persecution in the second-third century the Christian church became not only “respectable”, but also the pathway to power and influence in the royal court, and so many people joined the church for reasons other than love for the Lord. Finally the Roman Emperor became a "Christian" and gave preference to Christians in the civil service. Many people therefore became members of the church for reasons of power and position. We therefore have the change from Christianity to what became known as Christendom.

In Australia and New Zealand we are part of Christendom, with less than 20% of adults regularly attending church, let alone a Bible believing church. There is no Christian nation on the earth today, and probably there has never been! What remains true however, is that the more born again Christians there are in a nation, the safer, stronger and the more positive will be that nation. In many Christian African nations we see that, where unemployment figures are such that total chaos and violence would be predicted by the economic theorists, yet there is peace and a positive attitude in the midst of poverty.

This is not explainable any other way than by the blessing of God through the believing church within that nation. This is the so called “salt principle”, from **Matthew 5:11-16**. The presence of believers is a living preservative in the heart of a

nation, and when the believers lose their hold on biblical truth that preserving function is lost, and with it the freedom of the whole nation. History is full of examples of this principle working out in time and place.

The U.S pretends to be a Christian nation, yet you will be jailed if you read the Bible aloud or pray in a US school. More than 40% of the nation in a recent census said that they were "born again" Christians. If that were true it would be almost heaven on earth. Similar census results in Zambia can be seen to be true, given the impact of genuine faith in that nation, but I doubt the USA Census results! It is possible that 38% of the 40% are going to hell with a Bible under their arm. In the presidential races in the U.S. it is often said that the person is a Bible believing Christian because without that facade the chances of election would be minimal. America today is the best nation that illustrates "Christendom".

#### THE CHURCH AND STATE

This raises a very important question for Christians; the relationship of church and state. From the days of Constantine the Great Christianity in the West was associated with the State. This is I believe, one of the worst disasters that happened to the mission of the church. People entered the church because they wanted power and not because of belief in Christ. They entered to serve the State and to advance themselves, not to serve the Lord and advance his kingdom.

**Matthew 22: 15 - 22** gives the attitude of the Lord to the State. He says that people must live by faith and not by power that man can give. Christians today cannot work by political power, nor is the Gospel advanced by political influence. Christianity is based on Christ, God's Word, and the Holy Spirit's power working through ordinary believers transformed into extra-ordinary servants of the living God. Those interested in political power will compromise themselves to keep it. The Lord said to His disciples to render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's.

Make it clear that you stand for God, holiness and righteousness. You pay your taxes, no matter what you think of the Emperor, and with his own land under occupation, and with corruption in the taxation system, whereby rich men added to the taxes to enrich themselves. Jesus still orders the disciples to pay the unjust and corrupt tax collectors who collected money on behalf of Rome, the occupation power. Recognize that government has a job and that the first authority for you is God not the State, but that you are to honor the government, no matter what you think of it.

In **Romans 13:1-14** Paul takes the principle and goes further. The government is the one that the Lord wants you to have at the moment. Obey it as far as is possible. Do good in the State - v 3, pay your taxes - v 6, give to Caesar those things that are Caesar's and love one another, and walk honestly - v 13, do not be a drunkard or a partygoer/libertine but set an example of holiness, righteousness and justice.

The limits for obedience to the State are set in **Acts 5:27-32**. The Christian attitude should be to assist and help the State as far as possible but keeping always in mind that God is the final authority.

#### POWER RATHER THAN CHRISTIANITY

In **1 Peter 2:9-17** we find Peter urging the disciples not to be found guilty of crime but be standing for righteousness. We should abstain from earthly lusts. We should be honest [v 12], they should see your good works [v12], you should submit to the rulers who govern [v13], be obedient to the judges in the courts [v14], you should remember that if you suffer you do so because of the gospel and not because you are a criminal. As far as possible believers should be obedient to the State but they were not to stop preaching the gospel.

**James 1:12-15** had given a warning in the first century that lust for power can spoil and destroy everything. By 312 AD people were joining the church for other reasons than saving faith. Many of the courtiers of Constantine joined the church as Bishops and priests. They were not interested in Christ but were interested in power. The official church with its bishops became the servant of the State after the time of Constantine, and this reached its evil fullness in medieval times where the office of Bishop was related to the political power structure of the time.

The Medieval "bishops" were not interested in God's Word and abused the common folk. They wielded swords and tax collecting schemes at the same time as they were waving crosses, and saw no contradiction in that because they did not know Christ. They wanted power and money and everything that money can buy, and they got it. They joined the church to utilize the power that the Roman Emperors and the later kings gave the church.

As it is only normally the writings of the top echelon that survive, you have the explanation why so many of the so called "Christian" writings that have survived from that period are not Christian writings but writings of power hungry men who were on top of the evil heap. Remember, if life becomes a rat race, it is for rats, and rats tend to win, at least as far as man is concerned! The winner of the rat race is always the biggest and most ruthlessly powerful rat!

God however still had His people, many of them Parish priests, and they serve all through the dark ages, and they were still there serving Christian flocks throughout the world into the Reformation period. There were believers but they did not tend to rise very high in the church. The written works that have survived therefore need to be checked against the Scriptures. The majority of the believers in the world were in the Roman Catholic or Orthodox Church up to the sixteenth century. The majority of the leaders were evil men, with some wonderful exceptions. The great miracle of the late Roman period and middle ages is that the church survived at all! Enough of the Lord's genuine people were there for the salt principle to apply within the by then very corrupt church structure.



Shelley chapter 9 contains many historical details that raise some questions related to this. It showed how the Christian church working in the world changed to Christendom with all the splendor of the Roman Empire's Court. These included the cardinals; the so called "princes of the church". We see that from about 280 AD the Roman Empire was falling apart with internal inflation and corruption and external barbarian invasion, and by that time all the thinking Romans were sure that the Empire was heading towards destruction. This of course did happen, but not for another 195 years, but the situation was ripe for a "deliverer" and he was a pagan, initially tolerant, but seeing in Christianity and its power structure of bishops a potential cause of the disunity of the Empire.

#### DIOCLETIAN AND GALERIUS

Diocletian became that pagan deliverer. The son of slaves from Dalmatia, he rose in the army by sheer ability and strength of character, and now took over the Empire, took it by the scruff of the neck and reorganized the Roman Empire. He was a "good ruler" in a political sense, but he hatred Christians.

This stabilized the political and economic situation. But inexplicably, two years before he resigned as Caesar in 302 AD, Diocletian started the most aggressively systematic persecution of the Christian church in the history of the Empire. He eliminated professing Christians in the army and imprisoned his own wife Prisca, and his daughter Valeria, who were Christians. More Christians died in this period than any other period in history. The Christians were given a chance to recant and become a pagan again, or were killed without mercy. [refer page 99-101.]

He ruled the empire from Nicomedia in Asia Minor and established three other courts, none of them in Rome. The movement of the Empire's power center east was further consolidated when the Eastern Empire based on Constantinople, and the Western Empire based on Rome or later Milan, were formed after Constantine.

At the time of this last and greatest of the persecutions the church had been at peace for nearly fifty years and large churches had been constructed. All the church buildings were ordered to be destroyed and put over to pagan worship. All the Empire was subject to persecution but it did vary a lot between provinces with the persecution in Britain being far less severe than elsewhere.

Diocletian was replaced by Galerius when he retired in 305, who was keener than ever to eliminate the Christians. However on his deathbed in 311 he realised that he had been unsuccessful and signed an edict of toleration and with it for all practical purposes the persecution of the Christians was at an end.

#### CONSTANTINE

When Galerius died there was a battle for control of the Empire, with Constantine advancing from Britain through Gaul, across the Alps to do battle with Maxentius, who was the ruler in the Western half of the Empire, by then based back in Rome. Constantine was a pagan who worshipped the sun and they met for battle at the Milvian bridge over the Tiber. Just before the battle Constantine turned to the God of the Christians after he saw in a dream a cross (Chi-Rho Sign) and the words, "In this sign you conquer". He got the army to take the pagan symbols off their shields and replace them with a cross. Constantine saw Christ initially as the manifestation of the pagan sun god.

There is evidence later on that he did become a genuine Christian, but this early vision experience was incomplete, however his obedience to the light he had received was a turning point for him and the Empire. His conversion is similar to Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel 1-4. It is very unlikely that he was converted prior to the battle of the Milvian Bridge. By 312 he favoured Christian ministers in government, he abolished crucifixion, and the gladiators fighting in the arenas.

In 321 he made Sunday a public holiday. He called it the day of the sun, and also instructed that the birth of Christ be celebrated on December 25<sup>th</sup>, the resurrection day of the sun god in the northern hemisphere. He tried to weld together the Christian and the pagan. The pagans used to get drunk at this time and fornicate. Many people right through to our day get drunk at Christmas and wake up a few days later with a headache.

We should not stop celebrating Christmas, just because of it's political and semi pagan origin as a festival, as it is a good opportunity to give the gospel to unbelievers, and does celebrate a real event. The Christmas service should be an evangelistic service with the death on the Cross, and empty tomb emphasized, rather than the baby in the manger alone. The incarnation gets it's meaning from the redemption and resurrection!

Constantine waited until the last couple of days of his life in 337, before he was baptized and never after that put on the royal purple, dying in his baptismal robes. He was a tough semi-pagan soldier emperor, but finally does apparently become a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Christian should be dedicated to a separated holy life and not to power and money. Constantine had said that the church was in the Empire, that he was the Emperor and that he would tell the church what to do. As a result the church became one of the bureaucracies in the State. His rule is a major turning point.

#### THE MIXED MULTITUDE

Shelley notes correctly that before Constantine's conversion, the church consisted of convinced believers ready to die for their faith, but afterwards it was used for political purposes, with a string on unbelievers joining for power, to be enriched by their faith. This intrusion diluted the church – and it went from servant-leadership to prosperity gospel overnight. When unbelievers become members of a church for prosperity the values and practices shift over time. It is therefore of the greatest importance that you do not enter into membership anyone who does not show the fruit of righteousness in their life. If there isn't fruit then their faith is phony. Sadly in the fourth century it was only a matter of time before the church was ruled by many of these unbelieving power players and they held the Emperor appointed titles as bishops.

From 355-363 “Julian the Apostate” tried to bring paganism back, and then in 380 the Emperor Theodosius made Christianity a matter of imperial command, "It is our will that all the peoples we rule shall practice that religion which the divine Peter transmitted to the Romans. We shall believe in the single deity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, under the concept of equal majesty and of the Holy Trinity. We command that those people who follow this rule shall embrace the name of Catholic Christians. The rest however whom we judge demented and insane, shall sustain the infamy of heretical dogmas, their meeting places shall not receive the name of churches, and they shall be smitten first by divine vengeance and secondly by the retribution of our own initiative, which we shall assume in accordance with divine judgment".

He took for granted the closeness of God's and his will. In 303 Diocletian is killing Christians and by 380 Theodosius is killing pagans and many great pagan philosophers would be murdered, to the shame of the gospel. Hypatia, 360-415.

The Lord told us to go into all of the world and preach the gospel, not to go out and kill all pagans who resist the truth. As a result of this action most pagans decided to come to church once a week, take the Sacraments and go out and live normal pagan lives. They had treated the pagan temples the same way before this, and so the “nod to god” practical religion becomes dominant – and it is powerless, religious, and ritualistic. The liberal Churches have perpetuated this concept and it has been going on for 1600 years. This is Satan's lie and it deadens the church here. There may be very few born again believers in some of these churches, but there will have been some, and at times they make a positive difference to the course of history.

The halos around the saints in the ancient paintings are based on the sun disc concept. It was paganism and illustrates just how thorough the pagan infiltration of the churches was. The devil was invited into the church and he made himself at home. God the Father was pictured as Zeus, Mary as Diana/Artemis/Athena with blond hair, and blue wrap, and Jesus was pictured as Apollo or Bacchus with all the symbols intact.

In the midst of this paganism entering the church there are some wonderful exceptions amongst the bishops, as well as many believers active for the Lord amongst the people. Some churchmen, including Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, stood against the Emperor's claim to rule the church and yet they also compromised much truth on the way. A crowd at the games at Thessalonika released a charioteer who had been imprisoned as a homosexual, and killed the governor who had imprisoned him. Theodosius then sent in the army and slaughtered 7,000 of the crowd. Ambrose said that the Emperor Theodosius had sinned as a Christian in doing this, which pagan Emperors had done without any censure, and called upon him to repent and to humble himself before God. He had called the Emperor a mere man subject to repentance.

Eventually after Ambrose had refused him communion the emperor repented in sackcloth and ashes outside Milan for a number of days standing barefoot in the snow. Ambrose was saying that unless the Emperor did what the bishop said he could not be forgiven or saved. He demanded he come to the church where the bishop would minister God's forgiveness to him. We therefore have the church fully preaching the concept that no one can be saved outside their organization. Faith in Christ is no longer enough, the bishop's approval was also required. What had started in the second century, with monarchical bishops reaches it's fullness in the fourth and fifth century.

In a hundred years the church has gone from a persecuted body of Christ, to an all powerful political system. They have come from a church where faith in Christ was enough, to one where the priests were wearing robes like the old pagan priests. The Bishops saw themselves as in an apostolic succession with the authority of God's holy Apostles, and only they were able to give forgiveness and open the channel of grace whereby men could be saved.

By the time of Martin Luther the rot had got so far that he had to get out of the church as a converted person in order to serve God. Organised religion has power, but it is a political force rather than a spiritual force. Sadly the satanic temptation to mankind of religion will prove to strong and the reformation churches will be equally powerless within years.

## **DOCTRINES**

### **CHRISTMAS TRADITIONS: PAGAN ORIGINS OF MANY**

1. The word 'Christmas' comes from the words 'Christ's Mass' or 'Mass of Christ'. The mass as a religious festival was being conducted prior to the First Advent and was not invented by the Roman Catholic Church. On Christmas Eve the Catholics celebrate a mass to the Virgin Mary (Jeremiah 44:17).
2. The Hindus also celebrate the queen of heaven with an unbloodied sacrifice,

3. The Spaniards went to Mexico to convert the natives and found that there was an existing celebration which involved bread. They stated that after certain rituals conducted by the priest, the bread was converted into the actual flesh of the god involved. This is paralleled by Catholic dogma on the bread of the host.
4. The Serbs serve roast pig in celebration of Boshitch whose name means Christmas, whilst the Saxons offered a boar in sacrifice to the sun on Christmas Day. We continue the tradition with roast pork and crackling!
5. Santa Claus appearing in the chimney derives from a Norse legend which showed the god appearing in the fire hearth, bringing luck to the home.  
The Scandinavians used to worship trees and when they became Christians they incorporated evergreen trees in their worship of Christmas.
6. The Yule Log was burnt in celebration of Thor, the god of thunder. Yule is the Chaldean name for infant or little child. Yule day - child's day, was used by the pagan Anglo-Saxons.
7. Mistletoe came from the Druids. They gave mistletoe as a charm to the people for reconciliation - kissing under the mistletoe, bringing good luck and sexual favor.
8. Evergreen trees. The Evergreen tree is an integral part of Christmas. These were employed in religious observances in a number of locations. (Deuteronomy 12:2; 1 Kings 14:23; 2 Kings 16:4; 2 Kings 17:10)
9. Images on the green tree (2 Chronicles 28:4; Isaiah 57:5; Jeremiah 2:20; Jeremiah 3:6; Jeremiah 13:3; Jeremiah 17:2; Ezekiel 6:13; Jeremiah 10).
10. The pagans worshipped the sun. We have the death of the sun on the winter solstice, the 22nd December, and its rebirth or resurrection three days later on the 25th December.
11. God's attitude to the worship of the sun (Ezekiel 8:7ff). The sun is the east. It is therefore rising. We worship God in the west. Candles at Christmas has its origin in the worship of the unconquered sun.
12. Gifts under the tree represent gifts to the god. After they have been offered to the god under the tree they are distributed to the worshipers.
13. Santa Claus (Father Christmas)

Santa Claus has been given a number of characteristics of God:

- a) He is all-knowing.
- b) He is everywhere.
- c) He is the judger of works.
- d) He answers prayer, requests given at his knee.
- e) The white hair of (Daniel 7:9 ) has been given to Santa Claus (Revelation 1:13).

(James 1:17) states that God is the Father of Lights and the giver of every perfect gift. Santa takes over this role as the giver of good gifts out of his limitless treasury.

It is a time when lying is legalized or encouraged. Satan is the father of lies (John 8:44).

It promotes covetousness (Colossians 3:5).

14. Hogmanay. Derived from the Chaldean 'Hog-Manai'. It means the feast of the Numberer. Meni, or Manai, is the moon divinity or the Moon God. The Saxons had the Man in the Moon as Manai. Worship of the moon is given in (2 Kings 23:5). The moon is to number the seasons in (Psalm 104:19). Hogmanay is therefore derived from the feast of the man in the moon, or the moon god.  
Jerome, commenting on (Isaiah 65:11), said that this ceremony took place on the last day of the month and the year.
15. The Christmas Goose. The favourite offering to Osiris was a goose. The goose could not be eaten except in the depth of winter.

### **BIRTH OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST**

The birth of the Lord Jesus Christ in Bethlehem "house of bread" in Judea probably in the autumn. The date of the birth of our Lord has been placed variously from 1 to 7 BC. Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria and Herod was king in Jerusalem. - Luke 2:2 Justin Martyr also stated this referring to taxation records which were still in existence in his time to confirm that Joseph and Mary were resident in Nazareth and went to Bethlehem for the census [Apol.i. 34,46]

Until the middle of the 19th century the only historical reference to Cyrenius as the Greeks called him or as he was known by the Romans P. Sulpicius Quirinus was to a period some 10 years after the death of Herod which caused the school of higher criticism to try and discredit the account in Luke. However the German Dr Zumpt proved that Cyrenius was twice the Governor of the province and that his first period dated from BC 4 when he succeeded Quintilius Varus.

Josephus tells us that Herod died in the 37th year of his reign. It is known that Herod was made king by the Romans in 40 BC during the consulship of Domitus Calvinus and Asinius Pollio thus his death was either in 4 or 3 BC.

Josephus also states that on the night that Herod ordered the execution of his sons, who he believed were plotting to overthrow him, there was an eclipse of the moon. It is also known that Herod died within days of their execution. Johnson in his "Eclipses Past and Future" states that there was a lunar eclipse observable at Jerusalem with a maximum effect at 2:34 am on 13<sup>th</sup> March BC 4 with the next one visible in that city being a full eclipse at 12:15 am on the 9th January BC 1. It is therefore seen that the year of Herod's death was 4 BC.

Josephus also tells that Archelaus remained for 7 days in seclusion after the death of Herod, and that whilst he was well received initially he had to call in the guard prior to his going to Jerusalem on 8th Nisan to celebrate Passover. It is therefore concluded that Herod died in the last two weeks of March 4 BC.

The Greek word for young child which described our Lord at the time of Herod's search for him indicates a child less than 18 months old but not a baby. It is clear from scriptural evidence that Jesus Christ was born in September / October and it would appear likely that this was either in the year 5 or 6 BC. The Lord Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judea to the Virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit. - Luke 2:7 Joseph demonstrated to be the legal though not natural father. - Matthew 1:16-20

**BAPTISMAL REGENERATION: DOES WATER BAPTISM SAVE YOU?**

1. SCRIPTURE Acts 2:38 - "Then Peter said unto them repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost"

2. Apparent Problem - Water baptism is necessary in salvation (i.e. baptismal regeneration).

3. Evaluation:

a) Salvation is by faith alone in Christ alone, without any human works or merit. Faith excludes merit - it is merely a decision to believe what is true. (Titus 3:5, Ephesians 2:8,9)

b) Repent is equivalent to faith. To repent (METANOEO) means to change one's mind - we once thought that our own works were good and worthy of salvation - we now know that we are sinners and need Jesus Christ as Saviour.

c) Baptism involves doing something, and therefore can be classed as works, if we rely upon it for salvation.

4. Grammar:

a) "Repent" - aorist active imperative, 2nd person plural - METANOEO  
aorist - point of time  
active - you do the repenting  
imperative - it's an order  
2nd person plural - you all  
Literal translation - you all have to repent at a point of time.

b) "be baptised" - BAPTIZO - aorist passive imperative 3rd person singular. This is an individual order that at a point of time you receive baptism. The imperative mood indicates water baptism not spirit baptism which is given at the point of salvation. Water baptism shows reliance on the Good Work of Christ and not our own good works; it is a work of faith, an expression of obedience.

c) The difference between the 2nd person plural active of REPENT and the 3rd person singular passive of BAPTISM forms a strong syntactical break in the Greek which shows that BAPTISM follows BELIEF but not at the same time.

d) An exactly parallel passage is 1 John 3:23 "And this is his commandment. That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ and love one another as he gave us commandment. "  
Believe - salvation  
Love one another - part of your Christian walk after salvation.

e) "for" - EIS - because of or upon  
Examples:

Matthew 3:11 I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance. Literal "I indeed baptize you with water because of repentance".  
 Matthew 12:41 "because of (EIS) repentance"  
 Romans 4:20 He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief but was strong in (EIS) "because of " faith.

5. Literal Translation of Acts 2:38

All of you repent and let every one of you be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ (EIS) because of the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

6. Conclusion: Faith in the work of Christ is necessary for salvation. Water baptism and other good works in the Christian walk are the result of salvation, not part of it. They express our on-going obedience to Him.

7. The Repentant Gangster: One of the thieves believed in Christ (Luke 23:42-43). All he could do was believe. He could not be baptized nor do any other good work, but he is assured of heaven through faith.

**LECTURE 10 - THE TRINITY DEBATE**

CHRIST IS BOTH GOD AND MAN

The Christian message depends on the truth that God became man. All the cults and heretical groups throughout history have tried to obscure the truth about the person and work of Christ. Unless Christ is both God and man you are on shaky ground as far as your salvation is concerned, for he must be the Mediator and the King and the Saviour. Without being equal with both parties He cannot be your mediator or your redeemer, and yet he is Creator God. **John 20:28-29.**

In the great commission in **Matthew 28:18-20** the Trinity is very clearly indicated, as we are told to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. This focuses on the fact of the equality of the three members of the Trinity. The modern groups such as Jehovah Witnesses, and Mormons have an inadequate view of Christ when we compare their teachings to the letters to the Colossians and Hebrews. It is almost as if the Lord has made belief in Him hard, especially for the arrogant "foot stamper" who says, "unless I understand it all I will not believe..." Humility is crucial!

Shelley in chapter 10 shows that while we are now theologically clear about the centrality of the doctrine of the Trinity and Hypostatic Union, it wasn't so clear in the early church. Fourth century Christians felt a nagging restlessness about the doctrine. Three in One, and One in Three, each identical, yet different? With such mysteries to disagree upon, it wasn't long before everybody was calling someone else a heretic.

One bishop described Constantinople as seething with discussion: "If in this city you ask anyone for change, he will discuss with you whether God the Son is begotten or not. If you ask about the quality of bread, you will receive the answer that God the Father is greater, God the Son is less. If you suggest that a bath is desirable you will be told that there was nothing before God the Son was created." Space-Time has no cognitive connection to Eternity-Infinity.

Everybody argued about theology and yet few were genuinely saved. The Unsaved argued about these doctrines over the ages and have even killed others over it. It is a terrible evil when believers argue with violence about theology. It should be remembered that Church History is not necessarily talking about Christians in history. Satan has infiltrated his people into the church all the way through and in some of the great debates there are more of Satan's people active than God's. Robust debate is fine, and we see it in Acts 15, but violence is a sign of the enemy's presence and if you study this period you have to praise God that the truth survived at all given the evil power-hungry politicians on all sides.

1 JOHN AND THE TRINITY

The only biblical way of discussing things is set out in the **first letter of John, 2: 8 - 11, 3: 11 - 24, 4 : 4 - 21.**

Arius was a church leader in Alexandria and was the first recognized leader who rejected the concept of the Trinity as such. He then interpreted all the Scriptures on the basis of his theology. He was very eloquent and was good at public relations. Early in his ministry he put his ideas into jingles and had everyone singing them. Paul however made it clear that spiritual things are spiritually discerned not marketed by populism – **1 Corinthians 2:14-16.** With these jingles all the unsaved and many of the saved population were behind Arius in his views about the Trinity and the person of Christ. He was a populist, but God isn't with the majority many times in biblical history. God's people are mainly in the minority.

We need to be humble as we look at this subject. We are creatures thinking about and using time-space limited words talking about our Creator. We are treading on holy ground and therefore need to tread carefully, for our thinking is limited to space and time concepts, and we are speaking of the nature of God, the creator of space and time. The views of Arius made sense to people because they were space-time limited. It made sense because it was not the truth.

Many people will tell you that the Trinity does not make sense, that they have only one God, but you have three. They are right in a way, for the concept of "Tri-unity" does not make sense to man as a creature. We however are talking

about God, as He has revealed Himself to us, and we are forced to sit with this doctrine, because this is how the Lord has explained things, and if it doesn't make sense we must just "sit with it" and see what it means for faith and life.

A person who wins a debate has not necessarily got the truth on their side. The result often depends on the wit and charm of the person who is debating. At this stage in church history there is much debating but little of the truth being spread around.

**1 John 2:8-11** John says the sign of the Christian is his love for the brethren. If there is hatred towards another brother or sister in Christ, even if they have error in their thinking, it shows that that person is out of line and is probably saying things that are false. **1 John 3:11ff** says the same thing. We should not be like Cain but like Abel. If we hate others we are a murderer. We know that the fruit of the Spirit is love and if there is hatred we at best are out of fellowship. 1 John 4:4 ff we have the love of God. When Christians disagree they should argue for the truth in love. In the fourth century these debates over the Trinity reached a climax. Love however was in very short supply with spirit filled believers being few and far between in places of power.

#### ARIUS

Around 318 AD Arius clashed with Bishop Alexander in Alexandria. Arius claimed that the Father alone was truly God, the Son being essentially different from the Father. He did not possess by nature or right anything of the divine qualities of immortality, sovereignty, perfect wisdom, goodness or purity. We have seen in Colossians that this is clearly wrong, and Arius didn't grasp the Hypostatic Union. All the divine attributes are predicated on Him.

Arius said that the Lord did not exist before He was created by the Father. The Father produced Him as a creature and the creator of the rest of creation. Arius allowed that the Son was called God by grace and favour and was sinless and unchangeable by practice, though not by nature. Note the "Category Mistake".

Moreover the son received enough information from the Father to reveal His plan for the world. Nevertheless by not allowing that Christ was God he undermined the Lord's standing as Saviour and Redeemer of mankind. If Christ is not God there is no salvation. On the basis of God's Word, are the Arians (Jehovah's Witnesses and most Mormons are in this place) true Christians? Are they unsaved, or were they truly saved, just confused?

The church came together in Nicea and debated this issue fully, and as a result compiled the Nicene Creed. It is a standard of orthodoxy of the church; it was Constantine's way of trying to end the debate in favor of the Trinitarian view.

#### THE NICENE CREED

The Nicene creed states that

"I 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 of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things are made; who, for us men and our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried; and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life; who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the Prophets. And I believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins; and I look to the resurrection of the dead, and life in the world to come. Amen."

This took a long time to reach this formula with each word debated over. This gave a level of orthodoxy. All but two bishops present signed the creed and these two along with Arius himself were banished. Constantine held a great banquet to celebrate the agreement with all the bishops, the emperor and the church sitting down to usher in the coming "happy days" of the Church of Christ.

After Nicea, however, first Constantine and then his successors stepped in again and again to banish this churchman or exile that one. Control of the Church's offices depended too often on the Emperor's favors. The court was overrun by the spokesman of some Christian party or other, each lobbying for support. Prayer had been replaced by fund-raising and lobbying and letter writing..... As a result the imperial power was forever ordering bishops into banishment, and almost always bringing them back again when some new group of ecclesiastical advisers got the upper hand in the palace. Here we have the Satanic to and fro. It was not long before a semi Arian group came up with a compromise position.

#### ATHANASIUS

Athanasius stood for the truth all throughout the controversy, and was the bishop of Alexandria after Alexander, and held the position for 50 years. He was banished five times for defending the deity of Christ irrespective of who was in power. Five times the heretics got in charge of the church and Athanasius was exiled, but five times he came back.

The Lord asks us to be true to the Word and this man is a mentor of this. Often the first attack will try and kill the doctrine but if that does not succeed they will come back and try and pervert it, or just water it down. Satan now comes in with a compromise. Compromise is nearly always evil as a half bad apple will always go bad and take any good apples with it to the compost heap. The semi Arians said that the Son was similar to the Father, then he was not the same. Athanasius said no, He is the same; He is identical to the Father.

The difference in the Greek is one or two letters but in those one or two letters is the essence of the deity of Christ. Edward Gibbon the unbelieving historian sneered at the church of this time saying that the people fought over a diphthong. That diphthong was the difference between a clear proclamation of salvation and/or damnation. At stake was the full deity and humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and with that his qualification to be Savior and Lord.

Shelley says that the result of the dispute could have been that Christianity would form a religion not unlike the pagan religions. If Christ is not unique you have simply another pagan religion. Do not discuss the Trinity with the unbeliever, discuss the Cross and the Empty Tomb. Unless they accept the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God they are on their way to hell. You are either in the faith once delivered to the apostles or you are in gross error and on the way to perdition.

We need to take Athanasius as our guide. He was true to the truth to the end of his life, placing biblical truth ahead of political influence, popularity, personal safety, or a settled and wealthy life.

In attempting to explain the doctrine of the Trinity Christians occasionally appeal to patterns of threeness in the world: yoke, white, and shell of an egg; the root, branch, and fruit of a tree; or water in its three forms of ice, liquid, and steam. These are all fascinating ideas, and under certain circumstances might be useful as illustrations of the Trinity. But they miss completely the personal element in the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. It is a mystery – space-time faces eternity!

The true foundation upon which the doctrine rests is God himself. It is God as he acted in history, revealing himself to Israel. It is God as he acted in history, entering our world as a Jewish carpenter Jesus, dying and rising again to save. It is God as he acted in history at Pentecost, descending as the Spirit to share life with Christian church.

The Arians were slowly beaten and the Trinity confirmed. Athanasius was able to come back for the fifth time, at age 75, and say that the Trinity doctrine was safe. We are commanded to stand for the truth - **Ephesians 6:10ff**. Athanasius was debating bishops and archbishops, people who were in the church but not in the truth of Christ. Learn from this great man of faith and do not deal with them in anger and bitterness; deal with them in the filling of the Holy Spirit.

#### OTHER GROUPS

The Goths were converted to Arian Christianity and they sacked Europe. The Goths did not appear to be born again believers as they sacked Rome. Spurgeon said that Christianity owed nothing to the Goths and when you look at the "fruit" of the Arian system it doesn't stack up. Every cult and ism hits the Arian error at some time or the other.

The Colossians were seen to be sons and daughters of Christ, even though they had got the person of Christ wrong. They accepted the guidance of the apostle Paul and corrected their error. The Goths may have been genuinely saved, but the "fruit" of their lives lacked evidence of this, whereas the Colossians were changed, and their fruit was holy and good.

The religious people of the day of the ministry of the Lord were told by him bluntly that they were the children of the devil. Jesus was not hesitant to call religious evil by it's name! **John 8:44-52, 58**.

Another group of Arians were the Nestorians, who preached another form of this false view of Christ. Belief in the fact that Jesus is God is critical in salvation. The reason the JW's knock on doors is because they are told that in order to be saved they have to believe and do works. When the organization says they are "in", only then they are in. A very good book on this topic as it plays out in the modern cultic groups is the late Walter Martin's book, "The Kingdom of the Cults".

Satan has always been able to get the numbers on his side. They believe him because that is easy. Do not expect the truth to be popular. If you follow the Lord expect the same answer as Pontius Pilate gave when he sneered, "what is truth".

#### DOCTRINES

##### TRINITY

1. There is one God. He has manifested Himself in three personalities. (2 Samuel 23:1-3, Isaiah 48:16, Isaiah 63:7-10, Matthew 28:19, Acts 2:33, 2 Corinthians 13:14)
2. The oneness of God refers to the unity or sameness of character. All three members of the Trinity are equal (Philippians 2:6, Deuteronomy 6:4, Acts 17:29, Romans 1:20, Colossians 2:9), although they have different functions/purposes in relation to man.

3. The three members are distinguished according to their function in the plan of salvation (1 Peter 1:2-3)
  - a) The Father - the authority, who planned our salvation (Isaiah 14:27, John 4:34, 5:17, 12:44, 1 Corinthians 8:6a, Ephesians 3:11)
  - b) The Son - the obedient son, who was born as a man, died for our sins, and rose from the dead. (John 4:34, 5:17, Hebrews 10:7)
  - c) The Holy Spirit - the ministering servant, who reveals the Son and sanctifies us. (John 16:8-11).
4. The Son is the only visible member of the Trinity (John 1:18, 6:46, 1 Timothy 6:16, 1 John 4:12). He was revealed in the Old Testament in Christophanies (e.g. the Angel of Jehovah) and became flesh in the New Testament (Exodus 3:14 cf. John 8:58; Psalm 10:16 cf. Revelation 11:15; Zechariah 14 cf. Revelation 19).
5. Evidences of the Trinity:
  - a) Affirmed by the use of the title Elohim (plural yet unity) in the Old Testament and the plural pronoun "us" in (Genesis 1:26, 3:22, 11:7).
  - b) The worship of God we have repeated three times "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God Almighty (Isaiah 6:3, Revelation 4).
  - c) The name (singular) of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit indicates Trinity (Matthew 28:19-20).
  - d) The Lord's Baptism - the Spirit descends, the Father speaks from heaven and the Son is baptized (Matthew 3).
6. Light is a good illustration of the Trinity (1 John 1:5). Light is one, but has three elements:
  - a) Father - actinic light - that part of light which is not seen or felt.
  - b) Son - luminiferous - that part of light which is both seen and felt.
  - c) Spirit - calorific - that part of light which is not seen but felt.

**THE TRINITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT**

1. The plurality of God is given by the plurality of the word ELOHIM which is not only a word of magnitude but also of number - Genesis 1, 3, 11
2. The Tetragrammaton JHWH also refers to three personalities in the Trinity - Numbers 6:24-27
3. The Father speaks of
  - a) The Son - Psalm 2:6,7,
  - b) The Holy Spirit - Isaiah 11:2
4. The worship of God we have repeated three times "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God almighty" - Isaiah 6:3, Revelation 4:8
5. The Lord Jesus Christ is revealed in the Old Testament - Exodus 3:14 cf. John 8:58; Psalm 10:16 cf. Revelation 11:15; Zechariah 14 cf. Revelation 19
6. The Lord Jesus Christ is noted as the angel of Jehovah - Genesis 16, 22, 33, Exodus 13, 14; Judges 6, 13. The angel of the Lord is the Lord Jesus Christ.
7. The Lord Jesus Christ is the visible and audible person of the Godhead - Genesis 3:8 cf. John 1:18 - Adam; Genesis 18 - Abraham; Genesis 32 - Jacob; Exodus 3 - Moses; Exodus 25, Leviticus 16 - Shekinah glory.

**LECTURE 11 - THE NATURE OF THE LORD – The “Hypostatic Union”.**

Read the following passages; **John 1:1-5, 14, 18, Hebrews 1:1-6**

**INTRODUCTION**

You have the possibility of error here also, and this subject is one that we don't want to be in error over. Whilst we have observed from Scripture there are many texts that show that the Lord Jesus Christ is God and equal to God the Father there is enough difficulty in the understanding of this doctrine to create problems. However there are texts that if they are taken out of context could indicate that he was not equal to God. In His humanity, He was born of the Virgin Mary.



Deity took on a unique human form in the Incarnation. This was a unique event and when we start to discuss unique events we soon run out of words to be precise, for we have nothing to compare this to; it happens once in the creation, once in history. Refer below to the doctrinal study of the HYPOSTATIC UNION – “Who is the Lord?”

Here we are stepping through a morass of potential heresy. Yet with as much precision as limited language allows, the person of Christ needs to be described, so that his full deity and his full humanity are not lost nor obscured, so that his saving person and work is kept intact. In this area we have the danger of proof texting. You may have one text that appears to prove your point. The danger is clear in this, for it is all of God's Word that needs to be brought to bear on the subject. One text out of its context may be twisted to mean all sorts of "wonderful" or diabolical things.

#### THE GOD MAN

In **Matthew 16:13-17, John 20:24-28, Romans 8:5-11**, the Lord makes the issue clear for us to see, especially in the last passage where he appears to Thomas who says, “My Lord and My God”. We need to believe in Him as the God man. We accept His perfect deity and his perfect humanity, two natures in one person, only then is he able to complete His perfect work on the Cross. He is only significant if He is who He claims to be and God must reveal this to us.

After Arius others came forward through the years, who all had ideas of the person of Christ which were almost right but not quite. The next group of people agreed that he is God, that he is man, but they moved into error, by trying to explain things that as mere mortals we cannot really explain or understand this side of eternity. In a Bible teaching ministry it is important that the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth is your standard and the little errors should be faced along with the big errors, but that you work and teach with humility in these matters, recognizing what you cannot know, while proclaiming what the apostles clearly taught. If there is something wrong you must correct them from God's Word in a spirit of love as you cannot afford to have an error on who He was.

The Imperial Age did not create the question of the Incarnation; they simply debated it. The mystery of the God-man was central to worship long before it became central to Christian thinking. "A deep instinct", J. S. Whale once told the undergraduates of Cambridge University, "has always told the Church that our safest eloquence concerning the mystery of Christ is in our praise. A living Church is a worshiping, singing Church; not a school of holding all the correct doctrines." You can be doctrinally correct but dead. It is best expressed when worship is right rather than debating is right. God does not need more theologians, he wants more who love and worship him! That being said, we must get this as biblically correct as we can!

The best expressions of what you are learning will probably be found in the hymn book. If you are teaching God's Word you have to tie in your hymns. If you are teaching your way systematically through God's Word you should be choosing your hymns well in advance. As you come up to different hymns in the hymn book, it will demonstrate different doctrines which you are trying to communicate. You should be able to give the hymns for the following week a week ahead so that worship in song reflects teaching of scripture.

If you are teaching in this way it will be the great hymns, which will reinforce the doctrines and principals being taught. When the people can leave the service humming a tune and singing correct doctrine you have achieved some of the object of feeding the flock. To “get it” and then “sing it” is the perfect combination.

#### THE CONTROVERSY

The Gnostics had come along early, saying that the Lord Jesus Christ was not really God, whilst others came along saying that He was not really man, whilst others said he was in between.

Up until the fourth and fifth centuries the people trying to defend the situation were not trying to describe the person of Christ because they recognized that they could not. The great strength of the early creeds was that they did not define it. You have the mystery of the Lord Jesus Christ left intact but defined in such a way that heresies could be identified.

Three men rose up in the church and concerned the church over the doctrine, the first Apollinarius, secondly Nestorius and the third Eutyches. These three false positions are described in Shelley on pages 117-123.

Apollinarius was a young friend of Athanasius and the pastor of Laodicea. He understandably reacted against the school of theology at Antioch. In his day there were two major seminaries, one at Antioch, the other at Alexandria. In the former they stressed the humanity of Christ whereas in the latter it was the deity that was prominent. He thought that they were so magnifying the humanity of Christ that they were missing out on the deity. He was right but then he erred by approaching the subject the wrong way without the balance required.

He approached the person of Christ psychologically, with human logic rather than identifying the uniqueness of the Incarnation. He said that in the incarnation the divine word, the logos displaced the soul of man creating a unity of nature between the Word/Logos and the incarnation. Humanity he felt was the sphere but not the instrumentality of salvation. He spoke of the “one enfleshed” nature of the divine word. Here he tried to explain how you could have two natures in one; something no human being can really do. It was God he said, using the human body. The body was his humanity he said, and the deity was his divine soul indwelling him.

This however undermines things as it means that He is not truly human as we are and by implication we do not have a high priest who can be troubled with our infirmities. If our Lord did not have a human soul He would not know how we felt. He had a human soul and a divine nature and it is a mystery how they came together but the Scriptures say that that is true. If the divine fully displaces the human nature, how can man be fully redeemed?

## NESTORIUS

Nestorius was a preacher at Antioch. He stressed the humanity of Christ and was made bishop of Constantinople in 428. He was a popular preacher. Around this time many were starting to call Mary the "mother of God". You cannot say that Mary is the "mother of God" said Nestorius, for Mary is the mother of the humanity of our Lord. He also was right in his concern, but also went too far.

Nestorius rejected a popular designation of Mary as the, "God-bearer, Mother of God". In rejecting the phrase, Nestorius made it appear that he held that Christ joined two persons. He did not deny the deity of Christ; but in emphasizing the reality and integrity of the Savior's humanity Nestorius pictured the relation between the two natures in terms of a moral "conjunction" or a merging of wills rather than that of an essential "union". Although he never divided Christ into "two sons, "Son of God and son of Mary", he refused to attribute to the divine nature the human acts and sufferings of the man Jesus.

Once he said, "I hold the natures apart but united in worship". He insisted that calling Mary "Mother of God" was tantamount to declaring that the divine nature could be born of a woman, or that God could be three days old.

He said the right thing but in doing so with too much precision that isn't possible in such a subject he went too far. Every preacher who preaches anything for any length of time will make mistakes like this. Sadly his important statement about Mary not being the mother of God was lost in the battles that followed.

He was condemned more from a political than a doctrinal viewpoint. There was a lot of political intrigue in the court. He played a lot of politics himself, which he should not have, and he was outplayed by a more devious cleric. When Cyril the Patriarch of Alexandria expelled some of the clergy they went to Constantinople and were welcomed by Nestorius. Rather than being a teacher of God's Word he started meddling in politics. He fell out not only with Cyril but Celestine the Bishop of Rome who also disciplined clerics who were then welcomed by him in Constantinople.

His attitude and actions were criticized, and the view of "Mary Mother of God", became accepted as a doctrine at the council of Ephesus, which was riddled with power politics. It was said to be one of the most repulsive contests in Church history. Many people destroy their ministries today because they go too far and a study of this council illustrates this.

Followers of Nestorius formed churches which are still prominent in Syria, Ethiopia and Egypt. They sent out missionaries and went to both India and China. There are still remnant churches in India. The churches in China flourished until the Moslem murdering conqueror Tamerlane destroyed them in 1380.

Eutyches was the proponent of Monophysitism, the emphasis on the one nature of Christ. He combined the two natures of Christ so closely that one was absorbed by the other. It is important to distinguish between the humanity and deity of Christ to recognize that there are two natures of Christ. The Lord kept the distinction between His humanity and deity throughout his ministry and Eutyches tried to say that it was combined.

In a matter of 125 years from Nicaea to counter the Arian problem in 325 through the council of Constantinople where it was agreed that Christ was fully human, through Ephesus in 431 where Christ was stated as being a unified person we come to the Council of Chalcedon in 451 where the hypostatic union was fully developed. Christ is both human and divine in one person with two natures. This is the final form of the doctrine of Christology. What we know today as orthodox doctrine dates itself from the council of Chalcedon.

**Shelley quote page 122 (4<sup>th</sup> Ed).**

## DOCTRINES

### CHRIST: DEITY

1. Jesus Christ is both God and man. The two natures are inseparably united without mixture or loss of separate identity, the union being personal and eternal. (Philippians 2:5-11, John 1:1-14, Romans 1:4, Romans 9:5, 1 Timothy 3:16)
2. Jesus Christ is undiminished deity. This includes all the divine characteristics:
  - a) Sovereignty (Genesis 1, Revelation 1:5, 6,17:14,19:16)
  - b) Eternal Life (Isaiah 9:6, Micah 5:2, John 1:1-2, 8:58, Colossians 1:16-17, Ephesians 1:4, Revelation 1:8)
  - c) Holiness (Luke 1:35, Acts 3:14, Hebrews 7:26)
  - d) Love (John 13:1, 34, 1 John 3:16)

- e) Unchangeable (Hebrews 13:8)
- f) All Knowing (Matthew 9:4, John 2:25, John 18:4, 1 Corinthians 4:5, Colossians 2:3, Revelation 2:23)
- g) All Powerful (Matthew 24:30, 28:18, 1 Corinthians 15:28, Philippians 3:2 1, Hebrews 1:3, Revelation 1:8)
- h) Everywhere (Matthew 28:20, Ephesians 1:23, Colossians 1:27)
- i) Truth (John 14:6, Revelation 3:7)

3. Christ is the Son of God, equal with the Father and the Holy Spirit (Matthew 28:19, 2 Corinthians 13:14, 1 Peter 1:2)

4. Proofs of the deity of Christ:

- a) He is the Creator of all. (John 1:3,10, Colossians 1:16, Hebrews 1:10)
- b) He is the Preserver of all things. (Colossians 1:17, Hebrews 1:3)
- c) He pardons sin. (Luke 5:21,24)
- d) He raises the dead. (John 5:21,28-29, 11:42-43)
- e) He will reward the saints. (2 Corinthians 5:10)
- f) He will judge the world in the Last Day. (John 5:22)
- g) He receives worship (Hebrews 1:6)

5. Jesus Christ is so identified with the Divine plan as to be God. (Psalm 22:1-6, Psalm 40, Psalm 110)

6. The Christophony of Christ indicates his pre-existence therefore His eternity.

- a) Angel of Jehovah identified as Jehovah. (Genesis 16:7-13, 22:11-18, 31:11-13, 48:15-16, Exodus 3 with Acts 7:30-35, Exodus 13:21, 14:19, Judges 6:11-23, 13:9-20)
- b) Angel of Jehovah distinguished from Jehovah. (Genesis 24:7, 24:40, Exodus 23:20, 32:34, 1 Chronicles 21:15-18, Isaiah 63:9, Zechariah 1:12, 13)
- c) Angel of Jehovah is Second Person of Trinity, visible God. After his birth the Angel of Jehovah no longer appears. (John 1:18, 6:46, 1 Timothy 6:15, 16, 1 John 4:12)

7. Jesus Christ is Jehovah.

- a) Jesus is God. (Isaiah 9:6; John 1:1; John 20:28; 2 Peter 1:1; Titus 2:13). Jehovah is God. (Jeremiah 32:18; Isaiah 43:10; Isaiah 45:22; Philippians 2:10).
- b) Jesus is I AM (John 8:24; 8:58; 13:19; 18:5). Jehovah is I AM (Isaiah 43:10; Exodus 3:13-14; Deuteronomy 32:39).
- c) Jesus is the First and the Last (Revelation 1:17; 2:8; 22:13). Jehovah is the First and the Last (Isaiah 44:6; 48:12; 41:4).
- d) Jesus is the Rock (1 Corinthians 10:4; Isaiah 8:14; 1 Peter 2:6; Matthew 16:18). Jehovah is the Rock (Exodus 17:6; Isaiah 17:10; 2 Samuel 22:32; Deuteronomy 32:4).
- e) Jesus is Saviour (Acts 2:21; 4:12; Romans 10:9; Jude 25). Jehovah is Saviour (Psalm 106:21; Hosea 13:4; Isaiah 45:21; 43:3,11).
- f) Jesus is Lord of lords (Revelation 17:14; Revelation 19:16; 1 Timothy 6:14-16). Jehovah is Lord of lords (Psalm 136:1-3; Deuteronomy 10:17).
- g) Jesus is Creator (John 1:3; Colossians 1:15-17; Hebrews 1:10). Jehovah is Creator (Job 33:4; Isaiah 40:28; Genesis 1:1).
- h) Jesus is Light (John 8:12; John 1:9; Luke 2:32). Jehovah is Light (Micah 7-8; Isaiah 60:20; Psalm 27:1).
- i) Jesus is Judge (2 Timothy 4:1; 2 Corinthians 5:10; Romans 14:10). Jehovah is Judge (Genesis 18:25; Joel 3:12).
- j) It is quite clear that Jesus is God (1 John 5:5).

8. Jesus lived on earth in total dependence upon God the Father. He never used His own divine attributes in contradiction to the will of the Father. (Matthew 4:1-11, 27:42-43)

9. At the birth of Christ no change occurred in the deity of Jesus Christ. During His earthly life, some attributes were unused but they were never deleted or destroyed. To remove any attribute from His deity would be to destroy deity.

## EVANGELICAL BIBLE COLLEGE OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

10. Jesus Christ is true humanity. This includes attributes such as thirst, hunger, weariness. (John 19:28)
11. Jesus Christ had a body, soul and spirit, but no old sin nature. He did not receive an old sin nature because of the virgin birth.
12. God became flesh, it is not a case of God merely possessing humanity.

## HYPOSTATIC UNION OF CHRIST

1. Hypostasis means standing together under one essence, two things united under one with no loss or transfer to the other and no change to either.  
In the person of Jesus Christ the two natures, divine and human, were inseparably linked with no loss or transfer of properties or attributes, and no mixture or loss of separate identity the union was personal and eternal.  
The Lord Jesus Christ is still perfectly human and divine
2. See Isaiah 7:14, Isaiah 9:6, John 1:1-14, Romans 1:2-5, Romans 9:5, Philippians 2:5-11, 1 Timothy 3:16, Hebrews 1:4
3. The incarnate person of the Lord Jesus Christ included undiminished deity; He remained co equal and co eternal with the father while on earth. As a baby in the cradle he was holding the universe together.
4. The Lord Jesus Christ was also true humanity; body, soul and spirit although due to the virgin birth he had no old sin nature (1 Peter 2:22).
5. The two natures were united without transfer of attributes; the Essence of Deity and humanity were unchanged.
6. No aspect of the divine nature was lacking, although certain attributes were not exercised in line with the Father's plan (Matthew 4:1-10).
7. The union was personal and hypostatic; one essence with two natures.
8. Deity did not indwell humanity or possess it. The union was more than sympathy and harmony, it was unique combining the two natures eternally.
9. Christ had two natures in one person, therefore he could be supremely powerful yet weak at the same time.
  - a) Deity cannot be tempted, humanity can (Matthew 4:1-10).
  - b) Deity cannot thirst, humanity can (John 19:28).
  - c) Deity is omniscient, humanity learns (Luke 2:40,52).
10. The necessity of the humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ is seen in the following:-
  - a) To be our Saviour he had to be man as God cannot die (Hebrews 2:14,15, Philippians 2:7,8).
  - b) To be our mediator He had to be equal with both God and man (Job 9:2, 32-33, 1 Timothy 2:5-6).
  - c) To be our High Priest He must be a man (Hebrews 7:4,5 14-28; 10:5, 10-14).
  - d) To be a king he must be a man, a Jew in the line of David (Psalm 89:20-37, 2 Samuel 7:8-16).
11. There are three categories of sayings or actions of the Lord:
  - a) From his deity alone - John 8:58
  - b) From his humanity alone - John 19:28
  - c) From his hypostatic union - John 11:25,26
12. The uniqueness of the person of the Lord Jesus Christ is a key doctrine to understand for all believers, for it is on this point that the accurate preaching of the gospel rests (1 Timothy 3:16).
13. The gospel in one word is Immanuel - God with us. John's testimony on this point - John 1:14. In Christ we see God's love and favour towards man. As God revealed himself in the Old Testament, so He perfectly reveals himself in the person of the unique person of the universe, the God man the Lord Jesus Christ.

## CHRIST THE FIRSTBORN

1. He is the firstborn of all Creation (Colossians 1:15, John 1:18, 1 John 4:12).
2. He is called the firstborn of Mary. As such he is the elder of the household and as He is descended from David through both of His genealogies he inherits the kingdom of David. Through Mary He has his title as Messiah (Matthew 1:25, Luke 2:7).

3. The Lord is the firstborn of the Royal Family of God (Romans 8:29).
4. He is the firstborn in resurrection, He is the first to be raised from the dead (Colossians 1:18, Hebrews 1:5,6).
5. He is the first fruits of resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:20-23).
6. The church is called the assembly of the firstborn (Hebrews 12:23).

## **LECTURE 12 - MONASTICISM**

### INTRODUCTION

Martin Luther said that if anyone was to be saved by monkery it would have been him, but he wasn't, and he knew it deep within. He did all he could as a monk and he knew he stood in danger of hell and his life was a living hell every day. Most Protestants have looked at monasticism through Martin Luther's assessment and while this is legitimate, it is also inadequate. We must look at the monks in the earlier centuries, not just the last corrupt years of monasticism, and test the movement on the basis of Scripture, in terms of the days each generation lived within.

The monastery developed out of a historic situation and must therefore be judged accordingly, and as we will see it is not as simple as Friar Martin argues by 1500. By Luther's day the monasteries had been around for 1000 years, and they are a mixed bag; some good and some bad, but God used them through this millennial period.

Some of the monks/nuns were great men/women of God, and some kept the truth alive when bishops and kings were pagan. Many of the great evangelists of the dark ages were monks and they took the gospel to places where it had never been taken before. However some are better known for their alcoholic drinks than their spiritual life like the Benedictines, but even there many of that group were great Christians through very dark days.

### PRINCIPLES OF THE MONASTIC SYSTEM

The three principles on which the monastic system was founded were – (all of which we believe to be false)

- [a] That celibacy is a greater and more noble state than marriage.
- [b] That asceticism is the way to perfection in the spiritual life – to have the spirit dominate the body.
- [c] That Satan is defeated in the body by affliction and punishing your body.

**1 Corinthians 7-9** shows the Biblical view on nearly all these things. Paul is saying here that he is celibate and that it gives him more opportunity to work for the Lord. However if you are married you have responsibility to your marriage partner and not deny them time, commitment and sexual relationship.

It is possible to put this type of activity aside for prayer and fasting for a short time but then come back together again. Many people are tempted in this area because their partners are disobedient. If you come in too tired for too long you are defrauding your partner and sinning. So Paul's point is that whether you are married or single is not a spiritual issue, it is living "as you are called", meeting your responsibilities there; that is the issue.

He speaks this "by permission" and not commandment, as he cannot command people to be married but if you are, he says, these are the rules for life. Paul says that he wishes all were celibate, as it would allow one to be more effective without the impediment of a partner, family and the time commitment that these involve. Paul's statement, "It is better to marry than to burn" is often quoted. Paul is simply saying here, that if you have normal sexual desires you have not got the gift of celibacy and should be married and in a regular sexual relationship there.

Paul was clear, asceticism and celibacy were options, but not superior. OCD is not spirituality! God will provide a partner for you if you ought to be married. Paul was not tempted sexually as he had at this time the gift of celibacy, so it was not an issue for him. However to be a rabbi at the time of Paul you had to be married and as Paul was called a Rabbi it is concluded that earlier on he may have been married. However his wife was certainly not there at the time of his ministry. Early church historians speculated that she had died; we simply do not know.

This passage in Corinthians shows that celibacy is not higher than marriage. If you have the normal sexual urges and have to beat yourself with a rod to control it, or castrate yourself like Augustine of Hippo did, then there is something wrong. If you study the monks you find that they were beating themselves in order to reduce their sexual urges, which biblically is a sign that they ought not to have been celibate. Keep thinking here. **1 Corinthians 7:20-24**.

Some of the monks were also anti women, degrading God's creation, as if women were just sources of temptation. This is a very good indication that they were in rebellion to the will and plan of God. If you have sexual desires you are normal and should be married in conformity with the Lord's will to the person who the Lord has provided for you. If you

have to beat your bodies into submission this also is wrong, and not glorifying to God. Asceticism is not the path to spirituality, following the will of God and the leading of the Holy Spirit is. Some are celibate some are not....

**Philippians 4:11-13** gives the answer to the third situation. The concept that you have to be in poverty to be spiritual is shown to be a fallacy by this passage. We do not have to starve ourselves or beat ourselves at the slightest provocation. We follow the teaching of the Lord's and the Apostles. In this passage Paul says that everybody should be content in any situation he finds himself in. You do not have to live like Mother Theresa to be a model Christian. The obedient millionaire who uses their money biblically may be as, or more spiritual, than Mother Theresa was.

#### OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

We as Christians should be occupied with Christ, serving Him. The physical details of life should not be an issue with you. In regards to fasting and other rituals practiced, people can set things aside for a short time but it will not need to be their normal daily practice. They are voluntary not commanded, to assist with focused prayer, not to declare you more spiritual!

In regards to all property in common we have **Acts 2:44-47** where this occurred, but only partially, for all had homes, as the church met in them. However by Acts 11 churches throughout the world had to bail out the Christians in Jerusalem. It was right for them to do what they did in Acts 2 because there were a lot of problems at that time but by Acts 11 the situation had changed. It is therefore seen that it is not bona fide for all the churches or Christian communities to act in that way. It is not required for all Christians to sell all that they have and give to the poor, for then they become poor and others have to help them.

If you have a family you need to be responsible and not be reliant on the charity of others. As a married person your opportunities for service for the Lord are restricted. If you rent a house you could be at the mercy of unbelievers, but just as possible is that you may be at the mercy of the banks if you buy a house by mortgage; neither is "spiritual", neither is carnal, they are simply details of life that the Lord can guide you in decisions over. There can be a situation where you are converted, you read about the rich young ruler, you sell what you have and give it away to the poor and are soon in a position where you are looking for charity. What was said to the rich young ruler was said to the rich young ruler and not to all Christians in common. Heed the Holy Spirit, not an enthusiastic preacher.

You should protect the young Christian from taking these texts out of their context. They may have a car and a house, and they should keep them until the Lord directs otherwise. Once they are converted those material things which the Lord has seen fit to give to the believer are the Lord's and should be used to enhance the performance of the believer as an ambassador for Christ. Here we have no continuing city. **Hebrews 13:12-17**.

Monasticism does not stand up very well Scripturally. What is the command of God for us? – We are to grow in the knowledge and love of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are to abide in Him and obey His Word in everything but not to take commands given to others and apply it to ourselves in an inappropriate way.

In **Ephesians 6:10-18** we are told to put on the whole armor of God that we should resist the devil **everywhere**, not just in our monastic cell. The enemies we fight are spiritual not physical. You deal with sin in your life and abide in Christ.

#### ASCETICISM

The monks acted very like modern Hare Krishna's, chanting the name of Jesus over and over again. The Lord told us however not to expect to be heard because of our repetitiveness. Much of monasticism was taking the Christian life and living it in **their own strength often in a paganistic way rather than allowing the Holy Spirit control of their life**. You resist the devil by dealing with sin in your life not by beating yourself with rods, chanting, or starving yourself to death.

Many went to the desert to "fight Satan" in the desert. The tragedy was that those who were Christians left the cities where the people were and became hermits. They therefore failed to witness to the prostitutes and tax collectors. Wherever you are, be content in Christ Jesus, be guided by the Word in the power of the Spirit, and witness for Christ Jesus. Having said this, some of the monks were able to preach to the people, who were drawn to them because of their asceticism! Once again we are reminded that the Lord can use even those who may have entered monasticism for the wrong reasons, as long as their heart is right towards him.

Naturally, these conflicting views of the place of monasticism in the church have led to conflicting interpretations of the history of the movement. Everyone agrees that the monks were ascetics. They renounced the comforts of society and sought the spiritual rewards of self-discipline. Their theory held that renunciation of the body frees the soul to commune with God.

The key question is, how does renunciation relate to the gospel? Is it a form of self-salvation? Is it a works righteousness, an atonement for sin based upon denial of the self? Or is it a legitimate form, or private expression of repentance, an essential preparation for joy in the good news of God's salvation for these particular people?

Much of monasticism was a works based system; it was a person trying to do great things for God in his own strength rather than trusting in the strength of the Spirit through the ministry of God's Word. Many of the monks and nuns were

dealing with the sin problem in a physical sense rather than in a spiritual way, yet when we study the history of the movement we find great men and women of God serving him in the beauty of holiness. So once again, we see, simple conclusions about a whole movement are never completely true.

How does the body relate to the soul? If God's Word enlivens your spirit, your spirit controls your body because the Spirit in you controls your Old Sin Nature. You need to be occupied with Christ and filled with His Word, thinking, speaking and breathing spiritual things.

Soon other Christians sang the praises of self-denial, especially of celibacy-the renunciation of marriage. Once it was introduced, the practice of penance encouraged acts of exceptional virtue as a means of removing sin. Scripture is clear on this matter; acts of penance do not remove sin, confession removes the penalty of sin. Some of the things that we now see in the Roman Catholic Church are seen emerging at this time when monasticism emerges.

#### CHURCH FATHERS

A lot of early church fathers were hooked on asceticism; men such as Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian admired the monks. They are held up as great leaders, but we would not cross the road to listen to these people. These people came out of a time of great persecution and also great lasciviousness in the church. The church was becoming a recognized religion and all sorts of non-believers were being drawn to it. Many non Christians had come into the church and had brought in paganism with them and these men were therefore reacting to the false standards in the church. They saw monasticism as a higher level of sanctity, and if you look at their days you can see why they rebelled against the worldliness of the church.

But going into such a monastic system is not necessarily the right answer, because you are supposed to be a light so that other people can see the Lord Jesus Christ through you. Where the Lord has called you to serve you should serve him there, and do not remove yourself from the world.

Anthony, the first monk, was born in 250 and gave away all his worldly goods and he lived in a grave. He did not eat what most thought of as proper food, but he was healthy and died at the age of 105. He was always fighting what he believed were temptations from devils, demons and women. He took the command to the rich young ruler to himself. If all the church had done that the church would have had nowhere to meet. He would periodically come out of his tomb, preach the gospel and people would be saved, so once again even though he was wrong, he was also right with God and there was fruit in his ministry.

Another hermit was Simeon Stylites who lived initially in a cave but being troubled by people he resorted to living on a pillar top for some thirty years. He preached from the pillar and many were saved. He was fed by food in a basket.

The monks moved from the hermit situation to the community life in the fourth to fifth century. Pachomius in Egypt, a converted soldier called for a common life - "koinos bios". He had strict discipline making the monastery like a military camp, but a Christian camp. You were expected to wear a uniform and rise when the bugle blew at 3am in the morning. They then had four hours of Bible study before dawn, before singing and eating. They would then physically work all day. This had a great effect on a world that was becoming "soft". If you are a "real Christian" = "Really tough" = a monk.....

Basil took this idea into the Eastern Empire. He died in 379, he had a very strict rule of discipline and formed the rules for the eastern orthodox monks. The heroes of the church were those who had died in the arena for their faith and the following generation saw the battles in the wilderness of these monks as their present ground for heroism. However these great "pastors" should have been leading/serving a church rather than entering a secluded monastery.

Many of the monasteries however became the centre of education and evangelism. The Celtic monasteries founded under the Basil type rule were the centres of evangelism for Ireland, England and much of Germany. Their very toughness prepared them for missionary endeavors on the wild frontiers of the empire.

These people often had to battle tremendous evil. One of them walked into the grove of Odin chopped down the sacred tree and standing on the stump preached the gospel and converted the pagan Germans to Christ. These early monks were blessed by God because they loved the Lord and desired only to serve him. They may have been wrong in their interpretation of the Bible, but their ministries demonstrate that what God demands is our obedience and love, not necessarily 100% doctrinal correctness. It is not as simple a topic as it appeared. They rebuke us!

Shelley – chapter 12 – pages 125-132] - Benedict of Nursia - read passage page 131.

#### DOCTRINES

##### CELIBACY

1. Celibacy is not ordered in the Bible. It is recommended under certain circumstances and then only for those who can bear it.

a) To devote one's life completely to God's service (Matthew 19:11, 12; 1 Corinthians 7:32 - 35). This is a spiritual gift (1 Corinthians 7:7).

b) In times of persecutions or impending persecutions (1 Corinthians 7:26) it is better to:

i) stay unmarried (1 Corinthians 7:28b, 32a, 38; Revelation 14:4)

ii) postpone an intended marriage (1 Corinthians 7:37,38).

2. Because marriage is a holy institution ordered by God, celibacy is not a holier state of life than being married (Genesis 2:24; Matthew 19:4-6).

3. To forbid marriage is warned against as being a sign of apostasy (1 Timothy 4:3). This results from the pagan view that the physical life is of a lower order. Asceticism is not scriptural (Colossians 2:23).

4. Forced celibacy leads to debauchery (1 Corinthians 7:9).

### RICH YOUNG RULER

1. The Rich Young Ruler shows a noble attempting to gain the favour of God by keeping the law.

2. General Scripture Matthew 19:16-22

3. Evaluation:

v 16 Good Master he says - notice the Rich Young Ruler does not call Jesus Lord.  
What good things can I do to inherit eternal life - notice the emphasis on self.

In v 17 Jesus shows that one can only be saved by keeping the requirements of the Law, and mentions a number of the commandments - (Numbers 6, 7, 8 & 9), including loving his neighbour as himself (Leviticus 19:18).

In v 21 Jesus says to him, "If you will be perfect sell what you have and give to the poor.  
But the rich young ruler is not willing to do this.

4. Principle: -

People are not saved by selling possessions and giving them to the poor. Jesus is showing that the rich young ruler loves his riches more than God and more than his neighbours. He therefore does not keep the Law, and falls short of the righteousness of God.

Jesus then states that it is more difficult for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven than a camel through the eye of a needle (v 24). The rich tend to rely on their riches, rather than God. Man cannot provide his own salvation.

5. Summary on the Rich Young Ruler:

- a) The rich young ruler did not recognise Jesus as the Son of God.
- b) The rich young ruler wished to be saved by keeping the law - no one can be saved by keeping the law.
- c) The rich young ruler said that he had kept these all from the age of accountability. Jesus proved to him that there was one which he had not kept.
- d) Since the rich young ruler had not kept this commandment he was guilty of all (James 2:10).
- e) Ultimately the problem of the rich young ruler was that he failed to fully trust in the Lord (Matthew 19:28).

6. The Solution "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you shall be saved" (Acts 16:31).



## LECTURE 13 - AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

### THE SACK OF ROME

**ACTS 4:8-13.** Augustine came from Hippo in North Africa. This is a town that no longer exists except as a ruin. He lived at a time when the Roman Empire was falling apart and died 28 August 430 AD, just a few months before the Vandals destroyed his home town. The Vandals invaded Europe from the north east, swept across the lands then across the sea and destroyed the whole of North Africa and went through from modern Algeria to Libya. They destroyed Augustine's city, burnt down his cathedral and killed most of his congregation. He was therefore living at a time of great upset. Refer Shelley chapter 13. His test – his response – a text out of its context?

The year was 410 AD. It was some 620 years from the time of Hannibal and the empire had seen no invaders outside Rome. Alaric the Visigoth (another tribal group that had been attacking the empire for several hundred years) besieged the city. Those in Rome sent emissaries to talk to him. He demanded all the gold, silver and the freeing of all German slaves. The Romans continued to plead and the Visigoths got tired of listening and plundered the city. They took all the gold and the silver and set the slaves free.

Alaric thought of himself as a Christian so he sorted through the booty separating the crucifixes and other ecclesiastical items which he returned to the church of St Peter and St Paul. This is how St Peter's became the richest church in Christendom. The sack of Rome in 410 sent a shock wave through the entire world. Why had it happened asked Augustine? Was the end of the world at hand? In the light of this Augustine wrote his biggest and most influential book, "The City of God". He had previously written his life story, "Confessions".

Look at **Hebrews 13: 14, and 11:8- 6.** - Augustine quoted a great amount of Scripture, but was not a great follower of Scripture. Many of Roman Catholic Church doctrines and much of Calvinism trace themselves back to Augustine.

### OUR PERSPECTIVE TO MISSIONS

God's viewpoint, expressed in scripture concerning this life, is that here, upon this earth, we have no continuing city, but we look for one to come. This should be our attitude towards our house, our city, and our nation. We should have no attachment to a place or thing upon the earth. We may love it but our real attachment should be to heaven and to God. We should not be tied to any house, city, state or party. We can then be guided by the Lord to go anywhere in this world and it will not be a wrench. Be prepared to go anywhere the Lord wants you to go and serve Him. We need to check ourselves out on this matter well before the sort of test Augustine faced comes to us.

**Hebrews 11:8-16** gives us the biblical teaching on the relationship between the state and the Christian. What is our destiny? Is it heavenly or earthly? We are ambassadors to earth from the courts of heaven and our citizenship on earth should not become as important as our citizenship of heaven. Our role is the privilege of being an ambassador, evangelist, teacher, and witness of a superior power and manner of life to that being lived before our eyes in our place on earth.

This was a great and understandable problem for Augustine's time. The church was not busy with evangelism at that time, for they had become settled and secure within the empire that was now nominally Christian; they started to believe that the kingdom of God may be the Empire itself. Augustine preached to the people in Hippo but they did not go to the pagans who lived in the fields outside. He was buying food from pagans in the marketplace but they were not being challenged about Christ. Two hundred years later the Arabs came through bringing Islam and immediately the people became Islamic and the few surviving Christians were wiped out because of lack of evangelism through this time.

In other areas, at this time, the monasteries did the job of evangelism. Augustine of Canterbury, Patrick of Ireland were evangelizing, but from a monastic rather than a church base. The established church was so tied up in their identity with the Roman Empire and its cities, that they did not go out to the lost. The relationship of church and state and the effect of politics need to be assessed when you see what happened in the time period in which Augustine lived.

### AUGUSTINE'S BACKGROUND

Augustine grew up as a normal pagan with a good education and easy sex. He was your typical unsaved university student. He took a mistress in his early twenties and had a son by her, the three of them living together. His early sexual sin coloured his whole attitude to women. He considered sex to be of the devil and as a result considered marriage, as it

was tainted by sex, to be less noble than celibacy. He went to the extent of castrating himself to decrease his sexual appetites. His attitudes regarding sex, marriage and celibacy are clearly wrong on the basis of Scripture.

He committed the unpardonable sin as far as biblical theologians are concerned by reading his own thoughts into the Scriptures, rather than letting the Scriptures talk to him. We should always read the Scripture first and then any commentaries. We are in danger of this error ourselves and must be careful to avoid personalizing doctrines; in effect telling the scriptures what to say rather than listening. We must be careful if we feel too passionately about a particular doctrine, for it may be our own Old Sin Nature that is reacting to an old sin pattern rather than a correct emphasis on the truth of God's Word.

John Calvin got all his ideas on predestination and election from Augustine, and the spirit of Augustine is still with us in all with Obsessive Compulsive Disorder who think their disorder makes them spiritual! Calvin was a Roman Catholic who was brought up on Augustine's views. We should remember not to read into the Scriptures our experiences. John says that we must test our experiences by the Word of God. **1 John 4:1-4**. We do not get theology from experience we get it from the Bible with all texts interpreted in their context, not our forced associations, and only then we test our experiences.

Augustine was involved in the Manichean movement from 374-383 AD, which was a group like the Gnostics in the fact that they believed that Jesus did not have a physical body so they emphasized the spiritual and denigrated the physical.

After following this false concept for nine years, he became a teacher of grammar at Carthage before moving to Italy to the University of Milan in 384. Here he became a professor of grammar and his family joined him. He then dropped his mistress, or de-facto wife, with whom he had lived for 12-14 years. He owed her protection and respect as his de-facto, but he abandoned her. This would have meant death or prostitution for her. He now got engaged to a rich young girl to advance his own professional prospects, but he could not contain himself sexually, and he therefore fornicated, according to his confessions. Not being able to control himself sexually he castrated himself. This whole sorry story is not a biblical or spiritual epic; it is pagan awfulness. He does not come through as a pleasant person at all.

God may have been trying to show that he should have married his mistress, but he was more interested in a higher class of person. At this time the Roman Catholic Church was also starting to demand celibacy from its priests. There is a lot of hypocrisy and humbug in this man's life. He burned sexually and this indicated that he should have been married, but the church itself was full of pious nonsense about celibacy. Clerical celibacy was required of Bishops by this point, but would not be compulsory in the West until around 1097.

#### AUGUSTINE AND CHRISTIANITY

Augustine came under the influence of the godly but "strict" Bishop Ambrose of Milan, he read Romans 13 and was convicted by it. He was baptized on the Easter of 387 by Ambrose. His mother and son died within the year, and soon after he returned to North Africa. Within three years he was made the Bishop of Hippo at the age of 43. For the next 33 years he is at the centre of the storms of the times.

The confessions of Augustine are very interesting, but also disturbing, however they give you a good picture of life in his day, at the end of the old Empire. After the looting of Rome in 410, he wrote the "City of God", which he followed by books on the Donatists and the Pelagian controversy. The Donatists rejected the Catholic Church and followed Donatus the Bishop of Carthage who had stated that the Roman church had been too lax allowing back those who had surrendered Biblical books to be burnt at the beginning of the fourth century. Augustine was one of the key defenders of Roman Catholicism against the Donatists.

Augustine rejected the Donatist's view of the pure church. Until the Day of Judgment, he said the church must be a mixed multitude. Both good and bad people are in it. To support this idea he appealed to Jesus' parable of the wheat and the tares - **Matthew 13:24-30**. Augustine shows by this that he believed that everyone in the "Christian" country was a member of the church whether they had personally accepted the Lord or not.

#### SACRAMENTALISM

Donatus (313 – 355) had a different view of the sacraments as well, saying that if there was sin in the life of the minister he should not give the sacraments, whereas Augustine said that the sacraments do not rely on the minister, but on Christ and the authority HE gave to the apostles and that flows down through the "authorized" Bishops. Augustine said that all he needed to realise was that he was administering the grace of God; this is false. You are not dispensing grace in the communion. To both men the minister is the spiritual "chemist" dispensing a dose of Christianity each communion time.

Here we have sacramentalism coming in again on the basis that you are saved by accepting the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. In their thoughts a properly ordained minister was one that the Roman Catholics had ordained and traced back the lineage to Peter, and he is in effect, through this relationship a "power conductor" and a channel of grace to the people of God. Without relationship through the bishop appointed by Peter you were without salvation!!!!

Augustine added to this concept that the priest was a channel of grace to the church. This reached unfortunate extremes in medieval times. Augustine brought together the worst part of the medieval Roman Catholic Church and codified

Catholicism as we know it. Here the church becomes a channel of grace, the priest can channel grace, can forgive or withhold forgiveness, can save or withhold salvation, based on the selected administration of the sacraments.

We call the bread and wine emblems not sacraments, because we testify to what God has already done, and we recognize that communion, like baptism, is for believers only. What people are saying here, is that the sacraments are the priest controlled path of grace; you do not get saved unless that minister gives you these "sacraments". In his defence of the Roman Catholic Church he urged the use of force against the Donatists.

If the people are wrong, Augustine said that you should send out the troops, tell them that they were wrong and if they did not recant you were justified in killing them. Once you have accepted yourself as a priest and a channel of grace a lot of these perversions can come in, for you start to believe that you are standing for God, and that you are justified in judging upon earth the church to protect the "purity" of the church. What you are in fact doing, is acting to defend your belief system, and that is what John Calvin would do.

We are all believer priests and as such are all members of the family of God. **1 Peter 2:9-10.** Augustine's attitude of the use of force if people did not comply leads straight into the inquisition, whereby the Roman Catholic Church persecuted genuine believers and murdered them in Jesus' name, and launched crusades to kill Jews and Moslems, rather than try to convert them.

### PELAGIUS

The next controversy Augustine got involved in was against a monk called Pelagius. Pelagius was a British monk who was wrong in much of what he said, but also right in some things. He was trying to emphasize the free will of man but went too far. He denied that sin came from Adam and believed that some had lived sinless lives, which was wrong. Augustine opposed him, but did not do it solely on the basis of Scripture.

His own experience was the basis of his argument. He sensed profoundly the depth of his own sin and hence the greatness of God's salvation. He felt that nothing less than irresistible divine power could have saved him from his sin and only constantly inflowing divine grace could keep him in the Christian life. His Christian ideal was not stoic self control, but love for righteousness infused solely by the Spirit of God.

Pelagius has gone too far one way whilst Augustine as the first "Calvinist" went too far the other way. The truth was somewhere in between. Augustine has taken his experiences into the Bible rather than letting his experiences be rebuked, corrected and discerned from the Bible. You must let God correct you, and not interpret the Bible by your experience, but let it speak to, and correct you.

Augustine had the whole of the Scriptures, as this was the time when they got the Bible into one codex with the most ancient texts complete, texts that have survived coming from a period some 100 years before his time. He should have used the whole scriptures as his yardstick, but he did not. The older he became the more difficult life became for him and he died in 430 his room papered with the penitentiary Psalms rather than Pauline epistles, a very sad man.

He was also an Amillennialist, and it is from him we get the concept of the kingdom on earth being established through the church rather than looking forward to the Lord's return to establish his kingdom. He looked at Judea and there were no Jews left, so he couldn't see Israel being "reborn", and he interpreted all promises as belonging to the Church. Like most who practice ascetic self denial he looked to establishing the Rule of God through his own efforts.

The concept of bringing in the Millennium through the work of the Church, and the setting up of the kingdom by the Church, allows for the use of force. It is not legitimate to use political power from a moral viewpoint. Our job is to come out and give the gospel to all people. You cannot offer the gospel or death and still claim to be a follower of Jesus. This is akin to the Moslem teaching that develops out of this theology in Arabia two hundred years later.

### DOCTRINES

#### **AMBASSADORSHIP**

1. An Ambassador does not appoint himself, he is appointed by the nation he represents, the king he represents, the person he represents. We are appointed by God (2 Corinthians 5:20).
2. An Ambassador does not support himself. We are sustained and protected by God (Philippians 4:19).
3. An Ambassador does not represent himself. We represent God on earth (Matthew 28:19-20).
4. An Ambassador does not belong to the nation to which he is sent. Positionally we are in heaven, experientially we are in the world (Philippians 3:20, John 15:19).
5. All Ambassadors have instructions in written form. We have the Word of God (1 Thessalonians 4:1-2).

6. An Ambassador representing his country does not treat any insult as personal (Matthew 5:11-12).
7. When an Ambassador is recalled from a country it is tantamount to declaration of war. After the Rapture there will be massive warfare on earth. All Christians will be recalled at the Rapture (1 Thessalonians 4:13-17).

## **LECTURE 14 - THE PAPACY AND POWER POLITICS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Peter as Pope - the Catholic doctrine of the superiority of the Bishop of Rome. This is based on the premise that it is possible to trace the present Pope back by laying on of hands to the Apostle Peter. To some he is the leader of the faith, to others he is the symbol of the Antichrist. As we will see the truth may not be in either position, for these are both good and bad men through the centuries – no generalizations!!! **Matthew 20:25-28**. Shelley chapter 14.

The formal supremacy of the Pope was only defined finally in its present form at the first Vatican Council in 1870. It stated that Jesus Christ established the Papacy with the Apostle Peter and the Bishop of Rome as Peter's successor. There is therefore a supreme authority over the whole church and it is the successor of Peter, the Bishop of Rome. All of the Eastern Orthodox, Russian, Syriac and Egyptian-Ethiopian Orthodox, and the Protestant churches vigorously deny these claims.

As a result any discussion in this area creates controversy like putting your hand in a hornet's nest. We will look at the Biblical basis and the historic claims.

### **THE ROCK ON WHICH THE CHURCH IS BUILT**

On pages 141-149, Shelley records the historic basis for the claim. This claim was first made in the year after the Council of Constantinople in 382 AD. At the western church's synod at Rome the West argued, "The Holy Roman Church takes precedence over the other churches, not on the ground of any synodal decisions, but because it was given primacy by the words of our Lord and Redeemer in the gospel when He said, 'Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church'."

A study of the three texts, **Matthew 16:13-23**, **Luke 22:31-32**, and **John 21:15-17**, could construe that Peter has got the keys of heaven and he opens the door of heaven, and that he has primacy. However if you go back into the Greek you find that the word for Peter was Petros, which means a chip off the old block whilst the word for Rock on which the Church was to be built is the Greek word Petra which is the mountain itself.

The rock on which the church is built is Christ. Moses struck the rock in the wilderness and out of it came living water. He is building His church on Himself not Peter. It is built upon salvation, upon the testimony of the believer. Each Christian is to be formed into the living church by the power, baptism, and indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

What of the idea that Peter holds the keys of the kingdom? Peter preaches the first evangelistic message, the first sermon in the church age. This certainly opens the door to the new age, the age of the church. Peter opens the doors to the kingdom of heaven for all who hear and respond to his message. When you become a Christian you become a citizen of the kingdom of heaven and as such you walk in the kingdom of the earth, but this happens every time a person hears and receives the gospel message.

The early bishops of Rome realised that they were on really shaky ground in claiming what they were trying to claim. Their basis in history and Scripture are not final and clear, but a study of the time shows us why it was possible for this idea to take hold, for the man who sat in the "hot seat" was a truly great man, in an age that demanded a great man.

### **THE GREATEST OF ALL IS THE SERVANT OF ALL**

Shelley talks about the person who brought this claim into focus more than any other; he was Leo the Great. He used the Matthew 16:23 passage to claim primacy and he had the character to carry it off, and the double opportunity to prove it. However the Lord showed that the leader of the church was to be the servant of all, and therefore Leo was out of line for he does not stand for "servant leadership". All Christians are priests and are equal as believers, so you cannot have a dictatorship and claim to be in Christ's seat. But you can be a dictator if that is what men think they need at the time, and that is the age in which he lived.

Peter was told by the Lord in verse 23 to, "get thee behind me Satan", as he had the Satanic concept that he ought to stop the Lord from going to the Cross, for Peter at that point believed that He could have the crown without the Cross. This is in the same chapter as Leo is quoting calling Peter the leader of the Church. Historically Peter begins the ministry

of the Church, but early passes that over to James, nor was Paul the leader of the church in Acts. The leadership fell to James, the Lord's half brother, and all the "big three" stepped aside for this to happen.

In addition, while there is some evidence that Peter went to Rome to die under Nero he probably wasn't ever called the Bishop of Rome. So while it is likely that Peter died in Rome, and was buried on the site of what became St Peter's church, it is very unlikely that he ever served as the acknowledged Bishop of Rome.

The Romans realised that, but made it a dogma. In the seventh century under Gregory the Great you could say the Roman Catholic Church, as we know it, had arrived, as you have the Roman Church absolutely supreme in the West, with the Pope as the new Emperor in the Western area of the old Empire.

#### PRE-EMINENCE OF THE ROMAN CHURCH

The Roman church was the pre-eminent church in the West for three reasons:-

[a] Rome was the imperial capital, the eternal city. The church at Rome was the largest and wealthiest church and it had a reputation for orthodoxy and charity. It was conservative and fundamental.

[b] Despite persecutions the Roman congregation by the middle of the fourth century had grown to 30,000, with 150 pastors and 1500 widows and poor people supported. Size meant influence.

[c] Several Christian writers, beginning with Irenaeus, referred to Peter and Paul as the martyr founders of the church in Rome and to subsequent bishops as successors to the apostles. From this it was assumed that it was only the Roman church which you could rely upon to preserve the truth of the apostle's doctrine. You had therefore St Peter's church and St Paul's church in Rome.

The pre-eminence of Rome was due to three men:-

[a] **Damasus** Bishop of Rome [366-384], who after the council of Constantinople claimed pre-eminence. The political power had moved to the east with the eastern empire having its seat of government in Constantinople from 330 AD. Many people in the old western part of the empire still looked to Rome as a capital. They had an emotional attachment to it.

The only person who had status in Rome after the political centre of the Empire moved to Constantinople was the Bishop of Rome, as Christianity had been adopted as the religion of the Empire from shortly after the time of Constantine.

Theodosius called a council at Constantinople for the eastern bishops only to confirm the Nicene Creed and made a personal appearance at the council.

At the council Theodosius said that as Constantinople was the New Rome then the bishop of Constantinople would be pre-eminent after the Bishop of Rome. Many people entered the church in the eastern empire as the emperor favoured churchmen for his political appointments. There was then a power play between the two bishops.

In 382 a synod then took place in Rome, called by the bishop there, where the primacy of the Roman church was re-asserted. This represented the start of the split between the east and the west.

[b] **Leo** [440-460] was able to claim power because of the events that were happening in his day. There were four events which allowed him to put the statement of Damasus into practice.

In 410 the Goths and Ostrogoths under Alaric, sweep in and wiped out the Western Empire. The power of the Emperor in the West is gone with the Empire itself; the cities and political infrastructure was gone. The only person who had power in the west and was holding any influence and authority was the Bishop of Rome.

In 445 AD the Eastern Emperor Valentinian III issued a decree instructing Aetius, the Roman commander in Gaul to compel the attendance at the papal court of any bishop who refused to come voluntarily. The emperor's edict turned Leo's claim into law. The emperor was quite happy doing this if he was able to be supported by the religious power of Rome. It was the only way for the Emperor to have any influence over the West. Shelley page 147 – Quote.

You therefore have political power backing the claim for religious power of the Bishop of Rome. In 451 at the council of Chalcedon they had accepted that in effect Peter was still speaking through Leo. He sent his delegates and he sent well timed letters to the Council. By saying that Peter had spoken through Leo it implied that what he said went. In that year the Bishop of Constantinople was given equal status to Rome. Leo's representative protested.

In 452 a year after the council of Chalcedon, Attila the Hun arrived at Rome. He was called the "scourge of God". At the river Po he met a peace delegation. Leo was there and Attila negotiated with him. So here Peter's deputy acting in the name of the emperor sat facing Attila alone. Attila agreed not to take Rome. The Roman army had fled before the Huns who were very violent and evil people. Leo was a very courageous man. Attila left in peace and Leo secured more power for the papacy.

In 455 the Vandals under Geiseric who had just destroyed Augustine's city of Hippo and wiped out the Christian church in Africa crossed over by sea to Rome. They arrived with a hundred ships, landed north of the Tiber creating panic in Rome. There were 30,000 Christians in Rome but there were not 30,000 soldiers who were willing to fight for Rome. Everybody tried to run away, the imperial troops mutinied and the Western Emperor was killed by one of his own body guards. He was dragged through the streets and thrown in the river.

On June 2 the Vandals entered the city meeting no resistance. Leo was at the city gate alone on his horse. They looted for fourteen days, took the gold off the roof of the Capitol and all the Temple furniture that the Romans had taken from the Temple in Jerusalem in AD 70. They took it all off to the Vandal capital which they finally established in the south of France.

It appears that the Jewish people will get back all the regalia and items ready to start up sacrificial Judaism in Jerusalem. A parish priest living in poverty at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century suddenly became very wealthy and was able to rebuild his church and give money to the poor. He found one of the Vandal's treasure areas. There are many many more!

Because of all these things Leo was able to call himself the Pope and demand allegiance from all then bishops, and he got it! All his successors did so thereafter. From this time on the church in the west became the Roman Catholic Church. He took the title Pontifex Maximus, the old pagan Roman title of chief priest.

The third person who solidified the claims of Rome was **Gregory** the Great. Another lecture.

**DOCTRINE**

**ROCK**

1. Christ is the rock of salvation (Exodus 17:1-7, 1 Corinthians 10:4).
2. Christ is the rock of judgment (Isaiah 8:14, 1 Peter 2:8).
3. Christ is the rock of provision (Isaiah 26:3, 4). Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee because he trusteth thee. Trust ye in the Lord forever for in the Lord is the rock of ages.
4. Christ is the foundation rock (Isaiah 28:16, Psalm 118:22).
5. Christ is the foundation rock of the Church (Matthew 16:16, 18, 1 Corinthians 3:11, Ephesians 2:20-22).
6. Christ is the destroying rock of the Second Advent (Daniel 2:35).

**PETER'S CONFESSION: THE ROCK AND THE KEYS**

1. SCRIPTURE - Matthew 16:18-19

"And I say unto thee, that 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. "

2. Apparent Problem:

Peter is the foundation of the church. What are the keys of heaven and who has them?

3. Evaluation:

Jesus is talking to Simon (or Cephas) who is renamed Peter in this passage. In the previous verses, Peter has just acknowledged Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God.

4. v. 18 The Rock:

a) "And I say unto thee thou art Petros (Peter)" - PETROS is a stone a piece of a rock, a piece of stone that fell off the mountain but not the mountain itself.

b) "Upon this rock" - PETRA - this is the mountain or rock (from which the stone comes) the PETRA is Christ.

c) "I will build my church" future tense shows that the church is future. We are in union with Christ, we are part of the mountain. The Lord did not found his church on a human being, Peter, but on the God-man, Jesus Christ.

(d) "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" Once you are in the mountain, hell has no opportunity to take you away - ETERNAL SECURITY. (Romans 8:38,39)

5. v.19 The Keys to the Kingdom:

- a) "And I will give unto you the keys of the kingdom of heaven"
- b) "I shall give " - relates to the future tense of I will build my church.
- c) "unto thee " - thee is plural, the keys of the kingdom are not therefore given to Peter, but to all believers.
- d) "the keys of the kingdom" - this is the prerogative of witnessing for Jesus Christ.
- e) In v 19 we do not have to worry about the gates of hell but we have the key to the gate of heaven.
- f) In John 20:23 we have "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained". This deals with declaring the gospel regarding the remission of sins.
- g) "Whosoever" - third class condition - maybe yes maybe no.
- h) "sins ye remit " - aorist tense - at the point of time they believe.
- i) "are remitted unto them " - perfect tense - they are remitted forever.
- j) "sins ye retain" - those who reject and are condemned to eternal judgment.
- k) "and whatsoever" (maybe yes, maybe no) - third class condition.
- l) "thou shalt bind on earth" - decisions for Christ aorist tense - point of time of decision.
- m) "shall be bound in heaven" - perfect tense - eternal security in heaven.
- n) "and whatsoever" (maybe yes, maybe no) - third class condition.
- o) "thou shalt loose on earth " - this is use of the Holy Spirit during the Church Age.
- p) "shall be loosed in heaven " - more literally shall be loosed from the sphere of heaven.

6. Conclusions:

- a) Peter is not the foundation of the church. He did, however, preach the first sermon at Pentecost (Acts 2)
- b) The key to the kingdom of heaven is faith in Christ - You are the Christ, the Son of God...

**LECTURE 15 - ICONS**

**IDOLS**

Icons are pictures of saints or others, which became objects of adoration, channels of grace and revelation, and even objects to be worship. There were many people who tried to move them from the church and there was a great controversy over many years. This was the cause of a rift between the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Church.

A pastor once said that the only time you put a picture of the Lord Jesus Christ on the wall is when you are not having fellowship with the Lord in your heart. Images of God are universally condemned throughout the Scriptures. Every time the Israelites were involved in that sort of thing they were condemned by God. **Daniel 11:37-39, John 3:3 - 8, John 6:28 - 35, 63.**

The people of Greece, Turkey, Syria and Palestine were at the centre of idolatry, and the demonic does not change its strategy if people have an historic weakness. When Paul visited the city of Ephesus the silversmiths who majored in artistic works of the goddess Diana were antagonistic towards his ministry because people were being converted and not buying their statues. Corinth had one of the greatest art galleries in the ancient world. Both groups of artists prospered under the Eastern Empire – as skills that could be used for all manner of "Icon" making.

Many mosaic floors, statues, god idols and altars, and even painted wall paintings still survive from this time. This use of gods in the house is shown clearly in Herculaneum and Pompeii which were covered in the eruption of Vesuvius in 78AD. Idolatry was a cornerstone of paganism, and with the entry of many unsaved people into the church after the days of Constantine, their paganism became "Christianized" in east and west. However what was really happening was that Christianity became paganized! Satan doesn't change his policy – it just morphs into new forms with new names. Statues of Artemis become statues of the "Virgin Mary", and they all look the same...

When Christianity became the religion of the state, the artists did not have any of their pagan subjects to paint, carve or mould any more, so many of the pictures and statues took on Christian images. We therefore see quickly in the Roman State church with their new "members" all Christianized pagans, who no longer could have statues of Hermes or Diana and so they went for the Lord, Peter, Paul and Mary. These were done in gold, and family fortunes were spent on them. These beautiful objects became objects of reverence because the family fortune was tied up in them and they were beautiful indeed. The satanic loves art, music and beauty – religion is always designed to be attractive..... There is nothing wrong with art, music, sculpture, or beauty in any form, but when woven into cultic worship it becomes an evil.

These early statues and paintings were to become the "icons", and due to their expense, the people started to invest in that picture a power that it did not have, but once worshipped, it possibly built up power in a demonic sense. God condemns all idolatry - John 3:3 - marvel not that ye must be born again. Those that lack the internal spiritual ministry will be subject to the fleshly carnal things - 1 Corinthians 2:14.

The split between East and West was caused by carnal things on both sides. One side invested the pictures and idols with powers that they did not have whilst the others ridiculed the pictures, but without giving the gospel so that neither side returned to the truth in Christ Jesus. The problem was that the Spirit was not leading the people who were at the top.

## EASTERN ORTHODOX AND ROMAN CATHOLICS

Many people in the West think of Eastern Orthodoxy as Roman Catholicism without the Pope, but it is a lot more complex than that. In the West we tend to ask, 'how is a person saved?' 'What is the church, and where is the authority?' In Orthodoxy the questions themselves are not the same. The differences centered obviously in the icon controversy, for they represented much more than a simple picture or object, and they illustrated the quite different attitudes to faith, salvation and worship that had developed in the two halves of the old Empire.

Both positions when separated out and examined are **false in isolation**. The Old Roman Church stresses one thing the Orthodox another; both of which in isolation are wrong, but both of which are partially right. What the Orthodox say they believe is good, but what is meant is bad. They have left the path of spirituality and gone on the path of carnality. We know for instance that being born again is primary, and that being taught by the Holy Spirit is absolutely central, yet these things are perverted from the biblical path by both ancient groups.

The Eastern Orthodox believed that the icons are a type of window between us and heaven. The Eastern Orthodox believer believed in the image of God being personified in the icon. He carries the icon of God within him, and when he sees the icon of God on the wall, the icon in him can have fellowship with the icon on the wall and he can have an experience with God. This is dangerous, as it makes emotional connection the key without reference to belief in facts that works out in acts of faith. **James 2:9-26**. It is not through pictures on the wall but through obedience in the life that we can have fellowship with the Lord.

The emphasis in the Eastern Orthodox is the atmosphere, how you feel, what is going on, how you enter into a spiritual experience through the icon, the building, the incense and the feeling. The whole community is drawn to the icons which are strategically placed in the church so that they may kiss them. The songs are in chants. The beauty of the priest's uniform and the church buildings are hearkening back to the pagan days, and the emphasis is on having an experience of the presence of God in the community and in the heart. It is letting the environment be so transformed by the presence of the "icon of God" that everything is transformed by the presence of God. It is poetic, powerful and biblically suspect.

One of the great buildings in the world is Hagia Sophia. Here in the great dome you have pictures hundreds of feet above you. Imagine the place filled with incense with all the priests clothed in gold, silver and white vestments. In the church the candles are burning, you go up and kiss the icon of Jesus in this atmosphere and have a wonderful experience. They are told that this experience is one of being a Christian. It is not.

It is no different really than going to a Hindu temple with Indian music and you can have a mystical experience. This type of experience can be done with beautiful music, beautiful scenery. While this statement does not appear to be very kind, there are many Christians in jail in Greece because they tried to preach the gospel on the streets of Athens. It is currently a crime to preach the sermon that Paul preached on Mars hill.

Many people in these churches were not Christians in a biblical sense. We cannot do anything in the way of ritual or self improvement to have a relationship with God. We can only have a relationship with a righteous God through His work. The Medieval Catholic system gives the priest power to forgive sin, and gives penance for sins. Catholicism has taken legalism too far whereas the Orthodox took mysticism too far. The garments of both church's priests are taken from that of ancient Israel, Greece and Rome, but with many aspects of paganism at the heart of both.

When Constantine came in he brought in half Christianized pagans to join the civil service. In the eastern world however Constantine became the great hero. His take over of the Roman Empire muddied the water between State and Religion and in both parts of the Empire changes occur that keep things muddy.

## THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES

At Constantinople Constantine built a church which was rebuilt in 538 by Justinian who codified the laws and government of the Eastern Empire as Byzantium. Hagia Sophia, which he rebuilt, is the church of the Holy Wisdom. In this we have frescoes showing the emperor as the servant of the Lord on earth and with power to work with, if not at times rule over the church.

It is of interest that Queen Elizabeth II is still called "defender of the faith". This goes back to Henry VIII who wrote a small book against Luther. As a result the Pope awarded him the title defender of the faith. Even today the Queen formally appoints bishops even though she has delegated power to the Lambeth Conference and Arch-Bishop of Canterbury. She can over rule and therefore is the ruler of the Anglican Church. Few of the Church of England's evangelical wing ever get high into the hierarchy, although the Queen is a strong believer.

Justinian was a genius in art and culture. Byzantium at this time was one of the greatest places in all of history regarding art in the world. He did not distinguish between the State and Church considering himself both a Roman Emperor and a Christian Emperor. This issue is addressed by the Anabaptists who face the "Church-State" question directly.



This allowed the situation to occur where if a person preached the gospel and he did not like him he would kill that person by calling on the Imperial troops. In Greece you can still be brought before a church court and sentenced to a term in a civilian jail.

This is little different to the Protestant churches in Scandinavia where the church and state are interwoven although you are not likely to be arrested for giving the gospel. You study at a university to qualify for a career in the State Church being taught liberal theology. Everybody in the community is seen as a member of the State Church whether they have believed in Christ or not. In England the local Anglican vicar will quite often go to the pub to talk to the people there as they are technically his parishioners, and they will consider them selves "christian" as they were born into the church. We believe we need to be separate, but from 330-1520 that was not possible.

It was generally in the Eastern monasteries that the icons were made, venerated and sold. The orthodox church majored on relics of the saints also; items that people could see, or feel, and that made money. Western Monasteries made wine and liqueurs....

They did not live in a world where the gold, silver and precious stones could be theirs, but whilst in church or the Imperial Court, were surrounded with beauty, a glimpse of heaven. Many of the people in the monasteries were pagans in Christian garb practicing monastic ideals that at times were far from the faith of the apostles. Was there any spirituality in the biblical sense? Where are the Spirit filled believers? Keep asking that question in each age.

No longer is John Chapter 3 being read aloud in the language of the people, let alone applied. It is religion covered in all types of ritualistic trappings. These people were used to carrying images of the emperor in the form of coins thus a Christian form of idols was an easy transition to make. Many Catholics have a St Christopher medal for safe journeys nowadays, and in the Western Church medals and statues later did what the Icons did in the East.

A group now come in called the iconoclasts or image breakers who said that the only things that you ought to have is a cross, or very limited objects for veneration, and they had to indicate what Christ has done. They would gather and forcefully remove the icons. Then there would be a revival of icons, and the battle raged to and fro for years. We come now into an empty church, the only symbol in it is a cross, which is empty, for the Lord has risen, sacrifice completed.

If you are an unbeliever what type of church are you going to go to? Will it be a church which has an empty cross and a person talking out of a book which you cannot understand because you need spiritual life, or will you choose one which has tremendous pictures of saints and ceiling paintings. The only things that were needed were the Bible, the empty cross, the message of the empty tomb, and the elements of the Lord's Table, but the alternative was very attractive.

John of Damascus defended the use of icons. He went back to Plato and said that by concentrating on the image of the icon you go back to the person behind the image and that you can enter into heaven via the image. The supporters of icons tended to come out on top in the arguments, and other issues of division were raised with the Roman church. As a result in 1054 the two churches excommunicated each other. From then on the Patriarch of Constantinople was an opponent of Rome.

The judgment against Eastern Orthodoxy occurred in 1453 with the fall of Constantinople to the Turks. The Greek manuscripts that form the so called "textus receptus" came from Constantinople which was involved in more heresy than the Roman church. The manuscripts are however kept very pure to the originals, but sadly were seldom used by the ordinary people. Christianity is a real and practical relationship with Christ that works out in obedience to his Word, it is not how you feel.

## **DOCTRINES**

### **SEPARATION**

1. Believers are instructed to be separated from habitually carnal believers (1 Corinthians 5:10, 11).
2. Separation is ordered from apostate religious organisations (2 Corinthians 6:17).
3. Separation is commanded from unbelievers where scripture is compromised by the relationship or marriage, business partners (2 Corinthians 6:14 ff ).
4. Separation is commanded from the human viewpoint (Romans 12:2, Romans 16:17, 18).
5. Separation is commanded from pseudo spirituality (Romans 16:17, 18).
6. Separation is commanded from those who seek pleasure in fast living - pursuit of parties, immoral situations (1Peter 4:4).
7. Separation is commanded from other believers who reject Bible doctrine (2 Thessalonians 3:14, 15).

## IDOLATRY

1. Idolatry is forbidden (Exodus 20:3,4,23; 23:24; Deuteronomy 4:28; 5:7; 6:14; 7:16; 8:19).
2. In the Ten Commandments, the first commandment prohibits mental idolatry, the second commandment prohibits overt idolatry.
3. Idolatry is spiritual adultery, an attack on the believer's love towards God (Jeremiah 3:8-10; Ezekiel 16:23-43; 23:24-30; Revelation 17:1-5).
4. Idolatry of mind precedes idolatry of practice. Mental idolatry occurs before overt idolatry (Judges 2:10-13; Ezekiel 14:7).
5. Idolatry occurs when the creation, rather than the Creator, is worshipped (Romans 1:18-25).
6. Demons function through idols and practices of idolatry (Zechariah 10:2).
7. Idolatry is the devil's communion table (1 Corinthians 10:19-21).
8. Idolatry is related to sexual sins under the phallic cult (Ezekiel 22:3-18; 23:37-49). Consequently idolatry has a adverse effect on both soul and body (1 Corinthians 6:9).
9. Idolatry causes the national judgment of destruction and enslavement (Isaiah 2:8; 2:18-20; 21:9; 36:18-20; Jeremiah 2:27:30; 3:6-11; 7:17-20; 17:1-4; Ezekiel 6:4-6).

## LECTURE 16 - THE MISSIONS TO THE BARBARIANS

## INTRODUCTION

Shelley in chapter 16 gives a good short introduction to the fall of the Roman Empire. Many of the Christians thought that the return of Christ was near. At this point Augustine brought in his new concept of theology. Up to this time most Christians had been Pre Millennial but from the time of Augustine they have a post Millennial or Amillennial view and no longer are they expecting Christ to take them out of the world. Reformed theology tends to follow Augustine even today.

From these times we have a number of the so called conversions of the pagan tribes. If you look at the Lord's standards for conversion which involves genuine conversion from dark to light and fruit in the life, then they are absent in many of these tribes, yet clearly there is a work of the Holy Spirit here in some form, as the West is preserved. There were some mighty men of God in this period who took out the Word of God with real power and many miraculous signs verifying their ministries as the work of God. Once again we are confronted by patterns of evangelism that are problematic to us, but show that the Lord works in truly mysterious ways.

Boniface is the first man mentioned; he came from Britain, marched into the sacred forest of Thor the pagan god of thunder, where the German pagans were waiting to worship and took up an axe and started to chop down their sacred tree. He hit the tree once, there was a powerful gust of wind, and the thousand year old tree fell.

All the Germans dropped their axes, said "forget about Thor, we want to know about your God as he is mightier than ours". He stood on the tree stump and preached the gospel and many were converted. He used the wood to build a church. Many entered the church as make-believers, or semi-pagans however. This remains a problem when a mighty miracle is seen to start/plant a church, or begin revival. Many may feel coerced to join by the power present and the general feeling that "change is needed".

## MIRACLES AND THE GOSPEL

In **Mark 16:12-20** the Lord refers to signs following, but Matthew and Luke do not. In the book of Acts we find some miracles occurring in some situations, some not. We find this right down to today. It appears that miracles may occur when the gospel comes for the first time to people who have not heard it before and are held by satanic powers. The evangelist does not call the miracle down; God does the miracle. In almost all cases of the conversion of the pagan tribes you have miraculous situations. What is the key? Fruit following! **Matthew 7:13-23**.

This can be a mixed blessing as it could cause wrong motivation in joining the church, but the sovereignty of God operates here, and they seem to occur where they are needed to demonstrate immediately the superiority of God over the pagan gods (demons that held these people captive), and thereby open the door for the preaching of the gospel, rather than the minister be simply killed by the pagans.

We have a good example of this in **Acts 28:7-10**. This is the last ship wreck of Paul. They land on the pagan island of Melita (Malta) and the natives received the survivors with kindness. Paul the great apostle is not being waited on but is assisting in gathering the wood for the fire. We need to be like Paul ready to get our hands dirty. A viper bites him on the finger and the pagans think that it is divine retribution for things that Paul has done. Paul shakes the snake into the fire and they waited for Paul to die. He didn't, so they say that he is a god. This gives the chance for Paul to give the gospel and many are saved.

After this they go into the house of Publius whose father is sick of a terminal fever. Paul lays his hands on him, prays for him and he is healed, a second miracle. Others come with the sick and Paul heals many. Paul then is able to preach the gospel to the whole island. Here is an example of the Lord opening up an entire community by means of miracles, and the church in Malta today dates its origin to this time.

Note however that Paul does not set out to do a miracle as some of the "miracle workers" of today do. He does the job at hand, and the Lord provides the miracle and Paul sees that this opens the door for preaching and preaches. Paul prays for the man, laying his hand on him. This was a manner of blessing. There is nothing in this that indicates he is commanding God what to do. We need to follow the apostles and be ready for the Lord to do miracles but to just relax and do our work and if the miracle comes then we relax also! This is what happened in many cases in church history. If the Lord opens an opportunity we take it.

#### EVENTS AT THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Shelley gives a good summary in pages 163-169 of all the key things that were happening in the time of the fall of the Western Roman Empire. By the end of the fourth century the Roman Empire was controlled by the generals of the armies and the armies were basically made up of Germans. The Romans had given up military service and had paid others to fight for them for years, and it would come back to bite them. The invading Goths had as many of their people in the Roman armies as they had in their own army. The Roman army therefore often joined the enemy and did some pillaging themselves.

Ulfilas or Wulfa (circa 375 AD) crossed the Danube with friends and entered Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and adjacent areas which were controlled by the Goths. He was an Arian Christian and as such did not believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is fully both God and man. This was not doctrinally accurate Christianity but his people did read and teach the scriptures, and there was an impact on their culture and the history of Europe as a result.

The conversion of the Goths is not the same as saying the Goths became Jehovah's Witnesses, for their faith was much as our own in some areas, but in others..... They were wild people, and so their lives did not confirm their conversion as genuine in a biblical sense. They tended to think of Christ as a glorified warlord. If this is so they have not got the Lord of glory in their minds. One of the good things that Ulfilas did however was to translate the Bible into the Gothic language and this became a tremendous tool of evangelism. He translated it all except for first and second Kings as Wulfa thought that they were warlike enough without it.

#### PATRICK

Patrick (circa 450) - the Romano-British patron saint of Ireland. His father was a deacon in one of the early Romano-British churches. While John was still writing Christianity had reached England. By 90 AD England was Roman and some of the villas had chapels in them. There are a number of martyrs from the early persecutions of the church from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries. But sadly by the time of Patrick the church was spiritually dead or dying. The Roman Legions left Britain in 406 so the Picts and Scots were invading Britain from the north and the Angles, Saxons and Jutes from the south. These pagan groups wiped out Christianity where-ever they found it, but many local churches somehow survived.

Patrick was a make believer until he was captured by the Irish pirates and he became a swine herd, a slave. It was then he became truly converted, he escaped and got to France. He went into southern France where he joined a monastery. He then returned to England to add his weight to the British church. En route he spent some time in northern France strengthening himself in Bible doctrine and evangelism in another monastery.

Patrick had a dream about the Irish children and was haunted in the night by their paganism. Patrick returned to Ireland, went around especially Northern Ireland, and evangelized in the Lord's will and he converted Ireland establishing the church on monastic lines. Ireland was totally agricultural with no big cities; it was very tribal. Many of the great Celtic monasteries were established at this time. They were built with a wall for protection, a stone church and huts. They would keep themselves supplied with food from their farms, as the Irish did not have any money to support ministers as was the pattern in cities. They ran hospitals for the sick, schools for the children. Patrick also put the Bible in the Celtic language. There were also gospel texts carved on stones.

Patrick is buried in Northern Ireland. Patrick was not a Roman Catholic, he was a Celtic Christian who did not owe allegiance to Rome.

From Ireland the gospel was taken to Iona off the Scottish coast. From Iona other Celtic peoples came and were trained as evangelists and went into Scotland and the North of England and evangelized with true Celtic monastic Christianity. The people were illiterate and it was the translations of the Bible into their languages that brought literature to them. The

monk who founded Iona was Columba, an Irish monk. Many others went from there and started preaching in many other places.

#### POPE GREGORY

A hundred years later in 596 Pope Gregory the Great said that he wanted the true gospel (read the Roman Catholic form of Christianity under his authority) to go to England and sent Benedictine monks under another Augustine to do so. While the Pope's men were landing in the south the Celts were bringing the gospel down from the north.

Gregory saw Angles as slaves being sold as slaves in the market place in Rome. The Angles took over England with the Saxons and destroyed the structure of the old Roman Empire era Christian church. Some of the Angles had married Christians from the continent so there were people practicing their faith in Britain, but the church was in disarray.

The Angles had long blond hair and Gregory said they should be angels not pagans. He called one of his men Augustine and instructed him to bring the gospel to these people. They landed in the South and got a hearing from the King of Kent who had a Christian wife called Bertha. King Ethelbert was a strong man but he feared these monks' power and said that he would listen to them only outside. He sat outside on his throne and was converted. He gave land at Canterbury to build a monastery. Augustine became the first Archbishop of Canterbury around 600.

The missionary thrusts converged with the people from the south following the Roman Catholic view whilst those from the north followed the Celtic or Eastern view. A king from the north with a queen from the south had problems, as while he was celebrating Easter, she was still subject to lent. This doesn't do anything for marital harmony.

In 664 at the synod of Whitby, the king Oswy, said that he would follow the Catholics because he did not want to get offside with the fellow (Peter) who keeps the keys of heaven. So Britain became Catholic rather than remaining independent, which was one of the strengths of the Celtic church. Each church was independent and owed allegiance to the Lord alone.

Out of this Anglo Saxon church we have the great English missionary Winfrid, or Boniface, who then evangelizes Germany. Monks from Ireland moved all over the place. Boniface became the Archbishop of Mainz. He went to the Netherlands and became a martyr there as a very old man always seeking the Lord's path forward.

Amongst these great believers you also have a number of people who do not have enough Bible doctrine to come out of the rain and get themselves mixed up in things that are going to be evil in the Roman Catholic Church later. It is about 800 years before Christians are going to come out of the Roman Catholic Church. Within it through these years you can still see great believers operating in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Through this time period nearly all believers are within the Roman church and Holy Spirit filled believers operated well there within the monastic traditions that suited the agricultural society of the day. They were often not biblically accurate in doctrine yet these great men and women loved the Lord and were used mightily of God. A challenge to us all to ensure our heart is right!

The Christians of Patrick's Britain had been infected by the Pelagian heresy. Pelagius did not believe in original sin and believed that each of us by our own efforts could become righteous. Due to this the church lost its Holy Spirit dependence and thereby its power over time. By the time of the invasion of the Angles and Saxons they were ready to be wiped out and they were. Ireland then became the source of true Christianity, which in turn returns to Britain later. What we see again and again in history is that when the church goes under heresy it will lose its power. We have a picture here in British history of the consequences of heresy; the entire early British church all but disappears.

Even though it shrinks to a remnant, the original church in Britain had its last great revival just before the work of Patrick and Augustine. In the early fifth century two evangelists arrived in 429. Germainus had been a sailor and a man of action before becoming a Bishop. He found the British Christians timid and lacking in self confidence. He organised them into an army and with the shout of Hallelujah led them to victory against the Picts. He encouraged and strengthened the British against their opponents on his visits in 429 and 447. He revitalised the church before it finally went under. The Angles Saxons and Jutes arrived throughout the next century and eliminated organized Christianity and set up paganism again.

The Middle Ages was a time of political chaos with pirates at sea, and other marauding bands of adventurers roaming the country, with little law and order at all. God is not left without a witness at any time however. Many different people are used to evangelize and restore the church as seen above. The church that stands out in this period is the Celtic church that Patrick established in Ireland as a genuine born again believer who faced the challenge to find a form of church government that suited the local conditions and maintained the truth and power of the apostles.

#### THE FRANKS (The group after whom France gets its name)

The Franks were founded as a settled nation by Clovis who was married to a Christian woman Clothilda who evangelised her husband. He rejected it. He allowed his first son to be baptised but he died. She however as a believer rejoiced that

God had taken the child into heaven. The faith of this woman changed the nation. A second son is born and having been baptised becomes sick Clothilde prayed over the child, and the child lived.

In the middle of a battle Clovis' army is on the verge of a total rout. He calls on the Lord to save him. Just at that point in time the King of the opposing force is killed and Clovis was able to defeat the enemy army. This resulted in the first of what is called "the mass conversions" since the days of Constantine. This brings into question the paganizing of Christianity again. Evangelism should relate to individual conversion, not mass conversion, which are still being practiced today by a number of people. It is not legitimate but.... These Franks did not have a nation transformed, yet in the midst of false practice, there is gospel work done and bible teaching begins and this over time transforms them.

There was however a paganizing of Christianity. They had ritual appealing to the senses rather than their minds. Almost every human need was catered for by one "saint" or other. Rather than worshipping their old gods they worship saints. This is when the saints entered the church in the West as intercessors, to make the pagans feel at home. Here we have paganism in Christian clothing. Remember, when God is active so is Satan, yet even in the midst of this all, there are great works of salvation being worked out. Earl Cairn's book on this period is excellent here. Also refer to any texts on the history of the English and Irish church.

## **DOCTRINES**

### **ESCHATOLOGY – VIEWS OF ESCHATOLOGY**

#### **INTERPRETATION ALTERNATIVES**

##### **PRETERIST INTERPRETATION**

The prophecies of Revelation are viewed as having been fulfilled in the early history of the Church and are all past. Therefore an outline would be:

- [i] Chapters. 5-11 tell of the church's victory over Judaism.
- [ii] Chapters. 12-19 tell of her victory over pagan Rome. '
- [iii] Chapters. 20-22 tell of the happy bliss and glory of the church.

There is no indication that the early church interpreted this book in this manner. This view of the Book of the Revelation came from a Spanish Jesuit of Antwerp named Alcasar in the beginnings of the seventeenth century to counteract the teachings of the Reformers which included the concept that the Pope was the Antichrist.

##### **THE IDEALIST, POETIC, SPIRITUALIST OR ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION**

This interpretation considers the book a pictorial unfolding of great principles without reference to actual events. Such people regard the book only as a form of spiritual encouragement and assurance of the ultimate triumph of Christianity. Augustine regarded Revelation as presenting in a symbolic way the total conflict between Christianity and evil or the City of God versus the City of Satan. This point of view originated in the Alexandrian School of Theology represented in Clement of Alexandria and Origen. To them the book was one big allegory. The holders of this view do not believe that the 1,000 years mentioned in Revelation 20 should be read literally and are therefore Amillennial in outlook.

##### **THE HISTORICIST INTERPRETATION**

This view understands the book as portraying a panorama of the history of the church from the days of John to the end time or the second advent. Though it had earlier disciples, Joachim of Fiore [1135-1202], a Roman Catholic scholar, is largely responsible for this as was also the originator of the first forms of post-millennialism.

This method of interpretation achieved popularity during the Reformation because of its identification of the pope and the papacy as the beasts of chapter 13. Wycliffe, Luther, Joseph Mede were adherents of this view.

One problem with this view is that no two scholars can agree in the identification of the personnel pictured in Revelation nor of the historical interpretation of the events. The very multiplicity of historical interpretations is its own refutation. If this is the correct method of interpretation, then it is clear that no one has found the key.

##### **THE FUTURIST OR LITERAL INTERPRETATION**

This views most of the book, Revelation chapters 4-22 as prophecy yet to be fulfilled. This was the view held by the early church until spiritual decline corrupted her doctrine.

Under this interpretation, the events of chapters 4-19 relate to the period just preceding the second coming of Christ. This is generally regarded as a period of seven years with emphasis on the last three and a half years, known as the "Great Tribulation".

Chapter 19 refers to the second coming of Christ onto the earth, chapter 20 to the future millennial kingdom, where Christ will rule in His kingdom on the earth, which will follow, and chapters 21 and 22 to events either contemporary or subsequent to the millennium.

In contrast to other methods of interpretation, the futuristic position allows the most literal interpretation of the specific prophecies.

Though recognising the frequent symbolism in various prophecies, the events foreshadowed by these symbols and their interpretation are regarded as being fulfilled in a normal way, eg. chapter 13 is considered a prophecy of the future world empire with its political and religious heads represented by the two beasts.

## SUMMARY

Generally speaking proponents of the first three views are Postmillennial or Amillennial, while futurists are Premillennial. Postmillennialists believe that the spread of the gospel will lead to a golden age of peace on earth followed by the return of Christ. Amillennialists believe that the Christian's present heavenly position in Christ is the true "millennium", not an earthly kingdom.

In contrast Premillennialists believe that the six appearances of "a thousand years" in Revelation 20: 2-7 are to be taken literally as the duration of the earthly kingdom that Christ will establish between the second advent and the creation of the new universe. It is of interest that a number of early Jewish traditions divided history into seven one thousand year periods of which the last would be an age of peace.

Advocates of all four interpretive approaches to Book of the Revelation agree that it was written to assure the recipients of the ultimate triumph of Christ over all who rise up against Him and His saints. The readers were facing dark times of persecution and even worse times would follow.

Therefore they needed to be encouraged to persevere by standing firm in Christ in view of God's plan for the righteous and the wicked. This plan is especially clear in the stirring words of the book's epilogue (Revelation 22:6-21).

The book was also written to challenge complacent Christians to stop compromising with the world. According to futurists, Revelation serves the additional purpose of providing a perspective on end-time events that would have meaning and relevance to the spiritual lives of all succeeding generations of Christians.

The Apocalypse has been given an appropriate place as the last book in the canon of Scripture because it ties the themes of the Bible together. Just as Genesis is the book of beginnings, Revelation is the book of consummation.

## ADOPTED METHOD

Having stated the four methods we will adopt the orthodox one, the one that was once and for all given to the saints - Jude 3 - the futurist or literal interpretation.

## NOTES

## LECTURE 17 – GREGORY THE GREAT - THE MASS

## POPE GREGORY

Gregory the Great was the greatest of the early medieval popes. He, like Leo before him, was an amazing and great man of his time. He exemplifies many of the things which the Lord says a Christian should be. He also brings in many of the things that we would consider areas of greatest error in the Roman Catholic Church.

In many passages the Lord talks about the chief being the servant. **Matthew 20 : 25 - 28, 23:8-12** says not to be called rabbi or father, nor master or leader. Gregory the Great followed this closely. He was a very humble man. He stayed a humble man as Pope and was a true servant of the church and its people.

## THE GREATEST IN THE KINGDOM

**Mark 9:33-37** - the disciples were disputing who was to be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Any one who desires to be first shall be last. **Mark 10 :42-45** - here again we see the servant. Gregory is an awkward person to evaluate because he exemplifies these characteristics. He led the Catholic Church as a servant. He did not seek glory or position and he was apparently God's man for the time but he set in place dogmas which were totally unscriptural.

Gregory was born in 540, educated in Rome, from a wealthy background, and worked in Government services. When he was in his twenties the Lombards came in and vandalised the area burning churches, killing bishops and plundering. At the age of 33 he was in Rome facing the Lombard invasion. At that time both the Western Emperor and the Pope died.

Gregory took control and ruled the city and surrounding area for a while, settled the situation, but then went and founded seven monasteries which he funded himself and he entered one of them as a monk.

This is equivalent of the Prime Minister at the age of 33 leaving his post and becoming a monk with nothing but his Bible, cross, sandals and hair shirt. He prayed all night and worked all day and his health suffered for it. He said however that these were the most enjoyable years of his life.

After six years Pope Pelagius made him one of the seven deacons of the Roman church and sent him as Ambassador to the Church at Constantinople. When he returned six years later he was made an abbot of one of the monasteries he had founded. He is humble, not lifting himself up, but seeking God's path for his life through prayer and extreme self discipline.

In 590 Pelagius the Pope died and half the population of Rome died as well, due to the Black Death, (possibly Pneumonic form of the plague). This was one of the periodic visits of the Black Death. People went insane because of people dying around them in large numbers screaming. Gregory had been perfectly prepared for this great time of crisis, because he had been the ruler of Rome, faced the Lombards, he had been an ambassador, an abbot. He was a leader.

#### THE PAPACY OF GREGORY

Gregory is elected Pope and he flees the scene, as he did not want the job. The army follows him and captures him and escorts him back to Rome. He is 50, he is balding, he is frail and does not want to be Pope. He was so sorrowful that he could hardly speak, but once he reconciled to the task, he put himself in harms way daily to help others.

He begins his papacy with a prayer vigil for Rome for seven days. He walked through the city amongst the dead and dying every day for a week praying for the city and singing hymns. The dead were being thrown out into the streets where the carts would take them outside the city for mass burial. On the eighth day the plague started dying away.

He organised his monks as a spiritual militia. He wrote a book called "Pastoral Care". He organised the monks to be evangelists and carers for the sick and dying. He sent Augustine to Britain and appoints him later Archbishop of Canterbury and sends other monks to many other places.

He said that the Lord prayed in the mountains but yet wrought miracles in the cities showing the pastors that whilst the spiritual heights were great, the practical work of the pastor was also important. Here he is mirroring the Lord's Words in his life.

He told his followers, "If you want to be a Bishop, be a servant, visit the sick, do the menial tasks and you will become the prince of the church. Do not however expect to start as a prince". He started in power and became a pauper. Even as Pope he lived simply and humbly. He encourages people to visit the sick, to minister to the poor, to minister for Christ and pray. When he died in 604 worn out by his work and privations - he was called "God's Consul" by all.

He was a tremendous organizer and though he was Pope for only 14 years he organised the Roman Catholic Church into the form we know it today. He was a genius in organizational ability and in his concern for the poor.

At this time the world was in chaos. All of Gregory's sermons have survived. In fact the Vatican library has most of the sermons of all the Popes from this time onwards. What can we see in the world at this time?

Gregory in one of his letters to a bishop says that the bishop must rule over the church like a Christian or he will be in trouble with him. He was in poor health and was ill for most of his papacy. He hated pride and nearly excommunicated the Bishop of Constantinople when he called himself the universal bishop, a title that had been confirmed at the synod of Constantinople in 588. He classified himself as the servant of the servants of God. "Pride is a vicious evil", says Gregory.

#### THE THEOLOGY OF GREGORY

He is not into the theology of Augustine of Hippo, as he believes in the free will of man, and that he may co-operate with the will of God. He believes in salvation by good works and faith. Your works save you he says. They show that you that you believe in Christ. You work for your salvation after accepting Jesus as your Lord, which is the Roman Catholic view. Here we have faith plus works rather than by grace through faith, then works following.

He taught that baptism was one of the paths of salvation. You also needed penance for your sins and to do meritorious works for your sins. We believe however that Christ died on the cross for our sins and that you cannot add anything to it, but that works of faith will follow in the lives of the true saints as fruits of the work of the Holy Spirit within.

He also believed in the intercession of the saints. He implores them to go to the saints as their advocates. The saints had therefore replaced the gods of the pagans. In **1 John 1:5-10** we confess our sins to God direct not through saints or priests. Here we now have prayers to the saints and devotion to the holy relics of the martyrs.

Martyred Christians, if they had been notable would be the source of “relics” which were supposed to enhance your spiritual standing if you had them close by you; either in the church by the altar or even carried with you. They would at times go out with parts of someone’s body around their neck! This was the medieval idea of a “lucky rabbit’s foot!”

He also introduced the concept of purgatory where, if you could not sort out your sins in this life, you could atone for them in purgatory. The perfectly holy like Paul he said went straight to heaven as per **2 Corinthians 5:8ff** - absent from the body, face to face with the Lord, but for the rest of us there is a purging place where we have the sins burned off us, **1 Corinthians 3:10-17**.

We do not stand in our own righteousness we stand in Christ. For purgatory he takes 1 Corinthians 3 and takes it out of context. This is the fire of God’s judgment which burnt away the wood hay and stubble of all human strength works in the believer’s life. This however is done in an instant of time at the judgment seat of Christ. The things that remain are gold silver and precious stones, things that have been done in the power of the Holy Spirit, and for his glory. The verses of 1 Corinthians 3 deal with rewards, with the fires being fires of purification, not judgment. We enter heaven with what we have done in the power of the Spirit in His name. Take a text out of context and you get the pretext for purgatory.

#### MASS AND THE DEAD

The Mass had also come into its own with it no longer being a memorial feast but it being a re-crucifying of the Lord Jesus Christ and the elements becoming the real flesh and blood of Jesus Christ. The celebrants are called priests because they are again offering Christ. It is a real sacrifice again for them. The Cross was “forever”, but Gregory’s point was that its application was every day renewed by the church. We say “no!” to this dogma; the Lord Jesus Christ died once for our sins and that it is a memorial celebration now to be held until he comes. We look to Him not the altar!

The next was the so called miraculous power in the elements which will secure the release of a soul from purgatory. It was taught that it would allow the righteous dead get into heaven a little earlier, hence the last sacrament, or final communion was the pathway to heaven.

Shelley gives the story which proved to Gregory how that was right. Here you have a priest and a friend going through eucharistic services, the Mass, for a recently departed friend. This was repeated every day for thirty days offering the Mass for the man who they think is in purgatory. They pray for the deceased for thirty days and perform thirty masses. On the thirtieth day the friend had a vision that the deceased was released from purgatory and entered heaven. Gregory checked back on the number of days since this vigil had started and found that it was thirty days.

It therefore became a dogma that if a priest said thirty Masses this would release a loved one from purgatory. This soon became a money making exercise, as from this point people were paying the priest so much money per Mass. For instance there are today devout Roman Catholics who will pay \$100+ a Mass for this ritual to occur to release a loved one from the testing of purgatory.

This shows the great danger of applying experience to spiritual things without backup Scripture from the Bible. Was Gregory great? Was he even a believer? Many historians accept him as a great believer, but we must be discerning of the fruit of his life, but also identify that he was the man for the moment, and lived in a devotion to the Lord that most of us do not even get close to. In the end only the Lord knows how spiritual he was, and we ought not to judge him too harshly, for he saved the church in his day, and launched many evangelistic campaigns, but they were evangelism for what purpose? Did he simply enslave more people to legalism and falsehood?

You have the same enigma nowadays in cultic circles where people are living in apparent conformity with the Scriptures even though they believe in some crazy things. You have a number on the extreme Pentecostal side who are believers, but have crazy doctrines which they believe through special revelations like Gregory, yet the Lord still uses them to bring people into the kingdom. Once again we are challenged by these people to hold to the Lord and love him, for love covers a multitude of sins and errors!

Do not add your experiences to Scripture. Gregory added his experience to Scripture. Under Gregory the Roman Church cared for the souls of people with a desire for evangelism. However we have to see what the "gospel" is. In the case of Gregory it was faith plus works. We must follow Christ only, His Word only.

A lot of believers attack the Roman Catholic Church too quickly. There are believers in both the Catholic and Orthodox churches down the ages, but they are not necessarily right on all of what they say, **but neither are we!**

Let us be like Gregory humble servants of the church – nothing is simple as we look at men and women in history – they are as complex as we are.

#### DOCTRINES

##### COMMUNION: THE LORD’S SUPPER

1. There are three suppers which man is invited to:-



- a) The gospel supper (Luke 14:15-24)
  - b) Marriage supper of the Lamb (Revelation 19:7-9)
  - c) Lord's supper (1 Corinthians 11:23-29).
2. Those who accept the "gospel supper" will eventually appear at the wedding supper and in the meantime, whilst on earth, should partake of the Lord's supper. "Until He comes..." 1 Corinthians 11:24.
  3. At the Lord's Supper the believer meditates on:-
    - a) The death of Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour
    - b) The risen Lord who makes intercession for him
    - c) The coming Lord who will return for His church and set up His reign on the earth.
  4. The Lord's Supper is derived from the Passover meal (Exodus 12:1-11, 1 Corinthians 11:23-32). Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us (1 Corinthians 5:7).
  5. The bread represents the body of Christ which was broken for us when He bore our sins on the cross (1 Corinthians 11:24).  
The wine represents the blood of Christ which is the guarantee of our salvation. For without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin (1 Corinthians 11:25).
  6. The Lord's Table is prepared for believers in the presence of their enemies (Psalm 23:5).
  7. The believer must be in fellowship to discern the meaning of the Lord's Supper (1 Corinthians 11:29). This is accomplished by self judgment (1 Corinthians 11:31, 1 John 1:9).
  8. Partaking of the Lord's Supper without fellowship with the Lord can result in sickness or death (1 Corinthians 11:30).

**HUMILITY**

1. Humility is to be sought - Zephaniah 2:3
2. Humility is manifest in restraint - Luke 6:28-29
3. Humility is produced by the Holy Spirit - Galatians 5:22-23
4. Humility is essential in teaching - 2 Timothy 2:25
5. Humility is essential in learning - James 1:21
6. Humility is valuable to God - Proverbs 3:34; James 4:6, 1 Peter 5:5
7. Humility is the path to promotion - 1 Peter 5:6
8. Humility gives proper self evaluation - Romans 12:3
9. Examples of humility:
  - a) Moses - Numbers 12:3
  - b) David - 2 Samuel 16:11
  - c) Jeremiah - Jeremiah 26:14
  - d) Stephen - Acts 7:60
  - e) Paul - 2 Timothy 4:16
10. Evidences of humility:
  - a) Forbearance to others - Ephesians 4:2,6:9, Colossians 3:13
  - b) Endurance in trials - 1 Corinthians 13:7, James 1:12
  - c) Compassion - 1 Thessalonians 2:7
  - d) Peaceability - James 3:17
11. Humility was the primary characteristic of Christ - Isaiah 53:7, Matthew 11:29, 21:5
12. Promises to the humble - Psalm 22:26, 37:11, 147:6, Isaiah 29:19

**LECTURE 18 - THE CHURCH AND STATE IN MEDIEVAL TIMES (700-1077)**

## INTRODUCTION

This is the story of how the church and state came together and formed Europe as we have it today. If you want to understand what happened in the Reformation later you need to know what happened in this period.

The church was to be ruled, they believed, by God's Will, God's Word, and His man, the Pope. You then had rulers, the leaders of the invaders who had destroyed the old Roman Empire, who claimed to be the rulers of the church, and wanted to be "Roman". After the Empire fell in the West these kings did not want the church to interfere in their states, but the power of the church under the popes of the 5th and 6th centuries grew. What happened was that they had an arrangement between the Popes and the various kings in Europe.

The question raised during this period is, what is the correct pattern of church state relationship? Do we follow the Old Testament pattern where the king ruled over the church and the people? Should the church and state be close together with the king ruling over both? Or should there be complete separation between church and state with temporal and spiritual not mixing in politics? **1 Samuel 9:14 -16, 1 Peter 2:13-17, Matthew 22:17-21, 1 Timothy 2:2.**

**Romans 13:1-7** tells us what the Scriptures say. Where the things are of Caesar they are Caesar's and if God's they are God's. There is to be a separation. That is the NT position but if you think of yourself as the inheritor of Israel, then maybe you are to be like King David or Solomon? What passages will be applied, and what ignored?

## THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

At the time of Charlemagne the Pope crowned him as king with the title of Augustus and prostrated himself in front of him. At this point in this manner he created what became known as the Holy Roman Empire.

The idea that persisted was that the Old Roman Empire could be revived, that there could be a new empire established which was a Christian empire. Charlemagne is a tough man who was pulling the whole thing back together by the scruff of its neck. Palace at Aix la Chapelle, Aachen.

It is called Holy because it is in the church that authorized the king, Roman because they wanted to form a Roman style government, and Empire because he wanted it to be large. Many of the buildings from the Roman Empire which are now in 2020 ruins were still useful buildings in 800 AD, and he reused them.

The people were looking backwards to the Roman Empire and wishing that it could be restored to give universal peace to Europe after 300 years of chaos; they wanted peace like the old Pax Romana. The Europeans even today are hoping for someone to pull the whole of Europe together. The Scriptures says that this will happen and the ruler's name will be called the Antichrist. Daniel's visions all explain this – the Old Roman Empire hasn't gone away.

## CHARLEMAGNE

There was a strong king of the Franks called Clovis. The Franks were a German tribe, one of the Barbarians tribes which swept through the Old Roman Empire. After Clovis died there was much squabbling amongst his sons with most of them trying or succeeding in killing each another. The Franks give their name to France.

One of the positions that came into being amongst them was the "mayor of the palace" which was decided by some of the wealthy landowners. After a lot of maneuvering one of them became very strong. This was Charles Martel, Charles the Hammer. Charles was Mayor of the Palace in 714 and was the grandfather of Charlemagne. He was called the Hammer because in 732 he defeated a Spanish Moslem army near Tours in France.

By 718 the whole of Spain had come under the domination of the Moslems. In fact for several hundred years the southern part of Spain was Moslem. The Moslems came through the Pyrenees to conquer Europe and Charles defeated them at the battle of Tours in 732.

His son was Pepin the Short. He wheeled and dealt with the Pope. It was at this time that Boniface crowned him king of the Franks. He was crowned by the priest as God's anointed to lead the Franks. Three years later the Pope came across the Alps and anointed Pepin in the Old Testament manner as the chosen of the Lord.

Is this right and proper for a Christian leader to acknowledge a political leader as anointed and chosen of the Lord? While the Lord gives us governments do we take sides politically? When they have done this in recent times it has come back to haunt them.

The Lombards had been causing a lot of problems for the Pope so the "deal was" that Pepin was crowned and acknowledged as king, and Pepin was then called in to help the Pope. He did so and defeated the Lombards and secured the Pope. He also gave the Pope the area of land called the "Donation of Pepin" which became the start of the Papal States.

The Pope therefore became an owner of land from 756 and this continued until the present day, with the Vatican City being the last of the "Papal States". At the time of Michaelangelo the Pope would lead an army, conquer some more people and kill his enemies with the sword then dismount and celebrate mass in the centre of the conquered city. Peter had recovered his sword!

On the death of Pepin the Short, Charles the Great, or Charlemagne, came on the scene and was also asked to sort out the Pope's political problems. Charles the Great was a fighter. He was not a fair fighter but he won. History remembers the winners not the noble losers.

Spain was the battleground for many years with Barcelona representing the Christian portion of the country. The rest was Moslem. You had many knights involved including El Cid. We therefore have Roman Catholic knights butchering men women and children under Charlemagne to win back part of Spain for the Christians.

Charlemagne also took on the Bavarians and Saxons and fought 32 battles against them. He invited them all to a truce one day and butchered them all. He then forced the Saxons to become Christians. He had harsh laws against pagans, and so even though they were not Christians, they pretended to be to survive.

Charlemagne was a great ruler but his empire did not last long. Over a period of some 200 years to 1060 the Vikings attacked causing the people to come under a more feudal system for localized protection against the invaders from the sea. This is still the system in many nations, and in industry it has started to re-emerge ( few at the top – power down).

The feudal system is where there is a lord, with wealth and power, over a people who she/he has the responsibility to protect. In exchange the people had a responsibility to support their Lord with taxes of food and produce, and provide soldiers to fight in their Lord's army.

He supported you by organizing you and protecting you by leading your soldiers in war. Each town was a unit in itself. The town had a wall round it. The feudal lord stood, with his priest by his side, judging his people; living on a fortified hill, fighting both his neighbours and anyone who came from further afield. At times they would join together with other lords and serve with kings to fight common foes. Paintings of the lords at this time will show them carrying a sword and a knife which is the norm through to the Reformation.

#### THE CHURCH AND STATE

The priest and the king get close together but unfortunately the upper class priest of this time is not teaching the Word of God but is playing politics. The church tried to influence the attitudes and behaviours of the feudal barons. They would excommunicate any baron who had burnt or looted a church.

The popes established what they called "the truce of God" meant that Monday through Wednesday you could fight but not Thursday through to Sunday. This was sheer hypocrisy with Europe a battle ground at the time. The church was trying to stop the fighting rather than to convert the leaders and soldiers. They accepted the situation rather than asking what does the Lord want us to do? Some believers were active at this time in gospel work, especially in the Celtic church, but generally the organised church was not, with most of the action being political.

To answer the pressing need for spiritual power to return, the Benedictine order at Cluny started to reform the Roman Catholic monasteries with promotion of celibacy and the abolition of simony. This is where you get the celibacy of the priesthood becoming an important part of the Roman Catholic Church. The sale of church offices were to be stopped. There was an attempt to save the church from secular control and to get it back under the Pope's control.

This sounded good but in practical terms it was doomed for the Pope by this time was a secular ruler who had become as corrupt as the kings from whom the monks were trying to free the church.

In 1059 a College of Cardinals was elected. The church had gone away from God's Word, and mixed themselves with the world, setting up an alternative court to rule. The Middle Ages are called the dark ages by many historians. By the

time the light was needed to be seen it was not in the organised church. God's men and women were going out with the gospel but they were very few. At the centre of the church was deep darkness.

#### **WILDEBRAND AND HENRY IV**

Wildebrand (Pope Gregory VII) 1073-1085 gained unprecedented power for the papacy. He humbled the successor of Charlemagne, Henry IV. He was the first pope to excommunicate such a powerful king. He excommunicated Henry who then came and stood outside in the snow for three days. No burial could be undertaken by a Roman priest in the land, the church closed down the Holy Roman Empire until this man repented. This is not godly repentance but two political powers fighting for prominence with that of the Pope winning.

This is papal power at its peak. This pope is the evil man who started the inquisition and the Crusades. The Crusades were not against Moslems initially but against other Christians. These are against those who are like us wanted a pure church. Believers were brutally murdered by orders of Gregory. The church maintained that the spiritual preceded the temporal. Man however can only find true liberty and unity in Christ, not in a church which is full of hypocrisy. The unity that these men brought about was the unity of the sword.

This sets the scene for the revolt that will break out in 400 years under Martin Luther. We have a group of pre Protestants in Southern France. They suffered greatly as the church would not accept them as they were not part of the power system. They were not able to accept the rule of the Roman prince/pope. They were murdered by a crusade called for by the pope; well over 200,000 people were killed.

If you are an ambassador of the court of heaven, if you are a minister of God, you do not get mixed up with politics of this world. In this period the church was so closely aligned to the political that it lost its spiritual credibility. Many people leave the study of the Word to enter into the political system. Once you get in you never get out. We are called to the great commission not to accept the lesser commission. Our job is to make the policy of the King of Kings real to the kings of this world. What they do with it is on their heads. **2 Corinthians 5:20** or politics here and now?

#### **DOCTRINES**

##### **MINISTERS**

1. Used for political leadership in a nation (Romans 13:4).
2. Used as the pastor of the local church (Ephesians 3:7; Colossians 1:23,25; Colossians 4:7; Ephesians 6:21; 1Timothy 1:12).
3. Used for all believers (2 Corinthians 3:6; 4:1; 6:4).
4. Origin - in the classical Greek the word was used for those who rowed in the lower decks, the place of greatest toil on a ship - a servant or slave.
5. Principle - The minister should see himself as the servant as well as leader of his flock.

##### **NATIONS AND RACES**

1. God has set the geographical and historical boundaries for nations (Acts 17:26, Genesis 10:25; Deuteronomy 32:8).
2. All nations and races are descended from Noah's three sons Ham, Shem and Japheth (Genesis 9:19).
3. The nations were dispersed after the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11:9).
4. Internationalism and one-worldism is therefore against the will of God (cf. Genesis 11:4,9). Satan is attempting to unite the world as a counterfeit to the Millennium, when Christ will reign as King.
5. Nations are established by God to protect the freedoms and rights of people so that they may serve God peacefully (1Timothy 2:1-2).
6. The importance of free will - a government should not force people to accept or reject Christianity.
7. Freedoms in a nation are to be protected:
  - a) Externally by military forces
  - b) Internally by police forces and courts (Romans 13:4). Capital punishment is an integral part of law enforcement (Genesis 9:6).

8. The effectiveness of believers within a nation determines its blessing or cursing (Deuteronomy 11:26-28, Genesis 18:17-33, Matthew 5:13).
9. When nations become evil, God must destroy them. Examples include:
  - a) Amorites (Genesis 15:16, Deuteronomy 7:2)
  - b) Chaldea (Daniel 5).
10. Jews were forbidden to intermarry with other nations, so that the Jewish religion would not be defiled by heathen practices (Deuteronomy 7:1-3, Ezra 10:2,14)
  - a) Solomon's union with foreign women was evil (Nehemiah 13:23-27)
  - b) Abraham forbade Isaac to marry outside his people (Genesis 28:1)
  - c) Esau's marriage to Hittites brought grief (Genesis 26:34,35)
  - d) Moses' marriage to an Ethiopian caused trouble (Numbers 12:1).
11. The threefold split of humanity appears in the book of Acts as examples of salvation:
  - a) An Ethiopian (Hamitic) is saved in (Acts 10:1 -48)
  - b) Saul (Semitic) is saved in (Acts 9:1-16)
  - c) Cornelius (Japhetic) is saved in (Acts 10:1-48)

## **LECTURE 19 - CRUSADES AND CATHEDRALS**

Key Passages - **Jeremiah 7:1-16, Matthew 10 : 37 - 39, 16: 24 - 26.**

### INTRODUCTION

The crusades and cathedral building were undertaken at the same time. Jeremiah says that when believers are not concentrating on spiritual things and living in the Word they concentrate on the externals. In the 11th and 12th centuries most of the powerful people in the church were "make believers", carnal believers or unbelievers, yet even in this dark time there were those who loved the Lord. **Matthew 7:13-23.**

Many people today think that it is in the externals of life that you show your Christianity and spirituality, how long you pray, how loud you sing. External shows of religiosity it does not necessarily mean spirituality. The Lord makes it clear that it is the sacrifice of the heart, the dedication of the life, and the obedience of the soul that is important.

This time of the Crusades and the Cathedrals was a low point in spirituality. They used the sword of steel, rather than the sword of the Spirit and the Living Word, and built of stones rather than upon the rock that is Christ. Shelley Chapter 19, Pages 192ff.

### THE CATHEDRALS

The cathedrals were full of moving Latin chanting. The vast throng would stand in the cathedral and hear God's Word in a language that they did not understand, they would hear a sermon in a language that they did not understand, sing in a language which they could not understand and walk out of the service, emotionally moved, but as spiritually impoverished as they came in. They did however have a great experience for their senses, and even in spite of the Latin dominance of the rulers, some of the rich and the poor people loved the Lord! Note the parallels to the Eastern Orthodox services with their icons.

The people in Jeremiah's day were trusting in the temple of the Lord. "The Temple is here and therefore we can do anything that we like". Some people nowadays practice this "lucky rabbits foot religion", and think that if they have the Bible with them then God cannot touch them. In these times people thought that if they subscribed money to build a cathedral God would bless them, and for some they believed that to do this was to guarantee salvation. Their salvation was tied to the physical things rather than the state of their soul, and to be buried by the high altar was to be assured of eternal life. They had an emotional attitude to their faith, but no doctrine. They dissipated their energy into physical building projects and the wars of the crusades.

In the New Testament it is recorded that the Lord Jesus Christ says of the temple in Jerusalem, that His House has become a den of robbers. The building was no longer associated with holiness but with corruption through the carnality of the evil religious leadership. Buildings are neutral, and may work for good or bad to those who enter them, it is the attitude of the people, not the building that counts.

Shelley says that the cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris was only one symptom of a veritable fever of church building then infecting Europe. Between 1170 and 1270 more than 500 great churches were built in Gothic style in France alone. Gothic first appeared in the restoration of the abbey church of St Denis near Paris. The abbot of St Denis, Suger, conceived the project and guided the work of rebuilding between 1137 and 1144.

The idea of the Gothic church was that as you walked in you were lifted up by the architecture. In the age when most people lived in mud huts the Gothic church was something fantastic. Some of the cathedrals are thirty stories high.

If you live in a mud hut and on a Sunday you walk into a cathedral which is thirty stories high with stained glass windows, the incense, the chanting, the choir, you are likely to have an emotional experience. You are being lifted up in a mystic manner. This is what medieval Christianity was all about. Very little Bible doctrine and plenty of emotion and very little genuine faith, yet once again, in some places there was a move of the Holy Spirit. Be careful of feeling superior to these people however, for many Pentecostal churches today operate the same way, maximum emotion, minimal thought!

#### KINGDOM THEOLOGY

Shelley notes that these cathedral builders were the first “kingdom theologians”. We need to be “very scared” of the attitudes of the modern kingdom theologians. We see where it comes from, a lust for political power; an arrogance that proclaims that these men and women believe they have the ability to sort the world out, and we see in history where it always leads to. It leads to a destruction of evangelism, and often self righteous hypocrisy, which, in the eyes of the unbeliever who we are supposed to give the gospel to, destroys the message.

These people wanted to form the kingdom of God on earth so that people could be moulded into what the Pope and the Bishops wanted them to be. The irony of history is that it was the reformed theologians in the late twentieth century who were doing this again. Those who aim at their view of Utopia often ends up with hell for the rest of man, and we see this in Calvin’s Geneva, Knox’s Edinburgh, the Inquisition’s Spain, and the recent ISIS or Taleban terrorist’s vision of Moslem Utopia. Man simply doesn't have the brains or the moral perfection to bring in anything except arrogance personified!

The papacy was trying to get a perfect society on earth. Their attempt was not admirable as intimated by Shelley, yet they did genuinely believe it would be better for all mankind if they were forced to conform to Rome. All the people were really given however was subjugation and domination through the week, and great emotion each Sunday. They feudal lords and their bishop cousins had the poverty of the people to be rightly blamed for. They kept the people poor by taking what little cash they had and constructing these amazing buildings to the glory of the Roman Catholic Church. However let’s not get too carried away with our criticisms either, for where would the money have otherwise gone? Look also at the energy that this society had, and ask whether it would have had this energy in the face of the Moslem armies and the black death if they had not taken this route?

They did not however proclaim the glorious gospel of Christ, the people just heard the singing, prayers and other things with incense and they did not send out the evangelists to the lost. They sent out the soldiers to kill the infidels and that was the crusades. In this and other forms of kingdom theology, if someone disagrees with them, you get the feeling that they want to blot out the opposition. Yet as we will see some of the monks, in revived orders did take the gospel out, so as the organized church decayed revival sprang up in parallel movements.

There are likely to be few crusaders or cathedral builders in heaven. They trusted in buildings rather than God and their emotions rather than the Word of God. In their self righteousness they murdered those who Jesus ordered be given the gospel message. There is a lot of social good or human good rather than spiritual good today. People have the concept that if it feels good it must be of God. This is a false concept.

#### INNOCENT III

The great power Pope of the age was Innocent III who was innocent by name only. He was a great administrator and a canon lawyer. He stated that "the successor of Peter is the Vicar of Christ: he has been established as a mediator between God and man, below God but beyond man; less than God but more than man; who shall judge all but be judged by no one." This is not even remotely true but the popes of this period believed it, and most since have also.

He also said that the Papacy was like the sun and the Kings were like the moon and as the moon derived its light from the sun so kings derived their power from the Pope. Most of the people at this time believed in heaven and hell and believed the Pope had the “keys” – the only means by which they could get into one and avoid the other. The Pope used this and said that he was the mediator between God and man rather than the Lord Jesus Christ. He decided that he had the key to heaven and hell and that if he did not open the right gates you did not get in.

#### EXCOMMUNICATION

He had two weapons, which he used on the people. The first was excommunication which when applied to a person meant that they were looked upon as dead by all who were part of the church; that meant by everyone else. After a bishop had proclaimed a solemn statement of excommunication a bell tolled as if a funeral had taken place, a candle was extinguished and a book closed. If an excommunicated person entered a church while Mass was being celebrated the Mass would stop and the person was removed from the church.

He could not act as juror, judge, they could not defend themselves in any court, they could not be executors of a will, or a guardian, nor could they make a contract with anyone. The mark of the beast was on you and you could not do a thing. The church and state was so integrated that a person who had been excommunicated could only go to his backyard and

grow vegetables and if they were charged with any crime their accusers were believed. After they died they were left on the rubbish dump. If anyone buried them they were dug up and their body burned and the ashes scattered into a river.

Excommunication was biblical as shown in 1 Corinthians 5, where a person who is unwilling to deal with obvious gross sin is removed from the church. The door however is always open to restoration, and in **2 Corinthians 2:5-11**, the Corinthian pervert who has repented is brought back into the church. Note Paul's words here, for Satan got more than his foot in the door of the Medieval church. Thus the Christian concept of excommunication was that it was a limited action, due to unrepentant evil by the person, and designed for their change of life. By the high Middle Ages this had become pure power politics.

#### INTERDICTION

The second form of control was "The Interdict". This was an ecclesiastical lockout. With the Papal publishing of an interdict all church services within a country stopped. Innocent III threatened this 85 times. The priests went on strike under his orders. There were no weddings, funerals in the whole country; only baptism and extreme unction were allowed. This ground the whole state religiously to a halt. The Pope was exercising his power as the spiritual "Lord of Europe", custodian and guardian of the eternal souls of all.

Magna Carta in England was a result of an interdict being served against King John and England. It was not really a great spontaneous thing; it was built on the Pope's evil and King John's stupidity. King John had a difference with Innocent III over the election of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Innocent excommunicated John and put England under an interdict. The barons revolted, and he gave them their rights, and also gave Innocent what he wanted. Magna Carta is not about freedom, except by accident of history, it is about domination, by the Pope, and the wealthy over the poor. It was about John having to recognize that he needed the approval of the Pope and his nobles to rule, and in England it opened the door to freedom later.

#### THE CRUSADES

These things affected Christianity for years to come, but the greatest effect was from and through the crusades. The call went out, "take up the Cross of Christ" and free the land of the Lord from the Turks. Now we are told to take up our Cross. Commit yourself to Christian service, commit yourself to serve unto death. This is what the Lord did for us He served us unto death, even the death of the Cross. In a time where people were controlled more by emotion such a command as **Matthew 10:37-39, 16:24-26** was taken out of context.

"Taking up the Cross" according to Jesus does not mean exterminating anyone who disagrees with you. For seven hundred years the Christians have tried to forget the Crusades, but neither Jew or Muslim will allow them to do so. In our liberated generation it is easy to dismiss the whole bloody affair as insane religious bigotry, forgetting the context in which it occurred. The context was violence from both sides of the religious divide, and the demonic was present in both.

Christians have a lot of problems witnessing to the Jews and Muslims due to the Crusades. They saw the Cross on the chest of those who destroyed their families. Now also do not get too carried away with the need to apologize to Moslems either, although it is justified for the crusades, for the Moslem armies had exterminated all who would not convert in the places they conquered, and have kept on doing it right up until today!

For centuries peaceful pilgrims had visited the Holy Land, but there was some persecution of pilgrims and stories of that were sufficient to inflame men's minds. Urban II at the request of the eastern emperor declared the first crusade to rid the holy land of the infidel, the Muslims. The Muslims had been there since the seventh century when the Arabs took it over in the name of Mahomet. Urban however saw the opportunity to gain power for the Roman Catholic Church in the east due to both the Eastern Emperor and the Eastern Patriarch being hard pressed. He saw it as an opportunity to reabsorb the eastern orthodox branch of the church under his power and authority. It was a pure power play and led to the betrayal of Eastern Christians and the Eastern Empire.

He cried out "Deus Volt" - God wills it, which was to become the battle cry of the Crusaders. Off they went taking the cross. When they were going to the Holy Land they would have the cross on the chest whilst when they were on the way home they wore it on their back. They wore chain mail. Fighting for forty days in a crusade gave you an indulgence from the Pope for all your sins. Many crusaders went for that purpose but many were away for a number of years and plunder was on their minds, and many became rich. They were also told that by killing Muslims they would have their sins forgiven. This led to the murder of hundreds of thousands of innocent people, Jews, Moslems, and eastern Christians.

We are told to go into the world and preach the gospel. Yet here are people carrying swords spears and arrows, killing and murdering all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The inception of the Crusades ignited horrible attacks against the Jews and even fellow Christians were not exempt from rape and plunder. These people were thugs similar to the worst criminals in our cities today but they did it in the name of Christ. The Crusaders killed as more Eastern Christians than they did Moslems.

On the fourth crusade they did not even get to Jerusalem. The Venetians who took them by boat charged an enormous amount of money to get there so that all the knights were bankrupt. These people therefore attacked Zara, a Christian city on the Adriatic coast and Constantinople where they put the population to the sword. After raging against the

Crusaders, Innocent III saw this as an opportunity to put his bishop in Constantinople, thinking that he had beaten the Orthodox church, but it had gone underground, hating the Roman Catholics even more. Even today in Greece if you are a Christian from the West you are not really welcome.

The first crusade was the most successful, with Jerusalem being captured and the setting up of a kingdom in Palestine. There were 5000 knights in this crusade who beat the Turks in battle. They captured Jerusalem in 1099 and set up the Latin kingdom of Palestine. They built castles and for nearly two hundred years there was a Crusader kingdom in Palestine until the fall of Acre in 1291. When they entered Jerusalem they killed everyone, Moslem and eastern Christian, and then gave thanks for the killing with a solemn Mass. They herded the entire Jewish population into the synagogue and burned them all alive!

Bernard of Clairvaux in 1147 preached the Second Crusade but it petered out after a couple of years. Saladin the Sultan of Egypt and Syria brought fresh vigour and unity to the Muslim leadership. He also was the cultured person in the war being quite chivalrous. Whilst he declared a jihad or holy war he told his people to abstain from the shedding of blood for the blood that is shed never slumbers. Richard the Lionheart, who met Saladin in the third crusade, could have worked with him, but both men proved ruthlessly untrustworthy.

Most tragic of the crusades was the children's crusade where tens of thousands of little children were led away by the emotional preaching of a little boy. Ruthless merchants made sure that they were all sold into slavery on the Mediterranean coast. This is what happens when emotions take over. When people work on emotion thousands get hurt. We must work on making sure people know true doctrine. If you use emotion you will be up to your ears in strife.

Is there any thing good in all this? Raymond Lull argued for a peaceful mission to convert the Muslims rather than kill them. He was a voice in the wilderness. There were some who went out into Egypt to convert Muslims to Christ, they had limited success because of the Crusaders, but also because of the nature of Islam and the hatred of non-Moslems taught in parts of the Koran.

These crusades created three semi monastic orders, the Templars who had their first headquarters on Temple Mount in Jerusalem, the Hospitalers who were founded to look after the sick and were known as the Knights of St John of Jerusalem, the fore runners of St John Ambulance. They would kill others but nurse their friends. Finally there were the Teutonic Knights an exclusively German order with a black cross who fought in the North.

Other groups in Europe, the Albigensians and the Waldensians, were attacked by Crusaders on the authority of the Pope because they would not be subject to the Pope's power. Over 200,000 of these Christians were murdered by Simon De Montfort under the Popes orders.

Unfortunately the popes never held two basic truths which we must never forget: Christianity's highest satisfactions are not guaranteed by possession of special places, and the sword is never God's way to extend Christ's church. This fault assured the religious collapse of the whole structure.

## **DOCTRINE**

### **MILITARY**

1. Protection of the national entity is two-fold:
  - a) INTERIOR - the policeman and the judge
  - b) EXTERIOR - the military establishment (Nehemiah 4:14,15).
2. In spite of man's effort for peace, warfare will continue until the Millennium (Matthew 24:6; Mark 13:7; Luke 21:9). Therefore warfare is not only a normal part of history (Ecclesiastes 3:8; Numbers 21:14) but very necessary for the maintenance of national sovereignty and freedom.
3. In both the struggle for the perpetuation of Jewish freedom after the Exodus, Jesus Christ Himself was the Lord of the armies under the title "Lord of Hosts" (Joshua 5:13 - 6:2; Isaiah 1:24).
4. Armies both defend freedom and destroy freedom. In (Jeremiah 34:7) the Jewish Army fought to defend Jewish freedom, while the Chaldean Army fought to destroy Jewish freedom.
5. The issue of national sovereignty, integrity and freedom depends upon which army wins. The Chaldean Army won and the Jews lost their freedom (Jeremiah 40:1).
6. God uses the military in action, to demonstrate the degeneracy of a nation. Failure of the military on the battlefield indicates the lack of self-discipline, spiritual incentive, motivation for courage and respect for authority which are so basic in perpetuating freedom. Failure of the military indicates lack of character and stability among the citizens of a national entity.



7. National military training is important in a nation's life (Numbers 31:3-5; Luke 14:31).

## **LECTURE 20 - SCHOLASTICISM.**

Read **Isaiah 55:1-13, John 1:37-39, 8:12, 31, 32, 16:12-15, 1 Corinthians 13:12.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

These people established the Universities and were the first systematic theologians since the days of Origen and Clement. The Crusades and the Scholastics were also related. One of the things that the Crusaders brought back were the books and manuscripts that the Arab scholars had stored and saved from the old libraries their armies had destroyed.

The Arabs were the people who both destroyed in places, but actually kept Classical culture alive during the dark ages. While the Europeans were living in drafty castles with straw on the floor, with an unhealthy environment and short life span the Arabs were highly cultured, they had hot and cold running water, carpets on the ground, glass in the windows. The Arabs had better food, they bathed, and they also had formal education in mathematics, classics, and architecture.

In their conquests they had captured the great libraries of the world including that of Alexandria, although some lunatics burned it to the ground afterwards. They had the works of Aristotle, Plato and other thinkers of the ancient world and had made their own translation into Arabic and had written their own commentaries. They advanced the study of science, mathematics, and architecture. Islamic art and music was also highly advanced at this time. Averroes.

The Crusades did not only bring back the use of glass and carpets, but also oranges and other fruit, but most of all they brought back books. As a result many of the people in the church started to come to read the books that had made Europe great in the past, and so they began the revival of learning; the Renaissance. Sadly many of the books were in Europe, or had been, but were locked away in the Vatican, or in Monasteries, and the Vandal and later Viking raids had destroyed much. The Moslem rulers and merchants of Sicily and Spain were incredible students of everything and there was a lot of positive interaction between the two groups, Catholic and Moslem, with Catholics gaining from the books the Moslems had, but they often restricted the application of the texts, as they opened up thinking too wide for some.

### **PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY**

This brought the question as to whether the very existence of God was open to reason; was theology open to challenge by logic? Is it heresy to question? Others said that God runs the world on reason and therefore philosophy and theology can run parallel to each other. They asked questions of God and because they knew the character of God from the Bible then, they believed that they could know the answer. Has not God made us to question, and given us His Wisdom?

Much of the basis for the testing of faith by reason, was the confidence they had that Christianity made sense and was reasonable. Out of this group however there were many who thought that they could obtain salvation by study and that they were working out their salvation through their books. There was a problem here from the beginning, but the right questions were being asked, and they couldn't be in the closed religious worlds.

The curriculum of the early cathedral school was limited to grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy - these were the so called seven liberal arts; these being the basis of the liberal arts university later.

### **UNIVERSITIES**

The first universities growing out of the cathedral schools were Bologna, Paris, Salerno, Aberdeen, Oxford, Cambridge, Montpellier, Padua, Salamanca and Toulouse. They taught the seven liberal arts in Latin not in their native tongue. All the students had to become adept at thinking and singing, and playing musical instruments. At this time the person went to university not only to think, but to do. All of European learning was united in the Latin language, and later Greek was added after the Crusaders brought back more Greek manuscripts. Every student everywhere in Europe could speak and

write to each other in Latin. Unity was returning to Europe. Daniel's visions showing the Roman Empire would not disappear was proving correct – in politics and language Rome continued.

You learnt to be an orator and sing in the choir. The famous choirs of Oxford and Cambridge go right back to this time. Each student would have to play at least one musical instrument. They would write philosophy, theology and love sonnets. Having written your sonnets you then sang your song to your ideal lady love, not a "wife", but an ideal woman of virtue and beauty. Many of these people would start university at about 13 years of age and graduate with a doctorate in their early twenties.

Under one thousand books had survived/existed in the Western World, and after this period of study you would know all the available knowledge in the world at that time. A PhD graduate of those days was truly a "know it all".

They would have a doctorate of Sacred Theology. At the completion of their studies they would go off in the army to learn the art of war, or enter the church. It was a very comprehensive educational system and truly "European" as they all spoke the one language, Latin, in addition to their own. Most also learned Greek, and conversed in three+ languages.

The person who was a dropout in this area, was a person who did not get a doctorate. The largest of the universities had only 300 or so students. A person was not allowed to lecture until he was 35 and so was expected to practice their "art" for at least ten years in war, the church or politics before they taught. All lecturers were also celibate priests or monks.

This challenges our concepts of theological education. Many people who are into ministry today are far too young and often uneducated in the wisdom of the world. Spurgeon is often cited as the exception, but he is truly unique. The initial course at these early universities was a BA. This generally took 4 years. You had a tutor and you had to pass in everything. After this you had two years of study with another tutor and then you undertook a thesis which gave you an MA. You would then spend six years studying law, medicine or theology for your doctorate. It was very rigorous. The other question to challenge ourselves is, does this alone make a good minister? Most of these men were still not born again at the end of their study!

The main feature of university life was eating and talking together. You slept on straw under the cathedral, or in formal dormitories/colleges built by patrons of the university. As you ate together you discussed in Latin or Greek the things that you had studied. You dined together and learned good manners and discussion. You paid for your food as well as university tuition. Lecturers were only paid after their lesson was given, so if they were no good they didn't last. At meal times you learnt the importance of conversation. Most people ate with their knives and their fingers. You ate and fought with your dagger.

#### THE START OF THE UNIVERSITIES

Gerbert was among the first of "the school men". He later became Pope Sylvester II [999-1003]. He was master of the cathedral school at Rheims in the late nine hundreds. What changed him was a visit to Spain where he spent time with the tolerant Muslims there. Spain under the Muslims was a lot better than Spain under the Roman Catholics later. When he taught at Rheims, Gerbert discovered that the teaching of the church fathers was not sufficient. He would ask his students what they thought, challenging them to dispute and question these theological authorities. This was the first man to do this in Europe since the closing of the philosophy schools at Athens five hundred years before.

For a person to build up a manuscript library you needed to be rich. For instance, the Bible would take two years to be transcribed by hand by a qualified scribe. The book that we buy for \$35 nowadays would have cost the equivalent of \$35,000 in those days. Gerbert collected many books together.

The liveliest person in this era was Peter Aberlard [1079-1142]. If you entered the university in his day it meant that you were becoming priests. The lecturer was a minister of the congregation. They had the evil practice of not allowing their priests to marry by this time. He battled Bernard of Clairvoux.

Peter Abelard fell in love with the daughter of one of his friends. He taught her logic and secretly married her but one of his servants betrayed him. Peter was castrated by the local bishop whilst his wife was taken from him and put in a nunnery for the rest of her life. His writings on his love for her are very powerful. He finally got to be with her in death and was buried with her. The history of the Universities is a fascinating history of the battle for freedom of thought, and like in the Moslem world, the Catholic leadership hated and persecuted the thinkers at times through until the 1600s.

The church was evil in its basic structure regarding celibacy by this time. These people are real characters. Peter Abelard proposed 158 questions on Christian teaching in his famous work "Sic et Non" [Yes and No]. He also answered them contrasting conflicting passages of Scripture, Church Fathers and pagan writers. Some said yes, some said no. He challenged his students to think through the difficult questions; "What do you think?", he would ask them. He was condemned for heresy a couple of times by the local power Bishop, and went into the monastery at the end of his life.

The reason the doctor would have sleeves in his gown whilst the BA would not was based on the fact that the doctor would take books around in the sleeves of his gown whilst the BA fellow was still a novice without books. We should still only have a basic suitcase full of books so that we can relocate quickly with our ministry office, in fact today with small computers and books on disc/USB, we are back to their days with a "portable library up our sleeve".

If you were good as a lecturer you were applauded by your students, and paid, but if the teachers were not impressive, they were whistled at, booed and fruit was thrown at them. If you did not do a good job you were pelted out of university. I Love this system, and I often wonder whether that is what we should do with pastors?

#### CANON LAW

With the development of the universities there was the development of canon law around 1140. This originated in Bologna. They started to put together all the regulations and rules and organise and reorganize the Roman Catholic Church to centralize control systems to "keep people in line".

With Pope Innocent III you have the "high point" of the Papacy. Every detail of men and women's lives were organised by the Pope. The peak in OCD rules was reached with Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274). He was in the university of Paris. He was a Dominican, who were the preachers of the Catholic Church. He went as far as the mind could go with canon law in slavish conformity with Roman Catholic dogma. He tried to get the whole universe in his work Summa Theologica. He made a clear distinction between theology and philosophy.

Thomas Aquinas said that saving grace comes to men exclusively through the channel of divinely appointed sacraments placed in the keeping of the church, the visible organised Roman body, led by the Pope. So convinced was he of the divine sanction of the papacy that he insisted that submission to the pope was necessary for salvation. These people were total slaves of Rome, and if they differed they were disciplined, but more and more would write challenges before Friar Lecturer Martin Luther wrote his 95 Theses.

The limitation of scholasticism was that they did not take the Bible as importantly as canon law. Thus the concept of sacramentalism reached its high point at this time. If you go into the big cathedrals in Europe they have a big altar screen. The priest is behind the screen and is hidden from the flock by the screen. They would perform their ritual and then come out to give the mass to the people. He was going through his incantations turning the bread and wine into the literal body and blood of Christ. If you did not participate you were not saved.

We also have the full teaching on purgatory coming out of this area. The wicked go to hell, the wise and wealthy who have taken mass intelligently go straight to heaven but the mass of the people who are Christian in desire, but not perfect in wisdom, go to purgatory as they have followed Christ inadequately.

It is a doctrine which goes right the way back to the late Roman period. Prayers for the saints are offered to relieve the pain for those who are in purgatory. They also perform masses for the dead. We therefore come to the peak of ecclesiastical aspiration and arrogance. Here we have the priests of the Roman Catholic Church being "raised" to the level of a witch doctor in a pagan society. Religion becomes magical, mystical, and magisterial.

Like the crusades, scholastic theology claimed too much for itself and the church, but it sowed the seeds of revival by asking people to think. As the Roman Catholic Church is raising itself up through this process of canon law, there is a growing number of people who are saying, "actually this is not what the Scriptures are saying". There are believers but they are not in the high positions of the church. Read a number of biographies of these people and they are larger than life. Innocent III in contrast, is the height of arrogance, a real anti-Christ in word and deed.

#### DOCTRINE

##### **PHILOSOPHY**

1. Philosophy does not lead to wisdom. (Job 28:12-13,20-21).
2. It is a futile exercise. (Ecclesiastes 8:17; 1 Corinthians 3:19,20)
3. It does not produce happiness. (Ecclesiastes 1:13-18)
4. It leads to death. (Proverbs 14:12; 1 Corinthians 1:18-22)
5. We cannot find God through it. (Matthew 11:25; 16:17; 1 Corinthians 1:20,21; 2:13)
6. Philosophy is useless in preaching (1 Corinthians 1:20,21; 2:1) as it will rob the gospel of its power. (1Corinthians 1:17). Basic doctrines are then doubted or even denied, as is done in liberal theology.
7. Philosophy is a hindrance in coming to faith. (Acts 17:32; 1 Corinthians 1:23; 1 Timothy 6:20-21)
8. It has to be avoided. (Proverbs 3:5,7; 1 Corinthians 3:18; Colossians 2:8; 1 Timothy 6:20,21).
9. Real wisdom is to know and worship God. (Job 28:28; Psalm 11 1:10; Proverbs 1-7; 9:10; 14:16)

10. Philosophy creates "mental blocks" in the mind. This makes it hard for someone who has been trained in it to understand and accept Biblical truths.
11. A few examples as illustration-
  - a) Evolution: Leaves no room for a Creator, that is, for God.
  - b) Humanism: Denies the existence of God, human soul, life after death, heaven, hell, of absolute values in morals or otherwise.
  - c) Psychiatry: Does not keep man responsible for his deeds. It denies the root of all man's problems: sin.
  - d) Anthropology: Teaches evolution in human society. What is called "primitive man" or "stone age man" is, in reality, the end product of degeneration through sin.

**Isaiah 55:5-12**

## **LECTURE 21 – POVERTY AND WEALTH**

### INTRODUCTION

This was the time 200 plus years before the Reformation. It was a time with a very bad environment, with a great feeling and desire by many for reform. The clerics were preoccupied with clerical power and wealth, but many believers who were educated and could read scripture in Latin turned towards the simplicity of the Gospel.

The Four Gospels were being translated into the native languages of the populace also from the ninth century, and many were reading the Gospel stories to the poor people in their own language. As these people heard the stories of Jesus they looked at what the Pope and Clergy stood for compared to the Lord; they saw the contrast between the earthly power and wealth of the Papacy and the poverty of the Lord. Cathedrals rose, the last crusades were fought.

During these days the church stood in stark contrast to the Lord's words in **Luke 18:18-27**, where we have the rich man told to give his goods to the poor.

### FRANCIS OF ASSISI

Francis of Assisi was a rich man and he gave all his goods away. When his family challenged him he took off his clothes and gave back his clothes to them. He walked naked out of his native city into the fields. He was later given the clothing of a hermit in the form of a hair shirt and later adopted the habit of John the Baptist. Whatever we think of him we should not deny him the enthusiasm he showed, nor doubt his whole hearted devotion to the Lord and the poverty of the pure follower of Christ. He stood as he had to, as a prophetic warning voice in the wilderness to a corrupt church and many flocked to his banner. He was also, like many of the others, a child of his time, and his witness was required, but flawed.

In **Luke 12:22-40** we have a passage that burnt into the souls of the holy men of the Middle Ages. These were those who were not living in the structure that the church had formed for them, they rejected the wealth of the papacy and longed for the life that the Lord had called his disciples to live.

The "book ends" were Arnold of Brescia circa 1155, and Robert Grosseteste [circa 1235-1253] Bishop of Lincoln was the first powerful man who openly decried the state of the church on the basis of Scripture. He criticised the corrupt and immoral life style of the pastors saying that they were destroyers of men. Here we have a bishop who is saying that those in the Church are not living as the Lord had told his disciples to live. Dominic (1170-1221) and Francis (1182-1226).

They are in fact setting the worst possible example. He said that the people cannot read, but they read the priests and bishops lives. They were setting the worst possible example. It had a familiar ring as early in the tenth century the reformers had called for the church to go back to the poverty of the early church, but had failed.

Bishops and monks were not living the Christian life. Poverty was not a part of it. Canon law had been called in to control the church. Whilst sometimes the call for reform had been heeded, many times it had been seen as heresy. The church was seen to be the cement of society so that anyone who fell foul of the church was likely to be executed for not only heresy but also for treason.

A similar attitude occurred within China in the 1980s and even more recently, where anyone who criticized the Chinese Communist Party leadership was likely to be eliminated.

### TORTURE IN THE CHURCH

The concept of execution or torture of another Christian who criticized the church was also practiced; it was very dangerous to call for reform, even if you had powerful friends or family.

The people in power believed that society relied on the church for stability, and if the church was attacked the whole of society could crumble which would be a shocking thing for society. The men who began the persecutions of the reformers believed they were protecting society from a scourge that would return it to the dark ages!

The church adopted an attitude that was almost entirely impossible to reconcile with the kingdom of heaven to which she aspired by using violence to bring peace in the form of the Inquisition. The Inquisition not only executed people but also exposed them to prolonged torture.

They thought that a heretic was demon controlled, and genuinely believed that by torture they would be able to exorcise them, and so bring them to repentance, and that they would die in blessedness. In "driving out one demon", they opened the door to seven others in themselves; it was such a great evil, but a logical religious one, built on their arrogance.

It was with this background that Francis of Assisi adopted his views. He however stayed firmly within the Roman Catholic Church. Others stepped outside the fold and paid with their lives. Francis is called a saint by the Roman Catholics, others like Peter Waldo, founder of the Waldensian movement for reform, or the Albigenses were not considered saints but heretics and were burnt and mutilated. All these people are worth exploring as game changers in history.

#### ARNOLD OF BRESCIA (1139-1155)

One of the outspoken people of the day was Arnold of Brescia. He criticized the church in a series of sermons. The cleric's vices, he believed were as a result of the church's attempt to control the world. He urged the church to return its property and secular dominion to the state and return to the poverty of the early church. He said that the true church and its ministers should shun wealth. Wealth and power, lived for of themselves, he said, nullifies salvation.

The Pope Innocent II banished Arnold from Italy and he went to France where he studied under Peter Abelard (dies 1142), and aroused the hatred of Bernard of Clairvaux, a devoted Papal man, who called him another ravaging wolf in sheep's clothing. After five years of exile Arnold came back to Rome. He joined the movement to overthrow Papal power while the Pope was off preaching the Second Crusade. He preached that the church should return to poverty and that the council of cardinals was a den of thieves.

He was successful there for ten years before Pope Hadrian IV placed Rome under an interdict and secured the help of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa who captured Arnold and burnt him at the stake, and his ashes were cast into the Tiber.

#### PETER WALDO

Shortly after this man died, Peter Waldo, a rich merchant from France decided to come out and say that something is wrong in the church. He read the Scriptures and heard the troubadours singing the virtues of monastic life. Waldo sought a priest to ask how he lived like Christ. He gave him the story of the rich young ruler. He provided adequately for his wife, his two daughters went into cloisters, and gave the rest away to the poor.

He enlisted two priests who translated the Scriptures into French, and he memorised much of it. His innovation was to apply poverty to all Christians and not to just the monks. The Roman Catholics were quite happy to have their monks to live in poverty but to bring it to all Christians was a new idea. Many joined the movement and went into the market places to hear the Word of God being preached in their own language. He established a group called the Waldensians.

In due course the wealthy and powerful aristocratic Bishop of Lyons decided to arrest him. After being told to stop preaching he quoted back Acts 5:25. The Waldensians were examined by Pope Alexander III who found that there was no heresy. He found that they were all lay people, and so ruled that they could only preach by invitation of the bishops, which was an unlikely prospect. The bishops did not like the movement because by reading and listening to the Scriptures the common folk could see how the bishops didn't measure up to the standards of the Word of God.

In 1184 their disobedience caused Pope Lucius IV to excommunicate them. These are the first Protestants in the true sense. They held to the supremacy of Scripture over everything else and a literal application of Scripture. They said that the bishops who were not living in accordance with the Scriptures were to be ignored and that the church was bigger than the Roman Catholic Church and included all believers. Waldensians were in fact a "back to the Bible" movement. They eventually set up a new church against the Roman Catholic Church.

#### ALBIGENSIANS

The third group was the Albigensians and they began in the south of France. They were a political and religious movement but they were in error, as they believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was not a human being but a life giving spirit, so that the whole "New Age" type belief was to the fore, and the concept of the God-man was gone. It was a unitarian idea as well and with a type of Gnosticism coming through. They wanted to be rid of the evil of Catholicism and return to the simplicity of the gospel. They were destroyed in a crusade under Simon de Montfort who led the Northern French to crush the south and receive their lands as their reward. As many as 300,000 may have perished!

The Dominicans were one of a group of people who rose during this period. The Pope tried to send people to convert the Albigenses, and the successful ones were led by Dominic, who practiced poverty and was a humble man, but after only two years of preaching, Innocent III started a get tough policy and had a crusade to kill those who would not repent.

At the same time the Inquisition was established in 1184 under Pope Lucius III, who required the bishops to inquire into the beliefs of their subjects in response to people questioning the church from the scriptures. If people were found to have heretical ideas (often scriptural but not Papal) they were immediately excommunicated. Eventually this became excommunication and immediate death by fire. The Dominicans were given charge of the inquisition in 1220 and they were more ruthlessly efficient. If preaching failed then they were responsible for the Inquisition, and the execution of the people was passed over to the state.

If you were accused you were brought before the inquisitors and an inquiry into your beliefs began. In 1252 Innocent IV authorised torture as a means of getting confessions from heretics. After Innocent III they thought that the Roman Catholic Church was above not only the law of man but that of God.

It was a shocking situation but most of the "official theologians" after Augustine of Hippo agreed that if a body had a corrupt limb the limb needed to be amputated and the surgeon had to show no mercy or else the patient was lost. In this case of course the Popes thought the body was the Roman Catholic church and the limb the heretics. This is the way that they looked upon the early Protestants. It was very doubtful if many of these Dominicans were born again believers.

Francis [1182-1226] lived right at this time. By 1209 Francis had prepared a simple rule. This gained Innocent III's approval, for he saw him, like Dominic, as a possible weapon against the heretics. He was restating Peter Waldo's position, however the new pope saw that mistakes had been made with Peter Waldo, and also he saw that Francis would serve the Papacy. Rather than deny them orders, he made them an order called the Friars Minor or lesser brothers. These were the Franciscans, men dedicated to poverty, chastity and working amongst the poor.

Who is right, who should we follow? Peter Waldo would be followed. We would be involved with the Waldensians rather than the Roman Catholic Church of the day. What do we think of Francis of Assisi? Was he saved? It is an enigma. There is no doubt about his love for the Lord, commitment to the Scriptures and to the poor. However he was standing with a totally apostate organization, led by one of the most evil popes in the history of the Roman Catholic Church, Innocent III.

Checks each of these people out in a good encyclopedia – but beware the non-Christian bias of Wikipedia.

Francis' followers were tied into the Sacraments and had a very austere life. They were not allowed to receive money. They had no houses but were to be a pilgrim and servant of the Lord. They seek alms and ask for food. They were not allowed to have conversations with women. They were encouraged to go out as missionaries to Moslems and others.

Cairns states, "The friars strengthened religion amongst the people in the parishes by their unselfish service, their good deeds and their preaching in the vernacular. In fact preaching was restored to its proper place in the Roman church by the friars. They were directly responsible to the Pope and so they tended to strengthen the papacy."

The Dominicans and Franciscans provided many missionaries to many parts of the world. The Franciscans with their hospitals ministered to the physical as well as spiritual needs of the people. Nearly 10,000 friars died while ministering to the sick in the Black Death plague of 1348-1350. They also made major contributions to learning with such people as St Thomas Aquinas. However there were terrible evils the Dominicans wrought as the Inquisitors of the Roman Catholics against the Albigenses and many others.

In south France and northern Italy there are still Waldensian churches which hold the Scriptures high. This is a time of great conflict. You need to be discerning as you look at this period. Every action and person must be tested against Scripture.

## **DOCTRINES**

### **POVERTY**

1. God can raise the poor out of the poverty of their circumstances (1 Samuel 2:8, Psalm 113:7).
2. There is a special happiness for those who help the poor (Psalm 41:1, 2, Proverbs 19:17, Proverbs 29:14).
3. The poor are not only delivered by God from poverty but in the reality of their poverty they often see their need of salvation and respond to the gospel (Psalm 72:12-14, Matthew 11:5).
4. Whilst charity is good and honourable, it can be abused (Proverbs 14:30-31, 19:17). Charity is for the poor, but excessive dependence upon welfare makes the poor lazy (2 Thessalonians 3:10-11).

5. There is a special curse for those who ignore helping the poor (Proverbs 21:13, 22:16, 28:3). There is also a special curse for those who take advantage of the poor (Proverbs 22:22-23).
6. Until the Millennium there will always be poverty in the human race (Mark 14:7).
7. The poor are a target for hypocrisy and its victim (John 12:5). They are also the victims of backsliders (James 2:2-4).
8. Poor believers have the same spiritual privileges as rich believers (James 2:5). A person can be poor in material things but rich in doctrine.

**MONEY**

1. Money in coin form was unknown until the 7th century BC. Prior to coins, money or valuable metal was measured in terms of ingots or rings. Croesus, King of Lydia first preserved his money in coins. When Cyrus the Great conquered Lydia, he picked up the concept of coinage and gave it to the entire world.
2. Money is not evil. It has a legitimate function. (Genesis 23:9, Jeremiah 32:44)
3. The believer is urged to be content with what he has received, in his position, from the Lord (1 Timothy 6:6-10, Philippians 4:11-13, Hebrews 13:5-6).
4. It is the lust for money and goods that corrupts a man (Jude 11).
5. The giving of money is an expression of the believers' priesthood (1 Corinthians 16:2, 2 Corinthians 8 & 9).
6. Coveting money makes one a slave to his desire (Matthew 6:24). Money is a useful servant but a harsh master.
7. The danger of money to the unbeliever:-
  - a) Salvation cannot be purchased with money (Mark 8:36-37).
  - b) Money causes the rich man to put his trust in the wrong things (Mark 10:23-25).
  - c) Money often hinders the unbeliever from seeking salvation (Luke 16:19-31).
  - d) Money has no credit with God (Proverbs 11:4,28).
8. The danger of money to the believer:-
  - a) Money can become part of a slavery to a vain search for happiness (Ecclesiastes 5:10-6:2).
  - b) Love of money becomes a root of all kinds of evil (1 Timothy 6:6-12, 17-19).
  - c) Money can contribute to pride and self-centeredness (Acts 5:1-10).
9. Wealth is deceitful if a person believes it will buy him happiness or provide security (Matthew 6:24-33, Luke 12:16-21, Proverbs 18:10-12, Proverbs 13:7).
10. It is the believer's duty to wisely use his possessions, time, abilities and spiritual gifts which God has entrusted to us.

**LECTURE 22 - PRELUDE TO THE REFORMATION**

**POPE BONIFACE**

Here we are moving into the 14th century where we have Pope Boniface on the scene. In 1300 he proclaimed a jubilee year and said that anyone who had made a pilgrimage to Rome and visited the churches of St Peter and St Paul had their sins forgiven. There were so many people came that it kept two people working day and night in St Paul's church working counting the offerings. **Matthew 19:16-22, 20:25-28.**

Boniface had a flair for pomp and circumstance. He would appear in the purple robes of the Roman emperor and say that he was Caesar. His papal crown had 48 rubies, 72 sapphires, 45 emeralds and 66 large pearls while the ordinary people starved to death in the streets of Rome.

This was a time of evil in the church but also a time of change, which would undermine the papacy. Two hundred years before, the Pope had caused the king-emperor to grovel in the snow outside his palace. By 1300 however Kings of Europe were no longer willing to come in awe of the Pope. Nationalism had grown as a good force in Europe and the independence of France and Britain challenged the Pope.

Feudalism was beginning to break down in Europe in 1300, and money, and the power it gave, started to become very important. The banking houses that still dominate Europe and the world were being established and their lending made or broke dynasties, started and ended wars. There started to be a real struggle between the state and the church.

Edward I, the Black Prince and Philip the Fair of France were involved in this. The "Black Death" in 1348-1350 would change this world forever as over one third of Europe was wiped out and labour shortages changed economies.

They were fighting each other in what history records as the hundred years war, and all involved had to tax people. Some of the great castles of England and France were built at this time. These castles were built with money extracted by these ruling people, from the poor and from the clergy.

The Pope got frustrated with them and their monetary demands for their wars, and so in 1296 issued a Papal bull *Clericis laicos* threatening excommunication for anyone who taxed the clergy without his consent. In reply Edward said that if the clergy did not pay tax they would be stripped of all privileges.

They had special privileges in England, and lots of money, and the king wanted their money, in exchange for their privileges to earn more. His position was clear; if you wanted to accept the protection he gave as king, then you will pay for that protection. It sounds like a medieval mafia, because that is exactly what it was, but through it the countries shook off the power of Rome over time. Edward kept his power by force of arms.

Meanwhile Philip of France banned all exports of gold, silver, and jewels so that nothing could go from France to the Pope. Rome was therefore squeezed very strongly. Philip went further and began to question aloud, saying that Jesus Christ gave the church no temporal power. He said that he was the king of France with temporal power, you are rulers of the church, and so ought not to interfere with me. He showed he apparently believed in the separation between the church and state, although as events were to show he didn't, he just believed that the Pope should be under his power.

In 1301 Philip imprisoned a French Bishop on the charge of treason. In response Boniface issued *Unam Sanctam* the most extreme assertion of papal power in church history. He said, "it is altogether necessary for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff".

In reply Philip prepared to have Boniface deposed on the ground that his election had been illegal. To assist in the plan Philip chose William of Nogaret a shrewd lawyer. He was a master of lies and deceit, and torture. For "voluntary testimony" a person would be covered in honey and placed over a beehive. Thus both sides were bad, but through it God caused good things to occur, because the papacy was side-lined for much of this century and so ideas could ferment that had been expressed, but suppressed in the previous 300 years.

The accusation against Boniface was that his election was illegitimate, that he was a heretic, practiced simony, and that he was immoral. Boniface was power hungry but he probably was not guilty of all the things he was accused of (only about 60%). The French mercenary army broke into his summer residence at Anagni, beat him up and humiliated him. The pope who was 86, died within a month. A contemporary said that he crept in like a fox, reigned like a lion, and died like a dog. This was the first time in history that a secular ruler had gone and assaulted/killed a pope.

#### THE POPE IN FRANCE

In 1305 a Frenchman who took the name Clement V "became pope" with a little help from France. He was Archbishop of Bordeaux and set up the papacy in Avignon in France beginning what was called the 72 year period of the Babylonian captivity of the papacy. For 72 years the papacy was hijacked by the French secular power. Philip was not sincere when he was speaking about the separation of church and state; what he wanted was an obedient pope. The little French town grew to a city of some 80,000 showing the extent of the bureaucracy in the papacy.

The French milked the papacy for all they were worth to fight the English. The Germans and English got upset about it and a lot of problems occurred, but in the chaos that was caused the gospel message went out in a way it could not have under a strong papacy. All Europe was starting to see that the Roman Church was just a great money making apparatus, and the Pope just a puppet of power brokers, or a ruthless power broker himself.

Shelly states - page 229-233 - Most of the hostility aimed at the Avignon papacy complained of the use and abuse of money. The decline in revenues from the Papal States in Italy had brought the papal court to bankruptcy. To replace these funds and to raise new ones the Avignon popes resorted to a number of money making schemes, some old, some new, and with an enormous staff to do the paper work.

There were fees for this privilege, and taxes for that. For example the popes introduced the rule that whenever a bishop was appointed, the first year's income, called an **annate**, should go to the pope.

To fill a vacancy popes often transferred a bishop from another city and thus created more annates. Or perhaps the pope delayed the appointment and received all the income in the interim. This was called a **reservation**. This was a real money making exercise.

There were people who saw the evil of this, and the German and other nobles just saw the Money lost! In 1326 a call was made for a General Council of the church to sort it out. Two scholars, Marsilius and his colleague John of Jandun presented King-Emperor Louis with a work called "**Defender of the Peace**" which called for democratic government within a church. While little happened in the 72 year "Captivity of the Papacy" by the French, people were asking questions that they had not been able to ask before. The weakness of the French Popes gave all freedom to think.



This is a classic in pre Reformation literature. It asserted that all believers were in a community called the church and there was no clergy and laity. Neither popes nor bishops, nor priests had received any special function from Christ, they served only as agents of the community of believers, which was represented by the general council. It was a re-assertion of the concept of servant leadership.

Those who wanted to keep the papacy under control received this work with great thankfulness. It was politically and not spiritually received. These people were saying however for people to look at what the Bible said about the church and what the church had turned into and that there was no comparison. This is one of the witnesses of the movement of the Holy Spirit at this time. Many voices were starting to be raised against the evil and to look to the good of the scriptures.

#### THE BIBLE

Every man who went to university at this time wrote and spoke Latin. All were able to read the Scriptures in the Vulgate translation and many were led to Christ through that. Martin Luther was converted by reading the Vulgate.

Church history removes a lot of the problems that are caused by the present "KJV only" position. It was not the KJV that started the Reformation, it started nearly three hundred years before that version was first published.

There were other Latin translations as well as vernacular translations. Portions of the Gospels were being taken around and set to music by the troubadours. They sang love songs as well as Gospel tracts in the language of the people.

#### MOVEMENTS IN THE PAPACY

The papacy went from bad to worse with two popes eventually operating, with one in France and the other in Italy. They mutually excommunicated each other. This occurred with Clement in Avignon and Urban in Rome. It lasted 39 years with each pope having their own College of Cardinals.

In 1409 the majority of cardinals decided to meet. They met at Pisa and decided that a third person would be proclaimed Pope. He was Alexander V. The deposed popes did not like that. All three popes were saying that the others were wrong, each excommunicating the others. Like most evil men they believed their own publicity – they were infallible!!!!

In 1417 they got one of the Popes to step down, deposed the other two and elected a new one Martin V at the Council of Constance. As soon as the council dispersed Martin disclaimed them, and said that the only binding thing that they did right was to elect him. At this Council there was also the burning at the stake of John Hus. As Rome got its power back the fires of persecution against truth re-ignited.

Shelley gives a chart on page 232 from Innocent III to the Council of Constance. The popes after Martin V were a group of rascals; with Alexander VI [1492-1503] of the infamous family of the Borgias, grossly immoral, and he openly tried to get posts for his horde of illegitimate children. He made them cardinals, bishops and archbishops. This is the time of Michaelangelo and the bursting forth of the power of the Renaissance. The Pope who dealt with Michaelangelo was a warrior pope who would go into a city and kill all the men, have all the women raped, loot and then burn the city to the ground and then say a mass in the remains of the town square.

Most of the people in charge were now debauched unbelievers creating a mood for reformation as the papacy has sunk to an all time low. The people of Europe saw that this was not good enough.

WYCLIF and HUS - Shelley chapter 23 – page 234ff.

Men started to think at this time in terms of national churches, and the need to get back to simplicity of the Scriptures. One of these was John Wyclif who got his doctor's degree at Oxford University in 1372. Dominion or lordship over men was a major concern of the time. Rulers gained their power from God but how was this transmitted. These people are thinking about how a king can rule and be legitimate, and when does that rule become illegitimate.

One argument was that the power was derived from the Pope. When that transmission of power occurred, was it legitimate? Another said that it was not so much that it was from the church, but that the king was in a state of grace, and had not committed any grievous sin and was anointed of the Lord. The professor of Wyclif was Richard FitzRalph. He asked if this was the same for the church. Can people rule over the church and live in immorality? The Popes at this stage were obviously bad. It was clear that they were living in mortal sin. At this time many of the priests had mistresses, many kept money that was meant for the Lord. In Rome each of the "orders" had their own brothels!

There was therefore the rediscovery of the moral requirements of Christ. They went further to say that the rulers of England could depose those who were not acting appropriately and could confiscate church property. The English Government has the divine assigned responsibility to correct the abuses of the church within its realm, to relieve of office those churchman that persist in their sin. The Parliament however should not rule over the church, God's anointed King should, through the bishops. This was to become an important tool to keep papal power at arms length in England.

The pope condemned the thinking of the English reformer, and the church would have moved against him but he had powerful friends. If you are a "nobody" and you say something that is true people will not listen, but if you are influential, when you speak they will listen. Wyclif was emphasizing the freedom of the spiritual man. He said that all spiritual men have an equal place in the sight of God. A personal relationship between God and man is everything and is the one basis of office.

John Wyclif was a priest in the Roman Catholic Church, and he struck right at the heart of the evil of Rome. In 1378 the great schism gave him the opportunity to spread his ideas. If he had said this in 1200 Innocent would have had Wyclif killed so fast that no one would have noticed that he had said anything. God provided contention/division within the Catholic Church at this time so that Wyclif could be supported in his ideas. Through Latin his words reach all Europe and Hus is impacted, as are many others.

Wyclif also suggested apostolic poverty for the person who sat in Peter's chair and that the Pope should not have silver or gold quoting Peter in Acts. He said that if the Pope wanted credibility he must go back to apostolic poverty. The Pope should have a humble life spent in service of the church and be the shepherd of the flock and the preacher that brings men to Christ. There was also no room for the Pope to have temporal power.

Wyclif said that Christ is truth and the Pope is the principle of falsehood, Christ lived in poverty, the Pope labors for worldly magnificence, Christ refused worldly dominion, the Pope seeks it. The papal system is full of poison. It is Antichrist itself, the man of sin who exalts himself above God. Let judgment fall. Here is a born again believer in the Roman Catholic Church speaking!

He also said that the church is not everybody but only everyone who is saved. The church on earth is the whole number of the elect containing only those who will be saved. Wyclif followed Augustine and believed in predestination. Calvin put this together brilliantly. Wyclif had the doctrine of the invisible church as the elect. He brought a conclusion from it that if we are all one in Christ there is no papal primacy.

He challenged the whole range of medieval practices such as pardons, indulgences, absolutions, pilgrimages, the worship of images, and the adoration of the saints. He retained however belief in purgatory and extreme unction even though he could not find them in the Scriptures. He came to the conclusion that it was your relationship to God which mattered. This is what Luther would say over a hundred years later.

Wyclif said that compulsory confession is the work of Antichrist. He also said that preaching was of more importance than the giving of any sacraments. The standard which Wyclif used to judge the church was the Scripture or as he called it Christ's law. He encouraged people to search the Scriptures themselves, opening his own words to correction.

CHS – 234ff - Wyclif established a group of preachers and called them "the poor priests" or the Lollards. He translated the Scriptures from the Latin to the Middle English and his work provided the basis of Tyndale's work later, as well as the King James Bible in due course.

He would get his people to write out the Scriptures and when they had got a few pages they would go out through the villages reading the Scriptures in the market places. They would tell the common English folk the stories of Christ and the disciples. A revival resulted, the first major one since post Roman days in English history.

The Archbishop of Canterbury condemned him, particularly over his rejection of transubstantiation, and he was sent back to his parish at Lutterworth where he died in 1384. His work went on, his Bible was not condemned. It gave the common people some of the Scriptures in their own language. His movement was however condemned within years of his death and his poor priests killed, his body dug up and burned and his ashes scattered in the river Wye.

#### JOHN HUS

Richard II and Anne of Bohemia married causing a close relationship between Oxford and Prague. The works of Wyclif went to Bohemia and John Hus who preached at the Bethlehem chapel there, started to read Wyclif. He painted paintings on the church walls contrasting the action of Christ and the Pope. Hus preached in the local language and there were student riots for and against him.

Hus wrote a book, "On the church", challenging all the corrupt things. He went to the Council of Constance to argue his views but got offside with King Wenceslaus and lost his support. He was ushered off to the Inquisition, tortured, laid in jail for eight months where he wrote some of the great letters of the Christian faith.

"O most holy Christ," he prayed, "draw me, weak as I am, after Thyself, for if Thou dost not draw us we cannot follow Thee. Strengthen my spirit, that it may be willing. If the flesh is weak, let Thy grace precede us; come between and follow, for without Thee we cannot go for Thy sake to cruel death. Give me a fearless heart, a right faith, a firm hope, a perfect love, that for Thy sake I may lay down my life with patience and joy. Amen."

On the 16th July 1415 he went to his death. He died saying that, "God is my witness, that the evidence against me is false. I have never thought nor preached except with the one intention of winning men, if possible, from their sins. In the truth of the gospel I have written, taught and preached; today I will gladly die."

His legacy was the Unitas Fratrum, the Unified Brethren, which survives today. There is from this time onwards a groundswell against the papacy which will lead to the Reformation. We have a God who is in charge of history. We should be encouraged by this period and its people.

## DOCTRINE

### PLAN OF GOD

1. In eternity past, God designed a plan for every believer, which takes into account every event and decision in human history.
2. The plan centres around the person of Jesus Christ. (1 John 3:23, Ephesians 1:4-6)
3. Entrance into the plan is based on the principle of grace. (Ephesians 2:8, 9) where the sovereignty of God and the free will of Man meet at the cross. God brings salvation which is complete, Man brings his faith.
4. God's plan was so designed so as to include all events and actions. (1 Peter 1:2)
5. Under his plan God has decreed to do some things directly and some through agencies, Israel, the Church.
6. Without interfering with human free will in any way God has designed a plan so perfect that it includes cause and effect, as well as provision, preservation and function.
7. There are many functions in the Plan of God. They all constitute one whole comprehensive plan which is perfect, eternal and unchangeable.
8. The plan of God is consistent with human freedom and does not limit or coerce human free will. Distinction should be made between what God causes and what God permits. God causes the Cross but permits sin. God is neither the author of sin nor sponsors sin.
9. His plan portrays that man has free will. God never condones sin in the human race. Man started in perfect environment and innocence. Man sinned of his own free will. Man will sin in the perfect environment of the Millennium.
10. Distinction should be made between the divine plans which are related to the plan of God and divine laws which regulate human conduct on the earth. Divine laws occur in time, divine plans occur in eternity.
11. God's plans derive from His foreknowledge. He recognized in eternity past those things which are certain. The foreknowledge of God makes no things certain, but only perceives in eternity past those things that are certain.
12. There is a difference between foreknowledge and fore ordination. Fore ordination establishes certainty but does not provide for the certainty which is established. It is the plan that provides. (Romans 8:29, Acts 2:23, 1 Peter 1:2)
13. Therefore the elect are foreknown and the foreknown are elect. God knew in eternity past what way each free will would go for each particular problem in life. God does not coerce human free will but he does know what way each freewill will choose at any given time. As free will decides so God provides.
14. Since God cannot contradict his own character he plans the best for the believer. God is perfect, his plan and provisions are therefore perfect.
15. The cross was planned in eternity past but the human free will of Christ decided for the cross at Gethsemane. (Matthew 26:39-42) God has provided salvation through the cross and it is a free will decision as to whether one accepts it or not.
16. No plan in itself opposes human freedom but once a choice is made from the free will then the plan limits your human freedom. At the same time it gives you the freedom to love and appreciate God. God lays down the means of living the Christian life.

## NOTES

**LECTURE 23 - LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION**

## INTRODUCTION

Shelley's chart in chapter 24, page 246, provides an overview of the times. It includes the English civil war in the chart from 1643-1649 and Cromwell, who died in 1658. We need to know as Protestants this particular era of history. Henry VIII wrote a book against Luther and received the title "Defender of the Faith" from the Pope, and the English monarchs still carry this title. His reign later saw the reformation begin in England, but not because he was converted. It continued under his son Edward but sadly he died after only a short reign, and he was followed by "Bloody Mary", his sister, a Catholic who murdered over 500 Protestants, beginning by burning at the stake the reforming bishops Cranmer and Ridley.

It was however under Elizabeth I, the half sister of Mary, that the Protestant cause was consolidated in England. The great suffering of the bible believers at this time is recorded in "Foxe's book on the Martyrs" – and the blood of so many changed the way English speaking people think and argue about religion ever since.

Because of the state of the Church over the preceding centuries many of the Roman Catholic men and women were ready for the Reformation. They were looking at the Scripture in a new way, especially in England the life, work, and tortured deaths of the Lollards, had prepared acceptance for a new way of expressing faith. At the Diet of Speer in 1529 the Catholic ruler Charles V was ready to condemn and eliminate Luther and his followers, but many of the German princes stood up and protested it, hence the word Protestant.

## PROTESTANTS AND CATHOLICS

Shelley asks the question in this chapter, What is Protestantism? Protestantism is a modification of Catholicism in which Catholic problems remain, but different solutions are given. Roman Catholics and Protestants over the years have different answers to four basic questions which keep them apart. They are:-

[a] How is a person saved? The Protestant say that a person is saved through personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord. "Sola Fide". The Catholic will say that a person is saved through the sacraments of the church by obedience, attendance and faithfulness within the church. This is also the case in different cults today.

[b] Where does religious authority lie? The Roman Catholics say that it is in the Pope, Cardinals and the Bishops of the church. Protestants began with "Sola Scriptura". The Protestants say that authority begins and end in the Scriptures, which are given by God to man for that purpose.

[c] What is the church? The Protestants say that the church exists in two areas, the local church and the invisible church is the body of Christ over the ages, including all those that are born again, as they have obeyed the Saviour's command to Nicodemus in that you must be born again. The Catholics say that it is all within the Roman Catholic fold and outside that there is no church at all.

[b] What is the essence of Christian living? The Catholic will say obedience to the ordinance of the church whilst the Protestant will talk about the following of, and application of the Scripture under the power of the filling of the Holy Spirit – Christ like living.

## LUTHER

Luther responded to the convicting ministry of the Holy Spirit. He was convicted of sin, righteousness, and judgment as a monk. He said that if any monk would get into heaven by monkery, it would have been him. If he had kept on he would have killed himself with vigils. He was an Augustinian monk, a member of a severe and austere order. They lived in unheated rooms wearing only the clothes of a monk and they starved themselves. Many would die before they were 40 years old due to privation. They were doing this to be saved and to serve God. Ignatius Loyola, who founded the Jesuits would simply argue Luther wasn't tough enough for his team, but that doesn't ring true!

Luther was overwhelmed by God's righteousness and his own sin. He did desire to serve God. Under the convicting ministry of the Holy Spirit he knew that he was a sinner in need of a Saviour. In his first mass Luther was terrified as an unbeliever, but also a priest and he embarrassed himself. Often religious unbelievers are under conviction of their own unrighteousness by the Holy Spirit. Luther said that he hated God because of who God was and who he was.

He was made a professor of theology of the recently established University of Wittenburg. His journey to faith and his life's work began in 1505, when a bolt of lightning killed a friend with whom he was walking. He became a priest also in that year, and all his study moved him forward from that point, slowly moving him away from Rome.

## JUSTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH

Ten years later as a teacher at the University he read the Vulgate of Romans to teach it, and saw the connection of the justice of God and the phrase, "the just shall live by faith". He saw that through grace and the sheer mercy of God alone he justifies us through faith. He felt himself to be reborn and had gone through the doors into paradise – for the first time he felt free within of fear and anguish. The passage that convicted him was **Romans 1:13-19**.

The implications of Luther's discovery were enormous. If salvation comes through faith in Christ alone, the intercession of priests and saints is superfluous. Faith formed and nurtured by the Word of God, written and preached, requires no monks, no masses, no prayers to the saints, no indulgences. The mediation of the Church of Rome crumbles into insignificance. He not only saw how this affected him but also how it affected the rest of humanity. He kept his position as priest and lecturer, but used it to preach and teach and challenge people to think about these issues; all issues raised by Wyclif and Hus up to a century before.

In 1517 John Tetzel, a priest from Rome, came to raise money for the Pope, and he came selling indulgences. He said that in return for payment eternal life would be given by the Pope in the form of indulgences. He would preach hell fire and damnation until his listeners were emotionally shaken, then he would sell indulgences. The concept was that as the person was giving all their money to build a church in the name of St Peter, then God will let them into heaven.

Up to the arrival of Tetzel Luther had remained theoretical in his theological teaching and it was not until Tetzel started talking about indulgences that Luther really started getting angry, as Tetzel was not only getting money, but those people were going to hell without the truth that would set them free, and keep their wallets intact also. They had accepted a papal bull instead of the lamb of God, and Luther started to talk this way openly. As a result the Pope called him a, "wild boar in the vineyard".

Tetzel was a super salesman, and he had a lot of jingles such as, "As soon as the coin in the coffer rings a soul from purgatory springs". Luther now drew up 95 propositions to debate the issue of indulgences, and on the 31st October 1517 he nailed them to the church door, which was the way you challenged another scholar to a debate on an issue. The dramatic thing in the propositions was that the Scripture was taken as the basis of Christianity. The 95 Theses were a gauntlet thrown down to the Papacy's supporters, and were widely circulated around Europe in Latin.

In 1519 Luther had a very public 18 day debate with John Eck, the Roman Catholic theologian from Leipzig University. It was centered upon the Scriptures, the interpretation of them and the practices of the Roman Catholic Church. Luther in the end stated, "Neither the church nor the Pope can establish articles of faith. These must come from Scripture - Sola Scriptura". It does not matter what theologians, church councils and traditions say, it is what the Bible says that is authoritative. It was this conviction that got reform moving for Europe.

Eck did not miss the fact that Luther was saying exactly the same as John Hus had been saying a hundred years before and so immediately after the debate Eck went to Rome to get the Pope to declare Luther a heretic. The Pope was worldly, immoral and debauched, and so did not act on Eck's request straightaway, preferring the annoying problem to go away. This gave Luther a couple of years to further sow the seed. Had the Pope moved on him as his predecessor had against Hus it is quite possible that Luther would have been killed, and with his death, his ideas would have been hindered. The very immorality of the Pope protected Luther in the providence of God.

In those three years he issued three pamphlets in the German language, the first addressed to the nobility of the German nation calling on the princes to correct the errors in the church and to take charge of the church as a national church in Germany rather than a church covered by the Pope. His second one was on the Babylonian captivity of the church. The Avignon problem had only recently been finalized theologically. He attacked the Pope and everything in the papacy that separated man from their God.

In 1520 he brought out a pamphlet called, "The Freedom of the Christian Man", which talked about the whole realm of Christian behaviour and the need for Salvation, with faith in Christ as a starting point, and Christian works as a result of faith, not the means of faith. The freedom of the Christian man is to do what the Lord wants you to do, Not the bondage of the Roman Catholic Church put on you to hold you down.

In 1520 Pope Leo X finally moved against him, issued his bull condemning Luther. "O rise our Lord and judge our cause, a wild boar has invaded the vineyard". Leo was considering the Roman Catholic Church as having taken over from Israel as the vineyard. False views of the church will always lead to false views of everything else, as you will interpret scripture to suit your philosophy. Luther however was Anti-Semitic also!

The bulla, or Pope's seal, was on the letter. Luther's beliefs were declared as heretical. He got his copy on the tenth of October and he had now a sixty day period of grace to fully repent and seek the Pope's forgiveness, before judgment fell on him.

On the day he was supposed to repent he led his students out of Wittenburg, he burnt a copy of canon law, burnt a lot of the works of the medieval theologians as well as a copy of the bull. If they burn my books I will burn theirs, he said. It was obvious that there was going to be a battle to the finish between the ideas of Luther and the practices and traditions of the Roman Catholic Church.

He was condemned and was declared a heretic in January 1521, which was the equivalent of putting him under the sentence of death. Any Catholic killing him would be earning points of grace according to the Roman Catholic Church. - John 15:18ff.

Charles V was the leader of the Catholics in Germany, and summonsed Luther to the Diet of Worms. He was a young ruler, only in his twenties at that time. All the German princes attended, but unlike Hus, Luther had friends amongst the nobles, due to their own journey of faith since printing in the 1430s had brought the Bible to them all, and Luther's pamphlets opened the door to their control of the churches in their realms, rather than the Pope or even the Emperor.

Shelley notes what Luther said before the assembly, "My conscience is captive to the Word of God. I will not repent anything for to go against conscience is neither honest nor safe. Here I stand I cannot do otherwise. God help me Amen." Here is a man who is standing on the promises of God. Charles V condemned Luther to death calling him a devil in monk's clothes. The sentence had with it twenty one days of safe passage to Saxony before it fell.

Hus went to the Council of Constance to debate, but did not get away from there, and was taken by the Inquisition, was tortured and then executed. In Luther's case however God's purpose was different, and he was allowed to live for God's glory, in a similar way to Hus dying for God's glory in the previous century. The seed sowed by Hus' death meant the ground was ready Europe wide for Luther's call to challenge the Pope. Each man's call/journey was different, as ours is.

#### THE SCRIPTURES IN GERMAN

Luther was saved from death by Prince Frederick the Wise of Saxony who arranged for him to be "kidnapped" and carried away secretly to Wartburg castle where he was known as Junker George. Had he not been he would have died.

He was there for a year and translated the New Testament into the vernacular German. He organised the printing of it and getting it out amongst the people. This was his greatest work, as the setting loose of the Word of God will always achieve more than all the other works of men.

While he was away in the castle more radical voices were being raised in Germany. By 1524 the German peasants who had been abused by their nobles revolted. They said they followed the Scriptures too, and as they had not read about serfdom in the Bible they demanded a better deal. It was an anarchist group that led the revolt, as Wat Tyler had done in England two centuries before. Luther showed his weakness here and rather than saying to the leaders that they ought to reform, and teach the peasants the truth of scripture, he wrote a pamphlet against the murderous hordes of thieves and peasants and urged that the leaders should attack the peasants.

The injustices of the peasant's murderous revolt was nothing compared to those of the nobility. More than 100,000 peasants were murdered, especially in the south of Germany, which caused many of the Germans to return to the Roman Catholic Church, as they had lost faith in those who had relied on the Scriptures. Luther was no plaster cast saint, he was a straw man and made some grave errors. He was however facing a revolt that was leading to the murder of all leaders everywhere, and it had to be put down, for it was truly demonic in its actions, but great evil was done by all.

He married a nun Catherine von Bora in 1525. All the monasteries were broken up and the priests and nuns married or were murdered by mobs.... Parish churches were established as Lutheran Churches. Luther did a lot to organise the Lutheran church as a national church in Germany. There was war over this and it was not until 1555 at the peace of Augsburg was signed. It agreed that the Prince would determine the religion of their subjects, which was again contrary to the spirit of the Reformation, but was the first of many compromises that were put in place.

Before he died Luther wrote a number of pamphlets against the Jews. He also attacked the Anabaptists saying that whoever kills an Anabaptist is doing a good thing in God's sight. These more radical groups grew up after the peasant revolt, and false prophets abounded in its mixed bag of groups. The leader of the German Anabaptists was a dangerous man who thought/pretended he was Abraham and had a number of wives and lived a dissolute life. The group itself was however basically made up of earnest sincere Bible believing Christians, who due to their ignorance of the Word, and without good pastoral leadership and teaching, led them to follow an evil man. They met his fate in the massacre that followed the fall of their city, Munster.

Luther met Zwingli and agreed on 14 of the 15 major points in theology. The exception was communion where Zwingli believed as we do, whereas Luther believed in the real presence in the communion. Luther did not join forces with Zwingli. He was irascible; he could not agree to differ – but that was common in his age.

However the Reformers did get on from this point. Luther had a good friend called Melanthon who wrote the theology for the Reformation. He was the mind behind Luther. He wrote the Augsburg Confession. It is staggering that good came of these flawed men's actions, but praise God HE doesn't depend on us, and the Holy Spirit is able to use dodgy lamps to give light at times.

#### MAJOR PRINCIPLES OF LUTHER

Luther stressed four things that were great:-

[a] He restored preaching to the right position in the church.

- [b] He gave the Bible to the people in their own language.
- [c] He restored the role of the church as it should be.
- [d] He wrote a number of mighty hymns and had them sung in the local language. He took the tunes from the market place. Luther was either in the church or in the tavern talking about theology in either place.

This man was used by God through prayer and his holding of the Scripture even though he failed greatly in a number of places. From the events in Germany, the message of Reformation went by hand to Denmark. The Bible was translated into Danish in 1524. It continued through to Norway, Sweden and Finland. In 1530 a person who had known Luther was made Archbishop of Finland. From there it went to Russia, Prussia Switzerland, France and England.

Luther started well, but did not finish well, but let us not judge him too harshly, for the "fruit" of his life overall was good. His early life was great, but in the end there was failure, but God's work was still done through him. Luther is therefore a lesson to us all.

The Lutheran churches still survive but most of them have become liberal. The higher criticism of the 19th century came from the Lutherans of Germany, and the majority supported Hitler in Germany to a significant extent. Those who go to Germany to study theology even today must beware; the legacy of the 19<sup>th</sup> century theologians is a bad one for fruit. Revival has however broken out in many places over recent years. What Church History teaches us is that there are many "waves of the Spirit" through the years. God moves, when women and men gather with open agendas and pray!

## **DOCTRINES**

### **SALVATION**

1. Salvation is the gift of God by grace through faith.
2. We cannot work for salvation - we must receive it as a gift (Ephesians 2:8, 9, Romans 4:4-5).
3. The only means of salvation is by trusting that Jesus Christ died for your sins, was buried and raised from the dead. He therefore paid the penalty for sin, and conquered death (Acts 16:30-31, John 3:16, 14:6, 1Corinthians 15:3-4).
4. We are saved so that we can serve God. (Ephesians 2:8-10) Our good works show that we have been saved.
5. Salvation includes many other doctrines such as Imputation, Justification, Redemption, Propitiation, Reconciliation and Sanctification.

### **FAITH**

1. The Christian life can be divided into three sections or stages:
  - a) Stage 1 - Salvation
  - b) Stage 2 - The Christian Walk
  - c) Stage 3 - The Christian in Heaven.
2. Man has three means of obtaining knowledge:
  - a) Faith - to believe or trust that something is true
  - b) Reasoning - using human logic to deduce that something is true
  - c) Experimentation - to test and prove something to satisfy yourself that it is true.
3. The only acceptable method of gaining grace is by faith, since this means depending upon God without our human merit.
  - a) Stage 1 - Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved - salvation (Acts 16:31).
  - b) Stage 2 - Trusting in the promises and principles of the Word of God - the Christian walk.
  - c) Stage 3 - Trusting in God's provision - Heaven.
4. Salvation faith is the complete trust in the Lord Jesus Christ, who died for your sins and rose from the dead to give you eternal life (Romans 4:20-25).
5. Anything added to becomes works, and therefore nullifies faith (Romans 4:4).
6. Faith is shown outwardly by confession with the mouth (Romans 10:9-10).
7. Since faith does not depend on our own abilities, anybody can believe. Even little children (Matthew 18:2-4).

8. Assurance is by faith (Hebrews 10:22).
9. Overcoming by faith:
- a) The heroes of faith are illustrated for our encouragement in Hebrews 11:1-39
  - b) By faith learn to accept conditions as God's will for life and be thankful - Romans 8:28, 1 Thessalonians 3:3; 5:18
  - c) By faith maintain fellowship with God, walking in the light - 1 John 1:7
  - d) By faith consistently day by day examine your conduct, confessing all known sins - 1 Corinthians 11:28, 31, 1 John 1:9
  - e) By faith receive the Word of God daily - Matthew 4:4; 5:6, 2 Peter 3:18
  - f) By faith pray, casting every care on Him - Hebrews 4:15,16; 1 Peter 5:7
  - g) By faith resist the attempts of Satan and he will flee from you - Ephesians 6:10-13, 1 Peter 5:8
  - h) By faith meditate on spiritual values and priorities - Philippians 4:6-9
  - i) Walk by faith and not by sight - 2 Corinthians 5:7.

## **LECTURE 24 - EARLY CONGREGATIONALISM**

Read **Matthew 22:17-21, Acts 6:1-4** In the Roman Catholic Church the average believer were never considered to be a disciple. The average member of the church was not thought to be involved. Even Martin Luther had a complete division between the clergy and the laity. Radical voices were not all "nutty" or violent, but men and women opened the Word of God and saw a community of Believer-Priests in Acts, living together, with their leaders the first amongst equals, and they wanted that. **1 Peter 2:9-10.**

In spite of Luther's stress on personal religion, Lutheran churches were "established" churches. They retained an ordained clergy who considered the whole population of a given territory as members of their church. The churches looked to the state for salary and support. Official Protestantism seemed to differ little from official Catholicism – they were reformed Catholicism without a Pope, and that is what Henry VIII would want in England also (Controlled Religion).

### **ANABAPTISTS**

Anabaptists wanted to change all that. Their goal was the "restitution" of apostolic Christianity, a return to churches of true believers. In the early church, they said, men and women who had experienced personal spiritual regeneration were the only fit subjects for baptism and membership. They wanted a true "New Testament (32-70 AD) Church". Why not 90AD where John was Bishop of Ephesus? Keep thinking here.... Texts out of contexts?

Example - The apostolic churches knew nothing of the practice of baptizing infants. It began in the fourth century. That tradition was simply a convenient device for perpetuating Christendom, the nominal but spiritually impotent Christian society.

The true church the radicals insisted, is always a community of saints, dedicated disciples in a wicked world. Luther had taken over the Catholic Church in Germany and made it a Protestant church but everybody was still automatically a member of the church and ministers were paid by the State. With money collected from the people, much of it went for church buildings with the balance going to the State. The Church was therefore an arm of German State's Government.

Believers, once they opened the Scriptures, found that this was not the way the early church had been and said that it was wrong that every member of the state was a member of the church. The true Anabaptists were one of these more "radical" (or biblical) groups. The satanic counter punch to Luther had been from both sides, the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation, and from the German Peasant's Revolt, where some Anabaptist/leveler theology was found, but with the "nut-bar" fruits of some people pretending they were self style "apostles", "bishops" or even "King David". The biblically based genuine Anabaptists started with Conrad Grebel and Felix Manz in Zurich, and were challenged to believe scripture as the sole standard by Ulrich Zwingli, a man with whom we would be most comfortable, yet they were not over time.

### **ZWINGLI**

Zwingli in 1519 started preaching Scriptural messages from the pulpit in the Great Minster at Zurich. There were a number of matches that were lit at the same time as Luther, for it was a movement whose time had come. When the Holy Spirit moves genuinely you will tend to find it bursts forth in a number of places simultaneously (not of any man).

One of his congregation was Thomas Platter, who was greatly moved by the preaching. Zwingli was a student of the humanist scholar Erasmus. In one important area Zwingli differed from Luther. Luther would allow whatever the Bible did not prohibit, whereas Zwingli rejected whatever the Bible did not prescribe (Puritanism). Texts out of context????



Luther would therefore go down and drink with his friends at the inn, and there discuss theology with them. Zwingli was more restrictive and excluded more of the old Catholic past. He was therefore able to strip away more of the Roman Catholic traditions such as candles, statues, musical chanting, relics and holy pictures. These men were the fathers of the Puritans, those who wanted to lead a "pure" life. Zwingli however kept the association/bond of church and state. He believed that the divine institution of "Nationalism" was critical for mankind's survival, and all were to be protected by the Church-State authorities, and those who undermined civic unity were to be dealt with by the courts!

Zwingli took as his New Testament the Greek edition of Erasmus, an unbelieving but very accurate scholar. The Greek New Testament changed Zwingli's preaching as had the Latin Vulgate changed Martin Luther. Zwingli in 1522 expressed his rebellion in a very ordinary way, he ate two sausages during Lent, and a year later had a debate against a Catholic, Johann Faber. He had 67 theses for his faith including headship of Christ over the church, the right of the minister to marry, and salvation by faith. The debate was chaired by the Zurich Town Council who decided which way they went as a town. As a result Zurich became a Protestant town. The Mass was abolished and the church reformed. Berne was won over by a similar debate, as was Basle. The Swiss therefore led the way in the Reformation with democracy in action politically to change the religious atmosphere.

The people who emerged later from this early protestant group as radicals were called Anabaptists because they believed in baptizing adults only, or from the Greek "Ana baptize" to baptize again after the infant baptism practiced by the Catholic Church. Of course these reformers didn't consider the baptism of infants legitimate at all, and simply called themselves "Baptists". In 1525 the Town Council of Zurich decided that no one was allowed to baptize adults because they had been baptized as an infant. **Felix Manz** was the first Anabaptist martyr who died by drowning after the Zurich Town council lost patience with them. He was therefore executed by a Protestant City Council. Fruit?

In Switzerland over a period of a few years the Protestants killed 4,000 to 5,000 Anabaptists and finally drove them out. They were driven into Germany where they had other problems. The Anabaptists died saying that there was to be a separation between Church and State. Both Catholics and Protestants killed them.

Conrad Grebel's wife had given birth to a son in late 1524, and people had wondered if he would be baptized at the State's Protestant church. Grebel said "no" and this caused a crisis in the city council. Zwingli was involved with a church that baptized infants. He won the debate and the Zurich Town Council said that all children who had not been baptized, shall be baptized within a week, or the entire family would be expelled from the town. Grebel refused and they fled town, but were hunted down by the Council.

The Anabaptists seem to have made a very simple request on society, but in the 16th century it was an attack on what most considered the very stability of society. Many died not only in Switzerland but also in Holland and Belgium. They did not join the main State churches, as in many cases they were full of make believers, the equivalent of the liberals today. The Anabaptists said that only believers should be members of the local church. With this in mind when you witness an adult baptism it should really mean something to you. Also reflect upon the "Four Divine Institutions", the last "Nationalism", in a new way. Ask yourself - Is there a change after the Day of Pentecost in the relationship of the believer to the State, while recognizing the stability factors of the divine institutions?

The only place where there was tolerance was in Moravia, where Jakob Hutter brought together a lot of Anabaptists known as the Hutterites. The way Satan tried to remove the Anabaptists was to politicize the issues they raised, and to bring in immorality to destroy the movement through the "extremists" – Satan's presence is seen in "fruit" and disorder.

Radical Anabaptists caused what history knows as the Munster rebellion. In 1532 power hungry fanatics took over this German town. Under the leadership of Jan Matthijs, they looked to the coming 1000 year reign of the Lord to be set up at Munster. The Bishop of Munster put the town under siege and for two years it resisted. There was polygamy within the city and for many years any Anabaptists were tainted by the evils of the Munster incident.

A similar type has occurred with the extreme Pentecostal churches of our century where extreme practices have arisen and have destroyed the witness of their less radical brothers. An example would be the snake handling churches in the USA. Main line churches as a result of Munster rejected any Millennial Teaching, and any reference to the Second Advent or prophecy, in case simple people went into divisive things as a result. **Matthew 7:13-23** is our audit point always! We mustn't ignore any Scripture nor ban things because they are "divisive". Hear the Lord – **Matthew 10:34**.

#### THE CREED OF THE ANABAPTISTS

Shelley mentions - Menno Simons - a former priest who preached widely forming what is known as the Mennonites. They existed in Holland, Switzerland and Moravia but were not able to get together for quite a time. At Schleithem they met for the first synod of the genuine Anabaptists in 1527 and formed a fellowship of faith. The movement eventually spread to England, but it would be nearly 100 years later before the first English Baptist was formed.

Points of their confession.

The Christians relationship with Jesus Christ must go beyond inner experience and acceptance of doctrines. It must involve a daily walk with God in which Christ's teaching and example shape a transformed life style. There was an emphasis on **discipleship evangelism**.

In the **principles of love** - in their dealings with non Baptists they acted as pacifists, they would not go to war or take part in the coalition of the state against religious beliefs of any sort. Like the apostles they would die bravely.

If the Baptists were in the majority they did not coerce anyone as they followed the love ethic. In fact 5,000+ died practicing it. They shared all their material possessions. They were accused of wife swapping but that was untrue. This had occurred at Munster, but it was a satanic aberration. They practiced first century Christianity and looked after one another. They had a Congregational view of Church Government. Zwingli followed this system for the first years but his church went back to an Episcopal form in later years.

In the Anabaptist's meeting everyone could speak and all listened critically. They worked together and a very strong commitment was given to pastoral togetherness and joint authority. They truly practiced the priesthood of all believers. They did however allow for the godly gift of biblical leadership.

They believed in the complete separation of Church and State. They would not accept the priests being paid for by the State. If you get funds from the State you have an obligation to the State to push their policy. We should be obliged only to the Lord, they believed.

One of the people who was involved with this was Michael Sadler who four months afterwards gave his life at the stake for this principle. He was martyred by people who claimed to be Protestants. The Reformed people, the Kingdom and Dominion theologians were among the group that killed the Anabaptists. John Calvin was guilty of this on one occasion.

#### THE ENGLISH BAPTISTS

Eerdman's Encyclopaedia of Church History page 394 states that the beginning of the English Baptists was in 1608 when John Smith baptized himself at Amsterdam. He had been a fellow of Christ's College Cambridge but fled from the harsh/intolerant rule of James I of England, when the Authorised Version of the Bible was being translated.

If you were in the Church of England you were in a State Church. When Henry VIII abolished the Roman Catholic Church it simply changed to the Anglican Church; the priests were the same as were the churches, with a slightly different prayer book. The Church of England had parishes throughout England. If you lived in an area you were in a parish and were legally required to attend a certain number of communions annually. A court fine was assigned if you didn't.

The King James Version was produced for the Church of England in 1611. For the first thirty or forty years the Anabaptists refused to accept it, as it was associated with the church of the persecutor. The English Baptists changed from the pacifism of the early groups to become ready to fight for their freedom to worship. The persecution of James the First led to this change, and it was serious persecution of the Baptists that would run off/on until the 1680s.

After Smith died a group of Baptists went back to England and set up the first Baptist Church in Spitalfields London. You have two groups developing over time, the General Baptists and the Particular Baptists, the former being Arminian whilst the second were Calvinistic. At the time of the Civil War many of the Baptists joined Cromwell's New Model Army. These were the key to the defeat of the King's army. Cromwell allowed the Baptists independence so they were able to grow during the Protectorate.

There were over 300 Baptist churches in England at the time of the Restoration in 1660. Charles II was interested in having a good time, but was not interested in having a group of dissenters, or "non conformists", as the Baptists would not conform, so he persecuted them as his grandfather James had done. Even in World War 2 in the Navy men were asked, "C of E, RC or NC?" (NC = "non-conformist")

John Bunyan, the author of "Pilgrims Progress", was a Baptist pastor, who like many others, spent many years in jail. They were persecuted for some 20 years, after which the General Baptists became spiritually quite dead, and the Particular Baptists hyper Calvinists, and that always kills evangelism. For most of the 1700's they were in the doldrums.

There was a revival and awakening through the period 1720 - 1790, with Jonathon Edwards, John Wesley, and George Whitfield, the later of whom had a big impact on the Baptist churches. This revival led to the creation of the Baptist Missionary Society by William Carey in 1792. The Baptists and the Brethren were the main groups to promote missionary activity in the early years of the nineteenth century. The Brethren grew out of the Baptists during the mid nineteenth century, although their practice drew more upon Anabaptist beliefs, including "Chiliasm" – "Millennialism". They would rediscover Prophecy as a subject for theological study.

#### DOCTRINE

##### BAPTISM

1. Usage of word "baptism" prior to the Koine (common) Greek (pre. 350 BC).

a) The English word "baptism" is a transliteration of the Greek verb BAPTIZO meaning to identify. This word was used by Greek poets, dramatists and historians to portray identification of one object with a second so that the nature or characteristic of the first object is changed.

b) For example Xenophon (fourth century BC) tells of Spartan soldiers dipping their spears into pigs' blood before going into battle. By identifying the spears with blood, the nature of the spears was supposed to have been changed from a hunting to a warrior spear.

c) Euripedes (fifth century BC) used the word to describe a sinking ship. As it sinks, the character or nature of the ship is changed. It is so identified or "baptised" with the water that it no longer floats - it becomes a wreck.

2. Meanings of the Koine Greek:

a) Verb - BAPTO - to dip (John 13:26, Luke 16:24), to dye (Revelation 19:13).

b) Verb - BAPTIZO - to dip, to immerse, to cleanse by washing.

c) Noun - BAPTISMOS - washing of dishes (Mark 7:4), doctrine of baptisms (Hebrews 6:2).

d) Noun - BAPTISMA - ritual baptism (Matthew 3:7, 21:25), spiritual baptism (Romans 6:4), figure of martyrdom (Mark 10:38, Luke 12:50).

e) Noun - BAPTISTES - one who baptises like John the Baptist (Matthew 3:1, 11:11, Mark 6:25).

3. Real baptisms: an actual identification - a person identified with something real. These are dry baptisms, and do not involve water. There are four real baptisms:

a) Baptism of Moses - a double identification of the children of Israel at Red Sea (1Corinthians 10:2).

i) With Moses - the people were identified with Moses in his faith, leadership and deliverance. They had victory "in Moses".

ii) With cloud - the people were identified with God (the cloud) as He delivered them through the dry seabed and destroyed their enemies behind them. They had victory "in God".

b) Baptism of Fire - unbelievers are identified with judgment (Matthew 3:11, 13:24-30, 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9).

c) Baptism of the Cup - identifies the Church Age believer with the victory of Christ after the cross - Christ identified himself with our sins (Matthew 26:39, 2 Corinthians 5:21)

d) Baptism of the Holy Spirit - enters Church Age believers into the Body of Christ, and therefore identifies them with everything that Christ is (1 Corinthians 12:13, Romans 6, Ephesians 1:3)

4. Ritual Baptisms: involve literal water, which represents something else:

a) Baptism of Jesus - unique (Matthew 3:13-17). Water represented Father's Plan. Christ identified himself with the Father's will in going to the cross.

b) Baptism of John (Matthew 3:1-11, John 1:25-33, Acts 18:25). Water represented the kingdom. Identification of John's converts with Jesus and His Kingdom.

c) Believer's (Christian) baptism (Acts 2:38,41, 8:36-38, 9:18, 10:47-48, 16:33).

i) Water represents the work of Christ.

ii) Identification of Church Age believer, with Christ in his death (going into the water), burial (under the water) and resurrection to "newness of life" (coming up out of the water).

iii) Water baptism is a testimony to personal faith in Christ.

d) Two ordinances for the Church:

i) Water baptism - once; represents salvation.

ii) Communion - repeated; represents fellowship.

**GOD – DIVINE INSTITUTIONS**

1. Divine institutions is the name given by the Reformers to the Biblical building blocks which are absolutely necessary for the efficient working and stability of the human race. They are available for both believer and unbeliever alike.

2. There are four divine institutions:-

a) Free Will. (Genesis 2:16-17, John 7:17)

b) Marriage. (Genesis 2:22-24, Matthew 19:5-6)

- c) Family. (Genesis 2:24, 4:1, Psalm 68:6, Ephesians 6:1-4)
- d) National Government. (Genesis 9:6, 11:9, Romans 13:1-7)

3. Within the four are principles ordained by God for the protection, orderly function, survival and blessing of the human race.

4. Satanic attack on the things that God holds sacred is evil. Anything that attacks, or violates the four "divine institutions" is evil: -

a) All violation of the free will of human beings is evil doing.

b) All violation of marriage is evil doing. Adultery and all forms of promiscuity, pornography, or other perversions (child abuse, etc), is evil doing.

c) All attacks on the sacredness of the family are evil doing. Child abuse comes into all three categories as one of the great evils.

d) All attacks upon the integrity of the nation state are evil, for God has established the nations as his way to limit evil and enhance opportunities to spread the gospel, reversing the curse of the tower of Babel.

5. Every divine institution is dependant for its function on the previous institutions: nations depend on families, families depend on marriage, marriage depends on freedom of individual's will.

6. Believers are not to be known for attacking these four divine institutions; we are to be known as people who respect them and uphold them at all times.

### **GOD – DIVINE INSTITUTIONS – BIBLICAL CONCEPT OF AUTHORITY**

DEFINITION: Legal power delegated by God under the Laws of Divine Establishment for the protection of the free will (volition) of others. This authority exists in both the temporal and spiritual realms. There is authority within Marriage, the Family, and the State, and the Church.

In each area legitimate authority will always protect individuals from evil and ensure their freedom to serve God and fulfil the Lord's will for them is maintained.

### **GOD – DIVINE INSTITUTIONS – BIBLICAL CONCEPT OF THE STATE**

DEFINITION: The nation state is established by God in history to protect the freedom and lives of people, to ensure they have a stable life within which they are free to serve Him, grow spiritually, evangelise others and teach His Word. Nations that encourage these things prosper in history, and nations that resist these things disappear from history.

## **LECTURE 25 – JOHN CALVIN**

### **INTRODUCTION**

John Calvin was a great Christian, but he, like Luther, had some major flaws, possibly genetic in his case with OCD. He stressed the Sovereignty of God and the Eternal Plan of God, whereas Luther stressed justification by faith. All these doctrines of course are important but need to be in balance with all others. Both men spoke of biblical truths, and these things are true, but if you take either of them too far, they become an erroneous theology. By their "Fruit" you identify truth and error, by where the path leads. **Titus 1:1-3, 1 Peter 1:1-2.**

John Calvin came from a small town sixty miles northeast of Paris. His father was anxious for his son to have the advantages of a good education. Calvin entered the University of Paris at fourteen and mastered not only a brilliant writing style, but a skill in logical argument. In later years men might not like what Calvin said but they could not misunderstand what he meant, nor challenge the logic of his arguments. Once you accept Calvin's first premises his logic is impeccable. He left the university in 1528 with his Master of Arts degree.

After Paris, at his father's insistence, John turned to the study of law in the Universities of Orleans and Bourges, but his father's death in 1531 left Calvin free to pursue his own interests. Thus he returned to Paris as a student of the classics, intent upon a scholar's career within the Catholic Church.

He was a scholar indeed and his system of theology grew out of his study and was revised again and again. It is logical and internally self consistent, but that does not mean it is correct! Calvin's error is that of many scholars, and it is the philosophical "Category Mistake"; they speak of eternity as if it is still within the bounds of space and time.

Calvin came to his ideas about ten years after Luther. There are many contrasts between these two important believers. Luther was born of peasant stock whereas Calvin was from the middle classes. Luther studied philosophy and theology while Calvin studied humanism and the law.

We therefore find that much of reformed theology is based on legalistic precepts and has a humanistic social action aspect as well, that today morphs into liberalism. Calvinism was involved in a strongly democratic and republican form of Government while Luther dealt with Princes. The churches they therefore developed were different, with the churches of Calvin based on democratic/autocratic principles, while Luther's were still hierarchical. Luther emphasized preaching allowing the Word of God to do the work. Calvin emphasized organization and administration of the church.

#### TULIP

Luther worked on the basis that man had the opportunity to choose his own way. Calvin however with his legalistic approach tended to be far more constrained. He interfered with people's lives at all levels. John Calvin theologically held to double predestination and the TULIP concept.

T - the total depravity of man and everything about him is depraved. He is unable to save himself or to be involved in his salvation by any choices made.

U - Unconditional election. Man was elected to be a child of God on no basis of his own nature. Even God's foreknowledge was not involved. God did not even use His own foreknowledge to elect us.

L - Limited redemption. They believe that Christ died only for the saints, those who would believe.

I - Irresistible grace. When God decides to save someone He draws them irresistibly, so that they could do nothing else but to accept the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour.

P - Perseverance of the saints, or eternal security.

The doctrine of double predestination, that flows from these points, says that there are people on the earth who are predestined to be saved, called the elect, and by implication there are others who are predestined to be damned, and there is nothing they can do about it. The true Calvinist will accept this concept and relax with it, for they have put themselves in the elect category, and they leave it's conclusion with God's mysterious sovereignty and righteousness.

Once you accept the first precept of Calvin the rest flows logically from it. His theology was post millennial and did not accept the beliefs of the earliest Church Fathers, who said that the Lord Jesus Christ would set up his kingdom on the earth. He believed that the church had the responsibility to set up the kingdom, a concept which he had inherited from the Roman Catholic Church through Augustine of Hippo. Calvinism is already written up by Augustine of Hippo by 420.

He tried to do this in Geneva by creating a city run along what he believed were Christian lines as God's Commonwealth on earth. Between 1541 and 1546 in Geneva 58 people were executed and 76 were exiled because they broke the rules. Many of those who were executed had been truly guilty of capital offences, but under Calvin's laws these were many.

Luther was robust and healthy, Calvin thin and unhealthy, and some have argued that their differences were based in the fact that they had different temperaments and life styles. People tried to kill Calvin by shooting at him. What he attempted to do, he did in a very sincere manner, and was hard on himself. He believed that what he could accomplish in Geneva was a place where people could worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness. Geneva did benefit from John Calvin and under him it became the great centre of the Reformation. Luther's church however tended over time to be a pale offshoot of the Roman Catholic Church with Protestant doctrine. If you were a committed Christian who wanted to see the rule of the saints over the nations, Calvin was the one to follow, as John Knox from Scotland did.

The consequence of faith to Calvin, far more than to Luther, is strenuous effort to introduce the kingdom of God on earth. Though no longer judged by the law of God, the true Christian finds in the law the divine pattern for moral character. No one is justified by works, yet no justified person is without works. **James 2:14-26**. No one can be a true Christian without aspiring to holiness in his life. This rigorous pursuit of moral righteousness was one of the primary features of Calvinism. It made character a fundamental test of genuine religious life, and explains Calvinism's dynamic, social activism. God calls the elect for his purpose, and it is His Glory on earth and in heaven.

Calvinism's emphasis upon the Sovereignty of God led in turn to a special view of the state. Luther tended to consider the state supreme. The German princes often determined where and how the gospel would be preached. But Calvin taught that no man, whether pope or king, has any claim to absolute power.

Calvin never preached the "right of revolution", but he did encourage the growth of representative assemblies and stressed their right to resist the tyranny of monarchs. Calvinist resistance to the exercise of arbitrary power by monarchs was a key factor in the development of modern constitutional governments, and the Swiss led the way in democracy.

Many of the dominion/kingdom theologians, influenced by Calvinism, go back to the Old Testament Law as a basis of righteous living. Remember, that we however do not go back to the ten commandments, we go back to the twenty

commandments of **1 Thessalonians 5**, or the Great Commandment of **Ephesians 5:18**, the filling of the Holy Spirit. We have a far higher type of life than the Mosaic Law, and the only way to live it is through the power of the Holy Spirit. All this to Calvin was heresy, and such "Baptist" ways of thinking would have proved we were dangerous revolutionaries and worthy of death in Calvin's Geneva!

#### CALVIN IN GENEVA

In Geneva Calvin organised the city in a similar way to that of Old Testament Israel. You are not justified by works, he taught but no-one can be justified without works, and so he expected all citizens to work out their faith in service to the State. Holiness, we teach, comes from the work of the Spirit in the life, whereas Calvin brought in the Old Testament Law as a fundamental way to live the Christian life. He calls the elect for his purpose, he taught, and so the State was organized in a way that he believed allowed that purpose to be worked out in the lives of all more smoothly.

Calvinists tended to be dour and somewhat kill joy; they were rather legalistic and had a facade of holiness which was often harshness. They can be even today often very critical of others and OCD pedantic about rules. This form of what became known as "Puritanism" is where you have asceticism and legalism coming together. It can make people harsh rather than holy. It is absolutely critical for the Holy Spirit to be in control of your life, as it is the only genuine power for the Christian, without arrogance or self righteousness. Without the Holy Spirit's softening power, the soul of any man or woman trying to live in accord with the Law will become hardened and bitter.

Luther often considered the State supreme but Calvin said that neither the King nor Pope had the right for ultimate power. He encouraged the growth of representative assemblies and their right to resist the tyranny of monarchy. John Knox was a student of John Calvin and on the basis of what he learnt at Geneva he opposed Mary Queen of Scots. Calvinism set off the second wave of real dynamics in the Reformation and Democratization of Europe.

Theodore Beza took over in Geneva in 1564 when Calvin died. He is known as one of the great men of the time. He started organizing the Greek works of Erasmus preparing what became known as the "Textus Receptus"; or "received text" of the New Testament. He led the church in Geneva right the way through to 1605 through his devotion to the powerful and systematic nature of verse by verse Bible teaching. He influenced many throughout Europe and beyond.

One legacy of Calvinism is theocracy legislating what people can and cannot do. The danger of legislating Christian behaviour is that you have done something that obscures the need for the gospel. Many unbelievers will not listen to the gospel today as they were brought up in a Calvinistic environment. For the Calvinist, this is not necessarily a concern for they can simply say, "such a person is not elect anyway".

By the fact that we criticize what unbelievers should do on Sundays we may rob them of the opportunity of becoming believers. They will associate the people that interfere with them and tell them what to do with their business on Sundays and be resistant to the gospel. To the Calvinist, of course such an objection has no merit, for people do not make choices, only the elect will be saved. Their response is to preach with even more judgmental strength so that the non-elect might be revealed, and silenced, and the true saints identify each other through their response to the truth. This is true, but the harshness of it's delivery may be the source of their judgment before a loving God, if they are wrong!

Calvin achieved getting Geneva running on Christian principles but this was in the end a failure of the Great Commission. The unbelievers were told to baptize their children and many people became "make believers" to save their lives and property. People in Geneva had to conform to Christian behaviour or be expelled. It was also an offence not to be in church at certain times. Many churches today are still made up of people going to hell with Bibles under their arms, and the organized churches will be present through the Tribulation to come as "Mystery Babylon".

Just before the days of Calvin, Zwingli was working in Zurich leading in the Independent group. He was in Zurich in German speaking Switzerland. Berne and Basle joined the Zwingli type of church, as did Strassburg in Germany. In a battle with the Catholics in 1531, Zwingli was killed, and his work was carried on by Heinrich Bullinger.

In 1536 Calvin published his first edition of his classic work, "The Institutes of the Christian Religion", and he addressed it to Francis I, King of France defending the Protestant cause. This made him famous throughout Europe. He could no longer remain in France. This is why after some months of travel while he was headed for Strassburg that fateful night in July 1536, when William Farel enlisted him for the work of God in Geneva.

The city councils offered Calvin a position, "Professor of Sacred Scriptures", and he began his work with vigor. He prepared a confession of faith to be accepted by everyone who wished to be a citizen; he planned an educational program for all; and he insisted on excommunication, particularly expulsion from the Lord's Supper, for those whose lives did not conform to spiritual standards. His banner was holiness and purity.

This meant that only Christians could be citizens of Geneva. This meant that there must be mass evangelism, mass expulsions, or hypocrisy, and it ended up in a combination of the three. In every city there are going to be believers and unbelievers. The Institutes was however, whatever its limitations, one of the books that changed the course of the Reformation and European history.

In 1538 the people in Geneva threw Calvin out and he went to Strassburg where he was a pastor in a church for French refugees. He had a tragic marriage there. He married a widow with two children. They then had a child who died and his wife died after only nine years of marriage.

In 1541 he went back to Geneva at the people's invitation, and he went back on his own terms, and he governed. Democracy was his teaching, but in practice he ruled like a king in council. If you disagreed with him you died or left. It was a perfect place for those who were persecuted for their protestant faith, for he valued all they did. If you were committed to the Calvinistic view it was heaven on earth, but if you disagreed on even a minor point you were in trouble.

Many persecuted English went to Geneva, and there produced the English translation of the textus receptus manuscripts, the Geneva Bible, which was the Bible of the Bible believing Puritan movement well into the 17th century. The King James Bible was not accepted by the Independents, as it was associated with the Anglican Church that persecuted them. Only as the Geneva Bible went out of print did the KJV get its place ready for its great work in the Great Revival of the 1720s and following.

#### JOHN KNOX

John Knox achieved in a nation what Calvin achieved in the city. Geneva became a training centre for the Reformation leaders. Knox called it the most perfect school of Christ that there was since the apostles. It had great effect through those staying there for learning in Holland, Germany and France.

The French Protestants were called the Huguenots and they were finally nearly all massacred in 1572 on St Bartholomew's Day. The survivors split into three groups after this terrible day; some remained in France, a significant minority, but were not a challenge to the monarchy from that period forward. The majority of the survivors headed for either Switzerland or Prussia where they began their specialist businesses and established their churches again. Swiss watch making and banking is established by these Huguenot refugees, and in Prussia they became the educators of the nobility, preparing them for their rise to final power over Germany itself.

The Spanish ruled the Netherlands, but they were able to secure their freedom under William the Silent through the impact of the Calvinistic Reformation and many Huguenots moved there also, and from there to South Africa to establish that colony of New Holland at the Cape. The King of the Netherlands became the King of England in 1688.

When civil war broke out in Scotland in 1559, Knox went home and by 1560 the Calvinists were in control of Edinburgh. He drafted the "Articles of Religion" which were accepted by Parliament for Scotland as a whole. Mary Queen of Scots came home to try and put down the "Protestant Heresy" but Scotland remained Calvinistic. She plotted against her nobles, and her cousin Elizabeth and was eventually executed. Her son and heir was taken from her and brought up by strong and abusive Calvinists and he hated every moment of it. When he became king he sought a more Anglican path.

John Knox stood in front of Mary Queen of Scots and told her that she ruled because God allowed it but it should be according to the Scriptures. She did not agree with the Scripture as the sole standard. Knox said that their group did agree with the Scriptures as the sole standard, and if there was a conflict between the two the Queen would go. The Queen said that she would rather hear that there was an invading army coming into Scotland than to hear that John Knox was praying for her. By the early years of the new century Lowland Scotland was firmly Calvinist, a Scottish king, James the VI, had become James the first of England, and Catholicism was an underground movement that would rise again in the rebellions of 1715, and the famous uprising of the Highland Clans under the alcoholic and arrogantly stupid "Bonnie Prince Charlie" in 1745. The Stuarts fatal flaw of arrogance was common amongst aristocracy, but fatal when facing thinking Protestantism.

In 1640 the English Civil War started. Here Charles I, who was tending towards Catholicism, was at odds with the Parliament who comprised Puritans with a Calvinistic or Baptist/Independent viewpoint. They believed in democracy and did not need a King to tell them what to do. Their view was, if the King is ruling in accordance with the Scriptures, and cooperatively with parliament, that is fine, if he fails to do so however you remove the King. This comes to its final fulfillment in 1649 when he walked to his death on a scaffold in Whitehall.

This is the drama of the Protestantism and Catholicism at this time. Calvin stands head and shoulders above all others at this time as a thinker. The social gospel comes to us as a descendant of Calvinism. Of the big liberal denominations many have a Calvinistic or Episcopal background, but equally many may have a Baptist background. Systems of government in churches do not make the church anything other than "organized" – it's the quality of the leadership and the Holy Spirit filled biblical nature of the preaching that is the key.

#### DOCTRINES

**CHURCH AND ISRAEL**

1. It is critical to the evaluation of the Bible to distinguish between the Church and Israel.
2. The Jews started with Abraham (Genesis 12:1-3).

The Church started at Pentecost (Acts 2; Gal 3:26-28).

3. Israel was promised blessings on earth (Deuteronomy 28:1-14).  
The Church is promised blessings in heavenly places (Ephesians 1:3; Hebrews 3:1).
4. Israel's relationship to God was based on a Covenant (Genesis 17:7,8).  
The Church's relationship to God is based on new birth (John 1:12; 1 Peter 1:23).
5. Israel's prophecy is mainly in the Old Testament.  
Prophecy of the Church is only in the New Testament.
6. Israel worshipped at Jerusalem (Psalm 122:1-4).  
The Church worships where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name. (Matthew 18:20)
7. Israel lived under the law (Ezekiel 20:10-12).  
The Church is under grace (John 1:17; Romans 6:14).
8. Israel's destiny is with Palestine (Isaiah 60:18-21).  
The Church when completed will be removed from the earth (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18).
9. Christ is King and Messiah to Israel.  
Christ is Head and Bridegroom to the Church.
10. Israel contained Jews only.  
The Church is made up of both Jews and Gentiles.

**ELECTION AND PREDESTINATION**

1. The Biblical concept of predestination does not conflict with human freewill.
2. Christ was predestined for a specific purpose from eternity past - to go to the cross and be raised to glory (Isaiah 42:1, 1 Peter 2:4-6, Acts 2:23).
3. All members of the human race are potentially elect by the Father under the concept of unlimited atonement (2 Peter 3:9, 1 John 2:2).
4. When a person trusts in Christ for salvation, he is united with Christ and therefore shares His election and destiny (1 Corinthians 1:2, 30, Romans 8:28, 32, Ephesians 1-4).
5. Election is closely linked with foreknowledge. In eternity past, God knew who would believe, He therefore predestined them, called them, and they were saved (Romans 8:29-30, 2 Timothy 1:9).
6. Therefore, election and predestination applies to the believer only. No person is predestined for hell - it is a choice of freewill (John 3:18, John 3:36).
7. Election is a present and future possession of every believer (John 15:16, Colossians 3:12).
8. Election is also the foundation of the universal church (1 Thessalonians 1:4).
9. There are five Greek words used in conjunction with predestination:
  - a) Pro Orizo - to predesign (Romans 8:28, 29, Ephesians 1:5, 11)
  - b) Protithemi - to predetermine (Romans 3:25, Ephesians 1:9)
  - c) Prothesis - a predetermined plan (Romans 8:28, 9:11, Ephesians 1:11, 3:11, 2 Timothy 1:9)
  - d) Proginosko - to foreordain, to preordain. (Romans 8:29, 11:2, 1 Peter 1:20)
  - e) Prognosis - foreknowledge or predetermined purpose (Acts 2:23, 1 Peter 1:2).
10. The life of Judas is a good illustration of predestination and freewill:
  - a) God's call is to all people, His desire is that all will be saved. (Matthew 28:18-20, John 3:16 1 John 2:2, 3:23)
  - b) God is long suffering towards the lost, not willing that any should perish. (2 Peter 3:9)
  - c) God's call is to all, but people must respond. (John 3:36, 16:8-11)
  - d) God's call is of love. (Jeremiah 31:3, John 3:16)
  - e) Those who resist become hardened in their souls and open to Satanic influence or possession. (Romans 1:20-32, 2 Thessalonians 2:9-12)



f) Judas was chosen in love by the Lord (Matthew 10:1-4, John 13:18) and received the sop of the honoured guest and sat at the Lord's right hand at supper.

g) However Judas was a thief and a traitor. (John 12:6, 13:18)

h) As an unsaved man he was involved in evangelism. Others were probably saved through his reading of the word but he was not. (Matthew 10:1-8)

i) He became the Son of Perdition by his decision, he could not blame anyone else (John 17:12)

## **LECTURE 26 - THE ENGLISH SOLUTION**

### **INTRODUCTION                    Isaiah 55:10-13**

In England we have William Tyndale and many others in the 1520's following Wycliffe, trying to get the Bible into the English language; all these incredibly brave people were standing in the Lollard tradition, that was still strong.

The traveling Lollard preachers had prepared the way for the reformation, but it was the Kings desire to divorce that led to the Anglican church being formed. The English church was formed not as a direct result of the reformation beginning in Europe but rather as the result of politics and social change, but reforming men and women worked with these changes, seeing in them the hidden hand of God. There are great and good people on all sides in the English story, and many gave their lives for the truth. Because the "victors write the books" it may only be known in heaven how many great believers there were behind the scenes doing wonderful things in the power of the Holy Spirit.

In Germany the Lutheran church was formed by Catholics priests in a state church following Martin Luther. A similar thing happened in Switzerland, and also in the formation of the Anglican Church, where the first priests were catholic priests, who simply became the next day Anglican, owing allegiance to the King rather than the Pope. Henry VIII decided that they would be "reformed", for his own purpose, but like in the continent the church was formed of catholic priests as the first "ministers". In many cases in Europe the City Council decided whether the city would be Catholic or not.

There were over 500 monasteries in England in the year 1500. There were many more hundred churches under direct monastic control. Some of these houses were corrupt, but many were strong and stable institutions that were genuinely meeting the needs of the local people. During the 15<sup>th</sup> century there had been the Wars of the Roses between the house of York and that of Lancaster, and this had decimated the land and the people. There was the mood for change amongst the land owners, who sought the power and money that the church had acquired through the centuries.

### **HENRY VIII**

Henry Tudor unified the two roses of York and Lancaster in the Tudor Rose, which was both red and white. Henry Tudor's son was Henry VIII. His father left Henry VIII with one firm command, "get yourself an heir". He knew that the peace between the great houses of England was tenuous and uncles abounded who had legitimate claims to the throne, so only a clear heir to the throne would avoid a return to devastating civil war. Henry was driven by this need for an heir, and much of the evil flowed from his inability to produce an heir through his first Queen, Catherine of Aragon. This was referred to as "the king's great matter"; that Henry wanted a male heir and his wife, whom he had inherited from his elder brother Arthur, could not produce a male heir. A young woman who caught his eye in the court, maybe she could.....

The Pope would not grant him a divorce, as he was controlled by Charles V, related to Queen Catherine. Henry was also short of money so he looked at the monasteries and said, "unless the pope gives me a divorce I will not let any money go to the Pope from England". King John had done this before and paid dearly for it...Magna Carta... Henry saw the monasteries wealth as a carrot to use to get the greedy nobles support for divorce, and a new church structure.

Henry as a young and even a middle aged man was a great man, but always self centered, but sadly as an older man he became bitter, paranoid and evil in thought and deed. He reigned from 1509 to 1547. He was strong, generous and cultured when he started out. He studied theology and had a Bachelors degree in Arts. A good musician, Henry could speak Latin, French, Spanish and English.

He was a great hunter, a sportsman who introduced the game of tennis to England. He enjoyed putting on armour and jousting. The people loved young Henry and there was lots to love in him as a young man. He had problems as he aged with power lust and womanizing, and he was proud and vain (Fruit of his real spiritual state). Pride of course is top of the sins which God hates – and sadly it betrays a weakness that would kill many.

He had inherited a problem from his father, in the form of his wife who was the wife of his elder brother Arthur. Arthur had been married to Catherine of Aragon, a Spanish princess who brought with her great wealth in the form of a dowry.

When Arthur died his father could not afford to send back Catherine with her great dowry, because England was in a perilous state financially and therefore arranged that Henry would marry her so they could keep the dowry.

They had a child Mary Tudor, or Bloody Mary as she was later known, when she came to reign over England after the premature death of Edward VI, Henry's son by a later marriage. Mary was brought up a strict Catholic. Mary instituted the greatest persecution that England had ever seen. Fortunately her reign was brief and she was succeeded by Elizabeth I, who was, nominally at least, a Protestant.

Catherine was not going to have any more children and the need for a male heir became foremost in the mind of Henry. He was concerned that there was going to be a renewal of the civil war, which had only recently ceased. He read that in Leviticus 20 and 21 if he married his brother's wife and it was childless there was clearly God's judgement against it.

#### THE ROYAL DIVORCE

Henry wanted a divorce and wanted to get rid of Catherine. He applied to Pope Clement VII for a divorce. The Papacy however was under the influence of Spain. The Spanish king/Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V did not want a Spanish princess disgraced and sent to a nunnery for the rest of her life, and said to Clement that if he granted Henry a divorce Clement would be finished as Pope.

Henry sent Cardinal Wolsey to Rome to see the Pope and returned with the news that the Pope was not going to agree to a divorce, because the Pope's power depended on the Emperor Charles V support, and he was a close relative of Catherine and would not have her insulted. Henry planned to kill Wolsey but Wolsey conveniently died at Hampton Court Palace and bequeathed his house to the King. Wolsey's dying words were, "Would that I had served my God with such fervour as I have served the King".

Thomas Cromwell, a Protestant reformer, then came into prominence. He was the forefather of Oliver Cromwell as well as an ancestor of Winston Churchill and the Dukes of Marlborough. Thomas Cranmer, a Protestant, was installed as the first protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, but all had to tread carefully, as Henry wanted to walk a middle line, and so he killed protestants who were too fervent, Bible translators, and also Catholics who wouldn't bend to his will.

Over a century before, in the 1380s, Wycliffe had organised the Lollards preaching and reading the Scriptures in the native tongue, now his work was carried on secretly by Cranmer and they saw it as such. The seeds of Christianity which had been sown by this method was now combined with a sense of national pride generated by the Tudors under Henry VII, thus by the time that the schism occurred the English were quite content to dispose of Rome as they were feeling English rather than European. They were willing to fight the Spanish and French if necessary to preserve their independence. The reform was not as much about religion, as about a new sense of nationalism.

On the continent Erasmus had produced a Greek New Testament going back to the original Greek manuscripts, and Beza had codified it as "the received text". People now were looking at the Scriptures in the original Greek for the first time for a thousand years. They were translating it and getting excited about it and conversing together in English about it, rather than only speaking about scripture in Latin. Some actively opposed it, one of whom being Sir Thomas More who was later killed, but himself was happy to kill reformers also.

Early in Henry's reign William Tyndale made a translation, had it printed on the Continent and smuggled it into England. The Lollards were few by the time of Henry and the people were still not allowed to read the Scriptures in English. Henry tried to kill Tyndale to stop this "heretical translation". Tyndale was betrayed to the English Secret Service in 1535. He was arrested in Brussels on Henry's order, and in the following year he was strangled and burnt at the stake. His final prayer was "Lord open the King of England's eyes". As his text you could put Isaiah 55:10-13 is a text that should be placed as an epitaph as he let loose the Word of God in England again.

At this time also Zwingli is killed in battle in Switzerland, but Calvin is in Geneva, and Luther is active in Germany. In England therefore Tyndale's Bible arrived at the same time as the Reformation concepts arrive from the Continent from many other sources also. (3000 copies were made.)

#### DEFENDER OF THE FAITH

In 1521 the King wrote a defence of the Roman Catholic faith as an attack upon Luther's work in Germany and a strong defence of the seven sacraments. Due to his writing Henry VIII received a title from the Pope - "Defender of the Faith". Henry adopted a position early on in his reign, which the Protestants did not want, but changed when it suited him. He decided he wished to become the head of the English church, a position which Elizabeth II still holds. The church is ruled through the Parliament and if the Archbishop of Canterbury wants changes he has to do it through an Act of Parliament.

What Henry wanted to do was to control the Pope (he wanted the Pope a "kings' pope" who did as he was told by the kings of Europe) and the nobles of England (king's men) by giving them money, and he wanted to marry whom he wanted to, and get the son that he hoped would stop civil war.

In January 1533 he secretly married Anne Boleyn and so the English "reformation" truly began. Some men refused to accept the King's supremacy over the church, and one was the noble Catholic statesman Sir Thomas Moore and he

went to the scaffold. Sir Thomas Moore wrote two good books including the famous Utopia. He was a Catholic gentleman but he was a thorough Roman Catholic to the end, and he paid the price with his blood, and he also was happy to kill Protestants. Read his written works, but also examine his "works". Under Mary many of the men who killed More would give their lives at the stake. Anne Boleyn gave birth to Elizabeth.

In 1531 he had accused the clergy of following a foreign power without his consent putting them on the defensive and by 1532 they had agreed to be submissive to him. In 1534 he became the head of the church in England and two years later started the dissolution of the monasteries. In 1536 many of the monasteries were closed. About half the monks went into secular life while the rest went to other monasteries. One tenth of all the land in England was under the control of the monasteries. Henry used the confiscated lands to ingratiate himself with the nobles on the basis that if the crunch came they would have to support the king rather than the Pope. By receiving the church's lands they were siding with Henry to the death! Cromwell became wealthy through this "land grab", but his greed and hatred of Rome and the monks alienated nobility, and his destruction of Abbey churches where many ancestors were buried really upset important people! Cromwell felt invincible! He wasn't! And so they arranged his execution.... Pride and greed drove them all.

#### ENGLISH BIBLES

In 1536, the year when he allowed William Tyndale to be murdered, he wanted to get his own translation of the Bible into English. This was called the Great Bible. Miles Coverdale was chosen to do the translation, and he drew on Wyclif and Tyndale's work. There were enough produced to go to all the churches in England and it was to be used in the services. The Bible was huge and chained to the lectern so that people would not steal them. The hunger for the Word was extreme, with people gathered around the lectern hearing the words read aloud in English for the first time in a church.

John Rogers another Reformer produced the Matthew Bible. The churches were full and everybody who could read was used to read the Scriptures to the people. For the first time in their life the ordinary people were listening to the Word of God in their own language. The Word of God never returns void. Enough people became converted to biblical faith and so, having tasted true freedom would not return to the Catholic Faith – even when forced to later by Mary.

Henry still retained the belief in transubstantiation. However the bread and wine was available to the laity for the first time by his death in 1547.

Henry was succeeded by his sickly son Edward VI. He reigned only until 1553. He was surrounded by Protestant advisers, and it was during this time that Archbishop Cranmer brought out his Book of Common Prayer as well as the 42 articles which redefined the English Church. There was a great evangelism in this time for they feared their days would be short. They were right.

On Edward's death, Mary the daughter of Catherine reigned, although the reformers tried to bring in another claimant and have her crowned before Mary was called out of her exiled life, but the king's will was that she reign after him, and the disaster unfolded. In her four year reign she persecuted the English church in an attempt to bring them back to Catholicism and martyred over 300 people at the stake including Archbishop Cranmer. These deeds were recorded in Foxe's Book of Martyrs, which was published in 1571.

Latimer and Ridley were two of the famous martyrs with Latimer encouraging Ridley at the stake. He said, "Be of good comfort Master Ridley. Play the man. This day we shall light a candle which by God's grace in England shall never be put out". Under torture Cranmer had recanted his faith but when he went to the stake he repented and placed in the fire first the hand that had signed his recantation.

Mary died after 4 years but her bloody reign meant that Catholicism was finished as a force in England, and was thoroughly hated by most, and Elizabeth reigned in her stead. The Catholics made one last attempt at control through the Spanish invasion plan in the Great Armada of 1588 but this too failed, as did Guido Faulkes on 5 November 1605. From that time until the 19<sup>th</sup> century to be a Catholic was to be a potential traitor! This produced the world in which we now live. It was born in blood, and only starts to shift after Vatican 2 in the late 1960s.

Many of the people who went to the continent during the reign of Bloody Mary to escape persecution spent the time in Geneva with Calvin. These Puritans had the Geneva Bible at their side when they returned and this was the standard Bible until the late 17th century for Bible believing Christians in the United Kingdom (as it was under James I/VI).

#### DOCTRINE

**MARRIAGE**

1. Man and angels have personality but only men and animals have "nephesh" and experience physical death. Angels do not die because they are spirits.
2. Marriage requires both personality and life, therefore it is only applicable to man. There is no marriage in the angelic realm (Matthew 22:30).

3. Definition:- the personal relationship between a male and female member of the human race which typifies the saving relationship between Christ and believers.
4. God's instruction - "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish and the fowl and every living thing". This shows that man should subdue and have dominion over the animal kingdom.
5. If God was a solitary personality there would be no divine example of relationships, however with the three personalities in the Godhead relationships are demonstrated. He is a personal God and we can therefore have a relationship with him.
6. Marriage typifies the relationship between Christ and the church:
  - a) in the form of grace and faith (Ephesians 5:22), the word submit meaning to fall into line to the law of God which the carnal mind cannot do (Romans 8:7; 10:3).
  - b) you submit yourself by an act of freewill.
  - c) a family can strain marriage relationships if they are not submissive (Romans 13:1,5).
7. Grace is typified by the male and faith by the female. If this pattern is not adhered to it results in misery and suffering.
8. Grace and the man:
  - a) the man is in the role of an initiator
  - b) the man provides information to which the woman can respond but must not coerce her free will
  - c) the man has to show his character to the woman
  - d) the man has to be patient, a form of grace.
9. Faith and the woman:
  - a) the woman is in the role of a responder
  - b) the woman makes the choice of her free will
  - c) she is the one who uses faith
  - d) the woman needs time to grow.
10. Glory revealed:
  - a) The glory of God is shown in the man in the form of a changed life through regeneration.
  - b) The glory of the man is shown in the woman by changes in the woman.
11. Compatibility:
  - a) The important area of compatibility is that in the spiritual realm as one can be psychologically compatible with many people.
  - b) Spiritual compatibility is indicated by the phrase "one flesh" and is a picture of the union of Christ and the church.
12. Satan will attempt to blur the differences between man and woman and cause role reversals. The degree to which this occurs reflects the level of decadence in a society.
13. Legitimate reasons for the termination of marriage:
  - a) the death of one of the partners
  - b) the desertion of a believer by an unbelieving spouse where one of the two partners has become a Christian after marriage (1 Corinthians 7:10-16)
  - c) inappropriate marriage partners such as close relations as specified in (Leviticus 18)
  - d) adultery or fornication as this causes the destruction of the one flesh principle by forming another one flesh (Matthew 5:32; 19:9).

## **LECTURE 27 - THE COUNTER REFORMATION.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

For the Popes the question was, what was to be done to the Protestants who would not change back and submit to Rome again? For both sides coercion was the order of the day, even to killing people. By argument those who were not in agreement with you were of the devil, and the kindest thing to do would be to burn the devil out of them, preferably them having recanted. The Dominicans of the Inquisition looked on their work of persecution as a good work, for these pagans and false prophets, who were to be eliminated or brought back to "Mother Church". They were misguided, and like Rabbi Saul did evil, thinking it was good. **1 Corinthians 9:24-27, Deuteronomy 7:16, 13:6-11.**

The Protestants in large measure failed in evangelism in the countryside with the peasants, especially after the peasants revolt was crushed so ruthlessly. They concentrated in the towns where they had influence with the princes. The exception were the Anabaptists. The agrarian south of Germany remained Catholic whilst the north was Protestant.

They had examples of what to do in Wyclif and the Lollards, who would read the Scriptures in the market squares. The same bare foot evangelists were not sent out in the Reformation. This is the same nowadays where few people are going out to tell people in their own workplace what the Bible says.

This is the challenge of every Bible believing church. Are the masses being reached. Protestantism became known as a North European religion with the south being almost untouched. You therefore have your religion tied in with your race with Italians and Spaniards expected to be Catholics and Swedes Protestant, yet neither may be Christian in reality.

**Acts 8:1-4.** If we tie this in with the Great Commission we are to be out preaching the word of God to all. Here we see that persecution occurred and it caused the first missionaries to be sent out. Only the Anabaptists went out and they were martyred in their thousands by both Catholic and Protestant alike. They refused to accept the tie up between religion and politics that both sides accepted.

The main groups believed that the religion of the individual should also be the religion of the State, and that this was your family/cultural identity. The Reformers were not totally committed to the Scriptures, and still believed that the Church and State are one, and stability of society depended on all worshipping together. A modern example would be Northern Ireland where people hold that view so strongly that they will kill for it. Luther was a believer, but had that blind spot.

#### PROTESTANTISM AND THE SOUTH

There were a number of things that were happening in the south which were also to mitigate against Protestantism in the long run. In the Catholic Church there were many mystics through this time who saw dreams and visions, and those who stayed within the church were welcomed as adding to its spiritual life and devotion. In the 14th century there was a mystic who left a book called the "Cloud of Unknowing". There was Thomas a Kempis who wrote the "Imitation of Christ" which had a great effect on the Catholics. They thought that they could keep people within Catholicism with these books supplying the emotional, devotional, and mystic support and attraction, and they were right.

In the 1560's they had St Theresa of Avilla in Spain who was a very devout woman; St John of the Cross was another person of note at this time. These people had a very spiritual manner about them. Whether they were born again is an open question, but they were strongly devotional and appeared to really love the Lord Jesus. They had spiritual power in their lives and showed what they called the love of Christ in a very practical way. They cared about the people and this was in strong contrast to the harshness and violence that the Calvinists and Lutherans were practicing. They also had the old grandeur, awesomeness and holiness of the great churches and the Mass service that gave an emotional charge to people, but was the Holy Spirit filling the people?

In addition you had several popes who were reforming popes. They saw the need to deal with the abuses in the Roman Catholic Church, including the wealth of the church. Many Catholic orders reformed themselves helping the poor; the Franciscans were practical in their action to help those in need. You have a spiritual/religious revival in the south at the same time as there is the challenge of the biblical teaching from the North. But the Bible was still not opened.....

Sir Thomas More was a believer who refused to agree with the take over of the church by Henry VIII and became a saint to many. The Archbishop of Milan set a tremendous example when that city was hit by a plague, working with the people and giving them practical assistance even though others were fleeing. We also have the Spanish soldier, Ignatius Loyola the founder of the Jesuits, who set an example of strict holiness in his life; he "out monk'd" Luther and he felt spiritual. What was needed was more self discipline Ignatius urged, not Protestantism! Luther was a whimp – real men stay RC!

The Roman Catholic Church fought back with both sword and deeds. Leading churchmen established the "Oratory of Divine Love", and this group led the way in finding new ways to be opposing the Protestants. There were only about 50 of these men, but it gave great impetus to the reforming of the Catholic Church. They included Cardinal Pole who ruled with Queen Mary in England. They wanted the church reformed but still under the Pope, but a good Pope, devoted to the church not money, power and lust. Bible still not open nor taught to the people..... Legalism + Mysticism....

Pope Paul III (1534 - 1549) eventually gets reform away in his fifteen year reign, after the "capture" of the Pope in 1527, with the bravery/death of the Swiss Guard. He appointed to the College of Cardinals people of reform. He appointed nine of the new cardinals to a reform commission. One wanted to reach an agreement with the Protestants, but his plans were thwarted by the Jesuits, who did not want to have any dialogue with the Protestants, but to convert them back to Catholic Christianity. So an opportunity was lost at a time when it may have been possible to re-unite the churches; although there was violence on both sides, and the strong nationalism, that made reunification unlikely.

The Reforming Cardinal's report in 1537 was called "advice concerning reform in the church". It said that the Papacy was too secular and needed to give more attention to spiritual matters and spend less time flirting with the world. There were another series of offences that they highlighted, such as the sale of indulgences and prostitution in Rome which they said had to cease. To formally publish this report showed to what depths the Catholics had gone in their desire to turn things

around, but not to open the Bible and allow the church to return to apostolic practices. As a result they established the Council of Trent to reform the church, but there was not a heart of love at work here at all, just realistic desperation.

#### THE MAJOR "REFORMING" POPES

Paul III [1534-1549]. He published a list of prohibited books by such people as Luther and Calvin, he initiated new orders committed to him only, and he re-organised the Inquisition to deal with heretics. He put the death penalty on anyone who owned one of these banned books. He also organised the council of Trent to meet. This was the "reformer"!

Pius IV opposed nepotism; people had to get appointments on spiritual qualifications rather than family ties. Sextus V brought in financial reform and the church came under the influence of a much more Spartan economy. There was a call for a general council. The index of banned books lasted until 1959 when Paul VI abolished it completely.

It is interesting to see how parallel the lives of Martin Luther and Ignatius Loyola really run. Loyola is seen as a picture of a mystic, and some would say OCD fanatic. He fasted for days on end and he got to places through self discipline that proved he was a soldier of Christ, not a whimp. Luther was simply seen by men like the Jesuits as a failed monk, Ignatius as a successful one, who had the strength to succeed. Protestantism was for losers, Catholicism for soldiers!

#### IGNATIUS LOYOLA AND THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

Ignatius Loyola had a mystical experience at the river Cardona and the wounded nobleman became another man. Until his death in 1556 he decided to be the apostle of Catholicism. He established a manual of spiritual discipline for his men. This was the Society of Jesus and these were designed to be the storm troopers of the Pope.

They were trained to be evangelists of the Catholics, fearless soldiers, and to convert Protestants. They were very successful. He looked at what the Protestants were saying, and rejected the work of the Spirit in the life, replacing it with rigorous self discipline. It was very legalistic and went far beyond anything that John Calvin, (probably with the same OCD condition), was proposing, but had incredibly good psychology behind it.

Shelley picks up the story of Ignatius Loyola. He says Ignatius met God but I would argue that this is unlikely, as many people involved in eastern religion such as Buddhism have experiences like his, and they do not commit to such negative things as this man did. This man may have had PTSD, BPD, or OCD or ??? - he was a seriously powerful individual, but I cannot see the fruit of the Holy Spirit in his life, or that of many of his followers who "conquered" the Americas.

While Luther came out of his experience with the concept that man cannot save himself, he must rely on God alone, Ignatius believed that you could save yourself; that both Satan and God were external and could be chosen between. He in fact came up with the first book on extreme positive thinking, and strong use of active visualization with fasting to an extreme that will certainly produce emotional experiences.

He wanted to get to the stage where his followers were so attuned to what he was thinking that they would follow him without question. This was a very military model, as they had been trained like commandos to be religious to a degree not seen before – they left anyone other than St Anthony behind in their devotions and tough fanaticism.

He used illustrations and images/visualizations of the eternal state of the damned to stimulate his followers to total obedience. He also used the same method to show the nativity, the wonders of heaven, and that by discipline humanity could be changed to assist God to achieve His purposes on earth. It is a very humanistic approach but used to train them to be soldiers of Catholicism.

There is a lot of error in his concepts but it needs study to weigh it up against true biblical Christianity, for he is correct in much of what he said. This is still the problem with many Protestants and Catholics who look to what man can do. Compare this with Ephesians 5:18. Ignatius became a fervent evangelist/apologist. He went to Paris where he spent 7 years and became a master of theology, he collected a number of faithful friends around him. He felt the inquisitors fires a couple of times due to his high enthusiasm for evangelism, and never quite forgave the Dominicans for their "attention".

The course for those entering his society was four weeks of concentrating on the life, death and resurrection of Christ. They concentrated on every part of the Lord's life and imagined his sufferings. To achieve this you had to live and mentally experience the suffering of Christ, and he had exercises where this was possible for those with this sort of mind.

This can be a valuable thing for some, if it is part of true Bible study, but it can be dangerous if it is not done in the right way. It can cause traumatization – even to see the movie the "Suffering of the Christ" can traumatize people. He was the person who said, "Give me the child to the age of seven and I will give you the man". Psychologists have shown since, that what you have learnt before the age of seven is amongst the most valuable and powerful of anything you learn. He begins systematic effective operant conditioning four hundred years before B F Skinner. By using traumatization you have a doorway to manipulate the mind and emotion of people – it is powerful, but cultic, and satanically dangerous.

In 1540 Pope Paul III approved of the Jesuits, "The Little Society of Jesus", as a new order. They were to become the greatest force in the counter reformation and were devoted and answerable only to the Pope. Their aim was simple;

destroy the Protestants. "The aim of the order was simple, there is no salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church"; lead the lost to re-enter the one true church, or pass them to the Inquisition for death.

Within the next few years they spread out throughout the world. Francis Xavier went to India and Japan. When Ignatius died in 1556 he had 1000 members of his society and they were serving on four continents. This is why in the Americas, in Asia, and Africa, Roman Catholicism is such a powerful force.

**COUNCIL OF TRENT**

The second major development was the Council of Trent 1545-1563. There were three sessions 1545-1547, 1551-1552 and 1562-1563. The Italians were the major group although the French were well represented. Whilst Protestants did attend some of the early sessions, groups like the Jesuits were so uncompromising that reconciliation was not possible. This therefore became the organization for ideas and strategies behind the anti-protestant "counter reformation".

Trent rejected everything that the Protestants stood for. The Jesuits with the Pope's blessing, ran the Council, and they were well organized, as they were well trained in debate. They said that without good works salvation was not possible whereas the reformers said that salvation was by faith alone, with works as the fruit.

Loyola said, "Pray as if it depended on God alone but act as if it depended on you alone". The Protestants said that the Word of God was all sufficient while the Council of Trent said that the Scriptures are important but so are the teachings of the Popes and Bishops and the Fathers are equally important. This is still a part of Roman Catholicism today.

There were seven sacraments rather than two retained including the Mass, Saints with their power between God and man, and Indulgencies. The concepts were medieval and as Shelley notes, only the anger was new. Note the similarities to Moslem extremists today! There was a tremendous anger against Protestantism and it was determined to wipe it out by debate and if necessary by war. Both sides thought that they were right.

The stage was set for the "thirty year war" which broke out in 1618 in Germany. It was a series of wars [Map page 289] and raged from Germany right the way down to Italy. Whoever won set the religion for their subjects and this created the great evil of murder, rape and pillage in Europe for the next 30 years. You were unable to evangelize under these conditions. There was a concern that if your neighbour was not in conformity with your city on religion they had to be convinced of their error or eliminated.

Only the Anabaptists would know that this was not true and that a pluralistic society was possible. Elizabeth in England was quite tolerant although she did execute Jesuits who tried to plot against, and execute her, in order to bring back papal influence over her subjects. Tolerance and the separation of religion and politics were latecomers into the scene.

**DOCTRINE**

**ROMAN CATHOLIC TRADITIONS**

<b>TRADITION</b>	<b>POPE OR OCCASION</b>	<b>DATE</b>
Prayers for the Dead		320
Making the sign of the Cross		320
Wax Candles		320
Worship of Angels , Dead Saints and Images		375
The daily Mass		394
Mary Mother of God	Council of Ephesus	431
Different dress for the Priests		500
Extreme Unction		526
Doctrine of Purgatory	Gregory 1	593
Prayers directed to Mary and Dead Saints		600
Title of Pope [universal bishop]	Boniface III	607
Kissing the Pope's foot	Constantine	709
Temporal power of Popes given by Pipin	Stephen III	755
Worship of cross and relics	Hadrian I	786
Holy water blessed by a priest	Leo IV	850
Worship of St.Joseph	Stephen VI	890
College of Cardinals established	John X	927
Baptism of bells	John XIII	965
Canonisation of dead saints	John XV	995
Fasting on Fridays during Lent	Gregory V	998
Celibacy of the priesthood.	Gregory VII	1079
The Rosary - Peter the Hermit	Urban II	1090
The Inquisition	Council of Verona	1184
Sale of Indulgences	Clement III	1190
Transubstantiation	Innocent III	1215

Confession to a priest not God	Lateran Council	1215
Adoration of the wafer [host]	Honorius III	1220
Bible forbidden to laymen.	Council of Toulouse	1239
The scapular invented by Simon Stock	Innocent IV	1251
Cup forbidden to the people at communion	Council of Constance	1414
Purgatory proclaimed as a dogma.	Council of Florence	1439
Ave Maria	Julius II	1508
Jesuit Order	Loyola	1534
Tradition equal authority to the Bible	Council of Trent	1545
Apocryphal books added to the Bible	Council of Trent	1546
Creed of Pope Pius IV imposed as official creed	Pius IV	1560
Immaculate Conception	Pius IX	1854
Pope's Temporal Authority over all Civil Rulers	Pius IX	1864
Infallibility of Pope in matters of faith and morals	Vatican Council	1870
Public Schools condemned	Pius XI	1930
Assumption of the Virgin Mary	Pius XII	1950
Mary proclaimed Mother of the Church	Paul VI	1965

**LECTURE 28 - THE PURITANS**

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The agreement of nations to allow their people to worship in the manner that they wished to only commenced some three hundred years ago. We live in the greatest period of religious freedom in the history of the world, but it is only in the West – and blood was shed to achieve it. Understand the cost of tolerance and teach it to others who don't know!

One of the great things that came out of the Puritan movement was tolerance. In the early days there was great intolerance with significant persecution in the United Kingdom, first from the Catholics and then from the Anglicans. The early Independent Christians were persecuted by the unbelievers in the Anglican Church. The Anglican Church thought that everybody in their parish was a member of the Anglican church, and they used to persecute those who did not conform. This was evil, but it created a greater one during the Civil War period in the 1640s.

PURITANS AND NEW ISRAEL

As a result of persecution many Puritans thought that they were like Israel fighting against the pagan Canaanites - Compare **1 Peter 2:9-10**. They pictured themselves as Joshua and the twelve tribes and took these verses as a guide for them as they were under persecution.

They however took it one step further, and said that they were the new Israel and were to fight to remove the pagans from the "Promised Land" – England/America/South Africa..... They saw themselves not only as the spiritual children of Abraham, which they were by faith, but also the physical children of Abraham since they believed God had no further interest in Israel. This last statement is not true of course, but they went back to **Deuteronomy 7:1-8** and decided that they wanted to seize the land from the Canaanites.

These are believers but they took their "new Israelite" theology way too far. This is sadly like the story of the Afrikaners in South Africa and to some extent the Puritans in their fight against the Red Indians in America. These people went to extremes. Satan loves Bible believing people who go to extremes. If he can push them from a correct position to an extreme position he will do it, for then the Bible is lost, evangelism stops and God's name is brought to disgust.

We saw this with the Anabaptists who started in accordance with the Scriptures but later extremists came in to lead it. Many of the leaders of the Puritans were great men of God, but they were persecuted, and when a group grows out of persecution they tend to become more extreme.

THREE PHASES OF PURITANISM

There were three phases of the development of English Puritanism. Initially the group was in the Anglican Church trying to reform from within. This occurred under Elizabeth I in the early part of her reign. They were able to get things placed in the Prayer Book, and concentrated on the Scriptures as the basis of their faith.

The second phase was under James I of England from 1603. James, who was the son of Mary Queen of Scots, and was James VI of Scotland, was keen to get away from the Presbyterians of Scotland, who he hated with a passion for the abuse he had endured at their hands as a child under training. Elizabeth who was without a successor named him as her successor. He was an arrogant, pride filled, intelligent, religious person, but not a spiritual man. He was a fanatical persecutor of "witches", and most likely an active homosexual. His son Charles 1 was a secret Roman Catholic who married a devout Roman Catholic in the form of a French princess who brought her personal priest to live with them.



James however did one good thing, which was the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, in which he decreed that there would be a common Bible for his kingdom. This ended up with the publication of the KJV, Authorised Version in 1611.

James authorized this version to buy the Puritans off and tie them up. He wished to rule over all and realised that he had to do that through the Bishops rather than the presbytery, and he preferred Bishops. If the Puritans did not like it, they would either submit, or he would drive them out of the land, or worse. If you were committed as a biblical Christian you found it hard to stay in the Anglican Church after a few years of James. If you read any other version than the King James Version, or taught anything he did not approve of, then the King's men cut your ears or nose off – quite literally.

During this period there was the growth of separatism. The Congregational Church was born. One group went to Leyden and another to Amsterdam. They stayed there until 1618. In 1620 one group aboard the Mayflower sailed from Plymouth to Massachusetts where they founded Plymouth in New England. More and more headed to the “new world”.

Another group came together in 1609 as Baptists led by a John Smythe. His teaching was verse by verse from the Greek with everyday application. This caused the church to grow, but they were not able to worship openly and therefore met as a house meeting. You had to go to communion regularly in the local parish Anglican Church, and get certification from the Justice of the Peace that you had attended, or face the magistrate. You were fined or more severely dealt with if there was any suspicion that you might be spreading a seditious “free thinker”, “non-conformist” viewpoint.

#### CHARLES 1

When Charles I became King he went all the way into a more Catholic church service format, and favoured the “High Anglican” clergy who were close to Rome. He was probably a secret Roman, or at least Anglo-Catholic and believed in the divine right of Kings to reign absolutely, and had all the arrogance to go with it.

He wanted no restraint. He believed no one was above the King. If he wanted to break the existing law he simply made a new law. He married the French Roman Catholic Henrietta Maria. The people remembered what the Catholics under Mary I had done in the killing of 300 Protestants and did not want to return to that.

Charles appointed Archbishop Laud, an Anglo-Catholic, who became the hammer of the Puritans. He revived having crucifixes on the walls of the churches and elevated the communion table to form an altar. The priests had robes and uniforms. Many of the Puritans left the country, or started to think of rebellion.

Many Puritans, over 15,000 of them, went to America. The tradition of the Bible believing church in America goes back nearly 400 years to these days. Most of the Puritans would not touch the KJV, as it was the Bible of those who persecuted them. This however changed by the middle of the Commonwealth era when the AV/KJV gained acceptance due to its merit and the declining printing of the old Geneva Bible with it's now dated 1550s language.

Charles wanted to impose the Anglican Church on Scotland and declared war to do it, but had to go to Parliament to raise the taxes to wage the war. Parliament said that they were not happy, and the scene was set for the English Civil War. Here we have the two sides the Royalists and the Parliamentary, or Puritan group.

The King raised his standard at York and declared war on Parliament. The Parliament came together to see how the Anglican Church was to be remodeled under Parliamentary control, with the king as nominal head only.

#### THE CIVIL WAR

During the civil war period a synod of puritan divines met at Westminster - they formulated the Westminster Confession of Faith. This is the basis of most Congregational and Presbyterian confessions of faith. They wanted to promote the Bible rather than ceremony and rid themselves of Bishops. In 1645 they ordered the replacement of the Bishops with elders and presbyters. The Anglican Church remained alongside these new “congregational churches”, and was rather a mixed group.

If you were an Independent in the Kings area you would be shot as a traitor. Most of the believers in the Independent churches joined the Parliamentary Army to fight against the King who was seen as a persecutor. They had had 40 years in the wilderness with the Jacobean kings and were ready to turn England into their promised land by the force of their muskets and swords.

Oliver Cromwell tried to get the King to see sense. He was ready to go to America but was persuaded to raise a regiment. He was a great follower of military strategies of the Old Testament. He protected his people with armour. They had a crusading concept. He never lost a battle and by the end his army had become a model army made up almost entirely of Baptists and Congregationalists. The King continued to conspire after his arrest and he was executed. This was a mistake and made him a martyr in the land, rather than letting him escape as the nuisance he was.

The Presbyterians who controlled Parliament met and argued about the church to such an extent that Cromwell came in and with the Baptists and Congregationalists ejected them and set up his own Parliament. They were into excesses however. They banned dancing, closed down the pubs, banned plays, no music other than church music, and stopped Christmas. The gospel must be the only issue with the unbeliever. They tried to Puritanise the country by law.

After Cromwell's death his son ruled for a short while but lacked his father's brains or courage. There was a reaction against the excesses of the army and the death of the King. They invited back Charles II as King. He lived for fornication, drunkenness and everything that the Puritans were not. He persecuted the real church again with people like John Milton coming under pressure and John Bunyan and many other Baptists being in prison for a number of years.

Charles II had many sons to his many mistresses, but no legitimate ones, so he was succeeded by his brother James II who was an open Roman Catholic. James declared war on the Bible believing Christians, and he in turn was declared war on by the Protestant King of Holland, William of Orange. William was invited by Parliament to be King and fought a battle in Northern Ireland to finally defeat James, the Battle of the Boyne. He became William III. The Protestants in Northern Ireland call themselves Orangemen in honour of his victory. This victory guaranteed that the United Kingdom did not slide back into Catholicism. Denominations - Refer - Shelley pages 313 – 320.

William established an Act of Toleration in 1689, which allowed the English to worship as they pleased. The Anglican Church tended to go dead spiritually, and it is only the revival of Wesley a hundred years later which revitalized it. The Independent churches held the torch during this time. Small home group bible studies and prayer meetings began in the 1680s and continued through until the 1720 when the Great Revival broke out. God's people kept moving in the Spirit, no matter the state of the organized churches, and the Lord raised up the leadership for them.

In Europe during this period the Thirty Year War raged from 1618 to 1648. In the United States Jamestown Virginia was established in 1607. Many of the Puritans went to Boston with 25,000 Puritans going to New England in the period of 1629 and 1642.

The Congregational Puritans of Massachusetts Bay established a New Zion and felt that they had the right to eliminate the native Americans and others that opposed them. The most famous example is the witch trials of Salem. Many of the so called witches were herbalists and believed in natural childbirth. It became a legalistic community. Even today it is difficult to convert these descendants of the people of Mayflower. Shelley page 303-312 – the Puritans.

If you were persecuted you could move away from those who were persecuting you. The Bible however was the basis and formed a good counter foil to Parliamentary excess. In this you had a great basis for America, and it explains why the satanic focus in the USA has been to remove the Bible from public activity.

The Parliament in England formed a series of 4 fundamental truths on which many of the churches are founded:- Man is unable to see the truth, and therefore disagreements are inevitable. We are obliged to practice what we believe the Bible teaches. The full meaning of the church can never be represented by any full ecclesiastical structure.

Eerdmans page 388-397, 434 - 435

Introduction to the Puritans - Matin Lloyd Jones - The Puritans, their Origins and Successes

## **DOCTRINE**

### **LEGALISM**

1. There are some areas of God's law which the believer would never violate because it is his area of strength.
2. No two people have the same area of strength, no two people have the same area of weakness in their human nature.
3. Violation of one part of the law makes a person a sinner just as another part of the law - all have sinned and come short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23).
4. Legalism and self righteousness is prone to forget that all sin comes from the sinful nature.
5. Everyone has a sinful nature. Violation of law demonstrates its existence.
6. The legalist emphasises the commandments he keeps. The honest person recognises the commandments he breaks.
7. Doctrine removes legalism and self righteousness on the basis of grace.
8. Legalism minimises the weakness or besetting sin of the sinful nature while emphasising the weakness or besetting sin of someone else.
9. Legalism condemns those who fail in their own area of strength but legalism does not recognise that all have sinned.

10. Sometimes legalism is so strong that it fulfills both categories of 1 John 1:8, 1 John 1:10.
11. To be guilty, one only has to sin once not the thousands of times one does (James 2:10).

**BIBLE: INERRANCY**

1. The Scriptures are quoted as the absolute standard of truth. (Daniel 10:21, John 10:35)
2. The source of the Scriptures is God, there is no imperfection or error permissible with God. (2 Timothy 3:16, 2 Peter 1:20-21, 1 John 1:5, James 1:17)
3. The Scriptures therefore becomes the final authority in the resolution of disputes. (Romans 4:3, 11:2, Galatians 4:30)
4. The Scriptures are seen as authoritative. (Matthew 26:31, Mark 14:27, Luke 4:8, Acts 23:5 Romans 11:8)
5. The person who does not know the Scriptures is in error. (Mark 12:24)
6. The Lord believed the Scriptures:-
  - a) He implied there was only one Isaiah. (Isaiah 61:1,2 cf. Luke 4:16-21, Isaiah 53:1, and Isaiah 6:1-4, 9-10 cf. John 12:38-41)
  - b) Jonah was a prophet not a myth. (Matthew 12:39, Luke 11:29)
  - c) Daniel was a prophet not an historian. (Matthew 24:15, Mark 13:14)
  - d) Adam and Eve were created. (Matthew 19:8)
7. The Bible is called God's Word (Mark 7:13, Luke 5:1, 11:28, John 10:35, Acts 6:7, 12:24, Romans 10:17)

**LECTURE 29 - THE AGE OF (so called) REASON.**

INTRODUCTION - Shelley pages 322 – 345.

The so called, Age of Reason or the Enlightenment, followed the Renaissance. Secular historians will say that the Renaissance started the Reformation, although we have seen that it is not that simple, or cognitive – there are spiritual threads leading to the Reformation that the Holy Spirit wove together over more than a thousand years leading to the 95 theses. The unbeliever historians think that the next move - “Enlightenment” so called - was a great leap forward – but we will explore and challenge this. **James 2:19, Ecclesiastes 12:1-14.**

The Enlightenment may be seen as the secular counter-reformation, as it is the raising of the stature of man's wisdom and reason as the standard of truth. As Renaissance goes into Enlightenment, the age of Reformation moves into the age of Revival, and we will see how the two streams interact. The Renaissance is dated as commencing about 1500 and terminating about 1648 at the end of the 30 years war in Europe and the start of the Commonwealth in England. By this time the Congregationalist and Baptist churches have been established, and a new spiritual force is beginning to be felt in the Americas, England and the Continent. “Age of Reason”, “Enlightenment”, “Exploration”, and “Great Revivals”.

From 1650 to 1800 you have the so called, “Age of Reason”, and running parallel to it the time of the great revivals. The Roman Catholic writer Blaise Pascal dates from this time period, as does Milton and John Bunyan. By 1690 in England you have the Act of Toleration releasing “non-conformists” from jail, but laws are still to be passed in the United Kingdom that will drive Bible believers from the Anglican pulpits through to the early 1700s. The Puritans were a spent force after the Restoration, seen as dull and boring by most, and sadly most of them were irrelevant legalists with no spiritual power. As puritanism declined in spiritual power there was the grass roots growth of the home based bible studies and prayer groups throughout the land. These would sow the seed for revival, especially in Scotland and Wales, and this work of quiet prayer was followed from the 1720s by revivalists, including Whitfield, the Wesleys, and the Clapham Group's work.

At the same time we have the philosophers and Deists establishing the Royal Society. These first true scientists believe in a supreme intelligence behind the world and creation. However most of the Deists saw God as remote and did not accept any personal relationship, or responsibility to the Supreme Being. People like Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) will be quite different again. Deism is the “theological fighting ground” where the enemy's attack is centered in this period; the acceptance of God's reality, but making him irrelevant to man, and impersonal, making no demands upon people.

What they relied upon was human reason. They did not accept the Bible as God's Word, but as the words of men about the supreme being, and did not accept that He spoke directly through it to man. With this you had the origin of liberal theology by the later 1780s in Germany. God was put safely “out of the way” and people could live as they felt fit, with a reasonable God judging all mankind on the basis of reasonable standards of decency, not holiness. These men felt they

were too polite to need a gospel! God's counter punch would be the humble prayer meetings and the revivalists, and through them social activity would emerge from the saved aristocracy through the Clapham Group. God's moving prepares the revived nations to meet the needs of the Industrial Revolution, that is breaking out through this time.

#### THE AGE OF ELIGHTENMENT

The Age of Enlightenment begins in a way within the Renaissance period with the work of Erasmus at Rotterdam. He was a great satirist and criticized scholasticism and monasticism. He starts the philosophical rejection of both Catholicism and Calvinism. He worked on the Greek New Testament and identifies the Eastern manuscript tradition that is still called the Textus Receptus tradition. He also published a book on free will. He challenges everyone to think.

Luther however believed that man was enslaved and apart from grace was not able to serve God, which is the doctrine of the fall of man. Erasmus considered this a dangerous doctrine, as it threatened to relieve man of moral responsibility. There was therefore division, with Erasmus beginning the Age of Reason – and arguing that we didn't need enthusiasm or passionate religion, just polite faith in a theoretical creator who didn't judge, he/she just expected us to do our best.

Erasmus believed in the free will of all and the supremacy of our mind over religion. Luther however put revelation at the highest point. This is the difference between the Reformation challenge, and the Age of Reason. The philosophers and Deists looked on "man" as the ultimate creation, and ultimately looked on him as god, the standard for truth, as he was in the image of God. They spoke in the "male" language of their day, but there were amazing women in this group of philosopher-scientists. Common decency also cried out against fanatical religious groups. The people of the day hated Calvin as well as the Pope, because of inter religious strife and the terrible carnage and death of the thirty years war on the Continent, and the Civil War in England. There was revulsion against what passion in religion had given Europe.

This was combined with the work of Erasmus, the great art of Michelangelo and other artists through this period that lifted up the whole idea of what humanity was capable of. You also had literature flourishing with such people as Shakespeare – whoever he actually was..... This tended to exalt the power and creativity of us all. In this era you have a large number of nude statues to celebrate the human body as had occurred with the humanistic Greeks. This is again applying the concept that we are all made in God's image, and don't need a Saviour, just to truly be ourselves.

There is great poetry and literature and "humanism" is celebrated. Here mankind was celebrating man. Contrasted with this you have a lot of war and suffering in the name of religion. The appeal of a decent and respectable faith that recognized God as creator but didn't kill your neighbor over theological differences had great appeal to all reasonable men and women. The "Age of Reason" ends with the crowning of the goddess of reason in the French Revolution, just before the chaos is unleashed in the reign of terror – and the blood shed then ends the period – as it ends each....

#### THE RISE OF SCIENCE

You also have the rise of science. The first modern scientist who said that the earth went round the sun was Copernicus (1473-1543). For saying this he was attacked both by Protestants and by the Roman Catholic Church. If he had said this in Germany, he would have been persecuted by the Protestants. Theologically it would be quite appropriate to compare the son and the sun, one as the centre of the universe, the other the centre of the solar system and sustainer of physical life. Theology was dictating truth, and theology was only the theories of man! As some of them proved false the whole structure would come down and men would open the door to question all things – but in the protestant world only!

The next of the great scientists was Kepler, 1571-1630, who proposed the theory of magnetic forces, but the greatest of all of the age was Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), who manufactured a telescope, and proved that Copernicus was right. The year that he died Isaac Newton (1642-1727) was born. Others were, Rene Descartes (1596-1650), Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716). Study each of these great men on the internet and through texts, and look up the history of the Royal Society.

It was during his time that the Royal Society was formed. During this time the scientists acknowledged God and eventually this led to them being described by the term Deists, as these men of science believed in a God but wanted him simply as the starting principle and mind behind the universe, not the active God of the kill joy and austere John Calvin, John Knox, John Bunyan, or the interfering book burning and book banning Popes.

The things the scientists explained, the Roman Catholic Church had explained before, and the church had normally got it wrong. They were wrong about the distances, they were wrong about the planets and the sun. Intelligent people therefore started to think that science was a better bet than religion. The Bible in association was tied in with corrupt priests and blood thirsty, and dull and boring theologians. It was tied to hypocrisy, boredom, death and fanaticism.

Reason was the primary concern for these scientists, not the next life. Reason rather than faith was to guide, and this was attractive to the people who were sick of the excesses of forms of religion that tried to control the State and all that happened in it. Heaven was banned as a topic for discussion, it was just accepted, and the life on earth was all there was to be explored for the deist. What could be scientifically studied was alone worthy of discussion and study. They spoke of heaven, but as the certain abode of all after death. Modern liberalism was born.

If you have no other standard than your own mind as to what is the best for the human race you will eventually create as great a monster as fanatical theologians, but it will take more time. People may decide that the best for society is for you to go, so they eliminate you. Tolerant liberalism will be intolerant of any form of strong theology or philosophy that disagrees – the reign of terror is not far from liberalism! Watch Wikipedia's pages to see that.

The basis of this is that man is not a sinner and that he is basically decent. This is the basis of a lot of social work and prison reform, and so led to some very good things. However if we are all fallen creatures, as the Bible tells us their concept is false at its core, and so their speculations will not address the real issue of our need for a Savior. If you start with a false principle you will end up with one as well.

#### THE GREAT PHILOSOPHERS OF THE AGE OF REASON

One of these men was John Locke (1632-1704) - John Locke was a great philosopher. He wrote an essay regarding human understanding. There were very few atheists as such in the period of reason. They were God believing people who attended a polite church, but they rejected God as He is described in the Scriptures. They were able to prove that God exists but did not consider Him to have any application for a day to day running of their lives or any obligation to Him. They believed he was the decent, logical mind behind the universe and has left us here to do the best we can and will judge us on that basis. God was the great watch maker – leaving us to enjoy learning about and using the watch.

Among the second generation of these people was Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) who set up the whole basis of philosophical rationalism and empiricism. They only believed in general revelation, and not in special revelation. Their concept was that if you could not see it or touch it, it was probably not important. They would avoid denying special revelation but would not seek it out, nor discuss it in any terms other than “figurative language”. They loved the theology of Alexandria – of Origen and Clement – for they spiritualize away all prophetic passages, and yet they were intrigued by Nostradamus (1503-1566), and like their fore-fathers in Greece and Rome would study Astrology with vigour.

They had the concept, that all you had to do is to live well. If you lived up to the standard of the light that you were given that is all that could be asked of you, for God was as tolerant as they were of reasonable people. This is still the religion of the greatest number of people in the world. In this concept there is no belief in judgment or hell, but that there are just different grades of heaven. **Acts 4:12** is just Peter being dramatic....., and **Revelation 20:10-15** is to be ignored....

They all have a strong concept of morality, with nice people talking to other nice, and logical people and trying to get nicer. This is the germ of the liberal theology movement – it is a picture of rich, cultured, intelligent, pleasant, nice people triumphing in a lovely society – with the surviving (Georgia Stones call for 90% of the world population to be removed) simple folk, the poor people, serving at tables, cleaning their mansions and being incredibly grateful...(Oh dear I am getting sarcastic.....).

Shelley notes - "According to Locke you have to accept that Jesus is God's last word to man. Jesus showed by life, word and example how we should live. We need to emphasize his living as an example for our behaviour". This is what is considered to be salvation by liberals, which biblically it is not. The life example of the Lord is bring emphasized, not his challenging words, or confronting acts. These men, through to today, do not demand life changing salvation relationship; and they mock any concept of being “born again”, for that is “enthusiasm” not reason.

#### THE DEISTS

Most of these educated and intelligent people accepted God in terms of **James 2:18-19**, but ridiculed those who believed the Bible as God's Word as superstitious fanatics. These people were like the Sadducees who attacked Jesus, and at this time they attacked the great revivalists. These people mocked Wesley, they believed that God existed but mocked those who accepted the Word of God as literal. You are confronted in this period, like all others, to select your chosen company! With whom would you be most at home? Note Benjamin Franklin's words, **Shelley page 323**.

We will find that the people who oppose us today the most, are not the drunks, but it is the people from the liberal churches, or the freemasons who will not tolerate you. The pub or whore house on the corner is likely to provide the greatest number of converts compared with the liberal church, or Masonic Temple, which is most likely to provide your worst, but most subtle opponents. The first Grand Lodge is established in London in 1717, in Scotland a little earlier.

The free masons groups developed all through this time. They believed in one God, the Great Architect, or whoever they wanted to call them, as the great watch-maker. We see this in the form of the compass and the square which are the tools of the architect and temple builder. The masons do not openly speak of God as a personal and required Saviour, except in very specific Christian “orders”. They denied miracles and special revelation and denied that Jesus Christ was other than the greatest of good man. There are “Christian” lodges that do go further than this, but the movement arose in this period as a deist group for the betterment of the world order. This deist viewpoint is based on pride, and once again when we follow this philosophy we enter **Isaiah 14:13-15**, and **Ezekiel 28:1-5**. Again - Select your company believer!

They believe in a mind behind the universe, but they reject their need for a Saviour - **Romans 1:22ff** - they have changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image. They are then given over to their own lusts. The rest of Romans 1 deals with the moral decline of those who have not allowed God to have power over their lives.

The Bible teaches a powerful and on-going very personal spiritual conflict between God and Satan. It is not just the case of using your mind. It is also a concept of obedience to revealed truth and where you draw spiritual power from. You do not follow your reason alone; for there is a spiritual warfare here. It is not the case of man just not knowing enough. He knows as a creator of space-time only, so we always have inadequate knowledge, but in our free will the big issue is who we follow, what we believe and do, and in whose power we walk. The whole question is humility within reality, and then rulership. Franklin's words haunt me, as do some of the reports of the death of Voltaire, although these are suppressed.

The "high point" of the age of reason came in France with Voltaire 1694-1778. This was also the time of the "encyclopaedists". This was a good thing for European wide education, but they also used their work to set reason up above God, and mocked any thought of special revelation. Most people in the universities would subscribe to the philosophy of the age of reason. Their writings were behind the French revolution. In Notre Dame they crowned a beautiful prostitute as the goddess of reason. They hit the church hard, and with many good reasons. The goddess of reason worshipped the body and the mind. This is the seat of liberalism and critical attacks on scripture, 1780s onwards.

There are people in the university today who stand in this tradition, believing that in a few years time people will be able to prolong life indefinitely, and that the whole process of ageing will be reversed, and yet speak of climate change and the population emergency. "Georgia Stones" are chilling in their open, yet hidden elitism. Many still cling to this forlorn hope, that they will outgrow the need for God, for they will abolish death, but only for the "wise"! Our message is that this has already happened for all, by grace through faith, through the work of Immanuel, the God-Man – the Christ!

In Ezekiel 28 Satan said that he would lift himself up. He says to the woman in Genesis that 'you will both be as gods'. The deists believe that people are basically good, and Satan was of course right all along; he actually is really "god". Now there are none so deceived as those who wish to be, so if you want to believe something badly enough you will overlook the clues that what you believe may not be correct. In this case you have the pious front and the fornication in the back room. This group created great geniuses, who were often also great perverts. Don't panic darlings, for you can get around this by simply redefining perversion...

In England there was a "hell fire club" which celebrated reason with orgies. Humorously some of them were later converted by Revivalists and became missionaries. When any woman/man tries to elevate them self, God will often bring them down to wallow in the mire so that some can be converted. Values are challenged by the Lord. **Luke 12:16-21**.

The age of (atheistic) reason was eventually killed in France when Napoleon came along and killed it's surviving leaders. There was tolerance again in France after the "whiff of grapeshot". Christianity was under great attack through this time but was also being defended during this time. Once again we see that in the darkest times the Lord protects his people.

The encyclopaedists discounted miracles; they would not even discuss them as real events anymore than Wikipedia will now. Wikipedia is the true inheritor of the "age of reason", encyclopaedists. They did not accept the Lord Jesus Christ, for they would not even ask a question about miracles – just mock their very possibility. We need to ask if miracles happened, and if so what did it mean, and then ask, do they happen now, and what does it mean for us now? The rationalist's attitude to the Lord Jesus Christ is that he is a liar, he is mad, but we say, He is God! He could not have been just a good man, any more than the apostles could be "nice chaps", for they brought challenge, confrontation and individual destiny decisions had to be made.

The criticism of the encyclopedists was answered by Bishop Joseph Butler (1692-1752) who published a book called the "Analogy of Religion", in which he philosophically demolished the Deist's assurance that reason will resolve all our issues. With his ruthless logic he hit the philosophers and demolished their arguments. He did in his day what Josh McDowell has done with his books in our day. Butler said that reason by itself is not the answer for everything. He challenged reason's sovereignty. He showed that reason by itself could only have a probability of truth. It could not help you in the area of love or relationship, and by discussing the many enigmas and perplexities of existence he underlined the need for "Faith" as a way of seeing and living, and made it clear that only a living relationship with the real biblically revealed God would stop you dying in fear and doubt! The determined deists simply ignored Butler, and moved on!

Wesley and Whitfield came out of the Anglican Church at this time. You have the conservative in this period, as in all times, who keeps to the Scriptures, whereas the liberals reject anything other than their own thoughts. The rationalists say lift yourself up, whereas the conservative applies **1 Peter 1:5-7**, and humbles them self and allows God to raise them up to the role God wants for her/him. Study the many amazing men and women from this period – both "aint and saint"!

**DOCTRINE**

**BIBLE: INSPIRATION**

1. The principle of inspiration is found in (2 Timothy 3:16) "All Scripture is God breathed" - Gk. THEO PNEUSTOS.

The Holy Spirit communicated to the human authors God's complete plan (2 Samuel 23:2, 3, Isaiah 59:21, Jeremiah 1:9, Matthew 22:42, 43, Mark 12:36, Acts 4:24, 25, 28:25).

The human authors of Scripture so wrote that in spite of their personalities, they were able to communicate God's plan with perfect accuracy in the language they wrote.

2. The origin of Scripture is beyond human viewpoint (2 Peter 1:20, 21).
3. The Bible is the mind of Christ (1 Corinthians 2:16). Therefore it is the absolute standard for believers (Psalm 138:2).
4. Pre-canon revelation from God occurred through the Holy Spirit. There was no written scripture until the time of Moses (2Samuel 23:2, Ezekiel 2:2, 8:3, 11:1, 24, Micah 3:8, Hebrews 3:7).
5. Four categories of Old Testament revelation:
  - a) The spoken word - thus saith the Lord (Isaiah 6:9, 10, Acts 28:25).
  - b) Dreams (Numbers 12:6, Genesis 15:12, 31:10-13, 31:24, Daniel 10:9) - whilst asleep.
  - c) Visions (Isaiah 1:1, 6:1, 1 Kings 22:19) - whilst awake.
  - d) Angelic teaching (Deuteronomy 33:2, Acts 7:53, Galatians 3:19, Psalm 68:17).
6. The extent of revelation:
  - a) The unknown past - the Bible portrays past historical details unknown to man apart from revelation (Genesis chapters 1-11). The accuracy of these historical facts is guaranteed by inspiration, e.g. Creation, Noah's Flood.
  - b) Ancient history - whilst the Bible is not a text book of history, all historical citations are accurate.
  - c) Objective law - the Old Testament contains many laws for both individuals and national life. These laws express perfectly the mind of God to those people to whom they are addressed.
  - d) Some portions of the Bible contain direct quotations from God. The doctrine of inspiration guarantees that such quotations are properly recorded exactly as God desired.
  - e) God uses the emotions, trials and triumphs of certain believers to declare His grace in devotional literature like the Psalms, Song of Solomon
  - f) Inspiration extends to the recording of falsehoods just as they were uttered - Satan Genesis 3:4.
  - g) Inspiration guarantees the accuracy of all recorded prophecies.

### **LECTURE 30 - PIETISM**

Shelley chapter 33 – pages 334-345.

#### **THE PEOPLE WHO CROSSED THE THEOLOGICAL DIVIDE**

The Deists were the founders of modern liberalism. They tried to remove all emotion, or personal relationship from the Christian faith. They wanted to have a rational relationship with God the Father apart from any commitment to Jesus Christ as Saviour. All the main line churches of the time were infected with Deism with only the old Puritans holding out. The Puritans lapsed into legalism while the Lutheran, Anglican and Presbyterian Church moved towards ritualism, modified deism, and polite spiritual deadness. **Ezekiel 3:17-21.**

They had religion without the transforming power of any real relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ. With this lack of spiritual life many people in the church saw that there was a lack in their life especially when they read passages on the spiritual and mental peace that God was supposed to give you, for they had no peace. Calvinism was legalistic, the Roman Catholic Church and many of the Protestant churches were dead ritualism/formalism, or mystic emotionalism, and so satisfied some. Most people just want a "tame god" who is polite and makes no demands; they still do!

Through this time period another movement enters the scene. Pietism, or the need for a holy life, came into the Roman Catholic Church. At the time of the Counter-Reformation the Jesuits were formed. They were very clever and were brilliant psychologists. They became over time however very wealthy, and finally like all legalistic groups that wax wealthy, they became corrupt and finally lax in their requirements. As long as you contributed to the church funds, came to mass once a week and were baptized in the church your every day life did not matter. They said that you could even tell lies if you had a reason for it. They fell a long way from their founder's aims and methods and were finally dissolved.

JANSEN (1585-1638)

Their attitude sickened even the Catholics as being phony and false. A group following Jansen attacked these attitudes of the Jesuits and said that people need to have a combination of good works plus the grace of God to be Christians.

They went back to Augustine of Hippo, and beyond. Jansen (1585 – 1638) started preaching the sinfulness of man and the amazing grace of God, and that it was through God that there was gracious salvation, and that it was through the channel of grace of the Catholic Sacraments. He wrote a book called *Augustinus*, which was published in 1640 and it became the platform for what became known as Jansenism. It took on the Jesuits, and restored Grace in theology.

The contrast between Jansen and Calvin was that the former linked good works and grace, whereas Calvin said that it was purely the sovereign grace of God which saved mankind. The Roman Catholic Church had never repudiated the Augustinian principles, but they had been pushed into the background. The good works in the Roman Catholic Church had however been so amplified by the Jesuits as to reduce the gracious work of Christ into insignificance, except at the Mass. Jansen saw this internal contradiction and met it, bringing the message of grace back to the Catholic centre stage.

The message of Jansen was taken into France where it had a centre at Port Royal some 25 kilometers from Paris. There was a young abbess Jacqueline Pascal (died 1661) there, who was a grace-oriented believer, who was devoted to the Lord Jesus Christ, and stressed personal holiness before God. She recognized that each person needed a Saviour and that Saviour was Jesus, and that it was God's grace and Love in Jesus that was needed for each tortured soul. Blaise joined his sister at the abbey for the last years of his life and wrote his "Pensees" there.

Antoine Arnauld was a member of the Sorbonne University in the Theological area, embraced the book of Jansen and and many there adopted the Jansenist's views. He came to the Abbey and asked Blaise Pascal to write to support Jansenism, and he penned his 18 "Provincial Letters", the last in 1657. In 1653 the Pope had, under Jesuit pressure, condemned Jansenism, and called it a heresy in 1660, but as usual with the French they decided that they would take no notice of him, as he was not a Frenchman, but the French King did steadily restrict the Abbey from that date, and by 1790 the abbey was closed and its last nuns were forced to leave. Had the Pope accepted Jansen the history of Catholicism would have been very different, as would church unity, as it was one theology that could have united the churches.

#### BLAISE PASCAL (1623-1662)

Two doctors who had been influenced by Jansenism treated a nobleman by the name of Blaise Pascal. Pascal was almost always in poor health and had had a lot of tragedy in his life. He was a brilliant mathematician, scientist, philosopher. By the time he was 27 he had invented a calculating machine. He was a computer geek before computers. He discovered scientific principles of atmospheric pressure and hydraulics.

The Jansenist doctors taught Pascal that physical suffering was to do with tests from God, and that they come to you to show you something spiritual, entering you into the "fellowship of His suffering". **Philippians 3:10, Colossians 1:24-26, James 5:10, 1 Peter 2:19-21, 4:13**. Through this Pascal was able to find a way in which he could deal with the physical and grief based pain in his life. He studied the Bible meticulously and found the Bible coming alive through a living relationship with Jesus, and felt that it was the way to change the heart, not the psychology/exercises of the Jesuits.

For a while he felt abandoned by God, but then he came to John 17 and found what Jesus Christ had done for him and said certainty, certainty, joy, peace. He saw that as a deist he had crucified Christ, he had never bowed before the Cross. He was convicted when he read John 17, as a sinner in need of a Saviour and accepted Him.

After his conversion he only had 8 years to live, but he used them to write some amazing letters that have challenged all people since, both Catholic and Protestant. During that period he wrote many letters and thoughts down. They were published as "Pensees" - thoughts of Blaise Pascal by his friends later. He saw that reason will take you so far in logical thought, but that it was faith in the Lord Jesus Christ that would save and give eternal security to the soul now.

While this was happening in Catholic France other things were happening in Germany. Luther had got off to a flying start with justification by faith alone. However a century down the road Lutheranism had turned into a very boring legalistic and spiritually dead thing. The whole concept of surrender to God and reliance on God had gone, and had been replaced by the intellectual plod of ritualistic protestant faith. Revival was needed and "Pietism" would provide that.

The church at this stage had very few believers and many Deist "make believers". The Pietists realised that the Catholic and Protestant church were both spiritually dead, and there was a need to get back to what the Lord had spoken of. They stressed the importance of passionate personal faith in a similar way to the Puritans in their original form.

The Puritans by the time of Cromwell in the 1640s wanted to make a Christian nation, but God always deals with the individual and wants transformed people transforming their nations for good, not with swords and guns. The Christian is supposed to make disciples of individuals. People needed to give their heart, mind, body, and soul to Christ.

The Pietists said that if you have been baptised into the Catholic or Lutheran Church it is not good enough, you need to be born again into a personal loving-serving relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ. **John 3:15-36**. This is a personal experience of the grace of God in each individual believer's heart. They appealed to and challenged both groups.

SPENNER, FRANK AND VON ZINZENDORF



There were three other main men in the spiritual revival movement after Pascal, who had Europe wide impact; Philip Spenner, August Frank and Count von Zinzendorf. They were all Germans. The impact of Port Royal Monastery went far afield even after it was partly destroyed and burned to the ground by Papal order in 1711. Evil triumphed – or did it, for the work was done and the truth was out..... The surviving abbey buildings are now used as a hospital.

Spenner (1635-1705] went to the university to study theology at Strassbourg, and 'met the real Luther' through his books. He understood justification by faith alone, and became the only one in his theology class to be a believer. He went to Frankfurt after three years. In Strassbourg he had noted that the people who went to church lived like pagans and he saw that this was not the plan of God for any of them. He saw that over the last 100 years the reality of what Luther had discovered and preached had been lost by the State Church of the many German States.

He put away the prescribed texts and lectionaries and started preaching verse by verse. He started in Matthew and by the time he got to the Sermon on the Mount spiritual revival started in his church. If we are pastoring a church we should cover whole books systematically and call for repentance and discipleship as the texts demand. Historically from this approach revival will come – it "works" every time, because this is how the Holy Spirit works upon God's people. He started Prayer and Bible study meetings two nights a week in his own home - which was a revolutionary concept.

The religious unbelievers in the church were very critical of those who went to the Bible studies and called the people who did so mockingly "Pietists". They hated these people who wanted to get together and study the Word of God. Spenner preached the concept of being "born again" – taking Jesus words seriously. This was revolutionary for his time.

He was now called to be the Court Preacher to the King of Dresden, but when he was asked to become the Professor of Theology at the University of Halle which the King was setting up, he recommended his most brilliant young student August Frank for the post. This showed the graciousness of Spenner, and it guaranteed that the message would continue for another generation. We should always be concerned about the older Christian who will not graciously defer to a younger woman/man. It may well be that there is pride there, whereas in Spenner we see the fruit of the Holy Spirit.

At Halle, Frank established an evangelical university, with emphasis on being born again. The influence of this was felt throughout the university world of Europe in the "Age of Reason", and the challenge spread up into Denmark. King Frederick IV wanted to send a mission to India and used people who had studied under Frank sending them out in 1705, the year of Spenner's death. These were small time missions but it was a beginning. It was the first indication that Europeans were interested in taking the gospel to non Europeans as Jesus had ordered, **Matthew 28:18-20**.

This was taken further by Count von Zinzendorf, who became influenced by this movement. He went and invited the last of the Hussites Brethren to his estate and established a Christian community there. These were called the Herrnhut, the Lord's "watchmen". **Ezekiel 3:17-21**. These were the survivors of the hundred years of persecution, now known as the Moravians who are still a powerful spiritual force in Canada and the United States. The Moravians were so committed that they would sell themselves into permanent slavery in the United States in order to give the gospel to the slaves. They were martyred by the hundreds. Zinzendorf trained these people for five years in systematic theology and Bible before they went out. He realised the importance of training people in the Word.

He loved the Lord with a commitment which causes other great people's faith to pale into the background. We have inherited from these four people the modern understanding of the importance of being born again, the concept of revival and the importance of committing the whole person to the Lord. They also reintroduced emotion into the services. The Puritans were often legalistic kill joys. The Pietists were the first group who showed the joy of the Lord. Pentecostals often trace themselves back to Zinzendorf, and we will see his impact on the Revivalists later.

George Fox was another preacher in England whose style was charismatic. The "Quakers" he founded took emotion too far, but had the doctrine of the transforming power right. Fox was sentenced to six months in prison for his "enthusiasm". The judge said all his people shook or quaked, and therefore they became known as Quakers. To the judge, Fox directly told him to tremble for the judgment day.

The Quakers sadly got into evil very quickly with spiritism, and deism and satanic deception eventually killed them, with the modern "spiritualist churches" trace their origins to Fox, although they are openly chasing "spirits", and will ask any Holy Spirit filled believer to leave their meetings. At the same time as Fox, John Bunyan was preaching at Baptist churches in England to good effect, and preaching biblical truth. It is from the Pietists that much of the evangelical and Pentecostal churches theology emerges again, after being ignored by most since the apostolic days.

## DOCTRINE

### SUBMISSION

1. This means to humble oneself in willing service to another, with the connotation that it is for your good (Genesis 16:9, 1 Peter 5:6, Hebrews 13:17).
2. We must fully surrender ourselves to God (James 4:7, Romans 12:1-2). As the Lord made himself obedient unto death so must we (Philippians 2:18).

3. We are, in Christ to submit ourselves each to the other within the church. This involves putting the spiritual needs of others ahead of any personal interests (Ephesians 5:21).
4. Within the church believers are to submit to the teaching authority of the pastor as he preaches from the Word (Hebrews 13:17, 1 Corinthians 16:6, 1 Peter 5:5).
5. A wife is to submit herself to her own husband within their marriage. This involves respect for him as her spiritual leader and protector (Ephesians 5:22, Colossians 3:18, Titus 2:4-5).
6. Children also are to submit in love to their parents' authority under God (Colossians 3:20).
7. All believers are to be in submission to the laws of their land, unless those laws violate the clear command of God (Romans 13:1, 2, Matthew 22:21, 1 Peter 2:13-17; exception example: Acts 4:15-20, 5:40-42).
8. Workers are to be under authority of their employers and their managers (Colossians 3:22-25, Ephesians 6:5-8, Titus 2:9, 10, 1 Peter 2:18-24).
9. Those in authority have a special responsibility to treat those under them with care and respect (Colossians 4:1).

### **LECTURE 31 - METHODISM**

INTRODUCTION - Shelley Chapter 34-35 – pages 346-366 – **Romans 1:1-6, 16-17, 8:9.**

The Methodist Revival was part of the Great Awakening, which occurred first in Wales, independently in the United States and then some twenty years later in the entire United Kingdom. The revival was not the work of one man but of a group of people, all being led by the Holy Spirit in different places, and different times, in different ways. During the 18th century there was a great awakening on both sides of the Atlantic, where churches that were dead were awakened to evangelical zeal again. It was a true "wave of the Spirit". The Pietists, especially the Moravians from Herrnhut, laid the foundation for the revival and ignited the fires both in America and in the United Kingdom, but the Puritans work and their legacy of Cottage Prayer and Bible Study groups from the 1680s, also was woven together by God to produce this.

Jonathan Edwards saw the very public start of the revival in America in the 1720's, and he wrote it up and published his book on it, with the revival on the other side of the Atlantic starting in England under Whitefield and the Wesleys. This is the same time as the Erskine brothers were preaching in Scotland, and the Welsh Revivalists were also moved.

WESLEY Shelley Chapter 34.

Shelley on Page 346 gives us the story of young Anglican minister, the Reverend "pain" John Wesley (1703-1791) going to America. On the ship "Simmonds" to Georgia were a number of Moravian missionaries. On the way they had a huge storm which blew out some of the sails. Wesley was terrified. He noticed however that the Moravians were singing hymns. After the storm Wesley asked the Moravians whether they were afraid of dying and was most impressed that neither men women nor children had any fear of dying. There are still too many weak Christians today who are afraid to die, and just like people today, Wesley as a young minister was fearful. He knew he had a long way to go to really find God, but his arrogant Oxford based Anglicanism kept him focused on his task "before the Lord", but he didn't know Him. Only time and events would prove him a stuffed shirt hypocrite, who was as far from God as the drunks he despised.

Wesley was aware that the people he went to America with were weak, and he saw in the Moravians people who were strong; committed to the faith. They taught their children how to die but also to live for Christ. Wesley became aware that he had some form of godliness, but no power, but he persisted in stuffed shirt legalism. He believed in God, and would only over time see that **James 2:18-19** applied to him – he was an unsaved minister – **Romans 8:9.**

A lot of people are fundamental in their faith beliefs but have no power in their life. If they are in fellowship and feeding on God's Word they should not be getting into drugs, alcohol, tranquillizers and self help programs..... Like the Moravians we have to train ourselves in godliness through obedience to the revealed Word of God.

John Wesley, who was to become a giant figure in the Great Awakening, was a pathetic figure in his early ministry, and he was preceded in the awakening on both sides of the Atlantic. The church of his day was the proud inheritor of the Puritan tradition, but it had gone cold in the pulpit. In cottage groups however the Holy Spirit was still working.....

Puritanism had stressed the unmerited favour of God, the sinfulness of man, the eternal damnation of the unbeliever and other fundamentals of the faith. They had been right – dead right - the churches had however gone into legalism, and cold formalism. There was a real deadness in the established churches and as such were much like the church of Laodicea - **Revelation 3:14-22.** There are a lot of churches which 'have the truth', but will not allow the truth to get hold of them.

Unlike the Moravians and the Pietists these revivalists were not detached from politics and social action. Their prime interest was the saving of the lost, but they were also were interested in the social conditions of the day.

The pious hypocrites in the dead church hated any enthusiasm for the Lord, and still do. They wanted religion to be polite and quiet, acceptable to all. We can err on the other side today ourselves; we often laugh too much, we do not do enough weeping for sin. The joy comes in the morning, having dealt with sin. We should perhaps have our praise at the end of a church service after doing business with God, rather than at the beginning. Why do we “warm up” our congregations, is it that we don't trust the Lord to do it through the Holy Spirit working upon the Word?

The spiritual life in the Anglican Church had been greatly affected by Deism, which was dominant in Oxford and Cambridge Universities. This had reached the stage where one of the Archbishops of Canterbury positively disciplined any Anglican ministers who were evangelical. They stressed proper behaviour, decent conduct, and the fact that they should be humane, tolerant and the like. It is noted that not just the Anglicans, but many churches in many places are returning to this viewpoint, by appointing inter cultural facilitators, rather than evangelists or systematic bible teachers.

You are either worshipping the Lord in spirit and truth or you are going to end up worshipping yourself. Church History challenges us all to select our company. As real Christians we will be called bigots and intolerant, just as the revivalists were. If you are opposing abortion, and euthanasia and you see it as opposing murder, don't expect the polite churchmen to see that and agree. Studying church history is about selecting your company; choose to be with men and women like the revivalists. Women – just because the big name preachers were men, don't forget the women who did the real work or preparatory prayer, and ran those cottage meetings, and in social change flowing from the revival!

It was under these conditions that Wesley studied in Oxford for the Anglican priesthood. After completing his studies the Anglican Church sent out Wesley to convert the Native Americans of Georgia and to take over a small parish in that colony. Now reflect - An unsaved person is not going to be effective to go out and preach to the unsaved.

He found the noble American savages were liars, thieves, gluttons and murderers. He was not willing to give his life for the Indians, ignored them and settled into parish life in Savannah. He fell in love with Sophie, the niece of the Chief Magistrate. She refused him. She wanted money and social standing and not the living provided by the church, and probably looked upon him as the weedy, boring, pious little OCD twit he was also. Eventually she married a rich older plantation owner and Wesley immediately excommunicated them both, and did other things that show a petty and pathetic character. He eventual decided to leave, to avoid a law suite against himself by the "happy couple", and it was a heartbroken and spiritually low and thoroughly defeated Wesley who returned to England.

#### THE CONVERSION OF WESLEY

He realised that he had no purpose or meaning in his life. It was reluctantly that he went to a meeting on the 24th May 1738 in London at the urging of his brother Charles. Here he heard some readings from Martin Luther's book on Romans, regarding dealing with sin and he found his heart "strangely warmed" by the Holy Spirit. The man reading the passages was a nearly illiterate, uneducated man and the meeting hall was far from the great cathedrals. This was the real and powerful spiritual experience that changed his life, and he came to believe that every believer should have had that experience. He found the assurance and genuine spiritual relationship that he had lacked that night.

He traveled to Germany and visited the Moravians. He found that they almost worshiped Count von Zinzendorf and after a while parted company with them, but he had learned a great deal. He had seen the importance of small groups and lay members being able to lead their peers, and to personally develop, and learnt a lot from their disciplined love of the Lord.

He read an account of Jonathan Edwards and what had happened in the United States and believed that that was what should be happening in England. He got an invitation from his old Oxford University friend George Whitefield to join him in the ministry preaching in the open air. God was weaving people and spiritual revival together in Holy Spirit led power.

Wesley understood Hebrew, Latin, and Greek and was a scholar of the Scriptures. He was also prepared by his experience of total failure in the American colonies on what not to do. He was challenged by the words he had heard from the untrained man in the meeting hall, and changed by meeting the Moravians, and saw what real faith was, and so was able to determine what was important and what was not. He saw that the Holy Spirit had to move within people, and that the minister had to be open to what God wanted, not the plans of self important ministers, nor psychological tricks.

He realised that he had to avoid the cult of personality. When he came back to England he read/re-read the book written by Jonathan Edwards, and what he was doing challenged Wesley, and he realised that this was what was needed in England. He was therefore ready to commence a ministry when Whitfield invited him, and ready to allow God to move without Wesley telling God what was “proper” and what was not. God's timing was perfect – it always is.

The opportunity was given and his job was to take it and run with it and he did. We must do the same if an opportunity comes to us. You cannot train for the ministry overnight, and you need to be called of God, but even then there is a long process that the Lord will put you through before an opportunity may come up. Ministry preparation is positioning, and being made ready by many experiences, and then when the call comes to serve when that God given opportunity arises.

## WESLEY AND WHITEFIELD

Whitefield's was a far greater preacher than Wesley and could talk to the people in their vernacular. He was a robust type of fellow who could preach in the open air, yet he suffered with life long asthma, that led to his death at age 55 in Newburyport, Mass, after preaching to a crowded inn. Wesley did not want to do this, feeling it beneath the dignity of the clergy to preach outdoors. He went to Bristol reluctantly. Three thousand turned up to hear him. He preached without great enthusiasm but the Word was Holy Spirit anointed. Many hundreds were converted and this was the turning point in a great ministry. From this point on there was no going back.

By the end of 1739 he was ready to spread the gospel to anyone, anywhere. He now looked at the whole world as his parish. He preached in inns, prisons, market squares, in Britain, Ireland and America. He preached to 30,000 in one meeting in Cornwall because he was God's man with God's message, and he finally did it God's way (Holy Spirit).

Wesley understood a principle that we must embrace. God does not need you or I, but wants our obedience to His Plan and wants to bless us and others through our Spirit filled ministry, as HE directs it. Ministry does not rely on our natural ability it depends on what the Holy Spirit is doing in our life. Both men were very different, and God used them both. God does not have a "mould" that you and I must fit into; he requires only our love and devotion to him and his work.

In 1774 Wesley was doing 4,500 miles a year on horseback. In his lifetime he rode a quarter of a million miles, ten times around the world. Wesley was out all year. If it was raining too hard he would crouch over and keep the horse moving forward. He was out in the sleet, snow, and in any weather, and through any dangers. He walked with God, in absolute faith that God would get him to each destination in the eternal plan.

In 1751 he married a widow in London. He had had a fall and she nursed him back to health. She had a vision of being the famous man's wife, but didn't understand that God's man is also the enemy's lightning rod! Her health and nerves broke as she could not keep up with him. In the end she separated from him. It was not a happy marriage, although John would have been reconciled to her. His wife died in 1781 but Wesley did not hear of it until several months later.

He was married to his mission, and his marriage to the woman was a mistake. Note this, for some believe that such a mistake would bar a man permanently from ministry, but God is bigger than man's viewpoint. Remember Moses here.

He crossed the Atlantic several times, being tireless in his mission. He was Arminian in doctrine hating the predestination of Calvin, and as a result fell out for a time with George Whitefield over it. We may hold to the doctrine of eternal security but Wesley's attitude to evangelism was good, and the two men found their friendship was stronger than their differences in theology, for they shared a passion to go after souls.

We look at the whole character of God rather than just the sovereignty. Even though they decided to part company in their mission, that simply doubled the missions, and they kept their friendship. God blessed both of their ministries. We need to be obedient to the great commission, and like these two great men keep friendship even where we disagree on doctrine or how we run our appeal after the service. By their fruit we know them.... Whitefield died in the American colony of Massachusetts in 1770, and in his will he asked his old friend John Wesley to take his memorial service back in London, much to the shock of Whitefield's Calvinist friends.

John Wesley lived and died a member of the Anglican Church. He did not want to separate and form a new church. By the time of his death there were 80,000 people in Britain and 40,000 in America who would call themselves Anglican and Methodists. They were Anglicans with a method, a method of spiritual growth. Their method was weekly Prayer and Bible Class meetings. He introduced the concept to UK and America that believers should not only meet in the church but also in their homes as well. The Methodists would go to church on Sunday and then meet under Bible teachers, generally laymen during the week and build on the worship of the weekend service.

Charles, John's brother, was saved three days before John. He wrote some 7,000 hymns and songs. John died in 1791 at 88 years of age, and is buried behind his church in London, with his mother Susannah over the road in Bunhill Fields Cemetery. Soon after his death the English Methodists pulled out of the Anglican churches and set their own denomination up. In 1773 the Americans held their first American conference. Wesley asked the Bishop of London to supply a leader of the group but he refused, so Wesley eventually appointed someone.

We owe a great debt to the Methodists as they opened up many agencies. All the missions grew out of this area of Christian work, even the Baptist Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society and the Church Missionary Society. The Sunday School movement which was the basis of universal public education also began with the Wesleys and the Welsh revivalists who saw scripture learning as assisting literacy with children. Here they were taught from the Bible to read and write. The return to Christian schooling nowadays is a Biblical concept.

They had a Biblically based social justice movement unlike that of today. Wesley encouraged William Wilberforce to fight in Parliament for the abolition of slavery through determined political actions over decades. They encouraged prison reform. They also used the churches during the week for unemployed Christians, and gave them meaningful work to do for wages or food. They opened a bank. Legal aid was offered to others. Widows and orphans were provided with houses. People in need knew that they could go to a Methodist church to get help. All these things were established for Christians in need and not determined unbelievers, but many lost became believers when they saw these things.

Nowadays people are providing handouts for pagans, so that they can stay in their unsaved state with more comfort; that wasn't Wesley's way. Once people were saved their brethren looked after them. They took seriously God's Word. "By this will they know ye are my disciples if ye have love, one for another". We need to look after the Christians both here and overseas. The unsaved need the gospel; let us like the revivalists get the message out and then look after the new brethren.

## DOCTRINES

### ATTITUDE

1. Every believer faces the inner conflict of divine versus human viewpoint (Isaiah 55:7-9).
2. Mental attitude determines both the life and character of a person - what you think is what you are (Proverbs 23:7).
3. As Christians we are commanded to have our thinking in tune with the mind of Christ (2 Corinthians 10:4-5 Romans 12:2, Philippians 2:5, 2 Timothy 1:7).
4. Knowledge of the Bible (the mind of Christ, 1 Corinthians 2:16) and control by the Holy Spirit renews the mind of the believer, giving divine viewpoint (Romans 12:2).
5. The right mental attitude produces joy (Philippians 2:2), confidence (2 Corinthians 5:1,6,8), stability (Isaiah 26:3-4, Philippians 4:7, 2 Thessalonians 2:2), true giving (2 Corinthians 9:7), love (1 Corinthians 13:5).
6. Human viewpoint is called worldliness (Romans 12:2, Colossians 3:2).
7. Evil is something you think rather than something you do. Doing results from thinking. (Matthew 9:4, Galatians 6:3)
8. Mental attitude sins produce self-induced misery (Proverbs 15:13).
9. Without clear thinking there is conflict in the mind of the believer (Isaiah 55:6-9, James 1:7-8).

### ETERNAL SECURITY

1. When a person truly trusts Jesus Christ for salvation, he is saved forever. He cannot lose his salvation.
2. POSITIONAL APPROACH (Romans 8:38-39)  
We are united with Christ ("in Christ"). Absolutely nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ.
3. LOGICAL APPROACH (Romans 8:32, Romans 5)  
As unbelievers we are enemies of God (Romans 5), as believers we are his children. If he did the most for his enemies what will he do for his children? This excludes loss of salvation for he saved us while we were his enemies.
4. GOD'S HANDS APPROACH (John 10:28, Psalm 37:24)  
Neither shall anyone seize them out of my hand. God is all-powerful.
5. EXPERIENTIAL APPROACH (2 Timothy 2:12-13)  
If we deny Christ He is going to deny us rewards (context=suffering and rewards). If we renounce Him, HE REMAINS FAITHFUL. The believer is in Christ and Christ indwells the believer. He cannot deny Himself.
6. THE FAMILY APPROACH (Galatians 3:26, John 1:12)  
When you believe in Christ you are born again as a child of God. You cannot be unborn, once a child always a child.
7. THE INHERITANCE APPROACH (1 Peter 1:4-5)  
We have an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled which fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us who are kept by the power of God. Perfect tense - it will always be reserved, since it is kept by God, not us.
8. THE SOVEREIGNTY APPROACH (2 Peter 3:9, Jude 24)  
He is not willing that any should perish - refers to the whole human race (2 Peter 3:9) Now unto him who is able to keep you from falling (from perishing). Once you are saved, it is His will that you don't perish.
9. THE BODY APPROACH (1 Corinthians 12:21, Colossians 1:18)  
Christ is the head, we are the members of the body. If any are lost, the body of Christ is incomplete.
10. THE GREEK TENSE APPROACH (Ephesians 2:8-9)

"For by Grace are ye saved." Perfect tense of the verb "sozo". For by Grace have you been saved in the past so that you go on being saved forever.

11. THE SEALING MINISTRY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT APPROACH (2 Corinthians 1:22, Ephesians 1:13, 4:30)  
In the ancient world the seal was a guarantee for protection. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit guarantees our security.

## LECTURE 32 - THE GREAT AWAKENING OR REVIVAL IN THE USA. 1720-1760

### INTRODUCTION

The USA's greatness as a nation can be traced back to these years before the "revolution" of the 1770s. It began with the movement of the Holy Spirit in the life of a few in prayer and Bible study groups from the 1680s onwards and then spread as spirit led men preached the gospel with power from the 1720s, and the Lord wove it to challenge the UK.

**Acts 2:36-41** shows us that as people were hearing the gospel message they were convicted of their sin. **John 16:8-11** says that the unbeliever will be convicted of the sin of rejecting their Saviour, the fact that they have no righteousness and that they are subject to judgment. This is what we see in America in the seventeenth to eighteenth century revivals.

When revivals occur in history they do so round these three areas of the Holy Spirit's conviction. They were convicted that they had killed the Lord of Glory, not just Pilate, and that their own good deeds were worthless in God's sight, and that their unbelief in the Lord's person and work would land them in hell. This happened in the United States just as it had happened in the Roman Empire.

We must work in with the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit alone brings real revival that transforms lives; all else is psychological pretense. Edwards and others in the United States backed these revivals with a lot of preparatory prayer. This was the case also in Acts 2. When the Spirit moves the results are bountiful. If you pray that the Spirit will convict, in conformity with John 16, there is certainty that the Spirit will move, and there is power.

Wherever there is a revival this is always true. When this occurs the preacher can preach powerfully. Too often people try to do it another way. It is through the ministry of the Word, given in Holy Spirit power that people are converted. We should walk with the Lord, as it is His plan not ours. We are to be moving with God not on our own – or a committee.

The results of the Great Awakening were tremendous but it started with a few people in log cabin churches praying for the movement of the Spirit. America had been built on Puritanism but they, like those in England, had become slack. These prayer meetings were uncoordinated by men and they were unknown to one another, and that didn't matter. Men and women do not need to "coordinate" the work of the Holy Spirit, they just need to do what the Spirit directs in their corner of the vineyard! The Lord gave people a burden, and they were obedient to it and gathered and prayed for revival – God answered powerfully.

The Great Awakening spilt over into the nation and there was a dramatic change in America that would transform it for the next 200 years. We will change the nation in the prayer room, Bible study group, and pulpits. If you get a number of converted pagans on fire for the Word and will of God you change the nation. They faced the Indian and French Wars at this time. Many had become strong in Christ and this helped them as they went later into the American war of Independence. The effect of the Great Awakening was seen in the Declaration of Independence. Many of the leaders were Christians. They had seen the effect of the great teaching of Jonathan Edwards and others.

For the last 200 years the USA has been the centre of evangelical Biblical Christianity. In the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century Britain with America led the way but after WW II they both start to lose their way. Both nations are politically in the depths of paganism now in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and we pray for revival again; and it may yet come through the prayer of a few, as it did before. Refer the Post-Graduate books on Pastoral Theology to read further.

### WORKING AS A TEAM

Just as there was no one source of the Reformation, so there were a number of people who led the Great Awakening. The Spirit did not start to move in just one area. Wesley was an Arminian in theology, Whitfield a Calvinist yet they were both mightily used by the Lord. Luther and Zwingli disagreed but God blessed them both. Let us learn from history.

We may disagree with others but God works through a variety of people. All shared a commitment for the Word of God and the unsaved. If we disagree with others but are both committed to the unsaved the Lord will bless us both. In America there was a great difference in the people but God blessed them all. Every time there was a revival it divided the church in half. When God's Word is preached the saints will be under conviction while the "aints" will be saying, 'how dare you say these things in our church'. Is our local church "ours" or Gods? Destiny - Revival or Great Tribulation?

When God's Word is preached the sword of the Lord's word will divide them. **2 Timothy 3:14-17, Hebrews 4:12, 15-16.** The people who preach need to remember that they wield a sword. The tree needs to be pruned and the sword of the Spirit – the Word of God - is God's way. The Church must stand upon the Word of God.

Cairns states, "The revivals also brought schisms, ministers took sides concerning their attitude to the movement. In New England clergymen split into the New Lights and the Old Lights, with the Old Lights opposing the revival". The New Lights led by Jonathan Edwards supported it. In the Presbyterian, the Dutch Reformed, and the Baptists it broke out. Each church split into the Old and the New. Most of those who opposed the revival went into Unitarianism or liberalism within 40 years of rejecting this move of the Holy Spirit. Examine your local churches post Billy Graham Crusades...

Many people opposed the revival because the ministers who led the revival were often the least educated. The least educated challenged the educated to real faith. We are committed to a Holy Spirit led study. Many had studied in the Universities where the Holy Spirit was never mentioned and they were threatened by change or challenge. How open are we?

#### START OF THE REVIVAL

Shelley on Page 358ff tells us that the revival started in the Dutch Reformed churches of New Jersey. It appeared as a series of regional breezes and crossed denominational barriers. This refreshed the people who embraced it.

The Dutch Reformed minister who started it poured himself into his preaching. This man committed himself to the people. The ministers of the day were taught how to preach. They had homiletic classes. They were unemotional, but taught verse by verse and let the Holy Spirit move the people, not their trained eloquence, or emotional tricks.

The movement moved into the Irish - Scottish Presbyterians. William Tennant started expositional preaching, backed up by praying people. He started a Bible College. He sent people out and they started to spread the revival into the Baptists and beyond. Like Peter they were not university educated, but they were committed to God's Word. The greatest revivals have come from those who were despised by the well educated university types. "Converted" or "Educated"????

Finally the movement came into New England at Northampton where Jonathan Edwards was preaching. The Spirit worked on him and the people and they were changed. If the Holy Spirit moves on a congregation there will a desire to spread the news. It took only 20 years to cross the United States.

Jonathan Edwards dedicated himself to the Lord. There was a dedication to service. If you want to see revival it is you committing yourself to God's service and to his will for everything. After 11 years of dedicated preparation Edwards was used for the Lord's work. Jonathan Edwards spent 13-14 hours a day in his study. He had the leaders in the church doing all the jobs, other than feeding the sheep and coordinating the leadership of the church.

Wesley would spend 4 hours studying and praying in his small prayer room (3am-7am) before breakfast. He would then preach three or four times a day. He did his sermon preparation on his horse.

These people did not burn themselves out and yet they worked harder than most would today. They exercised daily and they ate well, but they prayed and kept to the Word without political distraction. Whitefield had bad asthma, and yet kept working until he died of an asthma attack finally, within an hour of giving his last message.

Shelley on page 361ff describes Whitefield's arrival in America. He found open doors everywhere. He moved north and traveled extensively as did the other itinerant preachers. Edwards was merciless in his preaching of hell. He pictured man over hell itself. This is a legitimate thing if the heart of the man is right and full of loving concern for the people he speaks to.

Jesus taught more about hell than another person, but one minister quipped, "if you preach about hell just be sure you do so with tears in your eyes for the lost". No-one knows when they might die, and we need to meet the Lord well before that appointment. If we do not preach the final judgment we are missing out on the Word of God and limiting the ministry of the Holy Spirit, for we are not giving people the "flip side" of the "good news".

Many new churches were founded throughout the Colonies. Many colleges were formed to train for evangelism. Harvard was one of them.

This was a mighty time of the movement of the Holy Spirit by committed people who preached from the Word of God. The whole thing centres around obedience to the Word of God.

#### DOCTRINE

#### REVIVAL

Twenty four Biblical revivals and Reforms are examined.

1. Jacob - On his return from Bethel he ordered his whole household to put away their false gods and to wash and change their garments. The false gods were buried. Jacob then built an altar to the Lord. (Genesis 35:1-4)

2. Moses - This occurred when the Israelites saw the parting of the Red Sea as a mighty act of God. Moses led the Israelites with the Song of Moses whilst his sister Miriam provided the music. (Exodus 14:31-15:21)
3. Samuel - He exhorted the nation to put away false gods and prepare to worship the one true God. (1 Samuel 7:3-6)
4. David - When the Ark of the Covenant was brought into Jerusalem for the first time. (1 Chronicles 15:25-28, 16:1-43, 29:10-25)
5. David - At the dedication of the materials for the future Temple. (1 Chronicles 29)
6. Solomon - At the dedication of the Temple. (2 Chronicles 7:1-3)
7. Asa - Who removed the idols and Sodomites out of the land. (1 Kings 15:11-15)
8. Jehosaphat - Who led a revival when he cleansed the Temple and ordered the sanctification of the Levitical priesthood. (2 Chronicles 19)
9. Elijah - After the contest with the prophets of Baal at Mount Carmel. (1 Kings 18:21-40)
10. Jehu - When he exterminated all worshipers of Baal and their temples. (2 Kings 10:15-28)
11. Jehoida - As High Priest he led the people in a covenant to turn from their idols and worship God. (2 Kings 11:17-20)
12. Hezekiah - He cleansed the Temple resulting in a revival. (2 Chronicles 29-31)
13. Manassah - When this wicked king became a believer he ordered the destruction of all idols. (2 Chronicles 33:11-20)
14. Josiah - When in cleaning up the Temple the Book of the Law was accidentally discovered. Its public reading before the king and nation had a profound effect. (2 Kings 22-23)
15. Ezra - When as a result of his preaching on separation the nation Israel turned from their practice of marriage alliances with the heathen in the land. (Ezra 9-10)
16. Nehemiah - After he had rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, Ezra publicly read and taught from the Word of God, causing a great revival. (Nehemiah 13)
17. Jonah - Despite a negative attitude, his preaching caused a mass conversion of the Assyrians at Nineveh. (Jonah 3)
18. Esther - Following the repentance of the Jews with the overthrow of Haman. (Esther 9:17-22)
19. John the Baptist - Who preached of the coming Messiah, warning them to repent. (Luke 3:2-18)
20. Jesus - When, after speaking to the Samaritan woman there was a revival in Samaria. (John 4:28-42)
21. Philip - Whose preaching regarding the kingdom of God produced a great revival in Samaria. (Acts 8:5-12)
22. Peter - At Pentecost after his great sermon. (Acts 2)
23. Peter - At Lydda after he had healed Aeneas. (Acts 9)
24. Paul - At Ephesus during his third missionary journey. (Acts 19:11-20)



**LECTURE 33 - PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND THE WORSHIP OF MARY**

## REVOLUTION IN FRANCE

Shelly, in chapter 36, pages 369ff, deals with the rebuilding of the Roman Catholic Church as the fortress of religious and traditional conservatism. The late eighteenth century was one of great upheaval, especially in areas which were not touched by the Wesleyan revival. Britain did not experience the revolution that France and others did, possibly only because of the impact of the great revivals. Things were changed in England through the spiritual power flowing after the revival rather than physical violence.

In France however a minority comprising the aristocracy and the religious leaders were corrupt and totally out of touch with reality. This is shown by Marie Antoinette's famous phrase on hearing that the peasants had no bread she suggested they eat cake. She was not a bad woman, just so out of touch with reality that she believed that a shortage of one thing would be made up by buying another. The leaders were debauched and corrupt, but also simply distracted by a reality they thought would last, with the genuine changes in UK, "just a fad...".

Backward looking faith, as Catholicism had been, went hand in hand with backward industry and politics. The agrarian reforms had caused a lot of pain to the poor, and the industrial revolution had not come to France at that point, and many were looking for radical change, but the rulers of France did not give any thought to the needs of the poor, nor did they see their threat. Marx would later realize what happened; that when people have nothing to lose except their lives, they will spend them freely to try to provide a better place for their children.

In 14 July 1789 the Bastille were stormed, the Governor murdered and the 110 troops killed or forced to "join the revolution", and a handful of prisoners (5 criminals and 2 insane inmates) released, but it was a symbolic overthrow of the Old Regime and the "spin doctors" got busy and invented a myth. The power of the revolution was the power of blind rage and hatred, born of years of injustice and neglect; few would help the aristocracy to escape the guillotine and the hated prison was just the symbol of it all, and so the murder of its governor a trifle....

The revolutionaries spoke of liberty, equality and fraternity, but that was just window dressing for a simple exchange of power groups to rule the poor. Always ask, "Who was free, and what did that freedom mean?" (The same hypocrisy would occur in the Communist Revolutions in Russia and China, neither delivering anything except alternative means of death to the poor, with Stalin and Mao being mass murderers well ahead of Hitler in their carnage caused to their own people.) For religion the changes in France meant the opening up of religion to all ideas that the revolutionaries thought appropriate, but not to genuine Christianity, for the closing of Port Royal's Jansenist group in 1711 had robbed France of its spiritual power station. This brought out one of the nastier sides of the revolution, with the worship of evil instead of good. By equality they meant socialism, with all the farm workers being the same, but those in charge being more equal than the rest. The final result of the revolution was the old aristocracy being replaced by a new one based on money and ruthless exercise of power – it was "Animal Farm"....

Fraternity was the concept of fellowship in a cause; what it meant in practice was, that if you have a group of people to form a mob and are armed you can break down the forces of Government and establish a new order. This was expressed on the day that the Bastille was stormed. With the corrupt aristocracy and corrupt religious power block in France it is likely that we would if we were a poor person then have supported the concepts of the Revolution at the start.

On the eve of the French Revolution the Roman Catholic Church basked in the glory of the old order, with Bishops and Cardinals in Versailles, and poor priests starving in their parish churches. For a thousand years she had sanctified the structures of an increasingly corrupt and inefficient feudal Europe. She gave divine blessing to the rule of kings and the marriages of nobles. Like these monarchs and aristocrats the Church gave little thought to the powerlessness of the peasants and the growing middle class. In eighteenth-century European society noble birth and holy calling were everything. Intelligence, real achievement and wealth meant next to nothing, except amongst the new intelligentsia in the fashionable "salons" where everything was open to debate, and from where the brains behind the revolution would come, and most of this group would believe that reason would prevail – most would die or join Napoleon to end the carnage....

To be born an aristocrat or hold a position high in the clergy meant power. About 1% of the French population held all the power (200,000 aristocrats and clergy, with 20 million with no power) and over 90% had no say in the running of their lives at all. The peasants @ 80+ % of the population staggered under intolerable burdens including heavy taxes to church and state. The 10+% middle class had wealth without responsibility, intelligence without authority, and ability without recognition. Drastic change was simply a matter of time - far less time than anyone dreamed..... Sadly no spiritual group existed to be the spiritual preservative. Violence quickly spun out of control.

It was the American War of Independence that inspired the French in the form of their slogan, "no taxation without representation"; that if you pay taxes you should have a say in how the country was run. The American Revolution was however driven by believers, the children of the "Great Awakening". The French King was not understanding of the peasant's plight and generally ignored problems. Like Charles the First in 1640. Escapism and Denial are always fatal!

The changes in France came quickly and violently. The monasteries were commandeered and in 1790 many monks were murdered or jailed, and the civil constitution was drawn up banning genuine faith until 1794. The number of Bishops who now had to be elected were reduced and they had to be approved of by the Government. The new priests were to be paid by the State. As a result over 4,000 bishops and priests left France for Italy or Spain.

In 1793 the Reign of Terror began with many of the aristocracy and bishops being executed for counter revolutionary activities, a phrase which has been used by revolutionaries ever since and by totalitarian regimes. It was a way of eliminating opposition. Over 4,000 were executed in the Place de la Concorde, and many more in provincial centres. They changed the calendar and the week to a 10 day one. This lasted to 1804 until Napoleon changed things back.

Christianity was banned and the Revolution under Robespierre set up their own religion, the religion of reason which was symbolized by crowning a beautiful prostitute as the goddess of reason in the Cathedral at Notre Dame.

#### EUROPE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Napoleon, when he regained power, executed many of the revolutionaries and re established a concord between the church and the state, but the Catholic Church heaved a sigh of relief and didn't change. It was the French revolution that gave Karl Marx his ideas of the power of the populace. In 1848 there were a number of revolutions throughout Europe. The face of Europe had changed through the nineteenth century totally with industrialization. The revival of Bible believing in Britain saved the country from total revolution, but there was growing social unrest and terrible poverty, but Holy Spirit filled people were led to do what was needed in society and church, for the UK to buy time and build strength through the nineteenth century. By the 1870's there were new militant nations such as Italy and Germany.

During this period the Pope remained basically inactive and lost ground and influence in all places. Catholicism was however strengthened by the Romantic movement, which is known today by it's poetry and novels. This held sway from 1790 to 1850. They looked back to the days of knights, of cathedrals and the mystic "glory" of the early Catholic Church. It had no reality to history but played on the imagination, and was a literary and religious escapism that tranquilized the spirits of many who could afford to play. In days of chaos people looked back and hankered for the times of stability of the past, and they looked to the glories of Rome that the church had inherited. Think Angelic Conflict...

The Jesuits were reformed, having been banned in 1773. Pope Pius VII reformed them in 1814. They set up schools which complemented this romantic period with rigorous indoctrination/education.

The Oxford movement was formed in England, and over 600 Anglican church men joined the Roman Catholic Church in the 1840's from the Anglican Church. It stressed the form of religion and is called in Anglicanism today "the high church" position, with its ornamentation. They made a great deal of atmosphere, and have very little doctrine that does not have it's source in Medieval Rome. Anglo-Catholic services still are common in many parishes in the Anglican Church world wide. The Bible was lost to them, and any lay involvement, or small group prayer and bible study was seen as "dangerous Methodism"; remember that we have seen that these two elements were at the heart of all revivals. The "Two Paths....", all through church history we have seen this principle from **Matthew 7:13-23**....

#### POPE PIUS IX

Pope Pius IX [1846-1878] was the first vigorous Pope in 150 years and he produced three major books, but they still looked back to the past and did not take into account the changes in the nations around them, and he brought in some very concerning pagan elements that were classical – that is pagan Roman and Greek. He hurt in 1848; looked back....

In 1854 he wrote his "Ineffabilis Deus", which dealt with the Immaculate Conception of Mary; stating that she had been born without original sin. He made believing that the basis of being a Roman Catholic, and belief in his right to say this, without any other support a tenant of faith. This reinforced the position of Mary ("Our Lady") in the Roman Church and moved the faith of Rome firmly away from Biblical and Apostolic Christianity.

In 1863 he said that salvation was only in the Roman Catholic Church and only with Mary as your mother, as "queen of heaven" and mother of God. **Jeremiah 7:18, 44:17-25**. The Jewish mother of the humanity of Jesus had many believed become Diana, Semiramis, Rhea, the blue robed, blond haired queen of the pagan pantheon, rather than the true "mother of faith" pictured in scripture. **Hebrews 12:1-3, Luke 1:26-43**.

In 1864 he produced the "syllabus of errors" where he condemned toleration of religion, the separation of church and state, socialism, Bible Societies, and all Schools that were out of Catholic control, and all civil marriage.

In 1869-70 he ran the first Vatican council where he proclaimed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility when he spoke ex Cathedra. Of the 533 people attending the council only 2 voted finally against it but many stayed away from the final voting. This put the Roman Catholic Church back into the Middle Ages again, but with more authority to the pope than ever before. This was the trend until Pope John 23rd after World War 2. He led the Catholic Church out of the theological Middle Ages through setting up the next great Council - Vatican II.

#### THE ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The Roman Catholic Church has changed more in the last 70 years than it has in the last 500. The council of Trent set the course for Catholicism to be backward looking through to 1564, and Pius IX had solidified that place in 1870, especially with Marianism. Pius XII was the last backward looking Pope who reigned until 1958. He hated Communism, believed the prophetic word of Fatima regarding Russia, and that meant he didn't see the danger of Hitler, although he tried to help the oppressed. He attacked all who tried to update the church. He did not want to go back to the Bible, or even the earliest Church Fathers, or empower laity, but the demand for change was growing post-war. What had occurred demanded a total change in attitudes – too many had died from evil to ignore.

This changed with Pope John XXIII [1958]. He convened Vatican II in the mid 1960's. In his early days he was more like a Protestant than Catholic because he openly read the Scriptures, encouraged prayer by all, and read the early Church Fathers. Everywhere he went he impressed people with his charm and his ability to organise. He was made a cardinal in 1953. His idea was to bring the church up to date. He was not however going to confront/change much of the dogma, but would provide ways to side-step it for many. This trend has continued, with a "1-9 belief scale" in some dogmas being acceptable, with the entire spectrum of belief welcomed within the church. There were 2,500 delegates who attended Vatican II. They were preparing to do battle with the Past, but deal with Protestantism in a very new way; to try to lead them back to the Roman Church, rather than just oppose them by changing all the obvious things that offended.

The progressives got the upper hand in the meetings. They looked on the Protestants as the separated brethren not the enemy. The Pope supported a link with the Protestants with the idea that they would over time, with openness come back under the Pope's leadership. The Council tried to tone down some things that Medieval thinking had established and move towards dialogue and acceptance of variant views. The Anglican and many of the United Churches have committed to heading back towards Rome. It will be of interest to see what compromises and changes are made in the years to come and by whom; for I expect them to be from both sides and 2017 was a key year in this process with Fatima celebrated and Mary celebrated as "our mother of faith" – something that the Bible, as we have seen, makes clear is true.

One of the main areas of discussion at Vatican II was the subject of revelation, which had been considered as a mixture of the Scriptures and Tradition. In the end the vote was two votes short to vote out the concept that Scripture alone was sufficient to do anything by. They were very close to the protestant position, and even closer today in 2021.

Vatican II was the Roman Catholic Church's attempt to reorganize to combat the Protestant churches and the Pentecostal movement that was sweeping through the Catholic churches as well as the Protestant ones. The new liturgy was now in the native languages not Latin. People were also to greet other people at the church so that it was to be a social gathering as well. The church was to be the place of community, living faith expressed in the love of Jesus.

After Vatican II the church got side-tracked again by a conservative, when Pope Paul banned artificial contraception even though the church committee had stated that it was permissible. The Pope issued a bull to this effect. Cover ups of sexual abuse scandals have also come back to bite the Vatican over recent years, but Francis open confrontation with the truth of the past evils done has impressed many, and he epitomizes the sliding scale of beliefs acceptable.

Paul also condemned abortion and divorce and held out on celibacy of the priesthood. These are the real remaining issues within Roman Catholicism today. Many Catholics have problems with the Pope over these matters. There was a major exodus leaving the church, many of the priests who wanted to marry leaving churches without regular priests in many parishes. If married priests were able to return to their work, all parishes world wide would have priests overnight.

Many Catholics nowadays are in the Pentecostal movement and so have their Bibles open. They are allowed to stay in their churches if they continue with the Catholic traditions and attend weekly Masses. It all began in a Catholic University in Pittsburg. They realised that they had no power and found it in the new wave of the Spirit. It started in 1967 with 100, and by the time that they met in 1972 those attending had increased to 11,500. The Pentecostals in Catholicism are encouraged today by the Full Gospel Businessmen and "Women Aglow" groups. In their common experience they have combined, rather than worry about their differences in minor beliefs, and even some quite serious differences.

This is similar to the Oxford Group 150 years before, where the emphasis is on love, community and feelings. There is a strong emphasis on emotion and feeling in the Catholic Church today, so that the basis of church re-integration is laid already. All that is needed is for a reforming Pope to sweep away the last vestiges of the Medieval church, and Papal power will be replaced by Papal Moral Authority, and many WCC churches will rejoin with Rome.

The growth of the threat from the extremists in the Moslem world may lead to another Leo or Gregory (Francis?) taking the lead for Christendom again and uniting the denominations under a common head who is strong and stable enough to lead them all, even to becoming the moral head of the other Mono-theistic faiths (Sunni Moslem and Judaism also).

## DOCTRINE

### MARY – GRACE

1. SCRIPTURE - Matthew 1; Luke 1-3.

## 2. BIOGRAPHY

Of the seven women named Mary in the New Testament, none has a more central role than Mary the mother of Jesus Christ. The genealogy of Mary is given in Luke 3. She is shown as the daughter of Heli (Luke 3:23), descended from Nathan the son of David (Luke 3:23-31). At the time of the conception of Jesus, she was engaged to Joseph who was also descended from David, through Solomon (Matthew 1:7-16). Through his parents Jesus was legally entitled to the throne of David. Living in Nazareth (Luke 1:26). Mary visited a close relative, Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist (Luke 1:39-56), before travelling to Bethlehem to be taxed under the orders of Augustus. In Bethlehem, Jesus was born (Luke 2:1-20). After the visit of the Magi (see Topic 27), when Jesus was about 18 months old, Joseph, Mary and Jesus fled into Egypt until the death of Herod the Great (Matthew 2:20,21). Joseph led his family to Nazareth because Archaleus, a very cruel king, was reigning in Judah (Matthew 2:22,23). Joseph is no longer mentioned, but Mary appears at the marriage of Cana (John 2:1-12); then later when Jesus was challenged by the Pharisees (Matthew 12:46-50); and at the cross (John 19:25-27). On the cross Jesus committed His mother to the care of the disciple John. Mary was with the disciples in the upper room after the ascension (Acts 1:13,14).

## 3. EVALUATION

- a) Mary was one of the few people prophesied in the Old Testament, as the woman from whose seed the Saviour would come (Genesis 3:15).
- b) Her state was amplified in Isaiah 7:14 that she would be a virgin.
- c) Since the sin nature is passed down through the father, Mary received a sin nature from Heli.
- d) Because Jesus was born of a virgin however, conceived by the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ was born without a sin nature (Matthew 1:20).
- e) Mary was highly favoured in grace by God (Luke 1:28,30), being called "blessed among women".
- f) Mary accepted the miracle of this birth as outlined by Gabriel (Luke 1:26-38).
- g) Mary praised God for His goodness (Luke 1:46-55; cf. 1 Samuel 2:1-10).
- h) Mary recognized that the child she was to have would be the long awaited Saviour (Luke 1:46-48).
- i) Joseph was noble by protecting Mary from public stoning as an adulteress (Deuteronomy 22:23,24).
- j) Mary and Joseph arranged for Jesus' circumcision on the eighth day (Luke 2:21) and His presentation to the Lord after the purification of Mary (Luke 2:22-24). They offered turtle doves and pigeons, showing they were not wealthy (Luke 2:24).
- k) Jesus never called Mary mother, but always the formal polite "woman" (John 2:4; 19:26), to ensure that Mary was never to be thought of as the mother of God. Mary remains certified as the greatest woman who ever lived.

## 4. PRINCIPLES

- a) We should be oriented to grace (Romans 5:2; 6:14).
- b) Parents are responsible for the spiritual welfare of their children (Deuteronomy 32:46).
- c) Christians should use common sense in making decisions (Proverbs 24:5,6).
- d) God uses unbelievers in the lives of believers to work His plan out (cf. the taxation of Augustus).
- e) Pre-eminence should always be given to Jesus Christ (John 3:30).
- f) There is only one mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ (1 Timothy 2:5).
- g) All except Christ have sinned (Romans 3:23).

## LECTURE 34 - SOCIAL CONCERNS

### THE BRITISH CHRISTIANS **James 1:26-27, 2:14-17.**

From the time of the Great Awakening there has not been a time when there has not been a revival going on somewhere in the world. With improved communications the effect of things happening in one place has spilled over into other areas.

There is the rise of the "evangelicals". The revival at Truro in Cornwall is one that is well written up, but there are many to study. Here we see things happening which is more akin to a Pentecostal revival. In the early great awakening it was the exception rather than the rule that people were struck like this, but towards the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century a phenomena called the "camp meetings" took place.

There was great impact through the evangelical societies which would often underwrite a Bible College. Many of these people with great wealth were members of these societies including some of the aristocracy. They would use their vast resources in training people in evangelical preaching. Having paid for them to train they then subsidized them with wages

to serve in a church and establish it. This is your missionary movement beginning and the model is still applicable and working today.

The most important thrust of the time for the Anglican church was that begun by John Thornton and taken over by the Rev Simeon who when he died had the right to nominate the clergy who served in 21 Anglican Churches. By 1820, 5% of the Anglican Church was evangelical, but due to the work of these societies, by 1830 it was 12.5%. These people would go to the Bishop and say that, "you cannot afford to put a person in this church, we will do so but want to have the say as to who is appointed". The impact in the Anglican Church was extensive and probably saved it in light of the exodus of so many to join the Catholic Church under John Henry Newman.

#### THE CLAPHAM GROUP

At the centre of the great leap forward spiritually in the Anglican church was the "Clapham Group". They were very wealthy aristocrats and mill owners and they met regularly for 50 years from around 1780 in homes in the Clapham area of London to see how best to effect support for biblical change in their area, and further abroad. Shelley Chapter 37, Pages 381ff.

The main areas of concern in those days were the elimination of slavery in the British Empire, confronting poverty, getting better working conditions, child health and working conditions, and prison, and educational reform. In their days many mill and factor owners treated workers as if they were things, objects to be exploited, which was totally anti Biblical.

William Wilberforce the great reformer gathered around him a large number of key figures in the Government and business. He had been saved at 25 and had great ability and suffering; with great pressure from ill-health and debility.

Under Wilberforce's leadership the Clapham friends were gradually knit together in intimacy and solidarity. At the Clapham mansions they held what they chose to call their "Cabinet Councils". They discussed the wrongs and injustices of their country, and the battles they would need to fight to establish righteousness. And thereafter, in Parliament and out, they moved as one body, delegating to each one the work they could do best to accomplish their common purposes.

"It was a remarkable fraternity", says Reginald Coupland, the biographer of Wilberforce. "There has never been anything like it since in British public life".

They bought up many of the large houses in Clapham and worked together both physically and spiritually and were able to effect significant changes in the British Empire that would not have otherwise occurred. The Clapham group however were not hooked on purely "social action", but were impressed by the power of God's Word and the need to meet people's physical need as well as their spiritual need.

Out of this group came the Church Missionary Council, the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804, the Society for Bettering the Conditions of the Poor 1807, the Society for the Reformation of Prison Discipline, and many others. It was a Christian cause where they could talk about God's Word and give the gospel at the same time. The people would be led by the Holy Spirit to an area of interest, form a sub group, get everybody behind things and do what they were led to.

#### THE SLAVE TRADE

The slave trade had been started in 1562 by Sir John Hawkings who took a cargo of slaves from Sierra Leone to the West Indies. Charles II after the restoration of the Monarchy authorised the carrying of 3,000 slaves a year. By 1770 this had grown to 100,000 slaves per year in what became known as the triangle trade. Clothes and other goods were taken from England to Africa, Slaves from Africa to the Americas, and Cotton and other products from America back to Europe each leg of the journey making a profit. It was a great and terrible evil, but made vast fortunes for those involved.

Wilberforce started in 1789 in the House of Commons to try and eliminate slavery. There was a considerable commercial lobby against it. Stage by stage the attitude was changed by preaching the Christian message against it. The end of slavery came in 1833 just 4 days before the death of Wilberforce. It was a forty year battle.

**James 2:14-17** was their motto. You must provide with the gospel something for their body if they are destitute. **James 1:26-27** was also important to them. If you claim to be holy in living the Christian life and you are not concerned for the victims of evil you are not holy, you are a hypocrite. They showed how to combine evangelism and social improvement. Few today get the two things balanced. If people are converted they need to be helped as a brother or a sister if they are in need. In the liberal churches they go all out with the social side of things and no gospel is given, but we err greatly if we give the gospel and nothing else to meet physical needs.

#### OTHER GROUPS

There were also those who formed the first industrial era orphanages the two great Brethren men Thomas Barnardo, and Georg Mueller. There is another man Tregellis who also was active in looking after the poor.

It is of interest that the Brethren descended from evangelical Anglicans and Baptists. There was a real emphasis on Bible teaching in this group. There were two groups, the open and exclusive Brethren. The latter were and are very legalistic

and very authoritarian with many unusual doctrines. The open Brethren are well known for their evangelism and emphasis on Bible teaching. We note throughout Church History that all who lift up the Word are prospered in their work by God. As we honour the Word and the one behind it we are blessed in our ministries.

Also in this period there emerged the "Lord's General", William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army, who began his mission in a tent in Whitechapel in 1865. He had been involved with the Methodists but decided to target a specific group of people who were not being looked after. His group is organised on military lines and very regimented. He was mocked for this but by doing so he eliminated all the pretenders, and all knew them as preachers.

They made a stand on alcohol and prostitution. Five to seven people were found dead on the streets of London every night with an equal number of suicides in the 1860's. The Salvation Army went into the city in uniform and were targets of attack which was violent, at one point by the "skeleton army". They had a balanced message. They were bitterly opposed however, some were killed, many hurt, and they only made ground slowly, but God blessed their determined desire to reach the lowest with the Gospel and transform lives the wealthy had written off as beyond help.

They were strong on the use of popular music in their services. They took Christian message with pop music of the day and people listened. Booth used music as the hook and put it to Christian lyrics. As soon as the last beat finished the message started and people were saved. They had prayer, playing and preaching groups. In a few years there were several hundred thousand members of the Salvation Army. The impact on the slums in "darkest London" was dramatic.

The tent meetings which became the Keswick Conference meetings were another great source of strength early in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The tent meetings began under the leadership of Canon Hartford Battersby in 1875, an evangelical Anglican. The preaching emphasized the victorious Christian life. My own grandparents were saved in these meetings in the early 1890s.

In the 1850's the "Lay Prayer Association" was formed promoting activity in the churches and reviving them. This did not start with ministers but was as a result of lay people. It took off and was a source of great blessing.

There were great revivals in Wales and Scotland through tent meetings. The YMCA was also established as a Christian group for Bible study and physical activity operating from America and around the world.

Spurgeon preached from 1850 to 1892. In 1862 he moved into the Metropolitan Tabernacle which had 4,700 seats and it was filled several times a week. Thousands of people were saved by his ministry in his church. His pastor's college trained 900 ministers for independent churches. As the Baptist Union went liberal Spurgeon became independent.

D. L. Moody and Ira Sankey traveled throughout the United States and Great Britain preaching a great revival in the late nineteenth century and both men were greatly influenced by Spurgeon. He founded the Moody Bible Institute and Moody Press. The evangelical movement went in a number of different directions at the same time.

Every evangelical group was then, and still should be associated with several things; the salvation of the lost, the protection of the innocent, helping the destitute, then training a new generation of ministers to multiply the effect. They got involved in publishing good material, and prayed for a thorough movement of the Holy Spirit; so should we.

In the liberal camp there was a movement in the contemplative and mystery areas such as the Oxford movement. People like Newman were evangelical Anglicans whose ardour cooled and they moved towards the medieval certainties of Roman Catholicism and studied and were attracted to the monastic area of spirituality and mystic emotionalism.

Some argued, that rather than relying on the Word of God in the power of the Holy Spirit as their ultimate source of the revelation of God's will, the Oxford Movement went back to the Bishops as their source, but that is too simplistic, for they were drawn back to the certainties, beauty, mystery, and splendor of the Medieval worship services. Public worship was very important to them. They believed that there was great importance in symbolism in public worship. Ritual should appeal to the senses. While ritual may be useful and not hinder worship we should look for the movement of the Holy Spirit. Step by step they moved towards Roman Catholicism, as Rome had and has the best rituals, for they are the oldest.

Newman joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1845 and 875 ministers left the Church of England with him. The Oxford movement joined the Catholics. Newman wrote many excellent hymns but he was an enigma. In 1988 the Archbishop of Canterbury went to mass with the Pope and the two groups have settled many of their differences, but the place of Mary and other dogmas are sticking points still. A leading Anglican Bishop is permanently at the Vatican since that time.

The Church of England still has real evangelical fervor in the low church/church army, yet moves closer to Rome each day at the high church end. We must have our eyes open to what is happening in our own days, for we live in times as exciting and momentous as Luther's! 2017 was the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the visions of "Our Lady of Fatima" and we saw interesting things, and can expect new things to unfold in the next years that are significant in church unity actions.

## **DOCTRINES**

CHARITY: BIBLICAL CHARITY

The requirements for a widow to receive charity is given in 1 Timothy 5

1. She should not receive charity if she had children or grandchildren. The church is not expected to take up the slack for disobedient families or to encourage the breakdown of the family. The Lord's money should not be spent making up for slack relatives. - v 4
2. If there is no one to help her and she is spending time in the work and praying she is eligible. - v 5
3. However if she is living for pleasure she is dead while she lives. If they are not willing to take responsibility they are not given charity. v 8 - the principle of [1] is reinforced restating that if there is family they must take responsibility first. It is your Christian witness to ensure that Social Welfare is not expected to replace your social responsibilities as a child. Many people are so busy doing the Lord's work that they neglect their parents. If you do not look after your parents you are worse than an unbeliever. - v 6
4. The widow should be over 60 years of age, having lived in the faith a blameless life and the wife of one man. - v 9
5. Eight characteristics:
  - a) No dependants
  - b) No means of support
  - c) She must be spiritual
  - d) She must be prayerful, night and day
  - e) She must have been a faithful wife to her husband.
  - f) She must have a good reputation with unbelievers.
  - g) Her home must be open to visitors.
  - h) She must be active in social work herself.

Unless a woman matched up to that standard she did not receive anything from the church. It should not be given to those who are not living in a God honouring way. A person who did not match up to God's Word had then to make a decision about whether she would change her life style to make herself eligible. This shows how serious charity is.

SOCIAL WELFARE

1. God has always been concerned for the needy poor, the weak and the oppressed (Exodus 22:21-27, Deuteronomy 15:11, 24:14, 15).
2. Orphans and widows were especially concerns of the Lord from the beginning (Deuteronomy 10:18, Ezekiel 22:7).
3. Any violation of the trust of others with money was also a concern of the Lord (Exodus 22:26, Amos 2:8).
4. The needy poor of the land were to be cared for. Only the needy were to be cared for, as those who were able to work should, and those with ability were expected to use it. (Isaiah 1:23, 10:2, 3:14,15; Amos 4:1, 5:11, 8:4, 6; Micah 2:2, 8, 9; Zephaniah 3:1; Habakkuk 1:4, 2:10-15; Jeremiah 5:28, 7:6; Ezekiel 18:12, 16, 22:29; Zechariah 7:10; Malachi 3:5)
5. The Lord addressed the poor and needy directly and met their needs, for food but more than that for focus on their purpose in life. (Matthew 11:28-30, Luke 4:18, 6:20)  
The Lord recognized that there will always be people who are poor, that need will always exist within a fallen world and that no attempt of man will change this. (Matthew 26:11, Mark14:7)
6. The early church during the time of greatest growth in Jerusalem adopted a dramatic welfare policy to deal with the numbers being saved and the numbers of martyrs and their dependants who needed the church to care for them. In Acts 4:32-37 tells us that many ( not all or they would not have had a home to meet in ) in the church sold their worldly wealth to ensure the work was not halted for lack of funds, or time to devote. It was a temporary measure and restricted to Jerusalem but it helped the church get established and made sure that no-one starved at a time when there was great expansion but also great persecution. Because of the church's needs they were permanently poor and other churches had to help the Jerusalem church throughout its history until 70AD. (1 Corinthians 16:3)
7. The churches cared for the poor and needy by regular giving, and through the office of the deacons who were the social welfare officers for the assemblies. (Romans 15:26, Galatians 2:10, James 2:2-7)  
Relatives were expected to look after their own first. (1 Timothy 5:8)  
If people could work they were expected to; such were not needy poor! (1 Thessalonians 2:9-12, 2 Thessalonians 3:7-12)

**CHRISTIAN WORKER**

1. Since the Fall of Man there has been a need to work for your living by the sweat of your brow; that is, energy needs to be expended to live, where-as for Adam and Eve in the garden they simply picked the fruit and vegetables that were there. (Genesis 3:17-19)
2. We all live with the results of the Fall and "groan" often as we must work to live, but as believers under the power of the Holy Spirit we should be daily turning cursing into blessing by transforming the work we must do into a offering of praise to God. (Romans 8:19-32, 1 Corinthians 10:31)
3. Authority within the work place may be harsh but the believer, if under authority, is to be an example of hard work and diligence so that his work is a witness to all. As a boss or business owner the Christian is to be a just and fair owner from whom the workers learn of God's grace and mercy. (Ephesians 6:5-9, Colossians 3:22 – 4:1, 1 Timothy 6:1-8)
4. All Christians who can should be working for their living. If they are unable to work they will be able to do something for the Lord, and such service should be supported by the church. Even Paul who ministered nearly full time, was a tent maker by day and a preacher and Bible teacher by night. He sets an example to all that work is not to be run from but rather is an opportunity for ministry, witness and evangelism. (1 Corinthians 9:18, 1 Thessalonians 4:11, 12, 2 Thessalonians 3: 6-12)
5. Paying the pastor is legitimate when he is doing the work full time and is unable to support himself. Such payment should always be ample, according to his needs, following the principle of the oxen treading out the grain; it ate whatever it needed to keep doing the job (1 Corinthians 9:6-14, Galatians 6:6, Romans 15:27, Deuteronomy 25:4, 1 Timothy 5 : 17, 18)
6. The principle behind all the work we do is summed up in Colossians 3:23. All service is to be looked upon as service to the Lord.

**LECTURE 35 - WORLD MISSIONS**

Shelley chapter 38 – pages 390ff

**AMERICA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY**

**Matthew 28:16-20, Philipians 1:12-18.**

There was a great spread of world missions from many denominations after the Wesleyan revival. It was however a denominational rather than a biblical type of mission. In the oldest, apostolic times the concept was for individual churches sending out missionaries and taking personal responsibility for them. This began again in the American Colonies with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel [SPG] in 1701, by devout Anglican Churchmen shocked at the prevalence of Presbyterianism and vice, in the American colonies. It was a revival mission and was the first since the early church.

There were two lines connecting missions:- There was a post Millennial view and it considered that if the people could get out they would be able to convert the world so that when the total job was done, the Lord would come back. This was the view of Jonathan Edwards. Another was evangelical, with the pre millennial concept, where simple obedience to the Great Commission was the motivating factor. The old Puritans, who previously had led the way, had hardened their hearts against mission work, being satisfied in their own family groups, and were not evangelizing.

In America the new evangelism led to the establishment of several universities, those of Princeton, Yale and Harvard as training colleges for missionaries to go out to the Indians. In Britain there was a growth in the desire to evangelize the world amongst the people touched by the waves of the Spirit and slowly the right people emerged to establish the work.

**Philippians 1:12-18** - This gives Paul's prayer and motivation regarding evangelism. Many of the motivations of the powerful men in some denominations for missions in this period however were suspect. The colonial powers had often political agendas, but the Lord still honoured his Word, and wherever it was preached it brought results. Paul in Philippians said that he was pleased that Christ was being preached. Even though the motivation may not have been 100% pure the Lord in His grace used them all mightily in spreading his Word. God doesn't need perfect people, He just wants us to spread the full gospel message and let the Holy Spirit move through it!



God continues to use unlikely people today, as at all times. We are not perfect but God uses us all. You need to devote yourself to Him. The Moravians were leaders in this area to such an extent that some even sold themselves into slavery to give the gospel. God doesn't need our head to be 100% correct in doctrine, but does need our heart 100% for Him.

#### WILLIAM CAREY

The really powerful missionary challenge came through the work of William Carey the cobbler [1761-1834]. He was converted in 1779, baptised in 1783 and in 1786 started pastoring, supporting himself through teaching and shoemaking. Note that the men who are used mightily in church history are prepared to pay their own way. They become spiritual millionaires but very few of them were rich materially, but those who were also devoted themselves to the use of their wealth as the Lord's bounty to be used for his work. Fruit = family! **Matthew 7:13-23** always applies.

Carey was a pastor of an important church in 1789 and two years later he published a book on world wide evangelism. In 1792 the Baptist Missionary Society was founded by Carey and a few friends who had a burden to take the gospel to the lost. Both the called and prepared missionaries and their business partners who financially supported them were obedient to their separate paths in the Plan of God, and there was blessing as each found their part to play. They prayed for the Lord to lead them to the right man to start this, and had to give up their leader!

He sailed to India in 1794 to become the foreman in an Indigo factory in Bengal. He worked for three months a year to pay his way, and studied the languages. In 1799 he was joined by two other Baptists and for the next 25 years encouraged the spread of mission stations. He learnt many languages and personally supervised the translation of six complete and many partial translations of the Bible into the Indian dialects. He established an agricultural society, studied botany, and opposed the evil practices of Hindu culture such as suttee/sati, or the burning of widows.

He encouraged the Indian converts themselves to take out the gospel. He was a prepared man. It was 20 years from his conversion to the greatest production in his life. He remains a great example of reaching another culture using knowledge of their language and customs, and then empowering the local people to reach other local people.

Calvinism was, at this time, the death of evangelical missions. Here there was a rejection of Calvinism and a need seen to comply with the Great Commission. Like these men we need to test our practices in our churches to see if they comply with those first given by the apostles - Jude 3.

He went back to the Scriptures and examined them in the Greek and in the Latin, he was a student. He wanted to understand the culture/language. Every one of the Reformers and Revivalists went back to the original language of the New Testament and studied in a Holy Spirit empowered way. From this the power of the Scriptures were revealed.

Many modern Bible Colleges do not have a language department any longer. The KJV only group says that if you getting to the original languages you get into liberalism. This is seen in history to be absolutely false, as all the reformers, and people like Carey, Wesley, all went into the original languages. The original languages do not make liberals, lack of thorough biblical study in the power of the Holy Spirit makes fools of all who are lazy or devious – one branch = liberals.

Carey and his companions also got to know the Hindu customs and thought patterns. They prayed and thought about how to get the gospel through to them without any ambiguity or danger of a cultic viewpoint emerging. They were committed and thorough in their preparation. You do not go and immediately give the gospel. To a different people you may need to give it totally differently. These people spent years preparing. Cross cultural evangelism still requires this dedication to the people you wish to reach. Many of these great missionaries were part time "tent makers" as Paul was also. All of them quickly indigenized the mission also, ensuring it was led by locals asap.

Carey was opposed by the British Government, who were concerned that the Hindus would be stirred up by them, and think they were equal with Englishmen. He was forced to move to Serampore which was under the Danish flag. This man was not put off by Government opposition, or corrupt, carnal, or inefficient fellow workers, nor by fires.....

#### OTHER MISSIONS

Both Edwards the Calvinist, and Wesley the Arminian, stressed the need for the Christian to get out and preach the gospel. However the Calvinistic missions were slow off the ground due to their theological stand and it's impact amongst the church membership.

**Zechariah 4:6 – 10.** We may be involved in a very small movement; a small church or Bible College. From small things, God by his might and power is able to make the great things come. Small beginnings are always God's way. If you are starting a church you need to allow at least three years of tent making before it can support you so you can study and teach up to 12 hours a day. If ten wage earners give biblically you ought to have enough to work full time.

**Acts 13:1-5** showed a very small start, three men start out into what is now Turkey and Cyprus. God called those men to go out. They went out in prayer and fasting, there was a commitment for the church to back them up. You do not go out as a solo act. If the Lord does not lead the church to set you apart your call is probably emotional and not true. As a church you send people out with prayer and fasting. This is the "normal" start to things that are of the Lord. In this case there was a little prayer meeting in a small church in Syria. If God is in it, it will grow.

This new move came from the Baptist and Anglican Church, but these were ordinary people establishing each society. They collected a penny a week to send out missionaries. It made them aware of faith promise giving. There was a requirement to both pray and give if you were going to be in the society.

Many things are done in fellowships today that were not widely publicized. There was publication of what the Lord was doing to like minded people, but money was not specifically asked for, they simply invited those the Lord moved upon to support them. These societies grew and sent out people throughout the world; they were open to all, and transparent in their book keeping, and shunned any hint of cultic type money raising practices, so should we.

In 1799 the Wesleyan movement quickly formed the Methodist Missionary Society. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland followed sending men, couples, and later women alone, out throughout the world telling them that the answer to problems is the Lord Jesus Christ.

Many of the people that went out suffered and died as martyrs. Robert Bruce an Irish missionary to Persia said that he was, "not reaping the harvest and was hardly sowing the seed but I am gathering up the stones". This is all in sad contrast with some of the international evangelical jet set today who are burning up the Lord's money but not communicating the gospel. Contrast the "Evangelical Conferences" of today and the real missions of these people. They are not seeking prayer, but seek money. These early people got support because they earned it as they were committed to God's work, so should we.

#### HUDSON TAYLOR

Hudson Taylor was the founder of Chinese missions who went to China in 1850. He was a trained doctor from a Brethren Baptist background and established the China Inland Mission in 1865, which was a faith mission. He was concerned to bring the gospel to every un-evangelized province of the Chinese Empire. Anxious not to divert funds from others, he decided never to appeal for funds, by operate in a similar way to George Muller. We need to be like these two men; ask people to join in the work of the mission, but never to ask for money.

The danger is, if you ask people for money you will not get the right people, you need to ask God to raise up His support people and provide the funds to do the work that He wants done and stop you from doing your things, by ensuring there are funds for His work alone. We need to read the life stories of those like Hudson Taylor and George Muller. They gave themselves to God alone, and never trusted in people or marketing systems, and He gave them back great blessing.

Hudson Taylor accepted people with no formal training and made them wear the same dress and eat as the local people. They had to meet the people where they were, and were not to be an exporter of imperialism in any way.

David Livingstone was another person of this type who went out serving the London Missionary Society. He said, "I place no value on anything I have or may possess, except in relation to the kingdom of Christ. If anything will advance the interests of the kingdom, it shall be given away or kept, only as buy giving or keeping it I shall promote the glory of him I owe all my hopes in time or eternity". This man walked over Africa giving the gospel as he went.

In addition the Bible Societies were formed in the wake of the Missionary Societies. Many got the Bible through into places where missionaries could not go. By 1906 there were over 5000 branches of the Bible Society around the world producing 207 million Bibles to be scattered around the world. This had a great impact that was visible, but an eternal impact we will only see in heaven. Today they are printed in China!!!

In many areas the conversion of a person meant that they lost their culture and their connections to their past. It is very important to accept, that if you are in a society which is anti Christian, you may have to pull back from your culture, and you may become a social outcast, just as the early Christians were.

Remember, the early believers were murdered in the arenas for being "enemies of the human race". If you water down your faith so that the pagans can accept your gospel you have probably left the true faith. This is particularly important where native religions are being pushed officially. We may be called culturally insensitive by saying that Jesus is the only way but, the message of Acts 4:12 must be emphasized.

#### DOCTRINE

##### MISSIONS

1. Whilst the words "missionary" or "missions" are not used in the Bible, the spreading of the Gospel by witnessing (Acts 1:8) and evangelists (Ephesians 4:11) is commanded.
2. In the Old Testament the proclamation of God's Word was shown in such passages as (Proverbs 14:25-27; Isaiah 6:8). The word "Hebrew" means one who crosses the river and indicates proclaiming the Word of God in another country.

3. Missionary passages in the Old Testament include (Joshua 2:16,19; 2 Kings 5:2-4; Jonah 1:2; 3:2; Psalm 96).
4. Believers are called to preach the gospel everywhere (Matthew 28:19,20; Acts 1:8).
5. Believers are ambassadors of Christ (Romans 1:14-16; Ephesians 6:20; 2 Corinthians 5:20).
6. Believers are assured of Christ's presence (Matthew 28:19,20; Hebrews 13:5).
7. Missionaries are:
  - a) Put in trust with the gospel (1 Thessalonians 2:4).
  - b) Sent forth (John 17:18).
  - c) Through open doors (1 Corinthians 16:9).
  - d) To foreign lands (2 Corinthians 10:16).
  - e) To preach the gospel (Acts 10:42-43).
  - f) To use every means possible (1 Corinthians 9:16,22).
  - g) Helped by prayer (2 Corinthians 1:11).
  - h) Supported by churches (1 Corinthians 16:1,2).
  - i) Workers with God (2 Corinthians 6:1).
8. A local church receives blessing by active and generous support of missions (Philippians 4:15-18).

Refer to the EBCWA Book 270 – “Fruit of the Great Awakening” – to follow up these lectures, as well as all the texts in the “Post Graduate File” of the Diploma Course on the CD/USB.

## **LECTURE 36 - THE RISE OF AMERICA**

### **INTRODUCTION**

America in the eighteenth through nineteenth century had been spiritually re-born in the Great Awakening of the 1720-1760's and the subsequent War of Independence. The universities of Princeton, Harvard, Yale and others were founded to train people to go as missionaries as they headed out and developed the West.

The American Constitution was formulated by people influenced by the spiritual changes, including some unbelievers who nevertheless saw the advantages of Biblical concepts and teaching on the population. The believers took seriously the command of the Lord to evangelize - **Matthew 5:13-16, 28:18-20**.

They wanted to shine the light of the gospel to the west of the settled east coast. Whilst many moved west from the east coast motivated by money and material advantage there were many who wanted to claim these areas for the Lord Jesus Christ. Shelley Chapter 39, pages 400ff.

### **LYMAN BEECHER**

1835 Lyman Beecher, the well-known Presbyterian and Congregational minister in New England, preached a sermon from the text, **Isaiah 66:8**, and he called it, “A Plea for the West”. He is the one who used first the famous phrase, “Go West young man!” He preached and he printed his cry for all to read and meditate upon.

Beecher believed firmly that a vast new empire was opening in the American wilderness. Nothing less than a whole culture and nation was at stake – would it be spiritual or carnal? Christians should seize the opportunity, he said, and shape the “religious and political destiny of the nation”. And how did he propose to do that? He called for the preaching of the gospel, the distribution of Bibles, the planting of churches, the establishing of schools, and the reform of American morals. Puritan that he was, Beecher knew that a free society needed just laws, and in a democracy just laws required popular support informed by Christianity, and it began with the conversion of the Native Americans.

He could see how they must send Bibles to the new lands, so that they did not have to send rifles later. This is an attitude which has not been common in churches in history. If we send Bibles and missionaries into places and saturate

the country with Christ it will preclude the need to send in troops later. What if we had sent a thousand missionaries into Indo China in the 1920's and 1930's? Very likely the Vietnam War probably would not have occurred. Biblical Christianity makes people free spiritually and makes them hunger after personal freedom as well.

Beecher was at the forefront of giving practical help in both spiritual and social areas and saw that one should complement the other. He saw that if you sow spiritual seeds you will reap a political as well as spiritual harvest to form a holy nation and a wonderful society.

After the Revolutionary War so many Americans poured into the Louisiana territory that the whole continent seemed to tilt toward the Pacific. Between 1792 and 1821, nine new states were added to the original thirteen. By 1850 half of the American people were west of the Appalachians.

Sadly Lyman Beecher's vision was not met by the Believers. It was in the end a violent shift in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries towards the West. Between the rough tasks of fighting, and sadly expelling the Indians, and subduing the wilderness, the frontiersman gained a reputation for wild and lawless living. This barbarian/pagan manner never failed to shock the occasional European who ventured beyond the mountains. There was conflict between the believers like David Brainerd, trying to win the Indians to the Lord, and those who just wanted them driven west or killed.

One English visitor found that the, "backwoodsmen fight for the most trifling provocations. Their hands, teeth, knees, head and feet are their weapons, not only boxing with their fists, but also tearing, kicking, scratching, biting, gouging each others' eyes out by a dexterous use of a thumb and finger, and doing their utmost to kill each other. . . ."

At the birth of the United States of America, the denominations seemed ill prepared to face the opportunities of the West. Christian influence was at an all time low even one generation on from the Great Awakening. Only five or ten percent of the American people were church members in the new areas. In time, however, the crude, turbulent, and godless society of the West was tamed and more than any other single force it was evangelical Christianity that did it.

At the time of Jonathan Edwards many frontiersmen went out and undermined the Christian message by their treatment of the Indians, and the power of the alcohol industry of the time, but the church rose to the challenge.

William Carey and other English evangelicals had designed the voluntary society to carry the gospel to India and to fight the slave trade in the West Indies. American evangelicals seized that idea for their own purposes in the early 1800s. It seemed to be the perfect instrument for the free society in America: to exert influence upon public opinion, to provide support for far-reaching missionary and educational activities, and to spread reform ideals in the youthful nation. The voluntary societies allowed Christians from the various denominations to unite in some matter of common concern, temperance, for example, or the observance of the Sabbath.

The early Christians pressed for temperance, as drunkenness was a real problem in the west. They also emphasized Sunday observance. We do not see Sabbath observance as so important today. It was an attack on the lawless west of the time where Sunday was a day of drunkenness. The Christians said that the Lord's Day was a day of temperance and hearing the preaching of the good news, which will not only liberate you from the sin of drunkenness, but the lawless behaviour that goes with it. Temperance is forever associated with failed "Prohibition" but see the heart it came from.

While you had crusades opposing the evils of the day, you also had the "new" forms for religion, with the advent of the Mormons, Seventh Day Adventists, which in those days had many errors, also the Masons and Spiritualists. Through this period the American Bible Society was formed as were a number of others that encouraged the spread of the good news to counter the new cults. Also, as in Britain, the mood turned slowly against slavery.

Charles Finney was one of the greatest evangelical forces against slavery, this feeling being particularly strong around Oberlin College where he was president. Lyman Beecher's daughter Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote her famous book, "Uncle Tom's Cabin", based on teaching from one of Finney's associates.

## THE CIVIL WAR

In the 1860's the great evil of the American Civil War occurred with huge loss in life. The result of the war was not all good for the Negro slaves who were freed either. They had technical freedom, but it was all too often freedom to be exploited in the factories of the North, or be murdered in the south where lynching and segregation were common and even preached from pulpits until the 1980s. Both the Civil War armies contained many great believers but the whole thing was a great evil.

One great believer was Stonewall Jackson, a general of the Southern Army, who used to take Sunday off to teach his slaves to read from the Scriptures. Many Christians fought with the south against the north because they felt that the north was interfering with the south. Many of the people in the south treated the slaves very well and expected them to be free in a few years, but wanted there to be a transition time to ensure chaos did not create greater evils than slavery.

After the Civil War most of the great southern plantations were broken up, and many slaves starved to death because they were not looked after, many others were abused by the northern carpetbaggers who exploited the south in the following years. Many ex slaves who were given land were swindled out of it and forced then to become serfs on their

own land. Within twenty years the blacks who stayed in the south were serfs on land owned by banks or big corporations in the north, or the south. Satan has a field day whenever hatred/arrogance/war gets into the hearts of foolish men.

There were, in spite of the evils that followed the war, great revivals through this time, especially in what we would now call the Pentecostal area. The black Americans had their own churches where spirit gifted men and women were "called" to preach and where the word and the message of salvation were kept alive through the slave days and into the days of exploitation and separatism that followed.

"In great contests," Abraham Lincoln once said, "each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both may be, and one must be wrong." Another time in his second Inaugural Address, he observed: "Both (Union and Confederacy) read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes his aid against the other. The prayers of both could not be answered. The Almighty has his own purposes." Lincoln knew that men should try to do God's will as well as they could determine what it was for them, but the Almighty has his purposes that go beyond the plans of men.

Due to the Civil War the flower of manhood in the south and the north of America were decimated and many of the people who would have assisted the Black slaves in setting up Bible colleges so that they could go and evangelize their own were not there; they are dead on a dozen battlefields. Many people who had supported abolition of slavery turned away from the ex-slaves after the War, and ignored the problem. It was a satanic victory, as most wars are.

The Klu Klux Klan was formed to keep the "Negroes" under control in the south rather than evangelizing them. At the same time the Americans started killing Indians again rather than trying to evangelize them, thus in the south and west a great evangelical opportunity was lost. There is still a legacy of hatred from the Civil War and its aftermath, and one of these is the rise of the Black Moslem movement, that is anti-Christian precisely for this reason. We need to learn these lessons of history that we never advance the gospel with the sword or the gun, nor by ignoring the real problems of any people group. You advance amongst peoples with the Word of God lifted up, and the gospel proclaimed with saturation of prayer.

#### MOODY AND SANKEY

D.L.Moody [1837-1899] was the most notable evangelist of his age through the Civil War period and beyond. He combined with Ira Sankey (1840-1908) the hymn writer, singer and musician. The evangelists had to have good voices as they preached to thousands without the aid of broadcast facilities, and did so successfully. As revival spread the churches split with those in the revival splitting from those who did not want to be involved, with new, vibrant evangelical independent churches being established in the big cities.

The Lord said that he has come to divide not always bring people together; he still carries the sword today, but we must be careful to let the Lord sort out the sheep and goats, not take the job over ourselves. The Southern Baptist Convention was established as an evangelical wing of the Baptists with the Northern Baptists quickly becoming liberal.

Whilst there were new sects formed such as the Seventh Day Adventists, and the Mormons, there were also groups such as the YMCA, Bible Colleges, and associations for the betterment of slum dwellers. There was a great growth of liberalism also by the late 1800's, in every college influenced by German Theology. The social gospel emerged emphasizing love and universalism, as the evil alternative to spiritually transformed people assisting their fellows. Here divine love is superimposed over divine righteousness, but their impact was limited in all places except the seminaries.

Many of the liberals that got into the seminaries at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century have descendants there producing liberal ministers even through to today, but Moody's answer was to establish the Bible College Movement, to train godly men and women for ministry to counter the theological liberalism of the older seminaries. Moody saw that once a College goes liberal you cannot recover it, but you can replace it! You leave the liberals with their "officially recognized" but pastorally useless degree courses, and produce bible believing pastors, who believing churches will embrace.

#### DOCTRINE

##### **EVANGELISM – NEW TESTAMENT PATTERN**

1. The pastor of the local church must practice a Bible saturated, Holy Spirit controlled life. By his systematic teaching of the Word he must encourage people to apply it in their life. The vessels that the Lord uses must be clean. Acts is the guidance book for church growth and powerful prayer.
2. You must have a co-ordinated prayer life in place in the weekly routine of the Church. This consists of the mid week prayer meeting and organising your prayer warriors. You need specific weekly prayer request sheets.
3. You need to have weekly meetings with your deacons and elders to heed quickly the Holy Spirit's real strategies for the church. You need to have that for your "prayer warriors' action plan" for the week. It is good to have this on Sunday morning over breakfast, before an adult Bible study for your Sunday school teaching staff, so that the prayer points can be noted down and duplicated by the pastor for the morning service. This gives current

material. You plan your visitations, your speakers and how it can be co-ordinated in with the overall preaching plan. There also needs to be a home fellowship strategy and a strategy for the Bible class and Sunday School.

4. In the preaching everything must tie into the evangelistic, witness function of the church. The pastor must emphasize that all members are ambassadors and evangelists.
5. The minister encourages the people to find the fish. Every week they should be reminded of their work in this area.
6. Every believer should have their own list of people who he is praying constantly for. Each should have a list of unbelievers to pray for, and as one is converted a new name should be placed on the list.
7. The church contacts should always be followed up as part of the evangelism strategy. This is the importance of a Pre-school, Sunday School and Bible Class work. The Sunday School should be well known in the local area. The unbelieving parents who send their children to Sunday School should be followed up by the minister to show friendliness towards them. You may be their only Christian contact.
8. There needs to be a church service follow up. Every visitor should be made to feel welcome but not embarrassed. Never ask visitors to stand up. After the service have a coffee time and a special room/tables set aside for visitors. It is an advantage to have a service which finishes a bit earlier. The minister follows up the visitors and lets an elder go on the door.
9. Organise visitation and be visible with walking through districts and greeting those you meet. This is far better than driving and parking. The morning should be in the study. Have a meal at home to have time with your wife or family, after lunch visitation. With walking you get exercise and are away from the phone. Plan to visit three or four locations only. Drive to a central location and walk. If you are seen on the street people get to know. You have raised the profile of the church. You are swimming in the sea with the fish. Sit down with street kids, help an old lady. The church needs to draw on the local area. You need to be decently dressed but not necessarily in a suit and tie. What culturally gives the message that you are professional, serious, and the man or woman of God?
10. Work with other churches that value the Word and heed the Holy Spirit. Other churches are the fellow Battalions of the Lord's Army, not the enemy!

## **LECTURE 37 - EVOLUTION AND LIBERALISM**

### **INTRODUCTION**

It was the theory of evolution that formed the philosophical basis for the real expansion of liberalism in the late 19th century. We need to look at the Biblical basis of creation, and the nature of the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

**Jude 3, 4, 2 Peter 2:1-3, 3:1-7** - these speak to our subject, for we live in a day of scoffers. Satan has got his people even inside the church to do this, but they do not have a case – and like Bishop Butler we need to take no nonsense from the enemy's people.

These people do not believe that Jesus is God become man, nor do they believe in his unique work to defeat sin and death, nor that he is coming again. They reject the Flood in the past, and mock the very thought of a day of judgment to come. These things need to be studied carefully so that we recognize that these important biblical subjects need to be known and defended. Solomon said that there is nothing new under the sun. With heresies this is indeed true.

In the last 100 years many people have entered the church for power and influence, not because of conversion, and have brought into the church the science and preferred philosophy of their day. They have their thoughts change the Word of God rather than the Word of God change their thoughts. With hindsight we can now see how foolish these men/women were, but the work of assault upon the truth of God's Word continues today.

Over the last hundred years the form and structure of the theories of science that they used to make changes to the Bible have now changed themselves! They should have stuck with the Bible and would have found that science will come back on track with it! Just in 2015 the background radiation from the "big bang" was discovered, proving a "moment of creation", the moment when space and time begin! Very embarrassing for the "eternal universe" God hating people!

Often the theologians in a university feel themselves to be second class citizens so they tend to want to compromise with the philosophy and the science departments. Christians should not feel second class – we have the only words that will give them gift of eternal life and we must seek good ways to challenge them to think about their pre-suppositions.

We should train to tackle all issues and not meet the world half way. We have God's Word and must not water it down. Jude tells us that we must not compromise on the essentials. Peter and Paul however warn us sadly that in these last days many will. **1 Timothy 4:1-5, 2 Timothy 3:1-5, 4:1-5.**

Unsaved people want to think they are improving and that God will “wink” at their short comings, and that Jesus doesn't need to be their Saviour, just a “mate”. It is the full confrontation with the truth that the Cross was essential and is crucial that must be communicated. The impact of Darwin's theory is confronted here – does mankind need a Saviour, or are we on a path to perfection? People have always had to choose the theory of the “great accident”, the “fortunate experiment by nature”, or the inner workings of a Creator God to whom they are accountable. They just don't like the last option!

Post-Darwin all now have a choice. Prior to this there were the Deists who were unbelievers in a gospel message, but they did not eliminate God, just removed him from daily life. By Darwin's work the educated and determined unbelievers had a chance to worship nature itself, or God. The Christian message is that God is involved with this world and with man. It is sin to ignore God, and unforgiveable to ignore what Jesus did and who he is. Here you have a real clash. Rebellion is not new but the form that rebellion took was new.

#### GERMAN PHILOSOPHERS

Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804) believed in God and with Rousseau said that if God did not exist you would need to invent God, but then Kant ruined it all by saying, you could not really talk about God, because man was limited to concepts of time and space. He identified, quite correctly that these are the “bounds of sense” for our language, and that we, and our words, are limited. This provided the opportunity however for the unbelievers/make-believers to reject the Bible, and water down it's language, or obscure it's message. He does raise the “category mistake” issue helpfully here however.

Many, following this road stopped talking about God because they said they could not do so intelligently for he was in a category of existence beyond our own – “God was “other”....”. This was foolishness, for mankind had been talking intelligently about their creator for thousands of years, and the Bible was God's Word to mankind! The theological colleges of Germany by the 1780s started to attack the Bible itself as fatally unreliable, and probably the result of natural philosophical processes, rather than revelation. If you had revelation you had a God you had to respond to, but if you had the great architect, the unknowable creator, then you might just have a bible that was as flawed as man's talk about God is bound to be.....

Once you have gone along this liberal road from Kant you have gone into their camp. You move into the concept of not thinking about God, or expected books to contain any real information about God, but thinking just of the example of the man Jesus. You stop talking about salvation, and position in Christ, and God the Holy Spirit, and simply stress morals and living good, and that in the after life, “in whatever form that takes”, we will be rewarded for the good we have done. You have limited “God talk”, and quite quickly no genuine gospel is left at all.

The Bible is full of the revelation of the Character of God, and it is the written revelation of God to man. When you stop talking about God you have eliminated **John 16:9**. When you no longer talk about the Character of God, you no longer talk about the danger of your own self righteousness. You no longer see yourself as God sees you, and start seeing yourself as others see you, and you have then a relative rather than an absolute standard that is required. Kant's great humility becomes over time humanistic arrogance, through it's rejection of biblical special revelation.

The Bible stands on the basis that the standard of God is vital and that the standard that is required is the righteousness of Christ. Morality is meaningless unless it is grounded in the character of God revealed in the God-Man Jesus Christ. In addition, the very human works that the liberal stresses becomes the basis of judgment rather than rewards at the Last Judgment. There is no Saviour, no Gospel, no message of grace here. This is not Christianity; this has become a not so subtle apostasy. It became the standard teaching of the German seminaries and infiltrated into the UK and America.

Hegel (1771 – 1831) was the founder of the philosophy behind Communism, Existentialism and Nazism. He reacted to Kant's message, and building upon it went far further, to bring all discussion of things down to how you experience things. The whole world he said was the expression of a universal spirit, but our discussion of this reality was both limited and only coherent when discussed from the basis of empiricism. He also believed in the eastern concept that God is being itself; the world is the manifestation of God. This is not the Christian concept of God, it is the eastern concept that was foundational in Hinduism, and quickly becomes the atheism of Buddhism. It is finally the “Star Wars Theology”, the force being with you. Hegel starts the philosophy behind the so called, “New Age Movement”. The New Age is a combination of philosophy and eastern religion. The concepts of Hegel form the basis of the religious thoughts of the atheists and agnostics of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Nietzsche [1844-1900] enters the scene, and he had the concept that God, as men had spoken of him before his day, is dead. He died insane as have many who have followed him. Many philosophers have an “I complex” saying that what is real to me is real, what is not is not. Reality is only me, they argue. This is the philosophy that dominated the twentieth century, and is called existentialism. If you eliminate God you eliminate purpose and meaning outside of yourself. He said that what God calls good, should be considered bad. You need to be tough, hard and ruthless. When you are gone everything is finished so you need to make your impact now. This is Satan's lie, but it proved very powerful in the twentieth century and led to the deaths of more than 100 million people in world wars.

Feuerbach [1804-1872] was a student of Hegel and talked about the spirit of nature itself, and believed that religion is a waste of time. He indicated that people should worship nature, the essential spirit behind the universe. Feuerbach said that he was an anti deist, but his philosophy has led to the "spiritual movement" of philosophy whereby people reject "religion" for an existential spiritual experience. It is the basis for the talk of "nature" in reverent tones, and evolutionary forces being personified as if they are god like.

#### CHARLES DARWIN

Charles Darwin graduated from Cambridge University on the road to becoming an Anglican vicar. Only 1 in 8 Anglicans were evangelical in the 1830's. "The Ascent of Man" which he wrote in 1871 followed his other famous book, "The Origin of Species", which he had written 12 years earlier, and had delayed publishing. He believed that the ancestor of man was a monkey/ape like animal not a monkey itself. Apes and man had a common ancestor and not that man was evolved from the ape. This view is still held by many, as it eliminates the story of the Garden of Eden, the "Fall" and our sin-problem, and once this is gone you don't need a Saviour!

There is nothing really scientific in the theory of evolution, and in fact it is not a very good theory. It is no better than any other theory, and is more like a religion amongst its followers. Shelley was probably a theist evolutionist, so be careful of his words through this section (Chapter 40ff). This issue is an important one. If Man was not created you cannot have a fall, you cannot have a sin problem, just an issue of good or bad choices, and so you do not need a Saviour, and therefore the death of the Lord Jesus Christ is meaningless or tragic, the resurrection is superfluous, and the second advent of no consequence. The theory of Evolution is a major blow at the heart of the gospel.

#### KARL MARX

Marx [1818-1883] was born of Jewish parents who converted to Lutheranism, but of a liberal deist form. They did not know the reforming power of the gospel, but only knew religion. He was influenced by both Hegel and Feuerbach. He said that there is nothing in the history of man except history itself; and history teaches evolutionary struggle, with the survival of the fittest, which he moved from the individuals to social classes as well. He said, on that basis, that it is a struggle from the beginning between classes, and if the working class, on whom production relies, could become better organised than their masters, then they could take over and run the country. He mixed evolution and politics and the social system and created a new political/religious force that went on in the twentieth century to create it's own aristocracy. He was a personally immoral and filthy man, who did not work to support his own family, who suffered.

It is of interest that the communists and fascists were the ones who were able to work much more in genetic engineering than the west. There were no limits to what they would do because of their concept of man being an animal. Marx was certainly "worse than an animal" in his personal behaviours! Experiments can be undertaken legitimately on humans, for they are things, and Marx certainly lived his theory. Evolution is used to move man forward and to control the march of history by making man better. It is man not God on the throne of history itself, as far as that theory is concerned. We see this being applied in medicine now world wide. There is a dangerous decline in ethics! This is the harvest of this powerful theory of origins.

The nineteenth century was however the time of the second great awakening. While the philosophers were arguing in the great universities, people like Spurgeon, Moody, Sankey, Billy Sunday were preaching the gospel and millions were still being saved in spite of what these evil philosophers were saying. In their life times the new godless philosophers influenced few, but they educated the teachers of succeeding generations and slowly changed the beliefs of the children who were no longer exposed to the churches. The Sunday School movement opposed error and biblical Christianity continues to do so in it's battles against secularization of education.

As the universities were becoming more liberal, Bible colleges were being founded. The next attack on the gospel came from the liberal theologians in the German universities; brought up on Hegel and the others, they reinterpreted the Bible their own way eliminating all the miraculous, as they argued it was not empirical nor rational to believe in miracles. They ignored miracles, refusing to accept any evidence that would overturn their theory.

#### LIBERALISM

Schleiermacher [1768-1834] was the first of these liberal theologians – yet He came from a Moravian Pietist background. He came up with the concept that the heart of religion is feeling, not rational proof. You contact God by your feeling of dependence. You need to feel the need for relationship with the creator. If you combine this thought with Hegel you get a world spirit, and a total undermining of historical faith. Philosophy determined the approach to scripture rather than the Word simply being opened and preached. Hegel applied to theology "corrected" Paul, Peter, John and eliminated Jesus!

The liberals over the last 200 years have all believed in God as the spirit behind the universe, that the universe is an expression of God, and that the living faith of the Christ idea, is the Christ that lives in your heart, with the Jesus of faith being the essence of Christianity. They are not interested in what happened in Palestine 2000 years ago.

This is the mind shift that the modern liberal brings into the present church. They say that the bones of Jesus are still somewhere in Palestine. This, they will tell you, does not affect your faith, as Jesus rose in your hearts, he is alive in you and that is all that matters. It does not matter that he is still in Palestine and is dead. His ideas, the Christ reality,



live on in you. They call the New Testament, "Scripture myths" – stories that transform lives irrespective of their historicity.

In this concept, your religion is what you feel is your religion, and by cutting the mooring rope of history you are in liberalism. This great evil was the main threat of the twentieth, and possibly still will be for the twenty first century, for its message can unite the careless Christian with the Hindu, or Moslem, who can accept the same views. Liberalism is the dodgy cement for religious world unity - with this theology, with power, emotionalism, ritual and social acceptance, I believe we see the Anti-Christ's message and theology.

A well spoken liberal will give you a good Easter message. She/He does not believe that Jesus Christ rose from the dead. They will see God as the spirit behind the universe as is portrayed in Star Wars in the phrase, "the force be with you". They talk about Christ but Satan is on the throne of their hearts, but they reject the very thought of a devil. There is no real relationship with God here. **Matthew 7:13-23 applies.** They talk about love, and they believe that there is no judgment, and that all religions are right – its sincerity that matters – they ignore the fact that you can be sincerely and fatally wrong about things that matter for your survival – and this matters eternally.

The fight back, against liberalism and its attacks on the historical facts of Christianity started with Professor Sir William Ramsey from Scotland, who decided to go to the Middle East to prove once and for all that the Bible **was false**. What he found was that the Bible was true; that it was very good history, especially the work of Luke, and he published a number of books showing that what he had found backed up the Scriptures.

Others who led the counter attack were the Cambridge linguistic scholars Westcott, Hort and Bishop Lightfoot. Westcott wrote a book on John's letters. They fought and beat the liberals in the Anglican Church at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century into the 20<sup>th</sup>. In addition you had Moody and Sankey, and the tent mission revivals of the Keswick movement. So the fight back against liberalism came from both the biblical scholars and the evangelists.

Systematic theologies were written. C.I Scofield produced a study Bible and founded Dallas Theological Seminary with L.S. Chafer, who had a proven record as an evangelist, as its first president and Systematic Theologian.

The battle is tougher today than it was earlier in the twentieth century. We are responsible for those who are being led astray by liberals; our job is to ensure we teach the "whole Word to the whole world" so that they might be without excuse. When people have heard the truth they will not listen to nonsense, and they will spot the false before it pollutes the church.

## **DOCTRINE**

### **SCIENCE AND CREATION**

1. The following are brief comments which support the creationist view of life and confirm the Biblical statements on science. Science supports creation rather than the theory of evolution.

2. Genesis 1 and 2 tell the correct sequence of created matter and life.

3. Atmosphere

a) Carbon 14. Scientists say that the production of Carbon 14 should reach equilibrium with Carbon 12 when the atmosphere is 40,000 years old. Modern calculations show that Carbon 14 is being produced at 3 1 greater rate than it is decaying. This indicates the atmosphere is less than 10,000 years old. Carbon dating is based on the speed of light which has been found not to be constant but gradually reducing in speed.

b) Helium. Produced by the action of cosmic rays on the atmosphere the amount of helium present in the atmosphere indicates an approximate age of 10,000 years. No atmosphere 10,000 years ago - no life thus fossils and men are contemporaries.

4. Oceans

Cosmic dust enters the atmosphere at 14.3 million tons per annum. If the earth was 4.5 billion years old the earth should have a dust blanket in excess of 100 feet in depth. This doesn't allow for the greater rate of dust deposit which most scientists believe occurred in ancient times. The dust is not evident. This dust has been subject to rain translating the dust from the land via the new system to the oceans.

a) Nickel. Assuming that the oceans were initially of absolutely pure water we would expect a certain amount of nickel deposits in the ocean as though somewhat rare on earth nickel is common in cosmic dust. There should be 950 pounds of nickel per square foot of ocean floor if the earth is 4.5 billion years old. The amount of nickel present in the ocean indicates an age of 9,000 years for the ocean.

b) Uranium and Silicon. Similar readings with uranium and silicon give ocean ages of approximately 10,000 years only.

5. The Earth's Crust

a) Magnetic Field

The magnetic field of the earth has a half life of 1,400 years. This means that 1,400 years ago the magnetic field was twice as strong, 2,800 years ago four times as strong, etc.

By continuing this process back into history by 8000 BC it has been calculated that the magnetic field would be the same as a magnetic star precluding life on the planet. A magnetic star maintains its field by thermo-nuclear reaction.

Projecting forward by 3100 AD the magnetic field decaying at its present rate will collapse causing the Van Allan belt to disintegrate allowing massive radiation of the earth which will end life on this planet. (This excludes divine intervention in the Millennium). The magnetic field is less than 10,000 years old.

b) Earth's Molten Core

The famous scientist Lord Kelvin calculated the heat loss from the molten core of the earth through the earth's crust and showed that the earth was far younger than its estimated 4500 million years. He also estimated the age of the sun as being young.

6. Biology

a) Mules. Mules are formed by crossing horses and donkeys. Whilst male mules are always infertile, occasionally a female mule can produce offspring. By crossing a male horse with the mule a horse will always result. Similarly a male donkey will produce a donkey. Nature will revert back to its own kind.

b) Cereals. Hybrid grains can be grown but are generally infertile. With the recrossing of wheat or oats with the hybrid, wheat or oats are formed, never the hybrid.

7. Geology

a) The Geological Column according to evolutionary theory ranges from Pleistocene in the Age of Mammals to Pre Cambrian of 570 million years or more. There are 15 subdivisions in this column. Nowhere in the world does the geological column exist in its correct order in nature.

b) In the column Trilobites are in the Cambrian period of 500 to 570 million years. In recent years a fossil of a trilobite has been found with a human sandal print superimposed over it showing trilobites and man coexisted on the earth at the same time.

c) In the Paluxy River, Texas, along the river bed are lines of dinosaur foot prints, foot prints of man and children together with giant foot prints 18" long. (Genesis 6:1-6). Giants in the land.

d) In the Appaluchian Mountains from Maine to Georgia are human foot prints in granite.

e) Supposed "missing links" in humanity.

i) Neanderthal Man is now considered to be modern man. The famous French general Lafayette had a perfect Neanderthal skull.

ii) Cro-Magnon Man had a brain capacity of 1450 cc towards the upper limit of human craniums nowadays which range from 900 cc to 1500 cc. Cro-Magnon had a skull exactly like Charles Darwin.

iii) Piltdown Man, found in East Sussex was found to be an elaborate hoax which fooled the scientific community for over 40 years.

iv) Nebraska Man was created from a tooth. The tooth was eventually identified as a pig's tooth.

v) Java Man was constructed from a cranium and jaw found many metres apart in a gravel bed in Java.

8. Astronomy

a) Jupiter and Saturn both give out 21/2 times the heat received from the sun showing they are young bodies.

b) Io, one of the moons of Jupiter, not only has an atmosphere but has active volcanoes.

c) Titan, the largest moon of Saturn also has an atmosphere. This indicated that the moon is less than 10,000 years old.

d) The rings of Saturn are undulating not smooth. By the gravitational pull of Saturn it is estimated that the rings would have smoothed out completely between 10,000 and 100,000 years.

e) Astronomers agree that comets have a life of no more than 10,000 years. Assuming that comets are not being created this shows a solar system of less than 10,000 years.

f) When the first space ships landed on the moon NASA expected that there would be a 28 mile thick layer of dust of the consistency of icing sugar. NASA spent \$1,000 million experimenting for a successful soft landing. When Neil Armstrong stepped on the moon he found the dust on the surface averaged 3" in thickness indicating some 8,000 years in age.

g) Space probes were sent to Mars and Venus to try to find life. Both were unsuccessful.

9. Thermodynamics

a) 1st Law - Energy is neither created nor destroyed. It changes from one state to another - this supports creation.

b) 2nd Law - When changes take place, the structure always becomes less organized, never more complex. Creation confirms this. Evolution is based on the opposite stance of simple systems becoming more organized or complex.

c) This very brief topic shows clearly how science supports the fact of creation rather than the theory of evolution with a likely date of original creation less than 10,000 years ago.

**LECTURE 38 - COMMUNISM AND THE SOCIAL GOSPEL**

INTRODUCTION

Industrialization and urbanization brought with them great evils. There was health, social and moral collapse in the cities of Europe. Crime was endemic and there was a moral decline in the working class people. It caused revolutions in Europe in 1848, but since the later years of the eighteenth century life in the cities and mill towns had been "nasty brutish and short". Working hours and conditions would be a major focus of the revivalists and the Clapham Group.

The cause of the problems, from a biblical perspective, was the Old Sin Natures of the rich who persecuted and exploited the poor, and the Old Sin Nature of the poor who sank into crime and evil instead of looking to God, and who then rebelled against the rich. The Scriptures talk about crime, poverty, and revolution, and provide the only permanent solutions, and they are not "economic arguments", for man is a complex creature. Only the Scriptures had the answer to the social evils, and the answer was given by people like William Booth on the streets, and Spurgeon in the pulpit.

The Lord and the Apostles are always pleading for the oppressed, pointing out that God is on the side of the poor. God never condones crime, abuse, rebellion and revolution as solutions to poverty. There was urban terrorism in the Lord's day as there was in 1820, and is today, and the apostles faced every evil in the cities that we face and more besides, and they met them and changed the world with the real gospel, not with simple economic and social action plans.

Many Christians are in two minds as to whether they should support the terrorist groups in some places, as often they are standing up against a corrupt government, as in South America. This issue has led to so called "liberation theology" which neither liberates from sin, nor is accurate talk about God. Do we get guidance from Sociology or from Scripture? History teaches that few revolutions do anything other than change the group that oppresses and abuses the poor. The Clapham Group's successors went into the nineteenth century with a focus on both increasing the spread of Bible teaching/evangelism, and reform of living and health conditions for the working poor. This overflowed to care for the criminal and prostitute also, especially with the Salvation Army.

The answer to poverty, corruption and crime was and always is in Holy Spirit powered Biblical Evangelism, a spiritual offensive to shame the world by proclaiming God's truth. The concept is to change society by changing spiritual standards, through transformed lives. There are no shortcuts by revolution except the short cut to more hell on earth. Lets look at the key texts on this, as we have now seen much of Church History illustrating ways of dealing with it. The key to assisting with poverty is helping the poor person meet the right person to help them in all aspects of their decision making, and that person is the Lord Jesus Christ. **Matthew 11:4-6, 26:9-11, 1 Corinthians 13:1-3, James 2:1-7.**

At either end of the social strata you have different aspects and expressions of the sinful nature. The Scriptures do not look at the evil of political corruption, or base crimes, and not call them all evil. The conservative view conflicts with the liberal view influenced greatly by Marxism, Hegel and Darwin. The liberals are aligned with Marxism and Evolution and do not believe that the Bible has the answer in and through salvation relationship, nor that Jesus Christ is coming again. To meet the needs of man, the social and political means are followed while the Bible believing conservatives believe that the spiritual approach is the critical one. The Liberals believe that if the social evils are removed everything will be all right, whereas we hear the words of Jesus and the Apostles, and so we know that is false.

The situation with the liberals at the end of the nineteenth century is very similar to what it is now. It honours man and dishonours God and relies more on Marx or economic-sociological theory, than on Jesus Christ. It is built on Darwin rather than Moses and Jesus, and leads to death. It does not improve the lot of the people at the bottom of the social

strata and never has. When the Berlin Wall and Communism in the West collapsed in the 1990s the West had to help the Communists, and in most of the old communist states welfare is still required to assist them.

Godless Humanism and Communism have never historically delivered to the people at the bottom of the heap anything except control and domination that is not efficient in its political police than the evil rich/aristocrats were! The radical Islamic states have also become basket cases very quickly, as evil never delivers anything except more evil!

#### TRANSFORMATION NOT SOCIAL ACTION

In **1 Corinthians 6:9-11** we see a complete church where it is demonstrated that the answer to the age long problems that beset human beings is the transforming power of the Holy Spirit in the life, not social action. Here we see all types of weaknesses displayed from kleptomania to religious sexual abuse of others, and that all their lives have been changed around by the power of God. People ask if even an abusing homosexual who preys on boys can become a wonderful Christian, and the answer is yes, they can by being genuinely born again just as any thief or adulterer. Either we approach this matter from God's perspective, or we do so from the liberal/humanist view. God is in the people transforming business; that is our call, and it is only done in Holy Spirit power!

We live in countries where there is a high degree of evil, and where it is celebrated in the weekly magazines and business journals – “greed is good”, adultery is fine, as long as you are open about it, and the new partner is “the love of your life to date”. We should not try to change the cultural evils from a political activist viewpoint, we should try and challenge it from a spiritual point of view, for only God's power changes determined evil people. As unbelievers wax worse we must stand firm, and preach the only truth that will save them. Turn the light on! **Matthew 5:14-16**. The question is, do we believe in Jesus words and approach as the answer, or do we think we know better?

On the positive side in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century we had C H Spurgeon, D.L.Moody, C.I. Schofield, R.A. Torrey, Billy Sunday and L.S.Chafer. They preached the gospel, and transformed the lives of many, and establish conservative theological training institutions to educate the next generation of bible believing pastor-teachers. The Salvation Army changed lives through regeneration rather than revolution. Skeleton Army members become Salvation Army members – “Recovery Church”....

The Liberals wanted everything to be respectable and acceptable and therefore hated the crusaders for morals. The liberals would prefer to be accepted by pagans, be they local pub attendees, professors, aristocracy or politicians. We do not care as “biblical conservatives” what such politicians of false “Christendom” think. Our only desire is to formulate the truth from the Word of God, and be apostolic, for the Lord's “well done” is all we seek. **Jude 3**.

The liberals thought that they could produce a new world order by being/doing good, but each of us know that we are not by the content of our Old Sin Nature good. They believe that they can eliminate crime by making the world a wonderful environment to live in. However the Garden of Eden, and all of history since, shows clearly that this does not work in reality. There is no meeting point between liberalism and Biblical Christianity. Just turn the light on believer and blow them away if they wont hear truth!

The old class conflict between the aristocrats and the middle class that had raged in Western Europe during the early years of the nineteenth century had ended in the triumph of the bourgeoisie. With their victory had come an economic philosophy called “laissez faire”. The theory held that the social ills of industrialism defied correction by statute, but that if the rich we left to get on with making money, and the poor could be workers and make money also, then all ills would self correct over time. Every individual should be left alone to pursue her/his own interests: then everything was supposed to work out for the happiness of the greatest number, with the riff raff dying on the sidelines as the useless and lazy people they are. It is thoroughly Darwinian and so the pagans cannot really complain about it!

What this laissez faire philosophy always ends up meaning, is the rich and powerful tread down and abuse the poor, and with the Police State and Armed Forces behind them they can kill or imprison, or “treat” the mental illness of the dissident at will. We have seen today in the West the return of economic feudalism with a growing gap between rich and poor. What is our answer to these evils? Will we, like the Clapham group rise up and stand for righteousness, like the Salvation Army move with the gospel hope into the dark corners of the cities, and will we like Moody and Spurgeon light the light of the lighthouse of Bible teaching to draw people in and stabilize them in Spirit and in Biblical Truth?

We can believe in a “free market” as a Christian, but in righteousness, for it has to be genuine so that the person who is poor can rise, and laws must be moral and the weak protected. In the case of total “survival of the fittest”, “laissez faire” the rich become richer and the poor more impoverished. This is continuing to happen in South America and our own nations still, but finally it is irrelevant, for we are not here for social justice, but to give the gospel. We are **not** here to make a better fish pond; we are here to fish for the fish! We stand for righteousness, challenge evil in all its forms, but the majority of our time is spent shining light for people to walk away from sin with!

Adam Smith's book, “The Wealth of Nations”, was the textbook for this economic philosophy, and many have followed him and his modern disciples since. Initially the active can progress but there is a tendency in time for the rich to buy out all who would be efficient and create monopolies again. Behind the rhetoric of the politician there is a legal and political system which allows free competition for those who have millions of dollars, but no freedom except to slave away for low wages for everyone else. See what is occurring and see the deviousness of politics. What is the answer?

While many frustrated people were moving towards revolution, the Clapham group in England were moving towards changes by spiritual and political means. There was a Godly alternative to political action in England, and the option remains open for us all, as we follow our godly ancestors in the faith once delivered to the apostles. The history of UK and France differ solely due to the Holy Spirit led Revivalists and their gospel preaching social activists.

#### THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

In January 1848 Marx published the Communist Manifesto. This was called “scientific socialism”, but it was neither thing. The Manifesto called for an implacable struggle against the bourgeoisie, not just the old aristocracy. It proclaimed the inevitable violent revolution and the triumph of the masses and closed with a stern warning:

“The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that all their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!”

This manifesto has been a powerful force in influencing history throughout this last 170 years, and always for greater evil than it says it seeks to resolve. The church responded to it, and said that the poor were not being looked after, and set up groups and organizations to look after the real spiritual and physical needs of the poor. As part of this they supported the formation of the early labour unions, which were formed as friendly societies by Christians to protect the workers and the workers families from those who would abuse them. Modern socialism was established from the Methodist Movement, and the Labour Party has its roots here, but those roots are Christian not Marxian, and the true Communists hated the socialists more than they hated the old power elites.

#### SOCIAL EVILS

Many of the workers were killed because of the unsafe work practices. If a person was killed in a coal mine their body would be dumped in a wheel barrow and trundled through the streets before being dumped on the new widow's doorstep. If the house was a company house the widow would be told that once she had buried her husband she would have to leave the house. There was no compensation paid to the family. She would receive wages up to the time her husband died and nothing after. If you lived to forty in industrial UK you were an old man. This happened to my own great grandfather, and my godly grandfather had to start work in the Coatbridge Coal mines outside Glasgow, in Scotland, at age twelve, to ensure his mother kept the house after his father fell 369 feet in a mine to his death.

The friendly societies were formed to help those who had been injured or lost loved ones. There was another group who worked to make working conditions much safer. My [Dr McEwan's] own great grandfather was killed in an unsafe mine in Scotland and the record above is what happened to him and his widow, as it happened to many others; my grandfather's life was turned around by being saved at a tent meeting by a Moody Bible College graduate, and it was there, with the “Band of Hope” that he met my grandmother.

There were many innocent victims of the daily violence of the industrial cities. Such people as Muller, Barnardo, Spurgeon, and many others provided orphanages for young girls and boys. Young people were often forced into prostitution, as outside the mills or “service” there was no hope for the young girls. Boys became apprentice to older tradesmen if they could, from carpenters to chimney sweeps, and the novels of Charles Dickens portrayed the evils of the laissez faire economics of England in the 1860s as today's South Asian and African children suffer now.

William Booth was originally a Methodist who organised himself with street preaching in 1864. He had a number of outreach stations in London. They were organised militarily and were called the Salvation Army.

He compared the darkness and evil in the cities of England to that of the darkness in Africa and shocked people by saying that the darkness in England was worse, but he was right. By the turn of the century he had a hundred thousand members, and was meeting the needs of those who others had forgotten.

In one year before Booth's work began over 2,000 people were formally reported as being killed/dying on the streets of London, with a similar number of people committing suicide. There were 30,000 prostitutes and 100,000 alcoholics and more than 900,000 paupers who were living below the poverty line in a population of some two million. The Salvation Army was evangelistic, practical and effective. They organised orphanages also and kept the gospel coming strongly through. London was transformed by their work and the work of the Bible teachers like Spurgeon.

The Anglican Church with its churches in the cities were not satisfying the needs of the populace as many of the clergy were religious unbelievers. There was a group that came out of that group called the “Christian Socialists” who felt that they could reform society through the social gospel, but it was built on ignorance of the true gospel message, and fluffy headed wishful thinking. They were not effective, for all work other than that of the Holy Spirit falls apart over time. We need to realise that we cannot change society by the social gospel but by the saving gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. The liberals talk about ideas but achieve nothing. Liberalism is popular among the state churches, but the churches controlled by liberal ministers do not grow, for they have no spiritual power, and their denominations are all slowly dying.

Many theological institutions that start as conservative Bible based schools often only last one hundred years or so before they are fully liberal. By that time they cease to draw their teaching staff from those who are teaching practically in

living churches, and have instead academics, often unbelievers with “recognized degrees” from the liberal universities. With every school that goes liberal, the Lord will always raise up men and women to establish Bible believing institutions and the wise churches draw their ministers from them only.

Many people that start off on the right track go off on the social action area, and that has affected many denominational seminaries. They go from Revelation to revolution to devolution. Rather than rely on the inspired Word of God they take their old theology professor's word as their guide. In some cases they tie in with the economic system and say that salvation is not possible while the capitalist economic system remains.

We have this concept embedded within the National and World Council of Churches. The majority of these people do not believe that the Holy Spirit is the person who changes people, they believe ideals change people, and have agendas that sound very similar, if you compare openly unsaved groups like the UN with them. They have a view that is called “humanism” that expresses faith in man rather than God. They prefer Marx to Moses and Engels to Christ. They thrive on media attention, and have penetrated media thoroughly, as it is sold out to the evil policies of the enemy. They have no impact on society at all. They claim to represent the poor but they politicize and exploit the poor. These are people who turn up for the photo opportunity like the politician – they will argue all night over wine and cheese, but not sit with the dying all night.

Many of the neo-evangelical writers come across to me, as a student of history, as teachers of unmitigated nonsense, peddling garbage, as stated by a liberal sociologist. Look at these pages in Shelley and think about what the Biblical response should be. In the 1930's the political ideas in Europe changed quite dramatically. The terrible harvest of Liberalism can be seen best in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s. Very few Germans stood for the truth. They had been a nation who had been taught by ministers who had been trained in liberal institutions and their, “Democratic”, or even “Christian Socialism”, had no strength or biblical light in it. Most of them were fooled by the state churches into accepting the evil of Nazism and had no problems with Anti-Semitism.

The evils of the Second World War were I believe partly, if not solely due, to the lack of Biblical faith throughout Europe, and Germany has paid a terrible price for the evils of liberalism – possibly even an illustration of the “Four Generation Curse”, as the time from the takeover of liberalism to 1945 was about four full generations. The “good news” is since the War there have been significant revivals in Germany and there is a strong believing church, alongside the State Lutheran liberal church.

## DOCTRINE

### REVOLUTION

1. The Word of God does not justify revolution (Numbers 16).
2. Revolution involves mobs which can neither think nor achieve anything worthwhile.
3. Revolution means apostasy and lack of the Word of God (Isaiah 1:3-5; 59:13).
4. Revolution is anti-God (Isaiah 31:6).
5. Revolution is always caused by some failure of the mind (Jeremiah 5:23) e.g. maximum mental sins, drug addiction, alcoholism, lack of morals.
6. Jealousy is a motivator of revolution. (Isaiah 11:13 cf. 1 Kings 12:19; 2 Chronicles 10:19).
7. When Bible doctrine is communicated it tends to stop revolution (Ezekiel 2:3-10) e.g. in England in the 18th and 19th centuries there were no revolutions. In Europe, however, with the lack of doctrine, many revolutions occurred.
8. Principle:
  - a) When human power and privileges are monopolized by a few, the people become oppressed. (1 Kings 21:1-16; 1 Samuel 8-11-19).
  - b) Limited in freedom and opportunity, they become slaves, even though they may not have shackles.
  - c) Anything accomplished by revolution could have been accomplished without revolution and therefore could have been undertaken in a stabilized form e.g. the reforms in Britain during the 19th century.
  - d) National trauma occurs in revolution as it is a sharp break with the past.

**LECTURE 39 - THE HARVEST OF LIBERALISM**

INTRODUCTION – Shelley Chapter 42 – Pages 435ff

Religious Liberalism and its twin, Religious formalism, or Humanism, in the twentieth century have produced the most evil things that the world has ever seen. In Communism and Nazism we have seen that political power is all, political power coming out of the barrel of a gun. Liberalism and the governments that followed their religious philosophies have hated Biblical Christianity with a hatred equaled only by the worst of the persecuting Roman Emperors.

At the end of the nineteenth century the aristocracy who ruled in Europe were arrogant self centered and far away from God. In Britain in the early part of that century we had the Clapham sect being led and promoted by members of the aristocracy, but by the end of the century it was within the lower classes where the conversions were taking place. The aristocracy were by 1900 mainly church attending pagans, at that time being respectable on the outside, but immoral on the inside. The new technologies coming on stream in the later Victorian Age made many materialists believe the lies of humanism and relax into pleasant religion and “the happy and gay life style” without boring moral restraint.

This is summed up in the Edwardian age with Edward VII having many mistresses, some of whom were given title and their illegitimate children given knighthood's and can be seen attending polite but powerless church services with the king. My own grand-mother's mother ran a stately home in the Scottish Midlands for the illegitimate children of the aristocracy and was rewarded by one mistress, Lilly Langtry, with gifts for her “discretion”. My grandmother told me she had met Lilly Langtry, and with a wink said to me, “she was a friend of the king's you know...” I still have these “gifts” (Edward's white opal “pinky ring”, and a German Violin) and smile as I reflect on the powerlessness and immorality of liberal Christendom. This was in great contrast with the lower classes, who were being evangelized and coming to the truth in Christ. There was increasing polarization through the twentieth century. Many would enter the liberal theological universities and despise their “evangelical” brethren, who they considered not “scholarly”, educated or “good enough” for polite society. Remember who we are! **1 Peter 2:9-10**.

**WORLD WAR**

The horror was, that when the First World War broke out, the people were led by men who talked about God but who were often far from Him. People died in their millions in trenches in the First World War for nothing, but in the carnage there was a return to the Bible, as desperate men faced their deaths and realized that liberal ministers offered them nothing, but the YMCA preacher (like Oswald Chambers) did. From the carnage, C S Lewis, J R R Tolkien would write.

All the leaders of Europe were from the same basic liberal and spiritually dead religious stock. The Germans in 1914 were no more or less evil than the British. Both were liberal, with Britain having experienced revival only amongst the lower classes. Germany asked for honourable peace at least four times during the war, but the arrogant and ignorant French and British Governments would not accept anything short of complete capitulation, so millions of extra men died. An entire generation was wiped out and while many were saved, others were hardened against the gospel message and against the reality of the loving God, due to the actions of evil men. Remember to do the “fruit analysis” always over men and women in history. Arrogance and callousness to others suffering are always satanic fruit!

Propaganda was total in the First World War. So many lies were told, that when there were terrible tales told of what the Nazis were doing in the 1930's nobody would believe them, for all recalled the lies of the first war. In 1914 American churches agreed to back their President Woodrow Wilson and remain neutral, allowing only humanitarian aid to be provided. They believed that Germany had generated the War, but the worship of Mammon by Europe as a whole meant that they were as bad as each other, and that discipline had come to them in the form of a war. The satanic malice of the war unleashed was such that America was going to be dragged in. Remember, Satan hates all people, and always bring in the doctrine of the Angelic Conflict into your study of such things as great wars or political movements!

In 1917 the American churches, persuaded by propaganda, started recruiting for the army and it was the entry of over a million American soldiers into Europe, which caused the capitulation of Germany. The terms of peace were so bad however that the seeds of the Second World War were sown at the treaty of Versailles, and America withdrew again, and so guaranteed the next war would hurt them all. Looked at through spiritual eyes, many things that the allies did were as wrong as Germany and her allies. When a nation goes against spiritual concepts laid down in the Scriptures it is going to miss out on blessing, and create evil. We must remember Daniel's prophetic words – for the Western Powers are the centre of the future Anti-Christ's kingdom power base, and what we have lived through over the last 120 years has set up the last great empire – world wars set the pieces on the stage for the end game. Keep the prophet Daniel open!

World War One was the first judgment of liberalism in Germany. Liberalism had no answer to the carnage of that war, but sadly there was no spiritual revival in Germany after that war and so the second became inevitable. The liberals all said that, “in every way, on every day we are getting better”, but the battlefields of the Somme told another story. They said that man in his own strength, with some principles from the Bible, will get better and better, as we “learn from the war...”. With the sight of millions of people lying dead on the battlefields, liberalism didn't fall apart, and it attacked the “Fundamentalists” in the 1920s; but it had no answer to that type of catastrophe, but tried again with the “League of Nations”. There is no end to satanic delusion.

As a result of a high degree of discontent due to the bad peace treaty arrangements in Germany, Nazism got off the ground. As the Nazi party grew some of the liberal church formed up behind Hitler, seeing the "honour" of their nation more important than their duty to God. The unbelieving liberal universities of Germany had robbed their graduates of eternal hope and biblical direction, and so they didn't look back to the revival of Luther and later the Hernhutt as their blue-print for recovery, as had occurred in the seventeenth century. No revival occurred in 1930, and so men found humanistic power in National Socialism, and paid the terrible price for it.

#### THE RISE OF NAZISM

After World War I right-wing governments sprang up all over Europe, but the greatest was German National Socialism, better known as Nazism. The Protestant churches in the lands of Luther lost millions of people to this new political religion. When spiritual power is missing people will be drawn to the satanic alternative.

Most of the Protestant clergy in postwar Germany in 1918 were democrats, but were also devoid of belief in the evangelical power of the Holy Spirit anointed gospel message. They had no sympathy for socialism, and finally none for the powerless and confused democracy of the German political system. Years of spiritually dead liberalism however meant that they had no biblical compass to see what was spiritually happening. Most of the ordinary people did side with the socialists or fascists in the hope that better working conditions would bring in prosperity – it was still an addiction to materialism as their hope. The industrial workers came to despise a socially and politically reactionary church. At the same time the German cultured class was ripe for Nazism, because they had turned to a romantic view of Germany's past. It was a non-historic heroic view, aristocratic and often pantheistic and as all satanic systems do, and it glossed over the evil at the core.

Hitler saw the weakness of the nation without faith and was determined to return Germany to the glories of its imagined pagan past. Most of the Germans still went to church, Roman Catholic in the south and Lutheran in the north. Hitler knew that there was no moral power or spiritual power in either camp. They no longer believed in the historical Jesus or the basic doctrines of the virgin birth, the resurrection, the Second Coming, but he saw that they hungered for a Messiah, and he was determined to be that man. The Popes vacillated and the liberal theologians pontificated, but lacked power.

What these liberal churches lacked, Hitler was able to supply. Study of the major rallies of Hitler showed a formation of atmosphere with much music and pomp and a strong speaker in the form of Hitler, once the "congregation" had been prepared. He had learned from all the pagan German liberal philosophers of the previous hundred years.

These people were looking for a leader, and they saw this in Hitler. We have a leader, the Lord Jesus Christ. We have purpose and definition in our life but only in His Plan, Power and Purposes. They did not hear or see that in the churches, and Hitler filled the vacuum. Liberal churches require dynamic Holy Spirit filled people, but without the truth they cannot have that. Hitler provided the power and was pictured as the neo-Christian knight of Germany, the Fuhrer. Hitler gave to them the old pagan religion, the war gods, Thor the god with a hammer, and the new religious cross; the swastika.

#### THE CHURCH IN GERMANY SPLIT INTO THREE

1. Hitler dealt with the Catholics by signing an agreement with the Pope in 1933, whereby the Catholics were able to worship freely. For several years the Pope saw Hitler as the supporter/protector of the church. Popes hated Communism so much, (especially following the Fatima Vision revelation), that they ignored the present evil of Nazism.
2. In the Protestant area some 3000 of the 17000 State Church pastors and an increasing number of people established a group called the German Christians, and they were simply a Nazi version of the church.
3. Another group of liberals, who were more committed to the spiritual message, but were not fundamentalist Christians, such as Barth and Bonhoeffer, established the "Confessing Church". In 1934 they spelt out their position in a declaration. Whilst the declaration called the church back to spiritual values, it did not call it back to the faith that was once and for all given to the saints as per Jude 3. It called the church back to the truths of moralistic but basically powerless liberal Lutheran "Christianity".

They needed a Luther to lead a revival, but they had boring little men writing lovely things, when the gospel truth was needed to be preached powerfully, and prayer groups let loose..... Do not pity Bonhoeffer for his "martyrdom", for he was a liberal fool, deluded by his own theology into powerlessness, and he stood against evil too late and so was killed.

This last group was more like political-social activists than committed conservative fundamentalist Christians standing for their faith. What happened to them caused them to be in the eyes of some "martyrs". It is likely that many of the people involved in the confessing church were believers, but they didn't have the biblical light on, for they doubted the historical facts of the faith, but their deaths would open Germany to revival in the 1950s and 60s, and so maybe they were indeed seed for the German Church. These men and women did suffer for their faith, but sadly the legacy of liberalism was such that they were a minor influence; bit players rather than mighty women and men standing up early enough in Holy Spirit power to stop Hitler. Germany was judged by the majority's repeated choices of evil.



In 1935 the Nazis created their ministry for Nazi affairs under their own lawyer Hans Kerl, who said that God's will was represented by the Nazi Party, and those who did not agree were not in God's will. The Gestapo moved against the confessing church and 700 were imprisoned in the first concentration camps, and while most were released after a year, many of them were re-arrested in 1944-1945. Some were executed towards the end, like Bonhoeffer.

There were fundamentalist born again believers in Germany at this time. One of the greatest was an air force officer Adolf Garland who fought on the eastern front. In this sad period the born again believers are not in influence within the churches at all, but after the War they became influential, and revival broke out through sitting with the pain of their nation's destruction and its occupation by foreign powers until the early 1990s.

In May 1937 the Pope finally saw what was happening and drafted an encyclical letter, "Mit Brenender Sorge", which was smuggled into Germany and on Palm Sunday every Catholic Church had the letter read out to them, and this called for all Catholics to oppose the Nazis' philosophy and evils. Hitler already had the loyalty of these people, thus the Pope's letter was too late and not effective.

#### KARL BARTH

These people [leaders of the confessing church] were influenced by Existentialist Theology rather than Biblical Theology. Barth dismissed liberalism due to the things that had been seen in the First World War and the rise of Nazism. They recognized that there is no good thing in man, but were still too influenced by their pagan philosophies and believed that the Bible was only a book written by men about God and contained errors.

They developed liberalism, from what it was into what we now know as Neo-orthodoxy. It stresses man's existence and God's existence, and that we must meet God in an existentialist encounter. They said that we all had to have an experience of God's power in our life, but that the history of the faith and historicity of the Bible was irrelevant.

The people that train many of the Presbyterian, Anglican and Baptist leaders teach neo orthodoxy, or its more charismatic wing, Neo-evangelicalism. They will study the neo orthodox textbooks, but they will allow the Charismatics to be involved, for they want the life in the church of the good worship that the spirit filled believer brings.

They talk about the Easter faith/event, that the thoughts of Jesus are alive in your heart, even though the bones of Jesus are still in Palestine. The power of neo orthodoxy is that it can talk about "the Christ", as if he is alive though physically they believe that he is physically dead. These were the great spiritualizers, following in the tradition of the Alexandrians.

To them he is the man Jesus, whose teaching and actions are the model for all humanity, and who became the Christ after his death, as an ideal of what we all could be in sacrificial love for others. As a trained philosopher, I am irritated by Barth and the men and women who waffled after the Alexandrian tradition, when biblical faith was called for. One word – Barth can take a bath...its Bull!!!!

Barth had the concept that God was totally OTHER and there was no real connection to man. He side-stepped all that was behind – Immanuel... following Immanuel Kant too closely. God is transcendent and holy, man is finite and sinful, so the Bible is written by man, and subject to higher criticism, as it is just a witness, but not a document from God. These deluded men got tied up in their ivory tower philosophy and lost touch with reality until it kicked them with a jack booted foot! As they migrated to USA just before or after WW II they took their nonsense with them, but because they were seen as "martyrs" of the confessing church, they were given the highest positions, to bring American Universities down to the powerlessness of pre-war Germany liberalism.

Under Stalin in 1920s-1930s Russia, war was openly declared on all genuine, and even make-believers and the churches were converted to museums and factories and many other uses. Anti-Religious propaganda was rife with those involved in religion being shown as the old, poor, the prostitute, the perverse and the priest living off them being well fed. The children were encouraged to join the Communist youth group called, The Young Pioneers, and were taught scientific atheism, with religion being mocked from kindergarten to university. Although Stalin himself attended confession twice in his last years – did he repent? We will only know in heaven. He certainly died of a terrible stroke and was left to die soaked in his own urine by his frightened staff, and may have indeed in those terrible desolate hours made his peace with God... He was certainly even more evil than Manasseh, and yet that evil king was saved in the end, even though he had murdered Isaiah, and Stalin murdered many Isaiahs.

By the 1960's Communism was starting to work against them. More people were killed under the oppression of Stalin in the 1930s than in the Second World War. Over 30,000,000 people were killed by Stalin, including hundreds of thousands of Christians. The legacy of this is that the church has grown, and in the area covered by the old Soviet Union today there are many churches, even taking over old KGB headquarters. The same occurred in China under Mao Tse Tung with over 50,000,000 people murdered by Mao in the "great leap forward" and other plans, and even though his persecution of believers was thorough, the church has re-emerged, and grown significantly since the 1990s.

The World Council of Churches runs on a basically neo orthodoxy/neo-evangelical basis, with liberation theology and sociology being their theological base, mixed with Marxism. This was specific mainly to Latin America and Asia, but is now general. In the Western World the liberal churches who do not believe in the risen or returning Christ, love to have the Charismatics in the church to liven up what otherwise would be dead. Many of these Charismatics are believers, but

know so little doctrine, that they do not discern that they are combining with neo orthodox people who do not believe as they do. I have seen many lovely charismatic believers slowly starved of spiritual food in liberal churches, and finally they drift away to spiritual death, taking their families with them.

We need to study church history, and understand where these people are coming from, and warn believers against the dangers of being fooled by their liberal idiots. Latest census data reports that Wiccans have outnumbered Presbyterians in the USA.... No surprises there, for at least the Wiccans are robust pagans who really do have experiences in their services – even though they are demonic...

## **DOCTRINES**

### **DENIALS THAT CHARACTERIZE THE END TIME CHURCH**

1. Denial of God (Luke 17:26; 2 Timothy 3:4-5)
2. Denial of Christ (1 John 2:18, 4:3; 2 Peter 2:1)
3. Denial of Christ's return (2 Peter 3:3-4)
4. Denial of the Faith (1 Timothy 4:1-2; Jude 3)
5. Denial of Sound Doctrine (2 Timothy 4:3-4)
6. Denial of Separated Life (Practical Sanctification) (2 Timothy 3:1-7)
7. Denial of Christian Liberty (1 Timothy 4:3-4)
8. Denial of Spirituality (2 Timothy 3:1-8; Jude 18)
9. Denial of Authority (2 Timothy 3:4)

### **DISCIPLINE UPON A NATION**

1. Discipline upon the damned. These nations have lived out their purpose in history and must be eliminated. This is shown in the story of Sodom in [Genesis 19]. This also shows that God will not punish a nation if He can find a remnant in that nation.

God will never damn a people to extinction in history as long as there is a remnant left. Believers are the salt of the earth and are the insurance policy for the nation in which they reside. [Matthew 5:13] God protects the believer from judgment [Genesis 19:17-23. Romans 8:1]. This was done without any external armies by means of a natural catastrophe.

2. The principle is given in [Acts 17:26] where God has set the geographical and historical boundaries for nations. God is therefore sovereign in history and geography. This is done so that they should seek after the Lord. Acts 17:27 No nation is that apostate that a person does not have a chance to be saved as when a nation becomes apostate it is either destroyed or changed.

3. Another damned culture is the Amorites of [Genesis 15:16] where Abraham's seed would be in Egypt until such time that the apostacy of the Canaanites had matured. However when the Israelites came out of Egypt they were used by God to destroy the Amorites [Deuteronomy 7:2]. As they were doing it for God they were not allowed to take booty. [Joshua 6:17]. This discipline was by direct military action and not by natural means. As the discipline continues they are warned about their attitude [Deut 9:3-6].

4. The fall of the Chaldean Empire under Belshazzar to the Medio - Persians and the Scythians is an example of the destruction of a powerful empire overnight. Daniel 5. Daniel pointed out the God made Nebuchadnezzar king but when he became proud he was discipline until such time as he acknowledged the source of his prosperity. No nation can attain power unless God grants them it. Belshazzar had the testimony of Nebuchadnezzar but chose to ignore it.

5. Part of our responsibility as believers is to pray for our country and its rulers [1 Timothy 2:1-2].

**LECTURE 40 - THE BATTLE FOR THE BIBLE**

INTRODUCTION – Shelley Chapter 43 – Pages 447ff.

**1 Timothy 4:1-6, 2 Timothy 3:1-7, 4:1-8**, gives an outline of “what to expect” at the end of the Church Age, and also our “daily orders” for leading the local churches. It is interesting to realise that these are not the pagans outside the church, but these are the people in the church. These are make believers who claim that they are believers.

These are people who might write books in the bible, but do not know God’s transforming power in their life. In **Matthew 7:13-23**, the Lord says that people will come to Him and say that they have done things in His name and He will say, I never knew you. Those that are truly born again will have the fruit of the Spirit and works of righteousness to show for it.

In **2 Timothy 3:12-4:5** - Paul spells out prophetically what will happen as we draw towards the end of the age, and what believers are to do. There will **not** be a period at the end of great righteousness, justice, and peace. It is **not going to get easier** as we get nearer to the Lord’s coming, it is going to get harder. We can expect persecution to get into high gear, and that there will be massive apostasy amongst the mainline churches, and that is what you find. There are so many cults and isms, and that is what we were told to expect..... **Luke 18:8**, “When the Son of Man returns, Will he find faith on the earth?”.... The way the Lord asks the question presupposes a negative answer.

## UNION ON THE FUNDAMENTALS

It is bad to divide from fellow believers on the non essentials, such as eschatology, if you have got the essentials together. The fundamentals are, the inerrancy of Scripture, the deity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the reality of the Miracles, the bodily resurrection of Christ, the Substitutionary, efficacious death of the Lord for the sins of the world, and the certainty of the Second Advent of Christ. These have become known as the fundamentals of the historic Christian faith.

It will be important to worship in a place where you share the same evangelical doctrinal viewpoint, but this should not prevent you working in cooperation with the reformed and moderate Pentecostal groups. In the fundamentals there ought to be unity, and in all else, charity. This will apply between Catholic and Evangelical Protestant also.

This is shown in Torrey, Chafer and others who had different backgrounds but were able to combine to advance American Fundamentalist movements against the liberals who set out to destroy faith in most seminaries, and they succeeded. Wesley the Arminian and Calvinist Whitfield were also able to do this two centuries earlier; if we are spiritual, as they were, so should we be able to work together with all who do not deny the fundamentals of our faith!

In 1976 Gallop did a poll and found that 34% of Americans considered themselves evangelical Christians. They believed that the Lord Jesus Christ died on the Cross for the sins of the world. Quite a large number of Catholics were included in this poll as “evangelical”. A more conservative poll in the 1980’s indicated a figure of over 20% as evangelicals who had had a born again experience. Even today a significant, but now rapidly declining, percentage of the American population claim that they are “born again”, but be careful of what that might mean to the responders.

The United States has been the greatest nation of the last century, and has been blessed spiritually and materially as Britain was in the previous century, but this has changed before our eyes. If you look at history the nations that are great in power and hold it for any length of time are those who hold to God’s Word. In the United States the evangelical camp evolved as the result of the Second Great Awakening. There were a variety of people who held to the Scriptures such as, R A Torrey, L.S Chafer, C.I. Schofield, A.T. Robertson.....

“BORN AGAIN” - “Yeh – Right!”

Amongst the World Council of Churches American branch, the “Neo-evangelicals” form a small conservative minority, amounting to under one third. There are millions in the WCC. Outside this group there are over more millions who are in independent churches with fundamental and evangelical views and wont join the WCC. As well there are millions who call themselves Roman Catholics, many of whom hold to the “fundamentals of the faith”.

Several recent Presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George Bush, Bill Clinton, all claimed to be “born again” but they did not necessarily show the fruit of it. It is of interest that several were married to women who had a strong relationship with astrology, or liberal theology groups. Beware all those politicians who seek photo opportunities at prayer or with bibles in their hands.

It is estimated today in 2021 that only 5% of New Zealanders would classify themselves as born again among the population. Having given some statistics, beware of statistics in this area, especially the Liberal or openly pagan University reporting or analysis of them. Not everyone who claims to be a born again believer is in fact one. Back to **Matthew 7:13-23** – remember, remember – the words of Jesus only....

You have to be discerning about this matter today, because your spiritual life depends on it. Shelley ties in a pre millennialist viewpoint with mocking, page 449, so be discerning here. He also criticizes Moody here for a lifeboat type of concept. He states, page 449, “The roots of fundamentalism lie in this surrender of social concerns”. Totally false!!! **Jude**

**20-25** however tells us to have compassion for the lost pulling them out of the fire. He is seeing those who are out to seek to save those who are lost as those who are defeated. The Moody movement was not a great reversal; it was a great advance. D.L. Moody was used by the Lord to lead millions to Christ, and he did not turn away from social concerns.

Note Shelley's viewpoint here – do theologies, or recovery of beliefs (pre-millennialism) “develop” as an evolutionary process in the social-political situation, or do political crises provoke people back to scriptures to rediscover lost/forgotten truths of the past that are now needed? Is the Holy Spirit guiding here, or is it just socio-economic processes?

The neo evangelicals, like Shelley, play with the words of Christianity. They say that the person of the historical Jesus Christ is not important, they want the Jesus of faith, who will give you hope and confidence. Let him rise in your hearts, they say. You should accept the Christ idea, and ideal, as your Saviour, not the real person who they believe is still in the tomb somewhere in Palestine.

There have always been two ways in which people look at social evils. There is the liberal concept of social injustice as the cause of all ills, with no fault to anyone except the rich and powerful, and then there is the fundamentalist viewpoint of free choice and it's result in opportunity for salvation and sanctification and through that transformation of society. The reality is there are children being abused and families being ripped apart, and we look for biblical solutions, that always start with salvation for the adults and the children.

The liberal gets involved with politics and social action. The believer does what the apostles did and goes out to give the gospel to all so that the people who have become involved in crime can be converted, changed and thereby change society rather than doing it by political means. This is seen bluntly with the difference between the present, “Howard League for Prison Reform”, (Named after a great believer of the Clapham Group), and the “Christian Prison Fellowship”.

The Liberals and the Neo-evangelicals amplify the “disconnection between the church and society”, and they are therefore denying the power of the Holy Spirit to change people society. They believe in their own actions and political power, not the Holy Spirit. We see that the majority don't care and don't ask about Jesus, and from history we see that this has been nearly always true. We don't get discouraged, any more than Paul did in Corinth, or William Booth did in London, we pray and we prepare, and we preach the truth. We adopt the “Lighthouse” principle the Lord directed us to adopt. **Matthew 5:14-16**. We take Jesus instruction not the sociologists, even if they are well meaning pseudo-Christians....

#### FUNDAMENTALISTS

There were two groups that met in the fundamentalist movement. One was the Pentecostal, the other non Pentecostal. The latter group included the Baptists, the Independents, the Reformed, the Salvation Army whilst the Pentecostals are quite a wide ranging group of independent and constantly changing churches.

They all formed an alliance in the 1920's with the publication of a 12 volume set called, “The Fundamentals. R.A.Torrey did the editorial work. They were opposed then and later by, A Harnack, C Fillmore, H E Fosdick, R Bultmann, P Tillich, L Weatherhead, J Pike, L Geering, P Moore, J A T Robinson,.... Liberalism speaks in double-talk. Wikipedia gives away more than it realises in its article... “Liberal...denoted a characteristic willingness to interpret scripture according to modern philosophic perspectives (Modernism) and modern scientific assumptions, while attempting to achieve the Enlightenment ideal of objective point of view, without preconceived notions of the authority of scripture or the correctness of Church dogma....”

These Sets of the “Fundamentals” went to 250,000 copies, due to the generosity of a Christian millionaire, and they went to all who were studying theology in the United States. The various believing churches and seminaries got together and decided not to argue about eschatology but to unite against liberalism, or as it was called for marketing purposes then “modernism” (Bible believers being insulting referred to as out of date, and non-scientific, non-scholarly). Even today expect this approach by neo-evangelicals – who will refer to you as hopelessly outmoded and the church structure irrevocably broken and needing new dynamic ways to be reorganized..... They will ignore the genuine moves of the Holy Spirit, because they are so busy trying to organize their latest scheme – and have the church pay for it of course! These people often want to abolish the local church, but be paid by the church members while they do it.

The twenties saw the next round of church group splits. In 1925 the Northern American Presbyterians started going liberal and Gresham Machen and others left, and formed the Westminster Presbyterian Seminary. C.I.Scofield and L.S.Chafer founded Dallas Theological seminary for dispensational teaching. They provided people who were trained to counteract the liberal groups. This is always God's way; when Satan's crew get control of buildings leave them there and establish a new college/fellowship.

The basis of liberalism/modernism is evolution, not only as man is involved, but also from a theological format. They also have an optimistic view of man. A moralistic view of God and that the Bible is man's view of God rather than the inspired Word of God to man, and thus has errors. They will not refer to the Holy Spirit as the power of the believer, and will speak of meditation and contemplation, but not prayer meetings. This path developed into liberation theology, which is Marxist, evolutionary, optimistic and moralistic but leads no-where except to shattered lives and nations.

The General Assembly of Regular Baptists left the Northern convention when it went liberal and by the 1990s were tending to go neo orthodox themselves. There were splits in other denominations as well. The liberals are no longer liberals, they often call themselves “moderates” ( as against the fanatics who believe the Bible). What you have going on in the church is double thinking and double speech; we must be very discerning, for satanic marketing is interesting. The one big defeat of the fundamentalist movement was the “monkey trial”, the Scopes trial in Tennessee where a teacher was charged with teaching evolution. The court case was won by the fundamentalists but the publicity was lost and when Hollywood declared war on Bible Believing viewpoints it swayed the majority.

“Elmer Gantry”, and other movies destroyed the credibility of the corrupt preachers, but indicated all revivalists were corrupt and fanatic. Today Moslem Extremists are called “fundamentalists” and Christian believers are guilty by association. It’s all in the words used and the publicity gained – “headlines burst bigger than bombs” (Quote from a manual of Military Counter Insurgency Theory and Practise). The truth is not the issue to the liberal, or the press, but their angle is. They want to push their ideas, and the “news” is biased viewpoint, carefully stated so as not to be sued, to make their liberal point.

As Christians who have studied Church History, we are not trying to build a Christian nation, but be part of a Christ influenced nation. We are with the Apostle Paul, and want all to hear and know Jesus as the only Saviour, and we seek any way, by any means, to reach any body the Holy Spirit is working upon. As a result of the teaching at Dallas and elsewhere there was a revival of fundamentalism after the Second World War with such groups as Campus Crusade for Christ, Billy Graham Group, Youth for Christ, Creation Science and others.

Billy Graham has been criticized, as all good men and women will be. We all make mistakes, and none of us are infallible. He was a great mentor however, and he pegged his salary at the salary that a person in charge of a large church would receive, even though he was heading up a multi million dollar organization and others urged him to take an appropriate salary. He kept on preaching the Word, and being an author, as had George Beverly Shea, so should we, and not criticize until we too are filling each day with the work of the Lord.

Are we “irrelevant” to many? If the answer is “yes”, then we need to assess what the Holy Spirit is actually doing in our community and nation first, before we read a new church growth manual pushing a man’s viewpoint. Many will dismiss the church as irrelevant, but when convicted will be saved, and so the question is not, how do we become more relevant, but how to we release the Holy Spirit in more power through the church membership where they connect to society? The study of the last 2000 years indicates that the release of the Holy Spirit’s power always tends to follow Prayer and Bible study growth!

## **DOCTRINE**

### **THE BIBLE AND THE BELIEVER**

1. The Scriptures are designed to have the following effect on the believer:

- a) Illuminating (Psalm 119:130).
- b) Making wise the simple (Psalm 19:7).
- c) Producing faith (John 20:31), hope (Psalm 119:49, Romans 15:4), and obedience (Deuteronomy 17:19-20).
- d) Cleansing the heart (John 15:3, Ephesians 5:26) and the ways (Psalm 119:9).
- e) Keeping us from destructive paths (Psalm 17:4).
- f) Supporting life (Matthew 4:4 cf. Deuteronomy 8:3).
- g) Building up in the faith (Acts 20:32).
- h) Comforting (Psalm 119:82, Romans 15:4).
- i) Promoting growth in grace (1 Peter 2:2).
- j) Admonishing (1 Corinthians 10:11).
- k) Rejoicing the heart (Psalm 119:18,111).
- l) Sanctifying (John 17:17, Ephesians 5:26).

2. The Scriptures should be:

- a) Believed (John 2:22) and obeyed (James 1:22).
- b) The standard for teaching (1 Peter 4:11).
- c) Appealed to (1 Corinthians 1:31, 1 Peter 1:16).
- d) Read publicly to all (Acts 13:15).
- e) Known (2 Timothy 3:15).
- f) Received as the Word of God (1 Thessalonians 2:13) with meekness (James 1:21).
- g) Searched (John 5:39, Acts 17:11).
- h) Used against our spiritual enemies (Ephesians 6:11,17).
- i) Taught to everyone including children (Deuteronomy 6:7, 11:19, Nehemiah 8:7-8).
- j) Talked about continually (Deuteronomy 6:7).
- k) Not handled deceitfully (2 Corinthians 4:2).

3. For the unbeliever the Scripture should be for:
- a) Regeneration (James 1:18, 1 Peter 1:23).
  - b) Quickening (Psalm 119:50,93).
  - c) Converting the soul (Psalm 19:7).

## LECTURE 41 - CHURCH UNION

THE BASIS OF UNITY – Shelley Chapter 44 – pages 459ff.

Scripture - **1 Corinthians 12:12 – 27**. Does the WCC assist the Holy Spirit in bringing the church together? Is it of the Holy Spirit, or another religious piece of politics that centres in the enemy's camp? Check the WCC published material, especially their "calls for action" and then compare the language, even to the very phrases used, with UN material. There is a "unity" of purpose with WCC and UN – both appear to be heading for a One –World system....

There is a unity of all born again believers as all believers are entered into unity in Christ. With born again believers there will be a unity in diversity in love. **1 John 4:1-4, 7-19**. If there is no love in your life for other believers you are probably not a believer. The unity that is talked about here is a spiritual unity, but it will lead to collective activities. We have unity with all believers in time as we are all in Christ in the filling of the Holy Spirit, but there may still be diversity in how we desire to express our worship. I don't dislike the traditional Presbyterian Service, but prefer my own Church, and also a lovely Roman Catholic or Anglican Communion, however I am united with all my brethren who love, honour, and serve the Lord, and enjoy fellowship and shared work in a wide range of areas. Do I want formal church union? NO!!! I love diversity....and unity in the Spirit with varied brethren, and I find the church union workers boring as a wet day.....

**2 Corinthians 13:11-14** tells us to be of one mind. **Romans 12:18**. We are to live in peace, as far as possible, as we are obedient to the things of God. **Ephesians 4:1-6** - The emphasis in our lives is to be in the spiritual realm. There will always be practical spiritual unity among believers irrespective of their preferred forms of worship. One may be a High Anglican another a Brethren but they will have a oneness in Christ, and will love each other as brethren and work together in Prison Fellowship; If there is no love, the Lord is not in them!

Why is there not just one church? We all like to do things differently – and it's OK! Is there a "break/tear in the body of Christ"? - no!!!. This is shown when true believers come together. You may not get along in the worship service format they have but you have unity in Christ, and you will have joy in that worship meeting. Each denomination is an expression of different people's natures, and often culture. However each church has a mixed multitude. There are believers and make believers in all churches. Who is worried about all this? The believers or the make believers?

### WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The aim for the World Council of Churches was stated in 1961 when the general secretary said- "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Holy Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit." What is the common calling? There is no definition of the gospel here quite deliberately. The Holy Scriptures are used to describe the books of the Hindus and the Koran. This means it is a special book, but not the only inspired Word of God to man.

By the 20th century more than 200 major denominations crowded the landscape in the United States alone. Many are not Christian in faith or practice at all. As "fundamentalists" we have a very narrow apostolic view of what Christianity is. Here note that Shelley says on page 460, that in the 20th century there has been a coming together of Christian denominations in the WCC. Is this so? Divisiveness was actually a good thing in the fact that in America as colleges went liberal Bible believers came out of them and set up new Bible believing colleges; choice being a good thing.

From the first century there has been a calling out of churches that have gone liberal so that the believers leave and form new groups and the old dies. When a church goes liberal the believers need to leave, and then it will die. Where that happens there is great growth elsewhere. As the ship goes down leave and allow the Lord to rebuild round a purer and spiritually more powerful doctrinal position in another place. Shelley says that binding together is the greatest thing for the church, whereas church history teaches us that the greatest spiritual victories have been when Bible believers have come out of the decaying structures of liberal or religious and legalistic organizations. This leads to thousands become Christians and a new bursting forth of life.

Do unbelievers need to see a united church? The liberal and neo-evangelical will argue so, and yet, is that the experience of the new converts you talk to? All I meet who have met Jesus recently were seeking real spiritual life and they were led to a church that was spiritually alive and where they could hear the Bible and be challenged by its truths. In our ESOL classes, ALPHA courses, regular Bible studies many are coming to the Lord. The people who are panicky about WCC or new models of the church are coming from places that are spiritually dead – so smart unbelievers are not interested anyway, and dumb, drugged or drunk ones will only be led by the Lord to genuine apostolic places of safety!

The first movements for what I call “fake Unity” were within the so called Evangelical Alliance in 1846, who were all theoreticians. At the same time missionaries and revivalists were leading thousands to Christ, but these academics gathered to talk about “unity”. The WCC tends to have long conferences to discuss what to do rather than getting on with the Great Commission. It does not appear to be good stewardship to use the Lord's money jet setting around the world to conferences, unless there is a spiritual result. These people love to talk and grab the headlines and speak about their relevance – but they have no grass roots impact – and yet the people like us, who they criticize or mock, are running the prison church service and bible study and seeing prisoners become pastors!

In 1908, 31 denominations in the US formed the Federal Council of Churches, and in 1951 they became the National Council of Churches of Christ. The real WCC was formed in Amsterdam in 1948. It has 3 arms; the International Missionary Council [IMC] to co ordinate Missionary activity, the Conference on Life and Work [CLW], and the Conference on Faith and Order [CFO].

In 1910 in Edinburgh there was a conference to discuss world missions, which was well supported initially by evangelical missions, but they later withdrew, seeing it as a group that was slowing them down, not adding any value. The key men - John Mott - Methodist - involved in the mission council and for the first twenty years its chairman. He spread the concept of Christian unity. This is not the unity spoken of in the Scriptures but a union of people who belong to different churches whether they are actively spiritual Christians or not. Charles Brent was a Canadian Anglican with a real zeal for unity based on the love of Christ. He saw the Anglican solution from High church to the Church Army as a means of spanning doctrinal differences. The Anglican Church however did not stress doctrine but experience to achieve this, and this is the Neo-Orthodox/Evangelical method. Check the “fruit” of each person named in this lecture.

Nathan Suderblum; what do we make of him? He was the Lutheran Archbishop in Uppsala Sweden. He rejected the apostolic revelation as authoritative, and considered revelation to continue today, especially to intelligent people like him. To this man - True religion rests on our moral character. Religion is what a woman/man is or what he/she does and not what he/she believes. He had an evolutionary view of religion. He is using the same words, but it means different things. The liberals use different meanings to apparently Christian concepts than we do. Were these people really Christians at all? The first CLW was held at Stockholm 1925 with 500 delegates from 91 denominations. They discussed social action.

John Mott and his successor were both in the YMCA and the Student Christian Movement, which were both totally liberal. SCM split and the Inter Varsity Fellowship was formed. The IVF is still more conservative in outlook. Mott was also influenced by Barth. He is the theologian of the ecumenical movement, and is neo-orthodox. Check him out – I don't think he is a believer at all – am I being too harsh?

WCC was financed by John D Rockefeller and others. There was a proposal to join together all Protestant denominations in 1960, and this was welcomed by Bishop James Pike, who was much involved in the occult. He said that the Holy Ghost is on our side every time we break through Christian barriers in this regard.

The prayer was offered in Detroit in 1961 asking the Lord to look mercifully on the “broken body of the church”. The Scripture never tells us about any such thing. The unity of the Christians is always united in faith but the expression of the body will be as a mixed multitude. Joining together a larger and larger mixed multitude is not going to unify the body of Christ, but for dying carnal/liberal churches it was a way to combine dead congregations and try to increase numbers.

As most of the churches involved in the WCC are liberal or “mixed multitude” fellow travelers, this means that there are less covert liberals to worry about in the independent churches, as they have come out and separated. Are we divided if we can join together in many things other than our services? There is unity in diversity with genuine believers and there is always joy when we gather together – for this is the fruit of the Spirit. Each church expresses itself differently. There can be no forced unity, nor can there be unity other than on the common ground of the fundamentals. Like all family members, some of them, though we love them dearly we are best not to hang out too long and intensely together!

There were two groups in the United States that stood against the WCC, the American Council of Christian churches and the National Association of Evangelicals. At the international level; there was the World Congress on Evangelism at Berlin in 1966 co-ordinated by Billy Graham. Later 2700 evangelicals met at Lausanne and affirmed that the church was a visible unity in truth as God's purpose. This unity was through the Cross of Christ - **Ephesians 2:14**. The unity of evangelicals tends to be in the work they do – not the political gatherings. We must be good stewards here, and I do not believe that international meetings, even of great groups, are necessarily a good use of the Lord's money!

## CONCLUSION

Christianity is growing in Africa and Asia at the greatest rate. The main growth is in the Pentecostal and Charismatic areas but that has benefits for all believing groups, Anglican and Baptist are growing significantly in many countries. Seventy percent of all missionaries in the world historically came from the United States. Over 50% of Americans went to church each Sunday a decade ago, but its declining, in New Zealand it is around 5%. Beware the American texts that argue for new forms for the church, simply because revulsion at decades of religious hypocrisy has led to a decline in church attendance at ritualistic, liberal and dead churches, but seen a growth in Pentecostal and fundamentalist fellowships, that don't keep stats, nor will they share their stats with the government!

Christianity is also beginning to flourish in Asia and Latin America. Here again we have the splits between liberals and conservatives. The division is quite violent, and the liberals are sadly often promoting revolution. Due to the communist and evolutionary theory that drives the WCC, genuine missionary work is coming up against great opposition from WCC agencies, because if the true gospel goes through and transforms a place, it will destroy the pseudo gospel of the ecumenical movement and its allies in that place.

What is our challenge? To learn from history and stand upon the faith once delivered to the apostles! **Jude 3** again! Prayer will always be more powerful than human organizers and committee meetings, and the simple word of God preached by one who believes it more powerful than twenty professors of theology arguing about their theories. There is "power in the blood", and it has opened the door of salvation to all. Our only task is to seek the Lord's direction for each of us to do the work we are called to do right here and now!

## DOCTRINE

### BROTHERHOOD OF BELIEVERS

1. All believers are referred to as brothers (Gk adelphos), the Greek word used indicating family relationship with both male and female included. As members of the same family who will rule throughout all eternity together it is of the greatest importance to have a special attitude towards our fellow believers (1 Peter 2:5, 9-10, Revelation 5:10).
2. This attitude should be one of agape love or caring for the ultimate well being of others (1Peter 2:17, 3:8, 1John 3:23, 4:12).
3. We are our brothers keepers, not by way of interference but by being active and alert for their good (Genesis 4:9 cf. James 5:20, 2 Thessalonians 3:15).
4. Because of family closeness there is a danger that one member may lead another astray, so discipline is required (1Corinthians 5:11).
5. In our family there must be a readiness to forgive (Matthew 18:21).
6. The world has its own brotherhood of evil and sin (John 15:19).
7. The soul and fruit of a person shows the family to which they belong (Matthew 12:33).
8. All of us were born into Adam's family (1 Corinthians 15:22).
9. We either stay there in sin or become a member of the Lord's family (John 8:42-44).

## LECTURE 42 VATICAN 2, FATIMA, AND THE EMERGING 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY CHURCH

Shelley Chapters 45-47, pages 468ff

What are we to expect of attitudes towards the truth as we enter this new century, with its challenges from hatred at a level that many believers have not experienced before. First hear the words of Jesus. **John Chapter 15:12-17**, as this remains our challenge, and we are to prayerfully seek the ways to obey these commands in our local church. We are also to truthfully confront the hatred of the enemy. **John 15:18-27**.

We have already dismissed the "irrelevancy" of attacks by theological theoreticians, for Holy Spirit led and filled believers are having maximum impact for the salvation of thousands world wide. We see it in ESOL classes, ALPHA classes, through prison ministry here and overseas, through Sunday teaching messages. What we see today in 2021 is that churches that pray expecting God's answers tend to get them. We see that churches that seriously lift up the Word draw crowds more eager for truth now than they were before "Nine Eleven", and before Covid19. What we also see is that the old "mainline denominations" are now "sidelined social clubs", or have been sold and are redevelopment sites.

Churches are dying, and that is a great and good thing!!!! All nonsense is best eliminated, and God does it as genuine believers gather with others and build new work under the filling of the Holy Spirit. Old churches that do not believe the Word, do not want the Spirit to move need to close down – they are oxygen thieves and space wasters.... What we see however world wide is massive church decline amongst liberals and massive church growth, in Catholic, Pentecostal and Conservative churches, and the occult....

The impact of the internet has been significant with "APPS", streamed movies, and gaming being the new "opiate of the people" – the satanic tranquilizer – but also for Holy Spirit led people, the opportunity to communicate and teach people world wide, at minimal cost from anywhere on the planet. I see it as a funny aside, that Satan no longer uses religion as



the “opiate of the people”, for the dead churches are irrelevant to most, so he goes back to his old “standards”; more for apps, drugs, alcohol, and new church killing theologies.

From genuine believers, many previously Moslems themselves have launched massive Moslem evangelism within the entire Middle East, and with new technology it is being run from Hong Kong, from Melbourne, and many places in Europe and America. Al Hayat out of Melbourne an example. There is a massive increase in hatred towards the genuine Christian faith, but for all who heed the Lord’s words there is massive growth and opportunities for more....

I was part of the Roman Catholic Students Movement from 1970 to 1978 when I left Auckland University. The McLauren Chapel was full of liberals and wallies, and I didn’t like the make-believers there! The Roman Catholic Students met at Newman Hall and our two leaders were priests; the first, Father John Batten – Prior General of the Dominicans, and an amazing and funny philosopher, and author of the Commentary on St Thomas’ Volume on Grace. The second was Father Eugene O’Sullivan, a lovely and Christ like man the like of which I have not often met anywhere. I attended post Vatican 2 Mass every lunch-time, as I loved the time of prayer, and the coffee afterwards was free and “real”. (I was a poor long haired student.)

I was gently told by Fr John that I couldn’t take “the host”, as I wasn’t a Roman Catholic, but in the spirit of Vatican 2 I was welcome as a “separated brother”, the university’s long haired “Baptist Catholic”. Being a long-hair helped, and majoring in Philosophy (I went on to be Tutor of Ethics at AU) made people accept that I was and would be expected to be a bit strange, so things were shared with me in an openness that a straight dress code would not have allowed to happen. The friendships were robust, with lots of wine, lovely intelligent and stable women, lots of song and pipe tobacco, but with people who were thinking, not the Pentecostal immoral “nutbars” that the SCM and EU had in it at the time.

I had been part of the Evangelical Union but the Auckland University group was led by a student more interested in fornicating than Bible study and I had nothing in common with most of them, other than church youth group in the weekends. I kept up my Baptist Youth Leadership role every weekend at Blockhouse Bay Baptist Church but enjoyed my university friendships with the robust and argumentative catholic group, and was part of the incredible ferment of discussion that stemmed from Vatican 2 and the Charismatic revival in the Catholic Churches.

Father John Batten was tasked by the Vatican to “monitor” and report back on the significance of the charismatic renewal in New Zealand and Australia, and so I had a first hand insight into the post Council thinking, and we would often talk into the night about what it all meant. He couldn’t share his work with anyone else, but he could with me as a fellow philosopher, and a Protestant who could comment upon the charismatic revival in ways that he needed to get perspective upon. There had been a wave of the Spirit in BHB Anglican and Baptist and I had seen and experienced the good and the nut-bar aspects of it.

The full impact of Vatican 2 was stalled by conservatives in the Papal Curia and by a couple of Popes, but it now has free reign with Pope Francis. Big issues remain; celibacy, purgatory, prayers to the saints and the role and titles of Mary. 2017 was the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the visions of Fatima, and so these issues need to be understood by all, as the Pope and Catholic Church will take a very definite stand on a number of issues, with the role of Mary at the centre. The Catholic Church is growing faster than all others, and the annual “Passion Week” times of music, prayer and Mass are drawing big crowds everywhere they are held. The Bible is open in Catholic churches and home groups and as we have seen that is always the precursor to revival and change.

This is an area where I do not want you to follow me without thoughtful prayer and real study/research. I suggest a point of view in my short paper on Fatima, but understand it comes from years of working alongside and with many Catholics; both clergy and lay people. Read through Shelley’s last three chapters as an introduction to reflection upon the movements of the last twenty years, but be discerning.

I **disagree strongly** with Shelley and his Revised Edition editor on a number of points, but that is because I was “there” at the centre of a lot of the debates, whereas these American church men and women would not ever have attended Mass daily for years, and been part of this as Protestants. I see things developing now with Pope Francis in light of those things from fifty years ago that are intriguing. There may be significant shifts to redefine the meaning of trinity and worship, in association with the events flowing from 2017 at Fatima and the openness of the 1-9 belief scale allowed.

I believe there is an ongoing palpable disgust with organized religion that murders (be it Islamic ISIS type groups or violent American hate groups), but also any clergy that wastes time, in light of death, on what unbelievers see as “crap”. Materialism – consumerism – secularism are all the same time-space wasting prelude to death, and serious people wants real answers to big questions still.

Is the answer still with the Scriptures and apostolic fathers? I believe it is, and that was the real debate at Vatican 2 in the closing days – and the answer that the Council came to has been delayed in its full emergence for decades, but it is emerging now world wide in catholic Education centres. Is the Bible and the earliest voices of the church fathers the best guide to real Christianity and Really powerful Holy Spirit Faith? The catholic position is a resounding “YES”. **Jude 20-25**

The so called “emerging church” theologies are just time wasting nonsense that we saw in the 1960s and in earlier periods of time, with Anabaptist type strategies, but without any real benefit. Lazy “Jesus freaks” looking for dumb

churches to pay them to waste time.... They want to be paid to hang out in coffee bars – it all happened in the 1970s – and the people doing it then drifted away into the drug or corporate worlds eventually – none remain active in churches today. The “emerging church” nonsense works for those who want a “fellowship” and home groups to entertain the locals, and by life style impact their community for evangelism – but even then it is not as good on the ground as in their literature. The Traditional Church model isn’t broken when the Holy Spirit is moving, for the building is just the framework within which the Spirit moves. The power of the Holy Spirit’s work depends only upon the openness of the believers to embracing God’s path. Look again at what the Lord is doing in your city – and then ask what are you and your church doing, and get the alignment right. Let the Holy Spirit move and lift up the Lord through His Word and you will discover the “secret of church growth” isn’t secret and hasn’t been for 2000 years.

## **DOCTRINE INDEX**

<b>DOCTRINE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Ambassadorship	58
Apostleship	7
Attitude	123
Baptism	97
Baptismal Regeneration: Does Water Baptism Save You?	43
Bible and the Believer	155
Bible: Canonicity	27
Bible: Inerrancy	114
Bible: Inspiration	117
Birth of the Lord Jesus Christ	42
Brotherhood of Believers	158
Celibacy	54
Charity: Biblical Charity	133
Christ: Deity	49
Christ the Firstborn	51
Christian Worker	134
Christmas Traditions: Pagan Origins of Many	41
Church and Israel	102
Church Government	33
Communion: The Lord’s Supper	71
Denials That Characterize the End Time Church	152
Discipline Upon a Nation	152
Election and Predestination	103
Eschatology – Views of Eschatology	68
Eternal Security	124
Evangelism – New Testament Pattern	140
Faith	94
Gospel of Salvation	24
Healing and Miracles	9
Humility	72
Hypostatic Union of Christ	51
Idolatry	64
Legalism	113
Love	17
Marriage	106
Mary – Grace	130
Military	79

**EVANGELICAL BIBLE COLLEGE OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

Ministers	75
Miracles of Christ	8
Miracles: Purpose	7
Missions	137
Money	85
Nations and Races	75
Nations – Divine Institutions	98-99
Paul – Pressure	37
Philosophy	82
Plan of God	89
Poverty	85
Religion	13
Revival	126
Revolution	149
Rich Young Ruler	55
Rock	61
Roman Catholic Traditions	110
Salvation	94
Science and Creation	144
Separation	64
Social Welfare	133
Spirituality	16
Submission	120
Suffering	20
Trinity	46
Trinity in the Old Testament	47
Virgin Birth of Christ	24