WORD AFLAME
8855 DUNN
HAZELWOOD, MO 630

A History of Christian Doctrine

The Reformation to the Holiness Movement

A.D. 1500-1900

Volume 2

David K. Bernard

A History of Christian Doctrine

The Reformation to the Holiness Movement

A.D. 1500-1900

Volume 2

A History of Christian Doctrine,
Volume Two

The Reformation to the Holiness Movement, A.D. 1500-1900

by David K. Bernard

©1996 David K. Bernard
Hazelwood, MO 63042-2299

ISBN 1-56722-187-4

Cover Design by Paul Povolni

All Scripture quotations in this book are from the King James Version of the Bible unless otherwise identified.

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced, stored in an electronic system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of David K. Bernard. Brief quotations may be used in literary reviews.

Printed in United States of America

Printed by

WORD AFLAME® PRESS
8855 DUNN ROAD
HAZELWOOD, MO 63042-2299

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Bernard, David K., 1956–
A history of Christian doctrine / by David K. Bernard.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Contents: v. 1. The Post-Apostolic Age to the Middle Ages, A.D. 100-1500.
ISBN 1-56722-036-3 (pbk.)
1. Theology, Doctrinal—History. 2. Church history. 3. Oneness doctrine (Pentecostalism)—History. I. Title.
BT 21.2.B425 1995
230'.09—dc20 95-35396
CIP

Contents

Preface *9*
1. The Protestant Reformation *11*
2. Martin Luther and Early Lutheran Theology . . . *27*
3. Ulrich Zwingli and Early Reformed Theology . . *49*
4. The Anabaptists *65*
5. The Radical Reformation *89*
6. John Calvin and His Reformed Theology *113*
7. The Reformation in Great Britain *137*
8. The Catholic Reformation *161*
9. Lutheran Orthodoxy *183*
10. Reformed Orthodoxy *201*
11. The Pietists and the Methodists *217*
12. The Nineteenth Century *241*
13. The Holiness Movement *269*

Appendixes *287*
- A. Dates in the History of Christianity *289*
- B. Oneness Believers in History *295*
- C. Baptism in Jesus' Name in History *297*
- D. Speaking in Tongues in History *299*
- E. Holiness Teaching in History *301*

Notes *305*
Select Bibliography *319*
Index *325*

Preface

This book surveys the history of Christian doctrine from approximately A.D. 1500 to 1900. It generally follows chronological order and identifies the most significant events in church history, but the emphasis is on tracing doctrinal developments. To further this purpose, it discusses some events thematically rather than in strict chronological sequence.

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

Occasionally material in this book may seem complex and foreign, but some treatment of details is necessary to provide background and to impart a feel for significant issues and problems. The main objective is to introduce the leading historical figures and movements in Christendom and to convey a basic understanding of their doctrines.

This information will provide various perspectives on biblical issues and will aid in dialogue with people of different backgrounds. The reader will see when, how, and why certain biblical doctrines were abandoned and certain unbiblical doctrines embraced, and will see how God has worked to restore and revive fundamental truths that were largely forgotten.

This book arose out of teaching two semesters of

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

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

1

The Protestant Reformation

In the sixteenth century, the Protestant Reformation brought dramatic changes to Christianity and instituted the modern era. Beginning with Martin Luther in 1517, significant numbers of people in Western Europe challenged and soon rejected many important features of medieval theology. In addition to Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, there emerged a third branch of Christendom, called Protestantism.

The Road to the Reformation

A number of individuals and groups had already repudiated some Roman Catholic practices and beliefs, but they had not successfully threatened the entire system. In the twelfth century, two strong groups had arisen

as alternatives to the institutional church of the Middle Ages. The Waldenses, or Waldensians, sought to return to a more biblical theology and a more holy lifestyle. The Albigenses, or Albigensians, also desired a purer, more simple life but brought elements of Persian dualism into their thinking.

In response, the Roman Catholics established the Inquisition to root out "heretical" beliefs and people. Although no one knows how many people were imprisoned, tortured, or executed, a crusade called by Pope Innocent III in the early thirteenth century slaughtered twenty thousand men, women, and children in the town of Béziers, France, because it refused to surrender its heretics. Under its first grand inquisitor, the Dominican monk Tomás de Torquemada, the Spanish Inquisition burned at the stake about two thousand people.[1] The Inquisition was successful in exterminating the Albigenses, and it severely curtailed the Waldenses.

By the early sixteenth century, the times were ripe for the Reformation. Undeniably the hand of God was at work. In addition, volume 1 of *A History of Christian Doctrine* discusses several important reasons for the beginning of widespread skepticism and the greater willingness to question traditional doctrines:[2]

• The Crusades raised questions by bringing new *influence from the Muslim world and from ancient Greek philosophy* preserved by the Arabs.

• *The corruption of the clergy and the papacy* caused great disillusionment and questioning.

• The Catholic Church was guilty of *many economic abuses*, including ecclesiastical taxation, absenteeism, simony, and the sale of indulgences.

• *The rise of nationalism* made people less willing to submit to the Roman pontiff, especially in political matters.

• *Mysticism*, an emphasis on subjective religious experience, helped undermine the authority of the church.

• *Nominalism*, the philosophical view that universal concepts and ideas have no objective reality, also helped undercut the church's authority.

• The *Catholic humanists*, led by Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) of Rotterdam, questioned and reinterpreted many traditional doctrines, proposed ethical reforms, and proved as forgeries some supposedly ancient documents that the church and pope used to support their claims of political power.

• *Theological and spiritual conviction* was undoubtedly the most important factor.

• *The invention of the printing press* in 1456 by Johann Gutenberg facilitated the spread of dissent. For the first time, the Bible and other literature could be published cheaply and made available to the masses. The common people were able to compare the teachings of the church with Scripture in a way that few had been able to do before. Now, dissenters could present their views to thousands via simple tracts, and it was almost impossible to destroy all the literature. Without the printing press, it is doubtful that the Reformation could have succeeded to the extent that it did.

Despite earlier dissenters such as Peter Waldo, John Wyclif, and John Hus (or Huss), the Reformation did not take place with them but with Martin Luther. Although Luther initially sought only to reform the doctrines and

practices of the Roman Catholic Church from within, the intransigent response of the pope and the logic of Luther's own views rapidly moved him to break away totally and found the Protestant movement.

Historically, he is unique as the man who successfully precipitated the break with Rome. Theologically, he is unique in that he clearly enunciated the doctrine of justification by faith and made it the basis of his entire theology. Other groups and individuals before him had attacked many of the same elements of Roman Catholicism as he did, and some of them operated to a great extent on the basis of justification by faith, but they did not clearly express their opposition to the Catholic Church in those terms. It was left to Luther to proclaim the central principle by which the entire Catholic system was attacked and upon which the entire Reformation was built.

Martin Luther and His Ninety-five Theses

Martin Luther was born in 1483 in Eisleben, Germany, to a family of peasant background, but by the time he was eighteen they apparently had some money, for he enrolled at the University of Erfurt, the best in Germany at the time. As a young man, Luther enjoyed life and lived exuberantly, but he was a pious Catholic. He first saw a complete copy of the Bible at the university at age twenty.

In 1505 Luther earned the master's of arts degree and, following his father's wishes, began to study law. That summer, however, his life changed drastically. Shortly after a close friend was unexpectedly killed, Luther was caught in a sudden thunderstorm and almost struck by lightning. In his fright he made a vow to St. Anne that if she would deliver him he would become a monk.

After surviving the storm, he entered the Augustinian monastery at Erfurt over the opposition of his father. There he began a systematic study of theology and became a priest. In a few years his superior transferred him to the monastery in Wittenberg, where he lectured on philosophy at the University of Wittenberg and earned a doctorate of divinity. Eventually he became a noted professor of theology there, as well as a preacher and pastor.

In 1510 Luther took a pilgrimage to Rome and performed various acts of devotion in sacred places. For instance, at a staircase supposedly taken from Pilate's judgment hall, he walked up the steps on his knees in order to obtain an indulgence promised by Pope Leo IV in 850. He wished his parents were already dead so that he might release their souls from purgatory by saying masses in the holy city.

Luther expected Rome to be the epitome of the highest ideals of the Roman Catholic Church. Instead he found a corrupt, cynical system dominated by secular and ecclesiastical politics, pleasure, and materialism. He saw first-hand the worldliness of the Renaissance papacy and heard about the shocking crimes and immorality of Alexander VI, pope from 1492 to 1503, who had numerous mistresses and illegitimate children. Luther returned to Germany disillusioned.

The pope at the time, Julius II, was a warrior who used military force to extend papal power. He amassed a great fortune through his office, lived in splendor and luxury, wore priceless jewels, and lavishly patronized the arts, including the work of Michelangelo and Raphael. His successor, Leo X, who reigned at the time of the Reformation itself, was made an abbot at eight and a

cardinal at fourteen. A member of the powerful de' Medici family, he pursued pleasure, lived extravagantly, and promoted numerous relatives to high and lucrative ecclesiastical positions despite their immorality.

As a monk, Luther was conscious of his sinfulness and greatly concerned about his personal salvation. Living under fear and guilt, he sought assurance of salvation through strict personal disciplines, including frequent confession to a priest, fasting, prayer, and even whipping himself. He never found peace or security in these practices, however.

As he studied the Scriptures, he came across Romans 1:17, which seemed to leap out at him: "The just shall live by faith." The statement burst upon his consciousness like a light as he realized that he could never be saved by his works but needed to trust in God's grace for the forgiveness of sins. He concluded that justification by faith is an act of God that makes the sinner righteous apart from his own works.

In the words of the noted church historian Philip Schaff, "This experience acted like a new revelation on Luther." Schaff explained its significance for Protestantism:

> The Pauline doctrine of justification as set forth in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, had never before been clearly and fully understood, not even by Augustine and Bernard, who confound justification with sanctification. Herein lies the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant conception. In the Catholic system justification is a gradual process conditioned by faith and good works; in the Protestant

> system it is a single act of God, followed by sanctification. It is based upon the merits of Christ, conditioned by faith, and manifested by good works.[3]

Luther's doctrine of justification by faith was the key insight that sparked the Reformation. Although for a time he remained a Roman Catholic priest and monk, his life took a radically different direction. He began to teach and preach in accordance with his new understanding of the Book of Romans. He gradually began to realize that something was seriously wrong with the Catholic system, which emphasized meritorious works, penance, prayer to the saints, relics, indulgences, and so on, rather than simple faith in Jesus Christ.

The catalyst that brought Luther's thinking to a culmination was Pope Leo's program to sell indulgences to complete the construction of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, which was to become the greatest cathedral in the world. To raise the enormous sums required, the pope sent agents throughout Christendom for an aggressive sales campaign. Actually, in Germany, half the proceeds went to retire the debt that the archbishop of Mainz, Germany's highest ecclesiastical official, had incurred in purchasing his post.

The sale of indulgences was a major source of revenue for the popes of this time. According to medieval Catholic theology, every person faced both temporal and eternal punishment for his sins. The remedy was the sacrament of penance, in which the sinner confessed his sins to a priest, received absolution (forgiveness) for the eternal punishment, and performed satisfaction (works of penance prescribed by the priest) for the temporal

punishment. Most people expected to suffer for a time in purgatory as well.

There was an alternative, however. Drawing upon the heavenly treasury of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, the pope could grant an indulgence to cover the temporal penalty. Typically he prescribed a certain pious act or payment of a certain fee. By purchasing an indulgence in this way, a person could render immediate and complete satisfaction for his sins, or he could help deliver a dead relative from purgatory.

In 1517, the papal sales agent in Germany, Johann Tetzel, was particularly crass in his methods. He played upon the emotions of people, appealing to them to deliver their loved ones from the tormenting flames of purgatory so they could enter heaven. He promised that when they heard the coins clink in the iron collection chest, their loved one's soul would be released from purgatory. He also assured those who purchased indulgences that upon death they would enter directly into heaven without having to suffer for years in purgatory. As one might imagine, Tetzel was enormously successful in raising funds for the pope.

Many theologians looked askance at these tactics, and Martin Luther began to preach against trusting in indulgences. Finally Luther decided it was time for further action. On October 31, 1517, he posted on the door of the castle church in Wittenberg ninety-five theses opposing the sale of indulgences. This was the accepted method for inviting academic debate.

This event is traditionally seen as the beginning of the Reformation, although at the time Luther did not envision a split from the Roman Catholic Church. His purpose in

posting the theses was to conduct an academic inquiry that would curtail the sale of indulgences and reform the thinking of the church. He did not engage in a frontal attack on the fundamental doctrines of Catholicism; the ninety-five theses dealt primarily with indulgences and the theory underlying them. Luther expected that members of the hierarchy would look favorably upon his points and halt excessive tactics like those Tetzel employed.

This first step was actually quite mild. What Luther did not fully appreciate at the time, however, was that he struck at the heart of the pope's financial system. Instead of getting a sympathetic hearing from the hierarchy as he had hoped, he was denounced as a deadly threat. Luther was ordered to stop speaking on the subject.

Luther refused to be silenced. Many of his colleagues and students at the university had already embraced his ideas. He engaged in public debates and began writing treatises to support his views. The ninety-five theses were widely distributed in tract form. Many people began to rally to his cause, for many already had similar reservations about the sale of indulgences and the worldliness of the church.

One thing quickly led to another. If the sale of indulgences was wrong, the entire system of merits was questionable. If the system of merits was wrong, then the sacramental theology of medieval Catholicism was fundamentally flawed.

It soon became clear that the problem was not merely one of excessive practices but erroneous theology. To establish the proper theological foundation, Luther began to develop further his central insight: justification by

faith. We are counted as righteous in God's sight not by our good works, but by our faith in Jesus Christ. This doctrine shook Roman Catholicism to the core.

It is probable that some sort of break was eventually inevitable under any circumstances, but the Catholic hierarchy grossly mismanaged the entire dispute. They issued ultimatums to Luther to stop spreading his views. Finally, in 1520, when it was evident that Luther would not retract his statements, Pope Leo X issued a papal bull (official pronouncement) threatening excommunication, or expulsion of Martin Luther from the church for heresy. His books were to be burned, and if he did not repent in sixty days, he was to be burned as well.

The pope next began to pressure Luther's ruler, Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony, one of the princes who elected the Holy Roman emperor. He was supposed to punish Luther or send him to Rome for punishment. Frederick was sympathetic to Luther, however, and deferred action.

Luther responded defiantly to the pope, denouncing him as a heretic and the Antichrist. He even said that no one who abided by the bull could be saved.[4] On December 10, 1520, he gathered in Wittenberg with a large group of colleagues and students, built a bonfire, and burned the papal bull. The break with the Roman Catholic Church was a reality.

In June 1520, Charles V, the twenty-year-old king of Spain, was selected as the new Holy Roman emperor. The pope urged him also to enforce the bull of excommunication. The German princes were not enthusiastic about upholding papal authority, however. They had long felt that the Italian popes were meddling in their internal affairs, and they sensed an opportunity to curtail intrusive

papal power. Some also sympathized with Luther for theological reasons.

Charles summoned Luther to appear at his first diet (meeting of the German princes), held in 1521 in Worms, and promised him safe conduct. Of course, in the previous century John Hus had been burned at the stake despite a similar promise regarding a similar summons, on the ground that a promise made to a heretic was not binding.

At the diet, representatives of the pope denounced Luther as a heretic and demanded that he recant. After requesting a day's delay, Luther responded that he did not accept the supreme authority of popes or councils but would recant only if someone could prove to him from Scripture that he was in error. His exact words are not known for certain, but it is traditionally reported that he said, "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen." He knew his life was at stake.

The next day, Charles V decided against Luther. True to his word, Charles gave him safe conduct for twenty-one days but said that afterwards he would treat Luther as a heretic. On the way back home, Luther was suddenly "kidnapped" by armed horsemen under the direction of Elector Frederick and secretly detained almost one year at Wartburg Castle for his own safety. During this time he translated the New Testament into German, which helped make the Bible available to everyone and also aided greatly in the standardization of the German language.

When Luther finally emerged out of hiding, he had such support from the German people and many of the German princes that he was able to preach and teach openly. Even though for the rest of his life he was still

under the sentence of death, he was able to give crucial leadership for many years to the movement he started, until his death in 1546.

The Spread of the Reformation

At this time the major powers of Western Europe were Spain, France, England, and the Holy Roman Empire. The empire was a conglomeration of semi-independent German states that included modern Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Bohemia, Austria, and parts of Italy. Russia was beginning to emerge as a power in Eastern Europe, and there were a number of smaller states.

As we have seen, the Protestant movement began in Germany, where it initially had the greatest impact. Soon the Germans began choosing between *Lutheranism* and Catholicism. Each state became characterized by the religious choice of its ruler. The Holy Roman Empire was riven by controversy, political infighting, and eventually religious warfare, with Lutherans and Catholics each trying to gain control over the other.

In 1529 the princes of the Holy Roman Empire gathered for a diet in the city of Speier. The Catholics under Emperor Charles V dominated the Diet of Speier, which forbade Lutheran teaching in the Catholic states of Germany but proclaimed tolerance for Catholicism in the Lutheran states. The Lutheran princes protested against this decision, but they were in the minority and lost. The princes who protested became known as *Protestants*. The rivalry and fighting continued.

Finally, the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 settled the matter. Charles V granted each state the right to choose and maintain its own religion. The northern and eastern

German states were Lutheran, while the southern portion of the empire, such as Bavaria (southern Germany) and Austria, remained Catholic. Lutheranism also became dominant in Scandinavia.

In Switzerland, the second major branch of Protestantism arose, called the *Reformed*. It began in 1523 in Zurich with Ulrich Zwingli, a noted preacher and pastor who, like Luther, had previously entertained doubts about the Catholic system. He differed with Luther in regarding the Lord's Supper as symbolic only, with no real presence of Christ in the elements.

Zwingli died in 1531 and was soon eclipsed in significance by John Calvin in Geneva, whose theology was quite similar. Calvin's comprehensive theological writings laid the foundation for the Reformed wing as it exists today. It gained ascendancy in Switzerland and the Netherlands (as the Reformed), in Scotland (as the Presbyterians), and for a time in England (as the Puritans).

The Reformed also gained a significant following in other European countries, including France, the native country of Calvin. The king and nobles upheld Catholicism and severely persecuted the Protestants there, known as the Huguenots. The most notorious example was the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572, in which thousands of Huguenots were brutally killed, to the immense satisfaction of the pope. Many of France's Protestants fled the country. Eventually the remaining Huguenots were protected by the Edict of Nantes in 1598.

Spain remained solidly Catholic; the Reformation never gained a significant foothold. The most severe persecutions under the Inquisition took place there

before and during the Reformation. Italy, home of the papacy, also remained Catholic, although there were sizeable pockets of dissent, especially in the north.

The third major wing of Protestantism in the sixteenth century was the *Anabaptist*, which had its beginning with some followers of Zwingli in 1525. They renounced infant baptism and sought to restore the doctrine, practice, government, and lifestyle of the early church, before its merger with the state under Emperor Constantine. The Anabaptists never became a majority in any country but were scattered across Europe, particularly in areas where the Reformed were strong. Unlike Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and the rest of Protestantism, they held it wrong to become a state church.

The fourth major branch of Protestantism was the *Anglican*, or Church of England, which began with King Henry VIII in 1534. Initially Henry denounced Martin Luther as a heretic, but he soon came into conflict with the pope over divorcing his first wife. He broke with Rome for personal and political reasons, naming himself rather than the pope as the head of the Church of England. Although he resisted theological change, eventually the leading Anglican theologians embraced the essential tenets of Protestantism. His daughter, Queen Mary I ("Bloody Mary"), tried to turn the country back to Catholicism and severely persecuted the Protestants. Under Queen Elizabeth I, however, England was permanently established as a Protestant state.

By about 1600 the Protestant Reformation had reached its greatest extent in Europe. Northern Europe had become mostly Protestant, particularly Lutheran. Central Europe was a mixture of Lutheran, Reformed,

Anabaptist, and Catholic. England was Anglican. Southern (Latin) Europe remained Catholic.

In 1618 the Thirty Years' War began. It was the last serious attempt to make all of Germany Catholic. The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 ended the war, finally settling Europe's religious conflicts and curtailing much of the pope's political power.

Looking at the major countries of modern Europe, Roman Catholicism continued to dominate the areas of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, southern Germany (Bavaria), Belgium, Austria, Poland, and Lithuania. Great Britain, most of Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Iceland, and Finland were predominantly Protestant.

In Eastern Europe, Eastern Orthodoxy continued to hold sway in its traditional domain, including modern Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Greece, Romania, Bulgaria, and Serbia. These lands were not affected significantly by the Reformation. The areas of modern Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Croatia were predominantly Catholic, but most had significant Protestant minorities. Albania and Bosnia-Hercegovina were predominantly Muslim. These Eastern European lands, except the areas of the former Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, were part of the Ottoman Empire at this time and thus under Muslim control.

In less than twenty years from Luther's ninety-five theses, then, four major wings of Protestantism emerged: the Lutherans, Reformed, Anabaptists, and Anglicans. Clearly, the stage had been set for theological revolution. Many people everywhere had begun to doubt traditional medieval doctrine. Luther was the one who struck the

decisive blow, but in a short time the movement developed momentum that took it far beyond the original ideas of Luther himself. We turn to a discussion of these developments in chapters 2-7.

Postscript

It is ironic that some Protestants today denounce the Oneness Pentecostal movement for the "revelation" of Jesus Name baptism and the oneness of God and for departing from "historic orthodoxy." Actually, however, Oneness Pentecostals explain that their teaching does not derive from extrabiblical revelation but from a rediscovery of biblical truth as illuminated by the Holy Spirit. They also affirm that traditional majority beliefs can never be the arbiter of orthodoxy, but Scripture alone.

This defense is precisely the one that Protestants employ for Martin Luther and his "new revelation," to quote Philip Schaff. As Schaff's further comments exemplify, they typically say that no one since apostolic times accurately taught the doctrine of justification by faith until Martin Luther, and they further maintain that this formulation is the essential core of the doctrine of salvation. In his own defense, Luther rejected appeals to councils and popes—the "historic orthodoxy" of his day—and insisted that he be judged by Scripture alone.

Protestants who wish to be consistent with their own history and theology cannot label Oneness Pentecostals as heretics or cultists simply because they do not follow historical tradition but claim to embrace biblical truth largely forgotten and abandoned. Instead, they should engage them in a respectful scriptural discussion with the goal of ascertaining the truth.

2

Martin Luther and Early Lutheran Theology

As we have seen, Martin Luther based his theology on the doctrine of justification by faith, which led him to reject the Roman Catholic system. A few months before the posting of his famous ninety-five theses, he had actually prepared ninety-seven theses that were more comprehensive and more explanatory of his early theology. But it was the ninety-five theses that precipitated the break with Rome.

When Luther's goal of stopping the sale of indulgences and reforming the thinking of the church was thwarted by unyielding opposition from the hierarchy, he was led step by step to consider the entire scope of Catholic theology. In a few years he was attacking the

sacramental system and the papacy itself in the strongest of terms. To him, the Roman Catholic Church was the Babylonian harlot in the Book of Revelation.

Justification by Faith

The fundamental insight of justification by faith is the basis not only of Lutheranism but also of the entire Protestant movement. In opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification by faith and works, Luther emphatically stated that justification is by faith alone. In his German translation of the Bible Luther insisted on adding the word "alone" to Romans 3:28, so that it said, "A man is justified by faith [alone]."

Justification means to be counted as righteous by God. When a person believes on Jesus Christ, God imputes the righteousness of Christ to him. Instead of looking at his sins, God sees only Christ's righteousness and rewards him accordingly.

The watchwords of the Reformation are grace alone, faith alone, Scripture alone, and Christ alone (*sola gratia*, *sola fide*, *sola Scriptura*, *sola Christus*). In other words, salvation is solely by the grace of God, not by human action. It is solely by faith in God, not by works of man but by trusting in God. Scripture alone is the authority for doctrine, the sole authority for our salvation. Christ is the only atonement for our sins; we can find salvation only in him.

Theology of the Cross

Martin Luther characterized his theology as the "theology of the Cross." From start to finish salvation is a work of God's grace purchased by Calvary. Jesus Christ's atone-

ment on the cross is what makes salvation available to us.

Luther contrasted his theology of the Cross with other concepts, which he called the theology of glory. Only if we teach that salvation is strictly by God's grace on the basis of the Cross, do we have the theology of the Cross. If we add anything by making human works part of the salvation process, then we detract from what Jesus did for us and instead we glorify man. Man becomes a co-redeemer, resulting in a theology of glory that exalts human accomplishments. Luther's entire theology revolved around justification by faith alone and the theology of the Cross.

Supreme Authority of Scripture

Luther rejected tradition as our authority and said Scripture is our sole authority for doctrine. Consequently, the Protestant Reformation reemphasized the study of the Bible, seeking answers from it instead of the church hierarchy.

The renewed emphasis on Scripture was a significant departure from both Catholic theology and practice. In 1229 the Catholic Church had forbidden the laity to read the Bible, because they were not theological experts. They would not understand it but would only become confused. Instead they were to accept the interpretations and pronouncements of the church as authoritative.

Indeed, the Bible was generally available only in Latin, the dead language of church ritual and scholarship, not in the language of the people. Likewise, the entire liturgy was in Latin and therefore generally incomprehensible to the average person who attended mass.

Luther declared that the Bible, the liturgy, and the preaching should be in the language of the people. He

believed that the average person could understand the basic message of Scripture (the doctrine of the perspicuity of Scripture), and he translated the Bible into German to make it available to them.

Although he elevated Scripture above tradition, Luther was quite conservative in implementing this principle. He said believers should only reject views and practices that clearly contradict the Scriptures, but they are free to retain all others. Unlike many later Protestants, such as the Anabaptists, he did not favor discarding all traditions, liturgy, and practices not found in the Bible. If a tradition is clearly erroneous in light of Scripture, then Christians must throw it out, but if the Bible does not specifically address the matter then they are free to retain it.

Luther indicated that the authority of Scripture does not rest in the canon, the list of books that have been historically accepted, but in the gospel message. What makes Scripture authoritative is its presentation of the gospel of justification by faith. Portions of Scripture have greater or lesser value depending on how much they present the gospel.

The Old Testament is not as relevant as the New Testament because the New Testament presents the message of justification by faith more clearly. Even within the New Testament, some books are more important than others. For example, Luther called the Book of James "an epistle of straw" because he believed it did not fully harmonize with the doctrine of justification by faith alone.[1] He considered James problematic because it emphasizes that faith can only be shown by works, and his Catholic opponents were fond of quoting James 2:20: "Faith without works is dead."

The Book of James reveals that faith is not merely mental assent but a living relationship with God that cannot help but produce works. If there are no works of faith in a person's life, that is evidence his faith is not genuine.

Luther's rejection of the correlation between works and faith in James reveals his willingness to interpret Scripture by his doctrine of justification by faith. He thus compromised his teaching that Scripture is the sole authority for doctrine.

Luther acknowledged that we must interpret Scripture by the illumination of the Holy Spirit but said the Spirit would not teach anything other than the gospel. When some Protestants began to emphasize the move of the Spirit, prophecy, and the need for a spiritual understanding of Scripture, he rejected them as "enthusiasts" (or "fanatics"), saying they did not adhere to the gospel. They in turn criticized him as a man of letter and not of the Spirit. In theory he was open to an anointing of the Spirit, but in practice he restricted the possibilities of the work of the Spirit to what would conform to his understanding of justification by faith.

Law and Gospel

Luther looked at the law (the Old Testament, particularly the law of Moses) and the gospel as radically different. He said that the gospel replaces the law, so he saw a sharp discontinuity between the way God dealt with people in the Old Testament and the way God deals with people today.

He identified the purposes of the law as civil and theological. God gave the law of Moses to establish civil regulations and to lead people to the truth of justification by

faith in Christ. Now that we have come to this truth, we no longer need the law.

He acknowledged that the moral law contained in both testaments shows a justified person how he is supposed to live in order to please God. But he did not put great emphasis on law, whether Old Testament law or the moral law of both testaments. To him, the moral guidance of the law is helpful, but it is not of the essence of salvation or the gospel.

Doctrine of Humanity

Luther taught that all humans are sinners from birth (original sin). They are born in sin, bound by sin, and destined for eternal damnation. They can only will to do evil. No one can choose good of his own accord, much less actually do good.

Not only are we sinners by our actions, but we are sinners by our nature. The sinful nature means that we are inclined to do evil and in fact bound to do evil, and it further means that we cannot even desire to do good or to seek after God. The only way for someone to desire God is for God's grace to work in him first.

In short, we have only a passive capacity to let God turn our will toward Him. We cannot exercise our will to choose God, but when God comes with His grace, He can change our will.

Doctrine of Salvation

Luther's doctrine of humanity logically leads to the doctrine of individual predestination (unconditional election), and that is exactly what he taught. Like Augustine in the fifth century (after all, he had been an Augustinian

monk), he said a person is saved only by God's prior, unconditional choice.

Luther was driven to this position by his desire to secure his doctrine of justification by faith against any possibility of compromise. He concluded that if a person could use his will to choose God, then he would be cooperating with God in salvation, and that would mean justification by works. Even though a person acknowledges that God's grace must work first, if he has a responsibility to accept or reject the message of salvation, in Luther's thinking it would dilute or destroy salvation by grace alone. He considered that any decision to accept God's grace, or any agreement with God, would be a work and therefore contrary to faith.

Consequently, he taught that God predestines who will be saved and who will be lost. God sends grace to the individuals he has chosen, changes their will, and gives them faith. Then they are justified by the faith that God has given them. They cannot resist this choice; it is purely by the grace of God with no human input whatsoever.

From a Wesleyan, Holiness, or Pentecostal perspective, Luther's views on predestination, grace, and faith are erroneous. By scriptural definition, faith is man's positive, active response to God. Accepting God's grace is not only possible but necessary. Doing so is not a meritorious human work that brings salvation, but it is the essence of saving faith. In the Bible, it is impossible to separate saving faith from the obedience of faith.[2]

In Luther's attempt to avoid a theology of glory (salvation by works), then, he defined faith itself as a gift of God that operates apart from an individual's will. He thought this definition was necessary to avoid the

works-righteousness system of the Roman Catholic Church. While his definition of faith certainly eliminates meritorious works, it does so at the unscriptural expense of eliminating the human will itself. Thus one's perception of choosing to repent becomes merely an illusion.

Luther defined justification as the decree of absolution that God pronounces upon sinners. He viewed the sinner as coming before God, unholy, unrighteous, and undeserving, and God as pronouncing him to be righteous. In other words, Luther taught that God washes away sins strictly on the basis of the Cross and through the faith God imparts to those He has chosen to save. Thus justification has nothing to do with the individual himself. It does not change the person internally. It is merely an objective act of God, purchased by Calvary, and applied by God according to His predetermined choices.

In summary, Luther taught that a person's salvation is not primarily something that happens inside him, but outside him. It was historically purchased by Calvary and it was decreed for him through the mechanism of predestination. There is no experience of salvation by the person himself at the moment of justification. The person continues to commit sin as before, but now as a justified sinner.

In an exaggerated phrase to emphasize this point, Luther wrote to his junior colleague Philip Melanchthon, "Sin boldly!"[3] He was not actually promoting a sinful lifestyle, but he sought to underscore his belief that no matter how much a Christian sins, God's grace covers him and he should not allow guilt to assail him. Luther was an advocate of morality, but his theology did not emphasize holiness of life. He focused on justification to the neglect of sanctification. His central theme was that

we cannot do anything to save ourselves; we must believe that God has elected and justified us. What we are, what we have done, or even what we are going to do is irrelevant to our salvation; God's choice alone is the determining factor.

The goal of Luther's doctrine of salvation was to help people overcome the doubt, fear, and pharisaism associated with the medieval system of works righteousness, but it went too far by taking away human responsibility altogether. Luther did not intend to lead people into a sinful lifestyle, but he regarded it as inevitable that people will continue to sin habitually after they become Christians. Since salvation rests solely in God's choice, there is nothing they can do about it, so they simply need to renounce any guilt feelings over sinning.

Luther did speak of a continuing work of God that leads into actual righteousness. Yet this progressive righteousness has no bearing on a person's standing in the sight of God, but merely with the ongoing Christian life. Thus he taught that salvation progressively transforms us, a process some later Protestant writers called sanctification. As a Christian grows in grace, he will become actually righteous in his actions. In this connection, the law—the moral law of both testaments, the natural law of God as revealed to conscience, and the principle of love—is helpful in showing Christians the path to follow in order to please God.

Doctrine of the Church

Luther's view of the church was positive—he called it "mother church"—but it was different from Roman Catholicism. While he felt it necessary for people to be

linked to the church, he rejected the authority of the pope and the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The supreme authority is the Word of God, not the pope or the priesthood. Moreover, every believer is a priest in the sight of God (the universal priesthood of believers). Jesus Christ has become our high priest; therefore we need no other earthly mediator. Each Christian can go to God directly for himself.

Luther did not, however, totally abandon the idea of confession to a priest. He still considered confession of sins to a minister to be appropriate and helpful in many cases, but a person's relationship with God is not based on the minister. Each person has his own relationship with God as a priest. No one has to go through another person to be justified in the sight of God or receive forgiveness of sins.

Not only is every Christian his own priest to God through Christ, but every Christian is a priest to others. There is no radical distinction between clergy and laity, for everyone can intercede and minister on behalf of others.

Not every Christian fills the role of publicly preaching the gospel, however. A person must be called to the preaching ministry. This call is typically approved by the prince, the magistrate, or the congregation. The secular government and the church government need to recognize a person's calling to preach and then ordain him.

Turning to public worship, the central focus of the medieval service was the mass (Eucharist). Only the priest and perhaps a choir sang in Latin, and often there was no preaching unless the bishop came to speak. Luther placed renewed emphasis on congregational singing and wrote hymns in German for that purpose, including "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God." He also made

the preaching of the Word the most important element of the service.

Church and State

To a great extent, Luther accepted a strong relationship between the church and the state. Of course, he rejected the supremacy of the pope over both church and state, but he retained the strong connection between church and state that had characterized Christianity since the time of Emperor Constantine in the fourth century.

Luther saw a parallel between law and gospel and state and church. As sinners we are subject to the law of the state, but as Christians we look to the church for the message of salvation through the gospel. Christians should not use the state to promote the church's goals, and the state should not use the church to promote the state's goals. Nevertheless, the state has an obligation to support the church, and secular rulers have a right to participate in the government of the church. In practice, Luther cooperated closely with the German princes in the operation of the church.

As a result, in lands where it gained political control, the Lutheran Church became the official state church. It was supported, at least in part, by taxes the government collected for this purpose. Even today, in some European countries, this practice prevails.

Doctrine of God

Luther retained the traditional medieval doctrine of God, including trinitarianism. He disliked the philosophical language used to define the trinity, however, particularly the word *homoousios* ("same substance"),

which in the *Nicene Creed* describes the relation between the Father and the Son.[4] When exposed to the work of Michael Servetus, who denied the trinity but upheld the deity of Jesus Christ, Luther confessed having had doubts of his own but rejected the book as "wicked":

> Visionaries like the writer do not seem to fancy that other folks as well as they may have had temptations on this subject. But the sting did not hold; I set the word of God and the Holy Ghost against my thoughts and got free.[5]

The Sacraments

Luther abandoned the Catholic interpretation of the sacraments, with its emphasis on merit. He defined a sacrament as a physical act chosen by God to be a sign of His promise. In order for a ceremony to be a valid sacrament there are two requirements: it had to be instituted by Christ and it must be bound up with the promise of the gospel. In other words, it has to be related to justification by faith.

Using these criteria, he reduced the seven sacraments of medieval Catholicism to only two: baptism and the Eucharist. He did not oppose the others but did not regard them as sacraments.

The Lutherans continued to practice confirmation and, of course, marriage and ordination. Luther strongly objected to penance with its requirement of works, but he was willing to allow confession to a priest (minister) as helpful but not essential. The Lutherans abandoned the administration of last rites (extreme unction).

Water Baptism

Luther held that baptism confers the remission of sins and is necessary to salvation. In this regard he adhered not only to the position of the Roman Catholic Church but to the teaching of the first five centuries of Christianity.

Luther's *Small Catechism* (1529) explains the significance of water baptism, citing Mark 16:16 and Titus 3:5-7:

> It works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to all who believe, as the Word and promise of God declare. . . . It is not water, indeed, that does it, but the Word of God which is with and in the water, and faith, which trusts in the Word of God in the water.[6]

The *Augsburg Confession* (1530), an early statement of orthodox Lutheranism, says that original sin brings "eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit. . . . Of baptism they [the churches] teach that it is necessary to salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered."[7]

How did Luther reconcile the necessity of water baptism with justification by faith? While many Protestant teachers today denounce the belief that baptism is necessary to salvation on the ground that it contradicts justification by faith, Luther did not see a contradiction between these two doctrines. He affirmed that God has ordained baptism for the washing away of sins, and faith is the means by which we receive this divine work at baptism. Faith makes baptism effective.

Like the Catholics, Luther continued to insist upon baptism for infants, but he had some difficulty explaining

how this practice is consistent with justification by faith. At first he said that baptism operates by the faith of the parents when they bring their child to baptism.

Eventually, though, he appealed to his doctrine of predestination for the answer. A person is saved because God has elected him and imparted saving faith to him. There is no difference between an infant and an adult in this regard. Neither one exercises his own will, but he only exercises what God has given him. Thus denying baptism to infants because they cannot consciously believe is a form of justification by works.

When we turn to the baptismal mode and formula, we see how Luther and his followers failed to implement fully the authority of Scripture over tradition. He expressed a preference for baptism by immersion based on Romans 6:4 and the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo* ("dip"), but he said immersion was not necessary, and Lutherans typically sprinkle instead.[8]

In *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520), Luther described some people in his day who insisted on using "the words, 'I baptize you in the name of Jesus Christ.'" He defended the validity of their baptism since "it is certain the apostles used this formula in baptizing, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles."[9] Once again, however, he deemed the formula nonessential. He did not regard the mode or formula as connected with justification; therefore they were relatively unimportant.

The Eucharist

The other sacrament that Luther acknowledged was the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper. On several points, however, he opposed Roman Catholic Church practices of the time.

First, he insisted that the laity receive both the bread and the cup in order to benefit fully from the sacrament. The Catholic practice at the time was to withhold the cup from the laity. Since Catholics believed that the wine literally changed into the physical blood of Christ, they did not want to risk spilling His blood by passing it around. Only the officiating priest drank from the cup, and he had to drink all the contents so that they would not be disposed of improperly.

Second, Luther denied that the Eucharist was a new sacrifice of Christ for the remission of the sins of the participants and denied that partaking of it counted as a good work that helped render satisfaction for sins. Such beliefs detracted from the Cross and from justification by faith.

Finally, Luther opposed transubstantiation, the doctrine that the elements actually turn into the blood and body of Christ. His alternative view was so close, however, that most Protestants since his time have had difficulty in seeing the difference.

Under the Catholic view the elements completely turn into the historical blood and body of Christ even though they still look like bread and wine. Luther ridiculed this notion, for the bread and wine were obviously still bread and wine. But since Jesus said, "This is my blood" and "This is my body," the blood and body of Christ must join with the bread and wine. The elements still are bread and wine, but they also invisibly contain the real blood and body of Christ. Later writers termed this view as *consubstantiation*, meaning the substances are joined together rather than being completely transformed into something different.

To maintain this doctrine, Luther developed an unusual view of Christ's body. Christ physically ascended to heaven, but because He was both human and divine his physical body took on some attributes of the divine. One attribute of deity is omnipresence (being everywhere present). Christ's physical body shares in this attribute to the extent that it can be *ubiquitous*, or many places at one time. While it is in heaven, it can also be everywhere people celebrate the Eucharist. It is not confined to one location or one celebration at a time.

Luther bitterly attacked other Protestants, such as Ulrich Zwingli, who held that the elements in the Lord's Supper are symbolic only. He denounced Zwingli as a heretic, a heathen, and of the devil. He said he would rather celebrate the Eucharist with the Catholics than with Protestants who held to a symbolic or spiritual view.

Summary and Evaluation

Five central tenets characterize the theology of Martin Luther, and to this day they distinguish Protestants from Roman Catholics:

1. *Justification by faith* instead of faith and works.
2. *Sole authority of Scripture* instead of equal authority of tradition and Scripture.
3. *Rejection of papal authority* instead of papal supremacy over the church as well as the state when possible.
4. *Universal priesthood of believers* instead of a professional priesthood who alone can administer the sacraments and therefore serve as the mediators of salvation.
5. *Two sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist*

instead of seven sacraments as means of grace.

People in prior centuries had challenged the medieval church in one or more of these areas, but the one who caused the formal break and who clearly proclaimed each of these distinguishing points, notably justification by faith, is Martin Luther. He is truly the founder of the Protestant Reformation.

Nevertheless, several points of Luther's theology are troublesome to Evangelicals and Pentecostals. For example, Luther's explanation of faith means something far different from what most Evangelicals and Pentecostals think today. In Lutheran theology, saving faith is not a conscious decision or a freewill response to the gospel message. Rather, it is something God grants to a person apart from his personal choice. The person is a passive recipient of irresistible grace; he cannot help but exercise the faith that God has given him.

When some proposed delaying baptism until a person could exhibit conscious faith, Luther denounced this idea as salvation by works. If a person has to respond of his own will, then it would be a work.

Evangelical Protestants today face a hard choice when they object to the teaching that baptism is necessary to salvation. If they use the doctrine of justification by faith alone as their means of doing so, they reject the meaning of this doctrine as taught by Luther. On the other hand, if they use Luther's notion that conscious acceptance of baptism is a meritorious work and therefore neither necessary nor effective, then they must also affirm that any act of choice—such as repeating the "sinner's prayer"—is also a meritorious work and therefore neither necessary nor effective.

In short, Luther's radical definition of justification by faith alone can only be maintained logically if a person also embraces his doctrine of individual predestination. In his system, connecting salvation to any human choice would mean salvation by works.

From a biblical perspective, the principle of justification by faith is truly the heart of the gospel, but Luther's definition of faith is seriously deficient. Making a conscious choice is inherent in any meaningful, scriptural definition of faith. Once a person accepts this biblical truth, then he will understand that responding to the commands of the gospel is not a meritorious human work that earns salvation, but an act of faith. God is the one who performs the work of salvation in a person as he exhibits his trust in Him by meeting the conditions of His Word.

Although Luther's theology often attacked the teachings of Catholicism, in many ways he still remained as close to the Catholic Church as possible. On baptism, for example, he still held that it was for the remission of sins, including original sin. The Lutherans still practiced infant baptism by sprinkling in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Luther still affirmed the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, although in a slightly different way. The Lutheran Church still maintained a close relationship with the state. In worship and liturgy it retained everything possible, rejecting only what the Bible absolutely forbids, such as the veneration of statues.

Luther retained so many Catholic traditions because of his intense, almost exclusive focus on justification by faith. According to his definition of the doctrine, other things were not of primary importance. Instead of letting Scripture have authority over all tradition, as his own doc-

trine called for, he let tradition override much of Scripture because he reduced the essential message of Scripture to the skeleton of justification.

As a result, the doctrines of the inspiration, the inerrancy, and the canon of Scripture suffered. Faith itself became a shadow of its biblical essence due to its link with predestination. Repentance was devalued, believer's baptism rejected, and holiness of life relegated to secondary importance.

Luther's conservatism caused him to reject in the strongest of terms the innovations of later Protestants, as shown by his harsh treatment of Zwingli. He himself took a dramatic leap, but once he had done so, he acted as if he were set in concrete. When others tried to develop his principles further, Luther refused to budge. He was vehement in his condemnation and unwilling or unable to capitalize fully on his own insights.

He especially opposed the Anabaptists because of their stand against infant baptism, and he advocated violent persecution and execution of them. When the theological and political ferment he had instigated eventually produced peasant revolts against the German princes, Luther supported the princes completely. He failed to see that just as he had broken with the authoritarian structure of the church, so many people wanted to throw off the authoritarian political structure. He wrote an infamous treatise entitled *Against the Murderous and Thieving Hordes of Peasants*, in which he said, "Let everyone who can smite, stab, and slay" them.[10] The rulers did exactly that in quelling the revolts.

In his later years Luther regrettably exhibited anti-Semitism, which contributed to this deadly poison in

German culture to such an extent that even the Nazis sometimes quoted his more intemperate remarks to justify their position. Initially Luther had high hopes that when the church was reformed, Jews would convert to Christianity in large numbers. When they did not, he turned against them, advocating that their books be burned and they be expelled from the country.

Luther's views on holiness fell short of the scriptural ideal. His medieval German peasant heritage influenced him more than Scripture in some ways, including his use of coarse language, his violent reaction to opposition, and his love of beer.

On the other hand, he did much to dispel faulty concepts of holiness that were prevalent from ancient times, such as the equation of sexuality with sinfulness and the identification of holiness with legalism, monasticism, and asceticism. For example, he left his monastery, rejected celibacy, married a former nun, and established a loving marriage and a happy home.

A notorious example of how Luther's theology adversely affected practical Christian living is found in his dealings with Philip of Hesse, a German prince. Philip had entered into an arranged marriage for political purposes, but over the years he engaged in many adulterous affairs. After he became a Lutheran, he felt condemned but did not have the power to change his ways. He fell in love with a seventeen-year-old girl and concluded that marrying her would cure him of adultery. However, divorce was also considered a grave sin. What was he to do?

Luther advised him to marry the girl without divorcing his wife. Although acknowledging both divorce and

bigamy to be sinful, Luther felt that bigamy in this case would be the lesser of two evils, citing Old Testament examples of polygamy.

Luther further advised keeping the second marriage a secret, since it was against the law. When the truth became widely rumored, Luther recommended telling "a good, strong lie."[11]

In this instance, his views on the inescapable sinfulness of Christians and the church's duty to support the state left him blind to the true solution: calling the prince to repentance (after the manner of John the Baptist) and encouraging him to overcome sin by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Luther's thinking is inevitable, however, if one believes that Christians are habitual, helpless sinners yet remain justified by an external faith that God grants them unconditionally, regardless of their personal attitude towards God, sin, and righteousness. Even though Luther wanted people to live a holy life, in the final analysis his doctrine allowed them to disobey God's will flagrantly and with impunity.

Despite Luther's unquestioned greatness, from an Apostolic Pentecostal perspective his theology is seriously flawed on a number of points.

Luther is somewhat of a contradictory figure, being so farsighted and progressive in some ways yet so limited and reactionary in others. Some historians have described him as the first modern man but also the last medieval man. Theologically, it was important for the Protestant Reformation not to stop with Luther but to pursue further reformation and rediscovery of the truths of Scripture.

Having noted Luther's many limitations, we must credit him for his insight, determination, and dedication to the doctrine of justification by faith. Others rejected various unbiblical aspects of the medieval church, but he went to the heart of the matter. He laid the axe to the root of the medieval system by denouncing righteousness by works and merits. Even Catholic theologians today typically acknowledge that Luther offered much-needed correctives. Modern society as a whole, and Bible-believing Christians in particular, are deeply indebted to the life and teaching of Martin Luther.

3

Ulrich Zwingli and Early Reformed Theology

The second major branch of Protestantism, the Reformed, began with Ulrich Zwingli in Zurich, Switzerland, around 1523. Zurich was a prominent city located in the German-speaking region.

Zwingli was born in 1484 in Wildhaus, Switzerland, and in the local dialect his first name was Huldreich. He studied in Bern, Vienna, and Basel, earned a master's degree, and entered the Roman Catholic priesthood at age twenty-two. He became pastor in Glarus after paying over one hundred guilders to buy off a rival candidate, and later he became chaplain of a monastery at Einsiedeln.

A patriot, Zwingli placed the interests of his country

above those of the Roman Catholic Church hierarchy and its Italian leadership. In his day the Swiss were renowned warriors and often served as mercenaries in foreign wars and at the behest of the pope. Zwingli preached against participation in these wars as ultimately harmful to Switzerland. Despite the opposition that this view aroused, he became a prominent preacher and public figure.

Zwingli was influenced by the teachings of the Catholic humanist Erasmus, who questioned or reinterpreted some medieval doctrines without leaving the church. As early as 1516 while at Einsiedeln, before Luther's break with Rome in 1517, Zwingli had begun to turn from Catholic theology to the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith. He did not undergo a dramatic conversion like Luther, but through a study of Scripture and the exercise of reason he gradually came to change his views. By 1518 he was attacking the sale of indulgences and other abuses, and he read with excitement the early writings of Luther.

At this time, the office of people's priest (pastor and pulpit preacher) came open at Grossmünster Cathedral, the leading church in Zurich, and Zwingli was considered for the position. He admitted that he had been unfaithful to his vow of celibacy while at Einsiedeln (as well as at Glarus), but he promised to reform. His sin was hardly unique: his chief rival for the position had fathered six sons! The bishop of Constance, whose diocese included Zurich, raised seventy-five hundred guilders in one year (1522) by charging priests four guilders each time they wanted absolution for the sin of fornication.[1]

Zwingli was chosen as pastor of Grossmünster and

began serving in 1519. He immediately started preaching on Protestant themes. By 1522 his opposition to Rome was obvious, and he was challenged to defend his views in public disputations. In 1523, in preparation for three major debates with Catholic apologists, he framed sixty-seven articles, or conclusions. Although not as famous or as significant historically as Luther's earlier ninety-five theses, these conclusions were much more thorough and comprehensive in setting forth the essential Protestant doctrines. They challenged the entire system of Roman Catholicism, including the papacy, the mass, priestly celibacy, indulgences, confession, and penance.

Perhaps 1523, then, is the best year to identify the formation of Reformed theology. It was distinct from Lutheranism yet closely aligned with it in opposition to Roman Catholicism.

Zwingli became the religious leader of Zurich and the unofficial political leader as well. He set up a presbyterian system of representative church government and instituted numerous ecclesiastical and political reforms. Under his leadership, the hiring of Swiss as mercenaries was banned, Lenten fasting was eliminated, and priests were given permission to marry. Zwingli himself married secretly in 1522 and openly in 1524, and in so doing was finally able to overcome his besetting sin of fornication.

Zwingli's influence and the Reformed movement spread rapidly in Switzerland and nearby lands. Some early Reformed leaders were Johann Oecolampadius (1482-1531) in Basel, Berthold Haller in Bern, Pierpaolo Vergerio in Italian-speaking Switzerland, Martin Bucer (1491-1551) in Strassburg (then Germany, now France), Guillaume Farel (1489-1565) in Geneva (French-speaking

Switzerland), followed there by John Calvin and then Theodore Beza (1519-1605), Pierre Viret in Lausanne, and Peter Martyr Vermigli (1500-62), an Italian who taught theology in Strassburg and England. Heinrich Bullinger (1504-75) was Zwingli's successor in Zurich.

Zwingli was influenced by Luther, but he was not simply a disciple of his. While indebted to Luther, he developed much of his thought independently, and in some instances his theology owes more to the ideas of the Catholic humanists.

In 1529, Zwingli and other Swiss Reformers met with Luther and some German Reformers in the town of Marburg to discuss doctrinal differences and to explore the possibility of joining forces ecclesiastically and politically. The discussion, known as the Colloquy of Marburg, foundered on their differing views of the Lord's Supper. Zwingli did not regard the difference as a barrier to fellowship, but Luther was not even willing to concede that Zwingli was a Christian.

Like Luther, however, Zwingli had little use for Reformers more radical than himself. When the Anabaptists emerged around 1525 from among his followers in Zurich, he opposed them despite initially sympathizing with many of their views. He allowed and approved of the execution of early Anabaptist leaders by the city council of Zurich.

The Reformed movement did not succeed in converting all of Switzerland; the country was divided between Protestants and Catholics. Each side vied for total supremacy and, in the territory under its control, denied religious liberty to the other.

At Zwingli's urging, the Protestants advanced militari-

ly against the Catholics, seeking to extend their domain. He accompanied the troops as chaplain and strategist. Although armed, he did not actually fight. At Cappel in 1531 he was wounded on the battlefield while attending to a dying soldier. Captured by the victorious enemy that day, he was killed by a captain who recognized him. His body was burned and the ashes mixed with those of a pig and scattered.

On hearing of Zwingli's death, Luther, who had already called him a "gross heathen," dismissed him as "the devil's martyr." He remarked that Zwingli perished "in great and many sins and blasphemy" and expressed regret that the Catholics were not successful in totally suppressing his followers.[2]

We now turn to Zwingli's theology. It is characteristically Protestant, but we will particularly examine its unique features or areas of strong emphasis.

The Scriptures

First of all, Zwingli believed that the Bible is our sole authority for doctrine. Like Luther he rejected the Catholic idea that Scripture and church tradition are equal in authority. Moreover, he taught that Scripture is infallible.

More than Luther, Zwingli emphasized the role of reason, yet he made it subject to the Scriptures. Human reason teaches us that God exists, but we can only learn about God through Scripture. Thus the natural mind cannot develop theology on its own. The best it can do is to realize that there is a God, but to understand who God is, what He requires of us, and what the truth is about Him, we must look to divine revelation (the Bible), not reason.

Predestination and Salvation

Like Luther, Zwingli taught that salvation is by grace through faith, not works, and believed strongly in the doctrine of predestination. For the leading Protestant Reformers, faith is not a freewill response to God's grace, but a foreordained, irresistible choice on God's part. God unconditionally decides who will be saved and then grants saving faith to those He has selected. Faith becomes an abstract philosophical concept that exists and operates apart from the individual.

Thus salvation comes by predestination, which rests on the providence of God. Like Luther, Zwingli championed this view because it refuted every form of salvation by works. To him, it was the only way to avoid the works righteousness of the Catholic system. He explained his belief as follows:

> We are saved by faith, not by works. Faith is not by human power, but God's. He therefore gives it to those whom he has called, but he has called those whom he has destined for salvation, and he has destined this for those whom he has elected, but he has elected whom he willed, for this is free to him and open.[3]

Zwingli taught that a person is either part of the elect or part of the reprobate. The elect are those God has chosen to be saved, and His act of choice is called election. Those God has allowed to be damned are called reprobate, and God's decision not to choose them is called reprobation.

How does someone know whether he is one of the elect or not? Zwingli's response was that, humanly speaking, we can only look at the outward signs of election. A

desire for the things of God is evidence of God's grace at work in a person's life. If a person is baptized, comes to church, prays, partakes of the Lord's Supper, and endeavors to live a godly life, he is manifesting signs that God's saving grace is present. Otherwise, there would seem to be no reason why he would want to do these things.

In theory, then, election occurs without reference to human action, but in practice there is a strong incentive for people to perform works that give them assurance of election. While some may conclude that the doctrine of predestination provides a license to sin, the early Reformed Protestants were motivated to follow many godly disciplines as signs of election. Of course, they interpreted their actions as being prompted by God's electing grace, not by their own human desires.

Unlike Luther, Zwingli believed that some noble pagans could be among the elect, such as the Greek philosophers whom ancient theologians admired so much. All the elect are saved by Christ's atonement, but some of the elect may not be part of the visible church. Pagans will be judged on a different basis from Christians, so it is possible that in pagan lands some people could be part of the elect without their understanding it and without the visible church knowing it.

Zwingli taught the doctrine of original sin—that all people are born in sin and therefore can only be saved by the unconditional grace of God. He believed, however, that infants who die unbaptized are part of the elect.

Law and Gospel

Zwingli had a somewhat different approach from Martin Luther to the relationship of the law and the gospel.

Luther emphasized the discontinuity between the two, stressing that the gospel has replaced the law. For Zwingli there was much greater continuity. The law naturally developed into the gospel. The gospel is the same as the moral law, or the law of love, or the natural law as revealed to the conscience; it just comes under a different name.

According to Zwingli, God has revealed His basic will throughout the Scriptures. We know it now in its fullest extent as the gospel, but actually we can find the elements of the gospel in the Old Testament and its moral teachings. Instead of saying the law has been replaced by the gospel, it is better to say that the law flows into the gospel. The gospel is the most complete expression of God's eternal moral law.

Zwingli classified the Old Testament law under three categories. First, we have the moral law. Some teachings of the law are moral in nature and they are eternal. They are part of the gospel. Second, there is the ceremonial law, which consists of types and shadows pointing to Christ. Now that Christ has fulfilled them, we need not observe them literally. Finally, there is the civil law. God gave some components of the law of Moses to regulate the civil affairs of the nation of Israel, and they do not have direct bearing on the church. They are instructive, however, and in some cases they provide guidance for the Christian state.

The purpose of the gospel is to make us whole and enable us to obey the moral law. It is not as if the law has simply been abolished and rendered irrelevant under a totally different system, but the gospel saves us and enables us to fulfill what has always been God's moral

law. It liberates us from the consequences of having broken the law and then gives us power to obey the moral law.

We see in Zwingli a greater emphasis on sanctification and holiness of life. In Luther's theology, the law for all practical purposes is irrelevant, even though he said it shows us how to please God. But here we have a characteristic of the Reformed movement: a greater emphasis on the need to obey God's moral law, to follow the teachings of Old and New Testament, to be holy in daily life. As a practical example, Zwingli's wife ceased wearing jewelry after their marriage.[4]

The Church

Zwingli taught that the true church is the company of the elect, those whom God has chosen. It is invisible because we do not really know who the elect are. We can observe the signs of election, but only God knows the heart.

The visible church consists of those who confess Christ, obey His commandments, and show the reasonable signs of election. When we see people who have been baptized, confess Christ, go to church, partake of the Eucharist, and live a Christian life, as far as we know they are elect, but only God knows for certain.

Zwingli used this distinction between the visible and the invisible church to explain backsliding. If someone backslides from the church and stays away permanently, then he was part of the visible church but never part of the invisible church. If he were truly elected by God he would have persevered to the end. A person's permanent departure from the church is conclusive evidence

that he was never truly elect.

Zwingli taught that the local congregation has the authority and the obligation to discipline members. If someone professes to belong to the church, he needs to live up to the standards of the church. If he does not, the church has the right and responsibility to discipline him and, if need be, to expel him. As much as possible, the visible church and the invisible church should be harmonized so that those who profess to be Christians actually try to live up to what they profess.

Zwingli also said the church must be subject to the civil law. Like the Lutherans and Catholics, but not quite to the same extent as either, Zwingli advocated a close relationship between church and state. As we have seen, he was able to gain ascendancy in Zurich, converting the city to the Reformed movement and establishing what almost amounted to a theocracy. The civil government of Zurich operated according to the teachings of the church and enforced them, regulating the conduct of its residents whether or not they were professing Christians.

With respect to church services, Zwingli abandoned the Roman Catholic liturgy and many traditional features of public worship such as the use of candles and incense. Instead he sought to devise a liturgy based on the specific teachings of Scripture. By contrast, Luther retained most of these traditional elements.

Although an accomplished musician, singer, and composer, Zwingli banned music in church, including congregational singing. He was displeased with the poor quality, hypocrisy, and monetary compensation associated with church music in his day, and he found no express scriptural mandate for music in the church. He further

believed that true worship was private and should be inaudible.[5]

The Sacraments

Like all Protestants, including Luther before him, Zwingli reduced the seven medieval sacraments to two: baptism and the Eucharist. He took a different approach from both Catholics and Lutherans by saying the sacraments are acts of initiation or pledge but do not convey real power in themselves.

For the Catholics, the sacraments are actually the means of grace, the means of salvation. The Lutherans similarly held that something truly occurs in the administration of the sacraments: in baptism God's grace brings the forgiveness of sin, and in the Eucharist God's grace brings the physical presence of Christ. In contrast to both positions, Zwingli made clear that the sacraments are simply symbols that identify people with the church. They do not confer inward spiritual grace.

To protect his flank against the Anabaptists, who regarded the sacraments as purely symbolic, Zwingli tried to make a distinction as follows: the sacraments are not merely signs of events that have already taken place, but of events that occur at the time of the sacraments. They do not merely look back to the past but function as a pledge in the present.

For instance, baptism signifies that a person is joining the church at that time, although baptism itself does not cause him to become part of the church. It is an act of identification. Similarly, in the Eucharist, a person continues to identify with the church through an ongoing pledge.

Thus the sacraments are signs or ceremonies that

inform the whole church of the participant's faith. The real significance is not an inward work in the individual but a corporate effect.

When the Anabaptists began to teach against infant baptism, at first Zwingli was inclined to agree, since he did not believe infants had to be baptized to be saved, but soon he became a strong advocate of infant baptism. He justified this traditional practice by an analogy to circumcision. In the Old Testament, male babies were circumcised to enter into the old covenant along with their parents, and Colossians 2:11-12 describes baptism as part of our spiritual circumcision.

What Zwingli missed in the analogy, said the Anabaptists, was that baptism is part of the new birth, not physical birth. Thus it should be part of a person's spiritual birth, linked with repentance and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It should be administered to people who come to birth spiritually, not naturally.

Zwingli agreed with Luther that the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and he argued that Matthew 28:19 does not give us the actual formula to use. Nevertheless, like Luther and contrary to his own principle of discarding tradition, he retained the trinitarian formula. He explained:

> The disciples baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. . . . Nowhere do we read that the disciples baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Therefore it is evident that the words in Matthew 28 were not instituted as a form, and the theologians have made the biggest mistake of their lives in their exposition of this text. Not that I forbid

> baptism according to that form. Not at all. I am simply pointing out that according to their true and natural sense these words of God do not impose a strict baptismal form. If they did, the disciples would not have used a different form when they baptized.[6]

Like Luther, Zwingli carried his reformation to a point and then stopped. He went much further than Luther, but like him, he refused to embrace additional logical developments based on his own principles. After a certain level, he remained with tradition instead of continuing to follow the Scriptures. He was almost as adamant in opposing those who carried some of his ideas further, namely the Anabaptists, as the Catholics and Lutherans were in fighting him.

Regarding the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist, Zwingli taught that it is a time of thanksgiving and rejoicing. Christ is not bodily present in the bread and the wine, but He is spiritually present in the ceremony. By faith Christ meets invisibly with His people.

In opposition to Luther, Zwingli said Christ's physical body is not ubiquitous: it cannot be in many different places at the same time. His glorified body is in heaven and remains in one physical location as all physical bodies must. Therefore, it cannot also be in the bread and the wine; the presence of Christ in the Eucharist cannot be physical but is purely spiritual.

Speaking in Tongues

While teaching that baptism is only a nonessential, outward "ceremonial sign," Zwingli held that the "inward baptism of the Spirit" is necessary to salvation. He admitted

that speaking in tongues sometimes accompanies this baptism as a sign but argued that this outward sign is not essential. His discussion indicates that he knew about instances of tongues speaking in his day and had no objection to it: "The outward baptism of the Spirit is an external sign, the gift of tongues. . . . This sign is not necessary to salvation, for it is given infrequently and only to a few."[7]

Summary and Evaluation

In summary, Ulrich Zwingli agreed with Martin Luther on the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, including predestination and the strange twist it gives to the definition of faith. He went much further than Luther in almost every other area, particularly in rejecting traditional practices.

Zwingli's principle regarding tradition was to reject everything that the Scriptures do not clearly teach. Whereas Luther was content to retain everything that Scripture does not explicitly condemn, Zwingli wanted to discard everything that Scripture does not explicitly command, even if it had been traditional for hundreds of years. We see these contrasting principles at work in their differing approaches to liturgy.

The sacraments are another prime example of the contrast. While Luther continued to view baptism and the Lord's Supper much as the Catholics did, Zwingli made a radical change by teaching that they were simply symbolic. On the doctrine of water baptism, however, he went too far in one respect and not far enough in another. He dropped the scriptural significance of baptism as being for the remission of sins, yet he retained the nonbiblical

traditions of infant baptism, sprinkling, and the trinitarian formula. Nevertheless, the trend of his theology was to be much more radical than Luther and much more willing to throw away unbiblical tradition.

In one sense, however, we see a regression, at least from the Lutheran point of view: Zwingli downplayed the sharp distinction between law and gospel that Luther insisted upon. Zwingli tried to show that the gospel is the culmination of the law, which the Lutherans saw as a dangerous trend that could lead people back into an overemphasis on works. But from the Reformed point of view, it was a corrective in leading people to place more emphasis on holiness of life.

The comparison of Luther and Zwingli underscores our earlier assessment of Luther: Luther was fundamentally conservative on every issue except justification by faith. On that point he was the most radical of the major Reformers in proclaiming assurance of salvation despite the continuing presence of sin in a person's life.

In chapter 6 we will discuss another Reformed leader who was to have an even greater impact than Zwingli, namely, John Calvin. Followers of Reformed Protestantism are often known as Calvinists because of Calvin's monumental work in developing and systematizing Reformed theology. Nevertheless, we should not neglect the earlier contributions of Ulrich Zwingli. He is the founder of the Reformed movement, and his work foreshadowed most of Calvin's theology. Calvin enunciated, expanded, and refined Reformed theology in his voluminous writings, but the basic tenets were quite similar to what Zwingli had previously espoused and outlined.

4

The Anabaptists

The third major branch of Protestantism in the 1500s was the Anabaptist movement. The Anabaptists are not as widespread today as the other three branches, but historically they were quite significant. Although they never attained the stature of the Lutherans, Reformed, or Anglicans, they offered a distinct theological alternative.

The movement began among followers and supporters of Zwingli in Zurich, Switzerland. We can trace early Anabaptist thought back to 1523—the same year Zwingli articulated his Reformed theology by his sixty-seven conclusions—but the Anabaptists became a separate movement two years later, in 1525, when they began to baptize adults who had previously been baptized as infants.

Everyone saw this action as a clear break from the Reformed Church as well as the Catholic Church. In the

words of Philip Schaff, "The demand of rebaptism virtually unbaptized and unchristianized the entire Christian world, and completed the rupture with the historic church. It cut the last cord of union of the present with the past."[1]

Early leaders were Conrad Grebel (c. 1498-1526), Felix Manz (d. 1527), George Blaurock, Ludwig Hätzer (1500-29), and Balthasar Hubmaier (d. 1528), the movement's earliest theologian. After a public debate with Zwingli in early 1525, the first rebaptism took place on January 21 when Grebel baptized Blaurock.

The movement spread rapidly in Switzerland, Germany, and Austria, in some cases arising spontaneously. Soon Anabaptists were also in Belgium, Holland, England, and Eastern Europe. Among the Czechs, some of the Hussites became Anabaptists.

Many other leaders also emerged, including Hans Denck, Pilgram Marpeck, John Hut, Melchior Hofmann, Obbe and Dietrich Philips, Jacob Hutter, Michael Sattler, and Menno Simons. The earliest Anabaptist statement of faith was the *Schleitheim Confession* of 1527.

At first, Anabaptist leaders thought Zwingli favored their views. Hubmaier said Zwingli agreed that infants should not be baptized. Zwingli also indicated support for their desire to separate church and state. They urged him to institute rapid reforms such as eliminating the traditional liturgy of the mass and the use of images in worship. Zwingli decided to wait for governmental approval, however. Consequently, he drew back from these more radical reformers and soon took a stand against them.

The Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed all classified the Anabaptists as heretics and tried to paint them as

political revolutionaries and religious extremists. The primary reason was their break with the historic church and their advocacy of separation of church and state.

The other religious groups, beginning with the Reformed, persecuted the Anabaptists severely. There was little thought of toleration, and since the other groups did believe in the union, or at least the close cooperation, of church and state, they used the power of the state in an attempt to exterminate their theological opponents.

At the beginning of the movement, the government of Zurich arrested the leaders and pronounced the sentence of death by drowning upon all who insisted on rebaptism—a punishment deemed particularly appropriate. Conrad Grebel was imprisoned but escaped and died of the plague in 1526. The first execution for heresy of a Protestant by Protestants was that of Felix Manz, who was drowned in the Limmat River in 1527.

Other Reformed Swiss cities, such as Basel and Bern, adopted the same policy. Many Anabaptists were killed and many others fled. When they entered Catholic and Lutheran lands, however, they faced similar persecution.

The Diet of Speier in 1529—a meeting of German Catholic and Lutheran princes—decreed that all Anabaptists be put to death by sword, fire, or other means as soon as they were captured, without judge or jury. The most severe persecutions took place under the Catholics. Since they did not want to "shed blood," they did not behead the Anabaptists but instead burned them at the stake.

Zwingli had Hubmaier tortured on the rack and thereby obtained a recantation, but it was only temporary.

Soon Hubmaier and Blaurock were both burned at the stake in Austria, and the former's wife was drowned in the Danube. Hätzer, who allegedly had fallen into adultery, was beheaded in Constance, Germany. By 1530, two thousand Anabaptists had been executed, often with severe torture.[2] So many Anabaptists were killed or scattered that they did not have an opportunity to gain ascendancy in any area.

For the most part, the Anabaptists lived simple, pious, modest, and productive lives. Typically they were hard-working farmers, trying to support themselves and be left alone. After persecution drove most of them out of Switzerland and adjoining areas, many of them eventually established rural communities in places where they were tolerated, especially northern Germany, the Netherlands, Russia, and America.

Revolutionary Anabaptists

The intense persecution of Anabaptists by both Catholics and Protestants caused the Anabaptists to scatter and hindered their ability to organize, develop a consistent theology, and maintain unity. It also created a dilemma as to how they should respond. Most Anabaptists were pacifists who believed there was nothing they could do except endure persecution or flee. A few, however, were radicalized by the persecution and decided to resist violently.

The most notable example was in the German city of Münster, capital of the state of Westphalia, where a group of radical Anabaptists won political power in 1533-34 and immediately found themselves besieged by a Catholic army. They decided to defend themselves and made Jan

Beukels of Leiden their king.

The new government began to regulate morals strictly. However, since there were many unattached women due to the flight of many men, it started allowing polygamy, appealing to Old Testament examples. Jan of Leiden acquired a harem and exercised dictatorial authority. The government also imposed some communistic rules, such as the confiscation of wealth for the war effort, the redistribution of necessities for the poor, and the reassignment of arable land according to the size of households.

Many Anabaptists in Germany and Holland tried to come to the aid of the besieged city, and for a brief time it seemed that the revolutionary element might dominate the movement. Both Catholic and Lutheran cities united against the Münster kingdom, however, fearing a widespread revolt. Ultimately the Catholic army captured the city in 1535 and massacred the inhabitants. The victors tortured Jan of Leiden and two other leaders until they died, clawing their bodies with red-hot pincers, pulling out their tongues, and finally driving daggers into their hearts.[3]

The rise and fall of the Münster kingdom forever discredited revolutionary violence among the Anabaptists. The movement repudiated all use of force and reaffirmed its original commitment to pacifism. It also abandoned any effort to establish a theocracy or communism. This tragic event had the positive effect of returning the Anabaptists to their theological roots and to moderate leadership.

Unfortunately, opponents used this violent interlude in an attempt to discredit the entire movement with the

excesses of the Münster kingdom. Persecution escalated, and many pacifists were executed in the name of suppressing revolution. The movement suffered a severe decline.

Menno Simons (1496-1561), a Dutch Catholic priest who formally converted to Anabaptism in 1536, became the most prominent leader of the movement after the debacle at Münster. He rallied the disheartened Anabaptists and reemphasized the original commitment to nonviolence.

Restorationism

Anabaptism was not monolithic; there were many doctrinal variations, particularly in the early years. Nevertheless, we can identify key themes and characteristic views.

The impetus for the Anabaptists was the search for purely scriptural Christianity. They took an approach similar to that of Zwingli but went much further, attempting to establish all doctrine and practice from Scripture alone. They decided to discard everything not found in the Bible. Instead of holding onto as much tradition as possible as the Lutherans did, they wanted to eliminate as much tradition as possible, keeping only what Scripture clearly teaches.

The Anabaptists searched for the original form of Christianity. More than a reformation, they wanted a restoration. They tried to leapfrog over the intervening centuries and go back to the beginning of the church.

For them, the turning point in church history was the conversion of Emperor Constantine to Christianity and the resulting merger of church and state. From that time forward, the doctrine and practices of the church were

unduly influenced by the state and thereby polluted. The establishment of Christianity as the state religion caused millions of pagans to enter into the church without genuine conversion, fatally corrupting its doctrines and practices. The church as a whole became apostate.

Consequently, they said, we cannot simply try to adjust Catholicism, or even Lutheran or Reformed theology. Instead, we must go back to the early church. We must restore the original, apostolic Christianity.

Even before the Reformation, this restoration impulse had surfaced periodically. The Waldenses of the twelfth century had the same goal of returning to original, pure Christianity. The Franciscans, the mendicant order of monks established by Francis of Assisi, sought to go back to a simple, pristine Christian lifestyle characteristic of the apostles. At the beginning of the Reformation, the development of a prophetic movement among the Lutherans as well as the peasant revolts in Germany were motivated to some extent by restorationism.

The Anabaptists desired the restoration of New Testament Christianity not only in theology but also in liturgy, church government, and lifestyle. They sought to purify and rectify all aspects of the church according to the apostolic pattern.

Separation of Church and State

As part of their desire for original Christianity, they advocated the total separation of church and state. This idea distinguished them from all other forms of Christianity in their day. The other branches favored the concept of a state church and established one whenever possible. Notable examples are the Orthodox in Greece and Russia,

the Catholics in France, Italy, and Spain, the Lutherans in Germany and Scandinavia, and the Reformed in Switzerland. When they had the opportunity, these groups tried to gain control of the government and use the state's power to promote their religion. While everyone else seemed to be stuck in this medieval mode of thinking, the Anabaptists harked back to the earliest Christian thought and at the same time prefigured the modern era by advocating freedom of religion and conscience.

A cynic might conclude that the Anabaptists held this position because they were the only group who never had an opportunity to gain political power, except for the disastrous and short-lived experiment at Münster. But there was a sincere theological reason for the Anabaptists' position: they found no precedent in the New Testament for merging church and state, for the church to use the state's power for its purposes, or vice versa. They understood Jesus to teach a strict separation between the two. (See Matthew 22:21; John 18:36.) The church should not seek support from the state, nor should the state coerce people to join the church or obey its religious rules.

Believers' Baptism

The Anabaptists received their name, meaning "rebaptizers," because they rejected infant baptism and advocated baptism of believers only. This view was not their main tenet, but it was their most visible one. Their opponents gave them this label because they baptized believers who had previously been baptized as infants, but the Anabaptists did not choose this designation for themselves. They did not consider that they were rebaptizing anyone; rather, they believed they were baptizing

people for the first time. To them, infant baptism is not scriptural; therefore it is invalid and no baptism at all.

As we shall see, the Anabaptists placed supreme emphasis on faith, repentance, and holiness. According to their understanding of these doctrines, infants cannot have faith or repent, both of which are scriptural prerequisites for water baptism. Consequently the Anabaptists only baptized those who repented and confessed faith in Jesus Christ.

As long as people simply discussed and advocated these positions they did not incur strong opposition, but when they actually began rebaptizing people, persecution began. The other churches invoked the Justinian Code of 529, which pronounced the death penalty for rebaptism, as justification for executing the Anabaptists. Justinian was a Byzantine (Eastern Roman) emperor who for a time was able to reunite most of the territory of the old Roman Empire under his rule. His code became a basis for subsequent legal systems in the West, and his prohibition on rebaptism was designed to deter splinter groups who sought converts from the Roman Catholic Church.

It is amazing to realize that the first rebaptisms occurred in 1525, only eight years after the beginning of the Reformation. While Luther and Zwingli were still examining how far they were willing to buck tradition, the Anabaptists were making literal application of the principle of *sola Scriptura* across the spectrum of Christian belief and practice.

The Church

The Anabaptists taught that the church is composed of believers who have separated themselves from the

world and who embrace a godly lifestyle. The church is a congregation of holy believers. To join the church a person must repent of sin, place his faith in Jesus Christ, and begin living a new life. Contrary to the practice of the other branches of Christendom, they did not consider anyone to be a church member simply because his family was Christian, he was born in a Christian state, or he was baptized as an infant. Instead they taught that becoming a Christian is an individual, personal decision and experience.

Carrying the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers to its ultimate conclusion, they held that the basic form of church government should be congregational, not hierarchical. In this type of structure, each local congregation makes its own decisions rather than having its affairs controlled by the state or officials of a general church organization.

By contrast, the Roman Catholic Church was strictly hierarchical and to a great extent so were the Lutherans and Anglicans. The Reformed developed a modified form of government, called presbyterian, which was a hybrid that provided for some involvement of the laity. The Anabaptists were unique in holding that the local congregation should control its own affairs, determine its membership, enforce its discipline, and choose its leadership. In their understanding, the body of Christ is composed of self-governing congregations that have fellowship with one another.

Freedom of the Will

Consistent with their view that saving faith involves conscious, personal repentance from sin and commit-

ment to Christ, the Anabaptists emphatically rejected the concept of individual predestination (unconditional election). Here again, they departed radically from the other Protestants of their day, particularly Luther and Zwingli.

They considered predestination—including its corollary, unconditional eternal security—to be an evil doctrine that actually encourages people to live in sin. If a person believes God has predestined him for salvation no matter what he does, they argued, then he will tend to live a sinful lifestyle.

They believed in the doctrine of original sin. Instead of teaching that infants are guilty before God or that people require irresistible grace (predestination) to be saved, however, they taught that all are born with the sinful nature, or the inclination to sin. But the sacrifice of Christ has delivered infants from the guilt of original sin.

Conversion Experience

More than any other sixteenth-century Christian group, the Anabaptists emphasized a conversion experience. The Catholics and most Protestants believed they were Christians from birth and could not identify any specific time or experience when they consciously became Christians. Even the devout among them typically described a gradual growth of faith and a gradual awakening. From their earliest consciousness they felt that they were Christians and had faith in God.

The Anabaptists, however, insisted on a definite experience of conversion. They could identify a time when they turned away from sin and yielded themselves to God—a specific point of repentance and exercising faith in God.

In general, they did not see water baptism or the baptism of the Holy Spirit (in the sense that Pentecostals know it) as part of conversion. Their theology of the new birth stopped at repentance.

Nevertheless, the experience of many Anabaptists went further than their theology of conversion. As one might expect of a group that emphasized the restoration of the apostolic pattern, repentance, a genuine conversion experience, and holiness of life, many Anabaptists received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues. Speaking in tongues occurred among them in both Switzerland and Germany at various times.[4]

In Holland, Menno Simons apparently was familiar with tongues, for he described the experience of Cornelius without noting anything unusual about it: "You see, kind reader, here you are plainly taught that Peter commanded that those only should be baptized who had received the Holy Ghost, who spoke with tongues and glorified God, which only pertains to the believing, and not to minor children."[5]

While we cannot say that speaking in tongues or the baptism of the Holy Ghost was characteristic of the movement as a whole, or a tenet of its theology, we know that many Anabaptists did speak in tongues.

Holiness of Life

The Anabaptists also stressed sanctification, although they did not typically use that term. They considered the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine of justification by faith alone to be inadequate in that it did not emphasize the reality of regeneration, or new birth. They held that when a person is born again, he receives power to resist sin. He

is not forced to live in sin any longer; he does not have to sin every day. In fact, he should not sin.

Moreover, if he continues to sin habitually, living a hypocritical, unrepentant life, the church should remove him from its fellowship. The church should consist only of those people who sincerely seek to live for God and to display holiness in their lives.

In other words, salvation must purify the actual lives of Christians as well as modify their thinking. Genuine conversion, and the Reformation itself, should not only change people's theology but also transform their lives. The focus is not primarily on profession but on lifestyle.

The unregenerate live sinful lives, but the regenerate (believers) are to live holy, godly, overcoming lives. For specific guidance on holy living, Christians should study the New Testament and apply its teachings literally. In particular, Christ's Sermon on the Mount provides important instructions for the church.

For example, Jesus said, "Swear not at all" (Matthew 5:34), so the Anabaptists refused to take oaths, whether in conversation or in legal proceedings. The other Christian groups developed rationales for taking oaths, but the Anabaptists decided they should simply follow Christ's words literally, without qualification. Since they were committed to telling the truth always, there was no need to swear in order to convince others of their truthfulness in certain situations. To them swearing by oath promotes two levels of honesty and suggests that a Christian cannot be trusted in ordinary conversation.

In like manner, they adopted pacifism based on a literal, unqualified understanding of the words of Jesus: "Ye

have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. . . . Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you" (Matthew 5:38-39, 43-44).

Consequently, the Anabaptists refused to take human life. They considered warfare to be part of the worldly system and wanted nothing to do with it. God has not called us to shed blood, they said, but He has called us to peace. Some resisted being drafted into the military, while others served in noncombatant roles. Hubmaier was an exception: he defended the government's right to use the sword.

Some Anabaptists promoted communal living and sharing of goods, based on early examples in Acts, but in general the movement held this to be an acceptable choice but not compulsory. They did cite the examples in Acts to teach that Christians should assist one another voluntarily.

The Anabaptists promoted modesty of lifestyle and dress. They opposed the wearing of jewelry and gaudy decorations. Hubmaier said Christians should be "respectably dressed" at the Lord's Supper, citing I Peter 3:3, which prohibits adornment.[6] Simons denounced professing Christians who wore jewelry and extravagant dress: "They never regard that the exalted apostles Peter and Paul have in plain and express words forbidden this all to Christian women. And if forbidden to women, how much more to

men who are the leaders and heads of their wives!"[7]

The Anabaptists advocated moderation, tried to avoid extremes, and sought to live a quiet and simple life. They opposed various worldly practices such as gambling, wild parties, drunkenness, and the debauchery characteristic of many professing Christians of their time. Many of them abstained totally from alcoholic beverages, despite the prevalence of beer and wine at European dinner tables.

They did not establish a new form of works righteousness, however. They were quite clear in teaching that holiness is not a means of obtaining salvation but a vital expression of the new life in Christ that results from salvation. The emphasis was on holiness but not legalism. Of course, there is always the danger of legalism when people emphasize holiness, and some Anabaptists did develop a legalistic orientation that persists even today.

Historically, the Anabaptists affirmed salvation by grace through faith but insisted that when a person is saved he does not remain in his former condition. A regenerated person has been changed, transformed, and empowered. The true convert is different from what he was before; if there is no difference, then something is lacking in his salvation experience.

In sum, works of holiness are not necessary to obtain salvation, for we receive salvation as sinners saved by grace. Once we are saved, however, God empowers us to lead a transformed life, and holiness is a necessary expression of that new life.

The Anabaptists looked for the soon coming of the Lord. They believed the events of Revelation were drawing near: Christ would return to earth, destroy the ungodly by His judgment, and establish His kingdom on

earth. The hope of the Second Coming sustained them in persecution and motivated them to holiness.

Worship

In the attempt to restore New Testament liturgy, the Anabaptists conducted their worship services simply, without many rituals or traditional forms. They decided to adhere strictly to the New Testament in their services.

Taking a cue from Zwingli, at first they did not have congregational singing because they were not sure they could justify it by the New Testament. As time went on, they concluded, like Luther, that congregational singing is a vital and scriptural part of public worship.

In the Roman Catholic Church, corporate worship was a spectator sport: the people who attended mass simply observed what took place and followed directions. Beginning with Luther, the Protestants sought greater congregational involvement, and eventually the Anabaptists did so more than anyone else. Instead of elaborate ritual, they emphasized praying, singing, and preaching. In the words of one secular historian, "The congregation sometimes shouted and danced, and always sang hymns with great fervor. Preaching was even more important than in more conservative forms of Protestantism, and more emotionally charged with hopes of heaven and fears of hell."[8]

All the Protestants placed more emphasis on preaching than the Catholics had. For Catholics, the central feature of the worship service was the Eucharist—the offering of Christ's blood and body as a sacrifice. The Lutherans still adhered to much ritual and placed emphasis on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The

Reformed made preaching the clear focus of the service. Even more so, the Anabaptists placed emphasis on preaching, and later Protestants followed this tendency.

The Sacraments

The Anabaptists acknowledged the two Protestant sacraments—the Lord's Supper and baptism—and regarded both as symbolic only. They said Christ is not bodily present in the Lord's Supper; it is simply a commemoration of what Jesus did for us by dying on the cross.

In connection with the Lord's Supper, they instituted the practice of washing one another's feet, based on the command of Jesus in John 13:14-15: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." In this instance, as was typical of them, they interpreted the New Testament, and particularly the teachings of Jesus, as literally as possible.

As we have already seen, water baptism was the immediate cause of the Anabaptists becoming a separate movement, but it was not the central feature of their theology. They did not regard it as part of the new birth or a means of grace but as a symbol of God's cleansing, a public confession of faith, and an act of joining the church. Typically they distinguished inner baptism from outer baptism, holding that only the former is the new birth and that it must occur in order to receive the latter. Thus forgiveness (remission) of sins comes before water baptism.

Nevertheless, they taught that baptism of believers is still necessary; it is a command for everyone to obey. Citing Acts 2:38, Hubmaier said, "It is not enough that a

person confesses his sins and amends his life, but beyond that it is necessary that he let himself be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. . . . Those who believe are obliged by the authority of this passage to let themselves be baptized." Against Zwingli, he quoted Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38, concluding, "If now faith alone would be enough, then Christ and Peter would have added baptism in vain. . . . It follows that every Christian is obligated to let himself be marked with the outward water of baptism."[9] The *Waldecki Catechism* (1778) of the Mennonites, says, "Is baptism essential to salvation? Yes. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Mark 16:16."[10]

Initially, the Anabaptists baptized by immersion or pouring. Ultimately, they came to see immersion as the scriptural norm.

The Doctrine of God and the Baptismal Formula

Most of the Anabaptists accepted the traditional doctrine of the trinity, but some did not.[11] For instance, Ludwig Hätzer wrote a hymn affirming that God is one person, not three persons.[12] He was accused of denying Christ's full deity, however.

It is difficult to identify precisely what some of these nontrinitarians believed—whether they affirmed, diminished, or completely denied the full deity of Jesus Christ. It appears that all three positions were represented. In sixteenth-century England, some Anabaptists fell in each category:

> Contemporary documents show how very many of the Anabaptists had lost all faith in the doctrine of the

> Holy Trinity. Some were reviving the Sabellian heresy [affirming the full deity of Jesus Christ], and denying that there was more than one Person in the Godhead; others were teaching a form of Arianism, denying the Divinity of the Second Person, while others again maintained that Christ was "a mere man."[13]

As we might expect, there is also evidence that some Anabaptists baptized in the name of Jesus Christ instead of with the trinitarian titles. Although Hubmaier was a trinitarian and used the trinitarian formula, one of his statements about water baptism implies that the Jesus Name formula was also in use and was acceptable: "It rather takes place in the name of God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, or in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."[14]

He cited Acts 2:38 frequently to show that repentance must precede water baptism, but he interpreted "in the name of Jesus Christ" to mean by the authority of Jesus Christ. Simons similarly explained that the phrase simply refers to Christian baptism.

In Poland, the Minor Church, a split from the Reformed, embraced both Anabaptism and antitrinitarianism and became known as the Polish Brethren. Ultimately, as described in chapter 5, this movement denied the full deity of Jesus Christ, but at first it appears that some nontrinitarians affirmed His deity.[15]

Some of the Polish ministers taught that baptism is necessary to salvation, and some insisted on baptizing in the name of Jesus Christ. Against them, Peter Morzkowski, a Polish Brethren pastor, defended the threefold formula:

> Now, concerning the words that the baptizer uses, of what importance is it to say those words, which until recently the whole Christian world has believed to derive from Christ as the form for the administration of baptism? To them, however, whom this displeases, because the Apostles are perceived to have opposed this precept, who are said to have baptized not by these words but only in the name of Christ, it is appropriate to adduce here those words of Irenaeus [d. c. 200]: "In the name of Christ there is understood he who has anointed and he himself who is anointed, and the unction itself wherein he is anointed."[16]

A Polish Brethren *Catechism and Declaration of Faith*, compiled by George Schomann in 1574, defines baptism as "the immersion in water and the emersion of a person who believes the gospel and exercises repentance in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, or in the name of Jesus Christ. . . ."[17]

Anabaptists Today

Most Anabaptists today are Mennonites, followers of Menno Simons. They are most numerous in Germany, the Netherlands, and the United States. They are characterized by pacifism, separation from the world, and simplicity of lifestyle.

Traditionally the Mennonites have emphasized modesty in their mannerisms, dress, and appearance. Typically, the women wear dresses and not pants, do not wear jewelry or makeup, do not cut their hair, and wear a head covering (following their understanding of I Corinthians 11:1-16). Today, some have relaxed these stands. A doc-

trinal book published by the Mennonites in 1952 explains their position:

> In recent years the Mennonite Church has had to resist the unnatural and unscriptural practice of women cutting their hair. . . . Mennonites have for centuries placed much stress on simplicity of life. Considerable emphasis fell on the external appearance of the Christian; the wearing of jewelry, for example, is proscribed. . . . In the liberation of the present era this Mennonite "Biblicism" with its ordinances and restrictions may seem like a neo-legalism. It is not so intended. The obedience of love is never legalism; it is loveless conformity to a code which is legalism. A joyful awareness of the centrality and foundation of Christ's redemption and of God's grace will prevent this simple and earnest obedience to Christ's Word from degenerating into a formalistic legalism. Furthermore, the "danger" of taking the Bible too seriously is far less grave than the peril of secularism and worldliness.[18]

In recent years a significant number of Mennonites have been baptized with the Holy Spirit, especially in Third World countries. It has been estimated that as many as twenty-five percent have spoken in tongues.

The Hutterites are a smaller branch of Anabaptism in existence today. Followers of Jacob Hutter, they began in Moravia (part of the Czech Republic), and they live communally. Quite conservative in lifestyle, they wear plain clothing and refuse to own televisions, considering them to be an excessively worldly influence.

Some people known as Brethren also have an Anabaptist heritage, particularly the Swiss Brethren. Some have both Anabaptist and Pietist roots, such as the Church of the Brethren, also known as the Dunkers because they baptize by triple immersion.

The Amish, originally led by Jacob Ammann, are a conservative split from the Mennonites. Believing that the main body was becoming too worldly, they determined to maintain the lifestyle of the preindustrial world. They reject modern mechanical inventions such as automobiles and farm machinery but are known as successful farmers. In dress, they are exceedingly plain, typically avoiding colored clothing, ribbons, and other decorations. The men do not shave, and the women have long hair. In some cases, they seem to have focused on legalistic details, such as disputes over whether it is acceptable to wear buttons or to allow chrome on their buggies.

The break with the Mennonites came over the shunning of backsliders—refusing to have fellowship with them in order to bring them to repentance. All Anabaptists historically practiced the ban (excommunication of sinful members), but some, particularly the Mennonites, further practiced shunning. The Amish chose to be much stricter in having no dealings with someone who has departed from the faith.

Summary and Evaluation

In many ways, the Anabaptists took the original principles of the Protestant Reformation—such as justification by faith, the sole authority of Scripture, and the priesthood of all believers—and carried them to their logical conclusions. They were able to do so because they

were motivated by a thoroughgoing restorationism rather than simply a desire to reform the existing church. On a number of issues, including the sacraments, holiness of life, and rejection of tradition, they took their cue from Zwingli, but they advanced far beyond him.

Of the major branches of sixteenth-century Protestantism, the Anabaptists were by far the closest to the later Wesleyan, Holiness, and Pentecostal way of thinking. To a notable extent, they foreshadowed these later movements. The Baptists in seventeenth-century England also adopted many of the same concepts, although there was no direct historical succession. Even the mainline churches in America today, Protestant and Catholic, have adopted important principles first embraced by the Anabaptists, such as separation of church and state and toleration for people of different religious views. In many ways Anabaptists seem to have been several centuries ahead of their time.

On the other hand, there were numerous excesses and false teachings. That was probably unavoidable given the unprecedented mass availability of theological writings via the printing press, the sudden emergence from a thousand years of ecclesiastical apostasy, and the chaos resulting from intense persecution.

Time and again, Apostolic Pentecostals find themselves in accord with Anabaptist views, including the following: the need to restore apostolic doctrine and practice, apostasy of the church under Constantine and afterwards, separation of church and state, freedom of conscience, importance of personal faith, genuine repentance and conversion, rejection of unconditional election and unconditional eternal security, communion as a

memorial, foot washing, believers' baptism, baptism by immersion, demonstrative worship, centrality of preaching, congregational church government, pacifism, avoidance of swearing, practical holiness in lifestyle and dress, and anticipation of the Lord's soon return.

Oneness Pentecostals today would argue that the Anabaptists needed to add only three key elements to attain their goal of restoring the apostolic church: the oneness of God, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of speaking in tongues. Even so, there is evidence that Oneness views of God, the practice of water baptism in Jesus' name, and the reception of the Holy Spirit all surfaced in the early Anabaptist movement.

With regard to the role of water baptism as part of conversion, it seems that the Anabaptists were pointed in the wrong direction by Zwingli's symbolic view. The other choice offered them—the mystical view of the Catholics and Lutherans, which divorced baptism from genuine faith—was so foreign to their scriptural emphasis on conversion that it apparently blocked them from considering that baptism could indeed play a vital role in conjunction with faith. Nevertheless, they did stress the necessity of baptism for the convert.

The restorationism of the Anabaptists was imperfect, but it is remarkable for the rapidity and scope of its development, especially in contrast to the rest of Protestantism. The advances were sufficiently great that, within a few short years from the beginning of the Reformation, it seems there were genuine Apostolic believers as defined by the experience of Acts 2:38.

5

The Radical Reformation

Historians typically use the term "Radical Reformation" to speak of the Anabaptists and others who went even further in rejecting Catholic and Protestant tradition. Since we have already discussed the Anabaptists in chapter 4, we will now turn our attention to other individuals and groups. As used here, the adjective "radical" is not pejorative but simply describes those who carried the Protestant Reformation to its limits, in some cases closer to Scripture but in others away from Scripture.

When discussing the Radical Reformation, many historians use a threefold classification: Anabaptists, Spiritualists, and Rationalists. In this context, the Spiritualists are not people who tried to contact spirits of the dead but those who emphasized spiritual experience or the inner

spiritual life. Mainline Protestants regarded them as mystical and believed they did not place enough emphasis on doctrine.

The Rationalists are so labeled because they rejected various aspects of traditional theology as being incompatible with reason. From the viewpoint of mainline Protestantism, they elevated human reason above divine revelation.

From an Apostolic Pentecostal perspective, some of these people brought needed correctives. Some did not elevate experience above doctrine but sought a balance of worship "in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). Some did not elevate reason above revelation but concluded that, when examined logically, some traditional doctrines are not supported by Scripture.

All three segments of the Radical Reformation generally agreed on the following doctrinal points: separation of church and state, rejection of infant baptism, regeneration or life in the Spirit instead of merely confessing justification by faith alone, rejection of predestination, restorationism, importance of discipleship (practical holiness), and congregational church government. They typically concluded that in practice the Lutheran and Reformed doctrine of justification operated as a new system of indulgences that encouraged its adherents to continue in sin.

In addition, many in the Radical Reformation deviated from traditional Catholic and Protestant orthodoxy by teaching soul sleep (sleep or death of the soul prior to the resurrection), the harrowing of hell (descent of Christ into hades to deliver the righteous souls of the Old Testament), or the divine humanity of Christ (Christ's flesh

was celestial, unlike ours, or not inherited from Mary). For instance, among the Anabaptists, Melchior Hofmann and Menno Simons taught that Christ's flesh was celestial, as did several of the Spiritualists we will discuss.

Early German Spiritualists

Shortly after the Reformation began in Germany, some people attempted to take it far beyond the intentions of Luther himself. Many of them sought a greater experience with God and a more biblical, spiritual way of life.

One of these men was Luther's colleague Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt, professor and dean of theology at Wittenberg. On Christmas Day in 1521, while Luther was hiding in Wartburg Castle, Carlstadt celebrated what is generally considered to be the first Protestant communion. At the urging of many of Luther's followers, he deleted the Catholic references to the Eucharist as a sacrifice, refused to elevate the host for adoration, and offered both elements to the laity. It appeared that the Lutherans were poised for sweeping and rapid changes in theology, practice, and lifestyle.

Upon hearing about the volatile situation, Luther returned to Wittenberg despite the personal risk and regained control of the movement. He reinstituted the traditional mass with its Latin liturgy (for a time), slowed the pace of reform, and blocked many proposals for radical change.

Carlstadt continued to move forward in his thinking, however, and soon split with Luther. He rejected infant baptism as unscriptural, taught that the Eucharist was symbolic only, and espoused pacifism. He advocated the

priesthood of all believers so strongly that he ceased wearing his priestly and academic garb. Carlstadt soon lost his influence in mainstream Lutheranism, but the Anabaptists drew inspiration from some of his teachings.

About the same time, the Protestant movement in Zwickau, a large and prosperous German town, took a radical turn under the leadership of Nicholas Storch, Thomas Dreschsel, and Marcus Thomas Stübner, whom Luther derisively termed "the Zwickau prophets." Inspired by the Hussite and Waldensian movements of the Middle Ages, they "preach[ed] a radical Biblicism characterized by direct revelation in visions and dreams, Spirit-possession, the abandonment of infant baptism, [and] belief in the millennium."[1]

The Zwickau prophets sought to follow the Bible literally, but they also insisted upon the illumination of the Spirit as necessary to understand Scripture. Luther denounced them as fanatics who minimized the written Word; they, in turn, rebuked him as a man of letter only and not the Spirit. Some of the followers of the Zwickau prophets joined the Anabaptist movement when it emerged shortly afterward.

Thomas Müntzer, a pastor who served in Zwickau for a time, was greatly influenced by the Zwickau prophets, and he in turn inspired some Anabaptists. Like the Zwickau prophets, he renounced infant baptism, followed a spiritual hermeneutic (interpretation of the Bible), and embraced the gifts of the Spirit. He believed in "direct instruction from the Holy Spirit in the form of vision, dream, ecstatic utterance, or inspired exegesis."[2]

Müntzer claimed that he and others received the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as promised in Joel 2, and he

integrated it into his theology by teaching a threefold experience of salvation. First, a person must undergo spiritual despair; next he must take up the cross of Christ personally; and then he can and must receive the Holy Spirit. He made a distinction between inner and outer baptism, saying only the former is essential to salvation.

In opposition to Luther, he stressed that faith must be experiential. It is not a work of God apart from the recipient's active involvement, nor is it merely an intellectual comprehension of the historic event of the Atonement. He gave a "vigorous and systematic defense of Spirit-possessed faith as opposed to the merely historic faith of the Wittenbergers [early Lutherans], which he proceed[ed] to expose as false."[3]

Müntzer preached against social injustice and advocated radical reform of society for the benefit of the common people, most of whom lived in poverty. He justified the use of force to deliver people from oppression, and he hoped his preaching would help ignite a social revolution that would usher in the Millennium.

The preaching of Müntzer helped instigate the Great Peasants' War of 1524-25 in Germany and Austria. He supported the revolt and tried to channel it in a theological direction but failed. The insurrection was crushed, and he was captured and executed.

Carlstadt was sympathetic to the aims of the revolt, but he sought to moderate it and was sidelined. Balthasar Hubmaier and others who were soon to become Anabaptists also encouraged the rebellion.

Luther sided with the rulers in opposition to the peasants, and the Lutherans and Reformed denounced Müntzer, Carlstadt, other Spiritualists, and the Anabaptists for

revolutionary violence. The Anabaptists as a movement were not guilty, for the revolt predated them. Early Spiritualists, particularly Müntzer, bore some responsibility, but the peasant wars were caused by historical forces far greater than a few individuals, and they were not primarily religious in nature. Moreover, if we must criticize the Spiritualists for condoning force in an attempt to liberate the poor and oppressed in a dictatorial, inequitable society, we must even more severely criticize the Lutherans and Reformed for their harsh, violent repression of all opposition, both civil and theological, and their attempts to extend their own religious views by conquest.

It seems clear that at least some of the followers of the Zwickau prophets and Thomas Müntzer received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, for they sought and experienced the miraculous gifts of the Spirit as recorded in the New Testament, including what historians call ecstatic speech (tongues, interpretation of tongues, prophecy). It is also probable that when Luther wrote in 1520 about people who baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, he referred to some Spiritualists, for the only active Protestants at that time were Luther's own followers and Spiritualists who had been inspired by him.

If this supposition is correct, then not long after the Reformation began, some people both baptized in the name of Jesus and received the Holy Spirit. Moreover, since some of these Spiritualists were inspired by the Hussites and Waldensians, who had come into existence in the Middle Ages, it may be that they obtained these teachings from people in those movements who had already embraced them.

Caspar Schwenckfeld

Another Spiritualist was Caspar Schwenckfeld (c. 1487-1561), a German nobleman and knight of the Teutonic Order who converted to Lutheranism. He attempted to reconcile Catholicism and Lutheranism by finding a middle way between them. Later, he saw his teaching as providing middle ground between the Lutherans and Anabaptists.

Schwenckfeld placed emphasis on prayer and personal devotion. Like other Spiritualists and like the Anabaptists, he was dismayed by Lutheranism's seeming lack of power to instill morality in its followers. Consequently, he promoted both justification by faith and progressive sanctification.

Schwenckfeld was a trinitarian, but he had an unusual view of the Incarnation. He confessed that Christ had two natures but called His human nature "uncreaturely." He also believed that when Christ died He descended into hades and delivered the souls of the patriarchs.

Much of the early conflict between Catholics and Protestants, as well as among Protestants, centered on the sacraments, particularly the Eucharist. Schwenckfeld proposed that everyone focus on the spiritual reality instead of the physical elements. Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, but in a spiritual rather than a physical way. Moreover, He is present only for those who believe. The Eucharist is spiritually nutritious but does not contain the physical body of Christ.

Not finding ready acceptance of these views, Schwenckfeld and his followers, the Schwenckfelders, eventually decided to suspend the Eucharist altogether until a consensus emerged in Christianity on its meaning. Instead they focused on spiritual communion with the Lord.

As one might suppose, Schwenckfeld took a similar approach to water baptism, regarding the outward ceremony as unimportant but seeking a baptism of the Spirit. He opposed infant baptism.

Schwenckfeld was unsuccessful in his attempt to reconcile various branches of Christianity. Luther rejected Schwenckfeld's view as inadequate, expressing his contempt by consistently calling him "Stenkefeld," meaning "Stinkfield."

Sebastian Franck

Another Spiritualist who held some views like those of Schwenckfeld was Sebastian Franck (1499-c. 1542) of Strassburg. He was a pacifist, held Christ's flesh to be of heavenly origin, and under the influence of Michael Servetus, moved away from trinitarianism while upholding the deity of Jesus Christ. He believed that the outward church broke up in the early centuries, so that no group in his day fully replicated the apostolic church, but the spiritual church was present among the outward churches and even among pagans. His writings have preserved the views of many contemporary Anabaptists and Spiritualists.

Michael Servetus

One of the most amazing men the Reformation produced was Michael Servetus. His theology is unique; he could be considered both a Spiritualist and a Rationalist. Only fourteen years after the beginning of the Reformation, he applied a thorough restorationism to the doctrine of God, denying the trinity while upholding the full deity and humanity of Jesus Christ. Because of his special

interest to Oneness Pentecostals, we will discuss him in some detail.

Life. Michael Servetus is the Latin name of Miguel Serveto alias Reves, a Spaniard who was born in 1511 (or possibly 1509) to a noble, devoutly Catholic family. At age fourteen he entered the service of Juan de Quintana, a Franciscan friar and doctor at the University of Paris who became the confessor of Emperor Charles V. As a teenager, Servetus spent two years studying law at the University of Toulouse in France. There he saw the complete Bible for the first time and participated in a student Bible study group. The Scriptures led him to a life-transforming experience.

In 1530 Servetus accompanied Quintana to Italy for the coronation of Charles V in Bologna. Then he apparently traveled to Germany with the imperial party for the Diet of Augsburg, where leading Protestants presented their views to the emperor. Soon afterward, Servetus left the service of Quintana and appeared in Basel, Switzerland, debating doctrine with Protestant leaders there. He also spent time in another city along the Rhine River, the German city of Strassburg (now Strasbourg, France).

Servetus's study of the Bible in Toulouse convinced him that the Roman Catholic Church was in serious error. His trip to Italy, which exposed him to elaborate religious ceremony, worldliness in high church circles, and adulation of the pope, further confirmed his opinions. While sympathetic to the Protestants' criticism of Catholicism, he concluded that they were wrong on some important points as well, particularly the trinity, predestination, and infant baptism.

In 1531, at age twenty, Servetus published *On the*

Errors of the Trinity in Strassburg, which challenged the traditional doctrine of the trinity. It is remarkable for its originality and scholarship. The next year, he published *Two Dialogues on the Trinity*.

Forced to flee for his life because of his unorthodox views, Servetus went to France, where, under the name of Michel de Villanueve (after his home town), he became a prominent medical doctor, author, and editor. He was a colleague of the famous anatomist Vesalius, and he was the first in the West to discover and record the pulmonary circulation of the blood (through the lungs from the right to the left side of the heart). He began an extended correspondence with John Calvin, the Reformed leader in Geneva. He sent Calvin a manuscript copy of his major work, *The Restitution of Christianity*, which he secretly and anonymously published in early 1553.

As the title of the book indicates, Servetus wanted not merely to reform but to restore Christianity. He concluded that the church fell into apostasy in the fourth century with the adoption of trinitarianism at the Council of Nicea, the merger of church and state under Constantine, and the consolidation of ecclesiastical power under the pope. Like the Reformers, he viewed the Roman Church as the system of the Antichrist, and he listed sixty signs of the reign of the Antichrist, including the doctrine of the trinity, the baptism of infants, the mass, and transubstantiation. He further considered the Protestants essentially as offshoots of the same system, with no organized group accurately representing the true church. He believed that this system would soon fall and the present age would end in the 1500s. He saw his role as heralding the restoration of true Christianity, although

he felt he would probably die in the attempt.

Tipped off by one of Calvin's friends in Geneva, who probably acted at the behest of Calvin himself, the authorities in France arrested Servetus on charges of heresy. While under arrest he managed to escape, apparently with the help of influential friends. The Catholic tribunal condemned him to die and burned him in effigy along with his books.

Servetus hid for several months and eventually decided to flee to Italy. On the way, he made the fatal mistake of passing through Geneva and remaining there for a time. While in church one Sunday, he was recognized and reported to Calvin, who immediately had him arrested and tried for heresy. With the approval of Calvin, the Protestant city council of Geneva condemned him to die on two counts: denying infant baptism and denying the trinity. On October 27, 1553, at age forty-two, he was burned at the stake. Amid the smoke and flames he cried out his last words: "O Jesus, Son of the eternal God, have pity on me!"[4] He died after one-half hour.

Calvin's colleague Farel noted that a shift of one word—moving the adjective "eternal" from before "God" to before "Son"—would have saved him. Thus, the dying cry of Servetus was "one last gesture of defiance to man and confession to God."[5]

Doctrines of God and Christ. In his first book, Servetus began his discussion of the Godhead by identifying Jesus Christ as a true man. The Son is not an eternal person but a man. The Son is a human like us in every way except sin, although He had a spiritual body and soul from heaven. The Son of God came into actual existence at the Incarnation, but we can speak of His preexistence

in the mind of God. In this sense, in his last book, Servetus was willing to speak of the generation of the Word or Son before creation.

Servetus explained that the titles of Father, Word, and Holy Spirit refer to the one God in three manners of acting—essentially, modes or manifestations. The Word is God's self-expression, which began at creation. The Word is not the same as the Son because the Son refers to the Incarnation. The Holy Spirit is God in activity, God exercising His power.

There is only one *hypostasis* of God, not three.[6] (The Greek *hypostasis* originally meant "substance or being," but trinitarians used it to mean "person.") Servetus was willing to use the Latin word for "persons," but only in the original sense of "manifestations" or "dispositions" (to him, the equivalent of the Greek *oikonomia*).

As a consequence of his doctrine, Servetus believed that Jesus Christ is not only the Son of God but also God. He is the revelation of the Father, the total deity, in flesh:

> [Christ] "is really the Father now. . . . He himself is the face of the Father, nor is there any other Person of God but CHRIST; there is no other *hypostasis* of God but him. . . . They [trinitarians] say that one portion, I say that the whole Nature, of God is in him. In him is the whole Deity of the Father. . . . He is God and the Lord of the world. . . . The Father is in the Son."[7]

From Colossians 1:19 and 2:9 Servetus taught that "the whole fulness of God, the whole of God the Father together with all the fulness of his properties, whatever God has, this dwells fully in this man."[8]

Because of some of Servetus's later statements, Calvin and others accused him of being a pantheist. Roland Bainton, his foremost modern biographer, concluded, however: "He is rather an emanationist. God confers being, essence, particularity upon all that is and God sustains all things."[9]

Doctrine of Salvation. Servetus taught salvation by grace through faith. Grace "makes us free from sin, justifies us freely, pours out the Holy Spirit upon us, bestows the kingdom of heaven on us." In opposition to Luther and Calvin, he strongly rejected "the servitude of the will" and the associated doctrine of predestination (unconditional election). He criticized Luther's doctrine of justification by faith for minimizing the value of good works and the supremacy of love. He denied that anyone could be saved by works, but he sought a middle ground between Catholicism and Lutheranism that would uphold salvation by faith yet give due regard to sanctification and love. The truth, he said, is that we receive eternal life through grace and faith, and "the reward of glory is increased by works of love." We begin with faith and are made perfect in love.[10]

Servetus affirmed the necessity of being born again of water and Spirit. For Servetus, like the Catholics and Lutherans but unlike the Reformed and Anabaptists, water baptism is essential to regeneration. He did not believe that unbaptized infants would die lost, however. The age of accountability for sins is about twenty, and baptism is only for those who repent and believe. It should be administered by immersion, and preferably at age thirty in imitation of Christ.

Servetus did not give specific attention to the baptismal formula, but he believed the full name of God was

invested in Christ. He explained that Matthew 28:19 does not teach three beings, but one:

> In the name of the Father because he is the prime, true, and original source of every gift. In the name of JESUS CHRIST, because through him we have the reconciliation of this gift, "neither is there any other name under heaven wherein we must be saved." And in the name of the Holy Spirit, because all that are baptized in that name receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.[11]

Here he identified "Jesus Christ" as the only saving name of Acts 4:12, and like Justin and Irenaeus in the second century he cited that name instead of the title of "Son."

In a letter to Calvin, Servetus referred to John 3:5 and Acts 2:38 to establish the necessity of repentance and baptism, and he urged Calvin to be baptized and receive the Spirit:

> Regeneration, I maintain, comes through baptism. . . . Is it not written that we are born anew by water? . . . As a prelude to baptism Peter required repentance. Let your infants repent, then; and do you yourself repent and come to baptism, having true faith in Jesus Christ to the end that you may receive the gift of the Holy Spirit promised therein.[12]

While Servetus taught the necessity of receiving the Holy Spirit, some of his statements indicate an automatic reception of the Holy Spirit at baptism. Elsewhere, however, he linked receiving the Spirit with faith. He further described a tangible, emotional experience of receiving the Spirit.

Servetus did not identify speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit, but he did indicate that the true church would have miraculous gifts of the Spirit.[13] In one intriguing reference, Calvin indicated that Servetus claimed to speak in tongues, but in the context Calvin probably meant a naturally acquired linguistic ability.[14]

It is interesting to note that, much like Calvin, Servetus rejected transubstantiation but taught that we receive spiritual nourishment through the Eucharist.

As a sample of Servetus's views as well as his strong language, here is an excerpt from a letter to Abel Poupin, a minister in Geneva, which was read at his trial:

> Your gospel is without the one God, without true faith, without good works. For the one God you have a three-headed Cerberus [in Greek mythology, the three-headed dog that guards the entrance to Hades]; for faith a fatal [deterministic] dream, and good works you say are vain shows. Faith in Christ is to you mere sham, effecting nothing; man a mere log, and your God a chimera of subject [enslaved] will. You do not acknowledge celestial regeneration by the washing with water, but treat it as an idle tale, and close the kingdom of heaven against mankind as a thing of imagination. Woe to you, woe, woe![15]

Sympathizers. At first, Servetus seemed close to convincing many people of his view. In Strassburg, some people "lauded it to the stars." The Reformed leaders there, Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito, were initially friendly, and "Capito was thought to favor his views." Oecolampadius, the Reformed leader in Basel, wrote to Ulrich

Zwingli that some of the Strassburgers had accepted Servetus's views. Sebastian Franck wrote to a friend, "The Spaniard, Servetus, contends in his tract that there is but one person in God. The Roman Church holds that there are three persons in one essence. I agree rather with the Spaniard."[16] Servetus himself claimed that Capito assented to his views in private and that Oecolampadius first seemed to accept them but later withdrew approval.[17]

James Ropes and Kirsopp Lake of Harvard University summarized the situation in early Protestantism as follows:

> Until now it had not been quite clear what attitude the newly reformed part of Christendom would finally take toward the traditional trinitarian dogma. It had indeed been, as one may say, provisionally retained in the Augsburg Confession in 1530, but the leaders of Protestant thought were plainly wavering about it, in view of its lack of clear scriptural support. . . . Luther disliked the terms in which the doctrine was stated, and left them out of his catechisms; Calvin had disapproved of the Athanasian Creed and spoken slightingly even of the Nicene, and had only lightly touched upon the doctrine in his Catechism; Melanchthon in his *Loci Theologici* in 1521 had hardly mentioned the doctrine except to pronounce it not essential to salvation; while Zwingli and Farel, Bucer and Oecolampadius, were far from being sound upon it.[18]

Later, when Servetus was tried in Geneva, some individuals were sympathetic to his doctrine. Vergerio, a minister from Italy, wrote:

> It is to be regretted that the scamp has supporters among the doctors and among those who are not just nominally for the Gospel, but wish to be considered as pillars. I say what I know not what I suspect. I have heard it from themselves, not from others, recently and not a long time ago. . . . A friend has written me from Basel that Servetus has supporters there.[19]

Paul Gaddi of Cremona similarly wrote to Calvin, "The heresy that flourishes the most of all, is the doctrine of the proud and Satanic Servetus. . . . How much rather ought you to come forward against this diabolical spirit, who is looked on by so many as having the highest authority in matters of doctrine."[20]

A number of prominent people opposed the execution of Servetus, both before and afterwards, some because of sympathy with his views, others on humanitarian and religious grounds, and others out of opposition to Calvin. Historians identify followers of Servetus in Italy, Poland, Lithuania, and Germany.[21] In most cases, however, they are so called simply because they rejected trinitarianism; apparently most did not also uphold the full deity of Jesus Christ as Servetus did.

Three professors of the University of Basel—Borrhaus (Cellarius), Curio, and Castellio—were suspected of embracing Servetus's views.[22] Under a pseudonym, an Italian wrote a work entitled *Apology for Michael Servetus* that championed his teachings. Some Waldenses in northern Italy became Anabaptists, and some of them were favorable to the views of Servetus.

Matthew Gribaldi, a professor of law at Padua, and John Valentine Gentile, who was beheaded in Bern,

espoused many of Servetus's views, but the former veered into tritheism and the latter into subordinationism. Another antitrinitarian, John Campanus, developed a binitarian theology. Ultimately, most antitrinitarians of the time became Arian or unitarian. No permanent group followed the specific teachings of Servetus.

Summary and Conclusions. The theology of Michael Servetus was original and unique. His writings contain inconsistencies, errors, ambiguities, and repetition, but considering that he practically invented his theology from scratch by age twenty, the results are still amazing. He was the equal of the foremost Reformers in intellect, scholarship, and spirituality, although his chief opponent, John Calvin, was more controlled in temperament and more systematic and lucid in writing. It took extraordinary brilliance and strength of personality to stand alone against "orthodoxy" and develop a biblical theology far more advanced than that of any contemporary.

On the doctrine of God, Servetus was essentially biblical. Despite some questionable ideas, faulty expressions, and doubtful analysis of certain historical views, the two key features necessary to a genuine Oneness theology clearly emerge: (1) There is one God with no distinctions in His essence. (2) Jesus Christ is the true God, the Father, the fullness of the Godhead incarnate. Apostolic Pentecostals today are not followers of Servetus, but the sixteenth-century Reformers would have gladly burned them alive along with him.

On the doctrine of salvation, Servetus was sound theoretically on grace, faith, repentance, the necessity of water baptism, and the necessity of the Holy Spirit, but it is not clear what he actually experienced. His theology of

the name and identity of Jesus Christ and his discussion of Matthew 28:19 lead us to expect that he was baptized with the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ. He testified to a definite experience in the Holy Spirit and valued the miraculous gifts of the Spirit; it would not be surprising if he spoke in tongues.

He exhibited human failings by dabbling with astrology, deceit under pressure, insolent remarks, and arrogance. He seemed to delight in objecting to everyone else's doctrines, even those closest to his own, and in ridiculing opponents. In the end, however, he died humbly and bravely, with conviction and faith. His martyrdom stands as an eloquent plea for religious tolerance and freedom of conscience, and above all as a testimony of faith in Jesus Christ.

When Servetus first challenged the doctrine of the trinity, the Reformation was quite young, and there were indications that the Reformers were somewhat uncomfortable with the doctrine. It seems that God was trying to restore biblical patterns of thought in this area as well as others. The Reformers faced a crucial decision: retain traditional orthodoxy as much as possible or follow the logical implications of their own emphasis on Scripture alone and reconstruct the doctrine of God from the Bible instead of the creeds. Unfortunately, they chose to follow tradition, not wanting to give the Catholics additional ammunition against them. Indeed, "Oecolampadius, at a conference in Zurich with Zwingli and Henry Bullinger, Capito and Bucer, expressed his alarm at the effect Servetus might have upon their relations with the Catholic cantons."[23] Instead of taking a further step of reformation or restoration, the Reformers completely

rejected Servetus and thereby consolidated the power of trinitarianism.

Faustus Socinus and Unitarianism

Some historians identify Servetus as the father of unitarianism, but as the term is typically used, it refers to the denial of both the trinity and the deity of Jesus Christ. By contrast, Servetus affirmed the full deity of Jesus Christ. He helped bring about a critical discussion of the trinity, but he was not responsible for the movement we will now discuss.

Unitarianism began in Italy and developed further in Poland. In Italy, many of the Protestants began as Reformed, progressed to Anabaptist views while retaining belief in predestination, and then eventually became Rationalists. Many began questioning the doctrines of the trinity, the deity of Christ, and the Atonement.

At first, the antitrinitarians subordinated Jesus to the Father, but soon they concluded that Jesus is not God at all but only a prophet. They viewed His death not as a substitutionary sacrifice but merely an expression of God's forgiving love.

Camillo Renato (c. 1500-72) was an early leader during this development, and Laelius Socinus (Sozini) (1525-62) was the key exponent of unitarian thought. Faustus Socinus (1539-1604) of Siena, Italy, nephew of Laelius, gave clear, specific formulation to these emerging views on the Godhead and the Atonement, and he became the most prominent antitrinitarian leader in Italy and later Poland. The views of Laelius and Faustus Socinus gave rise to what is known as Socinianism, a form of unitarian thought.

Faustus Socinus emphasized that the Bible is not contrary to reason, hence the term Rationalist. He denied the true deity of Jesus Christ, identifying Him as a man only. He retained language of devotion to Christ and adoration of Him on the ground that God allowed Him to share in divinity by an adoptive act.

Socinus rejected the explanation that Christ's death was the satisfaction required by the justice of God to redeem us. He argued that God could forgive us without any sacrifice, so that Christ's death was not strictly necessary. Moreover, His resurrection and ascension were more important than His death, for they proclaimed the eventual triumph of God's love. He is our Savior because He has shown us the way to salvation, which we can attain by imitating Him.

Socinus believed baptism to be irrelevant to salvation and discipleship. He taught the death of the soul with the body, and he was a pacifist.

For the last twenty-five years of his life, Socinus moved to Poland, where there was much antitrinitarian thought among the Reformed and Anabaptists as well as in neighboring Lithuania. It appears that initially some antitrinitarians affirmed the deity of Jesus Christ, but under the influence of Socinus and others, the Polish antitrinitarians as a whole eventually denied the deity of Christ. Due to their earlier Anabaptist convictions, however, for a long time they continued to place importance on water baptism, unlike Socinus himself. The Anabaptists of Poland were the strongest of all in their insistence on immersion as the only proper mode, and the antitrinitarians continued the practice of baptizing or rebaptizing believers by immersion.

In Poland, antitrinitarianism began with a range of views, including affirmation of the deity of Christ, subordinationism (subordination of Christ to the Father), and tritheism (belief in three gods). It gradually evolved into the direction of ditheism (belief in two gods), then adoptionism (teaching that Christ is a man who shares in divinity by God's adoptive act), and finally complete unitarianism (denial of the deity of Christ). There was a similar evolution of views from an early rejection of infant baptism, to the practice of rebaptism, and ultimately to a renunciation of baptism altogether.

Unitarianism eventually captured much of the Protestant movement in Poland, which was initially Reformed and then Anabaptist. It also spread and intensified in Transylvania (Hungary and Romania). Ultimately, however, Catholicism overcame most of the Protestantism in this region through political power and the work of the Jesuits.

The Unitarian Church of Romania is a remnant of the sixteenth-century antitrinitarianism that developed in Italy and Poland. The modern Unitarian-Universalist Church did not stem directly from these roots but emerged in the late eighteenth century out of Congregationalism in New England. Nevertheless, its founders owed much to the ideas of the earlier unitarianism and embraced essentially the same view of God and the Atonement.

The modern denomination affirms the salvation of all people and is tolerant of all beliefs. It has renounced all distinctively Christian and supernatural teachings, even to the extent of regarding the existence of God as an optional belief. It aspires only to be an ethical humanism.

Summary and Evaluation

The Radical Reformation encompassed an exceedingly diverse array of beliefs and practices. Many of them were serious deviations from Scripture, but many were important restorations of biblical truth. Some people in the Radical Reformation had a Oneness view of God, some baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and some received the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of tongues.

It is not difficult to suppose that some individuals or groups experienced both baptism in Jesus' name and speaking in tongues and so had a genuinely apostolic conversion. We can also assume that the evidence available represents only the tip of the iceberg, for the majority of such information was undoubtedly suppressed by the intense persecutions, the fragmented and diverse character of the various movements, and the failure to fully understand, appreciate, or record religious practices and spiritual experiences among the common people.

Most of the Radical Reformers emphasized both the Bible and the Spirit and sought to incorporate both into their lives. This approach received widespread acceptance among the common people and bears great affinity to the modern Pentecostal movement. As George Huntston Williams has stated, the Radical Reformation was "the reflection and the interpretation of the widespread pentecostal or revivalistic and charismatic experience of the new, largely popular, conventicular [characterized by religious meetings, often illegal or secret] forms of Christianity."[24]

6

John Calvin and His Reformed Theology

As we have seen, the Reformed branch of Protestantism began with Ulrich Zwingli in Zurich, Switzerland. Zwingli died early in the history of the movement, however, and the man who did more than anyone else to formulate, systematize, and propagate Reformed theology was John Calvin. Born in Noyon, France, in 1509—his French name was Jean Cauvin—he emigrated to Geneva, Switzerland, becoming leader of the Protestants and de facto head of government in that French-speaking city. His voluminous writings—both systematic theology and Bible commentaries—made him the foremost leader of the Reformed movement as a whole and the epitome of Reformed theology.

Raised as a Roman Catholic, Calvin converted to

Protestantism in 1532. His thinking was initially influenced by the Catholic humanists and then even more so by Martin Bucer, German leader of the Reformed movement in Strassburg. Bucer unsuccessfully attempted to reconcile Lutheranism and Zwinglianism and aligned himself with the latter.

Calvin published his major work, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, in 1536, when he was twenty-six years old. Throughout his life he continued to revise and expand this book, issuing the final edition in 1559. The first edition relied somewhat upon Luther and was much smaller than the later editions, but it presented the essential features of Calvin's theology, which remained virtually unchanged throughout his life.

The publication of the *Institutes* drew the attention of many people, some of whom hailed it as the most definitive theological work of the Protestant Reformation. Guillaume Farel, the Reformed leader in Geneva, was so impressed that when Calvin paid a visit there in 1536, he prevailed upon him to stay. He was promptly elected as pastor and assumed the role of religious and political leader of the city-state.

He was expelled by political enemies in 1538 but returned in triumph in 1541. Despite further political intrigue and struggle, he remained as leader in Geneva until his death in 1564.

Institutes of the Christian Religion became one of the best known books in Christian theology, and its closely reasoned, logical presentation was instrumental in converting many people to Reformed Protestant belief. The standard text for the Reformed tradition, it clearly distinguishes this branch of Protestantism from the Lutherans

and Anabaptists as well as the Catholics.

Largely as a result of Calvin's influence, to this day the Reformed churches are characterized by an emphasis on systematic theology. Historically, most of the major Protestant works of systematic theology have been written by Calvinists and most leading theologians in the modern Evangelical movement are Calvinists of one sort or another.

The Existence and Nature of God

Calvin stated that, through nature and conscience, everyone can know there is a God. The existence of God is evident even to those who do not have the Bible. Since all humans are sinners, however, we cannot truly know God in His essence and purity, and since we are finite we cannot truly comprehend His infinite nature. The only way we can know God personally and understand His character is through His self-revelation.

God's revelation consists in accommodating Himself to the limitations of the human mind. We find in Scripture many descriptions of God that do not exhaust His fullness; they are partial revelations because of the limits of our vocabulary and thinking. For example, the Bible speaks of God's ears, eyes, hands, and heart, but we are not to think of Him as a giant human being. Rather God uses these analogies to express Himself on our level of thinking and in terms that we can understand. Even when God reveals Himself to us, we cannot fully know Him because of our sinfulness and finiteness.

Calvin condemned all forms of idolatry. He specifically rejected the Catholic use of statues as idolatrous.

He emphatically taught that God is a trinity. Perhaps

early on he had some doubts about this doctrine, for he conceded that the terminology used to define the trinity is not scriptural and he disapproved of the Athanasian Creed, the most definitive trinitarian statement from ancient Christendom. As we have seen, however, he engaged in a heated controversy with Michael Servetus over the trinity and successfully prosecuted him for heresy, securing the death penalty. As a result, Servetus was burned at the stake outside Geneva, although Calvin wanted him to be beheaded instead.

Calvin asserted the sovereignty and providence of God. He rules the universe and intervenes in all its affairs.

The Bible

Like all Protestants, Calvin affirmed the sole authority of Scripture. He relied considerably on the ecumenical councils and the writings of early theologians, however. He did not regard them as strictly authoritative in the same sense as Scripture, yet he often appealed to them as a source of early Christian understanding about God and thus very important to the development of theology.

Turning to the value of traditional practices, Calvin's opinion was closer to that of Zwingli than Luther. Like the former, he said we should discard all nonbiblical tradition, retaining only what the Bible clearly teaches.

Angels and Demons

Calvin systematically progressed through the various doctrines of the Bible. He affirmed the existence of angels, describing them as servants of God. He likewise taught that demons existed and defined them as fallen angels.

Humanity

According to Calvin, humans are two-part creatures composed of body and soul. The soul, also called the spirit, is invisible, immaterial, and immortal. This view of the soul is the standard Western and Christian concept, expressed in Greek philosophy and first clearly enunciated in Christian theology by Tertullian.

Calvin denied that the soul goes to sleep or dies when the body dies, doctrines that were current in the Radical Reformation. Rather, after a person dies physically, his soul lives on in consciousness, awaiting his resurrection, judgment, and eternal destiny. Unlike Tertullian, who believed that a person's soul comes into being through the procreative process (the doctrine of traducianism), Calvin taught that God creates a new soul each time a new human being comes into the world.

He also taught that all human beings are born under sin. They are completely bound by sin. They are totally depraved, which means sin has corrupted every aspect of the human life. It does not mean, however, that people have no good qualities or that they are as evil as they can possibly be.

We inherit the sinful nature from our forefathers, and we particularly inherit the guilt of Adam. Thus the infant is destined for eternal damnation unless he is a recipient of God's grace. Here Calvin differed from Zwingli, who denied that an infant was born with actual guilt and condemnation.

Total depravity does not mean the human intellect has been destroyed, but it has been marred by sin. Likewise the human will has been so corrupted by sin that a person never chooses to serve God of his own accord.

Predestination

The logical corollary of total depravity is predestination (unconditional election). If total depravity as defined by Calvin is correct, then salvation could never depend in any way on human choice. If God ever gave humans a choice in regard to salvation, they would always choose wrong and so would never be saved. The only way God can save us in view of our sinfulness is by unconditional election.

Predestination is often regarded as the center of Calvin's theology, but he did not present it as such although he did teach it and emphasize it. Controversies between Calvinists and others often focused on the doctrine of predestination, and followers of Calvin elaborated upon it, expanded it, and drew out its logical consequences. Thus later Calvinists actually made more of this doctrine and discussed it in greater detail than Calvin himself did.

Calvin defined predestination as God's eternal decree by which He determined with Himself what He willed to become of each person. A person is not saved because he makes a choice; God has determined his eternal destiny before he is ever born.

Calvin clearly taught the concept of double predestination. That is, God has foreordained all human beings to one of two alternatives. Some are predestined to election: God has chosen them to be saved. All others are predestined to reprobation: God has not elected them to salvation, so they are consigned to damnation. Human choice plays no role in either case.

A common way to explain the scriptural statements about predestination is to say that election to salvation is

based on God's foreknowledge of human choice. (See Romans 8:29.) Calvin emphatically rejected this idea. God does not merely know the future and act accordingly; He actually predetermines the eternal destiny of each individual apart from that person's will.

Opponents of Calvin accused this doctrine of making God unjust. He responded that we cannot judge God as unjust, for He determines what justice is. By definition, whatever God does is right, because He is God. We cannot criticize the doctrine of predestination by our concept of what is fair. If it seems to contradict our notions of justice, then our ideas are faulty.

Calvin's detractors could hardly disagree that God is the determiner of right and wrong. He is just and holy, and we cannot stand in judgment of Him. Our concepts are faulty in comparison to His. (See Romans 9:14, 20-21.) They had a counterargument, however: God is the one who has given us our concept of justice through creation, conscience, and the revelation of His Word. If the doctrine of predestination seems to contradict our most fundamental ideas of justice and fairness, we should reexamine our theology. Perhaps the doctrine of unconditional election violates our God-given sense of fairness because it is based on a misinterpretation of Scripture.

Calvin struggled with this problem and concluded that predestination is a mystery. He even went so far as to call the decree of reprobation "an awful decree" (*decretum horribile*).[1] He could not explain predestination to his own satisfaction, or reconcile it with our perception of human freedom, but said we must affirm it because the Bible teaches it. That was his final answer to the various objections raised to his doctrine.

Law and Gospel

Calvin built on Zwingli's concept of the gospel as the continuation of the law of Moses. Instead of adopting Luther's emphasis on the radical disparity between the law and the gospel, Calvin emphasized continuity between the two and the logical progression from Old to New Testament.

He identified portions of the law as either ceremonial or moral. The ceremonial law, such as the animal sacrifices, is void. It has been fulfilled by Christ and abolished. There is no purpose in the ceremonial law today. The moral law of the Old Testament is still in effect, however. It was never abolished but is fully in force.

The first purpose of the moral law is to show us our sinfulness. Second, it restrains the wicked, helping to keep order in society. A third purpose for the law is to reveal the will of God to those who believe. In sum, the law shows the sinner that he is a sinner, acts as a restraint upon those who want to sin, and serves as a guide for those who want to live for God.

Christ has abolished the curse of the law, meaning the penalty of the law. He has abolished the ceremonial law, but not the moral law. The Old and New Testaments form a whole, with no conflict or contradiction between them. The Old Testament contains the promise, while the New Testament contains the fulfillment, but they are substantially the same. The moral law is continuous from the old covenant to the new.

As a result of this teaching, the Reformed movement placed more emphasis on ethics than the Lutherans did. In theory, both Luther and Calvin said that Christians should follow the moral law, but Luther focused on the

replacement of the law by faith while Calvin focused on the preservation of the moral law.

A characteristic of Calvinism, especially in the early stages, was to underscore the importance of morality, ethics, holiness of life, and strict discipline. Indeed, Calvin said the fundamental rule for Christian living is self-denial. In our relationship to God, we should submit to the will of God, seeking to do His will and not our own. In relationship to others, we should not seek to please ourselves but to serve them.

Jesus Christ

Calvin affirmed the deity and humanity of Jesus Christ in the context of trinitarianism. Against Servetus he championed the doctrine of Jesus Christ as the eternal Son. He spoke of Jesus as prophet, priest, and king, using these titles to identify and describe the ministry of Jesus.

Like the Council of Chalcedon, Calvin affirmed that Jesus has two natures, human and divine, but is one person. He stressed the importance of not confusing the two. The two natures are not blended together in a way that would eliminate their distinct attributes. For example, the humanity of Christ does not prevent His Spirit from being omnipresent. Even though Christ is God the Son incarnate, God the Son is omnipresent. The humanity is not omnipresent, but the deity is omnipresent. The humanity does not limit the deity, and neither does the deity change the humanity. The divine nature does not transfer its attributes to the humanity; thus the physical body of Christ is not omnipresent.

In this way, Calvin opposed Luther's teaching of the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Luther held

that, by virtue of His divine nature, Christ's physical body can be many places at the same time. The humanity of Christ so partakes of the deity that, although His body is not actually omnipresent (everywhere present) like His Spirit, the physical body can be distributed to many places at once. Calvin rejected this doctrine as a confusion of the two natures in Christ with their distinctive properties.

Salvation

Calvin embraced the fundamental Protestant tenet of justification by faith. He defined justification to mean that God declares the sinner to be righteous. From that point on, the justified Christian should show fruits of his justification.

Justification and regeneration occur simultaneously. When God justifies a person, He also regenerates him, causing him to be born again and giving him a new nature. Now he has the power to do good works, and the existence of good works is a test of whether a person truly has been justified and regenerated.

The death of Jesus Christ makes salvation available. Christ's death is a satisfaction, a sacrifice to satisfy the demands of God's holy law, and it has purchased the salvation of the elect. Salvation is applied to each individual believer by the work of the Holy Spirit.

Salvation is imparted through faith. Faith includes knowledge of God, agreement with God's truth, and trust in God. In line with Calvin's doctrine of predestination, he said faith is a gift God grants to the elect. It is not something that humans choose to exercise, but it is something that God chooses for us.

In sum, God first elected those He wanted to save. Then Christ purchased their salvation by His death. Next God imparts faith to those He has chosen. Finally, through their faith, God declares them justified and the Holy Spirit regenerates them.

From the Apostolic Pentecostal perspective, Calvin was correct in teaching that the death of Christ, faith, and the work of the Holy Spirit are all necessary to our salvation. Since Calvin divorced these elements from the will of the individual, he viewed them as operating only on a theoretical level. Therefore, Calvin's view of faith is not what it appears to be in Scripture or in personal experience, namely, our positive response to God's grace. Rather it is merely something that God demands and provides at the same time. He imparts it automatically to those He has elected to save.

The result is almost a mechanical system. God establishes a plan whereby these various elements are necessary and then He provides each of them. Humans are idle spectators who cannot affect matters one way or another. In Calvinism, the essential events of salvation occur outside humans and without their involvement.

The Church

Calvin's doctrine of predestination greatly influenced his doctrine of the church. He said there is the visible church, or those who profess Christ, and the invisible church, those who are truly elect. Not everyone who makes a profession is elect, but the visible church gives birth to the elect. The elect are in the visible church. Calvin did not explicitly espouse the salvation of some people outside the visible church, as Zwingli did,

although it is easy to take the doctrine of predestination in that direction.

How can we know if someone is truly one of the elect or not? We cannot know with absolute certainty, but we can look at the fruit in people's lives and see evidence of the saving grace of God at work in them.

We can identify marks of a true church. A true church will have the preaching of the Word of God and the administration of the sacraments, namely, water baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The personal holiness of the members is not necessarily a mark of the true church, however. The reason is that not everyone who is a member of the visible church is really one of the elect. If we observe sinners in the church, we may actually be looking at some who are reprobate. Moreover, even the elect are still sinners; they still commit sinful acts from time to time.

In short, we cannot judge a church by the actions of individuals, but we can judge it by whether it proclaims the gospel and administers the sacraments. If it does, then it is a true church. While not every member is one of the elect, we can expect that many people within that church are elect.

One might assume that the doctrines of justification and predestination as taught by Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin would result in great assurance of salvation, and for some this was undoubtedly so. They had confidence that they were saved no matter what happened and no matter what they did or did not do.

In practice, however, many wrestled with a dreadful doubt: How can I be sure that I am one of the elect? The only answer was to examine their actions and the motives

behind them. If a person attended church faithfully, participated in the sacraments, and sought to live according to God's will, then surely God's grace was working in His life. If he rejected these Christian disciplines, however, apparently he did not desire the things of God, which would indicate that God's saving grace was not at work in his life.

The result was a powerful motivation for people to live according to the teachings of the church, for only then could they convince themselves and others that they were part of the elect. Ironically, a doctrine that in theory completely eliminated any human response as part of salvation, actually resulted in great emphasis on the need for godly living.

Unlike Luther, Calvin believed it was important to return to a more biblical pattern of church government and organization as well as doctrine. He concluded that the ideal structure as exemplified by the New Testament church was somewhere in between the hierarchical church government of the Catholics and the Lutherans on the one hand and the congregational church government found among the Anabaptists on the other hand. That is, there should be both ministerial and lay participation in the government of the church.

This concept led to the presbyterian form of church government, named from the Greek word *presbuteros*, meaning "elder." The Presbyterians, as the Reformed in Scotland became known, ordained ministers who served as pastors and preachers, and they also ordained lay members as elders. These lay elders had a permanent position not only in the local church but in the church at large.

Under the presbyterian system, the governing bodies of the organization are composed of ministers and elders from various churches. Decisions such as the placement of pastors and the discipline of members are not made exclusively by a clerical hierarchy or by a local congregation, but by representatives of both clergy and laity in the regional organization.

The Sacraments

Calvin recognized the two sacraments of Protestantism and again took a middle position between the Catholics and Lutherans on the one hand and the Zwinglians and Anabaptists on the other. In departing from the earlier teaching of Zwingli he made an original contribution to the Reformed movement, which largely adopted his views. Many Lutherans were also attracted to his position on the sacraments because it seemed more in line with Protestant thought, whereas Luther's understanding of the sacraments was almost Catholic.

Calvin defined the sacraments as outward signs. They are not the actual channels by which God bestows His saving grace, as the Catholics and Lutherans held. On the other hand, they are not merely symbols either, which is what Zwingli and the Anabaptists believed.

Instead, the sacraments are efficacious: they produce results. Strictly speaking, they are not the means of salvation; they do not justify or bestow grace. Nevertheless, they are effective by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Water Baptism and Spirit Baptism

Water baptism is for the remission of original sin (guilt from Adam), past sin, and future sin. God uses this

means, but He is not limited to it. The blood of Christ washes away sins at baptism, but even without baptism the blood of Christ can still wash away someone's sins. In short, Calvin held that baptism is necessary but not essential:

> We, too, acknowledge that the use of baptism is necessary—that no one may omit it from either neglect or contempt. In this way we by no means make it free (optional). And not only do we strictly bind the faithful to the observance of it, but we also maintain that it is the ordinary instrument of God in washing and renewing us: in short, in communicating to us salvation. The only exception we make is that the hand of God must not be tied down to the instrument. He may of himself accomplish salvation. For when an opportunity of baptism is wanting, the promise of God alone is amply sufficient.[2]

This position acknowledges the importance of water baptism far more than most Evangelicals do today. Calvin did not reduce it to a mere symbol, but he was careful to uphold the priority of faith and the sovereignty of God:

> At whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified once for the whole of life. . . . [Forgiveness] at our first regeneration we receive by baptism alone. . . . In baptism, the Lord promises forgiveness of sins: receive it, and be secure. I have no intention, however, to detract from the power of baptism. I would only add to the sign the substance and reality inasmuch as God works by external means. But from

> this sacrament, as from all others, we gain nothing, unless in so far as we receive in faith.[3]

Baptism is an "initiatory sign." It gives assurance of forgiveness and the "knowledge and certainty" of regeneration by the blood of Jesus. Baptism itself does not confer grace, but the Lord "effectually performs what he figures."[4]

Calvin strongly affirmed infant baptism, which fit well with his beliefs in original sin and salvation by predestination. He also said the validity of baptism does not depend on the personal holiness of the baptizer.

Either immersion or sprinkling is acceptable. Calvin recognized that immersion was the original form in the New Testament, but he deferred to tradition, and Calvinists typically sprinkle.

Calvin also retained the traditional trinitarian formula. Unlike Luther and Zwingli, who acknowledged that the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, Calvin argued that "in the name of Jesus" merely refers to Christian baptism without specifying the formula. He denied that the disciples of John the Baptist at Ephesus were baptized in water a second time, saying the account in Acts 19 means only that they were baptized with the Holy Spirit.[5]

In discussing Acts 19, Calvin described the baptism of the Spirit as an experience accompanied by a miraculous sign: "The baptism of the Holy Spirit, in other words, the visible gifts of the Holy Spirit, were given by the laying on of hands."[6] He believed, however, that the miraculous gifts of the Spirit ceased in ancient times and were no longer available:

> It is notorious that the gifts of the Spirit, which were then given by the laying on of hands, some time after ceased to be conferred. . . . We therefore deny not that it [laying on of hands for confirmation] was a sacrament to the apostles, but we hold it to be one which was abrogated when the reality was taken away.[7]

The Lord's Supper

In Calvin's theology, the Lord's Supper is a visible sign of the union with Christ that comes through the Spirit. Even as baptism is the outward sign of the remission of sins, so the Lord's Supper is the outward sign of union with Christ. The actual union with Christ comes through faith by the work of the Holy Spirit, not through some mystical transformation of the elements of the Lord's Supper. Just as the blood of Christ washes away sins in baptism, so the Holy Spirit effects a union between Christ and the believer in the Eucharist.

This union is spiritual and not physical. The Lord's Supper is not merely a symbol or a remembrance, as the Zwinglians and the Anabaptists taught, for it is a visible sign of a spiritual reality that is actually taking place at that time. On the other hand, Christ is not bodily present as the Catholics and the Lutherans taught, but the Spirit raises us up to the body of Christ. The Spirit joins us to Christ in the spiritual realm.

Church and State

In Calvin's view, God's divine authority is the basis of all law, including civil law. Ideally, then, the civil law should be patterned after divine concepts. Since the New

Testament does not have much to say about civil law, for the most part Calvin drew upon Old Testament patterns and principles.

In Geneva, Calvin instituted what almost amounted to a theocracy in which the church ruled through the state. As shown by the execution of Servetus, he was willing to use the power of the state to promote religious laws and doctrines, based on Old Testament precedent.

Calvin urged Christians to participate in government and if possible to mold society according to Christian principles. If they are not in control, they still must submit to the authority of the state. There is an exception, however: in the case of tyranny, Christians have a moral right to overthrow the government.

Christian Discipline

Calvin stressed the importance of godly living, including self-discipline, the work ethic, moderation, self-denial, and the avoidance of ornaments and luxuries. His own personal life was simple. He wrote in the *Institutes*:

> He who makes it his rule to use this world as if he used it not, not only cuts off all gluttony in regard to meat and drink, and all effeminacy, ambition, pride, excessive show, and austerity, in regard to his table, his house, and his clothes, but removes every care and affection which might withdraw or hinder him from aspiring to the heavenly life, and decks the soul with its true ornaments. . . . Let us remember by whom the account [of our stewardship] is to be taken—viz. by Him who while He so highly commends abstinence, sobriety, frugality, and moderation, abominates luxury,

> pride, ostentation, and vanity; who approves of no administration but that which is combined with charity, who with His own lips has already condemned all those pleasures which withdraw the heart from chastity and purity, or darken the intellect.[8]

Under Calvin, the government of Geneva passed and enforced strict laws to regulate the lifestyle of all inhabitants in accordance with his teachings. The following quotes from historians cite specific examples:

> Dancing, gambling, drunkenness, the frequentation of taverns, profanity, luxury, excesses at public entertainments, extravagance and immodesty in dress, licentious or irreligious songs were forbidden, and punished by censure or fine or imprisonment. Even the number of dishes at meals was regulated. . . . Reading of bad books and immoral novels was also prohibited.[9]

> Any manifestation of Catholicism—such as carrying a rosary, cherishing a sacred relic, or observing a saint's day as holy—was subject to punishment. Women were imprisoned for wearing improper hats. . . . Consistory [governing body of the church, composed of ministers and lay leaders] and Council joined in the prohibition of gambling, card-playing, profanity, drunkenness, the frequenting of taverns, dancing, . . . indecent or irreligious songs, excess in entertainment, extravagance in living, immodesty in dress. The allowable color and quantity of clothing, and the number of dishes permissible at a meal, were specified by law.

> Jewelry and lace were frowned upon. A woman was jailed for arranging her hair to an immoral height. Theatrical performances were limited to religious plays, and then these too were forbidden.[10]

The renowned Swiss watchmaking industry got its start in Geneva when jewelers had to find new ways of making money after the Calvinists disapproved of the wearing of ornaments. Bernardino Ochino, leader of a Catholic monastic order who became a Protestant, resided in Geneva for three years and described in glowing terms what he saw:

> The Holy Scriptures are constantly read and openly discussed. . . . Every day there is a public service of devotion. . . . Cursing and swearing, unchastity, sacrilege, adultery, and impure living, such as prevail in many places where I have lived, are unknown here. There are no pimps and harlots. The people do not know what rouge is, and they are all clad in a seemly fashion. Games of chance are not customary. Benevolence is so great that the poor need not beg. The people admonish each other in brotherly fashion.[11]

The Calvinists did not merely rely upon the power of persuasion and the Holy Spirit to instill holiness. Nor did they advocate freedom of religion. They employed torture, execution, and banishment to enforce their discipline. For example, from 1542 to 1546 in Geneva, there were fifty-eight judgments of death and seventy-six decrees of banishment. In 1558 and 1559, there were 414 cases of punishment meted out in a population of 20,000.[12]

Summary and Evaluation

The theology of John Calvin took the Reformation further than the positions of Martin Luther, but not as far as the Anabaptists sought to go. On several important issues, such as the sacraments and church government, Calvin stood between the Lutherans and the Anabaptists. He embraced the school of thought established by Ulrich Zwingli but differed from him on a number of points. In these areas Calvin's views generally prevailed in the Reformed movement and nudged it a little closer to Lutheranism.

In contrast to Luther, Calvin placed greater emphasis on the kind of life a Christian should lead. As a result, there were significant differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed in lifestyle, with the early Calvinists insisting to greater degree on certain principles of holiness.

There was also a contrast regarding church government. Luther felt that church government is irrelevant or of minor consideration as long as the gospel is preached. The church is free to follow tradition or to use whatever structure is best under the circumstances. Calvin said it is important to restore biblical church organization as much as we can ascertain it from the Scriptures.

In some ways, Calvin did not go as far as later Calvinists. Calvinism today is commonly associated with two doctrines that Calvin taught but did not emphasize or develop as much as his followers did. Those doctrines are predestination, which he held in common with Luther and Zwingli, and the presbyterian form of government. In his treatment of these subjects, Calvin stood between Luther and the later Calvinists.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of John Calvin for the Protestant Reformation. He is just a step behind Martin Luther in historical significance. He, more than anyone else, defined and systematized Reformed theology, which is a major branch of Protestantism to this day, and he influenced the entire Protestant Reformation. The Reformed churches (originating in continental Europe), the Presbyterians (originating in Scotland), the Puritans and their successors in the Church of England, and many Evangelicals today trace their theological roots to John Calvin.

Calvin's influence on Western civilization is likewise great. Historians credit much of the political, economic, and technological success of Western Europe and North America to Protestant virtues, especially those championed by Calvin such as the work ethic, self-discipline, moderation, thrift, and honesty.

Despite the many admirable qualities of Calvin's doctrine and lifestyle, from an Apostolic Pentecostal perspective one cannot help but view his grand theological system with some sense of loss. The strict logic and rigid structure seem to close off avenues of the Spirit and alternative understandings of Scripture. Calvin appears to have been less open than Luther or Zwingli to the simple yet nontraditional message of Scripture (e.g., his failure to see that the apostles baptized in the name of Jesus), and he rejected important insights from the Radical Reformation.

He did much to solidify and perpetuate the doctrine of predestination, which undermines true biblical faith. Most significant from the Apostolic point of view, Calvin slammed the door shut to further restoration of scriptural

truths such as the oneness of God, baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the gifts of the Spirit.

7

The Reformation in Great Britain

The fourth major branch of Protestantism to emerge in the sixteenth century was the Church of England. Adherents are known as Anglicans; in America they are called Episcopalians. The latter term refers to the hierarchical form of church government, in which bishops (Greek, *episkopos*) lead the church.

In fourteenth-century England, John Wyclif (1330-84) was an important forerunner of the Reformation, preaching many doctrines later associated with the Protestants. He opposed the papacy, transubstantiation, penance, and the sale of indulgences. He and his associates were the first to translate the complete Bible into English. His followers, known as the Lollards, were severely persecuted and suppressed.

Shortly after Martin Luther took his stand against Rome, a number of Englishmen began to embrace the Reformation. One of them, William Tyndale (1494-1536), was the first to translate the New Testament directly from Greek to English and the first to print a portion of the Bible in English. He also translated much of the Old Testament, but before he could complete his work he was martyred by strangulation. Most of the King James Version is based on his efforts.

Henry VIII and the Church of England

No single great theologian like Luther or Zwingli served as a catalyst for the English Reformation. The person who precipitated the break with Rome was King Henry VIII, a most unlikely figure, for he had vigorously denounced Luther as a heretic and in return had received from the pope the title of "Defender of the Faith." The factors behind the breach were personal and political.

For economic and diplomatic reasons, as a teenager and heir to the throne Henry VIII was espoused to Catherine of Aragon, daughter of the Spanish monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella. Because Catherine was the widow of Henry's older brother, Catholic law prohibited such a union with Henry, based on an interpretation of the Old Testament teaching against incest. In order to overcome this obstacle, Henry VIII's father, Henry VII, obtained from Pope Julius II a papal dispensation, which was a special exception granted by virtue of the pope's authority as head of the church and vicar of Christ.

Unfortunately, Catherine never produced the male heir that Henry VIII desired. He eventually tired of her, became enamored of Anne Boleyn, and decided to end his

marriage with Catherine so that he could marry Anne. Since Catholic law did not allow divorce, Henry asked Pope Clement VII for an annulment, a statement that the marriage was invalid from the start. His reason was that the marriage violated the laws against incest and that even the pope did not have the authority to set aside such a grave impediment.

It was an audacious maneuver to disavow the dispensation he had previously sought and acted upon, but as the powerful king of an influential nation, Henry expected the pope to accommodate his desires as well as help ensure the future stability of the English throne.

The wishes of an even more influential monarch were also involved, however: Catherine was the aunt of Charles V, the Holy Roman emperor. Charles was both a defender of Catholicism against the Protestants and a serious political rival to the pope. At the time of Henry's request, Pope Clement was actually a military captive of Charles, who sacked Rome. Clement desperately needed his support and could not afford to displease him. Moreover, granting Henry's request would undermine the institution of marriage as well as the validity of papal dispensations.

When the pope refused to annul the marriage, Henry took a series of steps that overturned Rome's authority in his realm. In 1531, he had the English clergy to declare him the head of the church in England. In 1532, with papal approval he appointed Thomas Cranmer as archbishop of Canterbury, England's highest ecclesiastical office. Cranmer served as chaplain to the Boleyn household and was sympathetic to Henry's wishes.

In 1533, Henry secretly married Anne Boleyn, and

under his direction Parliament declared that the English church could decide its own marital cases without need of papal dispensations or rulings. Henry's case was referred to the archbishop of Canterbury. Cranmer annulled Henry's union with Catherine and pronounced his marriage to Anne to be valid.

In 1534 Parliament declared the king to be the supreme head of the Church of England, formally separating from Rome. Prominent Catholics who opposed this move, including former chancellor of the realm Thomas More, were executed. Soon Henry dissolved the monasteries, which were important centers of wealth and power and whose monks took orders directly from Rome. He transferred the bulk of the assets of the monasteries to the crown and royal favorites.

Henry's goal was the consolidation of political and ecclesiastical power under himself; he was not interested in reforming the practices and doctrines of the church. He sought to operate the church as always, substituting his authority for that of the pope.

At first, then, England was Protestant in name but essentially Catholic in practice and doctrine. Even after the Church of England became definitely Protestant in theology, some members, called Anglo-Catholics, remained close to Catholicism with regard to liturgy, tradition, and the role of the sacraments. Typically they regarded the Roman Catholic Church as a true church but believed the Church of England to be more pure or at least the rightful authority in England. Over the years, a number of prominent persons from this camp rejoined the Roman Catholic Church, but many remain in the Church of England today.

Developments after Henry VIII

As long as Henry VIII ruled, the Church of England did not undergo much theological change. Gradually, however, Protestant doctrines gained ascendancy, particularly under Henry's successor, Edward VI, his son by the third of his six wives (Jane Seymour). During the reign of this young king, the *Book of Common Prayer* was published, drafted by Cranmer in 1549. It became the standard for English liturgy and is still used in one form or another by many English-speaking Protestants. One example of its use is in the traditional wedding ceremony. Another is the Lord's Prayer, which is usually recited according to the *Book of Common Prayer* ("Forgive us our trespasses") instead of the King James Version ("Forgive us our debts").

Also during Edward's reign and under his authority, the *Forty-two Articles of Religion* were issued (1553). Largely the work of Cranmer, they set forth the doctrines of the Church of England, charting a Protestant course.

When Edward died as a teenager, Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine, ascended the throne. A devout Catholic who resented the ecclesiastical maneuvering that cast aside her mother, she attempted to reconvert England to Roman Catholicism. Much persecution ensued, and the queen became known as Bloody Mary because of her use of torture and execution against Protestants. Among those burned at the stake was Thomas Cranmer. By this time, however, nationalistic sentiment and Protestant theology were entrenched too strongly for Mary to succeed.

Mary was followed by Elizabeth I, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, and a Protestant. In her day, the

Church of England was firmly established as Protestant. In 1571 Elizabeth promulgated the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*, a modification of the earlier *Forty-two Articles*.

Anglican Doctrine

The *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*, still largely based on the work of Cranmer, became the fundamental position of the Church of England. While retaining some Catholic elements, overall these articles embraced a moderate form of Calvinism. They crystallized Anglican theology and defined the Church of England as a Protestant body.

The *Thirty-nine Articles* emphasized the supreme authority of Scripture, as did the rest of the Protestant movement. The Anglicans maintained a close tie to their Catholic heritage, however, by affirming the value of tradition. They did not go so far as to say tradition and Scripture are equal in authority, which is what the Catholic Church held, but they adhered to tradition as much as possible. Like Luther, they sought to retain all tradition unless it conflicted directly with Scripture. Moreover, they held that where Scripture is silent the church has authority to establish a binding tradition.

For example, they said the church has the authority to develop liturgy (traditional forms of worship), and no one has the right to change them on his own. Since the Scriptures do not prescribe a certain order for service, the authority to do so rests with the church.

Once the church has exercised its authority in this way, each individual believer and each local church must conform. If change is to come, it must come by the

church as a whole. The emphasis is on corporate tradition more than the conscience and freedom of the individual.

For the most part, the Church of England remained quite liturgical, like the Catholics and Lutherans. Those who emphasized traditional rituals became known as "high church," while those who adopted a more evangelical style of worship became known as "low church."

The Anglicans adopted the central tenet of Protestantism, namely, justification by faith alone. Despite the strong Anglo-Catholic element, this fact clearly identified them as Protestants, as did their rejection of papal supremacy and their retention of only two sacraments (baptism and the Lord's Supper).

In the process of establishing their Protestant identity, the Anglicans adopted much of the theology of John Calvin. For example, they embraced his spiritualistic conception of the sacraments. They also adopted his distinction between the visible and the invisible church, using it to explain how sin could exist in the church. That is, notorious sinners may be part of the visible church but not the invisible church (those who are saved).

The Anglicans tended to identify the Church of England as the one, true, visible church of God in England. As dissenting groups arose to advance the English Reformation further than the Anglicans were willing to go, the Anglicans tried to destroy them.

John Knox and the Presbyterians

In Scotland, John Knox became the outstanding Protestant leader. He fled to Geneva to avoid Catholic persecution, and there he became a devoted disciple of Calvin. He returned to Scotland in 1559, whereupon his

preaching became an important factor in swaying the nation to Protestantism. In 1560, the Scottish Parliament officially adopted Protestant articles of faith written by Knox and others, and banned the Catholic mass.

Under Knox's influence, the Church of Scotland became strongly Calvinistic in doctrine and presbyterian in government; its adherents became known as Presbyterians. Many Scots emigrated to Northern Ireland and later to the United States, establishing strong Presbyterian churches in these nations.

The Puritans

From the beginning of the English Reformation, a number of people believed that the Reformation was not going far enough within the Church of England. They regarded the Roman Catholic Church as apostate and wanted to divest the Church of England of all Catholic elements. Over the years the ranks of dissenters grew, and most of them embraced strict Calvinism. Instead of the episcopal government of the Church of England, they favored the presbyterian form. Because of their demand that the church purify itself in accordance with New Testament practices and doctrines, they became known as Puritans.

When King James VI of Scotland also became King James I of England, the Puritans believed their time had come, for James had been reared as a Presbyterian and shared their Calvinistic theology. They presented him with a petition asking for changes within the church. James favored episcopal church government, however, because he believed it supported the authority of the king while other forms would undermine that authority. He

granted only one of the Puritans' requests: the production of a new English translation of the Bible in 1611, which became known as the Authorized, or King James, Version.

Under James's son and successor, Charles I, an intense political struggle ensued between king and Parliament. The nobles and traditional, episcopalian Anglicans supported the king, while the urban middle class, some of the rural gentry, the Puritans, and the more radical Protestants supported Parliament. Soon the conflict erupted into open warfare.

During this time, Parliament convened the Westminster Assembly, composed mostly of Puritans, to advise it on religious matters. In 1646, the assembly adopted the *Westminster Confession of Faith* along with longer and shorter catechisms. These documents were formally adopted by the Church of Scotland and became defining statements of Presbyterianism. Solidly Calvinistic, the *Westminster Confession* features some elements, such as covenant theology, that are more characteristic of later Calvinism than the teachings of John Calvin himself. (See chapter 10.)

After a long civil war, King Charles was defeated and executed in 1649. The victorious Parliamentary army established a commonwealth with Oliver Cromwell, its general, as lord protector. He became a virtual dictator. Following Puritan principles, Cromwell sought to reform the morals of the country, purify the Church of England, and dismantle the episcopal form of government in favor of the presbyterian and congregational forms. At the same time, he allowed greater religious freedom for various dissenting groups than ever before.

A prominent Puritan pastor and author during this

time was Richard Baxter. Another famous Puritan was John Milton (1608-74), poet and author of *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and other well-known works.

The Puritans stressed personal faith, repentance, and conversion. Like the Calvinists in Geneva, the Puritans sought to live a godly life both inwardly and outwardly:

> Their clothing was modest, somber, and unadorned; their speech was grave and slow. They were expected to abstain from all profane amusements and sensual pleasure. The theaters, which had been closed in 1642 because of war, remained closed till 1656 because of Puritan condemnation. Horse races, cockfights, wrestling matches, bear or bull baiting, were forbidden.[1]

They even rejected wedding rings, saying they were a Catholic custom.[2]

The intentions of the Puritans were good, and their emphasis upon holiness of life was commendable, but they went too far in attempting to enforce personal morality upon secular society. Like earlier Calvinists but unlike the Anabaptists, they used the state's power to impose their views and way of life upon unbelievers.

Ultimately this experiment in legislated morality ended in failure, for holiness can never be established by the dictates of the law but only by personal regeneration. The English people as a whole rejected Puritanism, and after the death of Cromwell the monarchy was restored under Charles II.

Even after they lost power over church and state, some Puritans still remained in the Church of England.

Their successors constitute an evangelical wing that exists today.

Separatists and Congregationalists

Early on, some Puritans concluded that it would be impossible to purify the Church of England and began to separate themselves from the organized church. They became known as Separatists or Independents. Like the Anabaptists, the Separatists believed that the church consists only of believers and that each local assembly should govern itself. Unlike the Anabaptists, however, they retained infant baptism.

Among such people there arose a "prophecy movement" in the 1500s. This group emphasized the moving of God's Spirit, and many spoke in tongues.[3]

The earliest attempt to establish an independent congregational church in England occurred under the leadership of Robert Browne in Norwich in 1580. It ultimately ended in failure, with Browne returning to the Church of England. Nevertheless, similarly minded people eventually gave rise to the movement known as Congregationalism after its advocacy of the congregational form of church government. The most influential of the Puritan Independents was John Owen (1616-83), an advisor to Cromwell.

Fleeing persecution, many Separatists emigrated to Holland, and from there some went to North America. The Pilgrims who founded Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1620 were Separatists. Soon many Puritans from England settled in the area also, and Separatists and Puritans joined to form New England Congregationalism. In the twentieth century these Congregationalists merged with

several other groups to form the United Church of Christ.

The Baptists

Among the Separatists, some people began to reexamine the doctrine of baptism and to conclude that baptism is for believers only. This was particularly true of an independent group led by John Smyth that met in the London area but relocated to the Netherlands. They concluded that they had not been baptized properly and that, due to erroneous beliefs on the subject, no one else was qualified to baptize them. Thus, in late 1608 or early 1609, Smyth baptized himself and about forty adults, beginning the Baptist movement.

Soon Smyth became better acquainted with the Mennonites in Holland, decided that their baptism was legitimate, and sought to join forces with them. (He died before his group actually did so.) Some of his followers, however, rejected this move, and in 1611 their leader, Thomas Helwys, published the first English Baptist confession of faith. This group soon returned to England and founded the Baptist movement there.

In many ways the Baptists held beliefs similar to those of the Anabaptists, but there was no direct historical succession. It appears that the early Baptists were influenced by Anabaptists in both England and Holland, but for the most part they arrived at their beliefs by an independent study of Scripture. They were not converted to organized Anabaptism but emerged from an Anglican, Puritan, Separatist background to form their own distinct movement.

The central tenet of the Baptists was that the church is a community of believers. It is joined by personal

choice, and it should only accept those who show evidence of regeneration.

To them, water baptism is a public confession of faith and the means of visibly joining the local church. Thus they rejected infant baptism and practiced baptism for believers only. They further insisted that only immersion, not sprinkling (aspersion) or pouring (effusion), is the scriptural mode.

To some extent, however, the name Baptist is a misnomer, for they did not believe that baptism is necessary for salvation. According to them, it is not part of, but subsequent to, conversion. John Smyth's *Short Confession of Faith in XX Articles* (1609) states that baptism is merely "the external sign of the remission of sins."[4] Nevertheless, if someone from another church wished to join them, he had to be baptized by them. And indeed, some Baptists did teach the necessity of baptism; according to one seventeenth-century report, "Daniel Roberts, teacher to the Baptists at Reading, in Berkshire, did affirm, 'That baptism of water, that is to say elementary water, doth wash away sin.'"[5]

Other important beliefs of the Baptists were the necessity of basing all doctrine and practice on Scripture alone, the congregational form of church government, separation of church and state, and freedom of conscience. They held that the local church has the right to call out and ordain its own ministers. Soon they began to emphasize the responsibility of the church to send out missionaries.

The earliest Baptists, including Smyth and Helwys, did not accept the Calvinistic system of predestination that generally characterized the Puritans and Separatists

from which they developed. For instance, John Smyth and his followers taught that people do not inherit guilt from Adam and that infants who die are saved.[6] From about 1630 to 1640, however, other Baptists emerged who did adhere to Calvinism.

The non-Calvinistic (Arminian) Baptists became known as General Baptists because they held that Christ died for everyone, while the Calvinists were called Particular Baptists because they restricted the Atonement to the predestined elect. These groups remained separated until the nineteenth century.

Today, both views are represented within the ranks of Baptists. The vast majority agree on one aspect of Calvin's system, however: the perseverance of the saints, or unconditional eternal security, popularly known as "once saved always saved." A minority who think that a believer can lose his salvation through unbelief and disobedience are called Freewill Baptists. (See chapter 10 for further discussion of Calvinism versus Arminianism.)

The early Baptists were trinitarian and baptized with the trinitarian formula. As they studied the Scriptures, however, some of them questioned traditional trinitarian theology, and some began to baptize in the name of Jesus Christ. For instance, *Propositions and Conclusions concerning True Christian Religion*, written by John Smyth and his followers at Amsterdam in 1612-14, shows evidence of dissatisfaction with traditional trinitarian terms and concepts and expresses views that could easily be understood as modalistic:

> God is one in number. . . . These terms, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, do not teach God's substance,

> but only the hinder parts of God: that which may be known of God. . . . God [is] manifested in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[7]

The *Somerset Confession*, printed at London in 1656, was "the earliest important effort at bringing Particular and General Baptists into agreement and union." It does not even attempt to define God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit but simply says, "We believe that there is but one God" and "We believe that Jesus Christ is truly God." Moreover, it expresses acceptance of, and perhaps a preference for, the Jesus Name baptismal formula:

> It is the duty of every man and woman, that have repented from dead works, and have faith towards God, to be baptized (Acts 2:38; 8:12, 37, 38), that is, dipped or buried under the water (Rom. 6:3, 4; Col. 2:12), in the name of our Lord Jesus (Acts 8:16), or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19).[8]

The 1660 *Standard Confession* of the General Baptists, formally titled *A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith*, discusses the Godhead and water baptism in similar terms. In separate articles it proclaims faith in "one God the Father," "one Lord Jesus Christ," and "one holy Spirit, the precious gift of God." Then it quotes I John 5:7, which ends, "These three are one." Significantly, no distinctively trinitarian language appears:

> Early in the history of General Baptists, individual leaders raised questions concerning the doctrines of

> the Trinity. . . . Their biblicism led some to reject the term Trinity as noncanonical. . . . The ambiguity of the Confession of 1660 has been regarded as evidence of some uncertainty on the subject of the Trinity.[9]

This confession says that before people can be recognized as ministers they must first "repent of their sins, believe on the Lord Jesus, and [be] *Baptized* in his name for the remission of Sins." It then provides the following instruction for baptism:

> *Baptise* (that is in English to *Dip*) in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, or in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ; such only of them, as profess *repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*, Acts 2:38. Acts 8:12. Acts 18:8.[10]

Later Baptist confessions omit baptism in the name of Jesus and begin speaking of the "Trinity," indicating that tradition finally won the day. Even near the end of the eighteenth century, however, we still find Baptists who baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Robert Robinson (1735-90), a prominent English Baptist, noted that Acts makes no mention of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in connection with water baptism but only the name of "Jesus Christ" and further commented sympathetically:

> Many Christians taking it for granted, that the apostles thoroughly understood the words of the Lord Jesus, and supposing the form of words of local and temporary use, administer baptism in the name of

> Christ, and think themselves justified by the book of the Acts of the Apostles.[11]

Thomas Weisser has documented that in the seventeenth century many Baptists, including Francis Cornwell, baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ and many held a modalistic concept of God (three manifestations or offices rather than persons).[12] Weisser has also found evidence of Baptists in America, including Daniel Hibbard, who baptized in Jesus' name in the late 1700s and early 1800s.[13]

Interestingly, Francis Cornwell called Acts 2:38 the "everlasting Gospel" and Christ's "Gospel-Commandment." He further stated that when the twelve disciples at Ephesus in Acts 19 spoke in tongues and prophesied, they received the promise of Acts 2:38, "the gifts of his holy Spirit, and "gifts meet for the ministery."[14]

Baptists typically regarded the miraculous gifts of the Spirit as having ceased. *Propositions and Conclusions* (1612-14) puts the miraculous Spirit baptism in the past only:

> The outward gifts of the spirit which the Holy Ghost poureth forth, upon the Day of Pentecost upon the disciples, in tongues and prophecy, and gifts, and healing, and miracles, which is called the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire (Acts 1:5), were only a figure of and an hand leading to better things, even the most proper gifts of the spirit of sanctification, which is the new creation; which is the one baptism.[15]

A few confessions indicate, however, that people should seek a definite experience of the Holy Spirit. *The*

True Gospel-Faith (London, 1654) says, "God gives his Spirit to believers dipped through the prayer of faith and laying on of hands."[16] It also cites several references in Acts to Jesus Name baptism but never mentions the trinitarian formula. The *Standard Confession* admonishes baptized believers to go on to receive the Holy Spirit and then live a holy life:

> It is the duty of all such who are believers *Baptized*, to draw nigh unto God in submission to that principle of Christ's Doctrine, to wit, Prayer and Laying on of Hands, that they may receive the promise of the holy Spirit. . . . Unless men so professing, and practicing the forme and order of Christ's Doctrine, shall also beautifie the same with a holy and wise conversation, in all godliness and honesty; the profession of the visible form will be rendered to them of no effect; *for without holiness no man shall see the Lord.*[17]

Much like the Puritans, Baptists began to emigrate to the New World in search of freedom of religion. Unfortunately they found that the Puritans in Massachusetts established freedom for themselves but no one else. To remedy the situation, Roger Williams, who helped begin the first Baptist church in America in 1639, founded the colony of Rhode Island, which granted freedom of conscience to all.

In 1678 a jailed Baptist preacher in England wrote the most popular English book of all time aside from the Bible. It was *Pilgrim's Progress* by John Bunyan (1628-88).

George Fox and the Quakers

In the seventeenth-century, another important group arose out of the English Reformation: the Society of Friends, popularly known as the Quakers. George Fox (1624-91) founded it in 1652. He taught that each Christian could have a personal experience with God and receive an inward direction or guide from Him, which he called "the Inner Light." At the same time, he sought to base all teaching on Scripture alone.

At a typical Quaker meeting, there was no preacher or leader. The people would all sit down, pray, meditate, and wait for the leading of God's Spirit. Anyone who felt inspired could preach a message, read a passage of Scripture, or share a testimony.

In the early days, the Spirit of God often moved in their midst. Many of them literally trembled under the power of God; hence the nickname Quakers. A number of them received the Holy Spirit with the sign of speaking in tongues.[18] In his *Book of Miracles*, Fox recorded miraculous healings among them and even some instances of the dead being raised.

Much like the Anabaptists, Fox proclaimed the life of holiness, particularly stressing honesty, simplicity, and humility. He taught that Christians can live victoriously over sin. Following him, the Quakers were plain of speech, refused to wear jewelry or wigs, were pacifists, and refused to take oaths. They emphasized the equality of everyone and especially sought to help the downtrodden. Fox advocated absolute democracy, proper care of the mentally handicapped, just treatment of American Indians, and the equality of men and women.

To express their strong belief that everyone should be

treated equally, the Quakers always addressed people by the second person singular pronouns *thou* and *thee*. In the English language of the day, these forms were considered appropriate only for social equals or inferiors. It was necessary to address someone of a higher social class by the plural pronouns *you* and *ye*. The Quakers refused to use these and other formal terms to pay homage to someone's class or position.

William Penn, an important Quaker leader, founded the colony of Pennsylvania (the name means "Penn's Woods") as a refuge for Quakers and other groups. In *The Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers*, he identified some of the key characteristics of the Quakers as loving one another, loving enemies, refusing to fight, speaking truth with no oaths, refusing to pay tithes to support the state church, not respecting persons, and using plain speech. He emphasized the need of conversion, regeneration, and holiness.[19]

In *No Cross, No Crown* he wrote against luxuries, gluttony, fine clothing, worldly pleasures, jewelry, worldly books, makeup, and worldly plays, and instead he advocated self-denial, temperance, and moderation. He stated, "No pain, no palm; no thorns, no throne; no gall, no glory; no cross, no crown."[20]

The Quakers considered water baptism and the Lord's Supper to be spiritual in nature. They did not practice either sacrament literally, holding that these ceremonies in the Bible simply teach us to receive spiritual cleansing and to practice spiritual communion among believers.

Taking their cue from Scripture, the early Quaker leaders refused to speak of God as a trinity or as three

persons. Instead, they emphasized that God is one and that Jesus Christ is God manifested in the flesh. George Fox taught that the Father, Christ, and the Holy Spirit were not distinct from eternity but that Christ is in the Father and the Father in Him. Moreover, the Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son. He further explained:

> As for the word trinity, and three persons, we have not read it in the Bible, but in the common prayer book, or mass book, which the pope was the author of. But as for unity we own it, and Christ being the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his substance (of the Father) we own; that which agrees with the Scriptures.[21]

In England, William Penn "found himself a prisoner in the Tower of London for denying the Trinity. . . . To be freed from the Tower, Penn had to show that he did not deny Christ's divinity but only his distinction from God the Father."[22] In defense of the Quakers on this issue, Penn affirmed the deity, humanity, and atoning work of Christ and explained:

> [Quakers] believe in the holy three, or Trinity of Father, Word, and Spirit, according to Scripture. And that these three are truly and properly one; of one nature as well as will. But they are very tender of quitting Scripture terms and phrases, for schoolmen's such as distinct and separate persons and subsistences, etc. are; from whence people are apt to entertain gross ideas and notions of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[23]

Thomas Weisser has reproduced statements of early Quaker leaders, including Penn, Francis Howgill, and George Whitehead, in which they clearly affirmed that Jesus is God and that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are simply one God and not three persons.[24]

In later times, the Quakers became more traditionally Protestant in doctrine and more formal in experience. Some today are evangelical, while many have become quite liberal.

Ann Lee (1736-81), founder of a small group known as the Shakers, was deeply influenced by the Quakers. She advocated purity of life, enthusiastic worship, healing, and tongues, but she went to extremes by teaching communal living and celibacy and claiming to be the second coming of Christ. She emigrated to America in 1774 with a few followers, and they established communes, but after her death the movement became formal and withered away.

Summary and Evaluation

To a great extent, the English Reformation recapitulated the progress and division of the Continental Reformation, yet with its own unique characteristics. The high-church Anglicans resembled the Lutherans, the Puritans were strict Calvinists, and the Baptists and Quakers were remarkably similar to the Anabaptists. This rich and diverse theological heritage was in turn transmitted to America.

Among the groups that emphasized a return to simple biblicism, particularly the Separatists, Baptists, and Quakers, we find evidence that God sought to restore the scriptural truths of the oneness of God, water baptism by

immersion in Jesus' name, the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and holiness of life. Many Baptists baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, but relatively few were baptized with the Holy Spirit. Many Quakers were filled with the Spirit, but they did not practice water baptism. Some people in both groups grasped the truths of the deity of Christ and oneness of God.

Clearly, the hand of God was at work, and probably at least a few people received the full Acts 2:38 experience. As far as the Apostolic message is concerned, however, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Great Britain were a time of preparation for a greater work of God yet to come.

8

The Catholic Reformation

The Roman Catholic Church did not remain static during the Protestant Reformation; it continued to develop and it formulated a vigorous response. The changes it underwent in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are often called the Catholic Reformation, or sometimes the Counter Reformation.

While to some extent the Catholic Reformation was a reaction to the Protestant Reformation, it was more than that. Not only did the Catholics try to defend and solidify doctrines that were under attack, but they also sought to reform morals and practices to conform to stated Catholic ideals.

As Catholic historians and theologians today acknowledge, there were numerous abuses and moral failures in

the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages.[1] While asserting that the fundamental Catholic doctrine was correct, they admit that many leaders committed wrongs and that the system was often corrupt.

Before the Reformation began, the Catholic humanists, the foremost of whom was Erasmus, were already questioning certain doctrines and practices and proposing ethical reforms. While not directly promoting new doctrines, they felt free to depart from both tradition and the literal meaning of Scripture. They promoted the "philosophy of Christ," and believed that the Logos (Word) spoke through ancient pagan philosophers. Erasmus even spoke of "St. Socrates."

The Reformation made moderation impossible for the humanists, forcing them to choose sides. They remained with the Catholic Church and affirmed many doctrines they had previously questioned or rejected.

In addition, some Catholic leaders sought to reform the system without altering doctrine. A notable example was Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros in Spain.

When the Protestant Reformation came, the immediate reaction of the pope and hierarchy was to resist. Several theologians assumed the task of refuting Protestant leaders, both in oral debate and in written rebuttals. John Eck (1486-1543) was a prominent professor who personally debated Luther and Carlstadt. He later wrote against Melanchthon (Luther's younger colleague) as well as the Reformed leaders Zwingli and Bucer. Nevertheless, the Protestant Reformation provoked serious thinking about reform even among many who remained loyal to the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Reformation was characterized by two

key elements: theological scholarship and repression of dissent. Learned men arose to articulate the Catholic position, develop well-reasoned defenses, and correct inconsistencies and abuses. People who deviated from traditional orthodoxy, however, were not allowed to remain in the church. If they wanted to reform the church, they had to do so from within, in submission to its doctrines and leadership.

The Trial of Galileo

A notable example of the repression of dissent occurred with the trial of Galileo Galilei. Galileo was a noted scientist and astronomer who made effective use of a new invention, the telescope, in his research. Following the theory of Copernicus and based on his own astronomical observations, he concluded that the earth revolved around the sun rather than vice versa. In 1616 the Roman Catholic Church labeled this view as heresy because of passages of Scripture that speak about the rising of the sun and about the sun standing still in Joshua's day.

Catholic theologians interpreted these statements as references to astronomy when, in actuality, they simply use the language of phenomena. That is, they describe reality not in scientific terms but in the way it appears to the human eye. Even today, we typically speak of the sun rising and setting although we know the sun does not literally revolve around the earth.

The Catholic hierarchy, however, concluded that Galileo's scientific discoveries contradicted Scripture and therefore were heresy. In 1633 he was forced to recant his beliefs and cease teaching them, although he still believed them.

As Galileo's case shows, the Catholic hierarchy insisted that everyone conform strictly to official church dogma and interpretation. They did not allow dissent even in matters of science, much less theology. No doubt they felt this stance was necessary to maintain Catholic identity under the intense pressure of the Protestant Reformation.

The Dominicans

The Dominicans, an order of teaching and preaching monks founded in 1220, dominated Catholic theology in the early sixteenth century. They based their views largely on Thomas Aquinas, the foremost theologian of the Middle Ages and a Dominican.

An important Dominican theologian was Thomas de Vio Cajetan (1468-1534). He met with Luther at Augsburg in an unsuccessful attempt to resolve his protests. He wrote a series of influential commentaries on the Bible and on Thomas Aquinas, and he advocated the literal method of interpreting Scripture.

Francisco de Vitoria (1492-1546), another significant Dominican, did theology by commenting on Thomas Aquinas. He analyzed Spain's conquest of the New World. Spain was a leading world power and a stronghold of Catholicism. Spanish conquistadors overthrew the mighty Inca and Aztec empires, brutally massacring thousands of Indians and conquering much of what is now Latin America. They forced many of the native inhabitants to convert to Christianity on pain of death, and Catholic priests accompanied them as missionaries.

Many people justified the conquest of the New World on the basis that the inhabitants were heathens and sav-

ages. Since they had sinned grossly against God by practices such as human sacrifice, it was only right that they be destroyed. Moreover, the Catholics were doing them a great favor by bringing Christianity to them. While identifying some reasons that could justify conquest in certain cases, de Vitoria rejected most of the popular rationales and in the process helped lay foundations for international law.

The last great Dominican theologian of the age was Domingo Báñez (1528-1604). He asserted that the authority of church tradition was superior to that of Scripture.

The Society of Jesus

Soon the Dominicans had to share their leading role with a new order of monks called the Society of Jesus, or the Jesuits, with whom they developed a strong rivalry. The founder was Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), a Basque priest from Spain who had dreams, visions, trances, and ecstatic experiences. In one vision he claimed to see God the Father and God the Son; in others he perceived the trinity in a symbolic form.

Pope Paul III officially approved the Society of Jesus in 1540. It had three goals: reform the church, especially by education; fight heresy, especially Protestantism; and preach the gospel to pagans. The members took a special vow of obedience to the pope. They considered themselves soldiers of God, and their leader was called a general. They were to obey him and "reverence him, as is befitting, as they would Christ, if He were present in person."[2] Ignatius insisted on such loyalty to the church that he wrote, "To make quite sure of our orthodoxy, if the

hierarchical church pronounces to be black that which appears to be white, we ought to hold it to be black."[3]

The Jesuits were not accountable to the church hierarchy but reported directly to the pope. They became his personal army for obtaining important information and for maintaining control outside the regular chain of command. The Jesuits soon developed into a powerful and effective tool of the pope for reforming the church and opposing the Protestants.

The Society of Jesus was extremely well organized and well disciplined. It attracted and developed many intellectuals who were skilled at refuting their opponents, both Protestant and Catholic. They became well known for close theological reasoning and even hair-splitting.

The Jesuits became the most significant force in the Catholic Reformation. They were so successful in combatting Protestant ideas that they swayed areas such as Poland, Bohemia, and Moravia back to the Catholic fold. Peter Canisius (1521-97) and Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) were important Jesuit theologians who wrote against the Protestants. The latter took part in the tribunal that condemned Galileo.

The Society of Jesus also established strong missionary endeavors in pagan lands, especially India, Vietnam, China, Japan, Brazil, Ethiopia, and Congo. Francis Xavier (1498-1552), one of the original companions of Ignatius, was a noted missionary to India and Japan.

Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) followed Francis Xavier and established numerous missions in China by allowing converts to retain their own culture, including Confucian ideas. His successors even allowed the practice of Confu-

cian rites. The church condemned this approach in 1742 and lost most of its Chinese constituency.

The most significant Jesuit theologian of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Most of his theology is the accepted Jesuit view to this day.

Because of the Jesuits' tight organization and political strength (secular and ecclesiastical), many Catholics as well as Protestants feared them. In the 1700s France, Spain, and Naples expelled the Jesuits from their domains. In 1773 the pope dissolved the Society of Jesus, but it was fully restored in 1814.

Other New Movements

Teresa of Avila (1515-82), a Spanish mystic, was a Carmelite nun who spent many hours in prayer and fell into trances that left her paralyzed for days and sometimes months. In her forties she began to hear inner voices and see visions. She founded the first convent of Reformed (Discalced) Carmelites, which reinstituted strict rules, such as the requirement of perpetual solitude, that the Carmelites had relaxed over the years.

A close friend of Teresa's and a Spaniard like her, John of the Cross (Juan de la Cruz) (1542-1605) established Reformed Carmelite houses for men. He subjected himself to severe disciplines and deprivations. Like Teresa, he was a mystic who saw visions and spent hours seeking communion with God. Both Teresa and John were canonized (made saints) after their deaths.

In Italy, some Franciscans sought to return to the strictness of the original rule of Francis of Assisi. They eventually became a separate order called the Capuchins.

One of their early leaders, Bernardino Ochino, converted to Protestantism.

The mystical tendencies in Catholicism developed into quietism in seventeenth-century France. Adherents to this view believed that perfection consists of a continuous state of contemplation. They were indifferent to everything but God and did not worry about salvation or works. The church condemned them in 1699.

Probabilism

Bartolomé Medina (1528-80), a Dominican from Spain, advanced a new ethical theory called probabilism. He taught that just as it is proper to hold a probable opinion in theology, it is also proper to follow a probable course of action.

Most theologians agreed that some doctrinal issues are unresolved, and in such cases one may advocate a view that appears to be correct even though there is not absolute certainty about it or even though others have some objections. Medina extended this concept to moral choices. When faced with a certain decision, it is permissible to act according to what is probably right, even though there is some uncertainty about it.

Some theologians, particularly among the Jesuits, took Medina's theory to an extreme that he himself had not taught: If there is a reasonable doubt about whether something is sinful or not, then it is permissible to act as if it were *not* sinful. If a person can think of some plausible justification for a certain action, then he can safely act upon that justification and ignore contrary reasons, even if the rationale he adopts is not the most likely one. Reasoning such as this gave the Jesuits a reputation for casu-

istry (subtle but misleading or false application of ethical principles).

Of course, the Bible teaches a different approach. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Romans 14:23). If a person has doubts about something, he should not do it. As applied to questionable actions, probabilism is a prime example of how theology can distort and evade the teaching of Scripture.

Predestination

Just as there was a controversy over predestination in the Protestant ranks, so there erupted a similar controversy over this doctrine within Catholicism. The Dominicans typically emphasized the necessity of God's grace and thus were prone to think in terms of predestination, while the Jesuits usually emphasized human free will.

A Jesuit from Portugal named Luis de Molina (1536-1600) brought attention to this matter by teaching that the human will is necessary in the salvation process. He acknowledged that salvation is by God's grace and the process must start with God's grace. God does not bestow His grace merely on a select, preordained few, however, but makes it available to all. The difference between those who are saved and those who are lost does not rest in the choice of God but in the choice of humans. God's grace comes to everyone, but people decide whether or not to believe God and therefore to be saved.

Leading Dominicans such as Báñez opposed this view, drawing from Augustine, the first theologian to promote the doctrine of unconditional election, and from Thomas Aquinas, who similarly affirmed the predestination of the

elect although he linked it to God's foreknowledge of human choice.

Ultimately, in an effort to end this controversy, Pope Paul V declared in 1606 that neither side taught heresy. Either view was acceptable within the church.

Nevertheless, a Dutch bishop named Cornelius Jansenius (1585-1638) vigorously attacked Molina's doctrine in a book published after his death. He advocated a strict interpretation of the doctrine of Augustine, teaching double predestination: God predestines everyone either to be saved or to be lost. His decision is absolute, and there is nothing humans can do in regard to it. Grace is irresistible and infallible. If God chooses to save someone, He bestows grace upon that person.

Because Jansenism, as it became known, was quite radical in promoting double predestination and denouncing any other view, several popes condemned it. Jansenism involved more than just this doctrine, however. It was also a reform movement that issued a call to purity, holiness, and spirituality. Through Jansenism, a noted mathematician named Blaise Pascal (1623-62) had a spiritual conversion. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a number of Jansenists received the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues.[4]

The Council of Trent (1545-63)

In the sixteenth century, the Protestant Reformation threatened to engulf much of Europe. As a result, the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church soon felt a need to affirm traditional doctrines against the Protestants, to refute what they considered to be the errors of Protestantism, and to eliminate corrupt practices in the Catholic

Church that left it vulnerable to Protestant criticisms.

The Renaissance popes immediately before and at the start of the Reformation had allowed the papacy and hierarchy to descend to low levels of morality as they pursued political and military power, wealth, and worldly pleasures. Eventually, however, the popes began to realize the urgent need for major reforms throughout the church at all levels. Consequently, in 1545 Pope Paul III convened the Council of Trent in northern Italy. Under the direction of several popes and guided theologically by the Jesuits, it met in three major sessions, with the last one ending in 1563. Pope Pius IV confirmed the council's decrees in 1564.

The Council of Trent was a defining moment in the history of the Roman Catholic Church as it faced several crucial issues. Politically, the pope sought to reassert his authority, particularly over the increasing power of the Holy Roman emperor. Theologically, the church had to decide how to respond to the Protestants. Some bishops felt they could win back many Protestants if the church would grant some of their demands and make some doctrinal compromises with them. Others said the only way to survive was to condemn the Protestants wholeheartedly. Ecclesiastically, there was general agreement that some reforms of the system were desperately needed.

The Council of Trent had several important results. *First of all, it emphasized and solidified the power of the pope* over the Holy Roman emperor and also within the church hierarchy. While the doctrine of papal infallibility was not formally adopted until 1870, the council recognized that the pope had the supreme authority to interpret and implement its decisions.

Second, it implemented moral and institutional reforms from the top down. The impetus did not come from the grassroots, but the pope and hierarchy realized the need for reform and instituted changes that filtered down to all levels of the church. This reformation was strictly traditional and orthodox, specifically a reformation of morals, religious life, and church government, not of doctrine, liturgy, or basic institutions.

Third, the Council of Trent took a strict stand against the Protestants and in the process clearly defined Roman Catholic identity. The canons of the council repeatedly denounce distinctive Protestant positions, stating of anyone who holds them, "Let him be anathema [cursed]."

Not long before, Pope Paul III had revived the Inquisition, and the council strengthened it and set it in motion against the Protestants. Created in the twelfth century but lying dormant at the beginning of the Reformation, the Inquisition was a system of ecclesiastical tribunals that operated independently of secular law. Its purpose was to judge and destroy heresy. Although the worst abuses occurred before the Reformation, the Inquisition banned and burned books, and it excommunicated, fined, imprisoned, tortured, and even executed heretics.

The Catholic Church had earlier banned certain books and even forbidden the Bible to the laity in 1229, but in 1559 the Inquisition promulgated the first official *Index of Forbidden Books*. These books were considered heretical and thus were banned. Moreover, no Catholic could publish or read a book that did not have the imprimatur, or stamped approval, of the church. Both the Inquisition (in milder form) and the *Index* survived until

Pope Paul VI transformed the former into the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1965 and suppressed the latter in 1966.

Let us examine important features of the Council of Trent.

Moral Reform

The moral reforms instituted by the council were quite significant. It passed a number of rules designed to eliminate common abuses of the system. For example, it sought to eliminate absenteeism, the practice of a bishop receiving an office and yet not actually living in or serving his designated area but simply collecting the income.

The council also outlawed simony (the buying and selling of offices); helped to end nepotism (appointment of relatives), which even the popes often practiced; and made efforts to stop irresponsible ordination. In the Middle Ages it was common to bestow high ecclesiastical offices upon young boys from prominent families and to hasten them through the various clerical rankings so that they could technically qualify for the highest offices. To curtail such abuses, the council set strict qualifications for each office and guidelines for ordination to the priesthood and advancement through the various levels in the hierarchy of the church. The purpose was to ensure that religious appointments would be based on moral and theological criteria rather than political, social, and monetary influences.

Further reforms were designed to equip priests with a greater understanding of Scripture and doctrine by increasing their theological education. The hope was that they would thus be better able to respond to the challenge

of the Protestants, who appealed to the Bible for their authority and disseminated translations in the language of the people.

Trent also introduced the use of the confessional box, which gave parishioners greater privacy and shielded priests from temptations during confession. The council reiterated and enforced the traditional rules against clerical concubinage and marriage. And the council acknowledged that the sale of indulgences had led to many "abuses." As a result, the sale of indulgences from town to town—the immediate cause of the Reformation—finally ended. Indulgences were now generally granted for good works other than donations.

The Scriptures

With respect to theology, the Council of Trent proclaimed that Scripture and tradition are equal in authority, in opposition to the Protestant view that Scripture alone is authoritative. Just as God inspired the Scriptures to teach doctrine, so God inspired leaders throughout the history of the church to introduce additional doctrines and practices. The collective writings of the early church "fathers," the decisions of the ecumenical councils, and the decisions of the popes constitute this authoritative church tradition.

The council included as part of the Bible the Apocrypha, books from the intertestamental period that the Jews and the Protestants excluded. In the early centuries, some church writers had regarded them as Scripture, but no official church council had included them. In the Middle Ages they were commonly considered as scriptural to some extent. For the first time, the Council of Trent offi-

cially pronounced eleven books of the Apocrypha to be Scripture. The result is that the Roman Catholic Bible today includes in the Old Testament seven extra books and four additions to existing books.[5]

An important reason behind this decision was that some passages from these books offered support for Catholic beliefs and practices under attack by the Protestants, such as salvation by works and prayer for the dead. While Catholics defended these practices by appealing to tradition, the use of these books gave them an appeal to "Scripture" as well.

The council also pronounced that the interpretation of the church was authoritative. An individual did not have the right to his own interpretation of Scripture; whenever the church proclaimed a certain interpretation of a scriptural passage, then all Catholics had to accept it.

A prominent example was Matthew 16:16-18, where Peter confessed Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God, and Jesus responded, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." According to official Catholic teaching, Jesus identified Peter as the foundation rock of the church. He made Peter His personal vicar and ruler of the universal church, and He further conferred the same unique authority upon Peter's alleged successors, the bishops of Rome. Thus no Catholic could deny that the pope is the undisputed ruler of the church, adopt any other explanation of Matthew 16:18, or publish or read anything to the contrary.

The council further declared that the Vulgate, the traditional Latin translation of the Bible, was the official Bible of the church. Moreover, the translation process was inspired like the original writing so that the translation

itself was infallible. Since that time, other translations have been endorsed, including the Rheims-Douay Bible in English.

Sin and Salvation

The crux of the dispute with the Protestants was the doctrines of sin and salvation. The Council of Trent affirmed the doctrine of original sin, agreeing with the leading Reformers on this point. Every human being is born in sin, inheriting both a sinful nature and guilt from Adam.

In order to remove the guilt of original sin, a newborn baby should be baptized as soon as possible. An unbaptized infant who dies goes to limbo, a place where there is neither pleasure nor pain. All who deny that baptism remits original sin and all who reject infant baptism are accursed.

The single most important issue dividing Protestants and Catholics was the doctrine of justification. Trent said that justification is a process initiated by God's grace ("prevenient grace," the grace that precedes salvation), which humans can accept or reject. The sacrifice of Jesus Christ purchased our justification, and we receive it by God's grace, not our works. "Justifying faith" is more than "confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins for Christ's sake," however, and in addition, we are not justified by "faith alone."[6] Good works also play an important role in maintaining and increasing our justification:

> If any one saith, that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works; but that the said works are merely the

> fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof: let him be anathema. . . . If any one saith, . . . that the said justified, by the good works which he performs through the grace of God and the merits of Jesus Christ . . . does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life . . . let him be anathema.[7]

Trent presented justification as gradual. The Protestants looked at justification as instantaneous: at the moment of faith God freely counts a person as righteous on the basis of Christ's sacrifice. By contrast, the Catholics at Trent held that the term encompasses both the remission of sins and progressive sanctification. Protestants saw sanctification as a separate work, and those who embraced predestination did not consider that sanctification has any bearing on one's standing as a saved person. Catholics said one's right standing with God depends not only on the righteousness of Christ but also on the person's own righteousness that he develops by letting God work in him.

No one can know if he is predestined to salvation. Consequently, each person must continue to follow the sacramental system, particularly the sacrament of penance for sins committed after baptism. Through good works such as penance, he fulfills the law of God and merits eternal life.

In short, according to Trent, justification begins by faith, but it is increased by good works. Both faith and works are necessary to the process of justification over the course of one's life. Trent thus rejected the idea that salvation is purely unmerited. Rather, each person merits

salvation by actually becoming good. Of course, it is by God's grace that a person becomes good. Nevertheless, under this view salvation is by faith and works and not by faith alone.

While the Catholic Church accepted predestination as an allowable view in the controversies between Dominicans and Jesuits, and while Trent cautioned against trying to delve into the mysteries of predestination, it denounced various Calvinistic views on the subject, including the following: humans have totally lost their free will due to Adam's sin, they cannot cooperate with God in receiving His grace, they cannot resist God's grace, they cannot fall from grace, and a justified person must believe that he is predestined to salvation.

The Sacraments

The Council of Trent endorsed the seven sacraments of the medieval church: baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, ordination, and marriage. God confers grace through these sacraments. Water baptism is necessary to salvation, for it washes away sins and effects regeneration. Penance is necessary for sins committed after baptism.

Interestingly, the council left open a door of reconciliation so that Protestants could easily return to the Catholic fold as long as they were baptized into the trinity:

> If any one saith, that the baptism which is even given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism: let him be anathema.[8]

Thus a Protestant could have a valid baptism and so be regenerated. To be saved he needed to submit to the teaching and authority of the Roman Church, but he would not need to be rebaptized. Although Trent was harsh in its condemnation of Protestantism, this concession made it possible for Catholics in the twentieth century to speak of Protestants as "separated brethren" and to conclude that they may be saved while remaining in their churches. Even today, however, the Catholics base this broader acceptance and unity on confession of and baptism into the trinity.[9]

The council reaffirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation, the belief that at the celebration of the Eucharist the bread and wine turn into the physical body and blood of Jesus Christ, and it asserted that each time Christ is offered afresh as an atoning sacrifice. Moreover, each element contains the full humanity and divinity of Christ. By implication, this view justifies the Catholic practice of worshiping the consecrated host. It also makes unnecessary the partaking of both elements. The laity are to partake of the bread only; if anyone says they ought to receive both, he is anathema.

Other Doctrines

On a number of other contested issues, the Council of Trent reaffirmed the traditional doctrines and practices of the medieval church. These include the Latin mass; the doctrine of purgatory; the invocation and veneration of the Virgin Mary and the saints; the veneration of relics and images; and the value of indulgences.

Summary and Evaluation

In doctrine, liturgy, and outlook, the Council of Trent

maintained continuity with the past yet reinvigorated the Roman Church and shaped it for the next four hundred years. For instance, the Tridentine mass promulgated by this council became the universal Latin liturgy until Vatican II instituted a modern liturgy in the vernacular, and even then some splinter groups and traditionalists insisted on retaining the mass of Trent.

While the Council of Trent did not signal a break with the past, it did define doctrinal positions that the Catholic Church had not previously addressed with such explicit formulations. Many aspects of the church's philosophy and practice had evolved over the centuries with little theological opposition, but events now forced a clear enunciation of beliefs. In this way, the council set the direction for the future. In addition, though it did not eliminate all abuses, it did curtail a number of evils for which the church had been justly and severely criticized, and since that time the church has generally held to the reforms.

As a pivotal point in Roman Catholic history, the Council of Trent has few rivals. At the end of the sixth century, Pope Gregory I established the direction of the Roman Catholic Church for the next five hundred years by his endorsement and incorporation of many popular beliefs and practices. After the papacy reached a nadir of corruption and immorality in the ninth through eleventh centuries, Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand) set a new standard of morals. His reforms greatly enhanced papal power and authority and influenced the church to the Renaissance. Then in the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent set the tone for the Roman Catholic Church all the way to the twentieth century, particularly defining the Catholic identity as opposed to Protestantism. Not until

the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) did the Catholic Church adopt a significantly new attitude and outlook, and even then it continued to affirm the doctrines of Trent.

9

Lutheran Orthodoxy

As we have seen, by 1534 the Reformation produced four major wings of Protestantism. Three of them—the Lutherans, the Reformed, and the Anglicans—became large state churches in parts of Europe. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these movements crystallized their theology into their classic positions. While they sprang into existence almost overnight, and certain key doctrines characterized them from the start, they worked through a number of theological controversies before attaining their final form.

In this chapter we will discuss the development of Lutheran theology after Martin Luther to the *Formula of Concord* in 1577. This document records the resolution of the important controversies within the Lutheran camp

in the sixteenth century, and it is the expression of orthodox Lutheranism to this day.

Philip Melanchthon

The first systematic theologian of Lutheranism was Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560), a younger colleague of Martin Luther who joined the University of Wittenberg faculty in 1518, just after the Reformation began. At first, he was heavily influenced by Luther, and his early writings echo Luther's views almost identically.

In 1521 (age twenty-four) he published the *Loci communes rerum theologicarum*, translated *Commonplaces* or *Basic Theological Themes*, which was the first Protestant systematic theology. In 1530 he wrote the first major Lutheran creed, the *Augsburg Confession*, which had the approval of Luther himself. This creed came about at the Diet of Augsburg, where Emperor Charles V asked the Protestants to state their beliefs, and specifically how they differed from Catholicism.

Over time Melanchthon was influenced by Catholic humanism and Reformed Protestantism and gradually changed some of his views, particularly after Luther's death. In several instances he moved from Luther in the direction of John Calvin. In addition, his spirit was different from Luther in that Luther always emphasized correct doctrine above unity while Melanchthon sought unity above complete agreement in doctrinal areas.

Melanchthon was an influential figure because of his systematic writings and his early association with Luther, but also because he epitomized an important trend in Lutheran ranks. Consequently, he was often at the center of controversy between strict Lutheran traditionalists and

those who advocated some change of views.

One example of the evolution of Melanchthon's views is the doctrine of unconditional election. Originally he taught, like Luther, that humans do not have a free will and that everyone who is saved is predestined without regard to human choice. Later in life he began to teach that three causes are at work simultaneously in conversion: the Word of God, the Spirit of God, and the human will. We cooperate with or assent to the work of the Spirit and the Word in our salvation. We have the ability to perform external righteousness but not to merit salvation, and we have the ability to will for God to draw us. God draws, but we must desire for Him to do so.

Melanchthon did not explicitly deny predestination, but traditionalists attacked his teaching as a compromise of Luther's doctrine. They charged that it would make humans co-redeemers. Melanchthon denied that humans could assist God in salvation but insisted that the human will does play a role in conversion.

Another example of Melanchthon's shift was on the Eucharist. Initially, he adhered to Luther's view that Christ is bodily present in the elements. Eventually, however, he adopted an approach like that of Calvin, rejecting the physical presence and saying that the purpose of the sacrament is to fortify our faith spiritually.

Melanchthon also embraced some Calvinistic language regarding water baptism. He said baptism is "an external sign and blessing of divine promises" and it "signifies repentance and forgiveness of sins through Christ."[1] Nevertheless, he retained a strong view of baptism's role: "The Holy Spirit is given when we receive baptism; John 3 and Titus 3 clearly call baptism a bath of

new birth through the Holy Spirit."[2] He used the trinitarian formula.

Melanchthon's original *Loci* said it was unprofitable, unnecessary, and even dangerous to try to investigate the doctrine of the trinity and indicated that it was not essential to salvation.[3] Sometime later, Melanchthon confessed to "reading [Michael] Servetus a great deal," but he ultimately rejected Servetus's doctrine of the oneness of God in vehement terms and approved of his execution. Nevertheless, in several private letters he acknowledged his own questions and hinted that his private views were not altogether orthodox:

> I have little doubt that great controversies will one day arise on this subject. . . . On the subject of the Trinity—you know, I have always feared that serious difficulties would one day arise. Good God! To what tragedies will not these questions give occasion in times to come: Is the Logos an *hypostasis* [person]? Is the Holy Ghost an *hypostasis*? For my own part I refer me to those passages of Scripture that bid us call on Christ, which is to ascribe divine honors to him, and find them full of consolation. . . . I find it after all of little use to inquire too curiously into that which properly constitutes the nature of a *Person*, and into that wherein and whereby persons are distinguished from one another. . . . To me Tertullian seems to think on this subject as we do in public, and not in the way Servetus interprets him. But of these things more hereafter when we meet.[4]

The final edition of his *Loci* (1555) gave extended

treatment to the doctrine. He made it an essential component of theology and tried to explain it, but he had difficulty distinguishing a person from a being and came close to tritheism by comparing the persons of the trinity to human persons:

> Now the first article of faith is that there is one unified eternal omnipotent Being, and nevertheless that there are three divine eternal omnipotent persons, eternal Father, eternal Son, and eternal Holy Spirit. . . . *Person* is not a part of a detachable thing, but is instead an essence, a living thing in itself, not the sum of many parts, but a unified and rational thing, which is not sustained and supported by any other being as if it were but an addition to it. You are a person.[5]

Despite privately saying it was not very productive to analyze what makes the persons of the trinity distinct, he tried to do so, but the result is philosophical abstraction rather than meaningful biblical truth. He said there are only two distinctions among the persons—their "essential nature" and "their activities and functions toward us":

> The Father is the procreator; the Son is begotten of the Father and out of the Father's being and through eternity the Son is the essential and full Image of the Father. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son and is the love and joy in the Father and Son. . . . Every activity, be it creation or anything else, is an activity of all three divine persons. Nevertheless, in accordance with the order of

> the persons, each person has his own distinctive work.[6]

Throughout much of Melanchthon's career, wars raged between Catholics and Protestants. In 1547, the Catholic Emperor Charles V defeated and imprisoned two leading Protestant princes, Philip of Hesse and Elector John Frederick of Saxony. Charles sought to impose a compromise creed on the Protestants, called the *Augsburg Interim*. He demanded that all Protestant leaders sign it.

Many refused as a matter of conscience and were killed or exiled. Although the creed did not totally embrace Catholicism, it did renounce some important tenets of Lutheranism in favor of Catholicism.

Melanchthon and others could not accept the *Augsburg Interim*, but he was willing to make some compromises, so a revision was made, called the *Leipzig Interim*. It included both Lutheran and Catholic elements. Melanchthon and some Lutherans accepted this compromise.

Ultimately, due to the Lutheran sentiments of the populace, these efforts at compromise failed, and in 1555 the Peace of Augsburg granted the Protestant states in Germany freedom of religion. Understandably, the Lutherans who had refused to sign and suffered accordingly were indignant against Melanchthon and others who had signed. In response, Melanchthon explained that certain doctrines (such as justification by faith) are essential and must not be compromised, while other doctrines are not essential and so can be compromised if necessary.

Let us now turn to a discussion of eight major contro-

versies in the Lutheran movement prior to the *Formula of Concord*, many of which directly involved Philip Melanchthon.

The Antinomian Controversy

The first controversy we will discuss was over antinomianism, which comes from Greek words meaning "against law." It seemed to start innocently enough with the teachings of John Agricola (1494-1566), an early colleague of Martin Luther, on the subject of repentance. He held that, logically speaking, repentance follows faith. A person is first justified by the faith God gives him, and by this faith he then receives God's work of repentance. If repentance came first then it would seem to mean something more than faith would be required for justification.

Melanchthon responded that repentance comes before faith. While justification is by faith alone, repentance prepares the heart to believe, for how could anyone be saved without repentance?

Since the Lutherans had already excluded any kind of choice, response, obedience, or action from their definition of saving faith, the role of repentance was indeed problematic. Either someone could be saved without repentance, or something more than mental faith would be required for salvation.

Faced with this choice, Agricola later became even more explicit in stating that repentance is not necessary for salvation. Consequently, it is not necessary to preach the law or teach morality. The only necessary, sufficient, and important message is salvation by faith. Christians need no law, commandments, or moral guidance. They are saved by faith, and from that moment they are led by

inner spiritual impulses.

Later advocates of this position went even further than Agricola, saying that since good works are in no way necessary for salvation we need not be concerned about them. Christians are not subject to any form of obedience. The law is of no use to them.

The *Formula of Concord* denounced antinomianism. It affirmed that Christians are saved by faith alone, but they need God's moral law to teach them how to live. Good works are not irrelevant, for the faith that saves will produce good works. Christians are saved by faith alone but not by the faith that is alone.

Antinomian ideas are still current within Protestantism, especially among some who believe in unconditional election, unconditional eternal security, or "freedom" from holiness teachings. A recent dispute among evangelicals over "Lordship salvation" is reminiscent of Agricola's views. One side says we are saved simply by confessing Jesus as Savior. Neither godly sorrow nor a decision to forsake sin is necessary, although both are desirable. Repentance is only a synonym for faith, which in turn is only a mental acknowledgment. The other side says that genuine repentance is essential; a person must confess Jesus both as Savior and Lord of his life if he is to be truly born again.

The answer to the question of whether repentance precedes or follows faith depends on one's definition of faith. If it is merely a mental understanding or process, then it does not encompass the entire salvation experience of the New Testament, which includes repentance. In a scriptural sense, however, saving faith is a relationship with God that includes obedience to the gospel and

Christian initiation. In short, if by faith one means simply an acceptance of the teachings of Scripture, then faith is the first step, followed by repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. If by faith one means a proper and complete response to the gospel, then it includes all the foregoing elements.

Controversy over Inward Justification

Andrew Osiander (1498-1552) sparked a second controversy in sixteenth-century Lutheranism. Unlike most Lutherans, he was somewhat mystical or inclined toward inward spiritual experiences. Although Luther himself had had a dramatic conversion, his definition of justification by faith minimized an inward experience, focusing rather on Christ's historic work and God's predetermined choice. Moreover, Luther denounced the "enthusiasts" for placing too much emphasis on spiritual experiences.

Osiander reacted against the Lutheran tendency to minimize personal spirituality by teaching that justification is a work of the indwelling Christ. It is not merely an abstract theological concept whereby God imputes legal righteousness to a person without his experiencing something personally. Instead, it is Christ coming to dwell in the believer and thereby imparting His own righteousness to him. Righteousness comes by the Spirit of Christ.

The *Formula of Concord* rejected the idea that justification comes through the indwelling Christ. Rather it is an objective act of God, based strictly on Calvary. Christ is our righteousness not just by His Spirit but by His flesh, that is, according to both His natures. The essence of justification is a legal recognition by God, not an inward experience. Although both justification and regeneration occur at the

same time, the emphasis is not on an inward transformation but on a change of legal status in the sight of God.

Controversy over Essentials

The next controversy arose over the implications of signing the *Augsburg* and *Leipzig Interims*. The issue was which doctrines are essential and which are not. Theologians call it the adiaphoristic controversy, from a word meaning "nonessentials."

As we have seen, Melanchthon argued that some doctrines are not essential and therefore can be compromised. In opposition to him, some of the more strict Lutherans, particularly Matthias Flacius, said everything is essential when it comes time for a confession of faith. When faced with signing a statement of what one believes and taking a stand for truth, nothing can be discarded.

Melanchthon responded that this concept leads back to the authoritarian approach of the Catholic Church, with the church forcing everyone to conform on every iota. There is no room for Christian liberty.

The *Formula of Concord* said some things are essential and others are not. Some doctrines are essential to true Christianity and to salvation. Other doctrines should be believed but they are not essential to believe. On the other hand, there are circumstances in which everything becomes essential.

Controversy over Good Works

The fourth controversy arose over the teachings of George Major (1502-74), who took the opposite extreme from the antinomians and asserted that good works are necessary to salvation. He reasoned that faith is neces-

sary for salvation and faith necessarily produces good works; thus good works are necessary for salvation. This conclusion, however, undercuts the basis of Lutheran theology and the entire Protestant Reformation.

The response of orthodox Lutheranism was that salvation is by faith alone. We cannot say good works are necessary to salvation, but good works are important.

Since Luther questioned the value of the Book of James, his followers probably neglected its scriptural insights, but it helps illuminate the proper course to follow between the antinomian error and the Majoristic error. It teaches that the kind of faith that saves is the kind of faith that always produces works. We cannot say that works are necessary to obtain or even to retain salvation, but we can say the kind of faith that saves will always have works as evidence. If a professed Christian does not exhibit good works, then either he did not have genuine faith and regeneration from the start, or else he has departed from saving faith along the way. Works are never a means of obtaining salvation, but works are a necessary evidence of salvation.

Controversy over the Human Will

The synergistic controversy—synergy refers to an interaction or cooperation of two or more elements—stemmed from Melanchthon's idea that conversion comes by the Word, the Spirit, and the human will. The implication is that a person is not saved strictly because God has predestined him, but a person is saved as he assents to God's work of salvation in him.

Flacius and other strict Lutherans accused Melanchthon of betraying Luther's original views. They asserted

that salvation is solely by predestination and no human will is involved.

In championing this position, Flacius went to the extreme of saying that we are sinners by nature and thus do not bear the image of God in us but the image of the devil. Originally Adam and Eve were created in the image of God, but they lost that image when they sinned. Now we are in the image of the devil, so there is no way we can even assist in salvation.

The *Formula of Concord* rejected the notion that humans bear the devil's image, but it did reaffirm the original teaching of Luther with regard to predestination. It said we are born in sin but sin is not of the essence of human nature; it was introduced by the devil. We are sinners but not demonic or devilish.

Nevertheless, the human will can never lead people toward good, so it can play no part in salvation. The Spirit and the Word alone cause conversion in the heart of a person. Humans do not have a choice with regard to salvation, but they have freedom of choice and action in everything else.

Controversy over the Eucharist

As chapter 2 describes, Martin Luther insisted that Christ's blood and body are physically present in the Eucharist. Zwingli and the Anabaptists considered the Lord's Supper to be simply a symbol, while Calvin taught that Christ's presence is spiritual rather than physical.

Some Lutherans adopted the spiritualistic view of Calvin. Melanchthon favored this position but refused to take an open stand. The *Formula of Concord* affirmed the original teaching of Luther, known as consubstantiation.

Controversy over the Person of Christ

The Eucharistic controversy led to a dispute over the union of human and divine in Christ. To uphold consubstantiation, Luther taught that Christ's humanity and deity are so interrelated that His physical body can be many places at one time, specifically in various Eucharistic celebrations. Some Lutherans followed the thinking of Calvin on this point and said Christ's humanity can only be one place at a time.

The *Formula of Concord* affirmed the view of Luther. Christ's humanity participates in the omnipresence of His divine nature to the extent that His body can be in many places at once.

Controversy over Predestination

Finally, some Lutherans departed from the doctrine of predestination (unconditional election). We have already seen one aspect of this disagreement with respect to the role of the human will in salvation.

The *Formula of Concord* endorsed the doctrine of predestination with one qualification. It affirmed the doctrine of election; namely, God has unconditionally elected or predestined everyone who will be saved. The *Formula* was silent on the subject of reprobation, however. The Lutherans drew back from stating the idea of double predestination, namely, that God has predestined the unsaved to go to the lake of fire.

Logically, if single predestination is true then double predestination must be true as well, for if salvation comes only by God's election and God refuses to elect some people to salvation, then in effect He has chosen them for damnation. But it sounded too harsh to say God sends

some people to hell for no reason other than His choice.

The Book of Concord

The *Formula of Concord* was a largely successful attempt to end controversies and to bring together a divided church. In that sense it followed the spirit of Melanchthon in seeking unity, but doctrinally it adhered closely to the original teaching of Luther. It also helped maintain a clear distinction between Lutheranism and Calvinism.

In 1580, the *Book of Concord* was published. It contained the *Apostles' Creed*, the *Nicene Creed*, the *Athanasian Creed*, the *Augsburg Confession*, Luther's *Small* and *Large Catechisms*, the *Formula of Concord*, and three other writings by Luther and Melanchthon. These are the essential documents of Lutheranism.

George Calixtus and the Syncretistic Controversy

After the *Formula of Concord*, another controversy stemmed from the teaching of George Calixtus (1586-1656) in Germany. It is called the syncretistic controversy; syncretism refers to drawing doctrines from various sources and merging them together. The goal of Calixtus was to reconcile the various branches of Christianity. If they could not agree on all doctrines, at least he wanted them to agree that each of the others was a true Christian church.

To a great extent, his dream has been fulfilled in the twentieth century. At the time, however, this proposal was quite radical. Various groups were literally fighting for their very survival, and many people suffered intense per-

secution for their beliefs. They were not disposed to view other groups as brethren but considered them heretics.

The Protestants said the Roman Catholic Church was the great whore of the Book of Revelation and the pope was the Antichrist. The Catholic Church excommunicated the Protestants, saying they were eternally damned, heretical, and reprobate. Even within the ranks of Protestantism, one group denounced the other, not merely as wrong in doctrine but as heretical, false, and not a true church at all. For instance, Martin Luther condemned the Reformed and the Anabaptists as heretics and no better than heathen. The Lutherans and Reformed persecuted the Anabaptists, and the Anglicans persecuted the Baptists and Quakers.

In this environment, Calixtus proposed a distinction between fundamental doctrines and secondary doctrines. As long as a group agrees on the fundamental doctrines, we should recognize it as a true Christian church, a saved group of people, even though we may disagree with it on secondary doctrines.

Realizing that an outward organizational union might not be feasible, Calixtus proposed that all Christians should at least recognize one another as fellow Christians and confess an inner spiritual communion. Eventually outward communion could follow.

The question this proposal raises is, What are the fundamental doctrines? Calixtus defined them as the beliefs required for salvation. He made a distinction between heresy, the denial of a fundamental doctrine necessary to salvation, and error, a wrong doctrine that does not affect salvation. But how do we determine what is necessary to believe in order to be saved? Calixtus replied that we

should look to the consensus of the first five centuries. Whatever the early Christian writers agreed upon must be fundamental, and that is what we should agree upon.

The implication is that the Bible reveals more than what is necessary for salvation. But instead of simply looking at what the Bible itself identifies as essential, this approach in effect appeals to postbiblical writers as the supreme arbiters of truth.

From the Protestant perspective, there were problems with this proposal. First, it seemed to compromise the sole authority of Scripture by its reliance upon nonbiblical writings. Second, by the test Calixtus proposed, the doctrine of justification by faith would not be essential because the postbiblical writers did not clearly teach it. In fact, in the third through fifth centuries, a number of prominent writers clearly contradicted the Protestant understanding of justification by faith, describing good works as meritorious. Moreover, most Protestants did not believe water baptism is essential for salvation, while the consensus of the first five centuries was to emphasize its essentiality.

Consequently, the Protestants as a whole and the Lutherans in particular (Calixtus's primary audience) did not accept this proposal. Some Lutheran theologians argued that everything Scripture reveals is fundamental, which would make almost every deviation a heresy. Other theologians did not take such a strict view. They acknowledged that some people in other churches are saved but said it would be wrong to recognize those churches as true churches, as true expressions of apostolic Christianity.

In practice, most Protestants of the time seemed to

adopt the latter view. The Lutherans, for example, refused to consider the Reformed as a true church but conceded that some Calvinists were saved.

Today the various branches of Protestantism tend to follow the basic philosophy of George Calixtus. Moreover, the mainline Protestants and the Catholics take a similar approach toward each other.

Doctrine of Scripture

Luther and the early Lutherans assumed the inspiration of Scripture, but later Lutherans realized the need to develop this doctrine further. They affirmed the divine origin, inspiration, and authority of Scripture. They said inspiration is a special act of the Spirit, connected specifically with the writing of the text rather than with the writer. Moreover, inspiration is full and verbal (extending to every word). In opposition to rationalism, they stressed the revealed nature of Christian doctrine.

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit

Traditional Lutheran theology and experience did not leave much room for the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the sign of speaking in tongues. This is especially true in the age of confessional orthodoxy—the mid 1500s through the 1600s.

As time went on, however, many Lutherans began to hunger for a deeper, more fervent personal relationship with God. In the 1700s, this desire gave rise to the Pietist movement, including the Moravians, and among these people there are reports of speaking in tongues, particularly in Germany. (See chapter 11.)

In the 1800s there were several recorded outpourings

of the Holy Spirit upon Lutherans. Speaking in tongues occurred among the Lutheran followers of Gustav von Below in Germany in the early part of the century.[7] In 1841-43 the Readers (Läsare) of Sweden likewise spoke in tongues.[8] Today, under the influence of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements, many Lutherans have received the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of tongues.

Summary

We will briefly summarize and evaluate Lutheran and Reformed orthodoxy together at the conclusion of chapter 10.

10

Reformed Orthodoxy

Like the Lutherans, the Reformed movement underwent a period of consolidation, crystallization, and evolution before it reached its classic expression as held by Reformed and Presbyterian churches today. This process lasted from the early sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth century.

The earliest significant Reformed creed was the *First Helvetic [Swiss] Confession*, written by Heinrich Bullinger and others in 1536. (Bullinger was Zwingli's successor in Zurich.) All the Reformed cantons of Switzerland adopted this confession.

In 1566 it was superseded by the *Second Helvetic Confession*, a more detailed treatise written by Bullinger and adopted by almost all of the Reformed churches in

Europe. Another widely accepted Reformed document was the *Heidelberg Catechism*, produced in 1563 in the Palatinate, a German Reformed state.

Further Development of Predestination

The most notable development of the Reformed theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was their elaboration and extension of the doctrine of predestination. Although Augustine, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin all taught unconditional election, the Calvinists' preoccupation with and detailed exposition of this doctrine caused people to identify it supremely with the Reformed movement.

Calvin taught predestination as part of the doctrine of salvation. He did not present it as the centerpiece of his theology, and he confessed difficulty in understanding why God used this method, but he felt constrained to teach it by his perception of Scripture.

In contrast, later Calvinists such as Beza, Vermigli, Knox, and especially Jerome Zanchi (1516-90) derived predestination from the very nature of God. Given God's foreknowledge, providence, omniscience, and omnipotence, they said predestination is the only possible outcome. It is a logical necessity; there is no possible alternative. This approach made the doctrine of predestination the cornerstone of their theology.

Some theologians, such as Theodore Beza (Calvin's successor), further concluded that God's decrees of election and reprobation occurred before Adam sinned. In other words, before sin ever entered the human race God had already decided to send some people to the lake of fire for eternity. This position is called supralapsarianism

("before the lapse"), while the contrary view is infralapsarianism.

The infralapsarians accused the supralapsarians of making God unjust. Once human beings sinned, they argued, God had no obligation to save anyone, so we cannot object if He chose to save only a certain number. If predestination occurred before sin, however, God would become the author of sin and He would eternally punish the lost for something He caused and they could not avoid.

We should note, however, that if the nature of God indeed required predestination, then the supralapsarian position would appear to be correct. From a non-Calvinist perspective, the powerful argument against supralapsarianism thus not only defeats that position but the entire doctrine of predestination as well.

Unlike the Lutherans in the *Formula of Concord*, Calvinist theologians were quite willing to say that God has predestined some people to be lost. They emphasized double predestination: God has predetermined the eternal destiny of every human being, either to be elect or reprobate.

The later Calvinists also taught the doctrine of the limited atonement, which Calvin implied but never explicitly stated. According to this view, Christ did not die for the whole world but only for the elect, those God had chosen in advance.

In summary, later theologians pushed the Calvinistic system to its ultimate conclusions and consequences, and perhaps beyond. Debates over various aspects of predestination overshadowed other issues that were important in the original theology of John Calvin.

The Synod of Dort

A Dutch Calvinist named Jacob (James) Arminius (1560-1609) challenged the doctrine of predestination. In 1610 his followers published the *Remonstrance*, which rejected predestination, and they became known as Arminians or Remonstrants. The Calvinists debated the issues heatedly and finally resolved them at the Synod of Dort (modern Dordrecht, Netherlands) in 1618-19.

The Synod of Dort completely affirmed predestination, establishing five points that have become the classic expression of orthodox Calvinism. These points logically depend upon one another so that if one falls they all fall, with the possible exception of the last. A simple way to identify them is by the acronym TULIP (appropriate for a Dutch synod!).

1. *Total depravity*. Humans are completely sinful, totally depraved. Sin affects all their being so that only the grace of God can save them. Not only do humans have a sinful nature (which the Arminians taught), but specifically, they are so sinful and sin so affects every aspect of their being, including the will, that if they had a choice to serve God they would always choose not to do so. But total depravity does not mean they can never imagine, desire, or do good things. In short, total depravity has a technical meaning in Calvinism: sin has so corrupted the human will that only the sole choice of God (unconditional election and irresistible grace) can save people.

2. *Unconditional election*. God elects certain people to salvation based on an internal decision within Himself. There are no conditions to this election. He does not choose people because of their works, their response, or His foreknowledge of their choice.

3. *Limited atonement*. Jesus Christ died only for those God previously elected. He did not die to save everyone in the world, and His sacrifice does not extend to every individual.

4. *Irresistible grace*. A person cannot resist God's saving grace. Those whom God has elected will inevitably be saved. Of course, God molds the person's will so that he desires salvation and does not wish to resist. If a person could resist God's grace, due to his total depravity he would resist it. If God gave a choice, no one would ever be saved.

5. *Perseverance of the saints*. Those whom God has elected will endure to the end and be saved. They cannot fall from grace. This point is often called unconditional eternal security or, popularly, "once saved always saved." God's choice alone determines salvation from start to finish, regardless of an individual's attitude, choices, or actions after conversion.

Arminianism

In contrast to these five key points of orthodox Calvinism, Arminius taught the following:

1. *Universal prevenient grace*. Humans are sinners, but God gives grace to all to enable them to make a choice regarding salvation. "Prevenient" refers to grace that precedes salvation. Arminius did not deny that sin has corrupted the human will and every other aspect of human nature, but he said God has provided a remedy on the basis of the Cross.

Because of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, God bestows grace upon the whole human race. "The grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to

all men" (Titus 2:11, NKJV). (See also Acts 17:30; Romans 2:4.) This grace does not inevitably save them, but it draws them, woos them, illuminates their mind and conscience, and overcomes the effects of the sinful nature to the extent that they have the ability to accept or reject God's plan. Arminius explained:

> Those who are obedient to the vocation or call of God, freely yield their assent to grace; yet they are previously excited, impelled, drawn and assisted by grace: And in the very moment in which they actually assent, they possess the capability of not assenting.[1]

2. *Election based on foreknowledge*. God elected to save those who would accept His plan of salvation. God knows all things, including the future, but His foreknowledge is not the same as predestination. Although He knows everything that will happen, He does not foreordain or cause everything to happen. Salvation is by the grace of God, but humans must accept his plan for their lives. In the words of Arminius:

> All unregenerate persons have freedom of will, and a capability of resisting the counsel of God against themselves, of refusing to accept the Gospel of grace, and of not opening to Him who knocks at the door of the heart; and these things they can actually do, without any difference of *the Elect* and of *the Reprobate*.[2]

Arminius offered an interesting answer to the question of how repentance and faith relate to each other,

which, as we saw with the Lutherans, is a difficult one for those who believe in unconditional election: "Repentance is *prior* to [saving] faith in Christ; but it is *posterior* to that faith by which we believe that God is willing to receive into his favour the penitent sinner."[3]

The Arminians pointed out that many passages of Scripture speak of salvation as something that people accept or reject. The call to salvation extends to everyone, to "whosoever will," not just to the elect. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life" (John 3:16, NKJV). "Whoever desires, let him take the water of life freely" (Revelation 22:17, NKJV).

The Bible does speak of predestination in relation to the plan of God. For example, God predestined the Cross and the church. He guarantees the destiny of the church, but people choose whether to be in the church or not. We can speak of the unconditional election of the church collectively, but when we speak of individuals, we must say that God's election is based on His foreknowledge of their choice. (See Romans 8:29-30.)

3. *Universal atonement*. Jesus truly died for the whole human race. The Atonement makes provision for everyone to be saved, but each person must apply those benefits personally. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son" (John 3:16, NKJV). "And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world" (I John 2:2, NKJV). "The Lord is . . . not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance" (II Peter 3:9).

A Dutch Arminian, Hugo Grotius (1588-1645), developed the governmental theory of the Atonement, which

most Arminians did not embrace, however. He said Christ did not die to pay for our sins but to show that, although God is ready to forgive us, He considers sin to be so serious that it always has consequences.

4. *Grace can be resisted*. People can and do reject God's saving grace. Even though God's grace has appeared to all humanity, obviously some people are not saved. Some people will go to the lake of fire at the last judgment. The reason is that they have resisted the Holy Spirit. (See Acts 7:51.)

5. *No definite position regarding the perseverance of the saints*. Arminius refused to be dogmatic about whether a saved person could ever lose salvation. He said either view is orthodox but also pointed out that the majority of the church has always acknowledged the possibility of falling from grace.[4]

Later Arminians generally affirmed that it is possible to fall from grace. Just as a person must respond to God's grace initially, so he must continue to ratify that choice by faith. If at any point he departs from God in unbelief and disobedience, then he is no longer walking in God's grace, and he will ultimately be lost if he remains in that position.

Many passages of Scripture emphasize the need to continue in the faith or warn of the danger of falling away. (See, for example, Romans 11:17-23; Galatians 5:4; Hebrews 2:1-4; 10:38-39; 12:14-15; James 5:19-20; II Peter 2:20-22.)

Some people today reject the doctrine of predestination yet adhere to the fifth point (perseverance). Many Baptists fit into this category. They believe that humans must make a decision to be saved, but once someone has

made such a choice he can never rescind it.

As a practical matter, predestination, and particularly unconditional eternal security, encourages the thought that Christians will inevitably sin on a regular, perhaps daily, basis but need not be overly concerned about it. After all, their lifestyle is irrelevant to their salvation.

If someone leaves the church and lives in gross sin, what is commonly called "backsliding," the proponents of unconditional eternal security typically say he was never truly saved from the start. His faith was deficient—perhaps a "historic" faith rather than a living faith. If, however, he truly is one of the elect, eventually he will come back to God. In the meantime he is still saved; Jesus is still his Savior although not his Lord at that time.

On the other hand, if a person in the church expresses doubts about his personal salvation, others typically assure him to accept it by faith and not to doubt whether his faith or experience is genuine. In this way perseverance becomes a meaningless truism: if someone endures, he was elect from the start; if someone does not endure, he was reprobate (or at least not saved) from the start.

As a result of the Synod of Dort, predestination became the touchstone of Calvinist orthodoxy. If someone did not accept the five points, he was not an orthodox Calvinist, even though Calvin himself had not made predestination the central focus of his theology.

Covenant Theology

Another idea that became commonly associated with Calvinism was covenant (or federal) theology, even though Calvin himself did not teach it. It arose in the sixteenth century with Zacharias Ursinus (1534-83) and

others, and it was developed further in the seventeenth by Johannes Cocceius (1603-69) and then by the Puritans. According to this view, we are to interpret Scripture on the basis of God's covenant relationships with humanity. Moreover, God still relates to people on the basis of covenants. Some Puritans considered that the state (closely aligned with the church) was also in a covenant with God.

According to covenant theology, in the beginning God established the "covenant of works" with Adam and Eve. If they would keep the garden and obey His command, they would live perpetually. Since they failed to keep their side of the covenant, they fell under sin, and God instituted a new covenant: the "covenant of grace." This covenant provides salvation by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone to those whom God has elected.

In the nineteenth century, a related doctrine arose among the Plymouth Brethren in England with J. N. Darby. He taught dispensationalism, which divided God's redemptive workings into dispensations, or ages. In each age, God offered salvation on a different basis. Traditionally, dispensationalists taught that under the law of Moses God required "works" in the form of obedience to the law as necessary for salvation, but in the New Testament church He requires faith apart from any kind of obedience.[5] Today's dispensationalists have modified their position to say that in every age salvation is by grace through faith.

Covenant theologians and dispensationalists oppose each other's view, but in many ways their fundamental premises are the same. Both tend to minimize the "obedience of faith," saying that to require an obedient response

as part of saving faith would be to advocate salvation by works. A more scriptural approach is to recognize that God has dealt with humanity in various ways in different ages and has made different covenants with people, but in every age salvation is by grace through faith based on Christ's atoning sacrifice. And in every age, saving faith includes obedience to God's plan for that day.

The Westminster Confession

As we discussed in chapter 8, when the Church of England broke away from Rome at first it did not have a strong Protestant theology of its own. As time went on, the leaders began to adopt most of the tenets of Calvinism, such as Calvin's teaching on the sacraments.

The Puritans, the element within the Church of England that wanted to purge it completely from nonbiblical beliefs and practices, were strict Calvinists. They adopted predestination and most embraced the presbyterian form of church government, although many preferred the independent, congregational form.

The *Westminster Confession* (1646) is a statement of Calvinism adopted by the English Puritans who favored presbyterian church government. It is the prime confession of faith among Presbyterians today. The Reformed churches that originated in continental Europe look to earlier confessions in Latin and their national languages, such as the *French Confession of Faith* by Calvin and his student De Chandieu (1559), the *Belgic Confession* (1561), and the *Second Helvetic Confession* (1566).

The *Westminster Confession* is thoroughly Calvinistic, but it adds some features not prominent in Calvin's writings. It teaches the inspiration of the original text of

Scripture, which Calvin taught, but it goes further than he did in explicitly stating the inerrancy of Scripture, which is a logical consequence of inspiration. It also strongly emphasizes predestination and derives it from the nature of God Himself.

The *Westminster Confession* clearly differs from Calvin on the doctrine of the Sabbath. Calvin taught that the Sabbath was a shadow of things to come and was fulfilled and abolished in Christ. He distinguished between the ceremonial law and the moral law, saying only the latter is binding on New Testament believers. He identified the Sabbath as a ceremonial foreshadowing of the rest we find in Christ, so that Christians are not obligated to keep it literally.

Later Calvinists decided that the Sabbath is still in force. They placed great emphasis on the Ten Commandments, concluding that all of them are moral in nature and thus binding on Christians. Therefore they rejected the idea that the literal Sabbath has been abolished in Christ. Instead, it has been transformed; under the new covenant Sunday is the Christian Sabbath. The Sabbath law of the Old Testament still applies, but to Sunday not Saturday.

Following the *Westminster Confession*, later Calvinists imposed Sabbath laws on Sunday. Consequently, they deemed it a sin to work, play, buy, or sell on Sunday. In colonial America the Puritans passed "blue laws" to prohibit public buying or selling on Sunday, and remnants of these laws survived past the middle of the twentieth century.

Scripture does not record that God ever changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, however. In the mid

1800s, the Seventh-day Adventists developed in America in large part by seizing on this flaw in the Presbyterian position, and they advocated Sabbath observance on Saturday. From a new covenant perspective, both attempts to impose a literal Sabbath keeping upon the church are mistaken. (See Acts 15:19-29; Romans 14:5-6; Galatians 4:9-11; Colossians 2:16-17.)

Christians have spiritual rest in the Holy Spirit; in that sense every day is a Sabbath day. (See Isaiah 28:11-12; Matthew 11:28-29; Hebrews 4:9-11.) Of course the Bible does teach that Christians should assemble themselves together, and they should set aside times for worship and for rest, but there is no legal requirement as to a certain day.

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit

Like orthodox Lutheranism, orthodox Calvinism was not very hospitable to the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. This was especially true since Calvin taught that the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues was no longer available.

Nevertheless, a Spirit-filled movement arose among the Huguenots (French Protestants), who were Calvinistic although they did not totally embrace the strict post-Calvin orthodoxy. In the 1600s, spiritual revival swept a group of Huguenot peasants in southern France who resisted the efforts of King Louis XIV to convert them to Catholicism. Many were imprisoned, tortured, and martyred. Observers reported that people spoke in tongues; uneducated farmers and young children prophesied in pure, elegant French; there was enthusiastic, demonstrative worship; and people were "seized by the Spirit."[6]

These people became known as the Camisards. Another name given to them was the "prophets of the Cevennes," referring to the mountains in their region.

This movement survived in France into the 1700s. A number of Camisards fled to England to escape persecution, and they sparked a revival there in the 1700s. Their English converts also spoke in tongues.[7]

In the 1800s, Edward Irving, a Church of Scotland (Presbyterian) pastor, began to preach in Scotland and England that the miraculous gifts of the Spirit are available to the church today. Under his ministry, many people spoke in tongues. (See chapter 13.)

Summary and Evaluation

From the mid sixteenth century to the mid seventeenth century, the major branches of Western Christianity solidified according to the configuration that exists today. The Roman Catholics reaffirmed and expounded their position by the Council of Trent (1563). The Lutherans consolidated their position by publication of the *Book of Concord* in 1580. The Anglicans formulated the *Thirty-nine Articles of Religion* (1571). The Reformed movement in continental Europe adopted the *Second Helvetic Confession* (1566), and Presbyterians in Great Britain adopted the *Westminster Confession* (1646). The latter statement is considered orthodox Calvinism today, but it departed significantly from Calvin's original spirit.

The Anabaptists had an early statement of faith in the *Schleitheim Confession* (1527), but of all the groups we have discussed they were the least rigid. For one thing, they did not place the same emphasis on orthodoxy and

organizational control as the other groups; for another, they were so persecuted and splintered that they did not have the opportunity to develop a monolithic structure like the others. In smaller groups, of course, they did develop various confessions of faith.

The latter half of the sixteenth century, then, saw the official enunciation of the classic denominational positions, and the seventeenth century was one of confessional orthodoxy for Western Christendom. The major branches of Christendom placed emphasis on correct doctrinal formulation and precise theological identity.

While attention to theology is vital, an overemphasis on doctrinal positions to the neglect of spiritual experience can be stultifying and even deadly. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (II Corinthians 3:6). Thus the need was great, both in continental Europe and in Great Britain, for a spiritual revival in the eighteenth century.

11

The Pietists and the Methodists

In the late seventeenth century, a movement called Pietism arose in Germany in reaction to the cold theological orthodoxy of the day. It was not primarily a theological response but a refocusing on spirituality and practical Christian living.

As chapters 9 and 10 have discussed, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries both Lutherans and Calvinists participated in numerous theological controversies and placed much emphasis on orthodox confessions. They expended great energy in formulating detailed doctrinal statements, identifying and opposing heresy, and excluding and persecuting people with different views.

To many, it seemed that the theologians were splitting hairs over abstract doctrines while neglecting the basic

truths of Scripture and Christian living. Common people and even pastors began to think Protestantism was drifting away from personal faith in God and becoming an intellectual, philosophical system with little relevance to biblical and practical Christianity. For the most part, they accepted the doctrines considered orthodox, but they wanted to shift away from academic debate and theological disputes toward a personal experience and relationship with God.

Spener and the Pietists

Pietism had many roots and contributors, but its immediate catalyst was Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705), a German Lutheran. He wrote an influential book in 1675 called *Pia Desideria* (*Pious Desires* or *Heartfelt Desires*), from which the movement got its name. (Piety refers to genuine religious impulses, feelings, or desires.) In the book he stated six "pious desires," or "proposals to correct the condition of the church," that became the basis for this movement. These six points are as follows:

1. *More extensive use of the Scriptures, including Bible study in small groups.* Instead of relegating theological discussion to professional theologians, academic experts, councils, synods, and treatises, believers should study the Scriptures in small groups and house meetings. Not only should ministers preach theology from the pulpit; people should study the Bible at home.

2. *Reemphasis on the spiritual priesthood of all believers.* In theory the Protestant movement taught that all Christians are priests to God, but in practice most churches seemed to adopt the Catholic attitude that theology and ministry were only for the professional clergy. Spener wanted to give the laity positions of spiritual

responsibility in the church, letting them have an active part in its life and ministry.

3. *Emphasis on spiritual experience and practice in Christian life rather than mere knowledge*. More than engaging in formal discussions and disputes, people need to experience God for themselves. They need to learn how to live as Christians, how to walk in holiness.

4. *Conducting controversies in a spirit of charity*. People should not study theology for the primary purpose of debating doctrinal opponents, and in theological discussions they should remember and adhere to the overriding principle of love.

5. *Training of pastors in devotional literature and practice*. The education of ministers focused almost exclusively on doctrinal formulations to the neglect of practical instruction relative to their role of leading people in the Christian life. Spener wanted preachers and pastors to study devotional literature as well as theological treatises and to receive training on conducting worship, discipling believers, and leading people into greater spirituality.

6. *Renewed focus on the purpose of the pulpit to edify the people*. The purpose of preaching should be to instruct, inspire, and feed the believers rather than give discourses on obscure doctrines. All too often, the typical sermon was high and lofty in tone, heavy in theology and academics, and polemical in nature. For instance, the minister might preach on the doctrine of predestination, on why the Calvinists (or Lutherans) were in error, on the limited atonement, or on supralapsarianism. Spener desired practical preaching that benefited the lives and hearts of people.

Spener was careful to affirm his orthodoxy on the classic Lutheran positions. He upheld justification by faith, the Lutheran doctrine of sacraments, the essentiality of baptism, and consubstantiation.[1]

Spener was concerned about the moral laxity in his day. He called Christians to a life of personal holiness, advocating "a self-discipline which included abstinence from cards [associated with gambling], dancing, and the theatre and moderation in food, drink, and dress."[2] He specifically warned against jewelry, finery of dress, and drunkenness and said the mark of a Pietist was a willingness to "give up freedom in questionable little things."[3] The Pietists generally dressed in plain clothing and refrained from worldly amusements, oaths, warfare, and lawsuits.[4]

While Pietism began among the Lutherans, it soon spread to the Calvinists. The Pietists generally affirmed the theology of their mother churches but embraced the six principles Spener articulated. Moreover, they stressed repentance and an experience of conversion that changed people's lives. In practice, then, there was a significant difference of attitude and lifestyle from that of their co-religionists.

Pietism also generated a missionary zeal that heretofore had been lacking among Protestants. While the Catholics had long sent missionaries to non-Christian lands, the Protestants had expended most of their energy on establishing their own doctrinal identities, throwing off the yoke of Catholicism, and fighting each other's alleged heresies. Moreover, the doctrine of predestination that most of them embraced tended to discourage sacrificial missionary efforts, for missionary or no missionary,

God had already predetermined the exact number of pagans who would be saved.

Church of the Brethren

Although the Pietist movement operated within the existing denominational structure, it did result in the formation of two significant new groups: the Church of the Brethren, which arose among the Reformed, and the Moravians, which arose among the Lutherans. The Brethren, also known as the Dunkers because of their practice of triple immersion, originated in Schwarzenau, Germany, in 1708 and quickly spread to America. They were influenced by both Anabaptism and Pietism.

The Brethren followed mainstream Protestant theology. They taught five practical points of Christian living: pacifism, temperance (including abstinence from alcohol), simplicity of life (avoiding luxuries and unwholesome amusements while emphasizing stewardship of personal and family life), brotherhood of all people, and obedience to Christ above creeds.

Zinzendorf and the Moravians

The roots of the Moravians go back before the Pietist movement to the Bohemian Brethren, or Unitas Fratrum (Unity of the Brethren), who were disciples of John Hus in Moravia and Bohemia. (Hus was a fifteenth-century forerunner of the Reformation; Moravia and Bohemia are part of the Czech Republic today.)

Fleeing persecution, some of the Brethren from Moravia moved to Germany and settled on the estate of Nicolas Ludwig, Count von Zinzendorf (1700-60) in 1722, where they founded the village of Herrnhut. A

fervent Pietist who was devoted to Jesus Christ, Zinzendorf at age twenty-two organized these believers and infused them with Pietist sentiments. He soon became their bishop.

On August 13, 1727, a decisive event occurred at Herrnhut, which Moravian historians have described as a "signal outpouring of the Holy Spirit," "a modern Pentecost," and a Moravian "baptism of the Holy Spirit," comparing it to Joel 2, Acts 8, 10, and 19. Zinzendorf called it "the day of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the congregation" and "the Pentecost." In the words of a participant, "The Holy Ghost came upon us and in those days great signs and wonders took place in our midst."[5]

Extraordinary prayer preceded and accompanied this move of God. Children prayed fervently and wept. Many people prayed all night long, and "great emotion prevailed." Pastor Rothe reported that on Sunday, August 10, the whole congregation fell to the dust "overwhelmed by a wonderful and irresistible power of the Lord" and experienced an "ecstasy of feeling." They prayed, sang, and wept till midnight, and then they instituted a twenty-four-hour prayer chain.[6]

This spiritual revival resulted in a flood of new songs. Nearly all these hymns addressed Jesus, adoring Him as God.[7] Soon afterward, in 1732, the Moravians sent forth their first foreign missionaries, taking the first significant step for Protestant missions.

The foregoing accounts do not explicitly mention speaking in tongues, but historians report that tongues accompanied the move of God among the Moravians in the 1700s and 1800s.[8]

For the most part, the doctrine of the Moravians was

Lutheran. They stressed, however, the primacy of devotional and moral life over theological formulations.

John Wesley

While spiritual renewal was taking place on the European continent in the eighteenth century, a parallel development occurred in Great Britain and extended to America. The key figure in this revival was John Wesley (1703-91), a high-church clergyman of the Church of England.

John and his younger brother Charles (1707-88) had a strong desire to serve God and discipline their lives for His will. At Oxford University, Charles and two other students founded what came to be known as the Holy Club, and soon John became its leader. The purpose of the club was to structure the members' devotional life and academic study. They challenged each other to meet goals for self-discipline, personal devotions, and study. They received the nickname of Methodists because of their systematic methods.

During this time Wesley formed much of his theology, but an important spiritual experience was yet to come. In 1735, George Whitefield (1714-70) became a member of the club.

Also in 1735, the Wesleys sailed to America to serve as missionaries in the new colony of Georgia. On the voyage, they met a group of Moravians, who impressed John greatly with their spirituality. He noted their calm assurance and songs of praise during storms, while he himself was terrified of death and did not have personal assurance of salvation.

In 1736 Charles returned to England ill. John Wesley

followed him not long afterward, having achieved little success as a missionary. In his frustration, he recalled that the Moravians had something he did not. He sought counsel from a Moravian in London, who instructed him in repentance, conversion, and the joy of salvation. Shortly afterward, he attended an informal Anglican meeting in the Aldersgate area of the city. While someone read Luther's preface to his *Commentary on Romans*, Wesley had a dramatic spiritual experience in which he trusted God for salvation and felt a strong assurance from God.

Wesley continued his association with the Moravians for a while. For example, on January 1, 1739, John and Charles Wesley, Whitefield, and other friends met with the Moravians for all-night prayer. John Wesley reported, "The power of God came mightily upon us, insomuch that many cried for exceeding joy, and many fell to the ground."[9] Wesley also traveled to the Moravians in Germany and met with Zinzendorf.

Wesley continued to be impressed by the spirituality of the Moravians, and he adopted some of their ideas and methods. Ultimately, however, he deemed them too mystical (spiritually subjective), and he disagreed with their philosophy of quietism, or detachment from everyday life and uninvolvement with the world. While Wesley certainly advocated separation from worldly influences, he believed Christians should interact vigorously with the society around them.

From this point on, Wesley felt his mission was to bring revival to the Church of England. He did not intend to form a new organization, nor did he oppose the Anglican church structure, but he worked to renew and strengthen fellow believers. He regarded the Anglicans as

already saved, but he found something lacking in their Christian life, and he wanted to lead them into a deeper Christian experience.

Wesley's Theology

For the most part, Wesley continued to embrace standard Anglican theology and church government. He opposed any attempt to bypass the sacraments or the preaching of the Word. True to his original high-church views, he considered water baptism to be a vital part of Christian conversion and regeneration.[10] He also acknowledged immersion as the biblical mode but was content with sprinkling.

On one significant point he departed from the majority Protestant view of the day: he rejected predestination and embraced the Arminian position. He taught that God bestows grace upon the whole human race to lead them to salvation (universal prevenient grace), but only those who respond in faith will be saved. He also held that Christians could fall from grace.

The most distinctive aspect of Wesley's theology is his doctrine of sanctification and Christian perfection. Up until this time, most Protestants had emphasized the doctrine of justification to the neglect of sanctification (holiness), but Wesley placed the latter on a par with the former. He taught that just as we are justified by faith, so we are sanctified by faith.

In Wesley's theology, sanctification is a process of Christian growth that begins at justification but is not complete at that time. The goal of this process is entire sanctification, or Christian perfection.

Christian perfection means purification from inward

sin. It does not mean a Christian reaches a point in life where it is impossible for him to sin or where he no longer needs God's grace. But the wholly sanctified person no longer willfully breaks God's law. He attains a purity of motives, desires, and thoughts.

The wholly sanctified person is still subject to ignorance, mistake, external temptation, and infirmities of the flesh, and these things can lead him into sin if he allows them to do so. But God has progressively purged and transformed his inward nature, the sinful nature inherited from Adam, until it is no longer a source of temptation.

Wesley taught that Christians should not be content with the initial experience of justification or conversion but should live a holy life with the goal of being purified from inward sin. He taught that Christians can attain such perfection in this life, but he acknowledged that most Christians did not.

Many later Wesleyans identified Christian perfection as a specific experience, a second work of grace. Just as conversion and justification is an identifiable moment and a definite experience (the first work of grace), so they said Christians should seek an additional experience in which God instantaneously purges them of inward sin.

Wesley himself sometimes spoke of Christian perfection as an instantaneous experience, but he emphasized the continual growth process beginning with justification and continuing throughout the Christian life. At some point, a Christian can attain Christian perfection, but the process of sanctification, or Christian growth, still continues afterward.

According to Wesley, the Christian can and should live a life of victory over sin. That view was radical because

until then the Protestants—with the exception of the Anabaptists, who made little impact in England—had essentially said Christians are justified sinners. That is, they are still in bondage to sin and will commit sinful acts habitually. The only difference is that they are now continually justified.

The Catholics also assumed that Christians still sin habitually. Their solution was to confess their sins periodically and do penance. There was little incentive to overcome sin.

Wesley's doctrine of sanctification, by contrast, says the Christian can overcome the life of sin through periodic self-examination, godly discipline, methodical devotions, and avoidance of worldly pleasures. Sanctification is not an automatic cure for sin; the sanctified person still bears the responsibility to overcome. He cannot expect to live a victorious life if he continues to involve himself in various worldly activities that could overcome him.

Wesley stressed the need to obey the practical teachings of Scripture on matters of lifestyle and dress, and he established specific guidelines for avoiding worldly influences and unnecessary temptation. He "forbade the ladies of his congregation to wear rich dresses or gold ornaments. . . . [He] thought it a sin to go to fairs, to wear jewelry or fine clothes, to attend the theater or to dance."[11] Members of his United Society pledged to abstain from (among other things) drinking, suing Christians, wearing gold and costly clothing, worldly diversions, unwholesome music and literature, and borrowing without the probability of repayment.[12] He taught against the use of tobacco and alcohol.[13]

In *Advice to the People Called Methodist with*

Regard to Dress, he told his followers to dress neatly but plainly.[14] In *Thoughts on Dress*, he quoted I Timothy 2:9-10 and I Peter 3:3-4 and then commented:

> Nothing can be more express; the wearing of gold, of precious stones, and of costly apparel, together with curling of hair, is here forbidden by name. . . . Whoever, therefore, says, "There is no harm in these things," may as well say, "There is no harm in stealing or adultery."[15]

Critics accused Wesley of propagating a new form of salvation by works. They asked, How godly does someone have to live before he is saved? Under this system, how can anyone know he is saved?

In response, Wesley affirmed that we are both justified and sanctified by grace through faith. God is the one who enables us to overcome sin as we believe on Him. We cannot earn salvation by works or by a life of holiness, but part of God's work of salvation in us is to empower us for holiness. If we do not walk in sanctification, we are not implementing what God has provided for us. Holiness is a matter of doing the will of God and using the grace He has given us.

Instead of unconditional election and unconditional eternal security, Wesley taught the doctrine of assurance. Namely, the Spirit of God testifies to us that God has forgiven us and that we are His children, and He assures us that by God's grace we can endure to the end. (See Romans 8:16-17, 35-39.) We have an inner witness; we can know we are saved as long as we continue to walk by faith.

George Whitefield remained strongly Calvinistic and broke with Wesley over the issue. He and most Calvinists in the movement rejected Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection also. Augustus Toplady, author of "Rock of Ages," vigorously attacked Wesley for his Arminianism, but the hymn promotes his view of sanctification.

The Methodists

Eventually, the Methodists became a separate denomination because the Church of England as a whole did not embrace John Wesley's message and because of Wesley's organizational ability. He began organizing Methodist bands or societies patterned after the original club at Oxford. The people in them made a commitment to live a holy life, avoid worldly pleasures, engage in various devotions, meet together, and become committed and accountable to one another.

These Methodist bands sprang up all over the country. Wesley ordained clergy for them to ensure that the message of sanctification would be preached and that his followers could receive sacraments. The Church of England refused to acknowledge these ordinations, so the Methodists developed their own churches and ministers.

The Methodist revival inspired many new hymns. Charles Wesley was a prolific hymn writer, and he communicated Methodist theology through his songs. Notable hymns of his are "O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing," "Christ the Lord Is Risen Today," and "Jesus, Lover of My Soul." A later hymn with a Wesleyan theme is "Blessed Assurance" by Fanny J. Crosby. And "Rock of Ages" refers in Wesleyan terms to both justification and sanctification: "Let the water and the blood, from thy wounded side

which flowed, be of sin the double cure, save from wrath and make me pure."

George Whitefield became a powerful preacher who attracted multitudes to open-air meetings in which they repented publicly in tears. At his urging, Wesley adopted the same method, also with great success. When a clergyman tried to bar him from conducting an outdoor meeting in his parish, Wesley replied, "The world is my parish," which became a Methodist motto. Wesley, Whitefield, and others conducted great revival meetings in England and America in which thousands were converted.

Methodist ministers preached with great fervor, and the audience responded with high emotion and physical demonstration, much like Pentecostals today. Historical accounts describe people weeping, crying out, shaking, jerking, falling, and dancing under the power of God, resulting in the label of "shouting Methodists." There was strong conviction of sin, joy upon repentance, and ecstasy in worship. One unsympathetic historian wrote, "Extreme emotional disturbances, ecstasies and bodily seizures of various sorts were common in the Wesleyan Revival of the eighteenth century in England," with people in Wesley's meetings exhibiting "violent motor reactions . . . convulsions and shakings" and screaming.[16]

Over time, the Methodists became a large, influential, mainline denomination. Perfectionism was their distinctive doctrine, but gradually that emphasis faded. Today the Methodists are indistinguishable in lifestyle and worship from the other traditional Protestant denominations.

From the beginning the Methodists were doctrinally diverse like their parent, the Church of England, although they were Arminian. Thus, as the perfectionist and

revivalist fervor dissipated, there was little to keep them on their original course. Sadly, they fulfilled the fears of Wesley himself, who said he did not doubt that a people called Methodist would continue to exist but feared they would not maintain their original spiritual identity.

Speaking in Tongues among the Methodists

As we might expect of a movement that emphasized personal conversion, repentance, holiness of life, and freedom of worship, there are numerous reports of speaking in tongues among the early Methodists. In the 1700s, many people received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues in both England and America in the revivals of Wesley and Whitefield.[17] For example, Thomas Walsh, one of Wesley's foremost preachers, recorded in his diary on March 8, 1750, that he spoke in tongues.[18]

There is no record of Wesley personally speaking in tongues, but it would not be surprising if he did, based on his early connection with the Moravians and his own accounts of dramatic spiritual experiences. Perhaps he did not recount speaking in tongues because he considered it too private, or too controversial, or of no general theological import. Significantly, however, he believed the gifts of the Spirit had practically disappeared but a fully restored church would have them again.[19]

When a certain Dr. Middleton wrote that the gift of tongues was absent from later church history, Wesley replied that he was mistaken. He noted that many ancient Christian writings are no longer extant, that many Christians wrote no books, that the ante-Nicene writers did not say tongues ceased with the apostles, and that the lack of a record does not mean a lack of the

experience. He concluded, "Many may have spoken with new tongues, of whom this is not recorded; at least, the records are lost in the course of so many years." In reply to the objection that tongues did not exist in his day, he noted, "It has been heard of more than once, no farther off than the valleys of Dauphiny" [southern France].[20]

This discussion indicates that Wesley himself had not spoken in tongues by this time, for here would have been a natural place to mention it. On the other hand, Wesley did not refer to speaking in tongues among his own followers, although he surely knew of its occurrence. Probably he avoided reference to his own group because they were the ones under question and he sought to defend them by citing other examples.

Revival in England

The Methodist movement made a profound impact on Great Britain. Coupled with the continuing influence of Puritanism, it helped spark a spiritual revival in the country. Many of those involved were not Methodists but were other Nonconformists, that is, associated with other churches that operated independently of the Church of England.

This revival had a positive influence upon personal devotion, church life, contemporary culture and morals, and social conditions. We can note only a few examples.

Isaac Watts (1674-1748) a Congregational pastor, became the founder of the modern hymn with the publication of *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* in 1707. Prior to his time, the English churches had used psalms in public worship, with limited musical styles. Two of his best-known hymns are "Joy to the World" and "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross."

Watts firmly upheld the deity of Jesus Christ but had great difficulty in understanding and accepting the doctrine of the trinity. In *The Glory of Christ*, he stated, "The Deity itself personally distinguished as the Father, was united to the man Christ Jesus, in consequence of which union, or indwelling of the Godhead, he became properly God," and he described the Holy Spirit as the active energy or power of God but not a distinct person.[21] Shortly before his death he wrote *A Solemn Address to the Deity* in which he acknowledged Jesus as God manifested in the flesh but indicated that the idea of three persons in God was nonbiblical and incomprehensible.

In 1780, Robert Raikes began the first Sunday school. He started it in Gloucester for poor children who had no religious or moral instruction. This tool of evangelism and discipleship proved so effective that it has become associated with Christianity worldwide.

Many Christians worked fervently for the improvement of social conditions, including the abolition of slavery. John Newton, former captain of a slave ship, wrote the hymn "Amazing Grace" after his conversion. In 1807, due in large part to the untiring efforts of an evangelical Anglican, William Wilberforce, the slave trade was abolished in Great Britain.

The Great Awakening

Revival also came to North America, where it became known as the Great Awakening. This spiritual movement was remarkable for its mass evangelism, revival meetings, and personal conversions, all of which became characteristic of conservative American Protestantism.

The Great Awakening began in 1734-35 with the

preaching of Jonathan Edwards (1703-58), a Congregationalist and a strict Calvinist. Although he believed strongly in unconditional election, he preached powerful sermons such as *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God* that called people to make decisions for Christ and resulted in numerous conversions. As with the Methodist revivals, physical demonstrations such as falling, shaking, crying, and shouting accompanied these meetings. George Whitefield also held a series of successful revival campaigns across America in 1740. The universities of Princeton, Brown, Rutgers, Dartmouth, and Pennsylvania began as seminaries under the impetus of the Great Awakening.

The Great Awakening emphasized a personal experience with God and personal devotion. It greatly affected the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, although many traditionalists in both groups opposed it and some church splits resulted. The Great Awakening also spurred the growth of the Baptists and Methodists.

Here we see the beginnings of American revivalism, meaning an emphasis on special revival meetings, altar calls, decisions for Christ, repentance, and an identifiable conversion. Whereas European revivalists focused primarily on personal conversion, American revivalism emphasized right doctrine as the proper framework for right experience. It was not merely emotionalism, but it promoted the preaching of conservative doctrine in contrast to liberal trends.

Revivalism spread particularly along the frontier, in places like Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio. The Methodists were at the fore of the frontier revival. They were well known for circuit-riding preachers, who trav-

eled on horseback from town to town where there were no resident pastors.

By and large, the blacks in America—both slave and free—embraced Christianity, particularly the conservative, revivalist variety of the Baptists and Methodists. The first major black denomination was the African Methodist Episcopal Church, formed by members who began withdrawing from a Methodist church in 1787 due to racial discrimination. In 1816 it was formally organized, and a prominent Methodist bishop, Francis Asbury, consecrated Richard Allen as its first bishop.

Emmanuel Swedenborg

Before we leave the eighteenth century, we should discuss a interesting theological figure of that era named Emmanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772). He was a brilliant, accomplished scientist and philosopher in Sweden. Although he was a Lutheran and he never preached or started a church, he developed his own unique theology and attracted a following.

Central to Swedenborg's theology was an affirmation of the full deity of Jesus Christ coupled with a denial of the traditional doctrine of the trinity. He explained his views as follows:

> There is a God, and . . . He is one. . . . The one God is called Jehovah. . . . Jehovah God descended and assumed human nature, in order to redeem and save mankind. . . . There is a divine trinity which consists of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These three, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are three essentials of one God, which make one, as soul, body, and activity

> make one in man. . . . In the Lord God the Saviour Jesus Christ there is a divine trinity, consisting of the creative divinity, which is called the Father, the divine humanity, which is called the Son, and the proceeding divinity, which is called the Holy Spirit. . . . *In Jesus Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*.[22]

He denied that there were three eternal persons in the Godhead. He taught that the Son is not an eternal person but the human manifestation of the one God. Moreover, in heaven we will see only one God, namely Jesus Christ, and anyone who expects to see another divine person is in false doctrine.

Swedenborg taught that Christ's humanity was divine. Although He was born of Mary, His humanity was of heavenly origin. Instead of teaching that Christ's death was a substitutionary sacrifice to meet the requirements of God's justice (propitiation), he presented it as the epitome of divine love and a spiritual battle with Satan. He further held that Christ's work of redemption was not complete at Calvary but required that He descend into hell to defeat the devil.

On the doctrine of salvation, Swedenborg strongly opposed predestination. He affirmed salvation by grace through faith in Jesus Christ but criticized the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone as giving inadequate attention to the importance of love. He believed that baptism is spiritual and not literal.

Although he based his teachings on Scripture, Swedenborg claimed to receive numerous visions that confirmed his views. He described visits to the place of

departed souls and discussions there with famous theologians such as Luther and Calvin. According to his account, people who have died can still change their ultimate destiny, and some of them, such as Luther, did change their doctrinal views after hearing the expositions of Swedenborg and angels.

Followers of Swedenborg became known as the Swedenborgians, and they founded three small groups that exist today: the General Convention of the New Jerusalem, the General Church of the New Jerusalem, and the General Conference in England. Helen Keller was a famous convert.

Summary and Evaluation

The eighteenth century was one of great spiritual renewal among many Protestants in Europe and America. It saw a significant restoration of the biblical message of true repentance and holiness, mighty outpourings of the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and some attainment of a more biblical understanding of the oneness of God.

Shortly before the century began, the Pietist movement started with an emphasis on spiritual experience and devotional life. It brought much-needed correctives to orthodox Protestantism. Much of Protestantism today, including Evangelicalism, still needs the same correctives.

The Pietists, particularly the Moravians, exerted great influence far beyond their own ranks in at least two ways: they turned the attention of Protestantism to missions, and they played a significant role in the spiritual development of John Wesley.

Wesley ranks as the most significant Protestant

leader after Luther and Calvin. While they sought to restore biblical insight on the doctrine of justification, Wesley was the first Protestant leader to succeed in restoring proper emphasis to the doctrine of sanctification.

The Lutherans taught that Christians should abide by the moral law but affirmed their continued justification even if there was little or no evidence of sanctification. The Calvinists paid more attention to Christian discipline, but over time their doctrine of predestination and perseverance likewise undercut the zeal for holiness. The Anabaptists sought a balance of justification and sanctification, but they were a distinct minority and were not a significant factor in England. Thus it was Wesley who restored sanctification to its proper biblical role.

Scripture does not support, however, the concept of sanctification as a second work of grace that purifies the sinful nature. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, some spiritual descendants of Wesley would modify this view while retaining the emphasis on holiness and victory over sin.

Wesley founded one of the most prominent Protestant denominations, the Methodist Church, and indirectly served as the impetus for the Holiness movement of the nineteenth century. (See chapter 13.) From the Holiness movement, in turn, came the Pentecostal movement in the twentieth century.

As both the Pietists and the Methodists exemplify, speaking in tongues has accompanied every major revival movement that has stressed a personal experience of conversion, repentance from sin, holiness of life, and devotion to Jesus Christ. This is true even though most such

groups in history did not initially have a place in their theology for tongues, nor did they specifically seek tongues. Nevertheless, in the groups we have discussed, God graciously poured out His Spirit upon thirsty, seeking souls and worked to lead them step by step into the fullness of biblical truth.

The ultimate result of this process is the Pentecostal movement. Today's Pentecostals and Charismatics are pietistic in orientation, and they owe a great historical debt to John Wesley. In them, the spiritual impulses of the eighteenth century live today and have extended to their ultimate biblical conclusions. In particular, the Oneness Pentecostals have preserved the devotion, worship, and practical holiness that the original Pietists and Methodists stressed, while advancing further into the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the revelation of Jesus Christ as the almighty God.

12

The Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century saw many significant developments in Christianity. Fundamental shifts in politics, science, and philosophy in the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries had a dramatic impact upon theology. People began to change the way they thought about everything, including God, religion, and life.

The Impact of the Enlightenment

The revolution of Western thought in the eighteenth century is known as the Enlightenment, or the Age of Reason. It promoted belief in human progress and perfectibility based on the exercise of reason. Let us briefly identify some of its influences and their impact upon religion.

In politics, two important events occurred in 1789. In Europe, the French Revolution overthrew the monarchy and separated the church from the state. Indeed the revolutionary government actively worked against religion.

In North America, the United States adopted the Bill of Rights, which guaranteed many rights vital to the life of the church including freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. It also prohibited the government from favoring or supporting a particular denomination or religion, which set a new standard for tolerance and equality.

Up to the sixteenth century, science in Western Europe was the handmaiden of theology and philosophy. Medieval ideas about science came primarily from writings of the ancient Greeks and Romans and from theoretical reasoning. Science was limited by opinions of long-dead authorities and the Catholic Church's interpretation of Scripture.

In the seventeenth century, science entered a new era with the modern scientific method of experimentation and empirical investigation. *Galileo Galilei* (1564-1642) said the only source of scientific knowledge is our experience and observation, not theory based on preconceptions. With the telescope, he confirmed Copernicus's hypothesis that the earth revolves around the sun rather than vice versa, and his experiments with pendulums and falling bodies disproved notions about physics that dated from before Christ. For instance, medieval scientists accepted the ancient Greek theory that objects of different weights will fall at different speeds, but Galileo proved by experiments that, given the same air resistance, they fall at the same speed.

Francis Bacon (1561-1621) similarly overthrew tra-

ditional assumptions regarding philosophy and science, advocating that knowledge must come by experimentation. The ideas of Galileo and Bacon were quite disturbing, because people thought of truth as given, absolute, and revealed, needing only to be systematized and explained. The approach of Galileo and Bacon said, in essence, that scientific truth was largely unknown, and the only way to discover it was by experience.

Some people began to apply this new approach to theology. Before, people believed that God had already revealed all theological truth. As medieval scientists appealed to ancient authorities, so theologians appealed to Scripture and tradition. Now, however, some people began to think that perhaps not all theological truth had been revealed and not all accepted ideas were true, but they needed to explore theology a step at a time and let it evolve by trial and error.

Similar developments took place in philosophy. *René Descartes* (1596-1650) of France began a school of philosophy known as *rationalism*. He sought to establish everything by rational deductions. He started by doubting everything; the only thing he could not doubt was that he was thinking. From that premise, he concluded that he must exist. His classic statement was, "I think; therefore I am." He then reasoned from his perceptions that his body existed and the world existed; therefore the Creator must exist. Eventually, from the existence of God, he affirmed the basic doctrines of Christianity.

While he continued to support the Roman Catholic Church, his supreme authority was individual human reason and rational knowledge. Instead of starting with Scripture as the source of revealed truth, he started with

himself. He concluded that Christianity is true because it is reasonable.

Others, however, would use the same method to draw very different conclusions. For example, another rationalist philosopher, Baruch Spinoza (1632-77), embraced pantheism.

Another philosophical tradition, known as *empiricism*, began with the Englishman *John Locke* (1632-1704). He taught that we derive all knowledge from sense perception and experience, and he developed his philosophy by experience. When a child is born, he said, its mind is blank. There are no innate ideas. Everything the child learns comes from inward and outward experiences.

Locke applied this approach to religion and concluded that experience shows Christianity to be the most reasonable religion. It teaches the best morality and is the best way to live; therefore it is correct. While he upheld Christianity, like Descartes his supreme authority was no longer Scripture. Instead, he appealed to experience.

Others applied Locke's method in ways that undercut Christianity. For David Hume (1711-76), the result was skepticism about objective truth. For many others, the ultimate theological result of rationalism was *Deism*, an attempt to reduce all religion to its most basic, universally held, and reasonable elements. Thomas Jefferson once identified himself as a Deist.

The Deists sought to remove all "myths" from religion, such as the accounts of miracles, and to affirm only what makes sense to human reason. They concluded that the existence of the world requires a Creator—hence the label Deist—but He is not concerned with present human affairs and does not involve Himself with the universe. He

is like a watchmaker who creates a watch, winds it up, sets it on a table, and lets it tick by itself from that time forward. So God created the world, established natural laws by which it operates, and lets it continue on its own.

Under this approach, morality is determined by what is reasonable, by what is best for humanity. Moreover, revelation becomes unnecessary; the human mind can discover and comprehend all that is valuable about Christianity.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), a German philosopher, asserted that we derive all knowledge from experience but that the human mind has certain innate structures for receiving and organizing data. He defined morality by a universal principle he called the categorical imperative, which is a modification of Christ's Golden Rule (Matthew 7:12). It says we should do only those acts that we would be willing to choose as universal rules for all humanity. Reason is the source of the rule, and religion is an aid to fulfilling it. Kant reduced Christianity to moralism and salvation by works, saying that if we do our best to live a moral life, then God will take care of our deficiencies and failures and cover us by His grace.

Another German philosopher, *Georg Hegel* (1770-1831), spoke of the principle of rationality in the universe, which he called the "spirit." He maintained that truth progressively unfolds through the clash of opposite ideas, a process called the dialectic. First, we understand an aspect of truth, called the thesis. Then we see an opposing viewpoint called the antithesis. When we combine these two seeming contradictions, we attain a higher level of truth called the synthesis. There is no absolute, ultimate truth, but we must continually struggle for truth.

We must realize that there is always more to learn and that truth is gradually evolving.

In a way *Charles Darwin* (1809-82) applied Hegel's dialectic to biology, introducing the theory of evolution. While he believed in God, his views made it easier for people to deny the God of creation and become agnostics or atheists.

Karl Marx (1818-83), an atheist, applied Hegel's approach to sociology and economics. The result was dialectical materialism: through the clash of economic and social classes, society gradually progresses toward the ultimate goal of communism. Followers of Marx substituted an earthly utopia of communism for salvation, heaven, and eternal life.

Liberal Theology

The emphasis on reason challenged the Christian reliance on revelation. In response, some theologians of the nineteenth century accepted key tenets of rationalism but tried to defend and retain Christianity in some form. They sought to modify theology in accordance with the dictates of human reason and experience. In the attempt they reduced Christianity to supernatural rationalism or moralistic philosophy. Much like the Greek Apologists of the second century, when the liberal theologians of the nineteenth century adopted the ideas and methods of their secular opponents, they lost some of the essentials of biblical Christianity.

Associated with liberal theology was *historical criticism*, or *higher criticism*, of the Bible, in which scholars studied the Bible as they did uninspired literature. While some of the methods yielded positive, productive results,

many scholars employed them in a way that undermined the Bible's message. They typically denied the miracles of the Bible and questioned the accuracy of biblical accounts. Leaders of this type of destructive criticism of Scripture were F. C. Baur (1792-1860), David Strauss (1808-74), Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), and the Tübingen school, all of Germany. These methods came to full fruition in the twentieth century.[1]

For an understanding of the sources and trends of liberal theology, we will briefly examine three key Protestant theologians of the era: Schleiermacher, Kierkegaard, and Ritschl.

Friedrich Schleiermacher

The starting point for liberal theology was Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) of Germany. Brought up as a Moravian, he became a Reformed pastor. Like the Moravians, he emphasized religious feeling as prior to knowledge or ethics, and like the Reformed, he developed a precise theological formulation of his views.

Schleiermacher taught the need for absolute dependence upon God, and he insisted upon the centrality of Christ in Christianity. He defined salvation as the transformation of the self into total God-consciousness and the church as the community of the God-conscious.

He emphasized the need to belong to the church and to do theology in light of church tradition and confessions, particularly those of the Reformation. The church has six essential, immutable elements: Scripture, preaching, baptism, the Eucharist (spiritual communion with Christ), the power of excommunication, and prayer. The goal of the church is to establish the kingdom of God on earth.

Schleiermacher built his theology, however, on reason and experience rather than revelation. Because he could not explain them rationally within the context of typical human experience, he rejected the literal doctrines of Christ's virgin birth, resurrection, ascension, and return in judgment.

While acknowledging Jesus as our redeemer and not just our teacher, he rejected the substitutionary atonement. Instead, Christ's death is an example to us of love, forgiveness, and reconciliation. He suffered persecution and death, but instead of reacting sinfully He responded with total God-consciousness.

Schleiermacher taught that Jesus Christ was divine in that he was sinless and thus totally submitted to and united with God. Jesus is the supreme example for us to follow so that we too can unite with God.

While some of his teachings undercut the full deity of Jesus Christ, Schleiermacher recognized that the traditional doctrine of the trinity was not biblical: "The original faith-constituting impression made upon the disciples, even as they grasped it in thought and reproduced it, was not connected with any knowledge of a Trinity."[2]

Instead, trinitarianism is a product of pagan influences and evolution of doctrine. It originated in a time of "mass-conversion from heathendom," so it was easy "to speak of a plurality or distinction in God," and "unconscious echoes of what is pagan could find their way in." Consequently, "we have the less reason to regard this doctrine as finally settled since it did not receive any fresh treatment when the Evangelical (Protestant) Church was set up; and so there must still be in store for it a transformation which will go back to its very beginnings."[3]

He pointed out the erroneous logic of trinitarianism.

For example, despite trinitarian protests, the concept of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father makes the former dependent upon, and therefore inferior to, the latter. Moreover, "the idea of Origen [is] that the Father is God absolutely, while Son and Spirit are God only by participation in the Divine Essence—an idea which is positively rejected by orthodox Christian teachers, but secretly underlies their whole procedure." As another example he asked, Is Christ's "divine nature" equal to the whole divine essence? If not, does each member of the Trinity have his own divine nature outside his participation in the divine essence?[4]

He concluded that the traditional doctrine of the trinity is not necessary. What is "essential" about the doctrine is the "union of the Divine Essence with human nature, both in the personality of Christ and in the common Spirit of the Church." These stand independently of the doctrine of the trinity.[5]

Schleiermacher proposed the following understanding of the Godhead: "Son of God" is not a divine title only, but it refers to a whole human-divine person. "Father" and "Holy Spirit" refer to "God, Supreme Being." "In Jesus Christ divine nature and human nature were combined into one person." "The existence of God in the Redeemer is posited as the innermost fundamental power within Him." While not fully committing himself, he acknowledged that a Sabellian (modalistic) interpretation would explain all the biblical statements of Christ and the apostles.[6]

Søren Kierkegaard

Another theologian who blended rationalism with revelation was Søren Kierkegaard (1813-55) of Denmark. He

is also regarded as an important philosopher, the inspiration for *existentialism*. This philosophical movement emphasizes the existence and experience of the individual, saying that only by personal experience do we know reality.

Kierkegaard tried to combine his existential philosophy with Christianity, teaching that humans are totally free and responsible for their own acts. The individual must pursue truth, advancing through three stages of life by means of "leaps." The first stage is the aesthetic, in which people pursue pleasure. The second is the ethical stage, where they follow universal principles. The third and highest stage is that of religion. At this point, a person becomes conscious of sin and seeks absolute truth. Entering this stage requires a leap of faith into the unknown, irrational, and eternal; only faith (a direct relationship with absolute truth) can save.

In this way, Kierkegaard advocated a personal relationship with God, but he gave short shrift to other aspects of theology. There was little room in his theology for the doctrine of the church and the doctrine of grace. He exaggerated individualism, and he rejected doctrinal formulations in favor of the individual's inner experience and relationship with God.

Albrecht Ritschl

Albrecht Ritschl (1822-89) of Germany, son of a Lutheran bishop, was a third important source of liberal theology. He taught a subjective theory of the Atonement. According to him, the death of Jesus was not an objective payment for our sins but simply a demonstration of God's love for us and a motivation for us to love God in return.

It acts upon us subjectively by making us realize that God has set us free from sin.

In short, Jesus Christ does not actually take away our guilt by an atoning sacrifice, but His example shows us that we do not have to live under guilt any longer. Once we understand this concept, guilt loses its power to separate us from God. We simply get rid of guilt and follow after God. Salvation takes place within us as we accept God's love and reconcile ourselves to Him.

Ritschl thus emphasized the love of God to the point of completely rejecting divine wrath and judgment. In his scheme everyone is saved; people simply need to recognize this fact and live accordingly. His theology stripped the doctrines of sin, grace, atonement, salvation, and judgment of almost all their biblical meaning and reduced Christianity to a moral philosophy.

The Social Gospel

In the latter half of the nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth, liberal theology led to a movement in the United States called the social gospel. A prime exponent was Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918). Simply stated, the gospel of Christ calls believers to work for God's kingdom in this world, which is the kingdom of justice. The real mission of the church is not to save souls for an invisible, eternal kingdom but to establish the kingdom of God on earth. Its priority should be to work for justice, freedom, and a better society.

The Roman Catholic Church

Liberal ideas also challenged the Roman Catholic Church. In response, Pope Pius IX issued the *Syllabus of*

Errors in 1864. It defended tradition and it rejected "modern liberalism," namely, rationalism and historical criticism of the Bible. It also denounced the separation of church and state, freedom for other religions, public school education, and other principles that threatened the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church in Catholic lands. It specifically identified the following as errors:

> It is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship. . . . It has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.[7]

Despite official opposition, many Catholic scholars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries became modernists, adopting liberal theology and higher criticism of the Bible. Their reinterpretations of the Bible were not as devastating as those of the Protestants, because as Catholics they affirmed the authority of church tradition and the continuing work of the Holy Spirit to lead the church into new doctrinal understandings. Thus, even if they concluded that the Bible does not support a certain doctrine, they could uphold it on the basis of postbiblical tradition and progressive revelation.

The nineteenth century marked the victory of the pope over centuries of conflict regarding his authority. Beginning in the seventeenth century, there had been widespread opposition to excessive ecclesiastical centralization, particularly the papacy. Strongest in France, this movement became known as *Gallicanism*. ("Gallic" is

from "Gaul," the old Roman name for France.) The Sorbonne, a prestigious college in the University of Paris, published six articles in 1663 that said the king is independent of the pope in temporal matters, the pope does not have authority to depose French bishops, he is not superior to a council, and he is not necessarily infallible. The French Revolution effectively ended Gallicanism by radically separating church and state and suppressing the church's political influence.

An important step in consolidating the pope's ecclesiastical power was the proclamation of the immaculate conception of Mary. For centuries the Catholic Church had elevated Mary, venerating her, praying to her, looking to her as an intercessor, speaking of her as sinless, teaching her perpetual virginity, and so on. From early medieval times, many theologians, particularly the Franciscans (a monastic order), taught that by the special grace of God Mary was born without original sin and without a sinful nature. At conception, God sanctified her and gave her an innocent nature like that of Adam and Eve in the beginning. The Dominicans, including Thomas Aquinas, generally opposed this view, however.

In 1854, Pope Pius IX proclaimed the immaculate conception of Mary as official doctrine. This move was quite popular, for the doctrine had already won the hearts of most Catholics. The significance of this pronouncement went beyond the doctrine of Mary, however. For the first time, a pope defined a major new doctrine on his own authority, without calling a council or seeking approval from the rest of the hierarchy. Before this time, the immaculate conception was technically a matter of private belief or speculation, but as of 1854 it became the

official position of the Roman Catholic Church solely on the pope's authority. The immediate effect was to establish this doctrine, but the long-range effect was to enhance papal power.

The doctrine of papal supremacy reached its apex at the First Vatican Council (Vatican I) in 1870. This council, held in the papal city, proclaimed the infallibility of the pope. Again, what was once private belief or speculation became the official doctrine of the church.

Technically, infallibility does not mean the pope is incapable of making a mistake or expressing a wrong opinion. It applies only when he speaks *ex cathedra* ("from the chair"), or in his official capacity as pastor and teacher of the universal church, and then only when he speaks on matters of faith and morals. In these limited circumstances, God preserves him from error so that his words are the words of Christ on the issue at hand.

Some Catholics rejected this doctrine and split from the Roman Church, becoming known as Old Catholics. Even in the twentieth century several prominent Catholic theologians, including Hans Küng, have challenged it.

Interestingly, this decision applies retroactively: according to official Catholic theology, papal infallibility has always been true even though popes of previous centuries did not make this claim. For Catholics, it is difficult to reconcile this doctrine with theological positions of some ancient bishops of Rome that run counter to Catholic orthodoxy today. For example, Zephyrinus and Callixtus held modalistic views, Liberius signed an Arian creed to regain his position, Gelasius I denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and Honorius I denied that Christ had two wills—all views later deemed

gross heresy.[8]

Vatican I also declared that the pope has the final authority in church discipline and administration. As an example, the celibacy of the priesthood is a rule enforced by the authority of the pope, going back to the time of Gregory VII.

In essence, Vatican I ceded to the pope the historical authority of the councils, effectively ending the conciliar movement. The pope reigned supreme over every aspect of the church. Not until Vatican II (1962-65) did another council meet and play a significant role in directing the church.

Despite the confirmation and consolidation of his ecclesiastical power, the pope lost most of his temporal authority. In 1870, Italy annexed the Papal States, territory in central Italy that the popes had ruled from the Donation of Pepin in 754. The pope was left only with Vatican City, which remains an independent country under his reign.

Roman Catholicism received a boost from a Protestant source during this century. The high-church, Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church of England reacted against both liberalism and evangelicalism. Beginning at Oxford in 1833, the leaders of the Oxford (or Tractarian) movement championed church tradition and ritual through sermons and tracts. They believed the evangelical wing rejected too much tradition, and they reintroduced Catholic elements such as elaborate rituals, confession to a priest, monasticism, and frequent communion. Later many of them converted to Roman Catholicism, including the chief spokesman, John Henry Newman, who became a cardinal.

Eastern Orthodoxy

Space does not allow a thorough treatment of Eastern Orthodoxy, but there was much less doctrinal development in the East than in the West. The fall of Constantinople (the seat of Orthodoxy) to the Ottoman Turks in 1453 stunted the progress of Orthodox theology. As a result of the Turkish conquest, Islam ruled over much of the historic territory of Orthodoxy.

The Protestant Reformation affected the East very little. Eventually, however, Eastern Orthodoxy found it necessary to oppose Protestant doctrines. As new ideas in science, philosophy, and religion came from the West there was much opposition but gradually some acceptance.

In the Greek church, Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638) became, in effect, a moderate Calvinist. Patriarch of Alexandria and then of Constantinople (the highest position of leadership in Orthodoxy), he taught justification by faith, the supreme authority of Scripture, a spiritual Eucharist, and predestination. After his death, however, the Greek Orthodox Church condemned Calvinism.

After the fall of Constantinople, the Russian Orthodox Church considered itself to be the purest representative of Christianity. It said the center of Orthodoxy shifted from Rome to Constantinople to Moscow, and it considered Scripture, the church fathers, and oral tradition to be equal in authority.

The Russian church went through an anti-Catholic period and then an anti-Protestant period. The school of Kiev in the 1600s tended toward Catholicism, but it rejected papal supremacy and the procession of the Spirit from the Son. Meanwhile, Theophanes Prokopovic and his followers tended toward Protestantism, advocating

Scripture as the primary authority.

Nikon (1605-81), patriarch of Moscow, reformed the ancient liturgy. Those who rejected the changes and split away became known as Old Believers.

In the 1800s the Slavophile movement held that Russian Orthodoxy is the correct halfway point between Catholicism and Protestantism, avoiding the errors of both. The Slavophiles also criticized the stifling control of the hierarchy.

Overall, from the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries Eastern Orthodoxy was traditional, conservative, and hierarchical. Where it was the majority faith, it closely aligned itself with the state and, in the case of Russia, was quite subservient to the state.

New American Religions

In nineteenth-century America, several new religions arose out of traditional Christianity. We can only briefly discuss some of the more important ones.

The *Seventh-day Adventists* grew out of the preaching of a Baptist named William Miller (1782-1849). He predicted the second coming of Christ in 1843 and again in 1844, attracting numerous followers. When his prophecies failed, he renounced his methods and apologized, but some of his followers rallied under the leadership of Ellen G. White in 1846. She explained that Christ had entered a heavenly temple on the predicted date to begin the "investigative judgment." She taught that Christians must keep Saturday as the Sabbath, or else they run the risk of being lost. Today's Seventh-day Adventists regard Ellen White as a prophet whose writings are authoritative, but they seek to be recognized as fully

Christian by accepting the supreme authority of Scripture and justification by faith.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, better known as the *Mormons*, began in 1830 with Joseph Smith (1805-44), who claimed he was restoring the true church. He said an angel revealed to him the location of a second volume of Scripture, called the *Book of Mormon*, written by ancient inhabitants of America who received a visit from Christ. In the 1830s, before their most serious doctrinal deviations, a few Mormon leaders claimed to speak in tongues, but this practice did not continue.

After much persecution in which Smith was killed, Brigham Young (1801-77) led the majority of the Mormons to Utah in 1847, where they settled and became the dominant religion. Under Young's influence, Mormons came to believe that God was once a man and through obedience and good works we can become gods ourselves.

The founder of *Jehovah's Witnesses*, who also use the name of Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, was Charles Taze Russell (1852-1916). He and subsequent leaders made a number of failed predictions relative to the Second Coming and finally concluded that Jesus had already come invisibly. Jehovah's Witnesses deny the trinity and hold an Arian view of Jesus, believing that He is not the supreme God but a subordinate spirit being.

Mary Baker Eddy (1821-1910) founded the Church of Christ, Scientist, or *Christian Science*. Blending biblical terminology with Eastern religious philosophy, she taught that God is an abstract principle rather than a personal being. She denied the reality of disease and claimed that when a sick person fully embraces this truth he will be healed.

The Era of Protestant Missions

The nineteenth century is known as the great era of Protestant missions. As discussed in chapter 11, until the Pietists in the eighteenth century Protestants traditionally did not concern themselves greatly about missions in pagan lands but left that task to the Catholics. In the nineteenth century, however, many Protestants developed a missionary burden and vision.

Most of the early mission societies were formed in Great Britain by Baptists, but they were not initially associated with denominational structures. Methodists and others soon started to participate in them as well. Early missions societies also began in the United States and the Netherlands. Individuals from various churches and denominations joined together, pooled their money, and sent missionaries. This process encouraged lay leadership, for the initial impetus came more from the laity than the ministry. Much later, denominations began to catch the vision and organized their own missions departments.

One of the earliest efforts slightly predated the century. William Carey (1761-1834), a Baptist shoemaker and pastor, was instrumental in organizing the Baptist Missionary Society in 1792, and the next year he journeyed to India as a missionary. Other noted missionaries were Robert Morrison, the first Protestant missionary to China (1807); J. Hudson Taylor (1832-1905), founder of the China Inland Mission, which had the largest number of missionaries; David Livingstone (1813-73), the most famous missionary to Africa and a noted explorer; and Adoniram Judson (1788-1850), an American Baptist missionary to Burma.

As a result of these labors, in the nineteenth century

Protestantism truly became a worldwide movement. Before this time, the stronghold of Christianity was Europe, and by immigration, conquest, and colonization Christianity had expanded to North America (mostly Protestant), South America (mostly Catholic), and Australia (mostly Protestant). The continents of Asia and Africa had been largely untouched by any kind of Christianity, except for ancient churches in the Middle East, North Africa, and Ethiopia. To the extent they were touched, it was primarily by Roman Catholicism, but in the nineteenth century Protestants established strong missions on these continents.

The Second Awakening

In America, the nineteenth century ushered in a new wave of revival. The fervor of the Great Awakening had subsided years before, but in the 1790s and early 1800s, a renewed thrust of revival and evangelism, sometimes called the Second Awakening, began. It was characterized by great frontier revivals, circuit-riding preachers, and camp meetings, which originated during this time.

The new revival mostly involved Methodists and Baptists, but some Presbyterians took part, particularly in the beginning. Leading evangelists of the revival were James McGready, a Presbyterian, and Peter Cartwright, a Methodist circuit rider.

A wave of revival began in Logan County, Kentucky, with the preaching of McGready in 1799. The first camp meeting was held in July 1800 in the same area near the Gasper River, and it was noted for weeping and shouts of ecstasy.[9]

The most outstanding camp meeting took place near-

by, at Cane Ridge in August 1801. It was organized by Presbyterians and Methodists, and twenty to thirty thousand people attended. Participants engaged in extended prayer; enthusiastic, emotional worship; and physical demonstrations as the Spirit of God moved upon them.[10]

These demonstrations included sobbing, shrieking, falling (over three thousand fell under the power of God), exuberant singing, shouting, laughing ("holy laughter"), dancing, shaking ("jerking"), jumping, leaping, rolling, and running. People testified that they fell into trances, saw visions, and exercised various gifts of the Holy Ghost. There were also accounts of "barking," but Barton Stone explained that this report originated because some people grunted or gasped when they jerked under God's power.

Similar demonstrations occurred at other revival meetings throughout the century. Sometimes an entire congregation would begin breathing in distress, weeping, and repenting, with hundreds of people falling on the ground under conviction of sin. In the wake of these revivals were profound moral reforms.[11]

There were also numerous reports of speaking in tongues. As one example, a great revival swept the University of Georgia in 1800-1, and the students "shouted and talked in unknown tongues."[12] In many cases speaking in tongues probably went unreported because observers did not recognize it or its significance and did not distinguish it from other physical phenomena. One historian summarized: "Throughout the nineteenth century speaking in unknown tongues occurred occasionally in the revivals and camp meetings that dotted the countryside. Perhaps the phenomenon was considered just

another of the many evidences that one had been saved or sanctified."[13]

Leading revivalists in the nineteenth century were Charles Finney and Dwight Moody. Their efforts helped promote the Holiness movement, which became the heir of the Methodist revivals, the Great Awakening, and the Second Awakening. We will discuss Finney, Moody, and the Holiness movement in chapter 13.

The Christian Church and Churches of Christ

A leading participant in the Cane Ridge revival was Barton W. Stone (1772-1844), a Presbyterian minister who repudiated predestination and who emancipated his slaves. Stone described the revival as a genuine move of God in which God poured out His Spirit.

At first, Stone and his followers formed an independent Presbyterian group, but soon they dissolved it and determined simply to call themselves Christians and to advocate no creed but the Bible. Their chief goal was the restoration of primitive Christianity and of unity among Christians.

While a Presbyterian, Stone had difficulties with the doctrine of the trinity. One of his theology instructors introduced him to Isaac Watts's *Glory of Christ*, which advocated modalistic concepts. The instructor, Stone, and others embraced these views, although Stone merely said Watts taught that Christ had a preexistent human soul (instead of preexisting the Incarnation as the "eternal Son").[14]

Stone also revealed, however, his sympathy for a modalistic understanding of the Godhead:

> Sometimes my mind inclined to consider the three

> persons as three distinctions, appellations, or relations, in the one God. This opinion rather preponderated in my mind, yet I was unsettled. At the same time I so far doubted the propriety of the phrase Eternal Son of God, that I could not receive it as an article of faith.[15]

Stone did not make an issue of these ideas, but apparently he continued to hold them, for some trinitarians opposed him in later years because of them. He always upheld the deity of Jesus Christ.[16]

Stone's study of the Scriptures also led him to water baptism of believers by immersion in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. He wrote, "The subject of baptism now engaged the attention of the people very generally, and some, with myself, began to conclude that it ought to be administered in the name of Jesus to all believing penitents." He then quoted Acts 2:38.[17]

Similarly, Elias Smith (1769-1846), editor of the first religious newspaper in America, the *Herald of Gospel Liberty*, was part of an early group that called themselves simply Christians. He baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ and rejected the doctrine of the trinity.[18]

Before long, Barton Stone met Alexander Campbell (1788-1866), who with his father, Thomas Campbell, led another group with views similar to Stone's. Stone had not consistently proclaimed his earlier insight that baptism was for the remission of sins, but Alexander Campbell emphasized this point, and Stone renewed his commitment to it. Like Stone, Campbell refused to use trinitarian terminology because it was not scriptural, but unlike Stone he seemed to have no problem with the

concept, and he always used the trinitarian baptismal formula.[19]

In 1832 the two groups merged, resolving to use the Bible alone as their creed and to call themselves only Christians or Churches of Christ. They wanted to bring all churches under their banner and restore the original apostolic church.

Since there was no defining creed or articles of faith, over time this movement separated into two distinct camps. The more liberal wing became the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), which is now a mainline Protestant denomination.

The conservatives became known as the Churches of Christ, and these churches remained strictly congregational and independent. They closely followed the original ideas of Alexander Campbell. They stress the essentiality of water baptism, are staunch trinitarians, forbid the use of musical instruments in church, and oppose any tangible feeling, anointing, demonstration, or gift of the Spirit for today.

The Oneness of God and Deity of Jesus Christ

As illustrated by Barton Stone, many people in the nineteenth century questioned traditional trinitarian orthodoxy and redefined or rejected it in favor of modalistic concepts. They affirmed the absolute oneness of God and the deity of Jesus Christ but drew away from or abandoned the idea of three distinct persons.

Horace Bushnell (1802-76), a Congregationalist, accepted “trinity,” “three persons,” and trinitarian baptism but denounced the idea that in God there are “three distinct consciousnesses, wills and understandings.” He

described the "threefold denomination" of "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost [as] incidental to, and produced by the central fact, or mystery of the incarnation, as an impersonation of God developed in time." When asked whether he believed in a "modal trinity" and "three modal persons," he replied, "I must answer obscurely" and preferred rather to speak of the "Instrumental Trinity" and "Instrumental Persons." He concluded, "Through these living persons, or impersonations, I find the Infinite One brought down even to my own level of humanity, without any loss of His greatness."[20]

Henry Ward Beecher (1813-87), a famous Congregational pastor in New York City, identified "Christ as the Divine Spirit manifested in a human body and under the limitations of a human life." Against Unitarianism he strongly affirmed Christ's deity:

> Could Theodore Parker worship my God?—Christ Jesus is His name. All that there is of God to me is bound up in that name. A dim and shadowy effluence rises from Christ, and that I am taught to call the Father. A yet more tenuous and invisible film of thought arises, and that is the Holy Spirit. But neither are to me tangible, restful, accessible. They are to be revealed to my knowledge hereafter, but now only to my faith. But Christ stands my *manifest* God. All that I know is of Him and in Him.[21]

Other American Congregationalists, such as Lyman Abbott, Joseph Cook, and A. H. Bradford expressed modalism even more strongly.[22]

John Miller, an American Presbyterian, wrote an

intriguing book in 1876 called *Is God a Trinity?* in which he explicitly rejected trinitarianism as unbiblical. Except for a few differences in terminology, he explained the oneness of God and the deity of Jesus Christ in the same way as Oneness Pentecostals do today. He also explained that Matthew 28:19 refers to baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. The book evidently gained a following, for it went through at least three editions, with the third one published in 1922.[23]

Modern Oneness Pentecostals have discovered similar works in England, including the following:

• A book written in 1828 by John Clowes, pastor of St. John's Church in Manchester. It teaches that Jesus is the "only God" and that the Father is not "separate" from Jesus but is Him.[24]

• *A Few Words of Obvious Truth* (third edition, 1836) by an anonymous author who described himself as "a Unitarian Believer in the Divinity of the Son of God" and an "Apostolical Christian." He denied the trinity, upheld the oneness of God and deity of Jesus Christ, and advocated baptism only in Jesus' name.[25]

• *The Testimony of Jesus* (1884) by David Bailey. Founder of a school in Bilston, England, he taught that Jesus is Jehovah and the trinity is in Jesus. "God is One," he wrote, "in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ."[26]

The foregoing list is merely illustrative not exhaustive. Additional research will likely uncover others who expressed Oneness views, and many who held such beliefs probably left no written record.

Summary

In chapter 13, we will discuss the Holiness movement

of the 1800s, cite evidence for speaking in tongues throughout the nineteenth century, and draw conclusions about the century as a whole.

13

The Holiness Movement

The Methodist movement, the Great Awakening, and the Second Awakening prepared the ground in the United States and Great Britain for further revival and evangelistic efforts. These, in turn, ultimately led to the Holiness movement in the latter half of the nineteenth century and then to the Pentecostal movement at the beginning of the twentieth.

The Evangelists

In the nineteenth century there arose two conservative Protestant evangelists in the United States who became nationally known. They preached revival meetings and crusades across the country and later in Great Britain, pioneering modern techniques of mass evangelism. They

emphasized the need for personal repentance and a personal decision for Christ, and they were responsible for thousands of conversions.

Charles G. Finney (1792-1875) became prominent around the middle of the century. Originally a Presbyterian, he left that denomination because he rejected the doctrine of predestination. He believed that anyone could respond to the gospel message and be saved. In 1835 he published his views in *Lectures on Revival.*

After leaving the Presbyterian church, Finney became a Congregational pastor. He also served as a teacher of theology at Oberlin College in Ohio for many years, and for fifteen years he was its president. Oberlin was an innovative, evangelical Christian college that accepted both male and female students and both blacks and whites.

Dwight L. Moody (1837-99) was converted in a Congregational church in 1855 and became a successful businessman in Chicago. Although he was never ordained, he soon gave up business, founded a nondenominational church, and served as president of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chicago. Throughout the latter part of the century, Moody toured the United States and Great Britain, holding evangelistic meetings.

Ira Sankey (1840-1908), a singer and musician, traveled with Moody most of the time. His fervent singing of "gospel hymns" was a vital part of the evangelistic ministry, and he popularized a style of music that became characteristic of conservative Protestantism.

In 1886 the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions was founded under Moody's leadership. It swept through colleges, universities, and seminaries across

America, calling students to a dedicated Christian life. Many of them later became missionaries in foreign lands.

Although he was primarily a pastor, we should also mention *Charles Spurgeon* (1834-92), the most prominent Baptist preacher of the century in Great Britain. Spurgeon's powerful preaching attracted great crowds to his church in London. Calvinistic in theology, he was quite evangelistic in his ministry.

Holiness Groups

As chapter 11 has discussed, John Wesley and the early Methodists promoted the life of sanctification with the goal of Christian perfection. By the mid 1800s, however, it was evident that the Methodist Church had departed from the original emphasis on holiness. A number of people within or associated with Methodism were quite concerned to preserve this message. Phoebe Palmer (1807-74) initiated a revival of holiness teaching in Methodism, particularly with her book *The Way of Holiness* (1845).

We can date the formal beginning of the modern Holiness movement to a camp meeting in Vineland, New Jersey, in 1867. The organizers issued a call to holiness, dedicating the camp meeting to preaching and teaching on this subject. From this camp, the National Holiness Association was born. Its purpose was to renew and promote the message of holiness within the Methodist Episcopal Church and throughout Protestant ranks.

Toward the end of the century, the Methodist Church as a whole rejected this renewed emphasis, and Methodist publications condemned the movement. Consequently, many holiness-minded people felt they had no choice but

to form their own denominations. A number of conservative Wesleyan or Holiness churches were established, including the Wesleyan Methodist Church (1843), an anti-slavery split that embraced the later Holiness movement; the Pilgrim Holiness Church (1897), which merged with the preceding group in 1968 to form the Wesleyan Church; the Free Methodist Church (1860), which also joined the Holiness movement; the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana) (1880); the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) (1896); the Church of the Nazarene (1895), which became the largest Holiness denomination; the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church (1895), which in 1911 merged with the Pentecostal Holiness Church (1900) under the latter name; and the Church of God in Christ (1897), a black organization. From 1895 to 1905, over twenty small Holiness denominations were started.

Two other groups that taught sanctification and practical holiness were the Christian and Missionary Alliance (1887) and the Salvation Army (1878). The former was an evangelistic organization founded by A. B. Simpson, who proclaimed a fourfold gospel of Jesus as Savior, sanctifier, healer, and coming Lord. The latter originated with the ministry of William and Catherine Booth in the slums of London. Highly disciplined and with military-style organization, this group endeavored to meet both the physical and spiritual needs of people.

Holiness Theology

The distinctive doctrine of the Holiness movement was entire sanctification, or Christian perfection. While the Holiness groups sought to perpetuate the original Wesleyan doctrine and lifestyle, their emphasis was some-

what different from Wesley's in that they focused on sanctification as a crisis experience, an instantaneous second work of grace. Although Wesley had spoken of sanctification as instantaneous, he stressed the process of sanctification over a person's life both before and after the attainment of Christian perfection.

In short, the Holiness groups taught that everyone should seek two distinct experiences with God, or works of grace. First, a person needs to be saved. When he repents of sin, believes on the Lord, and confesses Jesus as his personal Savior, he is justified, forgiven of sins, and born again, and has Christ living within.

At this point he needs a second work of grace, called Christian perfection or entire sanctification. In this experience, God "eradicates" the indwelling nature of sin, thereby enabling the Christian to live a victorious, holy life.

Holiness people sought this experience with prayer, weeping, and soul searching, much as they did the initial experience of conversion. Many began to look for evidence of this second experience, such as a strong assurance, emotional feelings, or physical sensations.

As they studied the Scriptures, particularly the Book of Acts, they noticed that the disciples were "baptized with the Holy Ghost," and they began to equate entire sanctification with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. They did not necessarily associate this experience with speaking in tongues, although there were some instances of speaking in tongues in the Holiness movement.

In using this terminology, they deviated from Wesley, who thought that receiving the Holy Spirit occurred at conversion. They followed, however, the language of his

designated successor, John Fletcher, who described sanctification as receiving, or being baptized with, the Holy Ghost. Nineteenth-century leaders who employed this terminology included Phoebe Palmer; Asa Mahan, former president of Oberlin College who wrote *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*; Dwight Moody; and R. A. Torrey.

For the most part, Oberlin College and Charles Finney taught the Holiness doctrine of sanctification as a second work of grace. Their view is sometimes called *Oberlin perfectionism*.

A number of holiness-minded people began to proclaim an alternate view of holiness, however. The practical effect was much the same, but the approach was somewhat different. They denied that the inward nature of sin is eradicated in this life, but they proclaimed that by His Spirit God gives Christians power to overcome and suppress the influence of the sinful nature.

They exhorted all Christians to seek a distinct encounter with God's Spirit in which they would receive power for Christian service and power to bear spiritual fruit. It could happen at conversion or afterward. Subsequently, they should live in the "fullness of the Spirit" and participate in the "higher Christian life." These teachers also began to use the scriptural terminology of being "baptized with the Holy Ghost" for this crisis experience.

This view is sometimes called *Keswick holiness*, or Keswick higher life, from the village of Keswick (pronounced "Kessick"), England, which was the location of the first and most influential meetings to promote this view. Prominent advocates included William E. Boardman, F. B. Meyer, Andrew Murray, G. Campbell Morgan, A. B. Simpson, and A. J. Gordon. Dwight Moody, R. A.

Torrey (Moody's successor), and Moody Bible Institute were also close to this position, although they spoke primarily of power for service rather than power for holiness.

In sum, both Wesleyan and Oberlin perfectionism and Keswick holiness advocated the life of holiness, but the former stressed the eradication of the sinful nature while the latter stressed the endowment of power to subdue the sinful nature. Both movements used much the same terminology, encouraging people who had repented to seek for a subsequent baptism of the Holy Ghost to give them victory over sin and enable them to do the will of God.

There was a strong call to go back to the doctrines and practices of the apostles in the New Testament church. In describing this desire, the adjective "Pentecostal" became common, and a rallying cry was, "Back to Pentecost." Some leaders began to press for the restoration of spiritual gifts, including prophecy, healing, and miracles.

The Holiness movement particularly sought to restore the New Testament truth of divine healing. Healing became an important part of the message of Holiness preachers, and many miraculous healings took place. Some began to teach that Christ provided physical healing in the Atonement. Prominent advocates and evangelists for divine healing were Ethan O. Allen, Charles Cullis, William Boardman, A. J. Gordon, A. B. Simpson, and John Alexander Dowie. Charles Spurgeon also practiced prayer for divine healing.

The people of the Holiness movement, as well as other conservative Protestants, dedicated themselves to strict morality and a separated, holy lifestyle. They

preached that Christians should be godly in their conduct, dress, and speech. As part of Christian holiness, they preached against tobacco, alcohol, gambling, swearing, immodest dress, jewelry, theaters, dancing, and worldly amusements.[1] When the twentieth century ushered in new styles and inventions, the Holiness denominations extended the application of these principles to prohibit attendance at movies, women cutting their hair, women wearing pants, and the use of makeup.

Many Holiness preachers, particularly itinerant evangelists, determined to live and conduct their ministries "by faith," depending on God to supply their daily needs as they worked for him. Some established faith homes or Bible schools, where Christian workers and students pooled their resources and trusted God to provide what they lacked.

Preparation for the Pentecostal Movement

In many ways the Holiness movement prepared the way for the Pentecostal movement, particularly by its emphasis on repentance, seeking a distinct experience after repentance called the baptism of the Holy Ghost, demonstrative worship, the move of the Holy Spirit, divine healing, faith, and practical holiness standards for everyday conduct and dress. Although in theology the Holiness movement was trinitarian, in practice the hymns, prayers, worship, and faith of its adherents centered on Jesus Christ, which set the stage for the message of Oneness Pentecostalism.

Donald Dayton, a non-Pentecostal professor who has specialized in the links between the Holiness and Pentecostal movements, concluded:

> One might argue that the whole network of popular "higher Christian life" institutions and movements constituted at the turn of the century a sort of pre-Pentecostal tinderbox awaiting the spark that would set it off. . . . Indeed, when Pentecostalism emerged in the next few years, leaders of the Holiness movement recognized that it was only the gift of tongues that set it apart from their own teachings.[2]

The modern Pentecostal movement arose out of the Holiness movement. It began in the early hours of the new century, on January 1, 1901, in a small Bible school in Topeka, Kansas, operated by faith. The founder and director was Charles Parham, an independent preacher associated with the Holiness movement.

The Bible school began in the fall of 1900. Parham studied the Scriptures to find evidence for the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and he urged his students to do likewise. Under his guidance, they concluded that the initial biblical evidence is speaking in tongues, and they began to seek this experience.

In a prayer meeting on January 1, Agnes Ozman, a student at the school, asked Charles Parham to lay hands on her that she might receive the Holy Ghost with the evidence of speaking in tongues. When he did, she began to speak in tongues. Several other students soon received the same experience, and on January 3 Parham himself along with many others also received the Holy Ghost with the sign of speaking in tongues.

These new Pentecostals concluded that this experience was something more than what the Holiness movement had taught. At first, they thought of it as a third

work of grace, leading to the common testimony of early Pentecostals: "Thank God, I am saved, sanctified, and filled with the Holy Ghost."

Many Holiness groups soon embraced the Pentecostal message en masse, including the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), the Church of God in Christ, and the Pentecostal Holiness Church. These organizations advocated three works of grace, while later other Pentecostals reduced the number to two or one. For instance, the Assemblies of God believes in two works of grace: conversion and the baptism of the Holy Spirit (a postconversional endowment of power), while the United Pentecostal Church International holds that repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit are all part of the one experience of regeneration.

As we have already seen, January 1901 in Topeka was by no means the first time since Bible days that someone had received the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues. But it was the first recorded time in modern church history when people sought for and received the Holy Spirit with the *expectation* of speaking in tongues. The biblical knowledge and expectation of the evidentiary role of tongues is what set this movement apart from earlier outpourings of the Spirit and led directly to Pentecostalism as a distinct movement. The Pentecostals also differed from earlier believers by proclaiming this experience as the *norm* and urging everyone to receive it. Further discussion of this movement must await a volume on the twentieth century.

Speaking in Tongues in the Nineteenth Century

Before the Pentecostal movement, there were numer-

ous instances of speaking in tongues in the nineteenth century. Chapter 12 has already cited evidence that it occurred in revival and camp meetings in America throughout the 1800s. In addition, there were notable occurrences in other parts of the world.

In the late 1820s a prominent Church of Scotland (Presbyterian) pastor named Edward Irving began to preach that believers should seek the restoration of all the miracles and gifts of the Spirit that characterized the New Testament church. In 1830 the Holy Spirit fell among his followers, beginning with Mary Campbell and James and Margaret MacDonald. Although there is no record that Irving himself ever spoke in tongues, he approved of and promoted this experience both in Scotland and in his church in London.

Expelled by his denomination, Irving founded the Catholic Apostolic Church, which emphasized the gifts of the Spirit. The Irvingite revival also gave birth to the Christian Catholic Church and the New Apostolic Church, and there were Irvingites in the mainline denominations. These groups tried to institutionalize the revival by creating a hierarchical church government led by apostles and prophets. Unfortunately, they gradually lost the gifts of the Spirit, degenerated into ritualism, suffered a rapid decline, and are almost nonexistent today. Nevertheless, observers reported speaking in tongues in Irvingite churches in the latter quarter of the 1800s both in New York and London.[3]

Other outpourings of the Holy Spirit with tongues took place among the Readers (Läsare) in Sweden from 1841 to 1843 and in Irish revivals of 1859.[4] Speaking in tongues also occurred among the Lutheran followers of

Gustav von Below in the early 1800s in Germany and among Congregationalists and "gift people" ("gift adventists") in New England from 1824 on.[5]

Some of the Plymouth Brethren also received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues.[6] Founded by John Nelson Darby (1800-82), an Anglican, this group promoted the literal interpretation of Scripture, sought spiritual renewal, strongly taught holiness and separation from the world, and gave great attention to the study of Bible prophecy. Darby was primarily responsible for the doctrine of dispensationalism, which spread rapidly across Fundamentalism in the early twentieth century, and for the popularization of the associated doctrine of the secret, pretribulation rapture of the church. Interestingly, some of the Plymouth Brethren, as well as other English groups at this time, practiced baptism in the name of Jesus Christ in obedience to the Book of Acts.[7]

As the century drew to a close, reports of speaking in tongues escalated, and in the great Welsh revival of 1904, which predated the arrival of the Pentecostal movement there, some people spoke in tongues.[8] F. B. Meyer found Baptists in Estonia who spoke in tongues.[9]

Finally, speaking in tongues occurred in the Holiness movement in the latter part of the century well before the definite beginning of the Pentecostal movement. For instance, Holiness people in Tennessee and North Carolina spoke in tongues.[10] In 1896, about 130 believers in the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) received the Holy Spirit with tongues at the Shearer Schoolhouse in Cherokee County, North Carolina.[11]

After the Pentecostal movement began and started stressing tongues, many people recalled their previous

experience of speaking in tongues as Methodists, Holiness adherents, or members of other conservative Christian groups, and they realized its significance. In other cases they recalled hearing family members or acquaintances speak in tongues prior to the arrival of the Pentecostal message. Testimonies of this nature were common among the early Pentecostals.

Donald Dayton noted the increasing occurrence of speaking in tongues in the late 1800s:

> This phenomenon of speaking in tongues was not unknown at the time. Assiduous searches for antecedents to contemporary Pentecostal practice have compiled lists of reports of such outbreaks that occurred at an increasing rate of frequency from 1870. . . . These incidents were widespread and apparently unrelated. There seems to have been a tendency for the practice to arise spontaneously in many contexts.[12]

Summary and Evaluation

Christianity in the nineteenth century underwent rapid changes and innovations and became increasingly diverse. In the Roman Catholic Church, the pope attained greater ecclesiastical power than ever before but lost most of his secular power. In Protestantism, liberal theology came into its own under the impact of the Enlightenment, particularly in Germany, yet conservative revivals swept America and prepared the way for the Pentecostal outpouring of the early twentieth century.

As we survey the history of Christian doctrine beginning with the Protestant Reformation, we find an amazing

process of the restoration of biblical understanding and practice. It did not take place overnight, although in every age God provided a witness to the fullness of truth. In most cases, the leading theologians of the day took only a few steps at a time instead of making the full leap of restoration to the apostolic pattern.

Martin Luther restored to widespread understanding and acceptance the doctrine of justification by faith, although his explanation of it was flawed by his concept of predestination. Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin presented a more scriptural view of the Eucharist as a memorial and a spiritual communion. The Anabaptists restored the baptism of believers as well as proper emphasis on repentance and holiness of life. In the English-speaking world, the Baptists did much the same, while John Wesley brought much-needed attention and prominence to the doctrine of sanctification. Finally, by its restorationism and its focus on the work of the Holy Spirit, the Holiness movement set the stage for the great revival of New Testament truth in the Pentecostal movement.

We must not suppose that the vital New Testament doctrines of the oneness of God, absolute deity of Jesus Christ, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, baptism of the Holy Spirit with the initial sign of tongues, and holiness of life were entirely absent until the twentieth century. In each of the four major Protestant traditions—Lutheran, Reformed, Anabaptist, Anglican—we see God's hand at work to reveal these truths.

At the outset of the Reformation, Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon had difficulty with the doctrine of the trinity, and both became acquainted with the modalistic views of Michael Servetus. Luther recognized that the

apostles baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. In the 1500s, some of Luther's early followers or acquaintances baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and some received powerful experiences in the Holy Spirit accompanied by ecstatic utterances. It is likely that some were baptized in Jesus' name and received the Holy Spirit. Later there were other outpourings of the Spirit among Lutherans, particularly among the Moravians (1700s), who were Pietists in the Lutheran tradition.

In the Reformed movement, Ulrich Zwingli also recognized that the New Testament teaches baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Many of his associates and followers pursued scriptural truth further in the Anabaptist movement. The greatest Reformed theologian, John Calvin, initially had some difficulties with the trinitarian dogma, and in the person of Michael Servetus he and many other Reformed believers directly encountered a clear exposition of the oneness of God and the deity of Jesus Christ. Later on, some people from the Reformed tradition were baptized with the Holy Spirit, including the Camisards in France (1600s and 1700s) and the Irvingites in Great Britain (1800s). Moreover, the early Calvinists were quite strict in their advocacy of practical holiness.

Among the early Anabaptists of the 1500s, some questioned the traditional doctrine of the trinity and offered nontrinitarian alternatives, which included modalism. Some baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, some received the Holy Spirit with the sign of tongues, and some probably embraced both experiences. The movement as a whole emphasized holiness of life in conduct

and dress.

The doctrines we have discussed also arose in groups who emerged from the Church of England. Some early Baptists (1600s) expressed Oneness views, and many baptized in the name of Jesus Christ; it also appears that some received the Holy Spirit. The early Quakers (1600s) espoused Oneness views, and many were filled with the Spirit. Many of the Methodists (1700s) also received the Holy Spirit. In the 1800s, both Oneness views and the outpouring of the Spirit reappeared frequently in Great Britain and America. Both baptism in Jesus' name and speaking in tongues occurred among the Plymouth Brethren, for example. Finally, many groups, including the Puritans, Quakers, Methodists, Plymouth Brethren, and Holiness people, advocated strict holiness of life.

God also worked among the Catholics. Many of the Jansenists, for example, received the Holy Spirit in the 1600s and 1700s.

Undoubtedly many other people not recorded by history were baptized in Jesus' name and received the Holy Spirit. It should not surprise us that evidence for them is relatively sparse. The following comments of Kenneth Scott Latourette, church historian and professor at Yale University Divinity School, help explain why:

> Those events, movements, and institutions which usually attract the attention of men and therefore find a place in the records of the past which survive are not nearly as significant as some which are scarcely noticed and of which either little or no trace remains or which, if it is there, is normally passed over by the historian. . . . Then, too, many individuals and institu-

> tions which have borne the Christian name have compromised their Christian principles by mingling with the sub-Christian or anti-Christian world about them to such an extent that the latter has paid them the doubtful compliment of so noticing them that accounts of them have been kept.[13]

By faith—but a reasonable faith based on tangible evidence—we can affirm that in every age God has had people who received the full experience of New Testament conversion, which the apostle Peter proclaimed in Acts 2:38. Only eternity will reveal the true history of God's church.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, people's hearts and minds were finally becoming receptive to a greater restoration and experience of apostolic truth. The people of the Holiness movement earnestly sought for an outpouring of the Holy Spirit, even though they did not fully understand everything it would entail, and God graciously responded. The result is that, while liberal theology captured mainline Protestantism, the papacy consolidated its position in Catholicism, and sub- or non-Christian groups proliferated worldwide, the twentieth century has seen history's greatest revival of the name of Jesus and the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Appendixes

Appendix A

Dates in the History of Christianity 1500-1900

A single date for a group or movement identifies the approximate time it began or first became a significant force. For people identified by an official title, such as king, inclusive dates refer to their term of office. For others, inclusive dates identify their birth and death. Some dates are uncertain, and in some cases sources differ on dates.

Secular History	Church History
1300s-1500s Italian Renaissance	
1453 Fall of Constantinople, End of Byzantine Empire	
1456 Gutenberg Bible	1466-1536 Desiderius Erasmus
1492 Columbus discovers America	1483-1546 Martin Luther
	1484-1531 Ulrich Zwingli
	1486-1543 John Eck
	1487-1541 Caspar Schwenckfeld
	1489-1656 Guillame Farel
	1491-1551 Martin Bucer
	1491-1556 Ignatius of Loyola
	1494-1536 William Tyndale

Secular History	Church History
	1494-1566 John Agricola
	1496-1561 Menno Simons
	1497-1560 Philip Melanchthon
	1498-1526 Conrad Grebel
	?-1528 Balthasar Hubmaier
	1498-1552 Francis Xavier
	1499-1542 Sebastian Franck
1509-47 Henry VIII, King of England	1509-64 John Calvin
	1511-53 Michael Servetus
	1513-72 John Knox
	1515-82 Teresa of Avila
	1516 Greek NT of Erasmus
	1517 Luther's 95 theses; the Reformation begins
	1520 Leo X excommunicates Luther
	1521 Diet of Worms
	1523 Zwingli begins Reformed movement
	1525 Anabaptist movement begins
	1529 Colloquy of Marburg
	1530 *Augsburg Confession*
	1533-35 Münster kingdom
	1534 Church of England established
	1536 Calvin's *Institutes* (first edition)
	1536-1600 Luis de Molina
	1539-1604 Faustus Socinus
	1540 Society of Jesus founded
	1542-1605 John of the Cross

Secular History	Church History
	1545-63 Council of Trent
	1548-1617 Francisco Suárez
	1549 *Book of Common Prayer*
1553-58 Queen Mary, England	1550-1633 Robert Browne
1555 Peace of Augsburg	1559 Calvin's *Institutes* (final edition)
1558-1603 Elizabeth I, Queen of England	1560 Scotland becomes Protestant
	1560s Puritans
1561-1626 Francis Bacon	1560-1609 Jacob Arminius
1564-1642 Galileo Galilei	1572-1638 Cyril Lucaris
1564-1616 William Shakespeare	1580 *Book of Concord*
1588 Spanish Armada defeated	1580 Congregationalists
1596-1650 René Descartes	1585-1638 Cornelius Jansenius
1598 Edict of Nantes	1609 Baptists
	1611 King James Version
1618-48 Thirty Years' War	1618-19 Synod of Dort
1632-77 Baruch Spinoza	1624-91 George Fox
1632-1704 John Locke	1635-1705 Philip Jacob Spener
1633 Trial of Galileo	1646 *Westminster Confession*
1648 Peace of Westphalia	1652 Society of Friends (Quakers)
1649 Charles I beheaded	1675 Pietists (*Pia Desideria*)
	1678 John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*
	1700-60 Count Nicholas von Zinzendorf
	1722 Moravians
	1703-91 John Wesley
1711-76 David Hume	1703-58 Jonathan Edwards
	1707 Isaac Watts's *Hymns*
	1714-70 George Whitefield
1724-1804 Immanuel Kant	1734-35 Great Awakening begins

Secular History	Church History
	1739 Methodists
1775 American Revolution	1761-1834 William Carey
1789 French Revolution; U.S. Bill of Rights	1768-1834 Friedrich Schleiermacher
	1772-1844 Barton W. Stone
1770-1831 Georg Hegel	1780 Robert Raikes begins Sunday school
1807 Abolition of British slave trade	1792-1875 Charles Finney
	1800 Second Awakening
1809-82 Charles Darwin	1813-55 Søren Kierkegaard
	1813-73 David Livingstone
	1816 African Methodist Episcopal Church
1818-83 Karl Marx	1822-89 Albrecht Ritschl
	1830 Mormons
	1832 Disciples of Christ; Churches of Christ
	1832-1905 Hudson Taylor
	1833 Oxford movement
	1837-99 Dwight Moody
	1845 Phoebe Palmer's *Way of Holiness*
	1846 Seventh-day Adventists
	1854 Immaculate conception of Mary proclaimed by Pius IX
1861-65 U.S. Civil War	1864 *Syllabus of Errors* (Pius IX)
	1867 Holiness movement
	1869-70 First Vatican Council
	1870 Papal infallibility declared
	1878 Salvation Army
	1880 Holiness organizations

Secular History	**Church History**
	1886 Student Volunteer Movement
	1901 Pentecostal movement

Note: Sources for the foregoing dates include *Christian History* 9, no. 4 (issue 28: "The 100 Most Important Events in Church History"); William L. Langer, ed., *An Encyclopedia of World History; New Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia;* Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity;* Justo Gonzalez, *A History of Christian Thought;* and Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church.*

Appendix B

Oneness Believers in History

This list consists of people for whom we have documented evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people included (after the apostles). It appears that the people on this list affirmed the absolute oneness of God and the full deity of Jesus Christ and that they were nontrinitarian (by orthodox trinitarian standards). For documentation, see *The Oneness of God* and *Oneness and Trinity: A.D. 100-300* by David Bernard as well as *A History of Christian Doctrine*, volumes 1 and 2.

Century	Group or Individual
1	Apostolic church
2	Post-apostolic leaders, including Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp; some Montanists; modalists
3	Modalists, including Noetus, Praxeas, Epigonus, Cleomenes, Sabellius; probably the Roman bishops Victor, Callistus, and Zephyrinus; Commodian, probably a bishop in North Africa; "the majority of believers" in Tertullian's day
4	Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and followers; believers in Antioch, probably including Eustathius, the bishop there; Priscillian and followers; Sabellians

Century	Group or Individual
5-15	Sabellians, Priscillianists; possibly other heretics such as Euchites and Bogomils; some theologians such as Peter Abelard, William of Conches, and Gilbert de la Porrée
16	Michael Servetus, some antitrinitarians, some Anabaptists
17	Some English Baptists; George Fox, William Penn, and other early Quakers
18	Emmanuel Swedenborg, Isaac Watts
19	Barton Stone (Christian), some New England Congregationalists, John Miller (Presbyterian), John Clowes (Anglican), David Bailey, anonymous English author
20	Oneness (Apostolic) Pentecostals, some Charismatics, some Sabbatarians, some Baptists including Frank Stagg, some Neo-Orthodox theologians

Appendix C

Baptism in Jesus' Name in History

This list includes only people for whom we have documented evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people included (after the apostles). For documentation, see *The New Birth* by David K. Bernard as well as *A History of Christian Doctrine*, volumes 1 and 2.

Century	Group or Individual
1	Apostolic church
2	Early post-apostolic church, Marcionites, some Montanists, modalists
3	Many in the institutional church; "heretics"; opponents of Cyprian; Sabellians; endorsement by Stephen, bishop of Rome
4	Sabellians, Theophranes, Eutychus, endorsement by Ambrose and Hilary
5-6	Sabellians, other "heretics"
7	Endorsement by Bede
8	Endorsement by Council of Fréjus
9	Endorsement by Pope Nicholas I
12	Support by Peter Lombard and Hugo Victor
13	Mention by Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, and

Century	Group or Individual
	Albertus Magnus; endorsement by Synod of Nemours
16	Some antitrinitarians, some Anabaptists, people known to Martin Luther
17	Some English "heretics"; some Baptists, including Francis Cornwell
18	Some American Baptists, including Daniel Hibbard
19	Some Christians, including Elias Smith and perhaps Barton Stone; some Plymouth Brethren; John Miller (Presbyterian); an anonymous English author
20	Some trinitarian Pentecostals, Oneness Pentecostals, some Sabbatarians, some Charismatics

Appendix D

Speaking in Tongues in History

This list includes only people for whom we have documented evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people included (after the apostles). For documentation, see *The New Birth* by David K. Bernard as well as *A History of Christian Doctrine*, volumes 1 and 2.

Century	Group or Individual
1	Apostolic church
2	Early post-apostolic church, Justin, Irenaeus, Montanists
3	Tertullian, Novatian, Sabellians
4	Endorsement by Hilary and Ambrose
12	Some Waldenses, some Albigenses, some Franciscans, some among other mendicant religious orders
16	Some Anabaptists, prophecy movement in England
17	Camisards; some Quakers; some Jansenists; some Pietists, including some Moravians
18	Some Methodists, some from the 17th-century groups mentioned above

Century	Group or Individual
19	Some in American revivals and camps, Irvingites, some Plymouth Brethren, some Congregationalists and the "gift people" in New England, Readers in Sweden, some German Lutherans, Irish revivals, some Estonian Baptists, some in the Holiness movement, other Christians
20	Welsh revival, Pentecostals, Charismatics from every denomination

Appendix E

Holiness Teaching in History

1. Groups That Emphasized Practical Holiness. This list includes only people for whom we have documented evidence. It is incomplete, and for some groups the evidence is indirect or fragmentary. We do not necessarily know about or endorse all the doctrines of the people included (after the apostles). For documentation, see *Practical Holiness: A Second Look* by David K. Bernard as well as *A History of Christian Doctrine*, volumes 1 and 2.

Century	Group or Individual
1	Apostolic church
2	Post-apostolic church, Montanists, Greek Apologists
3	Ante-Nicene writers, including Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria
4	Some post-Nicene writers, such as John Chrysostom
12	Waldenses, Humiliati, Albigenses
14	Hussites
15	Bernardino of Siena and followers, Savonarola and followers
16	Anabaptists, including Mennonites, Hutterites,

Century	Group or Individual
16	Amish; Calvinists
17	Puritans, Quakers, Baptists
18	Methodists; Pietists, including Moravians and Brethren
19	Holiness movement, Plymouth Brethren, other conservative Christians
20	Early trinitarian Pentecostals, early Fundamentalists and Evangelicals; Oneness Pentecostals

2. Teachings. Here are examples of various teachers or groups who have taken a position against the following worldly practices. These lists are representative and do not necessarily include everyone who has taken such a stand. Some of the groups originally held the position but no longer do, and in other groups only some of the members held or hold the position. For documentation, see *Practical Holiness: A Second Look* by David K. Bernard.

Worldly theater: Tatian, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, *Apostolic Constitutions*, John Chrysostom, Calvinists, Puritans, Spener and Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, Pentecostals.

Movies: H. A. Ironside; R. A. Torrey; Moody Church; Roman Catholic Archbishop George Mudelein; Holiness movement; Pentecostals, including Apostolic Faith, Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), Assemblies of God, United Pentecostal Church International; Baptists, including Baptist Bible Fellowship, John R. Rice, Liberty Baptist College.

Television: Holiness movement; Anabaptists, includ-

ing Amish, Hutterites; some Evangelicals, including Malcolm Muggeridge and Joe Bayly; some independent Baptists, including Bill Gothard; some trinitarian Pentecostals, including David Wilkerson; United Pentecostals.

Personal ornaments: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Tatian, Commodian, Cyprian, *Apostolic Constitutions*, John Chrysostom, Waldenses, Humiliati, Hussites, Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvinists, Puritans, Quakers, Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, Pentecostals.

Makeup: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Commodian, Cyprian, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Savonarola, Holiness movement, Pentecostals.

Immodest dress: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Waldenses, Humiliati, Hussites, Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvinists, Puritans, Baptists, Quakers, Pietists, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Wearing clothes of the opposite sex: Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Councils of Gangra and Chalcedon, Holiness movement, some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Short hair on women and long hair on men: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, *Apostolic Constitutions*, John Chrysostom, Councils of Gangra and Chalcedon, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Holiness movement, some independent Baptists, Pentecostals.

Alcohol: Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Anabaptists, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Tobacco: Anabaptists, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Abortion: Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Roman Catholic Church, Holiness movement, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Warfare: Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Lactantius, Waldenses, Anabaptists, Quakers, early Pentecostals.

Astrology: *Didache*, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Lactantius, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Worldly sports and amusements: Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, Tatian, Chrysostom, Bernardino, Savonarola, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Gambling: Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Bernardino, Savonarola, Hussites, Calvin, Puritans, Pietists, Quakers, Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Evangelicals, Pentecostals.

Dancing: Clement of Alexandria, Commodian, *Apostolic Constitutions*, Waldenses, Hussites, Bernardino, Savonarola, Anabaptists, Calvin, Puritans, Wesley and Methodists, Baptists, Holiness movement, Fundamentalists, Pentecostals.

Notes

1. The Protestant Reformation

[1]James Fallows, "Vatican City," *National Geographic*, December 1985, 735.

[2]David Bernard, *A History of Christian Doctrine* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1995) 1:293-302, 267, 271.

[3]Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (1910; Repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 7:123.

[4]Ibid. 7:247.

2. Martin Luther and Early Lutheran Theology

[1]Schaff, *History* 7:35.

[2]See, for example, Acts 2:38; 5:32; 6:7; Romans 1:5; 6:16-17; 16:26; 11:19-22; Hebrews 5:9; 10:23-39; Revelation 3:20; 22:17. For full discussion, see David Bernard, *The New Birth* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1984), 31-64.

[3]Schaff, *History* 7:24, n. 1.

[4]Roland Bainton, *Hunted Heretic: The Life and Death of Michael Servetus, 1511-1553* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1953), 60.

[5]Robert Willis, *Servetus and Calvin: A Study of an Important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation* (London: Henry S. King & Co., 1877), 44.

[6]Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (1931; Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983) 3:85.

[7]Ibid. 3:7, 13.

[8]Schaff, *History* 7:218.

[9]Martin Luther, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, in *Word and Sacrament II*, vol. 36 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Abdel Wentz (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), 63.

[10]Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978), 216-17.

[11]Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1953, 1975) 2:728.

3. Ulrich Zwingli and Early Reformed Theology

[1]Schaff, *History* 8:6; Sherwood Wirt, "You *Can* Buck the System and Win," *Christianity Today*, 3 February 1984, 21.

[2]Ibid., 20; Schaff, *History* 8:188.

[3]Ulrich Zwingli, *Selected Works*, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1901, 1972), 238.

[4]Schaff, *History* 8:49.

[5]William Lock, "Zwingli Was the Reformation's Most Gifted Musician," *Christianity Today*, 3 February 1984, 22.

[6]Ulrich Zwingli, *Of Baptism*, in *Zwingli and Bullinger*, trans. G. W. Bromiley, vol. 24 of *The Library of Christian Classics* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), 145. For reiteration of this point, see ibid., 144, 168, 171.

[7]Ibid., 137-38.

4. The Anabaptists

[1]Schaff, *History* 8:77.

[2]Will and Ariel Durant, *The Story of Civilization* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1935-75) 6:401.

[3]Ibid.

[4]George Huntston Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962, 1992), 228,

667; Donald Bloesch, *Essentials of Evangelical Theology* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978) 2:115-16.

[5]Menno Simons, *Christian Baptism*, in *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons, c. 1496-1561* (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1956), 277.

[6]Balthasar Hubmaier, *A Form for Christ's Supper*, in *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*, trans. and ed. H. Wayne Pipkin and John H. Yoder (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1989), 394.

[7]Simons, *The True Christian Faith*, in *Complete Writings*, 377.

[8]Crane Brinton et al., *A History of Civilization*, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967) 1:480.

[9]Hubmaier, *On the Christian Baptism of Believers* and *On Infant Baptism against Oecolampad*, in Pipkin and Yoder, 123, 293-94.

[10]John Christian Wenger, *The Doctrines of the Mennonites* (Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1952), 108.

[11]Schaff, *History* 8:738.

[12]Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1962 ed., 193, quoting the hymn from Frederick Weis, *The Life and Teachings of Ludwig Hetzer*, 214ff.

[13]Edgar Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* (London: Methuen & Co., 1896), 91.

[14]Hubmaier, *Summa of the Entire Christian Life*, in Pipkin and Yoder, 86; but see Hubmaier, *A Form for Water Baptism*, in Pipkin and Yoder, 389, for his trinitarian formula.

[15]Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 668, 738.

[16]George Huntston Williams, ed. and trans., *The Polish Brethren* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1980) 2:455. Brackets are in original. The quote is from Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3:18.

[17]Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 704. See also Albert Henry Newman, *A History of Anti-Pedobaptism* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1897), 336.

[18]Wenger, 42-43.

5. The Radical Reformation

[1]Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 46.

[2]Ibid., 49.

[3]Ibid., 56.

[4]Roland Bainton, *Hunted Heretic*, 212; Schaff, *History* 8:785.

[5]Bainton, *Hunted Heretic*, 214.

[6]Michael Servetus, *On the Errors of the Trinity*, in *The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trinity*, ed. James H. Ropes and Kirsopp Lake, trans. Earl Morse Wilbur (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932), 168.

[7]Ibid., 173-74.

[8]Servetus, *Two Dialogues on the Trinity*, in *Two Treatises*, 196-97.

[9]Bainton, 131-33. George Huntston Williams concurs that Servetus was not a pantheist. See *Radical Reformation*, 323.

[10]Servetus, *Dialogues*, in *Two Treatises*, 238-63.

[11]Servetus, *Errors*, in *Two Treatises*, 44-45.

[12]Willis, 178-79.

[13]Servetus, *Dialogues*, in *Two Treatises*, 235.

[14]Willis, 347; but see Bainton, *Hunted Heretic*, 187.

[15]Ibid., 359; see Bainton, *Hunted Heretic*, 147.

[16]Bainton, *Hunted Heretic*, 60, quoting Sebastian Franck, *Letter to John Campanus*.

[17]Willis, 371.

[18]Ropes and Lake, eds., xvi-xvii.

[19]Bainton, *Hunted Heretic*, 205.

[20]Willis, 302-3.

[21]Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 617, 622, 647-50, 808.

[22]Schaff, *History* 8:789-90.

[23]Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 199.

[24]Ibid., 822.

6. John Calvin and His Reformed Theology

[1]Schaff, *History* 8:559.

[2]John Calvin, *Acts of the Council of Trent with the Antidote* (1547), in *Tracts and Treatises in Defense of the Reformed Faith*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958) 3:180.

[3]John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 514, 521.

[4]Ibid., 513, 520.

[5]Ibid., 523.

[6]Ibid.

[7]John Calvin, *The True Method of Giving Peace to Christendom and Reforming the Church*, in *Tracts and Treatises* 3:287.

[8]Calvin, *Institutes*, 1981 edition, 2:33-34. The reference to "true ornaments" comes from the literal translation in footnote 1.

[9]Schaff, *History* 8:489-90.

[10]Durant 6:469, 474.

[11]Schaff, *History* 8:644-45.

[12]Ibid. 8:492-93.

7. The Reformation in Great Britain

[1]Durant 8:194-95.

[2]Tony Lane, *Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984), 148.

[3]"Tongues, Gift of," *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. H. B. Hackett (1870; Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971) 4:3310-11.

[4]John Smyth, *A Short Confession of Faith in XX Articles* (1609), in William Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Chicago: Judson Press, 1959), 101.

[5]George Fox, *The Great Mystery of the Great Whore Unfolded* (London, 1659), repr. as vol. 3 of *The Works of George Fox* (New York: AMS Press, 1975), 507.

[6]*Propositions and Conclusions concerning True Christian Religion (*1612-14), in Lumpkin, 127.

[7]Ibid., in Lumpkin, 125.

[8]*A Confession of the Faith of Several Congregations of Christ in the County of Somerset, and of Some Churches in the Counties Near Adjacent* (London, 1656), in Lumpkin, 204, 206, 209. Description of the confession is from Lumpkin, 202.

[9]*A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith* (London: G. D. for F. Smith, 1660), in Lumpkin 225, 227. The discussion is from Lumpkin, 339.

[10]Ibid., in Lumpkin, 226, 228; emphasis in original.

[11]Robert Robinson, *The History of Baptism*, ed. David Benedict (Boston: Lincoln & Edmands, 1817), 60.

[12]Thomas Weisser, *Early Baptists Preaching Acts 2:38* (By the author, 1987), 4-7, 11, 12, 15.

[13]Thomas Weisser, *Jesus Name Baptism through the Centuries* (By the author, 1989), 37-38.

[14]Weisser, *Early Baptists*, 24-25, 30-31, quoting the following: Francis Cornwell, *Two Queries Worthy of Serious Consideration, concerning the Gospel Faith of the LORD JESUS the Christ Once Given unto the Saints* (1645), 4; Robert Whittle, *An Answer to Mr. Francis Cornwell's Posi-*

tions and Inferences (London: W. H., 1646), 20; Francis Cornwell, *A Description of the Spiritual Temple* (London: John Dawson, 1646), 44-45, 53, 60.

[15]*Propositions and Conclusions*, in Lumpkin, 134.

[16]*The True Gospel-Faith Declared according to the Scriptures* (London, 1654), in Lumpkin, 193.

[17]*A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith*, in Lumpkin, 229; emphasis in original.

[18]Donald Bloesch, *Essentials of Evangelical Theology* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978) 2:115-16; Schaff, *History* 1:237.

[19]William Penn, *The Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers* (Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore, 1849), 25-28, 39.

[20]William Penn, *No Cross*, *No Crown*, ed. Ronald Sedleck (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1981), cover.

[21]George Fox, *The Great Mystery*, in *Works* 3:180.

[22]Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, *The Quakers*, no. 3 of *Denominations in America* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988).

[23]William Penn, *A Key Opening the Way to Every Capacity How to Distinguish the Religion Professed by the People Called Quakers from the Perversions and Misrepresentations of Their Adversaries*, published with *Rise and Progress* ((Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore, 1849), 15-17.

[24]Thomas Weisser, *Anti-trinitarianism of Early Quakers* (By the author, 1985).

8. The Catholic Reformation

[1]See David K. Bernard, *A History of Christian Doctrine* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1995) 1:245-47, 255-60.

[2]Latourette 2:847.

[3]Ignatius of Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises*, quoted in Lane, 159.

[4]Michael Hamilton, ed., *The Charismatic Movement* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 76; "Charismata," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951) 3:370.

[5]These additional writings are Tobit, Judith, I and II Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus (Sirach), Baruch with Epistle of Jeremiah, Additions to Esther, Song of the Three Holy Children or Prayer of Azariah (added to Daniel 3), History of Susanna (added as Daniel 13), and Bel and the Dragon (added as Daniel 14). For further discussion, see David K. Bernard, *God's Infallible Word* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1992), 84-86.

[6]*The Canons and Dogmatic Decrees of the Council of Trent* (1563), in Schaff, *Creeds* 2:112-13.

[7]Ibid. 2:115, 117-18.

[8]Ibid. 2:123.

[9]"For the Roman Catholic Church, the basis of ecumenical dialogue with Pentecostals, properly speaking, is found in the Catholic recognition of the baptism performed by Pentecostals in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. . . . Our agreement on the trinitarian basis of baptism draws and impels us to unity." "Perspectives on Koinonia: Final Report of the International Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue (1985-89)," par. 54, in *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 12, no. 2 (Fall 1990): 128.

9. Lutheran Orthodoxy

[1]Philip Melanchthon, *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*, trans. and ed. Clyde Manschreck (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 206.

[2]Ibid., 215.
[3]Lane, 121.
[4]Willis, 45-47.
[5]Melanchthon, 11.
[6]Ibid., 16.
[7]Hamilton, ed., 85-86.
[8]Schaff, *History* 1:237.

10. Reformed Orthodoxy

[1]Jacob (James) Arminius, *The Works of James Arminius*, London ed., trans. James Nichols and William Nichols (Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986) 2:722.

[2]Ibid. 2:721; emphasis in original.

[3]Ibid. 2:723; emphasis in original.

[4]Ibid. 2:725.

[5]See Daniel Fuller, *Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 16-17; C. I. Scofield, ed., *The Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1917), 999-1000, 1115, 1002; M. R. DeHaan, *508 Answers to Bible Questions* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1952), 219.

[6]Hamilton, ed., 75; Schaff, *History* 1:237; "Camisards," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings 1:175-76.

[7]"Tongues, Gift of," *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. H. B. Hackett (1870; Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971) 4:3310-11.

11. The Pietists and the Methodists

[1]Philip Jacob Spener, *Pia Desideria* [*Pious Desires*], trans. and ed. Theodore Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 63.

[2]Latourette 2:895.

[3]Dale Brown, *Understanding Pietism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 122-23.

[4]Frank Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, 7th ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1980), 62.

[5]John Greenfield, *When the Spirit Came: The Story of the Moravian Revival of 1727* (1928; Repr. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1967), 9-17.

[6]Ibid., 23-24.

[7]Ibid., 57.

[8]Hamilton, ed., 77, 95.

[9]Greenfield, 34-35.

[10]Donald Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987), 38.

[11]Durant 9:131, 135.

[12]*Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church 1952*, ed. Nolan Harmon (Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1952), 34-35.

[13]John Wesley, *To Mr. S., at Armagh*, in *The Works of John Wesley*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950) 12:248.

[14]John Wesley, *Advice to the People Called Methodist with Regard to Dress*, in *Works* 11:466-69.

[15]John Wesley, *Thoughts on Dress*, in *Works* 11:477-78.

[16]Elmer Clark, *The Small Sects in America* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1937), 111-12.

[17]"Tongues, Gift of," *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898) 4:796.

[18]Stanley Frodsham, *With Signs Following* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1926), 232.

[19]Howard Snyder, *The Radical Wesley* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 96.

[20]John Wesley, *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Conyers Middleton*, in *Works* 10:54-56.

[21]Isaac Watts, *The Glory of Christ*, quoted by Arthur Davis, *Isaac Watts: His Life and Works* (London: Independent Press, 1943), 120.

[22]Emmanuel Swedenborg, *The True Christian Religion* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1933), xv-xix, 268; emphasis in original.

12. The Nineteenth Century

[1]See David Bernard, *God's Infallible Word*, 42-46.

[2]Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928), 399.

[3]Ibid., 747.

[4]Ibid., 743, 747, 395.

[5]Ibid., 738, 741.

[6]Ibid., 391, 397, 750-51.

[7]Schaff, *Creeds* 2:232.

[8]See David Bernard, *A History of Christian Doctrine* 1:119, 129-30, 156, 212.

[9]Robert Davidson, *History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky* (New York: Robert Carter, 1847; Repr. Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1974), 131-62.

[10]Ibid.; Barton W. Stone and John Rogers, *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself with Additions and Reflections* (Cincinnati: J. A. & U. P. James, 1847), 34-42, in Hoke Dickinson, ed., *The Cane Ridge Reader* (N.p., n.d.).

[11]William Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), 133, 227-31.

[12]Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), 25, quoting E. Merton Coulter, *College Life in the*

Old South (New York, 1928), 194-95.

[13]Synan, 25, n. 29.

[14]Stone and Rogers, 13, 275. See also Barton Stone, *History of the Christian Church in the West*, 28, in Hoke Dickenson, ed., *The Cane Ridge Reader*.

[15]Stone and Rogers, *Biography*, 277.

[16]Ibid., 329-31, 346.

[17]Ibid., 61.

[18]Weisser, *Jesus Name Baptism through the Centuries* (By the author, 1989), 38-40.

[19]Stone and Rogers, *Biography*, 325-27, 340.

[20]Horace Bushnell, *God in Christ* (Hartford: Brown and Parsons, 1849), 127, 168-69, 175, 177.

[21]Lyman Abbott, ed., *Henry Ward Beecher: A Sketch of His Career* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), 110, 113, quoting from Henry Ward Beecher, *Views and Experiences of Religious Subjects*, 197; emphasis in original.

[22]Thomas Weisser, *After the Way Called Heresy* (By the author, 1981), 98, citing Levi Paine, *A Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1900), 141-42.

[23]John Miller, *Is God a Trinity?* 3rd ed. (Princeton, NJ: Privately printed, 1922; Repr. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975).

[24]David Campbell, *All the Fulness* (Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, 1975), 167-73.

[25]*A Few Words of Obvious Truth*, 3rd ed. (London: R. Hunter, 1836); repr. as Thomas Weisser, ed., *Baptism in Jesus' Name Early 1800's* (By the editor, 1986).

[26]The building in which Bailey founded his school is now the home of a United Pentecostal Church pastored by Frederick Turley. David Turley, his son, discovered the book.

13. The Holiness Movement

[1]J. Gordon Melton, *The Encyclopedia of American Religions* (Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing Co.) 1:200.

[2]Dayton, 174-75.

[3]Schaff, *History* 1:237

[4]Ibid.

[5]Hamilton, ed., 85-86, 89; Stanley Frodsham, *With Signs Following* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1926), 232.

[6]Bloesch 1:115-16.

[7]W. Robertson Nicoll, ed., *The Expositor's Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956) 5:330.

[8]Hamilton, ed., 95-96.

[9]Fordsham, 234.

[10]"Pentecostal Churches," *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Chicago: William Benton, 1976) 14:31.

[11]C. W. Conn, "Church of God (Cleveland, Tenn.)," in *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley Burgess, et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 198.

[12]Dayton, 177-78.

[13]Latourette 2:xviii.

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources

Arminius, Jacob (James). *The Works of James Arminius.* London edition. Translated by James Nichols and William Nichols. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1986.

Baille, John, et al., editors. *The Library of Christian Classics.* 26 volumes. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1950s.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1989.

—. *Letters of John Calvin.* Compiled by Jules Bonnet. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1858.

—. *Tracts and Treatises in Defense of the Reformed Faith.* Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1958.

Fox, George. *The Works of George Fox.* New York: AMS Press. 1975.

Hubmaier, Balthasar. *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism.* Translated and edited by H. Wayne Pipkin and John H. Yoder. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press. 1989.

Lumpkin, William. *Baptist Confessions of Faith.* Chicago: Judson Press. 1959.

Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works.* Edited by Abdel Wentz. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press. 1959.

Melanchthon, Philip. *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine:*

Loci Communes 1555. Translated and edited by Clyde Manschreck. New York: Oxford University Press. 1965.

Penn, William. *The Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers* and *A Key Opening the Way to . . . the People Called Quakers.* Philadelphia: Friends' Bookstore. 1849.

Schaff, Philip, ed. *The Creeds of Christendom.* Sixth edition. 3 volumes. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1931.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Christian Faith.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1928.

Servetus, Michael. *The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trinity.* Translated by Earl Morse Wilbur. Harvard Theological Studies 16. Edited by James H. Ropes and Kirsopp Lake. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1932.

Simons, Menno. *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons, c. 1496-1561.* Scottdale, PA: Herald Press. 1956.

Spener, Philip Jacob. *Pia Desideria* [*Pious Desires*]. Translated and edited by Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1964.

Stone, Barton W., and John Rogers. *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself with Additions and Reflections.* Cincinnati: J. A. & U. P. James. 1847. In Hoke Dickinson, ed. *The Cane Ridge Reader.* N.p. N.d.

Swedenborg, Emmanuel. *The True Christian Religion.* New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1933.

Walker, Williston. *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism.* Philadelphia and Boston: Pilgrim Press. 1960.

Wesley, John. *The Works of John Wesley.* Third edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1950.

Williams, George Huntston, editor and translator. *The Polish Brethren.* Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 1980.

Zwingli, Ulrich. *Selected Works.* Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1901, 1972.

Secondary Sources

Bainton, Roland. *Here I Stand.* Nashville: Abingdon. 1978.

—. *Hunted Heretic: The Life and Death of Michael Servetus, 1511-1553.* Boston: Beacon Press. 1953.

Barbour, Hugh, and J. William Frost. *The Quakers.* Number 3 of *Denominations in America.* New York: Greenwood Press. 1988.

Berkhof, Louis. *The History of Christian Doctrines.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1937.

Bernard, David. *The New Birth.* Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1984.

—. *Practical Holiness: A Second Look.* Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press. 1985.

Bloesch, Donald. *Essentials of Evangelical Theology.* San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1978.

Boettner, Loraine. *Roman Catholicism.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company. 1962.

Brinton, Crane, et al. *A History of Civilization.* Third edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1967.

Brown, Dale. *Understanding Pietism.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan. 1978.

Brown, Harold O. J. *Heresies: The Image of Christ in the Mirror of Heresy and Orthodoxy from the Apostles to the Present.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday. 1984.

Christian History. Volume 9, number 4. Issue 28: "The 100 Most Important Events in Church History."

Dayton, Donald. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers. 1987.

Dowley, Tim, et al., editors. *Eerdmans' Handbook to the History of the Church.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1977.

Durant, Will and Ariel. *The Story of Civilization.* 11 volumes.

New York: Simon and Schuster. 1935-75.

Gibson, Edgar. *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.* London: Methuen and Company. 1896.

Gonzalez, Justo. *A History of Christian Thought.* Nashville: Abingdon. 1975.

Greenfield, John. *When the Spirit Came: The Story of the Moravian Revival of 1727.* Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship. 1967. Originally published as *Power from on High.* 1928.

Hamilton, Michael, editor. *The Charismatic Movement.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1977.

Harvey, Van. *A Handbook of Theological Terms.* New York: Macmillan. 1964.

Hastings, James, editor. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1951.

Heick, Otto. *A History of Christian Thought.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1965.

Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology.* Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1986.

Johnson, Paul. *A History of Christianity.* New York: Atheneum. 1976.

Klotsche, E. H. *The History of Christian Doctrine.* Revised edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1945, 1979.

Kolenda, Konstantin. *Philosophy's Journey: A Historical Introduction.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. 1974.

Lane, Tony. *Harper's Concise Book of Christian Faith.* San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1984.

Langer, William L., editor. *An Encyclopedia of World History.* Fourth edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1968.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of Christianity.* Revised edition. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1953, 1975.

Mead, Frank. *Handbook of Denominations in the United States.* Seventh edition. Nashville: Abingdon. 1980.

Nigg, Walter. *The Heretics.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1962.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine.* 5 volumes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1971-89.

Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church.* Third revised edition. 8 volumes. 1910. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Snyder, Howard. *The Radical Wesley.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press. 1980.

Strong, Augustus. *Systematic Theology.* Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell. 1907.

Sweet, William. *The Story of Religion in America.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1950.

Synan, Vinson. *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1971.

Wenger, John Christian. *The Doctrines of the Mennonites.* Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House. 1952.

Wilbur, Earl Morse. *A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and Its Antecedents.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1946.

Williams, George Huntston. *The Radical Reformation.* Third edition. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1992.

Willis, Robert. *Servetus and Calvin: A Study of an Important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation.* London: Henry S. King and Company. 1877.

Index

Abbott, Lyman, 266
Absenteeism, 12, 173
Adiaphoristic controversy, 192
Adoptionism, 110
Africa, 166, 259, 260
African Methodist Episcopal Church, 235
Agricola, John, 189-90
Albania, 25
Albigenses, 12
Aldersgate, 224
Alexander VI, 15
Allen, Ethan O., 275
Allen, Richard, 235
Ammann, Jacob, and Amish, 86
Anabaptists, 24, 30, 45, 52, 59, 65-88, 89, 91-95, 105, 109, 146-48, 155, 158, 194, 197, 214, 221, 282-83
Angels and demons, 116, 237
Anglicans, 24-25, 74, 137-47, 183, 197, 211, 214, 224-25, 229-30, 232, 255, 280, 282, 284
Anglo-Catholics, 140, 158, 255
Anthropology. *See* Humanity, doctrine of
Antichrist, 20, 98, 197
Antinomianism, 189-91, 193
Antitrinitarianism, 83-84, 106, 108-10
Apocrypha, 174-75
Apostolic Pentecostals. *See* Oneness Pentecostals
Arianism, 83, 254, 258
Arminius, Jacob, and Arminianism, 150, 204-8, 225, 229
Asbury, Francis, 235
Asia, 166, 260
Assemblies of God, 278
Assurance, 228, 229
Athanasian Creed, 104, 196
Atonement, the, 28-29, 34, 55, 109, 122, 150, 203, 205, 207-8, 236, 250-51
Augsburg, Diet of (1530), 97, 184
Augsburg, Peace of (1555), 22-23, 188
Augsburg Confession, 39, 104, 184, 196
Augsburg Interim, 188, 192
Augustine, 16, 32, 169, 202
Australia, 260
Austria, 22, 25, 93
Bacon, Francis, 242-43
Bailey, David, 266
Bainton, Roland, 100

Báñez, Domingo, 165, 169
Baptism, water: formula, 26, 40, 44, 60-61, 82-84, 88, 94, 101-2, 128, 150-54, 178-79, 280; mode, 40, 44, 82, 88, 101, 109, 128, 149, 221, 225; of believers, 65-66, 72-73, 88, 101-2, 148-49, 282; of infants, 24, 39-40, 43-44, 60, 66, 72-73, 90, 92, 97-98, 128; significance, 38, 43-44, 59-60, 62, 76, 81-83, 88, 96, 101, 109-10, 126-28, 149, 156, 185-86, 220, 225, 263-64
Baptist Missionary Society, 259
Baptists, 87, 148-54, 158-59, 197, 234-35, 257, 259, 260, 271, 280, 282, 284
Basel, 51, 67, 97, 105
Baur, F. C., 247
Bavaria, 23, 25
Baxter, Richard, 146
Beecher, Henry Ward, 265
Belarus, 25
Belgic Confession, 211
Belgium, 25
Bellarmine, 166
Below, Gustav von, 200, 280
Bern, 51, 67
Bernard, 16
Beza, Theodore, 52, 202
Bible, 13, 21, 29, 92, 97, 175, 218. *See also* Scripture, doctrine of
Bigamy, 47
Bill of Rights, 242
Binitarianism, 106
Blacks, 235, 272
Blaurock, George, 66, 68
Boardman, William, 274, 275
Bohemia, 22, 166, 221
Bohemian Brethren, 221
Boleyn, Anne, 138-39
Book of Common Prayer, 141
Book of Concord, 196, 214
Booth, William and Catherine, 272
Borrhaus (Cellarius), 105
Bosnia-Hercegovina, 25
Bradford, A. H., 266
Brazil, 166
Brown University, 234
Browne, Robert, 147
Bucer, Martin, 51, 103-4, 107, 114, 162
Bulgaria, 25
Bullinger, Heinrich, 52, 107, 201
Bunyan, John, 154
Burma, 259
Bushnell, Horace, 264-65
Cajetan, Thomas de Vio, 164
Calixtus, George, 196-99
Callixtus, 254
Calvin, John, and Calvinists, 23, 52, 63, 98-99, 104, 106, 113-35, 144-46, 149-50, 158, 178, 184, 202-3, 211-13, 217, 237, 256, 271, 282-83
Camisards, 214, 283
Camp meetings, 260-62, 271
Campanus, John, 106
Campbell, Alexander and Thomas, 263-64
Campbell, Mary, 279
Cane Ridge meeting, 261

Canisius, Peter, 166
Canon, 30, 45,
Capito, Wolfgang, 103-4, 107
Capuchins, 167-68
Carey, William, 259
Carlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein von, 91-93, 162
Carmelites, 167
Cartwright, Peter, 260
Castellio, 105
Catherine of Aragon, 138, 141
Catholic Apostolic Church, 279
Catholic Reformation, 161-81
Catholics. *See* Roman Catholics
Celibacy, 50, 158
Chalcedon, Council of, 121
Charismatics, 200, 239
Charles I, 145
Charles II, 146
Charles V, 20-22, 97, 139, 184, 188
China, 166-67, 259
Christian and Missionary Alliance, 272
Christian Church, 262-64
Christian perfection. *See* Perfectionism
Christian Scientists, 258
Church, doctrine of, 35-37, 57-58, 73-74, 123-26, 143, 148
Church and state, 37, 44, 46, 58, 66, 70-72, 87, 90, 129-30, 149
Church of England. *See* Anglicans
Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), 272
Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee), 272, 278, 280
Church of God in Christ, 272, 278
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 258
Church of Scotland. *See* Presbyterians
Church of the Brethren, 86, 221
Church of the Nazarene, 272
Churches of Christ, 262-64
Clement VII, 139
Clowes, John, 266
Cocceius, Johannes, 210
Communion. *See* Eucharist
Communism, 69, 246
Confession, 17, 36, 38, 174
Confirmation, 38, 178
Confucius, 166-67
Congo, 166
Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 173
Congregational church government, 74, 88, 90, 125, 145, 147, 149
Congregationalists, 110, 147-48, 232, 234, 264-65, 270, 280
Constantine, 24, 70, 87
Constantinople, 256
Consubstantiation, 41, 194
Conversion, 75-76, 87, 146, 149, 156, 230, 233-34, 270, 273
Cook, Joseph, 266
Copernicus, 163, 242
Cornwell, Francis, 153
Covenant theology, 209-11
Cranmer, Thomas, 139-42
Cromwell, Oliver, 145-47
Crosby, Fanny, 229

Crusades, 12
Cullis, Charles, 275
Curio, 105
Czech Republic, 25, 85, 221
Darby, J. N., 210, 280
Dartmouth University, 234
Darwin, Charles, 246
Dayton, Donald, 276, 281
De Chandieu, 211
Deists, 244-45
Denck, Hans, 66
Denmark, 25, 249
Descartes, René, 243-44
Dialectic, 245-46
Disciples of Christ, 264
Dispensation, papal, 138
Dispensationalism, 210-11, 280
Ditheism, 110
Dominicans, 12, 164-65, 168, 169, 178, 253
Donation of Pepin, 255
Dort, Synod of, 204-9
Dowie, John Alexander, 275
Dreschsel, Thomas, 92
Eastern Orthodoxy, 24, 25, 71, 256-57
Ecclesiology. *See* Church, doctrine of
Eck, John, 162
Eddy, Mary Baker, 258
Edward VI, 141
Edwards, Jonathan, 234
Election, 54-55, 57-58, 118-19, 123-25, 202, 206
Elizabeth I, 24, 141-42
Empiricism, 244
England, 22-25, 52, 82, 137-59, 214, 232, 244, 266, 269, 271, 274, 279, 280, 283-84
Enlightenment, 241-46, 281
Enthusiasts, 31, 92-93, 191, 283
Episcopal church government. *See* Hierarchical church government
Episcopalians, 137
Erasmus, Desiderius, 13, 50, 162
Estonia, 280
Ethiopia, 166
Eucharist, 23, 40-42, 52, 59, 61, 80, 81, 87, 91, 95, 103, 121-22, 129, 156, 178-79, 185, 194, 247, 282
Evangelicals, 43, 237
Evangelists, 230, 234-35, 260, 262, 269-71
Evolution, 246
Excommunication, 20, 86, 247
Existentialism, 250
Extreme unction, 38, 178
Faith, 14, 16-17, 20, 28, 30, 33-34, 39, 42-45, 48, 50, 54, 62, 87, 93, 122-23, 176-78, 189-91, 193, 206-7, 235, 250
Farel, Guillaume, 51, 99, 104, 114
Ferdinand and Isabella, 138
Finland, 25
Finney, Charles, 262, 270, 274
Fire-Baptized Holiness Church, 272
First Helvetic Confession, 201
Flacius, Matthias, 192-94
Fletcher, John, 274
Foot washing, 81, 88
Formula of Concord, 183, 190-92, 194-96, 203

Forty-two Articles of Religion, 141
Fox, George, 155, 157
France, 12, 22, 23, 25, 72, 98, 167, 213-14, 232, 243, 252-53, 283
Francis of Assisi and Franciscans, 71, 167, 253
Franck, Sebastian, 96, 103-4
Frederick the Wise, 20-21, 188
Free Methodist Church, 272
Freewill Baptists, 150
French Confession of Faith, 211
French Revolution, 242, 253
Fundamentalism, 280
Gaddi, Paul, 105
Galilei, Galileo, 163-64, 242-43
Gallicanism, 252-53
Gelasius I, 254
General Baptists, 150-51
General Convention of the New Jerusalem, 237
Geneva, 23, 51, 98-99, 104, 113-14, 130-32, 143, 146
Gentile, John Valentine, 105
Georgia, 223, 261
Germany, 14-23, 25, 68, 72, 76, 84, 93, 105, 196, 200, 217, 224, 245, 247, 250, 280, 281
Gift people (gift adventists), 280
Glossolalia. *See* Tongues
God, doctrine of, 37-38, 99-101, 115-16, 150-52, 235-36, 248-49, 262-66, 282-84. *See also* Jesus Christ; Trinity
Gordon, A. J., 274, 275
Gospel, 31-32, 55-57, 63, 120-21
Grace, 28, 33-34, 50, 101, 169, 176-78, 205, 208, 245
Great Awakening, 233-35
Great Britain. *See* England
Grebel, Conrad, 66, 67
Greece, 25, 71, 256
Greek Orthodox Church, 256
Gregory I, 180
Gregory VII, 180, 255
Gribaldi, Matthew, 105
Grotius, Hugo, 207-8
Gutenberg, Johann, 13
Haller, Berthold, 51
Hans Küng, 254
Hätzer, Ludwig, 66, 82
Healing, 158, 275
Hegel, Georg, 245
Heidelberg Catechism, 202
Helwys, Thomas, 148-49
Henry VII, 138
Henry VIII, 24, 138-41
Hermeneutics, 30-31, 77, 90, 92, 163-64, 175, 242, 280
Herrnhut, 221-22, 224
Hibbard, Daniel, 153
Hierarchical church government, 74, 125, 144-45,
Historical (higher) criticism, 246, 252
Hofmann, Melchior, 66, 91
Holiness, 45-47, 76-80, 84-86, 88, 90, 121, 124, 130-33, 146, 154, 155-56, 220-1, 273-76, 280, 282-84. *See also* Sanctification
Holiness movement, 33, 87, 238, 262, 269-78, 280-81, 284-85
Holland. *See* Netherlands

Holy Club, 223, 229
Holy Roman Empire, 20, 22, 171
Holy Spirit, 31, 61-62, 76, 85, 92-94, 102, 128-29, 153-54, 191, 199-200, 213-14, 222, 273-74, 276-85
Honorius I, 254
Howgill, Francis, 158
Hubmaier, Balthasar, 66-68, 78, 81, 83, 93
Huguenots, 23, 213
Humanists, Catholic, 13, 114, 162, 184
Humanity, doctrine of, 32, 117, 194, 204-5
Hume, David, 244
Hungary, 25
Hus, John, and Hussites, 13, 21, 92, 221
Hut, John, 66
Hutter, Jacob, and Hutterites, 66, 85
Hymns, 36, 58, 222, 229, 232, 233, 270
Iceland, 25
Ignatius of Loyola, 165-66
Independents, 147
Index of Forbidden Books, 172-73
India, 166
Indulgences, 12, 15, 17-19, 27, 50, 137, 174, 179
Infralapsarianism, 203
Innocent III, 12
Inquisition, 12, 23, 172
Interpretation of Scripture. *See* Hermeneutics
Ireland, 25, 279
Irenaeus, 84
Irving, Edward, and Irvingites, 214, 279, 283
Italy, 22, 24, 25, 72, 104-5, 108, 255
James, Book of, 30-31, 193
James I, 144-45
Jan of Leiden, 68
Jansenius, Cornelius, and Jansenists, 170
Japan, 166
Jefferson, Thomas, 244
Jehovah's Witnesses, 258
Jesuits, 110, 165-69, 171, 178
Jesus Christ: deity, 82-84, 96, 100, 105, 108-10, 121, 151, 157, 233, 235-36, 262, 264-66, 282-84; humanity, 42, 61, 90-91, 95, 99, 121, 195, 236
Jesus Name baptism, 26, 40, 60-61, 82-84, 88, 94, 102, 107, 150-53, 154, 263, 280, 282-85
Jewelry, 57, 78, 84-85, 132, 146, 155-56, 220, 227-28, 276
Jews, 45-46, 174
John of the Cross, 167
Judson, Adoniram, 259
Julius II, 15, 138
Justification, 14, 16-17, 20, 26-28, 30, 34, 39, 42-45, 48, 62, 76, 90, 95, 101, 122, 176-77, 191-92, 198, 225, 236, 238, 282
Justinian Code, 73
Kansas, 277
Kant, Immanuel, 245
Keller, Helen, 237

Kentucky, 234, 260-61
Keswick holiness (higher life), 274-75
Kierkegaard, Søren, 249-50
Kiev, 256
King James Version, 138, 145
Knox, John, 143-44, 202
Läsare, 200, 279
Latin, 29, 179-80
Latourette, Kenneth Scott, 284
Law, 31-32, 55-57, 63, 120-21, 189-90, 212
Lee, Ann, 158
Leipzig Interim, 188, 192
Leo IV, 15
Leo X, 15-17, 20
Liberal theology, 246-52, 281
Liberius, 254
Lithuania, 25, 105
Liturgy, 29, 58, 142-43
Livingstone, David, 259
Locke, John, 244
Lord's Supper. *See* Eucharist
Lordship salvation, 190
Louis XIV, 213
Love, 101, 236
Lucaris, Cyril, 256
Luther, Martin, 11, 13-22, 27-48, 52, 55-56, 58-59, 61-63, 73, 91-94, 104, 116, 120, 125, 133-34, 138, 162, 164, 183-85, 189, 191, 193, 194, 199, 202, 224, 237, 282
Lutherans, 22-24, 26-48, 70, 72, 74, 80, 88, 90, 92, 93, 95, 114, 124, 126, 129, 143, 158, 183-200, 207, 214, 217, 220, 222, 279, 282-83
MacDonald, James and Margaret, 279
Mahan, Asa, 274
Major, George, 192-93
Manz, Felix, 66, 67
Marburg, Colloquy of, 52
Marpeck, Pilgram, 66
Marriage, 38, 51, 138-140, 174, 178
Marx, Karl, 246
Mary, doctrine of, 179, 253-54
Mary I, 24, 141
Massachusetts, 147, 154
McGready, James, 260
Medina, Bartolomé, 168
Melanchthon, Philip, 24, 104, 162, 184-89, 192-94, 196, 282
Mennonites, 70, 82, 84-86, 148
Mercenaries, 50-51
Methodists, 223, 227, 229-32, 234-35, 238-39, 259, 260-61, 271-72, 280, 284
Meyer, F. B., 274, 280
Middleton, Dr., 231
Miller, William, 257
Miller, John, 265-66
Milton, John, 146
Minor Church, 83
Missions, 164-67, 220, 222, 237, 259-60, 270-71
Molina, Luis de, 169-70
Monasticism, 15-16, 46, 140, 255
Moody, Dwight, 262, 270, 274-75
Moody Bible Institute, 275
Moravia, 85, 166, 221

Moravians, 199, 221-24, 237, 247, 283
More, Thomas, 140
Morgan, G. Campbell, 274
Mormons, 257
Morrison, Robert, 259
Morzkowski, Peter, 83
Moscow, 256
Münster, 68-70, 72
Müntzer, Thomas, 58, 92-94
Murray, Andrew, 274
Music, 58
Muslims, 12, 25, 256
Mysticism, 12, 224
Nantes, Edit, 23
Naples, 167
National Holiness Association, 271
Nationalism, 13
Nepotism, 173
Netherlands, 22, 23, 25, 68, 76, 84, 147-48, 150, 204
New England, 147, 154, 280
Newman, John Henry, 255
Newton, John, 233
Nicea, Council of, 98
Nicene Creed, 38, 104, 196
Nikon, 257
Nominalism, 12
Nonconformists, 232
North America, 158, 260
North Carolina, 280
Norway, 25
Obedience of faith, 33, 82, 189, 211
Oberlin College, 274-75
Ochino, Bernardino, 132, 168
Oecolampadius, Johann, 51, 103-4, 107
Ohio, 234
Old Believers, 257
Old Catholics, 254
Oneness of God. *See* God, doctrine of
Oneness Pentecostals, 26, 87, 88, 90, 97, 123, 134, 266, 276
Ordination, 36, 38, 178
Origen, 249
Original sin, 32, 39, 55, 75, 126, 176
Osiander, Andrew, 191-92
Ottoman Empire, 25, 256
Owen, John, 147
Oxford, 223, 229
Oxford movement, 255
Ozman, Agnes, 277
Pacifism, 68-70, 77-78, 84, 88, 91, 109, 155-56, 220, 221
Pagans, 55, 162
Palmer, Phoebe, 271, 274
Pantheism, 100, 244
Papacy, 12, 15, 36, 42, 97, 137, 166, 171, 175, 252-55, 285
Papal States, 255
Parham, Charles, 277
Parliament, 140, 145
Particular Baptists, 150-51
Pascal, Blaise, 170
Paul III, 165, 171-72
Paul V, 170
Paul VI, 173
Peasant wars, 45, 71, 93-94
Penance, 16, 17, 38, 137, 178, 227
Penn, William, 156-58

Pennsylvania, 156
Pentecostal Holiness Church, 272, 278
Pentecostals, 33, 43, 87, 200, 238-39, 275-78, 281, 282, 285
Perfectionism, 225-26, 230, 272-74
Persecution, 23, 66-68, 99, 137, 141, 197
Perspicuity of Scripture, 30
Philip of Hesse, 46, 188
Philips, Obbe and Dietrich, 66
Philosophy, 12-13, 55, 162, 243-46
Pietists, 199, 217-24, 237-39, 283
Pilgrim Holiness Church, 272
Pilgrims, 147
Pius IV, 171
Pius IX, 251, 253
Plymouth Brethren, 210, 280, 284
Poland, 25, 83-84, 105, 109-10, 166
Polish Brethren, 83
Portugal, 25
Poupin, Abel, 103
Preaching, 36-37, 80-81, 88, 219
Predestination, 32-35, 40, 43, 54-55, 62, 75, 87, 90, 97, 101, 118-19, 122-23, 133, 149, 150, 169-70, 185, 195-96, 202-9, 225, 236, 282
Presbyterian church government, 51, 125-26, 133, 145
Presbyterians, 23, 125, 134, 201, 213-14, 234, 260-62, 265, 270, 279
Prevenient grace, 176, 205-6, 225
Priesthood of believers, 36, 42, 74, 92, 218-19
Princeton University, 234
Printing press, 13, 87
Probabilism, 168-69
Prokopovic, Theophanes, 256
Prophecy, 92, 94, 147, 213-14
Protestants, 11-26, 42-43, 87, 90, 95, 98, 104, 143-44, 161, 170-74, 179, 197-99, 256, 259-60, 281-85
Providence, 54, 116
Purgatory, 15, 17, 179
Puritans, 23, 134, 144-49, 154, 158, 210, 211, 284
Quakers, 155-59, 197, 284
Quietism, 168, 224
Quintana, Juan de, 97
Radical Reformation, 65-111
Raikes, Robert, 233
Rapture, 280
Rationalists: in nineteenth century theology, 246-52; in philosophy, 243-44; in the Reformation, 89-90, 108
Rauschenbusch, Walter, 251
Readers, 200, 279
Reason, 53, 241-46
Reformation, 11-26, 184, 281-83
Reformed, 23, 24, 49-63, 72, 81, 90, 93-94, 98, 113-35, 183, 197, 201-215, 221, 247, 282-83
Regeneration, 76, 80, 122, 149, 156, 191

Remonstrants, 204
Renaissance popes, 15, 171, 180
Renato, Camillo, 108
Repentance, 45, 75, 189-91, 206-7, 282
Reprobation, 54, 202, 206
Restorationism, 70, 90, 98, 262-64, 275
Revivalism, 233-35, 260-62
Rheims-Douay Bible, 175
Rhode Island, 154
Ricci, Matteo, 166
Ritschl, Albrecht, 250-51
Roberts, Daniel, 149
Robinson, Robert, 152
Roman Catholics, 11-25, 27-28, 38, 41, 58-59, 67, 72, 74, 80, 87, 88, 90, 91, 95, 97, 107, 126, 131, 140, 143, 161-81, 197, 199, 214, 243, 251-55, 260, 281, 284-85
Romania, 25, 110
Romans, Book of, 16-17
Rome, 15, 256
Russell, Charles Taze, 258
Russia, 22, 25, 68, 71, 256-57
Russian Orthodox Church, 256-57
Rutgers University, 234
Sabbath, 212-13, 257
Sabellianism, 83
Sacraments, 38-43, 59-62, 81-84, 95, 126-29, 143, 178-79
Salvation, doctrine of, 32-35, 54-55, 101-3, 122-23, 236
Salvation Army, 272
Sanctification, 16-17, 34-35, 57, 95, 101, 177, 225-29, 238, 272-76, 278. *See also* Holiness
Sankey, Ira, 270
Sattler, Michael, 66
Scandinavia, 23, 25, 72
Schaff, Philip, 16, 26, 66
Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 247-49
Schleitheim Confession, 66, 214
Schwenckfeld, Caspar, and Schwenckfelders, 95-96
Science, 163-64, 242-43
Scotland, 23, 125, 143-44, 214, 279
Scripture, doctrine of, 28, 29-31, 42, 45, 53, 116, 142, 174-76, 199, 212
Second Awakening, 260-62
Second Coming, 79-80, 257
Second Helvetic Confession, 201, 211, 214
Separatists, 147-49, 158
Serbia, 25
Servetus, Michael, 38, 96-108, 116, 186, 282-83
Seventh-day Adventists, 213, 257-58
Sexuality, 46, 50, 51
Shakers, 158
Shunning, 86
Simons, Menno, 66, 70, 76, 78, 91
Simony, 12, 49, 173
Simpson, A. B., 272, 274, 275
Sin, 32, 176, 226-27. *See also* Original sin
Slavery, 233
Slavophile movement, 257

Slovakia, 25
Smith, Joseph, 258
Smith, Elias, 263
Smyth, John, 148-50
Social Gospel, 251
Society of Friends. *See* Quakers
Society of Jesus. *See* Jesuits
Socinus, Faustus, and Socinianism, 108-10
Socinus, Laelius, 108
Socrates, 162
Soteriology. *See* Salvation, doctrine of
Soul sleep or death, 90, 109, 117
South America, 164, 260
Spain, 12, 20, 22, 23, 25, 72, 97, 164, 167
Speier, Diet of, 22, 67
Spener, Philip Jacob, 218-220
Spinoza, Baruch, 244
Spirit. *See* Holy Spirit
Spiritualists, 89-96
Spurgeon, Charles, 271, 275
St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, 23
St. Peter's Basilica, 17
Statues, veneration of, 44, 115, 179
Stone, Barton, 261-63
Storch, Nicholas, 92
Strassburg, 51, 52, 97-98, 103
Strauss, David, 247
Stübner, Marcus Thomas, 92
Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 270
Suárez, Francisco, 167
Subordinationism, 105, 108, 109
Sunday school, 233
Supralapsarianism, 202-3
Swearing (oaths), 77, 88, 155-56, 220
Sweden, 25, 200, 279
Swedenborg, Emmanuel, and Swedenborgians, 235-37
Swiss Brethren, 86
Switzerland, 22, 25, 49-52, 72, 76, 201
Synergistic controversy, 193-94
Taylor, J. Hudson, 259
Tennessee, 234, 280
Teresa of Avila, 167
Tertullian, 117, 186
Tetzel, Johann, 18-19
Theology. *See* God, doctrine of
Thirty Years' War, 25
Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, 142-43, 214
Thomas Aquinas, 164, 169, 253
Tongues, 61-62, 76, 85, 88, 94, 103, 107, 147, 158, 199-200, 213-14, 222, 231-32, 238-39, 258, 261, 277-85
Toplady, Augustus, 229
Torquemada, Tomás de, 12
Torrey, R. A., 274-75
Tractarian movement, 255
Tradition, 42, 44, 53, 62, 70, 103, 116, 142-43, 174, 255
Traducianism, 117
Transubstantiation, 41, 98, 137, 179
Trent, Council of, 170-81, 214
Trinity, 37-38, 82-83, 95-110, 115-16, 121, 150-52, 156-58, 186-88, 233, 235-37, 248-49, 262-66, 282-84
Tritheism, 105, 110
Tübingen school, 247

Tyndale, William, 138
Ubiquity of Christ's body, 42, 61, 121-22, 195
Ukraine, 25
Unconditional election. *See* Predestination
Unconditional eternal security, 75, 87, 150, 205, 208-9
Unitarianism, 108-10
United Church of Christ, 147
United Pentecostal Church International, 278
United States of America, 68, 84, 147, 158, 223, 233-35, 242, 260-66, 269-78, 280-81, 284
Unity of the Brethren, 221
University of Georgia, 261
University of Pennsylvania, 234
Ursinus, Zacharius, 209
Vatican City, 255
Vatican I, 254-55
Vatican II, 181, 255
Vergerio, Pierpaolo, 51, 104
Vermigli, Peter Martyr, 52, 202
Vesalius, 98
Vietnam, 166
Viret, Pierre, 52
Vitoria, Francisco de, 164-65
Vulgate, 175
Waldo, Peter, and Waldenses, 12, 13, 71, 92, 94, 105
Walsh, Thomas, 231
Wartburg Castle, 21, 91
Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, 258
Watts, Isaac, 232-33, 262
Weisser, Thomas, 153, 158
Wellhausen, Julius, 247
Welsh revival, 280
Wesley, John, 33, 87, 223-32, 237-39, 271-73, 282
Wesley, Charles, 223-24, 229
Wesleyan Church, 272
Westminster Confession, 145, 211-14
Westphalia, Peace of (1648), 25
White, Ellen, 257
Whitefield, George, 158, 223-24, 229, 230, 231, 234
Wilberforce, William, 233
Will, human, 32-34, 54, 74-75, 101, 117, 185, 193-94
Wittenberg, 15, 17, 20
Works, 16-17, 20, 30, 33-35, 54-55, 122, 176-78, 190, 192-93, 228
Worms, Diet of, 21
Worship, 58-59, 80-81, 88, 230, 260-61
Wyclif, John, and Lollards, 13, 137
Xavier, Francis, 166
Ximenes de Cisneros, Francisco, 162
Young, Brigham, 258
Zanchi, Jerome, 202
Zephyrinus, 254
Zinzendorf, Nicolas Ludwig von, 221-22, 224
Zurich, 23, 49-52, 65, 67, 113, 201
Zwickau prophets, 71, 92, 94
Zwingli, Ulrich, 23-24, 42, 49-63, 65-67, 70, 73, 87-88, 103-4, 107, 113-14, 116-17, 123-24, 126, 133-34, 138, 162, 194, 201-2, 282-83