

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1149 – December 18, 2011

Soteriology

Turn to John 14:26. We've been working with the Historical Maturing of the Church or the growth of the church down through the corridors of Church History and I've broken it into segments or chunks so we can work with it. The first chunk is AD30-500, the foundational period. And in this period we have three or four major issues that the Holy Spirit brought to the church's attention. The point to recognize is that the Lord Jesus Christ is directing His church from heaven through His agent, the Holy Spirit who has taken up residence in saints on earth. We don't want to get the idea that just because Christ has finished His work on the cross that Christ is just sitting there twiddling His thumbs. He is very actively directing His church, He is the head of the church which is His body and He periodically brings issues to light for His body to struggle with and work through. The first of those is the issue of authority. What is the authority for all of life? What is the source of truth? Answer, the canon of Scripture, the set of written documents. Of course, we highlighted the importance of a written set of documents and showed that Jesus predicted in John 14:26 that a written canon was coming. He said, "But the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said to you." That was necessary because people forget but the Holy Spirit doesn't forget so it was by means of the Holy Spirit working through the apostles that the NT was written down with absolute precision. So the canon was completed early on but the recognition of the canon took some time. By the 4th century the church was overwhelmingly in agreement as to what NT books were on the list. They already had the OT books because they had come from the Jews. So the canon was set. One of the best places to capture the idea of what then is to look at Gal 1:8 because what Gal 1:8 says is that "though we or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we have preached to you, let him be accursed." Think about

what he says, “we or an angel,” so if Paul came back later and said, no, this is the gospel, then they aren’t supposed to listen to him. The point is that once Scripture is written down in history it was set, never to be added to, never to be subtracted from, never to be changed, it was the authority over all men. In verse 8 you see the argument is logical continuity; it has to be consistent with prior revelation. In the OT you have Deut 13 and 18 and in the NT you have 1 John 4 and what all those passages are doing is setting up prior revelation as the standard by which you measure whether someone who comes along and says I’ve got the word of God is valid or not. So the Scripture test of theological continuity.

The next thing Christ brought to the Church’s attention was who is Christ and who is God; the doctrines of Christology and the Trinity. We flippantly sometimes refer to these doctrines, forgetting that it took 300-500 years of debate before these got articulated carefully. They got researched and studied out because of heresy. There were very vigorous claims being made against the deity of Christ and therefore against the Trinity. So serious were these challenges that the Church felt they had to call councils with pastors coming from all over the Mediterranean to sit down and hash them out - what is it that the Scriptures are saying? What is the apostolic teaching here? It wasn’t some thing that got solved over coffee and donuts one morning. That’s the impression you get. For example, when somebody from some cult comes knocking on your door and they pass out this literature and the literature says well, the Church created the Trinity because it got infiltrated by Greek philosophy. Nobody created the doctrine of the Trinity by synthesizing the Bible with Greek philosophy. The doctrine of the Trinity came about by looking at the Scripture text and harmonizing what is there.

We covered Christology and Trinity back with the Life of Christ and we said there are several lines of evidence for the deity of Christ. So let’s review those evidences. The first one is Christ for YHWH Substitutions and we looked at Eph 4. What we mean here is that an OT passage that clearly refers to YHWH is picked up by a NT authors and applied to Jesus. Now you’ve got to admit that’s quite strange for a bunch of Jews to do if those Jews held to a strict monotheism, a monotheism that allowed no diversity. So the logic was if Ps 68:18 refers to YHWH descending, being victorious, rising and giving gifts to men and Paul in Eph 4:7-11 quotes that and applies it to Jesus then the NT authors are implicitly acknowledging that Jesus is YHWH. So that

was one line of argument they used. There are a whole series of these passages we could cite. But the idea is that Christ is substituted for YHWH when the NT authors quote the OT. How do you explain that if Jesus isn't YHWH?

The second line of argument was Christ for God Substitutions in Historic Roles. That is, things only God could do were said to be done by Christ. For example, we could think of Jesus calming the storm on the Sea of Galilee which brought to mind the fact that YHWH alone controlled the waters of the flood and then you see Jesus talk to the Sea of Galilee and say, "Be still" and instantly, in a moment of time all that energy dissipates. How did He pull that off if He isn't God? The most powerful example is Jesus saying I forgive you of sins. That is a powerful argument. Why? Not even a priest could say that. A priest could say God has forgiven your sins. But a priest could not say I forgive your sins. Why? Because the priest isn't the one the person sinned against. God is. Only God can forgive. So if Jesus says I forgive your sins, then it implies that the sins must be against Him and that He must be God who alone forgives sins. That's a powerful argument.

The third line of argument is that you have at least five passages in the NT, three definitely, maybe five, that explicitly claim the deity of Jesus. The first one we all know, John 1:1, "In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God, and the Word was God." It wasn't *a* God, "the Word was God." The second verse in the NT that explicitly declares the deity of Jesus is Titus 2:13, "our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ." The Granville Sharpe Rule there proves that both the noun God and Savior refer to Jesus Christ. A third one is 1 John 5:20 where Jesus is explicitly called God.

Then the problem is that if the NT was claiming deity for Jesus then how did that reconcile with the NT teaching that Jesus was humanity. He got tired, He got hungry, He prayed, He died on the cross, so the critics at this point in church history started to argue hey, you have a contradiction, Jesus can't be God and man, He can only be God or man. The argument hasn't changed. That's one of the beauties of studying church history, the arguments don't change; the same arguments come up again and again. And if you master it the first time around from reading church history then you hear it again, you can say, so what, that was solved centuries ago. The basic argument is that He can't be both, He has to be one or the other. It makes more sense to think

of Jesus as a man, so we'll take this as the true picture and reject the other verses. That's basically the argument, it's always done. The critics who assault the deity of Jesus will always take you to passages that show His humanity. And you can say well so, that's what we're saying, Jesus is man, but Jesus is also God. Well that doesn't make sense. What do you mean it doesn't make sense? Why can't God take to Himself true human flesh? The people at the Council of Chalcedon clarified how it made sense. And that was in the 5th century. What they said at Chalcedon was this and I won't read all of it, just portions "...our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body; of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead, and at the same time of one substance with us as regards his manhood; like us in all respects, apart from sin...recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence, not as parted or separated into two persons," all that was very carefully thought through and written to protect against what? All the heresies about Jesus Christ. Each of those words and expressions are chosen to cut out a heresy about the person of Jesus Christ. So at Chalcedon they had clarified Christology. The early foundational period of Church History had clarified the issues of Authority, Christology and Trinity.

Now we want to move on in church history to the next chunk of time, about AD500-1400, the Middle Ages, sometimes referred to as the Dark Ages. But be careful because that's a label given to this period later on by those of the Enlightenment who considered their epoch to be the dawn of human reason and inner light and the religious people before were stupid, so that's the Dark Ages. They weren't all dark. Francis Schaeffer says, "we must not think that everything prior to the Renaissance had been completely dark. This false concept grew from the prejudice of the humanists (of the Renaissance and the later Enlightenment) that all good things began with the birth of modern humanism." Actually good things began in many cases before the Renaissance. For example, integrated villages, villages working with one another to increase the efficiency of agriculture, towns were built on the grid model, agricultural advancements were made, towns were gradually freed from the feudal system, early universities began to emerge and hospitals

were developed by the Church in order to meet medical needs. So it was not all dark, there were several good things in the Middle Ages.

What was the Holy Spirit teaching in the Middle Ages? If you want a figure to associate with the start of the Middle Ages remember Augustine; Augustine was the brilliant mind at the head of the Middle Ages. You go through the fall of the Western branch of the Roman Empire when they were invaded by the Vandals, the Visigoths, through the first Pope, Gregory I, on to Thomas Aquinas, then you come to the Reformation. So from Augustine to Luther and Calvin at the Reformation. What was the Holy Spirit teaching in this period of time? The next thing for the Church to work out was what did Jesus do on the cross? And how are the benefits applied to me? Two issues both related to soteriology or the study of salvation. So this week we'll work with what did Christ do, what is the cross of Christ and next week we'll work with the personal reception of the benefits, how the cross is applied. But all this is under the theme of Soteriology.

Both of these have been heavily discussed and debated. Remember, when you study the Bible, you are not the first person to see these texts. Lots of people have seen them before you have, and a lot of people have thought about them before you have and the Holy Spirit has worked with them before you or I came along. So we might just benefit from going back and looking at the questions they asked of the text and the answers they got from the text. It helps.

It also helps to know their conclusions because then you can trace how they work out, where it leads, which often takes two or three centuries to see. So, if I believe this, where does that lead me? What if I believe that? Church history is a laboratory of ideas. What happens if I deny the full humanity of Jesus? Where does that lead me with respect to salvation? Where it leads you is there's no atonement for humans. What if I deny the full deity of Christ? Then you don't have any revelation of God and knowing Jesus wouldn't mean knowing God and if salvation is knowing God then knowing Jesus doesn't save you. If Scripture isn't our authority then reason and imagination have to be the authority; there has to be some authority. What authority are you appealing to? So you can go through these "what if" scenarios. Those are arguments you can trace out.

Working with the Soteriological Work of Christ I want to give you a sample of what the early church fathers said when they referred to the work of Christ. Here is a second or third century guy and just from reading him you see they were not asking profound questions about the work of Christ, they just sort of said it and moved on without much explanation. That doesn't mean they weren't thankful for the work of Christ, they were very thankful, they just hadn't asked a lot of questions about it and so their grasp of it was somewhat thin. "O the sweet exchange," notice the word "exchange," some people say oh well it's only the fundamentalists that thought of the substitutionary atonement of Christ. Excuse me! What do you see there? "O the sweet exchange, O the inscrutable creation, O the unexpected benefits; that the iniquity of many should be concealed in One Righteous Man, and the righteousness of One should justify many that are iniquitous!" You can see there's some good stuff in there, this guy was unquestionably orthodox; it's just that there's not a lot of clarification of the terms, of what is meant and it's sort of mimicking the Scriptural words but there's simply no articulation of the meaning. And whenever you aren't clear it's only a matter of time before people start debating the meaning. Notice what was going on that stimulated heretical views of Christ. Shelley recounts, "To Arius, when Christians called Christ God, they did not mean that he was deity except in a sort of approximate sense." See, there were different understandings of Christ is God. People say, oh, they must mean this. These are the interpretive games that are played with language. Arius says, what they mean is that "He was a lesser being or half-God, not the eternal and changeless Creator. He was a created Being—the first created Being and the greatest, but nevertheless himself created."¹ So that's why you've got to clarify.

One of the key theologians in church history during the Middle Ages that came along to clarify Soteriology was a man named, Anselm (AD1033-1109). There were lots of important theologians. I'm singling out Anselm because he wrote a book, *Cur Deus Homo* (*Why the God-Man* or *Why God became Man*) that is considered to be one of the greatest books the world has ever seen. Of course we wouldn't dare have one of the greatest books ever written in the public school system for fear of the ACLU, but truly literate people are concerned with these great books. You don't even have to buy this one, if you do a search on the internet you can find it. I've read sections of it, I haven't read the whole thing but it's a conversation between Anselm and a man

named Boso, strange name but it's a dialogue that goes back and forth. You ought to read some of it just to realize, hey, there were other believers in other centuries who really thought about the Scripture and the Holy Spirit really worked in their life and we're brothers in Christ. It kind of helps your faith to realize that these guys are reading the same sheet of music we are.

Anselm's contribution was in the area of the atonement. What was the atonement accomplishing? Where was the atonement directed? Up to that time the majority view in the church was the Ransom view, that it was directed to Satan. Satan had to be paid off, we were being kept ransom by Satan and so what Christ did was pay Satan the ransom. That's what most Christians believed. Well, Anselm said, no, there is a debt that has to be paid but it's not paid to Satan it's paid to God. So he came to the view that the heart of what was really going on was that God is just and God's justice was offended and so what Christ did was satisfy God's justice. It's called the satisfaction view of the atonement. Let's look at it.

What did we say was the basic idea you have to have straight in your head to understand the cross work of Christ? You have to have straight in your head the idea of God's justice. If you don't have the concept of God's justice you'll never be able to understand the work of Jesus Christ. To get the true idea of justice, where do you go? You have to go to the OT. The OT gives you the idea of what justice is all about and the core of justice in the OT is restitution. That is, if something is wrong, something has been broken, stolen or destroyed it has to be restored. In fact, it's more than that. It has to be restored and then some because of the lost time, the psychological damage, etc... God demands that it be restored three or four times. It's not man demanding this it's God demanding this. Why does God have such high demands? That's one of the great issues in church history. Why the cross of Christ? Why not some other thing? Anselm tried to answer that.

There was a little debate going on at the time. Here are two views that they had about the cross issue. Some said that God demands the cross because His character demands it. That is, God's character has a shape to it that necessitates the cross. Others said that God demands it because He chose it to demonstrate His love for us, but He could have, and this is the important point, He could have chosen another way. So the cross is not necessary

because of God's character, it's just the way God chose to do it and any number of ways could have been chosen by God with the same result.

So one view said it's *necessary* because God's character necessitates it. God is just and His justice demands restitution be made by a satisfactory payment and Jesus Christ on the cross is the only satisfactory payment, there is no other possibility, even God Himself could not come up with another satisfactory payment that would meet the demands of His character.

Those who argued the other way said well, Jesus is the only way of salvation, but had God wanted to He could have designed another way for man to be saved; men could have theoretically been saved in some other way if God decided another way. They say God had the freedom, the freedom to design the salvation package however He wanted to design it. They granted and fully accepted that the cross is the only way. That's not the debate. The debate was whether there could be another way. The danger of this is that this leads to other things. For example, people can say gee, can God ever decide that a square be a circle? Could God ever declare that murder is okay? Could God do this? Could God do that? Could God do something else? It opens up this God is free to do whatever He wants business which is stemming from an alternative view of God, namely that God has an arbitrary nature, He is a God of caprice and does whatever He wants. That turns God into some sort of an amorphous, character-less God, He just does whatever He wants, there are no internal controls. And that's not the revelation we have of God. Think of how many passages in the Psalms you read, O God... and they worship Him because of some aspect of His nature. So that view gradually was rejected and this view that God had a definite character was left and therefore the cross of Christ is the only way of salvation because it is the only possible way to satisfy the very nature of God Himself. You cannot be saved any other way; there is no other way but satisfying His character, period! Even God Himself, as it were, cannot save in any other way than this way. His nature necessitates it.

Here's Anselm's argument and I want you to follow the logic of it. There's a logic to brilliant argument that stems from God's nature. God is just and therefore His justice must be satisfied before there can be any forgiveness of sin. Church historian Phillip Schaff summarizes, "Can man make this satisfaction? No. Were it possible for him to lead a perfectly holy life, from the

moment he became conscious of his debt, he would be simply doing his duty for that period. The debt of the past would remain unsettled...ⁱⁱ God's justice, then, man is not able to satisfy...ⁱⁱⁱ But as God himself must make the satisfaction, and man ought to make it, the satisfaction must be made by one who is both God and man, that is, the God-man...^{iv} To make satisfaction, the God-man must give back to God something he is not under obligation to render. A life of perfect obedience he owes...Death he does not owe, for death is the wages of sin, and he had no sin. By submitting to death, he acquired merit. Because this merit is infinite in value, being connected with the person of the infinite Son of God, it covers the infinite guilt of the sinner and constitutes the satisfaction required."^v

Now, Anselm brought this clarification to the church but look at the response. Don't think this went unchallenged. For every clarification there comes somebody to muddy the waters. And here's the man who came to muddy it all up. His name was Peter Abelard; notice the dates, 1079-1142; Peter Abelard came on the scene slightly behind Anselm. This guy was a real piece of work when it came to women but I really want you to understand what Abelard said here, because this has come up 1001 times since Abelard, it's coming up today in our own evangelical circles. It comes up in a lot of so-called Christian circles, again and again and again and again; it's like nobody ever thought of this before in church history.

Anselm was a critic; he was a guy who liked to tear stuff down. If you taught one thing he'd teach the opposite. Against Anselm's Satisfaction Theory came the attack of Peter Abelard who sought to explain the work of Christ by his early version of the Moral Influence Theory. He argued that Christ "did not make satisfaction to divine justice and appease God's wrath." The cross of Christ was a manifestation of God's love..."and thus to stir up love in the breast of man, and to draw man by love back to Himself. God might have redeemed man by a word, but He chose to set before man an exhibition of His love in Christ." See, he could have done it any way He wanted Abelard argued. What does he want to do? Make God's nature amorphous, you know, God isn't required to deal with sin by this cross thing, He could have done it any way He wants, God is free. See how modern this sounds. So Abelard... this guy is smart, he isn't some guy that's an idiot, he's thought this through, and for Peter Abelard, his argument was that Anselm is so judgmental, every time you guys talk about the work of Christ on the cross you're always

talking about justice; I want to put God's justice in the background, I want to deal with God's love. So he split God's love off from His justice, and the emphasis was put on God as a loving God. It's always this way, sacrifice God's justice on the altar of love. As Charles Clough says, "He argued that humanity's problem wasn't sin before a holy God but lack of love and selfishness. The purpose of the Cross," and here's the key sentence, watch this sentence, "The purpose of the cross, therefore," for Peter Abelard, "was to demonstrate love and selflessness. It generates," now watch this, here's salvation starting to come in, watch what you've done now, we've moved away from justice and we've turned to love. By the way, this is what's so subtle about Abelard. Isn't it true that the cross is a demonstration of love and selflessness? It sure is: "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son," but there's something greasy going on here. We want to do a little exercise; I want you to follow with me in the remaining part of this class because this is how Satan hits us. He'll take a truth that's really half true and then he greases the sled and kind of gets us off the road. You know, we slide off the road this way or we slide off the road that way; you can't stay on the road. So what he did, he picked up a true thing, that the cross does demonstrate God's love, but what he did in so doing that was that he shoved justice aside and isolated the attribute of love and emphasized love, love, love, love, and then he said well how does the cross save you? Well if it's a demonstration of love, and it's an act of love, it solicits your response. So to Abelard salvation is an emotional response to a message of love. He says, "It generates a human emotional response in order to change human behavior." That's how it saves, the cross becomes an inspiration to reform our selves and change our behavior and that's how we are saved. *"This Abelardian Moral Influence Theory has recurred again and again since the Middle Ages throughout Unitarianism, liberalism, and even in evangelical revivalism."* It's easy to slip into because there is a truth here. The cross does show God's love, but is that all that is needed? Is that sufficient? That's not all the truth. Now careful here, we're not denying that the cross shows God's love. But why is it that the cross does show God's love? Turn to John 12:32; there is Scripture to support what looks like Abelard's view of the atonement. What does it say? Jesus said "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to Myself." So it is an influence but however much influence it exerts it is due first and foremost to the fact it satisfied God. In other words, if God's justice wasn't satisfied first of all, and there was no real necessity of blood atonement, isn't the cross a little excessively bloody and brutal? Aren't there

other ways that God could have showed His love to us than having His own Son nailed to a cross just for a show? Is the cross just a show? Do you see what it does to the cross? It makes it strange. If the cross is just showing God's attribute of love, it's a pretty bloody love message, unless there is a justice issue behind it and God is showing us His love by solving the judicial issue that came up in His nature.

To see that and how that comes together, turn to Rom 3, that classic passage. The Reformers all went here, to Rom 3, and this verse is where the justice and the love of God come together. Keep in mind Abelard wanted to separate the two. The Unitarians wanted to separate the two. The liberals want to separate the two. But Paul combines the two and he does so precisely because of the cross in Rom 3:26. In Rom 3:26, he's talking about the cross as a demonstration, but what is it the demonstration of? Paul elsewhere says yes the cross is a demonstration, for while we were yet sinners Christ died; God manifested His love toward us. Paul knows about the love, but in verse 26 he's not talking about love per se, he's says it's a demonstration of His what? "...of His righteousness at the present time, that He might be just," there's His nature, "that He might be just and" at the same time, "the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus." But you don't split love away from justice.

So the fight in this period of time, in the Middle Ages, the primary debate was going on about why the cross and what did the cross do? We want to summarize some of this and where these ideas lead. Remember I said church history is a laboratory. You can always go to church history and ask yourself, I would like to see what happens when we believe this way. Then you watch day after day after day, oh, that's where that theology leads.

So what happens if we are Abelardians? It's all a big moral influence, makes us behave better. Where does that lead us? It has moved the central issue away from God's character, God's justice and it has made it man's psychology, man's emotion. It's a man-centered thing. The cross gets its justification only by what it does for them. Gee, it moves men emotionally making them want to repay God, or to behave better, etc. It's primarily a man-centered thing. It's primarily a psychological thing; it's what goes on inside man's heart that is the issue.

Are we denying that salvation affects man psychologically? No, of course it affects man psychologically, but the point is that you cannot eliminate the justice behind it, God's justice is the primary reason for the cross, and secondarily yes, it has psychological effects, but it has psychological effects only because first it has resolved the issue, the fundamental issue of my relationship with God.

And I don't think God is going to be too impressed if you stand up before Him at the judgment and say, well, gee, the cross really made me emotional and so look how I changed my life. I don't think He's going to be too impressed with the changes. He's going to deal with your nature and your acts. You violated My nature and I satisfied My nature by giving My only Son and what did you do with My Son? The issue isn't you, the issue is up here in Me, it's not man, it's God. So the Middle Ages was a time when the issue was let's deal with the objective nature of the cross, not just the subjective; that will come, but it's got to be objective first or it washes out into a man-centered, psychological thing.

The Abelardian influence was not killed off in the Middle Ages. It has gone on and like the other things that we've talked about, you can trace it in church history. We've had the authority of Scripture, we've had the doctrine of the Trinity, we've had the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and now we're talking about the work on the cross. These were settled; we checked them off in that they came to be settled in open public debate. That does not mean that there are not still attempts to deny these. There are always going to be attacks against each of these points, but as church history went on in time, these things had their day of discussion. So when somebody starts talking to you about the Trinity, that's old. That's been debated. There's no argument that somebody is going to bring up that wasn't handled back before AD451. There are no new arguments here. So it's old news, and when somebody tries to tell you, like the liberal pastors, all about the cross of Jesus and weep tears about the cross of Jesus Christ, and have no more meaning in their words than Abelard did, its old news.

Next time we're going to deal with what the Reformation dealt with, because here's a problem and here's how this thing wasn't finished with Anselm. After we agree that the justice of God is the center of focus and not the psychology of man, the Church then had the question of does the grace of God coming

through that cross save from all sin right now, or does it only save from my past sins, and the sins that I will commit aren't yet forgiven, the cross hasn't been applied to those yet?

This left open a door that came to be powerfully expressed in Roman Catholicism through the doctrine of the sacraments. There was no debate that whatever merit existed came through Christ on the cross, that wasn't a debate between Protestants and Catholics. Both Protestants and Catholics agree to that. But what was a debate was how much of that merit comes down, how much of that merit is appropriated, and on what basis does that merit come to you and to me? Does it come instantly? Does it come through a baptism of an infant, through the sacrament of baptism? The Roman Catholic Church holds that baptism washes the past sins of the infant up to the point of the baptism, and then from there on it comes through the mass, it's participation in the sacraments, etc. that bring down the merit of the cross, the merit of the cross, the merit of the cross, and hopefully the merit of the cross will be applied enough so that you'll eventually be saved.

Or, as Luther and Calvin said, and this was a bombshell, this was a nuclear bomb. If you contrast this you see the power of what happened in the Reformation. Calvin and Luther argued that the merits of Jesus don't dribble down; the merits of Jesus are solely deposited to your account at the point of salvation, period! Jesus Christ's cross saved from past sin, present sin and future sin. Oh said the Church, you can't teach that, if you teach that people will go out and lead licentious lives. The repercussion of that came back on the Protestants and the Protestants said gee, maybe we shouldn't teach that, so they started to hedge. So you had a backlash, it's called the Council of Trent. The Catholics got together and they attacked Luther, they attacked Calvin, they attacked the Protestants, you people have unleashed men, you have made sinful men think they are not under the justice of a wrathful God, you Protestants have immunized men against that, and you watch, your ranks will be filled up with the licentious people who could care less because you've told them they've completely been saved. You can see where this is headed.

That created a whole second issue, and that's the issue we're going to talk about next week with the Protestant Reformation. So these are all things

that the Holy Spirit has led the Church through and through the Scriptures I teach and the Scriptures you read, we understand these great debates that went on over these texts and after fighting them out the Church grew in doctrinal maturity and in appreciation for what God has done.

ⁱ Shelley, B. L. (1995). *Church history in plain language* (Updated 2nd ed.) (100). Dallas, Tex.: Word Pub.

ⁱⁱ Schaff, P., & Schaff, D. S. (1997). *History of the Christian church*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

ⁱⁱⁱ Schaff, P., & Schaff, D. S. (1997). *History of the Christian church*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

^{iv} Schaff, P., & Schaff, D. S. (1997). *History of the Christian church*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

^v Schaff, P., & Schaff, D. S. (1997). *History of the Christian church*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2011